

New Contributions to the History
of the Ukrainian Language

Peter Jacyk Centre
for
Ukrainian Historical Research

Monograph Series
Number seven

New Contributions to the History of the Ukrainian Language

Michael Moser



Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press
Edmonton 2016 Toronto

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6G 2H8

University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5T 1W5

Copyright © 2016 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
ISBN 978-1-894865-44-9 (pbk.)

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Moser, Michael, 1969-, author

**New contributions to the history of the Ukrainian language
/ Michael Moser.**

**Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-894865-44-9 (paperback)**

1. Ukrainian language--History. I. Title.

PG3815.M67 2015

491.7'909

C2015-906050-8

The translation and publication of this book has been funded by the Austrian Science Fund (Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, START prize project Y-271 "1,000 Years of Ukrainian Language History in Galicia") and by a generous grant from the Ukrainian Studies Fund, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. A grant for this publication was also provided by the Canadian Foundation of Ukrainian Studies. This book has also been published with financial support from the Cosbild Investment Club Endowment Fund and the Julian and Savella Stechishin Endowment Fund at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in Canada

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Preface	xi
Part I: Instead of an Introduction: Does Ukrainian Have a History?	1
Contemporary Anti-Ukrainian Myths about the History of the Ukrainian Language, or: Does Ukrainian Have a History?	3
Part II: Ukrainian in Contact: The Early Modern Period	37
Phonetic Polonisms in Lavrentij Zyzanij's <i>Slavonic Grammar</i>	39
Too Close to "the West"? The Ruthenian Language of the <i>Instruction of 1609</i>	64
Was Ivan Uževyč's <i>Розмова-Бесѣда</i> Really Not Based on a Polish Model?	77
Some Phonologically Marked Meta-Polonisms in Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stravrovec'kyj's <i>Перло мношцѣнное</i>	90
The <i>Synopsis</i> and Maciej Strykowski's <i>Kronika</i> : Ruthenian Ways of (Re)Translating Rus'ian History from Polish	105
A Linguistic Analysis of Ivan Mazepa's Universals and Letters	121
How It All Began: Ukrainian-Russian "Surzhyk" in Eighteenth-Century Sources from the Hetmanate	138
Part III: The Long and Winding Road: Ukrainian Becoming a Standard Language	169
"Ruthenians" and the "Ruthenian Language" in Galician Grammars Dating from the First Half of the Nineteenth Century	171
Ukrainian Dialectal Materials in Galician Sources of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century	219
The Slavic Idea among Galician Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in the Przemyśl Eparchy (from 1830 to 1848–49)	229
"Austro-Ruthenian"? The Vienna <i>Вѣстникъ</i> as a Newspaper "for the Ruthenians of the Austrian State"	245
Some Notes on Code-Switching in Taras Ševčenko's Letters	299
Pantelejmon Kuliš, the Galicians, and the Ukrainian Language (1863–1876)	305

Ukrainian “Language-Building” in Light of Ukrainian Nation-building —Critical Remarks on the Historiography of the Ukrainian Language	337
Populists Editing “Old Ruthenians”: “Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) Textbooks for Galician Primary Schools	350
The Linguistic Legacy of the Galician Russophiles (Based on the Works of Ivan Naumovyč)	377
Part IV: Challenges to the Standard Language: Ukrainian in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries	409
The “Mirror from Overseas”: The History of Modern Standard Ukrainian as Reflected in the North American Ukrainian Newspaper <i>Svoboda</i> (The Early Years: from 1893 to the 1930s)	411
Ivan Pan'kevyč's <i>Grammar of the Ruthenian Language</i> and the Galician Ukrainian Language in Subcarpathian Rus'	445
Rusyn: A New-Old Language between Nations and States	471
“Ukrainization” and the Ukrainian Language	482
Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting: The Galician Variant of the Ukrainian Language and Anti-Ukrainian Discourse in Contemporary Internet Sources	585
Language Politics in Contemporary Ukraine (25 February 2010–25 February 2011)	601
Bibliography	620
Index	658

Acknowledgments

Contemporary Anti-Ukrainian Myths about the History of the Ukrainian Language, or: Does Ukrainian Have a History? Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. Extensively revised by the author for this volume. **Originally published as:** "Antiukrainische sprachgeschichtliche Mythen der Gegenwart" in *Wo liegt die Ukraine? Standortbestimmung einer europäischen Kultur*, ed. S. Höhne and J. H. Ulbricht (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 2009), 197–226.

Phonetic Polonisms in Lavrentij Zyzanij's Slavonic Grammar. Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** Фонетичні полонізми у Граматиці Лаврентія Зизанія. In: Українська історична та діалектна лексика. Збірник наукових праць, вип. 5. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. Івана Крип'якевича 2007, 111–143.

Too Close to "the West"? The Ruthenian Language of the Instruction of 1609. Originally written in English. **Forthcoming** in a conference volume edited by Serhii Plokhii (Harvard University), Marko Pavlyshyn (Monash University, Melbourne, Australia), Giovanna Brogi (University of Milan), and Giulia Lami (University of Milan).

Was Ivan Uževyč's Розмова-Бесѣда Really Not Based on a Polish Model? Translated from the Ukrainian by Michael Moser. **Originally published as:** Чи «Розмова – Бесѣда» Івана Ужєвича написана під впливом польських зразків? In: Писемні пам'ятки: сучасне прочитання. Редколегія: Г. Дидик-Меуш (відп. ред.) – Н. Багнюк – Ю. Осінчук. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. Івана Крип'якевича 2011, 16–27.

Some Phonologically Marked Meta-Polonisms in Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj's Перло многѣѣнное. Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. **Originally published as:** "Einige phonologisch markierte Metapolonismen in Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyjs „Перло многѣѣнное"". In *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia byzantina. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Dagmar Christians, Dieter Stern, and Vittorio S. Tomelleri. Munich: Otto Sagner, 2009, 430–447.

The Synopsis and Maciej Strykowski's Kronika: Ruthenian Ways of (Re) Translating Rus'ian History from Polish. **Originally published in:** *Translation and Tradition in "Slavia orthodoxa,"* ed. Boris Gasparov and Valentina Izmirlieva. Münster, Vienna, and Zurich: LIT Verlag, 2012, 141–158.

A Linguistic Analysis of Ivan Mazepa's Universals and Letters. Originally published in: *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth*, ed. Serhii Plokyh. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2012, 391-411. Reprinted with permission. © 2013 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

How It All Began: Ukrainian-Russian "Surzhyk" in Eighteenth-Century Sources from the Hetmanate. Originally written in English for this volume.

"Ruthenians" and the "Ruthenian Language" in Galician Grammars Dating from the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** „Русини” й „руська мова” в галицьких граматиках першої половини XIX століття. In: Українська мова в Галичині: історичний вимір (Серія „Історія мови”). Відп. ред.: Ярослав Ісаєвич – Міхаель Мозер – Наталія Хобзей. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України 2011, 9–54.

Ukrainian Dialectal Materials in Galician Sources of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** Українські діалектні матеріали в галицьких джерелах першої половини XIX століття. In: Лінгвістичний атлас: від створення до інтерпретації. Відп. ред.: Наталія Хобзей – Павло Гриценко. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. Івана Крип'якевича, Київ: НАН України 2006, 71–81.

The Slavic Idea among Galician Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in the Przemyśl Eparchy (from 1830 to 1848–49). Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** Слов'янська ідея в середовищі галицьких русинів (українців) перемиської єпархії (1830–1848/49 rr.). In: *Amoenitates vel lepores philologicae (Festschrift for Waclaw Twardzik)*, ed. Roman Laskowski and Roman Mazurkiewicz. Cracow: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN – Wydawnictwo „Lexis,” 2007, 416–427.

"Austro-Ruthenian"? The Vienna *Вѣстникъ* as a Newspaper "for the Ruthenians of the Austrian State." Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. **Originally published as:** „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*, ed. Michael Moser and András Zoltán. Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2008, 29–100.

Some Notes on Code-Switching in the Letters of Taras Ševčenko. Originally published in: *Жнива. Essays Presented in Honor of George G. Grabowicz on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Roman Koropec'kyj, Taras Koznarsky, and Maxim Tarnawsky. Special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 32–33, Part One (2011–14): 543–49. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2015. Reprinted with permission. © 2015 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Pantelejmon Kuliš, the Galicians, and the Ukrainian Language (1863–1876). Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. **Forthcoming** in conference proceedings edited by Alfred Sproede (Münster).

Ukrainian “Language-Building” in Light of Ukrainian Nation-building—Critical Remarks on the Historiography of the Ukrainian Language. Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. **Originally published as:** Die Ukrainer auf dem Weg zur Sprachnation – kritische Anmerkungen zur ukrainistischen Sprachhistoriographie. In: *Die Ukraine. Prozesse der Nationsbildung*, ed. Andreas Kappeler. Vienna: Böhlau, 2011, 97–110.

Populists Editing “Old Ruthenians”: “Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) Textbooks for Galician Primary Schools. Translated from the German by Michael Tauchmann. **Originally published as:** „Ruthenische“ (ukrainische) Volksschullesebücher der galizischen Volkstümmler („Narodovci“). In: *Die slavischen Grenzen Mitteleuropas. Festschrift für Sergio Bonazza*, ed. Stefan Aloe. Munich: Otto Sagner, 2008, 149–166.

The Linguistic Legacy of the Galician Russophiles (Based on the Works of Ivan Naumovyč). Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** 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*, ed. Andrii Danylenko and Serhii Vakulenko. Munich and Berlin: Otto Sagner, 2012, 154–180.

The “Mirror from Overseas”: The History of Modern Standard Ukrainian as Reflected in the North American Ukrainian Newspaper *Svoboda* (The Early Years: from 1893 to the 1930s). Originally published in English. In: *Slavic Languages in Migration*, ed. Michael Moser and Maria Polinsky. Vienna et al.: LIT-Verlag, 2013, 43–80.

Ivan Pan'kevych's *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language and the Galician Ukrainian Language in Subcarpathian Rus'*. Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Olynyk. **Originally published as:** „Граматика руського языка“ Івана Панькевича та галицька українська мова в Підкарпатті. In: *Studium Carpato-Ruthenorum – Штудії з карпаторусиністики 2009*, ed. Kvetoslava Koporová. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, 2010, 68–93.

Rusyn: A New-Old Language between Nations and States. Originally written in English. **Forthcoming** in a volume on “Borders and Languages,” ed. Tomasz Kamusella and Motoki Nomachi.

“Ukrainization” and the Ukrainian Language. Originally written in English for this volume.

Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting: The Galician Variant of the Ukrainian Language and Anti-Ukrainian Discourse in Contemporary Internet Sources. Originally published in: *Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe*, ed. Larissa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych and Maria G. Rewakowicz. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2009, 316–335. Copyright © 2009 by M. E. Sharpe, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved. Not for reproduction.

Language Politics in Contemporary Ukraine (25 February 2010–25 February 2011). Originally written in English. **Forthcoming** in a Slovak volume on Ukraine to be edited by L'ubor Matejko.

Preface

The idea of this volume was born on the eve of the 150th anniversary of the Valuev Directive (Valuev Circular), when a couple of colleagues and friends decided to join me once again in demonstrating that, contrary to the well-known phrase from that Russian imperial document of 1863, Ukrainian is certainly not “a language that did not, does not, and cannot exist” but in fact a language with an intriguing past, present, and future. One of the projects we envisaged was a collection of my more recent articles that would in a way continue and build on my Ukrainian-language *Pryčynky do istoriji ukrajins'koji movy* (Contributions to the History of the Ukrainian Language). That collection of articles, first published in 2008, has been reissued twice, thus vividly confirming that interest in Ukrainian philology and linguistics remains vital, in Ukraine and elsewhere.

In the present volume, I raise a variety of new issues in the hope that they will help develop our understanding of the past and present of one of the world's largest languages, which deserves to be studied more carefully than hitherto.

In the first part of the book, I discuss the question of whether the Ukrainian language has a history at all. My arguments are built upon responses to various widely held beliefs—myths, actually—about the history of the Ukrainian language as frequently encountered in a variety of scholarly works, on the Internet, and in everyday conversation (as frequently witnessed by myself). Although my *New Contributions*, just like the *Pryčynky*, do not dwell particularly on the study of the medieval Slavic languages of Rus', I offer some new arguments to suggest why the term “Old Russian” is ultimately no less anachronistic than “Old Ukrainian” and why both terms can still make sense, although in most cases one should, admittedly, speak rather of “Old Rus'ian” or “Old East Slavic” (*nota bene*, these terms are largely anachronistic as well). This introductory article also strongly maintains that although the glottonym “Ukrainian language” is in fact of quite recent origin, we have little reason to doubt the value of studying the “Ukrainian” language of earlier periods, even if it was not fully standardized (what language was?), because variants of Ukrainian have, of course, always been Slavic dialects, but we have no reason to describe them as dialects of Russian, Polish, Belarusian, or any other language. As soon as we allow ourselves to speak of “Old Russian,” “Old Polish,” or “Old Belarusian,” we are fully entitled to employ the term “Old Ukrainian,” even if variants that were only later termed “Ukrainian” served as a basis for shared written traditions within a medieval “Rus'ian” and, later, an early modern “Ruthenian” framework.

Part II offers a couple of articles that examine the essence of Ruthenian and, more particularly, Ukrainian contacts with Polish, Ukrainian, and Church Slavonic in the early modern period. They highlight the fact that, as in other languages, genetically different forms coexisted in early modern Ukrainian texts and contributed their share to the makeup of an admirably developed Ruthenian

written language. What I also wish to demonstrate is that the impact of Polish on some variants of early modern Ruthenian was in fact enormous, but that this obviously was not considered problematic in early modern times, as opposed to later periods. The influence of "Russian" increasingly gained ground during the eighteenth century, the path having been paved initially and primarily by common Church Slavonic traditions, as demonstrated in my paper on the language of Ivan Mazepa's chancery and the earliest traces of "Surzhyk." Finally, the studies in this section on the early modern period attempt to shed some light on the multifaceted textual history of some key texts of early modern Ukrainian written culture, which is in fact one of the richest written cultures of early modern *Slavia ortodossa*.

"The Long and Winding Road—Ukrainian Becoming a Standard Language" is the subject of Part III. Here I examine a variety of issues in an effort to contribute to a better understanding of this crucial period. First, I shed light on some ill-studied Galician grammars of the first half of the nineteenth century that were typically Galician in many ways but obviously influenced by the conviction that the "Ruthenians" of Galicia and the "Little Russians" of the Russian Empire constituted one nation speaking one "Ruthenian or Little Russian language." In two briefer studies, I revisit the problem of what can be regarded as a "dialectal" element in the nineteenth century against the background of these grammars and the language practice of the period. I then turn to autobiographical and biographical materials that shed some light on the question of how Ruthenians from the westernmost periphery of the Przemyśl eparchy came to an awareness of their Slavic and Ruthenian national and linguistic identity. In a lengthy article, drawing on the evidence of a Vienna-based newspaper for the Ruthenians of the Austrian Empire, I discuss the question of whether there ever existed an "Austro-Ruthenian" language. As for developments in the Russian Empire, I concentrate on the puzzling language of Taras Ševčenko's personal letters, which seem at first glance to switch between Ukrainian and Russian for no apparent reason but in fact reflect quite comprehensible mechanisms of code-switching. I then discuss Pantelejmon Kuliš's encounter with the Galician Ukrainians, which was extremely important for the history of the Ukrainian language and anything but unproblematic. In a more general study, I briefly summarize what I regard as the most important shortcomings of traditional Ukrainian language historiography of an important subject—nineteenth-century Ukrainian. Subsequently, I examine what Galician "populists" of the early 1870s were actually doing when they edited "Old Ruthenian"-oriented textbooks in the new, Ukrainian spirit. Finally, I elaborate on the important observation that the boundaries between "populists," "Old Ruthenians," and "Russophiles" were often blurred, as demonstrated by Ivan Naumovyč, who wrote several works in impeccable vernacular Ukrainian even though he denied the very existence of that language.

Part IV begins with a look across the Atlantic Ocean, where the language of the oldest (still existing) Ukrainian newspaper, *Svoboda*, intriguingly reflects the dynamic development of Ukrainian in Europe even as it increasingly adopts its own, North American approach. I then delve into the history of the Ukrainian

language in interwar Subcarpathian Rus' (today's Transcarpathian oblast), where Ivan Pan'kevych's *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language* exerted great influence on the dissemination of the Ukrainian standard language, although it could not be written in that language itself. In the next study, I offer a critical assessment of modern efforts to standardize a separate Rusyn language and conclude that any reasonably selected variety of Rusyn capable of bridging the significant differences between existing variants would probably be extremely close to Ukrainian. A lengthy article on the so-called "Ukrainization" period compensates for my lack of attention to the intriguing early Soviet period in the *Pryčynky*; having promised there to produce such a study, I wrote it especially for this volume because I am convinced that the subject is appropriate to the present collection. My last two articles demonstrate how politicized the Ukrainian language still is, both as an object of discourse and as an object of language policy itself.

The very fact that this book has come into being makes me very happy.

Some of the articles collected here were originally written in Ukrainian or in German. Marta Olynyk translated several studies from the Ukrainian and my Viennese student Michael Tauchmann from the German, as indicated in the Acknowledgements section. Tauchmann's and my own English have then been made significantly more readable by Myroslav Yurkevich. My sincere thanks to everyone mentioned here.

This book either would not have come into existence at all or would look very different were it not for my START prize of 2005. This prize, awarded by the Austrian Science Fund (Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, FWF) on behalf of the International Wittgenstein and START jury for my research project Y 271 "1,000 Years of Ukrainian Language History in Galicia," has not only enabled me to work in the most relevant libraries and collect valuable scholarly input during a considerable number of talks, conferences, and research stays all across Europe and North America but has also provided considerable funds for Michael Tauchmann's translations and for the editing and printing of this book.

Between March 2006 and February 2014, my START award project gave me the opportunity to work with a team of young scholars who often made valuable contributions to my work. The last remaining team member, Kathleen Beger, compiled the bibliography out of the various articles. In previous years, Philipp Hofeneder, Marina Höfinghoff, and Katarzyna Hibel often provided me with materials or asked questions that ultimately brought new insights to all of us. My thanks go to all of them.

Coincidentally, the START prize has also enabled me to travel repeatedly to Toronto, one of my favorite cities, where I have been in close contact with several important people, particularly the staff of the Toronto office of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, whom I regard as my dear personal friends. Frank Sysyn, Roman Senkus, Marko R. Stech, and Andrij Makuch have ultimately made Toronto one of my scholarly homes. To my great delight, this first book of mine to be published originally in North America has now become part of the history of that wonderful institution.

Once again, I am pleased to add my sincere thanks to the Ukrainian Studies Fund and to its director, Roman Procyk, who have generously supported this project both morally and financially, as well as to the Canadian Foundation of Ukrainian Studies which provided a generous grant for this publication.

I dedicate this book to Ukrainians living in the diaspora, who, although I am not Ukrainian, have in fact made me a member of their community.

Vienna, 26 January 2015

Michael Moser

Part I

**Instead of an Introduction:
Does Ukrainian Have a History?**

CONTEMPORARY ANTI-UKRAINIAN MYTHS ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE, OR: DOES UKRAINIAN HAVE A HISTORY?

1.1. “Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist” in the history of the Ukrainian language

Leopold von Ranke’s venerable demand that historical writing should tell “wie es eigentlich gewesen ist” (“how it really was”) can have only limited application in the postmodern age. Historiography (as we realize now more than ever) is part of a string of experiential and communicational mechanisms whose parameters themselves are historically contingent. For a variety of reasons, this relativizing world view has been acknowledged in the study of the history of languages only reluctantly, owing, among other things, to increasing isolation from the historical disciplines and a gradual reduction of the subject to so-called “modern grammar theories.” Above all, events of the recent and most recent past, such as attempts to establish new regional languages (for instance, “Rusyn” in our particular context, discussed below), manifestly put the traditional discourse of historical linguistics to the test. The need for a reconsideration of traditional paradigms is evident. It is becoming increasingly obvious that not only languages themselves but also conceptions of historical linguistics and narratives developed by them have been and are now being instrumentalized for various purposes, and that there are more perspectives than that of the predominant master narrative. In this context, Ukrainian and its language history may, perhaps, even be especially instructive.

1.2. “Experts” and “laymen”

The working basis for the following observations consists predominantly of materials from the Internet. The data analyzed in the present paper and in a related one (“Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting: The Galician Variant of the Ukrainian Language and Anti-Ukrainian Discourse in Contemporary Internet Sources,” Moser 2008b; see pp. 585–600 in this volume) is the result of a Google search for the collocations *галицький язык* (Russian) and *галицька мова* (Ukrainian), both meaning ‘Galician language,’ which I conducted on 20 March, 2 July, and 4 July 2007 and revised with checks between 11 and 20 July 2007 (as far as the sources analyzed here are concerned, the last checks date from 5 December 2007). My original aim was to gain a quick general impression of the contemporary evaluation of the Galician variant of Ukrainian and its history. For both the Russian and the Ukrainian search items, the first 150 to 200 entries, respectively, were taken into account. Among them, there are contributions by alleged experts (generally also issued in printed form, but most of these publications are unavailable in Vienna) as well as numerous opinions voiced by laymen in important new genres of text, such as contributions to Internet forums and weblogs. The length of the examined contributions varies greatly, from short sentences in blog entries less than one printed page in length to rather substantial material, some of which is in fact available in monograph form.

The following analysis cannot lay claim to universal validity. Our findings offer no more than a general impression of specific language attitudes that become

apparent in a particular segment of reality—the Internet, perhaps the most important medium of communication in our day—and pertain to a particular, quite ephemeral period of time. These Internet sources are not, of course, detached from modes of communication outside cyberspace.

One of the most striking findings of this research is that almost all sources concerned with Galician Ukrainian also refer to the Ukrainian language in general. To be more precise, they are predominantly characterized by markedly negative language attitudes toward Galician Ukrainian in particular, which soon turn out to extend to the modern Ukrainian Standard Language in general. Blog contributions by laymen are quite frequently (though not always explicitly) based on the authority—highly questionable, as a rule—of articles and books. These publications, written by alleged experts, are available on the Internet. One of the most important alleged authorities is Nikolaj Ul'janov (1904–85), a Russian exile author whose book *История украинского сепаратизма* (A History of Ukrainian Separatism) was first released in the West in 1966 and reprinted several times in recent years by the Russian Academy of Sciences (Ul'janov 1966/1996/2003; there are more editions). Another is Aleksandr Karevin, a comparatively young historian from Kyiv (b. 1966), whose work *Русь нерусская (Как рождалась «ридна мова»)* (Non-Russian Rus': How the 'Mother Tongue' Was Born) was first reprinted in 2006 by the Moscow publisher "Имперская традиция" (Imperial Tradition) (Karevin 2006).

Many comments made by Ul'janov, Karevin, and others clearly demonstrate that they have no understanding (or only very limited understanding) of the history of languages, yet this does not prevent them from posing as experts in linguistics, and they are obviously accepted as experts by a certain community.¹

In "Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting" (see pp. 585–600 in this volume), I deal only with sources relating to the most recent history of the Ukrainian language since the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the present article, I will focus on a historical line of linguistic argument that looks back farther into the past. In contrast to the "synchronic" article, here I draw almost exclusively on "expert" accounts—mostly because, with regard to older language history, laymen are entirely dependent on information provided by alleged "experts."² Virtually all segments of

1 Incidentally, the same applies to the archaeologist Petro Toločko of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv, who is fondly advanced as a leading authority by numerous laymen and 'experts,' although a whole series of major errors in his often-quoted paper of 1998 (Toločko 1998) demonstrates that he definitely cannot be considered a reliable source in linguistic matters (see pp. 596–597 in this volume).

2 In a review of the volume in which this paper originally appeared, the young historian Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe harshly attacks me for "differentiating between experts and laymen" with respect to "scholars examining the Ukrainian language" (Rossolinski-Liebe 2010). Rossolinski-Liebe forgets to mention that none of those who in fact present themselves as Ukrainophobes in these lines is either a linguist or has ever actually examined the Ukrainian language. The only exception is Andrej Zaliznjak, a distinguished Russian linguist whom I quote with utmost respect, although I allow myself to disagree with him regarding some details. Indeed, most of the Ukrainophobes who pose as experts in the sources quoted below—with the exception of Petro Toločko, who is a professional archaeologist and whom I do not label a Ukrainophobe, although I have strong reservations regarding most of his non-scholarly pronouncements about Ukrainians and the Ukrainian language—are no scholars at all.

the “expert discourse” introduced in the following lines are also extensively quoted or documented in lay contributions to Internet forums and weblogs.

2.1. “Old Russian” Kyivan Rus’?

As expected, the thesis of “Old Russian” linguistic unity, still widespread generally and among Slavists as well, is regarded as completely beyond question in the contributions with which we are concerned. Naturally, the experts encountered in our materials highlight the Russianness of this unity with utmost emphasis. These authors also occasionally mention that there may have been dialects in Kyivan Rus’, but at the same time they stress that the language was nevertheless completely uniform in its capacity as the “Russian” language of Kyivan Rus’. Aleksandr Karevin (2006) formulates this thesis, seemingly so universally valid and irrefutable, as follows—in context, incidentally, he draws heavily on Toločko (1998):³

As is known, all East Slavic tribes inhabiting Kyivan Rus’ used the same Russian language, and a Galician coming to Suzdal, Smolensk, or Novgorod did not need an interpreter.... The linguistic schism [*sic*] resulted from political separation.⁴

The Kyivan political scientist Andrej Vadžra (2007a) clarifies this alleged state of affairs even more drastically:

You will not find anything even remotely resembling the Modern Ukrainian language in any of the written monuments of Ancient Rus’.... There are no traces or even allusions to the existence of a Ukrainian language prior to the second half of the nineteenth century.⁵

The Ukrainophobes often utilize the work of older philologists from the Russian Slavophile camp, such as Boris Ljapunov’s programmatic essay “The Unity of the Russian Language in Its Dialects” (Ljapunov 2006), which can now also be consulted on several websites. They virtually ignore more recent linguistic scholarly literature, primarily those works that run counter to their views.

In fact, the assumption of a “uniform Old Russian language,” which has always had to be analyzed against the background of its “dialectal differences” in any event, can be sustained only as long as one is prepared a priori to elevate the assumption of a “uniform Old Russian language” to an axiom. This axiom, however, is itself paradoxical from the outset, for a language, like anything else, can theoretically be either uniform or (dialectally) differentiated, but not both at once. Aside from that,

3 Since almost all texts were available to me only on the Internet, no page numbers are indicated.

4 “Как известно, все населявшие Киевскую Русь восточнославянские племена пользовались одним русским языком, и приехавший в Суздаль, Смоленск или Новгород галичанин в переводчике не нуждался. [...] Начало языковому расколу положило разделение политическое.”

5 “Ни в одном письменном памятнике Древней Руси вы не найдете ничего, хотя бы отдаленно похожего на современный украинский язык. [...] Нет никаких следов и даже намеков на существование украинского языка глубже второй половины XIX века.”

who is to say—even more so with regard to the Middle Ages—what distinguishes a Slavic dialect from a Slavic language? And what precisely makes the non-Church Slavonic elements of Kyivan medieval texts more “Russian” than “Ukrainian”? How many elements “even remotely resembling” the Modern Russian language would one encounter in the texts of medieval Rus', leaving aside Church Slavonic elements and those that Russian shares with Ukrainian? Are Andrej Vadžra and his colleagues aware of the apparent existence of a language called “the Rus' language” in the Middle Ages, although there is no evidence to suggest that, prior to the Mongolian onslaught, this language was anything other than the language of the Scandinavian Varangians, i.e., a Germanic language? What do the most ardent adherents of “Old Russian linguistic unity” actually know about the spoken language(s) of medieval Rus', by no means only the Slavic ones? Why are they so unexpectedly certain that, for example, an eleventh-century traveler from the Principality of Halych could have managed without an interpreter in Novgorod but would have been in desperate need of one in, say, Cracow or Prague, or anywhere else in the Slavic-speaking world?

Admittedly, the rejection of the traditional axiom of a “uniform Old Russian language” by no means entails the assumption that a fully developed Ukrainian or Belarusian language already existed in Kyivan Rus' in a sense corresponding to the modern concept (of a standard language). Precisely the same, however, also applies to the Russian language, the linguistic past of which is certainly no deeper or more prestigious than that of Ukrainian, Belarusian, or any other Slavic language.

2.2. A more realistic view of the Slavic dialects of Rus'

Ironically enough, it is primarily the work done in Russian linguistics over the past decades that has provided the most convincing evidence undermining the assumption of linguistic unity in Kyivan Rus' as never before. The study of medieval birchbark letters in particular, the first of which were unearthed only in the 1950s in the northern Russian city of Novgorod, has shown definitively that the language of the Novgorod and Pskov regions of Rus' differed significantly from that in the regions of Kyiv or Halych. The careful examination of these documents has established that the so-called “dialectal specifics of Old Russian” can by no means be reduced to a few footnotes. On the contrary, the specifics of the language of the Russian north actually require a detailed monograph, which has in fact been published (Zaliznjak 2004).

What we know today, with less doubt than before, is that the language of the Novgorod and Pskov lands of northern Rus' differed significantly from that of the south on all linguistic levels, and that the differences concerned very important and very old features:

- the so-called second (chronologically third) palatalization of velars, which obviously did not take place in the Novgorod region, as opposed to the south: see Novgorodian *кѣле* ‘whole’ as opposed to *чѣлѣ* in the rest of East Slavic territory; see also, in **kv-*, **gv-* groups, Novgorodian *зѣзѣда* ‘star’ as opposed to *зѣзѣда* etc. (ibid., 41–45; see also Moser 2011: 7–9);
- the so-called third (chronologically second) palatalization of velars, which

did not take place regarding **x* and **g* but did take place regarding **k* in the Novgorod region, as opposed to the south, where all velar sounds generally underwent the third palatalization: see Novgorodian *въхо* 'all' as opposed to *въсе* in the south, Novgorodian *не лезо* 'is not allowed' (as opposed to modern Russian *нельзя*), etc. (ibid., 45–46; see also Moser 2011: 9);

- Novgorodian and Pskovian *cokan'e* (merger of *č'* and *c'*) and Pskovian *šokan'e* (merger of *š'/ž'* and *s'/z'*; see Novgorodian dialectal *ц'* 'исто' 'pure,' *пътиц'* 'a bird' (< *чисто*, *пътица*), Pskovian *здуци* (< *ждучи*) 'wait' ([adverbial] participle) (ibid., 52; see also Moser 2011: 14);
- the results of **tj*, **dj*, **sj*, **zj* may have been quite specific for the Pskov region, as modern dialects feature forms such as *розать* 'bear' instead of *рожать*, *вѣхатъ* 'hang' instead of *вѣшатъ*, *вѣжывать* 'transport' instead of *важывать* (Zaliznjak 2004: 47–48), although some scholars suggest that these forms may be recent innovations. As for the Ukrainian side, one should add that southwestern Ukrainian dialects in particular feature another specific reflex of **dj*, which is not known in other East Slavic areas, namely *dž* (and not *ž*). As Jurij Ševel'ov (George Shevelov) convincingly argued, if the reflex *dž* in Ukrainian and Belarusian deverbative forms such as *ходжу/хаджу* has often been dismissed (though unconvincingly) as a result of morphological analogies, this is impossible for southwestern Ukrainian dialects, which feature forms of the type *уроджай*, *меджа*, *їджа*, *чуджий* (see Moser 2011: 11);
- the results of **stj*, **zdj*, with Pskovian [š'k'], [ž'g'] and Novgorodian [s' c''] (< *Cokan'e*), [ž'dž'] as opposed to southern [š'č'], [ž'dž']; see the written forms *дъжгъ* 'rain,' *наѣжгала* 'ride toward, attack' ([adverbial] participle) (ibid., 47–49; see also Moser 2011: 12);
- the reflexes of *tl*, *dl*, with *kl*, *gl* in the Pskov region and simplified *l* in all other realms of Rus' (and the Slavic south); see the Pskovian written forms *блѡглицѡ* 'were guarded, past tense masculine plural,' *повегле* (for *повель* in other Rus' territories) 'led, past tense masculine singular,' *сустрѣкли* (for *-стрѣли*) 'encountered, past tense masculine plural' (ibid., 49; see also Moser 2011: 6–7);
- the development of the groups **CъLC* etc., which yielded **CъLъC* in the western Novgorod and Pskov region; see Novgorodian *жълътое* 'yellow' (as compared to *жълтое*), *смъръди* (as opposed to *смърди*) 'peasants,' or **CLъC*, see Novgorodian *мловила* (< *млъвила*) 'said, past tense feminine singular,' and many dialectal forms (ibid., 49–52);
- the sound *ѣ* (expressed by the Cyrillic letter *ѣ*) was variously pronounced on the territory of Rus' (ibid., 52–53);
- as for the sound *е*, it should be observed from the non-Novgorodian side that in the Kyiv-Polisia zone, the front nasal vowel apparently yielded different results depending on intonation; see northern Ukrainian *дѣветъ* along with *дес'амуї* (< *devęt-*) (Ševel'ov 1979: 132–42);
- the retention of the plosive consonant *g* (typical for the entire northern area of those Slavic dialects that later developed into Russian), as opposed to the spirantization into *γ* or *h* in the southern area (of the dialects that later

- developed into Ukrainian, Belarusian, or southern dialects of the Russian language); hence [g]opodъ 'town' in the north, as opposed to [ɣ]opodъ or [h]opodъ in the south (ibid., Zaliznjak 2004: 39; see also Moser 2011: 15);
- It is precisely the careful study of Novgorod birchbark letters that has demonstrated that even so-called pleophony, which is widely regarded as the most striking feature shared by all East Slavic languages, is not as uniform as it seemed earlier. In fact, it is very likely that on the territory of northern Rus' there were some dialects with reflexes resembling those of Polish; see early Novgorodian spellings such as *срочька* 'fur, a currency' (genitive singular, insted of *сороцьк-*), *позродьѣ* 'a tax for town dwellers' (instead of *позородьѣ*), etc. (ibid., 40–41; see also Moser 2011: 9–11).
 - In the sphere of morphology, probably the most important and oldest typically Novgorodian feature is the nominative singular form of *ǫ*-stems ending in *-e* (see *хлѣбе* 'bread,' *братѣ* 'brother' for *хлѣбъ*, *братъ*; ibid., 99–102), which, incidentally, caused a major delay in the development of the category of animacy in Novgorodian dialects for the simple reason that the coincidence of *o*-stem nominative and accusative forms, typical of all other Slavic dialects, did not occur in the Novgorodian realm; moreover, *u*-stems continued to represent an autonomous morphological type in the Novgorodian realm longer than in other territories of Slavdom (ibid., 147–151). Another striking Novgorodian and Pskovian feature in the sphere of noun morphology is the genitive singular of *a*-stems in *-ě*; see Novgorodian *женѣ* 'woman, wife' (ibid., 146–147). As for pronominal declension, the genitive singular masculine/neuter ending *-oga* (as in Southwest Slavic languages, i.e., Slovenian and Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian) is noteworthy (ibid., 152). The prevailing verbal ending of the first person plural indicative and imperative in the Novgorod area was *-me* (as in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects, in Czech, Slovak, and Bulgarian), while *-mo*, the prevailing ending in southern Rus' (also used in Slovenian and Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian), was alien to the Novgorod region (ibid., 153). In the Novgorod realm, participles of the type *идѣ* 'go,' *несѣ* 'carry,' *река* 'say' with softened verbal stems (see Old Serbian *несе*, *моге* < *несѣ*, *могѣ*) were used, while other Rus' dialects used forms of the type *ида*, *неса*, *река* (see Czech *jda*, *nesa*, *buda*, and Old Polish *rzeka* as a participle from *rzec*) (ibid., 153).
 - The most striking syntactic feature that was well known in Novgorod, Smolensk, and Polatsk, but not in the south, was the use of the object in the nominative if dependent on an infinitive form (of the type *вода пити* 'to drink water') (ibid., 156–157).

As for those developments that produced the varieties of Slavic speech in Rus' during the earliest period of written culture, they continued to share some common tendencies but not to coincide completely (the same may be said with reference to the entire Slavic-speaking area). Precisely for this reason, many scholars speak of Late Common Slavic at least until the so-called reduction of *jers* (i.e., the development of the Late Common Slavic ultrashort vowels ъ, ь). Although the reflexes of so-called strong *Jers* were basically identical on the territory of Rus' (*сѣнь* > *сон*, *дѣнь* > *день*),

important differences evolved as well. One of the major differences is older than the reduction of *jers*. In the eastern Novgorod region, as well as in most dialects that evolved into Russian, strong *jers* in front of *j* behaved like other *jers* and developed *-ъjb*, *-bjb* into *-oj*, *-ej* (hence genuine Russian *доброй* 'good,' *синей* 'blue' nominative masculine singular); the same applied to weak *jers* before *j* if developed into full vowels, as in Modern Standard Russian *мóю* 'I wash.' In all other Slavic languages, *jers* before *j* developed a character of their own as "tense vowels" that yielded *-ъjb*, *-bjb* > *-yj*, *-ij*. The western Novgorod region was apparently a transition area, with reflexes of *-ъjb* ranging from *-yj* and *-ej* to *-oj* (ibid., 66–67; see also Moser 2011: 13–14). The treatment of *ТъТ* groups differed as well; see Ukrainian *кривавий* vs. Russian *кровавый*, etc. As Jurij Ševel'ov has demonstrated, even the Russian (and Novgorodian) development *e* > *o* (see ibid., 69–70) has little in common with partly similar developments on Ukrainian language territory, etc.

East Slavic dialects had some other ancient common features but shared them with other dialects as well; see the reflexes of liquid groups such as **ol'kьtb* 'elbow' > North Slavic *lokьtb*, South Slavic *lakьtb* (Zaliznjak 2004: 39). Even the development of initial (j)e- > o-, which applied only to a limited group of words of the type East Slavic *озеро* vs. reflexes of *jezero*, or the reflexes of the denasalization of the nasal vowels (front nasal vowel > *ä* > *a*, back nasal vowel > *u*), are not limited to East Slavic territory only (ibid.). East Slavic dialects differed with regard to very important features whose age is also uncertain, including *akan'e*, that is, the qualitative reduction of unaccentuated vowels in Belarusian and South Russian dialects, but not in North Russian and Ukrainian dialects (apart from a small northern zone transitional to Belarusian dialects; see Moser 2011: 14–15).

The distinguished Russian linguist Andrej Zaliznjak asserts that, ultimately, only the development of the groups *Telt*, *ТьТ* > *Tolt*, *ТьТ* (see *melko* > *molko* (> *молоко*) 'milk,' *vьlkь* > *vьlkь* (> *волкь*, Modern Standard Russian *волк*, Modern Standard Ukrainian *вовк*, Modern Standard Belarusian *воўк*) stands out as a "phenomenon shared by the bulk of Old Novgorodian dialects with other Old East Slavic dialects" and not attested elsewhere (Zaliznjak 2004: 39). This can, of course, hardly be regarded as a solid basis for the assumption of "Old Russian linguistic unity."

It is thus first and foremost our new insights into the medieval language of Novgorod that ultimately confirm that the language area on the territory of medieval Rus' is to be conceived of primarily as a segment of the Slavic language territory, and that it should not be delineated in terms of any national languages. The varieties spoken in the realm of Rus' were dialects of Slavic, definitely not dialects of Russian or, ultimately, even of the "Rus'ian" language.

Of course, the above does not imply that Slavic dialects spoken on the modern Ukrainian language territory of medieval Rus' had nothing in common with those spoken on the modern Russian language territory. To begin with, it is reasonable to assume that much of the ethnically Slavic medieval population of the "Russian territories" of Rus', or their ancestors, had in fact migrated to those areas from the lands of modern Ukraine (see Goehrke 1992), mixed there with the local Finnic or Baltic population, and ultimately assimilated most of the inhabitants. Moreover, as soon as "Rus'" as such was established as a polity, its lands were politically

united—sometimes tightly, but much more often very loosely—as a realm governed by representatives of the ruling Varangian “Riurikid” dynasty, whose members increasingly adopted, along with their Old Germanic mother tongue, the Slavic varieties spoken by their servants and, in time, became primarily speakers of Slavic. Finally, Kyiv and Novgorod were economically linked by the north-south trade routes leading from Scandinavia to Byzantium, and “Rus” warriors from various regions made war together or against one another, etc.

It is thus unsurprising that certain elements more or less characteristic of most Slavic dialects spoken in the realm of medieval Rus' did exist, and that in certain spheres a quite uniform language was used. It is this very fact that has motivated linguists generally to preserve the notion of an “Old Rus'ian” or “Old East Slavic” language, even if they have decided to reject the term “Old Russian” in the outdated sense. Apart from certain features that the dialects of Kyiv and Novgorod shared because of common innovations, the decision to accept the operational term “Old Rus'ian” or “Old East Slavic” results, *inter alia*, from the fact that all realms of Rus' shared something more than the adoption of the South Slavic-based Church Slavonic language as the predominant medium of writing, which they increasingly adapted to the dialects of Rus' in partly similar ways. That decision is also based on the notion that Slavic literacy on the territory of Rus' was held together at the same time by the use of a (“Rus'ian”-based) supradialectal written language in the secular sphere. It is precisely this supradialectal “Rus'ian” variant that initially gave rise to the very notion of an “Old Rus'ian” or “Old East Slavic” language—a notion that prevailed until the Novgorod birchbark letters ultimately confirmed that below the level of written high culture, in everyday communication, the Slavic dialects of medieval Rus' were even more varied than previously assumed.

As for this supradialectal written variant, Andrej Zaliznjak (2004: 3 et al.) called it a “supradialectal form of Old Russian” (*наддиалектная форма древнерусского языка*) or, more briefly (and a bit less carefully), “supradialectal Old Russian” (*наддиалектный древнерусский язык*). As Zaliznjak correctly emphasizes, the component *русский* of the term he suggests must be read in this case as “belonging to the Rus',” and definitely not as “Russian.” This important remark shows yet again that in the terminological sphere, the Russian adjective *русский* is in urgent need of revision because of its ambiguity, and that the existing terminological mess should by no means be transferred to any other language.

As for this supradialectal “Old Rus'ian” language, Zaliznjak (2004: 5) plausibly characterizes it as a language formation characterized by high social prestige that was most probably in use among literate elites on the whole territory of Rus':

It is precisely this variant that is usually denoted simply by the term “Old Russian language” in historical courses. In the Novgorod land, this language variant was used mainly for the composition of official documents, political (treaties, etc.) and juridical.⁶

6 “Именно эта форма обычно описывается просто под именем древнерусского языка в исторических курсах. В Новгородской земле данная форма языка употреблялась главным образом при составлении официальных документов – политических (договоры и т. п.) и юридических.”

While for the most part this supradialectal Old East Slavic variant has hitherto been wrongly interpreted as an almost immediate reflection of the vernacular pertaining to all parts of Rus', including Novgorod, it is now very clear that this language was not actually based on Novgorod speech but, in all likelihood, on the Slavic dialect spoken in Kyiv, the capital of Rus' (as Zaliznjak himself argues, *ibid.*).

Although, as Zaliznjak himself specifies, this assumption is more a hypothesis than a well-founded theory, it is, again, obvious at the very least that the supradialectal form of Old East Slavic is certainly *not* based on the dialects of Novgorod or Pskov, nor is it based on the narrower local *koiné* that Zaliznjak identifies for the region of Novgorod and Pskov. Since, in the first decades of literacy, other Rus' territories did not yet have any cultural significance comparable to that of Kyiv,⁷ it is first and foremost highly likely *ex negativo* that the supradialectal Slavic language of medieval Rus' was based precisely on the language of Kyiv, which remained the leading cultural and political center of medieval Rus' at least until the mid-twelfth century.

Zaliznjak (2004: 7) further writes:

It must be taken into account, however, that such labels as "Old Russian language," "Old Czech language," etc. reflect above all the perspective from present-day languages (Russian, Czech, etc.).⁸

Nevertheless, if one is prepared to accept this important argument, the conclusion to be drawn is quite different from the one suggested by Zaliznjak, to wit, that if supradialectal Old East Slavic can deliberately be given an anachronistic

7 As for the territory of modern Central European Russia, the so-called *Zalšsje* area grew to become one of the more important regions of Rus' only under Jurij Dolgorukij's son, Andrej Bogoljubskij, in the mid-twelfth century, a few decades before the ultimate collapse of medieval Rus'. Little is known about medieval written culture from these realms (the chronicles emphasize, for example, that Jurij Dolgorukij provided one of the churches he had established in his realm with books and relics of the saints; see Stökl 1983: 114). The eminent Russian historian Vasilij Ključevskij wrote, already in the nineteenth century: "Prior to the mid-twelfth century, nothing is known about a direct connection between Kyivan Rus' and the remote Rostov-Suzdal' land. The settlement of this northeastern periphery of Rus' began long before the twelfth century, and its Russian colonization ['русская колонизация'] initially took place from the northwest, the Novgorod land, to which this land belonged under the reign of the first princes. Here, even before the twelfth century, several Russian towns emerged, such as Rostov, Suzdal, Yaroslavl, Murom, etc.... Interestingly, when a prince from Rostov or Murom had to go south to Kyiv, he did not travel there directly but made a long detour" (Ključevskij 1956: 286–287). The detour went by way of Tver and Smolensk. Ključevskij also writes about the dense forests between *Zalšsje* and the Kyiv realm (*ibid.*, 287–288) and mentions that a better connection between Rostov and Kyiv was not established until the mid-twelfth century (*ibid.*, 288). It is these very circumstances that account for the lack of genuine transitional dialects between Russian and Ukrainian.

Elsewhere, Ključevskij argues that in the twelfth century the *Zalšsje* area, the source of the ethnogenesis of Russia proper, was still populated more by non-"Russians" than by "Russians": "Великорусское племя вышло не из продолжавшегося развития [...] старинных областных особенностей, [...] причем в краю, который лежал вне старой коренной Руси и в XII в. был более инородческим, чем русским краем" (*ibid.*, 293). The region was then increasingly colonized by Slavic-speaking settlers from the Rus' realms, including those of the south.

8 "Следует учитывать, однако, что такие названия, как древнерусский язык, древнечешский язык и т. д., отражают в первую очередь взгляд современных языков (русского, чешского и т. д.)."

name derived from modern Slavic languages, then the appropriate name would be “Old Ukrainian,” not “Old Russian.” What can still be called “Old Russian” are, for example, the dialects of Old Novgorod and other lands that became part of the Russian language territory, but, again, it is reasonable to use such a name only if one is fully conscious of its deeply anachronistic character.⁹

It is thus in all likelihood the language of Kyiv that became the primary language of expansion within Rus', but it did not suppress other Slavic dialects in such a way as to make the country's linguistic landscape regionally uniform (except for the Finnic, Baltic, or Turkic variants spoken in the Rus' realm). To be sure, the *koiné* that presumably had a Kyivan basis is very different from Modern Standard Ukrainian, as those who deny the Ukrainian language its medieval history are fond of asserting with such emphasis. What these critics forget to mention, however, is the obvious fact that the very same applies to Modern Standard Russian as well.¹⁰

While Modern Standard Russian may seem at first glance to be more closely associated with the written languages of medieval Rus' than Modern Standard Ukrainian, this is due primarily to the former's very significant and definitely non-Russian Church Slavonic linguistic layer. The eminent role of that layer in the Russian language reminds us that Church Slavonic has no particularly deep roots in the Russian vernacular but is much more solidly based on the tradition of an originally imported ecclesiastical language that was used for decades mainly by a rather narrow circle of elitist Orthodox clerics. Needless to say, this is by no means to belittle the Russian language. These facts should be remembered, however, upon encountering notorious assertions about the “artificial Ukrainian language” (see pp. 590–591 in this volume).

Ukrainophobic authors such as Nikolaj Ul'janov or Aleksandr Karevin, who regard anything associated with Rus' as “Russian,” minimize or completely disregard the overwhelming role of genuinely non-Russian Church Slavonic as by far the most important written language of Kyivan Rus'. If these authors claim simultaneously that nothing even remotely similar to the modern Ukrainian language can be found in even a single written monument of ancient Rus', then that claim is simply inaccurate. Medieval Rus' texts definitely exhibit features that are characteristic of contemporary Ukrainian, while certain others reflect genuinely Russian features in the actual meanings of words. Aside from the Novgorod birchbark letters, only a handful of which have been found on the territory of modern Ukraine, the “Russian” language of medieval Rus' is no more apparent in the written sources than the “Ukrainian” one.

Persistent terminological inaccuracies in Slavic studies unfortunately continue to favor the Russocentric view of the languages of Rus' in the Church Slavonic sphere as well. Even some scholars who have already rejected the term “Old Russian” in its traditional sense continue to employ the term “Russian Church

9 The argument that the Russian language is widely used in present-day Kyiv is of course irrelevant, as this is the result of much later periods of Russification.

10 This passage is partly derived from Moser 2005: 267ff.

Slavonic" with reference to the variant of Church Slavonic used in the Rus' realm. This is inconsistent, however, in that the so-called recensions of Church Slavonic are primarily defined by their vernacular-based deviations from classical "Old Church Slavonic." But in this context as well, it is highly inappropriate simply to apply the label "Russian" to the vernacular features in a Church Slavonic text from medieval Halych or Kyiv. To repeat, variants of Church Slavonic used in Kyiv and Novgorod were undoubtedly quite similar, but vernacular intrusions must have differed at least to some extent, given that the variants of the vernacular were themselves different. For that very reason, philologists and linguists have the wherewithal to establish more about the local origin of many "Rus'ian" Church Slavonic texts than their mere "Rus'ian" provenance. There is no reason, for example, to call the Dobrylo Gospel of 1164 (Dobrylove Jevanhelije 1164/2012) "Russian Church Slavonic" unless one has better arguments than its recent editors, Vasyl' Nimčuk and Jurij Osinčuk, who have convincingly confirmed the view that this manuscript derives from the southern territories of Rus', most probably from the Kyivan realm (Dobrylove Jevanhelije 1164/2012: 7–34). In reference to the language of younger texts such as the Jevsevij Gospel of 1283 (Jevseviye Jevanhelije 1283/2001), a document that derives from the Galician-Volhynian Principality and features a number of Ukrainian-based vernacular elements, the label "Russian Church Slavonic" is even less justified.

As in the above-mentioned discussion concerning the vernacular sphere, it must be realized that any term for the early medieval recensions of Church Slavonic is anachronistic from the outset. In full awareness of this anachronistic approach, one could apply the term "Ukrainian Church Slavonic" or "the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic" to texts such as the Dobrylo or Jevsevij Gospels with much less problematic implications than those produced by any Russocentric label, although in many cases, when one cannot be certain about the actual origin of a particular manuscript (which, more often than not, has a history of having been copied in various places), the term "Rus'ian Church Slavonic" or "the Rus'ian recension" of Church Slavonic seems quite appropriate, as opposed to the outdated Russocentric labels. In the late Middle Ages and in early modern times, Church Slavonic as used on the territory of modern Ukraine and on that of modern Russia diverged even more, so that in reference to these later periods the label "Russian Church Slavonic" is even less appropriate.

Neither scholars nor non-scholars from outside the Ukrainian context are used to applying the term "Ukrainian" to the Middle Ages, but many of them somehow use the label "Russian" as if it were unproblematic. Ukrainophobes usually take this practice to the extreme. They stubbornly adhere to the assumption of the quasi-eternal, largely static existence of the Russian language but summarily dismiss the assumption of a centuries-long evolution of the Ukrainian language, developing in the course of more than a thousand years, as nationalistic and absurd. Pavel Baulin (2007), a member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine and, incidentally, a people's deputy of the Communist Party of Ukraine, does not purport to be a scholar but applies his understanding of historical linguistics directly to current language policy:

The language problem of Ukraine: political myths and reality: One such myth is precisely that of the quasi-millennial history of the Ukrainian language. If anyone thinks that these myths play nothing but the harmless role of allowing the ruling regime to indulge in self-congratulation, he is profoundly mistaken. For it is precisely these myths that serve to justify practical actions in the struggle against political opponents, and the language problem is a striking confirmation of that.¹¹

Nikolaj Ul'janov's line of reasoning (Ul'janov 1966/1996/2003) perpetuates the tone and content of traditional nineteenth-century all-Russian nationalist discourse, according to which the Ukrainians began "arrogating" a centuries-old history to themselves only with the development of their national movement in that same century. Along with Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, the Galician intellectual Omeljan Ohonovs'kyj is said to have been crucial to this development, inasmuch as he allegedly established the "pattern of Ukrainian literary history." According to Ul'janov, however, Ohonovs'kyj came up against the fact that "Old Russian" literature has nothing to do with Ukrainian literature, whereas "the direct genetic link between the written culture of the Kievan state and the later Common Russian literature is apparent even to the untrained eye."¹²

Availing himself of traditional paradigms, Aleksandr Karevin (2006) explains the linguistic schism that took place in the course of the collapse of Kyivan Rus' as a consequence of nothing other than the process of Polonization in western and southwestern Rus':

From the times of Kievan Rus', the Russian language alone existed throughout its territory (in the southwest as well as in the northeast). This language began splitting into dialects (Little Russian, Great Russian, and Belorussian) after the temporary breakup of the unitary state and the seizure of its individual parts by foreign enslavers. The Great Russian dialect developed on the basis of the language of the former Rus'—that of Kiev. This can be explained by the relatively free cultural development of the northeastern Russian lands (the area of dissemination of the Great Russian dialect).¹³

11 "Языковая проблема Украины: политические мифы и реальность: Одним из таких мифов и является миф о якобы тысячелетней истории украинского языка. Если кто-то думает, что эти мифы играют всего лишь безобидную роль самоукрашательства правящего режима, он глубоко ошибается. Ибо как раз они, мифы, служат обоснованием практических действий в борьбе со своими политическими противниками. И языковая проблема является этому ярким подтверждением."

12 "Нельзя, в то же время, не заметить доступную даже неученому глазу прямую генетическую связь между письменностью киевского государства и позднейшей общерусской литературой."

13 "Со времён Киевской Руси на всей её территории (и на юго-западе, и на северо-востоке) существовал один русский язык. Этот язык стал разделяться на наречия (малорусское, великорусское, белорусское) после временного распада единого государства, захвата отдельных его частей иноземными поработителями. Великорусское наречие развивалось на основе языка прежней Руси - Киевской. Это объяснялось относительно свободным культурным развитием северо-восточных русских земель (области распространения великорусского наречия)."

Interestingly, Karevin depicts the “Tatar yoke,” which is usually bitterly lamented in Russian national discourse outside Eurasian circles, as a liberating phenomenon. According to his outline, Russian culture thus remained largely untouched during this period; in southwestern Rus', by contrast, Polish influence allegedly led to a situation in which the “Little Russian vernacular dialects” had by then already turned into a “colorful Russo-Polish mixture.” This Polonization is said to have ended only after the reunification of “Little Rus” with “Great Rus’.”¹⁴ Afterwards, according to Karevin, there began the “natural process of purifying the vernacular of Polonisms” (Karevin 2006).¹⁵

It is thus apparent that the history of language, an entirely different field from the one in which Ul'janov, Karevin, and similar authors operate, is not the actual subject of their accounts. They use pseudolinguistic arguments to pursue a sociopolitical goal, namely, the perpetuation of the Common Russian idea in the traditional, ultimately Russian nationalist, setting. In most cases, their presuppositions are fully concordant: Russia and its cradle, Kievan Rus', have always been morally and culturally pure, mighty and, of course, destined for unity since time immemorial. The same applies, by extension, to the “Russian” or “Common Russian” language. Unfortunately, this quasi-natural ideal is forever threatened by external, invariably Western, enemies, most notably Poles and Germans (as well as Austrians). Galicians, being notorious—perhaps non-Russian or even non-Slavic—traitors to Rus', have been their inseparable allies.

In Oles' Buzyna's (2007) obtuse account, this discourse is taken to the utmost extremes. Not only does he hold Roman and Danylo, two rulers of the medieval Principality of Galicia, personally responsible for the destruction of Kyivan Rus', but, in accordance with post-1945 Soviet paradigms, he also consistently associates any alternative interpretations of history with the ideology of the followers of Stepan Bandera, a leader of twentieth-century Ukrainian nationalists. According to Buzyna's absurd line of reasoning, the medieval Principality of Halych was the center of “local separatism” in the twelfth century, although he finds it necessary to note that, allegedly, no Slavs had lived in this part of Rus' at all, as the medieval inhabitants of the Galician realm were, “in essence, Slavicized Moldavians.”¹⁶ The latter differed “in every respect” from true Rus'ians: “in psyche, in anthropological type, and (most important) in their non-Slavic origin.”¹⁷ Nikolaj Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003), too, emphasizes—although with reference to constant waves of immigration to Galicia—that “no little alien blood flows in the Galicians' veins”¹⁸ and ultimately manifests the true nature of Slavophile “anti-nationalist” discourse (to be sure, if an alternative approach seems desirable in a different context,

14 “[...] после воссоединения Малой Руси с Великой.”

15 “Начался естественный процесс очищения народной речи от полонизмов.”

16 “[...] галичане — это по сути славянизированные молдаване.”

17 “Галичане отличались от настоящих русичей всем — психологией, антропологическим типом и, (что важнее всего!) неславянским происхождением.”

18 “[...] в жилах галичан течет не мало чужой крови.”

Ukrainophobic authors and their colleagues find it appropriate to emphasize the deeply "Russian" nature of the Galicians).

Dmitrij Skvorcov (2007), finally, delivers the epitome of eccentricity when, on the occasion of the 750th anniversary of the city of Lviv, he transposes the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia and its annexation by Poland into current parameters in remarkably absurd fashion:

How Danylo Romanovych built a town for the Europartners

As a result of Daniil Galickij's "farsighted" Eurointegrationist policy, the Poles spent 250 years exterminating the "local element (Hruševs'kyj's term)" as best they could: they introduced the Magdeburg Law (the then equivalent of the WTO [World Trade Organization], with privileges for Polish-German goods and the suffocation of the "local producer"), a pale of settlement for natives of Lvov, and every conceivable type of discrimination according to religious affiliation.¹⁹

The Ukrainophobic authors are agreed that contrary to nature, the virulent seeds of separatism (including linguistic separatism) bore fruit time and again precisely in Galicia. Here, they either bring into play an additional external source of discord or present Galicia itself as the alien aggressor.

These authors do not wish to acknowledge that the political unity of Rus' was almost always fragile. They do not want to recognize that there is considerable evidence against the thesis of a "Common Russian language," and that the Slavic dialects spoken in the regions of present-day Ukraine steadily developed away from their proto-Slavic basis and from neighboring dialects on every linguistic level, just as those neighboring dialects themselves did and as languages generally do, both independently and under the impact of contacts with neighboring languages. Moreover, these authors disregard the fact that in Ukrainian dialects, numerous structural features have developed that are not inherent in any dialect of Russian. Their reason for doing so is, ultimately, that they do not wish to acknowledge that the Ukrainian language and its dialects exist at all. After all, these authors have not ceased to dream of the "one and indivisible" (imperial) Russia (be it tsarist, Soviet, or whatever else), where only the "great and powerful" Russian language is spoken.

In contrast to these authors' views, the question of whether Ukrainian has a history might be answered as follows: if, say, Russian or Polish have a history, then there is no reason why Ukrainian should not have a history. Aside from loans, minority languages, or adopted second languages, all autochthonous Slavic linguistic phenomena on what is now Ukrainian language territory remain Slavic, but they also become, in a sense, Ukrainian from the outset. First and foremost, there is no compelling reason to assume that these linguistic phenomena are either

19 *"Как Данило Романович для европартнеров город построил*

В результате «дальновидной» евроинтеграционной политики Даниила Галицкого поляки 250 лет, как могли, изводили во Львове «туземный (по Грушевскому) элемент»: вводили магдебургское право (тогдашний аналог ВТО с привилегиями для польско-немецких товаров и удешевлением «отечественного производителя»), черту оседлости для коренных львовян и всевозможные виды дискриминации по религиозному признаку."

Russian or Polish or anything else (again, apart from loans, minority languages, or adopted second languages). The history of the Ukrainian language is as deeply rooted in the past as that of any other Slavic language.

2.3. The Common Russian project as an antidote to Polonization?

In the Ukrainophobic discourse we are concerned with, the history of the Ukrainian language in the early modern period is summarily dismissed as a period of Polonization, which is depicted as uniformly negative. Although leading Russian intellectuals of very different ideological attitudes have time and again studied the Polish impact on the cultures and languages that developed after the breakup of medieval Rus', the Ukrainophobes completely exclude from their discourse any mention of how remarkable and fruitful late medieval and early modern contacts with Polish were. This applies not only to the Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) sphere, but also, especially during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, to Muscovite culture and the history of Russian language and literature. At the same time, our authors do not even ask whether any Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) developments might have occurred independently. In their minds, an ideal and uniform Rus'/Russia is opposed to a noxious Poland: with regard to language, this translates into a mere opposition of "Russian" to "Polish." Surprisingly, our Ukrainophobic authors not only overlook the impressive early modern development of Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) but also pay almost no attention to the extremely important role of Church Slavonic both in Muscovy and in the Ruthenian lands. This is due to their unwillingness to admit that not only was Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) Church Slavonic an integral part of Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) culture, but that the lands of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—and not Muscovy—were precisely those where the Church Slavonic language developed most powerfully in early modern times. That development is evidenced by the first complete printed Church Slavonic Bible, which appeared in the Volhynian town of Ostrih, and the first grammars and dictionaries of Church Slavonic, which were written by learned men from what are now Ukraine and Belarus and originally appeared in Vilnius, Lviv, or Kyiv (Moser 2011: 40–74, 162–222).²⁰

Paradoxically, our Ukrainophobic authors readily recognize the important role that the Ruthenian (particularly Ukrainian) elites played in Russian cultural history beginning in the second half of the seventeenth century. Indeed, these authors even especially underscore the significance of those elites, representing their role as an alleged return of Ukrainians to the all-Russian sphere. But in light of the aforementioned preconditions for these developments, such a return is incomprehensible, and the question must arise: How could the Kyivan intellectuals become so overwhelmingly important in Russia if the Ruthenians had been mere victims of an ongoing noxious Polonization?

20 Needless to say in light of the above remarks, the still widespread practice of applying the name "Russian Church Slavonic" to the early modern Church Slavonic language of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is highly questionable.

Of course, our authors emphasize that the “southwestern Russians”—their preferred term for the Ukrainian group of Ruthenians—participated in the development of Common Russian culture of their own free will, and that precisely because of the large proportion of “southwestern Russian” scholars in Muscovite culture, especially in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, something depicted as the development of a new, truly Common Russian language set in (Ljapunov 2006 was already making such a claim). In this regard, Nikolaj Ul’janov (1966/1996/2003) also mentions Jepyfanij Slavynec’kyj, Arsenij Satanovs’kyj, Dmytrij Tuptalo (Rostovs’kyj), Stefan Javors’kyj, Teofan (Feofan) Prokopovyč, and Simjaon Polacki (the latter hailed from what is now Belarus). He writes:²¹

As time went on, the southwestern bookmen took an increasing part in the formation of the Common Russian literary language.... Under Peter [the Great], the influx of Little Russians might have inspired the notion of the Ukrainization of Muscovites, but by no means of the Russification of Ukrainians, about which the *samostijnyky* [an ironic appellation for adherents of Ukrainian independence] frequently complain.... This “Great Russian” language was, of course, that Common Russian language in whose elaboration the Little Russians took an equal part with the Great Russians, if not a greater one.²²

To be sure, it is only in the Russian imperial context that Ul’janov discusses the role of Meletij Smotryc’kyj’s Church Slavonic grammar of 1619, “from which Hryhorij Skovoroda and Mixail Lomonosov” learned, while “it would not have occurred to either that they were not learning their own but a foreign literary language.” As “secular poetry and prose” developed, seemingly out of the blue, both Russians and Ukrainians allegedly had “no other literary tradition than the one beginning with Nestor, Metropolitan Ilarion, Volodymyr Monomax, the Ihor Tale, the Lives and the missives; the tradition to which Maksim Grek, Andrej Kurbskij and Ivan Groznyj, Ivan Vyšens’kyj and Isaja Kopyns’kyj, Meletij Smotryc’kyj and Petro Mohyla, Jepyfanij Slavynec’kyj and Simjaon Polacki, Inokentij Gizel’ with his *Synopsis*, Sil’vestr Medvedev and Dmytro Tuptalo (Rostovs’kyj)” all belonged.²³ As

21 Incidentally, even the highly appropriate Ukrainian or Belarusian spellings of these names are enough to unsettle many contemporaries of the all-Russian persuasion, as if this admittedly anachronistic practice were not in fact universal.

22 “Чем дальше, тем больше юго-западные книжники принимают участие в формировании общерусского литературного языка [...]. При Петре наплыв малороссов мог навести на мысль об украинизации москалей, но никак не о руссификации украинцев, на что часто жалуются самостийники. [...] Этот ‘великорусский’ язык был, разумеется, тем общероссийским языком, в выработке которого малоруссы приняли одинаковое, если не большее участие вместе с великоруссами.”

23 “В Московщине и на Украине, это развитие представляло один общий процесс. Когда стала зарождаться светская поэзия и проза, у писателей тут и там не существовало иной литературной традиции, кроме той, что начинается с Нестора, с митрополита Иллариона, Владимира Мономаха, Слова о Полку Игореве, ‘житий’, ‘посланий’, той традиции, к которой относятся Максим Грек, Курбский и Грозный, Иоанн Вишенский и Исаия Копинский, Мелетий Смотрицкий и Петр Могила, Епифаний Славинецкий и Симеон Полоцкий, Ин. Гизель с его ‘Синописом’, Сильвестр Медведев и Дмитрий Ростовский.”

Ul'janov contends, what happened at the turn of the eighteenth century continued later, when Ukrainian authors contributed substantially to the development of Russian literature. Particularly notable in this regard was Nikolaj Gogol'/Mykola Hohol', who, according to Ul'janov, also did not write in Great Russian but, naturally, in the "Common Russian literary language" ("общерусский литературный язык").

With regard to all these classic elements of the all-Russian master narrative, it must be admitted that not everything is completely wrong; it is merely oversimplified. Most importantly, the unspoken assumption that the Eastern Slavs in Poland-Lithuania and the Great Russians had no literary or written tradition other than that of Church Slavonic is certainly wrong. We shall not deal here in detail with the situation of early modern Russia, where the written traditions beyond the Church Slavonic sphere were indeed quite weakly developed as compared with those in Poland-Lithuania or other cultural communities, but where a certain corpus of secular manuscripts existed. Their more vernacular-based language is very remote not only from the Church Slavonic writings of the time but also from the Modern Russian Standard Language. As far as the Ukrainian sphere is concerned, we cannot go into details here either, but mention must be made of the extraordinarily rich early modern Ruthenian corpus written in the so-called "common Ruthenian language" ("простый языкъ рускій" or, as it is usually termed in contemporary linguistic literature, "prosta mova"), a language that was indeed powerfully influenced by early modern Polish but can by no means be dismissed as "Polish" (cf., for instance, Moser 2002).

Contrary to the all-Russianist discourse, it should furthermore be noted that the Ruthenian impact on the development of the Russian language at the turn of the eighteenth century did not immediately apply to any "Common Russian" or merely "Russian" literary (or standard) language for the simple reason that such a language did not yet exist. Therefore, the above-mentioned Ruthenians who worked in Muscovy or the Russian Empire during that period could not have written in the Russian language even if they had wished to do so. Rather, they all contributed more or less successfully to the modernization and, in fact, to the later partially reversed Ruthenization of Russian Church Slavonic (see, e.g., Uspenskij 2002). The fact is that Ruthenized Russian Church Slavonic then became the most important basis for the development of the modern Russian literary language in the further course of the eighteenth century, as stated above, and that Ukrainians and Belarusians also took an active part in the development and expansion of that language without being forced to do so. But their impact soon ceased to be as important as it had been during the reigns of Tsars Aleksej Mixajlovič, Fedor Alekseevič, and Peter I. In the long run, the Ruthenian impact at the turn of the eighteenth century left significant traces on the elevated style of the eighteenth-century Slavic language, which was still primarily based on late Church Slavonic and had little in common with Russian per se. As the Russian standard language was increasingly nationalized by nineteenth-century Russian authors who increasingly distanced themselves from the lofty, "un-Russian" language of imperial high-style eighteenth-century literature, the "Little Russian" elites of the Russian Empire began to react with their own project—the elaboration of Modern Standard Ukrainian.

Incidentally, it is quite true that Ukrainian philology (much more than, for instance, history) denies itself a holistic perspective if it merely takes note of such developments but does not study them because, given their “non-Ukrainian” character, they have been largely excluded from the Ukrainian master narrative.

In the same vein, but even more so, it is a traditional error of Russian studies to downplay the properly Ukrainian elements of the “Little Russian” element of imperial Russian culture. This becomes particularly apparent when (as frequently happens) developments such as those described here are used as an argument against the nineteenth-century Ukrainian national and linguistic movement, as if the active contribution of some Ukrainians to the development of imperial Russian culture, including the Russian language, constituted proof that the elaboration of the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language was an artificial and, indeed, superfluous endeavor from the outset.

The fact that the elites of many peoples took an active part in the development of various imperial projects, including the elaboration of imperial languages, in no way detracts from the legitimacy of those peoples’ distinct nation- and language-building efforts, not even if those cultures and languages are as closely related as Russian and Ukrainian. In our particular context, this means that the increasing adoption of Russian by some Ukrainians, primarily the “Little Russian” elites, who began regarding it as their own language from the eighteenth century, cannot serve as an argument against the legitimacy of the elaboration of Modern Standard Ukrainian. Many similar imperial situations confirm the fallacy of such an argument, but Ukrainophobes may find the following formulation even more helpful: the fact that some Russian (and Ukrainian) elitist circles increasingly adopted French as their preferred language of culture, beginning in the eighteenth century, does not delegitimize the elaboration of Modern Standard Russian.

2.3.1. Modern Ukrainian nation- and language-building—a matter of Polish and German/Austrian-motivated separatism?

Unsurprisingly, the Ukrainophobes’ view of the development of the Modern Standard Ukrainian language differs significantly from the one that predominates in Ukrainian studies. At times, however, the Ukrainophobes offer a perspective that, regardless of its biased contextualization and occasionally absurd elements, is of some use in helping us examine rarely questioned elements of the Ukrainianist master narrative.

Attempts to relate everything “Little Russian,” “Ruthenian,” or “Old Rus’ian” to Russian alone, accompanied by insistence on the comparatively short history of the ethnonym and glottonym *Ukrainian* in its present-day meaning, are of course unconvincing. While scholars in Ukrainian studies are perfectly aware that national activists introduced and disseminated the name *Ukraine* and the corresponding adjective *Ukrainian* in their modern meaning very consciously, they have every reason to ask whether a phenomenon can really be only as old as its name, and then go on to ask whether the continuous use of a particular name necessarily entails the continuity of the notion to which it refers.

While some Ukrainianists occasionally make the mistake of looking at all things “Little Russian,” “Ruthenian,” or “Old Rus’ian” through an exclusively “Ukrainian”

lens from the outset, the Ukrainophobes tend to label anything Ukrainian, especially the Ukrainian language, as artificial and Polish-motivated, and in fact inadmissible outside the “Little Russian” context, with all its imperial Russian connotations.

In this vein, Andrej Vadžra (2007a) writes:

Neither Kotljarevskij nor Ševčenko had ever heard of any “Ukrainian language.” They did not write in the Ukrainian language but in the Little Russian dialect.²⁴

Mixail Smolin (2007) joins in:

Kotljarevskij’s and Ševčenko’s Little Russian variant of the literary language is a local dialect.... Any people can have only one literary language; hence the Little Russian dialect was not and cannot be [cf. the Valuev Circular of 1863, noted below] equated with the Common Russian Literary language, which had already been brought into existence and developed by Lomonosov and the great classics of the nineteenth century.... [T]he “Ukrainian language” is an artificially invented jargon imbued with Polish, particularly in the spheres of terminology and phraseology. It is a conscious attempt to distance the Little Russian population from the Common Russian language and from Church Slavonic language roots in general.²⁵

Leonid Sokolov, having initially (2005) emphasized the allegedly Common Russian character of the Russian language, even praises Taras Ševčenko for his “superb elaboration” of the “Little Russian vernacular” but still finds it necessary, citing deliberately selected quotations (in this case, from Myxajlo Drahomanov), to question the legitimacy of the autonomous Ukrainian Standard language:

But neither Kotljarevskij nor his successors, including T. G. Ševčenko, in whose works the Little Russian vernacular found superb elaboration, had any notion of creating a wholly autonomous Ukrainian literature, as emphasized, in particular, by the Ukrainophile M. P. Dragomanov, who remarked that no such idea had prevailed among all Ukrainophiles in Russia until the 1890s.²⁶

24 “Ни Котляревский, ни Шевченко и слухом не слыхивали про «українську мову». Они писали не на украинском языке, а на малорусском наречии.”

25 “[...] малорусская разновидность литературного языка Котляревского и Шевченко — это областной диалект [...]. Литературный язык в одном народе может быть только один, поэтому малорусское наречие и не было, и не может быть поставлено рядом с общерусским литературным языком, уже рожденным и развитым Ломоносовым и великими классиками XIX века. [...] ‘украинский’ язык есть искусственно изобретенный жаргон, пропитанный польским языком, особенно в области терминологической и фразеологической. Он является сознательной попыткой увести малорусское население от общерусского языка и от церковнославянских языковых корней вообще.”

26 “Но ни у Котляревского, ни у его последователей, в том числе и у Т.Г.Шевченко, в произведениях которого малорусский народный язык получил прекрасную обработку, не было мысли создавать совершенно самостоятельную украинскую литературу, о чем писал, в частности, украинофил М.П.Драгоманов, отмечая, что такая мысль к 90-м годам XIX в. еще не овладела всеми украинофилами в России.”

According to such authors, anything Ukrainian can thus only be regarded as "Little Russian" or, alternatively, as a betrayal of Russia stemming from a purely and simply "artificial" endeavor. Nikolaj Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) remarks that Ivan Kotljarevskij's *Enejida* was composed as a "literary curiosity" ("литературный курьез"). According to him, the works of Kvitka-Osnov'janenko or even Marko Vovčok were nothing more than "essays" with no pretensions to "great literature,"²⁷ the latter being limited, in Ul'janov's view, to Russian literature alone. As Ul'janov would have it, all these authors were first and foremost "Russian-speaking," while their contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language would appear to lack any further significance.

Aleksandr Karevin (2006) expressly reduces the linguistic and national identity of the early protagonists of Modern Standard Ukrainian to an explicitly Russian one:

...Kotljarevskij, Grebënka [Ukr. Hrebinka] and Kvitka-Osnov'janenko regarded themselves as Russian and Russian as their native language. They had no intention of creating yet another literary language or "reviving Ukrainian literature" but used the dialects of simple folk (in this case, the dialects of the Poltava and Kharkov gubernias), for the better rendering of local color or for comic effect.... I. P. Kotljarevskij, incidentally, only came to be regarded as a contributor to the "renaissance" of Ukrainian literature in the late nineteenth century, when the activists of the Ukrainian movement found it necessary to prove that the "Ukrainian renaissance" they were propagating was not inspired by the Poles. Until then, Ivan Petrovič [Kotljarevskij] was not considered such a figure....²⁸

According to Karevin, the characters in the above-mentioned authors' works simply had to communicate with one another in "Little Russian dialects" for literary reasons, just as characters in the works of Great Russian writers from the Viatka, Riazan, or Pskov oblasts interacted in a regionally colored language. Karevin is either unaware of or chooses to remain silent about the very simple and obvious fact that in the works of Ukrainian literature he is attempting to categorize, the use of the Ukrainian language is by no means limited to the characters' speeches.

Not surprisingly, Ukrainophobes find Taras Ševčenko (on his language, see Moser 2008a) a particularly controversial figure. In a particularly provocative turn, Andrej Vadžra (2007a) depicts his achievements as something like the maximum that can be accomplished in the Ukrainian language, which is based on a beautiful but ultimately primitive dialect:

27 "[...] не более как 'опыты', не претендовавшие на большую литературу и не отменявшие ее."

28 "[...] Котляревский, Гребенка, Квитка-Основащенко считали себя русскими, а русский язык – родным. Создавать ещё один литературный язык, «возрождать украинскую литературу» они не собирались, а простонародные говоры (в данном случае диалекты Полтавской и Харьковской губерний) использовали в своем творчестве для лучшей передачи местного колорита или для комических эффектов. [...] Кстати сказать, в «возродители» украинской литературы И.П.Котляревский попал лишь в конце XIX [sic] века, когда деятелям украинского движения потребовалось доказать, что пропагандируемое ими «українське відродження» происходит не от поляков. До этого Ивана Петровича таковым не считали. [...]."

The Little Russian dialect is what we denote nowadays with the derogatory label “surzhik.” The dialect of the Little Russian peasants of the Poltava and Chernigov regions is the highest standard of the Little Russian vernacular. It is very beautiful and melodious, but, as you understand, too primitive to be a language of literature, scholarship, etc. The poetry of Taras Grigor'evič Ševčenko is the maximum that could be “squeezed out” of the folk dialect on the literary level.²⁹

Like many other Ukrainophobes, Mixail Smolin (2007) also seeks to create the impression that he thoroughly appreciates the “Little Russian dialect” in general and Ševčenko in particular, but he adds that this holds true only as long as this dialect, in his words, remains in the “primitive” sphere.

Other authors are more aggressive in questioning Ševčenko’s literary merits. Nikolaj Ul’janov (1966/1996/2003), for instance, offers the following evaluation:

He was neither a poet “of genius” nor a great one; three-quarters of his verses and poems are epigonic, tasteless, and provincial; their whole significance comes down to the fact that they are a tribute to the Little Russian language. Even a significant part of the last quarter was appreciated not by lovers of poetry but by the revolutionary intelligentsia.... Many who preceded and followed Ševčenko have written in Ukrainian, often better than he, but he alone is acknowledged as the “prophet.” The reason is that he was the first to revive the Cossacks’ hatred of Moscow and eulogize Cossack times as national.³⁰

In a further emotional escalation, Andrej Vadžra (2007a) also describes Ševčenko as “abominably provincial,” while Aleksandr Karevin (2006), in a spiteful gesture, points out that Ševčenko’s language has been adapted to the modern Ukrainian standard in modern Ukrainian editions. He seems not to notice that this method is also common practice in Russian editions of Russian authors (and not by any means in such editions alone).

Allegedly, however, not all Ukrainophobes have a serious problem with Ševčenko’s language as such: after all, they regard his language as still quite close to Russian and, ultimately and notoriously, as a “Little Russian” dialect. What these authors frequently add is that in their view, the Modern Ukrainian Standard language is fundamentally different from the language of Ševčenko and the Little Russian vernacular, given that Modern Standard Ukrainian allegedly represents an artificial concoction produced by the Galicians.

29 “Малорусское наречие — это то, что сейчас у нас называют презрительно суржи́ком. Говор малорусских крестьян Полтавщины и Черниговщины является эталоном малорусского наречия. Он весьма красив и певуч, но, как вы понимаете, слишком примитивен, чтобы быть языком литературы, науки и т.п. [...] Поэзия Тараса Григорьевича Шевченко это тот максимум, который можно было «выжать» из народного говора на литературной ниве. [...]”

30 “Поэтом он был не ‘гениальным’ и не крупным; три четверти стихов и поэмы подражательны, безвкусны, провинциальны; все их значение в том, что это дань малорусскому языку. Но и в оставшейся четверти значительная доля ценилась не любителями поэзии, а революционной интеллигенцией. [...] Многие до и после Шевченко писали по-украински, часто, лучше его, но только он признан ‘пророком.’ Причина: — он первый воскресил казачью ненависть к Москве и первый воспел казачьи времена, как национальные.”

Andrej Vadžra (2007a) remarks in this regard:

Why do the Kobzar's offspring not wish to speak Ukrainian to this day? Because in its current condition, it is a mixture of a Galician-Polish dialect and a newspeak invented in the nineteenth century.³¹

Pointed statements of this kind recur with particular frequency in several Internet forums (cf. Moser 2008b and pp.585–600 in this volume). In this context, Nikolaj Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) writes as follows:

From the end of the [18]70s, Lvov becomes the headquarters of the movement, and the character of Ukrainianness is defined by the Galicians.... Even the hastily created "literary language" that was declared to be "Common Ukrainian" cannot conceal the existence of two languages linked only by orthography.³²

Andrej Vadžra (2007a) actually goes so far as to specify the "so-called Galician mountain dialect" (whatever that may be) as the basis of the Modern Standard Ukrainian language.³³

Georgij Geraščenko (2007), too, emphasizes that the "Galician language" is fundamentally different from true Ukrainian:

It turns out that in late nineteenth-century Austrian Galicia...Ukrainophile writers did not write in the Ukrainian language, as we were taught to think, but in the "Galician language." ...in Russian Ukraine—more precisely, in Little Russia—people spoke and wrote in a language that was quite remote from the "Galician language."... As a matter of fact, even in the late nineteenth century the absolute majority of the inhabitants of Austrian Galicia did not know that they were, as it turned out, Ukrainians!... Throughout those five centuries, the inhabitants of Austrian Galicia regarded themselves as Rusyns [Ruthenians?], and they spoke and wrote in the Rusyn [Ruthenian?] dialect, which was close to the Russian language, and they gravitated toward the Russian Empire.³⁴

31 "Почему же потомки Кобзаря до сих пор не желают говорить на украинском? Да потому, что он в своем современном виде – смесь галицко-польского наречия и новояза, придуманного в 19 веке."

32 "С конца 70-х годов, Львов становится штаб-квартирой движения, а характер украинизма определяется галичанами. [...] Даже наспех созданная 'литерацка мова' [the expression literary language, which Ul'janov introduces with polemical intent in order to characterize the Ukrainian language as a Polish intrigue, is in fact uncommon in Modern Standard Ukrainian and in most former variants of Galician Ukrainian], объявленная общеукраинской, не способна скрыть существования двух языков, объединенных только орфографией."

33 "На самом деле, в основу современного украинского литературного языка положен т.н. подгорский галицийский диалект."

34 "Оказывается, в австрийской Галиции конца 19-го века [...] украинофильские писатели писали не на украинском языке, как нас приучили думать, а на «галицкий мові». [...] в российской Украине, точнее Малороссии, говорили и писали на языке, достаточно далеко от «галицкой мови». [...] Дело в том, что даже в конце 19 века абсолютное большинство жителей австрийской Галиции не знали, что они, оказывается, украинцы! [...] Все эти пять столетий жители австрийской Галиции считали себя русинами, говорили и писали на русинском диалекте близком к русскому и тяготели к Российской империи."

According to Geraščenko, most representatives of the Little Russian elites defended themselves against the “Galicianization” of “Little Russian.” As one would expect, Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj is cited as the most important source, given that in his publications devoted to the criticism of language he polemicized with particular zeal against Galician elements in Ukrainian (see Moser 2011a: 124–135). Nečuj-Levyč'kyj's often unconvincing explanations are not only cited with utmost delight by most of our Ukrainophobic “experts” but also fondly featured in various Internet forums.

Other materials important to these “experts” are selected quotations from Pantelejmon Kuliš, who took quite a variety of attitudes to the Ukrainian language in general and the Galicians and their language in particular in the course of his multifaceted life (Moser 2008b; Moser 2011: 84–93), or from the works of Mykola Kostomarov, such as his famous assertion that “there was much artificiality in the desire to elevate the Ukrainian language to the level of the fully developed literary languages.” Sokolov (2005) and Karevin (2006) in particular regard Kostomarov's words as proof that after their first, modest attempts at emancipation under the influence of Polish intrigue, most “Little Russians” in the Russian Empire soon came to their senses. According to the Ukrainophobic authors, the process of Ukrainian nation- and language-building would ultimately have failed at that time if the Galicians, instigated by the Poles and Austrians, had not persisted in it.

According to “Rusyn” (2007), a contributor to an Internet forum, the “whole might of the Austrian Empire was dedicated to” support for the Ukrainian movement. He adds that the Austrian Empire “did not recoil even from the *physical extermination* of Rusyns [or Ruthenians?] who resisted ‘Ukrainization.’”³⁵ This odd allegation is apparently inspired by the blogger's anticipation of developments in the course of the First World War, when the Austro-Hungarian imperial administration detained numerous Galician Ruthenians of various ideological backgrounds in internment camps, most notably in Thalerhof (near Graz), on collective suspicion of Russophilism. With an eye to the climax in Thalerhof, the blogger calling himself “Rusyn” follows “Rusyn” historical master narratives, generally derived from the Russophile camp of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and attempts to describe the entire Austrian period in Galicia as a consistent campaign against the “Russian” language and the “Russians.”

With regard to the latter, as noted above, the Ukrainophobic authors are not always in full agreement. Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) and others find it important to disseminate the view that much alien blood flows “in Galician veins,” and that the Galicians are not even of Slavic descent. Others of this persuasion, such as Karevin (2006), are eager to emphasize the ultimately “Russian” identity of the Galicians—an identity allegedly oppressed by Austrian nationality policy (needless to say, Karevin does refer to Count Stadion, who supposedly invented the “Ruthenians”...). As Karevin notes:

35 “Для этого была использована вся мощь Австрийской Империи, которая не остановилась даже перед физическим уничтожением сопротивлявшихся «украинизации» русинов.”

It is hard to imagine today that even in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the indigenous population of the western Ukrainian lands (Galicia, Bukovyna, Transcarpathia), which were then part of Austria-Hungary, did not yet distinguish itself in national terms from the Great Russians and regarded Russian as its native language.... In a word, Austrian policy was entirely dedicated to the mission of forcing the inhabitants of Galician, Bukovynian, and Hungarian Rus' (Hungarian Rus' was the name of Transcarpathia) to forget their Russian origin. This continued up to the year 1848.³⁶

According to Andrej Vadžra, Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, who initially did not even know the "Little Russian dialect," as he himself admitted in his diary, began learning the "mother tongue" [the Ukrainian expression "ридна мова" spelled in Russian characters]—notably, the Galician variety—only when he moved to Lviv (Vadžra 2007a).³⁷ Then, as "Rusyn" (2007) notes, Hruševs'kyj supposedly attempted to disseminate the heavily polonized Galician dialect in the central and eastern territories [of Ukraine], where that language was not really understandable (Vadžra 2007a). Smolin (2007) joins in, adding that it was only Hruševs'kyj who successfully managed to disseminate the Ukrainians' new name, in the "invention" of which he had been significantly involved. The essence of the Ukrainian project allegedly consisted in eliminating Church Slavonic words and replacing them with Polish elements (which, according to Smolin, were often themselves derived from Latin, French, or German), although Smolin does at least admit that these words were pronounced in a "Little Russian" manner.³⁸

For the Ukrainophobic authors, Galicia thus remains the breeding ground of "artificial" and noxious modern Ukrainian identity. In the nineteenth-century Galician context, Germans and speakers of German are presented for the first time as major enemies of the unity of the Rus'. The blog contributor "Rusyn" (2007), for example, finds it particularly important to emphasize that Josyf Levyc'kyj composed his grammar of Ruthenian (1834) in German (in this regard, again, he follows Russophile authors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries). To be sure, "Rusyn" does not add that in the course of the history of the languages of the world, a great many grammars have been written in languages different from those described in their body text for various reasons, including the simple fact that they were not always written only for speakers of the language described. What is more

36 "Сегодня трудно представить, что ещё в конце XIX - начале XX веков коренное население западноукраинских земель (Галиции, Буковины, Закарпатья), находившихся тогда в составе Австро-Венгрии, в национальном отношении не отделяло себя от великороссов и признавало родным русский язык. [...] Одним словом, вся австрийская политика была направлена на то, чтобы заставить жителей Галицкой, Буковинской, Угорской Руси (Угорской Русью называлось Закарпатье) забыть о своем русском происхождении. Так продолжалось до 1848 года."

37 "[...] (Надо заметить, что малорусского наречия Грушевский не знал (он в этом сам признавался в своём дневнике). «Ридну мову» в галицийском варианте профессор стал изучать, переехав во Львов."

38 "На совести Грушевского лежит также большой вклад в изобретение особого "украинского" языка: отказавшись от церковнославянских слов, он заменил их польскими (через польский язык он ввел много латинских, французских и немецких слов), но с соблюдением малорусского произношения."

important to “Rusyn” is to promote the impression that anything coming from the West is an evil anti-Russian plot, as is the “invention” of Ukrainian.

In this latter regard, the so-called “(Second) Alphabet War” of the year 1859 in Galicia is of utmost significance to the Ukrainophobic authors, who usually take no notice of the so-called “(First) Alphabet War” of 1834. As for the so-called “(Second) Alphabet War” of 1859, it is a well-known fact that the Czech official Alois Jireček and the Polish count Agenor Gołuchowski were in charge of that project, which sought to replace the Cyrillic alphabet with the Latin one in Galician “Ruthenian” written culture. The initiators of that endeavor did indeed regard it as an attempt to counter the Russophile movement in Galicia. With reference to the events of 1859, “Rusyn” (2007) remarks:

And in fact, what could be more humiliating: an Austrian, a Czech, and a Pole got together and debated in which language the “Ukrainians” should speak and in which letters they should write. In this regard, no one had any thought of asking those very “Ukrainians,” who were simply expected to be patient and await their fate.³⁹

What these emotional lines definitely do not reveal is the simple truth that the so-called “(Second) Alphabet War” came down to the following: the Austrian authorities submitted a written request for a statement to the Ruthenians (the term “Ukrainians” was never used in the Austrian imperial context at that time, which makes “Rusyn”’s polemical turn even less convincing). Since the Ruthenians were not in favor of the proposal, the Latin alphabet was not introduced.

Thus the Ukrainophobic authors even find the Austrian government guilty of replacing etymologically oriented orthography with phonetically oriented orthography, although in actual fact the Austrian authorities insisted on the traditional Cyrillic alphabet and etymological spelling until the 1890s. It was only the Ukrainians who insisted on the “phonetic” orthography, which the Russophiles opposed with such vehemence as a particularly blatant expression of the autonomous status of Ukrainian vis-à-vis Russian.

In this context, Andrej Vadžra (2007a) finds it important to state that the “Russian” orthography was “raped”⁴⁰ when the “phonetic” orthography replaced the “etymological” one, and that the “modernized alphabet” was imposed on the “Russian schools of Galicia, Bukovyna and Transcarpathia” by simple fiat of the Austrian authorities.⁴¹ Vadžra does admit elsewhere that the so-called “phonetic” Galician orthography ultimately derives from the one developed by Pantelejmon Kuliš in the Russian Empire (the so-called “Kulišivka”), but he emphasizes above

39 “И в самом деле, что могло быть более унижительным: собрались австрияк [a derogatory term, used polemically instead of австриец], чех и поляк, и провели диспут о том, на каком языке говорить и какими буквами писать «украинцам». При этом самих «украинцев» никто и спрашивать не собирався, они были должны просто терпеливо дожидаться своей участи.”

40 “[...] было изнасиловано русское правописание [...].”

41 “Этот модернизированный алфавит был приказом австрийских властей навязан русским школам Галиции, Буковины и Закарпатья.”

all that at a certain point Kuliš distanced himself from his own orthography, while overlooking Kuliš's continued use of the very same orthography despite his own reservations about it.⁴²

Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) makes similar observations. In the process, he remarks that the Russian government and Russian society, which allegedly did not understand the nationality issue and never looked into it, would never have meddled with such "trifles" as an alphabet.⁴³ Ul'janov is perhaps unaware of the very well-known fact that the "Kulišivka" was explicitly banned in Russia in the context of the Ems Ukase of 1876. Perhaps he also does not know that in 1859, the very year of the "(Second) Alphabet War" in Galicia, the Russian government had already prohibited the use of the Latin alphabet for writing in Ukrainian, but whether we are dealing with ignorance or prevarication, Ul'janov's inaccurate information, particularly as regards the regulations of 1876, confirms the impression that his remarks on Ukrainian language history are mere propaganda disseminated by an individual lacking expertise in this field. Since Ul'janov does not refrain from equating the largely phonetically oriented spelling of modern Ukrainian orthographies with a "phonetic transcription," and then contends that such "phonetic transcription" is otherwise only applied "either in a scientific research paper or in language teaching,"⁴⁴ he shows in the final analysis that he has no idea of what he is talking about.

As one would expect, the Ukrainophobic authors notoriously downplay the significance of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood, the Ukrainian patriotic society of the mid-1840s with which Taras Ševčenko and Pantelejmon Kuliš, among others, were affiliated. They also prefer to pay little attention to the question of how the society was discovered and disbanded by the tsarist police in 1847. Moreover, these authors deliberately attempt to create the impression that the infamous bans on the Ukrainian language, the Valuev Circular of 1863 and the Ems Ukase of 1876, were of very limited significance. Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) and, inevitably following after him, Karevin (2006) as well, find it particularly important to emphasize that Valuev's famous words "that an autonomous Little Russian language never existed, does not exist, and can never exist"⁴⁵ in the Valuev Circular did not reflect Valuev's personal opinion, but that the minister merely reported the opinion of "most of the Little Russians." Even if one acknowledges that this passage in the circular (and the denunciatory document to which it refers) actually does make such a claim, one is left wondering whether the passage could possibly be interpreted in a more naïve manner.

42 Incidentally, according to Vadžra (2007a), Kuliš condemned his own orthography "in a letter to the Ukrainophile Didyc'kyj"; in fact, he did so in a letter to the Russophile Jakiv Holovac'kyj. Moreover, Didyc'kyj was not a Ukrainophile but one of the leading Galician Russophiles.

43 "Русское правительство и русская общественность, не понимавшие национального вопроса и никогда им не занимавшиеся, не вникали в такие 'мелочи', как алфавит."

44 "Фонетическая транскрипция употребляется, обычно, либо в научно-исследовательской работе, либо в преподавании языков."

45 "[...] что никакого особенного малороссийского языка не было, нет и быть не может."

Also as expected, our Ukrainophobic authors make up Austrian bans on the Ukrainian language, although they never existed in that form. Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003) remarks:

There have been countless indignant outcries about Valuev's ukase on the Ukrainian language, but no Galician has ever reacted appropriately to the conclusion of an Austrian governmental commission of 1816, according to which the Galician dialect was entirely inappropriate as a medium of instruction in the schools....⁴⁶

In reality, the official correspondence of those years merely determined that "Ruthenian" was inadequately developed for use in comprehensive education (quite a reasonable assessment at the time). Nonetheless, language education in "Ruthenian" for a few hours per week became widespread in the elementary schools of Galicia, especially after 1816 and, even more so, after 1848, when the "Ruthenian" language was also introduced into secondary education (Moser 2011: 402–404). By contrast, "Little Russian" was not used at all in the schools of the Russian Empire, except for private Sunday schools during the brief period between 1859 and 1862, but that is a story Ul'janov prefers not to tell his readers.

It is important to note that the Ukrainophobes' unanimous efforts to depict the Galician Ruthenian language- and nation-building endeavors in the period before March 1848 as a purely "Russian" movement (see especially Pašaeva 2001) bear little relation to the facts. The Galicians were definitely concerned with the creation of a new written language on the basis of their own vernacular; in this phase, they did not intend to write in Russian but demonstrably thought in "Ruthenian" and not in Common Russian parameters. In their writings, they declared more than once that in their view, the Ruthenians were the same people as the "Little Russians" of the Russian Empire and spoke the same language (Moser 2011c). Although these Galician intellectuals occasionally included the Belarusians in their "imagined community" according to early modern parameters, Russians were generally regarded as different.

Admittedly, before March 1848 the language used by the Galician Ruthenians was not based primarily on the "Little Russian" developments in the Russian Empire. It was still rooted first and foremost in the specifically Galician dialects and traditions of writing. Ukrainian language-building in the Russian Empire did not develop strongly enough to convince the Galicians that it might have made sense to use a vernacular variety not ultimately based on Galician dialects of Ukrainian.

In highly stereotypical fashion, A. Ju. Suvorov (2006), a functionary of the Party of Regions, sums up the "long" nineteenth century as a period of Austro-German-Polish intrigue intended to "break the ties between the two fraternal

46 "Нет числа возмущенным возгласам по поводу указа Валуева об украинском языке, но ни один галичанин не отозвался соответствующим образом о заключении правительственной австрийской комиссии, высказавшейся в 1816 г. о галицийском наречии, как совершенно непригодном для преподавания на нем в Школах [sic] [...]."

peoples" and "separate Ukrainian culture from the enormously rich heritage of Great Russian culture."⁴⁷

Advancing this thesis of an intrigue orchestrated by foreign powers, many Ukrainophobic authors blame the Soviet policy of "Ukrainization" for the ultimate dissemination of the supposedly artificial new Ukrainian written language from Galicia to "Little Russia." Their account is even more interesting, as there can be little doubt about the pro-Soviet ideology of many of the Ukrainophobes.

As Ul'janov (1966/1996/2003), a Russian émigré author, tells the story, the "Bolshevik Revolution in Russia...openly took the side of the anti-Russian minority aiming at independence."⁴⁸ According to his narrative, which is also to be encountered in many other Ukrainophobic sources, as well as in the Internet forums, the artificial Galician-based Ukrainian language was forcibly imposed on the population of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the era of "Ukrainization" against all resistance and, indeed, against nature itself.

In this context, one is particularly struck by the importance that Ukrainophobes attach to emphasizing the role of Jews, as in the following quotations:

Jews played a particularly remarkable role in the "Ukrainian" movement.... All activists of "Ukrainianism," including Gruševskij himself, were revolutionary socialists by political conviction and collaborated closely with the international Jewish revolutionary movement. (Smolin 2007)⁴⁹

"Jewish officials took Ukrainization most seriously," wrote [Serhij Jefremov] in his diary in October 1924. At that time, remarked S. A. Jefremov, Ukrainians ("me-too Little Russians" [as Jefremov contemptuously referred to those Ukrainians]), following the example of Great Russians, resisted Ukrainization in all possible ways and stubbornly refused to learn the *ridna mova* [Ukrainian for "native language"]. During the implementation of "Ukrainization," this situation forced the authorities to rely to a significant degree on Jews.... [The Soviets] increasingly "purged" the institutions of Russian specialists (Great Russians and Little Russians "lacking national consciousness" [Karevin's comment]). Their places were taken "first and foremost by Ukrainians ("nationally conscious ones" [Karevin's comment]), and partly by Jews.... "The Jewish element⁵⁰ began to break its way into Ukrainian literature itself. The Jews A. Xvylja, I. Kulyk, and S. Ščupak dictate pathways and norms to Ukrainian writers," muttered one of the Ukrainian patriots [here Karevin uses the contemptuous expression *ненькопатриоты*] with dissatisfaction [Who and when, in what context?]....

47 "Но в XIX веке при поддержке Австрии, Германии и Польши радикальные украинские националисты пытались разорвать узы двух братских народов и обособить украинскую культуру, разом лишив ее всего богатейшего наследия великоросской культуры."

48 "[...] большевицкая революция в России, открыто принявшая сторону самостийнического антирусского меньшинства."

49 "Весьма заметную роль в >украинском< движении играли евреи. [...] Все деятели >украинства<, как и сам Грушевский, по своим политическим убеждениям были социалистами-революционерами и тесно сотрудничали с еврейским мировым революционным движением."

50 It is important to note here that in Ukrainian, as in Polish, the word *foms жид*, *жидівський* "Jew, Jewish" bore no pejorative connotations prior to the twentieth century, as opposed to the Russian *жид*, *жидовский*. Karevin obviously chose the Ukrainian word for his Russian translation in order to create the false impression that Serhij Jefremov used a swearword directed against Jews.

"The 'Little Russian' type has not died out and exists in Ukraine to this very day," wrote an ardent supporter of Ukrainization, the well-known Ukrainian literary critic V. Korjak (Blumštejn)... And another ardent Ukrainizer, the Ukrainian poet and first head of the Writers' Association of Ukraine, Izrail' Judelevič Kulik (who adopted the first name and patronymic Ivan Julianovič in response to Ukrainization), [did this and that]. (Karevin 2006)⁵¹

The alleged experts, as well as contributors to the Internet forums, are very keen to emphasize the Jewish ancestry of Lazar Kahanovyč, the Stalinist politician who played a leading role during the period of Ukrainization. Accordingly, they refer to him as "Lazar' Mojseevič" (as do Karevin 2006 and "Enals-Pilugina" 2007).

The anti-Semitic turn in the Ukrainophobic sources is indeed remarkable. With regard to the late nineteenth century, "Vpichatinec," another contributor to an Internet forum, finds it important to note that the Ukrainian movement spread from "Lvov, this ancient, age-old Russian city, which was in the hands of Poles and Jews."⁵² This anti-Semitic gesture marks the nadir of Ukrainophobic vulgarity.⁵³ Other, particularly aggressive authors allude to Joseph Goebbels with reference to the Ukrainian national movement, outside any perceivable context. Finally, they do not even balk at calling the creation of the Modern Standard Ukrainian language a Ukrainian "Jihad" against Russian culture (Geraščenko 2007).

51 «Наиболее серьезно к украинизации отнеслись служащие – евреи [...]» – записал он [Serhij Jefremov] в своем дневнике в октябре 1924 г. В то же время, замечал С.А.Ефремов, украинцы («тоже малороссы») вслед за великороссами всячески противились украинизации и упорно не желали учить «рідну мову». Подобное положение вынуждало власти при проведении украинизации в значительной мере опираться на евреев. [...] Постоянно усиливалась «чистка» учреждений от русских специалистов (великороссов и «несознательных» малороссов). Их места занимали «в первую очередь украинцы («национально сознательные» – Авт.), отчасти евреи». [...] «Жидовский элемент начал вдираться в самую украинскую литературу. Жиды А.Хвилья, И.Кулик и С.Шупак диктуют украинским писателям пути и нормы» – недовольно бурчал один из ненькопатриотов. [...] «Тип «малоросса» не умер и до сих пор на Украине» – писал ярый сторонник украинизации, известный украинский литературный критик В.Коряк (Блумштейн). [...] А еще один ярый украинизатор, украинский поэт, первый глава Союза писателей Украины, Израиль Юделевич Кулик (переименовавшийся по случаю украинизации в Ивана Юлиановича) [...].»

52 "[...] во Львове, в этом древнем, исконно русском городе, находившемся в руках поляков и евреев [...]." "Vpichatinec"'s contribution dates from 20 April (Hitler's birthday), and one might well ask whether this is a coincidence.

53 In his above-mentioned review, Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe (2010) reacts very nervously to the obvious fact that some of the anti-Ukrainian authors published on the Internet turn out to be anti-Semites as well. Here is his comment: "The confrontation-driven search for and finding of countless 'Ukrainophobes' on the Internet...as well as in the scholarly literature, whereby some of them turn out to be anti-Semites who also detect Jews behind the 'Ukrainian movement,' indicates not only the detection of a 'Ukrainophobic' conspiracy theory, but, owing to its triumphant unmasking of 'Ukrainophobias,' always in the name of scholarship, makes the article itself look like an outmoded practice resembling a conspiracy theory." Rossolinski-Liebe's comment is incorrect: as I stated clearly in the introduction to this article, I do not refer here to any sources other than those discovered by my search engine. Incidentally, it is remarkable that Rossolinski-Liebe is so astonished to encounter anti-Semitism in a Ukrainophobic context. The combination of Ukrainophobic hate speech in the cause of all-Russian unity and militant anti-Semitism has had a long tradition ever since the Slavophile movement and its militant offspring, the Black Hundreds, eagerly welcomed or took a leading role in the Jewish pogroms in the Russian Empire (see Dzjuba 2011).

2.3.2. *Audiat et altera pars?*

Can a historian of the Ukrainian language possibly make use of at least some isolated fragments of this generally absurd and often downright abominable discourse “from the other side”? Which elements might potentially motivate us to revise the master narrative of Ukrainian language history, which, like any master narrative of Slavic—and not only Slavic—language history, tends to be primarily a success story replete with teleology and anachronism?

One might note, for instance, the Ukrainophobes’ emphasis on the significance of Galicia, whereas most historians of the Ukrainian language have not yet taken due account of Galician developments, despite the widely acknowledged role of Galicia as a Ukrainian “Piedmont” during the bans on the Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire from 1863 to 1876 and 1905 (see Moser 2011 and pp. 337–349 in this volume), and despite a certain awareness of the Galician contribution to the formation of Modern Standard Ukrainian, which was particularly highlighted in some of Jurij Ševel’ov’s studies (see especially Ševel’ov 1966). Regarding the early stage of Ukrainian written culture in the Russian Empire, many studies on the history of the Ukrainian language do not sufficiently clarify an obvious fact that the Ukrainophobes consider particularly important: that early Ukrainian literary efforts were indeed still embedded in the Russian imperial context, and that in all likelihood those engaged in such efforts did not in fact intend at the outset to create a polyfunctional and autonomous Ukrainian standard language. The Ukrainophobes’ allegation that Ivan Kotljarevs’kyj did not regard himself as a national awakener or creator of a new written language would appear to be correct, and even the claim that some early nineteenth-century writers were mainly experimenting with the use of “Little Russian” in specific literary genres cannot be completely dismissed. The well-known assessment that Myxajlo Maksymovyč made in a letter of 1840 to Denys Zubryc’kyj was presumably quite correct at the time: “Little Russian” written culture was generally still interpreted as a regional variety of Russian (Moser 2011a: 79–84). And even if this began to change as soon as Taras Ševčenko appeared on the scene with his *Kobzar* (1840), neither Ševčenko himself nor his contemporaries managed to create a full-fledged Modern Standard Ukrainian language in the course of the following decades.

All this, however, is not to question that Kotljarevs’kyj’s literary work was a clear expression of the richness and beauty of the Ukrainian language; that folk-song collections, most of which merely featured songs of the “Little Russian” people, confirmed those qualities; that provincial “Little Russian” literature as written by Jevhen Hrebinka or Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov’janenko continued to prepare the ground for Taras Ševčenko and further literary developments; and that even if Ukrainian in the Russian Empire had not yet developed into a full-fledged modern standard language, its stage of elaboration had already approached that level quite closely, despite the lack of any institutional support, when further work on the Ukrainian language was seriously hampered by the imperial language bans of 1863 and 1876.

The Ukrainophobes’ suggestion that Ukrainian became a full-fledged, truly polyfunctional language only in Austrian Galicia is thus not completely untrue.

In the Russian Empire, modern Ukrainian written culture was still mainly limited to the sphere of belles lettres when the first modern Ukrainian-language primers appeared in the second half of the 1850s; the bilingual journal *Osnova* (1861–62) featured several Ukrainian-language contributions of a non-belletristic character; and Pylyp Moračevs'kyj completed his Ukrainian translation of the Gospels. The Galicians had faced the challenge of developing a polyfunctional language at least since the revolution of 1848–49, when they had already gained the opportunity to publish newspapers and journals in their language, to read the imperial Austrian laws in their language, and so on (Moser 2008: 667–683; see pp. 337–349 in this volume). They had made good use of those opportunities, but, under the impact of growing Russophilism, remained much less successful regarding the elaboration of their own language. From the early 1860s, when powerful impulses from the Russian Empire reached Galicia, the Galician populists (“narodovci”) took up the challenge. In the following decades, in collaboration with Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, they managed to create a truly polyfunctional Modern Ukrainian Standard Language.

Moreover, one should frankly admit that some representatives of the Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire who came closest to the Galicians in their attempts to create a full-fledged Ukrainian standard language wavered precisely at those moments when firmness on their part would have been particularly desirable, as did Pantelejmon Kuliš in the years 1863 and 1876 (Moser 2011a: 84–93 and pp. 305–336 in this volume).

But all this is by no means to imply that the Modern Standard Ukrainian language is a Galician creation *sui generis*. The foundations of Modern Standard Ukrainian are ultimately supradialectal, but it is definitely not based on southwestern Ukrainian dialects. Even so, a certain genuinely Galician layer in the Modern Standard Ukrainian language cannot be denied, and it is not limited to vocabulary alone (see Švel'ov 1966; on vocabulary and phraseology, see Tkač 2007).

Most important, the Modern Standard Ukrainian language ultimately appears to be the product of constant dialogue between the “Ruthenians” of Galicia (subsequently, Galicia and Bukovyna) and the “Little Russians” from various regions of the Russian Empire. As an addendum to the master narrative of Ukrainian language history, one might single out the following major steps in the development of “Ruthenian”–“Little Russian” cooperation. In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Galician “awakeners” initially advanced their linguistic movement mainly on the basis of their own, Galician foundation, but they did so in full awareness of the achievements made in the Russian Empire. In their writings, the Galicians expressly referred to the folk-song collections published there, as well as to the most popular works of Ukrainian literature from the Russian Empire, accepting them without hesitation as part of their own literary heritage. In the wake of the revolution of 1848–49, the Russophiles became powerful in Galicia for many reasons, including the fact that the Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire had little to offer after the dissolution of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius in 1847. Beginning in the 1860s, soon after the revival of the Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire in the mid-1850s, the Galician

"Ruthenians" not only continued to adhere to the view that the "Little Russian" language was their own but also deliberately associated themselves with "Little Russian" language traditions and increasingly tried to write in a language that was expressly not based on Galician dialects (even though it retained certain Galician elements on all linguistic levels). In this regard, the poetry of Taras Ševčenko was of decisive significance. It was under the impact of Ševčenko's works, which became well known in Galicia only from the early 1860s, that the Galicians began increasingly to distance themselves from their own literary traditions (Moser 2007; Moser 2008a: 63–82; 426–431). Nevertheless, they made a weighty contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language, particularly in the last decades of the nineteenth century, and primarily in the sphere of vocabulary. Their ongoing success in that regard was due not only to the absence of language bans, which allowed them to develop the Ukrainian language freely, but also to their ability to draw on the experience of other Slavic and non-Slavic peoples of the Austrian Empire, who clearly demonstrated that in nineteenth-century Europe, a language had to be fully codified and fully functional in all spheres of society if it was to gain international status, and that all this could only be achieved by consistent, well-organized work. Galician collaboration with outstanding Ukrainians from the Russian Empire, such as Pantelejmon Kuliš, Myxajlo Drahomanov, and Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, proved highly fruitful in that regard. True, some Ukrainians from the Russian Empire, such as Borys Hrinčenko and Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj—and even Pantelejmon Kuliš and Myxajlo Drahomanov, who nevertheless adopted many Galician elements into their own language—continued to criticize the Galicians for allegedly using an artificial language (Ševel'ov 1966, Moser 2011a). Most of their reproaches were certainly unjustified, but the dialogue proved useful nevertheless: the Galicians continued to bring their language closer to that of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, while the latter accustomed themselves to a number of (apparently or genuinely) Galician elements that subsequently became integral elements of the Ukrainian language as such.

The Ukrainophobes' notorious claim that the period of "Ukrainization" was a leap in the development of the Ukrainian standard language is undoubtedly quite correct as well.⁵⁴ It is also quite true that Jews had a lively and significant share in this development. In this connection, however, it is not enough to mention Stalin's watchdog, the political functionary Lazar Kahanovyč, who played a leading role in the policy of Ukrainization after 1925. More attention should perhaps be paid to such influential scholars as Olena Kurylo, Leonid Bulaxovs'kyj, and Ijeremija Ajzenštok, who made signal contributions to the development of the Ukrainian language in those years. Their contributions were much less ambiguous than those of Kahanovyč, who supported the process of Ukrainization while simultaneously undermining it by his political measures against the most resolute proponents of

54 Since 2004, complaints about the "Ukrainization" of the 1920s have often been advanced with an eye to the new "forcible Ukrainization" that allegedly took place under the "Orange" rule of President Viktor Jušenko.

Ukrainization (see the article “‘Ukrainization’ and the Ukrainian Language” in this volume). The same Ukrainophobic authors who frequently point out the role of Jewish politicians in implementing the Ukrainian version of *korenizacija* forget to mention that, for example, individuals of Jewish origin were disproportionately represented among leading members of Stalin’s secret police who then prosecuted the “Ukrainizers” (see Šapoval–Prystajko–Zolotar’ov 1997: 531–581). Once again, while anti-Semites claim to know what further implications can be drawn from the Jewish background of one person or another, normally thinking people merely observe that in the process of Bolshevik “Ukrainization” both Jews and Gentiles were represented in very different social groups and camps.

The silence of our Ukrainophobic authors about the Stalinist terror against promoters of the Ukrainian language and against the Ukrainian language itself is hardly surprising, since it does not fit their narrative. As opposed to them, no serious historian of the Ukrainian language can remain silent about the far-reaching consequences of the Stalinist onslaught on the Ukrainian language and its speakers, which actually began during the period of Ukrainization itself.

As for a final and very important element of the basic repertoire of Ukrainophobic authors, namely the allegation that in the post-Soviet period, particularly since the “Orange Revolution” of 2004, the Galician variant of Ukrainian or, even worse, the mostly Galician-based variety of Ukrainian spoken by the North American diaspora has been forcibly imposed on the Ukrainian population, while the Russian language has been forcibly suppressed, I address it in some detail in my “Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting” (Moser 2008b, included in this volume).

The approach to the history of the Ukrainian language generally shared by Ukrainophobic authors is perfectly summarized by Aleksandr Karevin (2006), whose magnanimous toleration of that language comes down to lip service:

It is worth reiterating: what has been said above does not mean that the Ukrainian language should be discriminated against. But it should not be forgotten that the native language of most Ukrainians is Russian; that Ukraine is a wonderful land with its own character, but that it is only a part of historical Rus'.⁵⁵

Karevin ultimately confirms that whether we like it or not, the notorious Ukrainophobes, who still play an important role in modern Ukraine, turn discussion on the history of the Ukrainian language into a highly politicized issue. With regard to its demands in the sphere of language policy, however, the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine needs better-qualified creative advocates than those whose unconvincing assertions have been discussed here and who simply continue to break elementary rules of democratic conduct. If one refers, on the one hand, to the

55 “Стоит повториться: вышесказанное не означает, что украинский язык нужно дискриминировать. Но нельзя забывать, что родным для большинства украинцев является всё-таки язык русский, что Украина - прекрасный, самобытный край, но она – только часть исторической Руси.”

European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages in advocating the rights of an allegedly suppressed minority language of Ukraine (see pp. 601–619 in this volume), it is inadvisable to persist in stubborn adherence to deeply intolerant attitudes and continue denying the legitimacy of Ukrainian identity, including the legitimacy of the Ukrainian language as such.

Part II

Ukrainian in Contact: The Early Modern Period



PHONETIC POLONISMS IN LAVRENTIJ ZYZANIJ'S SLAVONIC GRAMMAR

1. Some comments on the language of Lavrentij Zyzanij

Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* (Грамматика словенска) was published in Vilnius in February 1596. This text is a remarkable example of early modern Ruthenian and, more precisely, Ukrainian written culture in many ways. First, it is of outstanding importance for the history of the Church Slavonic language and its recensions, especially for the codification of Church Slavonic. Second, the Ruthenian-language sections of this text clearly demonstrate that this very symbiosis of the Church Slavonic and Ruthenian languages is crucial to the understanding of early modern Ruthenian culture in general. Third, this work confirms the generalization that as far as the Ruthenian language is concerned, local and supraregional aspects interact, and that contact with Polish is of great significance.

Given that Zyzanij, who was a native of Galicia, arrived in Vilnius in 1595 "probably with a completed manuscript" of his grammar, "which drew on his many years of teaching Church Slavonic in Lviv and Berestja (Brest)," and that the texts featured in his grammar contain certain dialectal elements that are especially characteristic of the southwestern dialects of the Ukrainian language (Nimčuk 1980: 10–11, 37), it is my contention that this monument is by and large closely associated with the Galician Ruthenian/Ukrainian sphere. According to Vasyľ Nimčuk (1980: 10–11), "Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* was the first original attempt to grasp and consistently elaborate the morphology of the Church Slavonic language and normalize it. At the same time, it is the first systematic school textbook on the grammar of this language." It should be remembered that Zyzanij had already played a part in compiling the first Greek-Slavonic grammar, the *Adelphotes*, which was published in Lviv in 1591. I concur with the view advanced by Kyrylo Studyns'kyj (Studyns'kyj 1911: 26–32) that "in its definitions and translations alike, [the *Adelphotes* already contains many] characteristics of the living Ukrainian language, above all its southwestern dialects" (Nimčuk 1980: 10–11). See, e.g., the adjective *дурнейкїй* (fol. 49) with $j < н'$ and the degrees of comparison of adjectives, such as *крѣпчаншїй* (C/No. 47), *ближаншїй*, *внѣшнѣншїй*, and *моудрѣншїй* (C/No. 48), along with *цѣломудрѣншїй*. These forms can hardly be explained as typographical errors, as Studyns'kyj did (1911: 31), if only because they appear so often. The most likely explanation is that these are hypercorrect forms attesting to this particular development of $j < н'$ and to their confusion. In addition to these forms, the *Adelphotes* records, for example, a hard *p* in the words *царѣ* and *опѣ* (Studyns'kyj 1911: 26–32). The same characteristics are also typical of Zyzanij's grammar, which contains *любой* (fol. 82^v) with $j < н'$ and *творѣ*, and many other forms with a hard *p* (several times in fols. 56–56^v). As for $j < н'$, it is worth noting that Ševel'ov (2002: 876) lists the very same example from the *Slavonic Grammar*, along with the appropriate form of *lyboy* (which appears in the writings of Jakub Gawatowicz), and confirms that the change $н' > j$ is first attested in sixteenth-century monuments.

As for the hard *p*, in the chapter of his grammar titled “Канонъ ѿ, ѡ ю,” Zyzanij writes: “Се ѡпотреб'лаетсѧ¹ в'мѣсто ѡ. ѿко, зрѡ, ю. црѡ, црю” (fol. 88^v), which apparently indicates that he even regarded the hard *p* in this position as a characteristic of the classic Church Slavonic language. In *Leksis*, *борѡса* and *жрѡ* are listed as Church Slavonic and Ruthenian (“prosta mova”)² forms: “борѡса, воюю, борѡса,” “жрѡ, заколюю, зарѣзю, офѣроване” (Nimčuk 1964: 28, 47) et al. A considerable number of other words typical of the Ukrainian language are encountered both in the *Adelphotes* and in Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar*.

As is known, Zyzanij's grammar and the translated sections of the *Adelphotes* were written in the “Ruthenian” recension of the Church Slavonic language. However, texts that were published before and after the *Slavonic Grammar* are written in “Ruthenian,” or the “prosta mova” of the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, and even some Church Slavonic sentences from Zyzanij's grammar appear in “Ruthenian” translation as well. In those sections, the model of the Polish language plays the same significant role as in other classic “prosta mova” texts of this era: phonetics and inflectional morphology are largely “Ruthenian,” while the lexical stock most often either corresponds to the Polish lexis of the time or is taken directly from it. To a great degree, the syntax and phraseology correspond to Polish syntax and Polish phraseology of the early modern period. Besides the above-mentioned characteristics, the Cyrillic script indicates particularly clearly that, despite all the Polonisms, these texts are written in “Ruthenian.”

The “Ruthenian” language of this text is marked by a distinct degree of supraregionalism, although certain dialectal features are to be encountered.

In general, the letters *ѣ* and *е* are used quite consistently in accordance with etymology. The only interesting examples of *е* instead of *ѣ* are *члвекъ*, a word that Voznjak (1911: 62) already characterized as “unquestionably a Polonism,” and the word *обещаючи*. Next is the form *тѣлесный*.³ There is no ultimate scholarly consensus on this word (cf. differing views in Nimčuk 1980: 26). It would appear, however, that Ševel'ov is correct in saying that the root vowel *е* in the expanded stem is an early proto-Ukrainian feature. Ševel'ov (2002: 151) points out that “Zyzanij legitimized this usage in his grammar [1596]” when he wrote the following in the chapter entitled “Канонъ ѡ, ѣ” (87–87^v):

“Се ѣ, оу нѣкихъ въ мѣсто е приемлетсѧ, егда тѣлесный глаголютъ въ мѣсто телесный, и ѡ христе, // въ мѣсто ѡ хрїстѣ. и ѡ господа, спасѣ, и прочаа. нелѣпо же естъ ихъ оупотребленїе. оуподобляетсѧ [sic] въмѣсто ѧ, ѿко, бѣхѡ, бѣхѡ, и прочаа. и се естъ бл҃гоугодно оупотребленїе.”

1 For technical reasons, letters written in superscript in the original printed text are not rendered in italics in this book.

2 On “prosta mova,” see Moser 2011: 75–31.

3 Cf. also “цѣлость телесе, здорове, свѣжость” in the *Leksis* (Nimčuk 1964: 87).

As Ševel'ov convincingly argues, "the most natural thing would be to see, in forms with *e*, positional truncation, which occurred within a syllable before a stressed syllable in three-syllable forms." Furthermore, "with the exception of certain early Novgorod monuments, these forms with *e* are exclusively Ukrainian" (ibid.). It would thus appear that only the ending *-e* instead of *-ѣ* in the phrase *в' поме лица нашего* must be explained by a non-Galician basis. In this regard, it is entirely possible that what we are dealing with here is the result of intrusions on the part of the Belarusian printers in Vilnius.

Meanwhile, there are other features that are characteristic of Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar*, namely, southwestern Ukrainian dialectal features. Several of them have already been discussed in an excellent article by Natalja Netreba (2004), who does not, however, give due consideration to the fact that orthography sometimes fails to reflect the phonetic reality of a language⁴ and is also based on tradition. The author also underrates the significance of literary borrowings.⁵

A typically Ukrainian feature of the *Slavonic Grammar* is the reflex *i* from the original *ѣ*, as attested, on the one hand, by the words *мнїе* instead of *мнѣ* (82), *или* (= *ѣли*, 91) and, on the other, *нѣ* in "Бѣ не искоушаетъ нѣкого" (twice on 92^v) and *мѣзерного* (91) (cf. also "мѣзерный," "мѣзерность" (Nimčuk 1964: 86). The reflex *ѣ* [i] is occasionally encountered in Zyzanij's *Leksis* in a newly closed syllable, cf. *намѣтъ* (Nimčuk 1964: 233; cf. Netreba 2004: 233) and cf. *намїотъ* in the *Slaveno-Ruthenian Synonyms* (Синоніма славеноросскаа) (Nimčuk 1964: 130).

Another important feature of this text is the writing of *уѡ*- in the word *оувесъ* cf. "а ѡ мїрѣ зас пишеть // в першом листѣ своем, в главѣ ѣ. иж оувес свѣтъ в злости естъ" (92–92^v; this form is not mentioned by Muxajlo Voznjak, Vasyli' Nimčuk, or Natalja Netreba), and "в' вес свѣтъ" in the *Leksis*—and *у* instead of *ѡ*; cf. "прото бѣ приписѣтѣ в'вожене в напасть. не иж бы бѣ оуводилъ, але иж дїаволъ оуводити допущает. так же тыж и тѣло къ искѣшенїю нас приводит" (92^v). (This form, too, is not mentioned in the three above-cited works.)

Examples of confusion between *и* and *ѣ* definitely occur, but this incidence pertains most often to the position following *р*—cf. *которим* (instrumental singular (90^v) and *рихло* (90^v), etc.—and only rarely to other positions, cf. *дны древнаа* (85). The text contains frequent occurrences of *о* after sibilants, cf. "без допущена и дозволена божого нѣчого не может" (92^v), etc., but *нашего* (91^v) and *ѡ словѣ бжемя* (91^v), etc. (forms with *e* can hardly be regarded as a direct reflection of the living language, since traditional ways of writing are at issue here; it should be noted, however, that Galician dialects of Ukrainian do sometimes retain *e* instead of *о* after sibilants).⁶

4 For example, the use of the ending *-тъ* in such words in the *Leksis* as *снумъ*, etc. cannot be regarded as direct evidence of the hard pronunciation in its native dialect (Netreba 2004: 233) because this usage also corresponds to Church Slavonic norms. The same applies to the writing of full-form endings of adjectives and pronouns (Netreba 2004: 235).

5 For example, with regard to the forms *хороба* and *хорую* or the presence of the particle *нехай* (Netreba 2004: 233, 236).

6 See Netreba (2004: 233), who, in citing the examples *жерно* and *черницѣ*, writes that "the preservation [of *e*] after sibilants before long-standing hard consonants" is typical of Zyzanij.

The language of the *Slavonic Grammar* is marked by such typical Galician characteristics as, for example, the above-mentioned forms with a hard *p* (cf. also Netreba 2004: 235)—the hard *p* is a very ancient feature of many Ukrainian dialects—and the form *либой* with *j < н'* (this form is not mentioned in Netreba 2004). Moreover, the forms *вѣнтпачи* and *вѣнтпливостѣ* (see below), and the hypercorrect *о* instead of *ѡ* in *ѡрозоѡ* (“и еден ѡрозоѡ [sic] добродѣтел'ною працею переходѣмо,” III^в) indicate that the Galician-born Zyzanij pronounced unstressed *о* as [u] (there is no mention of such *ukannia* forms in the three works cited above; cf., after all, only the forms *вонтплю*, *вонтпливостѣ* in *Slavono-Ruthenian Synonyms*); in this respect, it is worth mentioning that Ševel'ov (2002: 664) found another example of *ukannia* in Zyzanij's writings—the form *парубок* from his *Leksis* (cf. Nimčuk 1964: 89).

There are examples in the *Leksis* of a soft *ц'*, cf. *казаница* (Nimčuk 1964: 46) and *молодица* (Nimčuk 1964: 89), along with hardened *оузданица* (Nimčuk 1964: 27); at the end of words, only *-цѣ* occurs, cf. *втецѣ* (Nimčuk 1964: 23), *посланецѣ* (Nimčuk 1964: 24), etc. (cf. also Netreba 2004: 235).

Also noteworthy is the form *ѡмана*, which appears in the *Leksis*—cf. “призрачѣ, привиденѣ, кѡклар'ство, ѡмана” (Nimčuk 1964: 71; Netreba 2004 does not mention this form).⁷ This form does not necessarily reflect a simplification of the *-bm-* group; cf. also the old Polish form *отан*, which corresponds to *отам* in the contemporary Polish language.

Also striking is the form *з вѣсѣлам* (91) with *'a < 'e* in the suffix *-bj* (*e*), which also occurs in the *Leksis*: “звѣсѣлам [sic, i.e., з вѣсѣлам],” “на повѣтра” (Nimčuk 1964: 34–35; cf. also Netreba 2004: 233–34) along with *e* in the forms “зѣльемъ,” “зелѣе, зѣлье” (Nimčuk 1964: 48). The ending *-'ам* in the instrumental case of this category of nouns is first recorded in the sixteenth century: the first example of *замышленамъ*, which is listed in the *Morphology* (Morfolohiia 1978: 96–97), comes from the Peresopnytsia Gospel of 1556–61.

One more characteristic of Zyzanij's *Leksis* deserves particular attention: old pleophony in the verb *пожерету* (92) versus the newly introduced form “пожертѣ” (Nimčuk 1964: 69) from the *Leksis*, cf. the contemporary Ukrainian *жеретія* (Ševel'ov 2002: 371). According to Ševel'ov, forms such as *жерти* (Ševel'ov 2002: 135, 372) were introduced only in the seventeenth century; hence Zyzanij's *Leksis* apparently contains one of the earliest examples.⁸

7 Netreba (2004, 236–37) indicates several dialect words and the construction *на обѣ сторонѣ* in the dual number, which today “is typical of the dialects spoken in the territories along the Sian and Dnister Rivers” (Netreba 2004: 236). Theoretically, the dual number could also be regarded as a nod to written tradition, but it is most probably to be explained as an authentic archaism typical of many Galician dialects (after all, the form reads *сторонѣ*, not *странѣ*).

8 Ševel'ov (2002: 135) singles out the form *умерти* in the *Palinode* (Palinodiia) of 1621 as the first example of this phenomenon. As regards *жерти*, he cites an example from the early eighteenth century. Later (2002: 135), he writes: “Today pleophonic forms have been preserved in certain southwestern dialects (*умерѣти*, *терѣти*, *подерѣти*, *заперѣти*, *зачерѣти* ‘зняти чертаком’—Drohobych, Sambir; *умерѣти*, *сперѣти*, *дерѣти*—Eastern Lemkos [Uherts], as well as the dialects spoken in territories situated along the Sian River [Nadsiania] and Transcarpathia.”

Interestingly, Zyzanij writes: “се ти есть оупотребленіе, тоеты [*sic*, i.e., тоє ты] звык чинити” (Nimčuk 1964: 63), which indicates that he did not use the personal endings -м, -б, -смо, -ме when an explicitly expressed pronoun functioned as a subject.

Zyzanij's linguistic characteristics show unequivocally that he was a native of Galicia. It is still uncertain, however, whether he was born in the village of Potelych in Zhovkva raion, Lviv oblast (Netreba 2004: esp. 237).

2. The Polish language among sixteenth-century Ruthenians

During the sixteenth century, Ruthenian writers distinguished increasingly clearly between the “Common Ruthenian language” (*prosta mova*) and the Church Slavonic language, with the result that over time, beginning in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, texts written in the “*prosta mova*” contained fewer and fewer Church Slavonic elements, apart from certain ecclesiastical words and quotations and other, mostly lexical, impregnations. Meanwhile, the more these authors moved away from the Church Slavonic language, the more readily they made use of the Polish model, a language in which the Ruthenian elites were, as a rule, perfectly fluent. Ruthenians wrote in the Polish language, at the same time increasingly using it as a source of borrowings, particularly on the lexical and syntactic levels. Ruthenians must have been aware that Polish had developed into a full-fledged early modern written language only recently, largely in the second half of the sixteenth century (the “Golden Age” of Polish culture).

The “Common Ruthenian” language and Church Slavonic are of course unmistakably distinguished in Zyzanij's grammar as well. True, some vernacular elements also occur in its Church Slavonic sections. It is doubtful, however, whether one can truly explain these impregnations as a manifestation of Zyzanij's “aspiration...to bring the Church Slavonic language closer to the living East Slavic languages” or “to bring the Slaveno-Ruthenian language closer to the literary East Slavic languages,” as Vasyl' Nimčuk asserts (1980: 38, 55). It is more likely that these intrusions actually “reflected the state of the Slaveno-Ruthenian language in Ukraine in the late sixteenth century” (Nimčuk 1980: 55), but, it would appear, only in the sense that not every author in every case knew exactly which element corresponded to Church Slavonic norms, and which did not. It is interesting to note that this applies even to Zyzanij, who was unquestionably one of the preeminent specialists in the Church Slavonic language of his era.

Meanwhile, it would seem that Polonisms in a text written in “Common Ruthenian” did not perturb either authors or readers. They were perceived as “Common Ruthenian” elements, so much so that, as mentioned earlier, the lexis of model texts written in “Common Ruthenian,” with certain exceptions, fully corresponds to the lexis of existing Polish originals or potential Polish originals, which may be reconstructed without difficulty on the basis of texts written in “Common Ruthenian.” As a rule, in translations from Polish into “Common Ruthenian,” not only words common to both the Polish and the Ruthenian language but also a number of genuine Polonisms were often adapted to the rules of the

"Ruthenian" language, and this was done so flawlessly that the Polish derivation of those words cannot be established on the basis of phonological rules, since these were aptly borrowed according to the morphological, not the phonological, principle, particularly in those cases where their etymology was completely transparent (Moser 2007a). Meanwhile, certain words occurring in texts written in "Common Ruthenian" reveal their Polish derivation through Polish reflexes of certain sound changes. This article will focus on those particular words.

In his classic article on Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar*, Myxajlo Voznjak compiled a "small dictionary of the more interesting words that Lavrentij used in his exposition, introduction, and certain explanations of Church Slavonic definitions" (Voznjak 1911: 63–67), adding: "I am not excluding Polonisms" (Voznjak 1911: 63). Unfortunately, Voznjak neither specified nor researched those Polonisms. Vasyľ Nimčuk (1980: 28) cited certain "living language...characteristics, including western Ukrainian folk [characteristics]" in his work on Zyzanij's grammar, but he did not study the question of Polonisms.

In the present work, all the Polonisms that appear in Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* have been researched on the basis of the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (SUM XVI–XVII) and the dictionary compiled by Jevhen Tymčenko (Tym). Later, I checked Zyzanij's *Leksis*, published in Vilnius in 1596 (Nimčuk 1964), which contains many more Polonisms than the *Slavonic Grammar*. Finally, I consulted the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (SUM XIV–XV) in order to verify whether the Polonisms in Zyzanij's grammar already occur in documents dating to those centuries.⁹

3. Lavrentij Zyzanij's Polonisms

3.1. Modern Ukrainian has preserved "a comparatively small group of adverbs ending in *-e*, which are related to hard-declension adjectives, e.g., *добре, зле, марне* (also *марно*), *навмисне* (*навмисно*), *певне* (*певно*), etc." (Morfolohiia 1978: 379). In the "Ruthenian" language of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these adverbs occur rather frequently (and in nineteenth-century Ukrainian, they still occur more often than they do today). Linguists have concluded that adverbs ending in *-e* are either derived from adverbial forms of the accusative singular of contracted forms of full-form neuter adjectives or can be regarded as phonetic variants of adverbs ending in *-ѣ* (Morfolohiia 1978: 379–81). In all likelihood, they should be considered Polonisms; Lukijana Humec'ka and other scholars, including Jurij Ševel'ov (2002: 550), all concur on this point.¹⁰

Admittedly, the change of the unstressed *ѣ > e* in northern Ukrainian dialects, as well as the concatenation of *ѣ* and *e* in the Belarusian language, could have fostered the dissemination of adverbs ending in *-e* in the "Ruthenian" language, which was

9 Only the word *napmanu* was checked in the card file of the Lviv-based Ivan Kryp'jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies during a conference at which this paper was presented.

10 Ševel'ov points to an earlier example in a document of 1422 from Sambir.

proved by Humeć'ka. If, however, we consider Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* to be first and foremost a Galician text, the most likely point of departure should be that adverbs ending in *-e* are Polonisms. At the same time, borrowings of Polish forms with *e* without palatalization of the preceding consonant should be explained as a consequence of an already established tradition (Morfolohiia 1978: 379–81).

The following adverbs ending in *-e* occur in Zyzanij's grammar:

Егїїрaмма На Граммaтїкѹ

латве (II): "Граммaтїка писмa всѣх наѣчаєт, чтырма частми латве ѡразѹмлаєт." The stem as such undoubtedly derives from the Polish language, but there is no certainty based on historical phonology. Тымчєнко (Тым) lists entries for *латве*, *-o*, *латвость* and *латвий*; he offers an example of *латве* from the *Apocrisis*. The *латв*-stem does not appear in SUM XIV–XV.

власне (II): "По которой власне ѡкѣ по в'сходѣ пойдєть, каждый если хочєт всѣх наѣк дойдєт." The stem, which came into Ukrainian from Polish, derives from the Czech language (**vold-* with a Czech metathesis, cf. 3.4.). SUM XVI–XVII records the following examples under the entry for *власне*: 1. In the sense of "actually": from a document from Zhydychyn dated 1540 (Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie IV [1535–47]: 247); other examples date from the seventeenth century. 2. In the sense of "correctly, literally": The first example is taken from Zyzanij's *Leksis* of 1596 (!), while the second example, from the sixteenth century, occurs in the margin of the text titled *The Appearance of Saint John the Theologian* (З'явлєнє Ивана свєтoгo тєoлoгa: fol. 618), which is found in the Krekhiv Apostol; other examples date to the seventeenth century. The word *власне*, performing the function of an emphatic particle in the sense of "precisely, exactly," occurs in a Vilnius monument dated 1546; other examples date to the seventeenth century. SUM XVI–XVII also lists many examples of the use of the adjective *власный*. The word *власный*, together with the purely Polish form *влостный*, already appears in SUM XIV–XV, but not the form *власне*. Zyzanij's *Leksis* also includes the genuinely Czech Polish lexeme "владза" (Nimčuk 1964: 39) with a Czech metathesis, as well as the adverb *власне*, cf. "так згред'ког власне выкладаєтсѣ" (Nimčuk 1964: 88).

Послaнїє спѣдєщѹ

добре (III): "добре сѣ наѣчивши, добре читати." The use of the adverb *добре* already appears in SUM XIV–XV and very often in SUM XVI–XVII.

зле (III^v): "зле єсть неѣчивши сѣ читати." Here the form *зле* does not, in fact, function as an adverb but as a predicative adjective in an impersonal construction. In SUM XIV–XV forms of *зле* are not yet recorded, whereas SUM XVI–XVII lists many examples, the earliest of which comes from Herasym Smotryć'kyj's *Key to the Heavenly Kingdom* (Ключ царства небесного, 1587). In *Leksis*, Zyzanij writes "злѣ чѣєть" (Nimčuk 1964: 45) with genuine *ѣ*; the form *зле* occurs only in the phraseological unit "за з'ле маю," "зазле маючїй" and the derived noun "зазлеманє" (Nimčuk 1964: 58–59). Here *зле*, however, again functions as an ordinary neuter adjective; the ending is rather the result of the Polish contraction

than of the Ukrainian truncation, since the phraseological unit as such is most likely a Polonism.

Типограф Младенцемъ

добре (IV^v): "добре писати и добре читати."

Граммати́ка словенска

добре (1): "Граммати́ка єсть пев'ное вѣданє, жебысмы добре мовили и писали." Here, the adverb *добре* is a translation of the Church Slavonic word *благѣ* ("блѣ").

праве (83^v): "Каа сѣтъ [значеніа] величаніа. или распространеніа; сѣло, всакѣ, праве докѣска." The stem with this very meaning ("almost") is probably a Polonism, although this cannot be established with any certainty on the basis of historical phonology. SUM XIV–XV has no entry for *праве*, but Tymčenko (Tym) lists an example, among others, from the *Apocrisis* (1597–99).

Толкованіе Молитвы

охотне а досконале (91): "Ѡ двѣ речи тѣтъ просимѣ. ѡ еднѣ, абы нам дал бѣведе волю своею всѣ добродѣтели чинити. и ѡкъ онѣ хочеть все ѡхотне а досконале ѡправовати. ѡкъ и стѣи агглы Єго на нѣѣ з весѣлаам ємѣ сѣлѣжати." Both stems are most likely of Polish origin. As for the word *досконалый*, there is no evidence based on historical phonology. However, the derivational structure, specifically the formation with *-л-*, very likely indicates Polish origin (cf. also *несталое богатство* [91]). Use of the word *досконалый* is not recorded in SUM XIV–XV, and it appears infrequently in SUM XVI–XVII; the latter dictionary, in fact, lists an example from the 1596 grammar. The word *охотный* is not recorded in SUM XIV–XV or by Tymčenko (Tym). Tymčenko lists examples of the use of the words *охота* and *охотій* beginning only in the seventeenth century. Russian *охотно* is probably also of Polish origin. The coordinative conjunction *а* may, after all, also be considered a Polonism or at least an indication of the author's Galician origins (Morfolohiia 1978: 451).

порожне (91–91^v): "Тѣт нас ѣчит хѣ ... абысмы са молили ... толкѣ ѡ хѣбѣ безъ которога са не можемъ обыти, и тотъ же быхмы не порожене или, але // в' поте лица нашего." SUM XIV–XV records entries for *порожень*, *порожнии* (with the genuinely East Slavic form of the stem), and *прожний* (with the Polish stem form), but there are no forms of the adverb. Under the entry for *порожне*, Tymčenko (Tym) cites examples from Zyzanij's *Leksis* (!), the works of Ivan Vyšens'kyj, etc. He offers more examples from the sixteenth century under the entry for *порожній*. Listing entries for *порожноване*, *порожновати*, *порожность*, each time Tymčenko indicates Polish equivalents, cf. also *прож'нѣ* (3.4.) (with the Polish stem). The *Leksis* contains the form *порожній* in the locution "пѣлѣцъ порожній" (Nimčuk 1964: 55), as well as the adverb *порожне*, cf. "тѣце тоще порожне," "тѣне, надаремне, порожне" (Nimčuk 1964: 80).

власне (91^v): "бо ѡкъ тѣло ѡ того хѣба насѣщного кор'митса и посилокѣ беретъ, такъ власне дѣша словомъ бѣжѣимъ кор'митса измоцнаетса."

годне (91^v): "просимѣ тыжъ тѣт ѡ хѣбѣ насоущный, ѡ покармѣ тотъ которій єсть з нашего сѣщества. ѡ пречистое и животворящее тѣло и кровь хѣѣ, абы

нам далъ годне его прїймовати." SUM XIV–XV records the word *годныи*, but there are no forms of the adverb. Under the entry for *годне*, SUM XVI–XVII lists examples from Vilnius (Archiwum ksiąg Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie III [1432–1534]: 235) and from a document from Volodymyr dated 1569 (*The Life of Prince Andrej Mixajlovič Kurbskij in Lithuania and in Volhynia*; Жизнь князя Андрея Михайловича Курбского в Литве и на Волыни II: 198). Other examples date to the seventeenth century. Tymčenko (Tym) lists later examples, noting the Polish word *godny*. Zyzanij's *Leksis* contains the word "негодный" as a translation of the word "недостойный" et al. (Leksis 1964: 62). It is hard to say how Zyzanij himself pronounced this word. If he pronounced it with the unchanged *o*, then one could speak of a phonetic Polonism; cf. also *згодний* 'ладний' and *згідний* 'відповідний' (Ševel'ov 2002: 920). There is, however, no reason to assume that Zyzanij pronounced Polish [g] in this word, so that the stem form as such is definitely not merely Polish.

зле (92): "але зле в' искꙋшенїах изнемагати и ꙋпадати." Here, too, we are dealing with a predicative adjective in an impersonal construction.

годне (92^v): "щасливыиъ тыи которїи годне моват тꙋю молитвꙋ."

вдачне (92^v): "Прїймѣте дрꙋзи мои въз'любленїи вдачне, тоюю мою малоую працꙋ." The stem is of German origin and, according to scholars, was borrowed through the Polish language. Under the entry for *вдячне*, SUM XVI–XVII records several examples from the sixteenth century (cf. also the entry for *вдячне*, -*o* in Tym). In SUM XIV–XV, the stem *вдячн-* appears only in one adverbial form: *вдячно*. Zyzanij's *Leksis* also contains the phrase "блꙋ възпрїемлю, вдачне прїймꙋю."

It is worth noting that adverbs ending in *-e* are not predominant in the text of the *Slavonic Grammar*, and even obvious loans from or via Polish, such as *сꙋнтел'нꙋ* (91^v), have the ending *-w*.

3.2. In other instances, *e* < *ѣ* as a result of Polish influence occurs in a few words:

Посланїе сп҃сѣшмꙋ

речь (II^v): "потребнꙋя речь толькꙋ знати." With regard to the modern Ukrainian form *річ* (*reči*), Ševel'ov (2002: 555) writes that "oblique cases were refashioned in the Polish manner, yet the nominative was semantically assimilated to the Polish word [i.e., it adopted the meaning "thing"] but phonetically formulated in Ukrainian." He goes on to mention dialects in which forms with *i* (< *ѣ*) are still used to the present day. Nevertheless, in the example from the *Slavonic Grammar* we see that even in the nominative singular, the form with *e* appeared, at least in Zyzanij. SUM XIV–XV gives entries for *рѣчь*, *речь*; both forms also coexist in oblique cases. Tymčenko (Tym) also cites entries for *речь* and *рѣчь*. Examples of *речь* date only from the seventeenth century, as do examples of *рѣчь*.

Епїграмма На Грамматїкꙋ

речь (II^v): "розꙋмѣлемъ зарѣчь [*sic*, i.e., за речь] пианꙋ потребнꙋю."

Посланїе сп҃сѣшмꙋ

вырозꙋмена (III): "кꙋ томꙋ [*sic*, i.e., кꙋ томꙋ] тыж без неи еси кто и читает. многократ вꙋнтпачи вырозꙋмена певен не бывает." Most likely, the *e* instead of

the *ѣ* here must be explained as the result of Polish or Belarusian influence. SUM XIV–XV does not record this word or its direct verbal derivative base. Tymčenko (Тым) includes entries for *вырозумѣње* and *вырозумѣти*, indicating their Polish equivalents in both cases (*wyrozumienie*, *wyrozumieć*); moreover, all his examples are cited with *ѣ*. Zyzanij's *Leksis* also lists the word form “вырозѣмѣване” with *ѣ* (Nimčuk 1964: 57).

Граммати́ка словенска

члѡвекъ (27^v): Genitive plural “члѡкѡвѣ, и члѡвекѣ.” Surprisingly (and, ultimately, erroneously), the genitive plural forms “члѡкѡвѣ, и члѡвекѣ” (cf. above) occur in Church Slavonic paradigms. SUM XIV–XV lists an entry for *члѡвѣкъ*; only *ѣ* appears in all forms, while the form *człoweczyj* appears only in a later, unreliable transcription (SUM XIV–XV). Tymčenko (Тым) lists an entry for *члѡвѣкъ* with *ѣ* from the *Diary* (Diariusz) written in 1646 by Hegumen Atanasij Filipovyč of Berestia. Zyzanij's *Leksis* contains the form “члѡвечества,” which the author calls an example of the “Common language,” while the form “вѣчлѡвеченіе” is deemed a Church Slavonic one. The latter word is explained by the word “оучѡлвѣченье” [*sic*] with *ѣ* (Nimčuk 1964: 39–40). Elsewhere, Zyzanij writes: “зѣница, зѣнка, чѡлѡвѣчокъ” (Nimčuk 1964: 49) and even “прѣстѡсовѣт свой голось до чѡлѡвѣчого” with pleophony and a *ѣ* (Nimčuk 1964: 64; cf. *члѣчій* from the *Adelphotes*; Voznjak 1911: 62). Thus, apart from the lexical borrowing *члѡвекъ* < *człowiek*, forms with *ѣ* are preserved throughout.

чѡвека (85): “Единственнѡ а значить. ѡко, чѡвека спѡща, сѣдаща.” In most cases, the noun is written with a diacritic; cf. *члѣкъ* (84), *сѣ члѣки*, *члѣкъ* (87).

Толкованіе Молитвы

речъ (90^v, 3x; 92): “А третаа речъ ... А четвертаа речъ ... А пятаа речъ”; “а ѡ дрѣтѣю речъ просимо абы нас выбавиль ѡ злого вѡрога нѣшего шатана, которій нас хочеть потлѣмити в тѣх искѣшеніях.”

реч (90^v): “Тѣтъ ѡ еднѣ реч просимо.”

речи (90^v–92, 4x): “Тѣтъ ѡ три речи просимѡ,” “ѡ двѣ речи ... просимо ѡ три речи,” “Тѣт ѡ двѣ речи просимо.”

речах (90^v): “ѡ нѡбѣных речах мыслити.”

обѣцаючи (91^v): “Не кажет тѣж сѡ нам роспрѡстѣрати на том свѣтѣ много лѣт собѣ обѣцаючи жити але толко поки нѣнѣшній днѣ естъ.” SUM XIV–XV records entries for *обѣцати* (“see *обѣцати*”), *обѣцѣти* (“see *обѣцати*”), and *обѣцати* with the instruction “see also *обицѡвати*, *обицѡватисѡ*, *обѣцати*, *обѣчѡвати*, *обѣчѡвати сѡ*, *обѣщевати*, and *обѣщати сѡ*.” Thus, all possible reflexes of both *ѣ* and **tj* occur; forms with the Church Slavonic reflex *щ* < **tj* are also recorded. Tymčenko (Тым) lists an entry for *обѣтница* along with *обѣтница*; an example with *e* comes from the Lutsk Castle Record-Book of 1571 (fol. 34). Tymčenko then lists entries for *обѣцѡный*, *обѣцати* (*обѣцѡвати*), and *обѣцѡватисѡ* only with the *ѣ*, indicating their Polish equivalents each time. All examples of the use of all the listed word forms date to the seventeenth century. Ševel'ov (2002: 550) also writes that “the verb *обѣцати* was a very widespread Polonism,” indicating the Commentaries of the *Instructional Gospel* (Учительне Євангеліе) written in 1585 in Lviv, documents of the Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood dated 1609, and the works of Ioanikij Galjats'kyj.

3.3. Reflex of the Polish *é* ("e pochylone"):

Послание сп҃сѣемъ

тыж (III): "кѣтомѣ [sic, i.e., кѣ томѣ] тыж без неѣ есѣи кто и читает. многократ вѣнчѣпачи вырозѣмна певен не бывает." In connection with this form, Ševel'ov (2002: 400) writes: "The form of *tiž* ~ *tyž* (contemporary *теж*, but *миж* in the Lemko dialect), which is prevalent in Middle Ukrainian, may also recreate the Polish sound *é*." The first examples of the use of *миж* cited by Ševel'ov appear in Moldovan documents dating to 1421 and 1495; the first examples of the use of *тыж* appear in a document of 1549 from Odrekhova and the *Instructional Gospel* (1585). SUM XIV–XV has entries for *тежь* ... *мижь*, *тыжь* ..., *тѣжь*, *тажь* Tymčenko (Tym) does not provide an entry for either *миж* or *тыж*. The word form *теж*, also recorded by Tymčenko, may have sounded like *тыж* or something similar when the *u* in certain western dialects changed into a sound similar to *e* in the seventeenth century (Ševel'ov 2002: 847). In the *Leksis*, *тыж* occurs frequently (cf. Nimčuk 1964: 24); *теж* is also used (Nimčuk 1964: 27). However, the word "аптыка" also appears in the *Leksis* (Nimčuk 1964: 36), but this is not evidence of the confusion of *e* and *u* in the Ukrainian language, since the form *aptyka* is also vernacular Polish (Brückner 1989).

Толкованіе Молитвы

тыж (90^v–92^v, 8x): "Пристоит теде абы едины над дрѣгих не подносилис а нѣ о собѣ болше розѣмѣли, так кролеве ѣкъ и пѣве над подрѣчных своих. ...ѣкъ тыж и мѣдрїи и ѣчении в писмѣ над простаквѣ [е учении]; "в згладом того же тыж и чѣкъ естѣ двоакїи ..."; "Тѣт нас ѣчит хѣ избавител нашѣ. абысмѣ са молили не ѣ панства тогосвѣтнїи, а нѣ ѣ жадными преложенства. а нѣ тыж ѣ несталое богатство мѣзерного свѣта того"; "Не кажет тыж са нам роспростирати на том свѣтѣ много лѣт собѣ обещаючи жити але толко поки нѣнѣшнїй днѣ естѣ"; "просимѣ тыж тѣт ѣ хлѣбѣ насоущный"; "наоучаемо тыж са ижѣ бѣгѣ барзо милосерднїй естѣ, которїй кающихся и наигрѣшнѣших прїймѣетѣ. наоучаемо тыж са тоут иж онѣ справедливым бѣдучи, немилосерднїм и злопомнителным, а не каючимса выстѣпшѣ их не ѣпѣститѣ"; "прото бѣ приписѣтѣса вѣвожене в напасть. не иж бы бѣ оуводилѣ, але иж дѣволаѣ оуводити допѣщает. так же тыж и тѣло кѣ искѣшенїю нас приводитѣ."

3.4. Polish (or Czech) metathesis occurs in the following words:

прожнѣ (I): "Прожнѣ Тыса [sic, i.e., Ты са] кѣсишѣ писмо оумѣти." Cf. *порожне* above, with East Slavic pleophony. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *прожно*, *прожноване*, *прожномовство*, and *прожнїй*, indicating equivalents with the stem *порожн-*. Zyzaniј's *Leksis* contains these forms: "плацѣ порожнїй" (Nimčuk 1964: 55), "тѣце тоще порожне," "тѣне, надаремне, порожне" (Nimčuk 1964: 80) (i.e., *порожне* translates the Church Slavonic forms in both quotations) and, on the other hand, the compound form "прожнохвалца" (Nimčuk 1964: 80), which is, in all likelihood, a lexical loan as such (see the suffix *-ca* for a masculine *nomen agentis*). Cf. *порожне* (3.1.).

Епїграмма На Грамматїкѹ

предреченъное (II): "А предреченъное еи шпаство, подаеть певное искѹство." The prefix *пред-* may be of Church Slavonic or Polish origin. The word *предреченный* may be a Polonism, like several other words beginning with *пред-* listed by Tymčenko (Tym: 211–12). However, the entry for *прѣдречи* with the word form *прѣдреченный* also occurs in the Church Slavonic context, e.g., in Sreznevskij's *Materialy*, which contains an example from the *Life of Stefan Permskij* (Srez). SUM XIV–XV gives an entry for *предреченїи*, which is often recorded in Ukrainian documents, along with *напредѣреченїи*, *пререченїи*, and *прореченїи*, as well as *передѣреченїи*, *напередѣреченїи*, *прежереченїи* and, finally, *первореченїи*.

преправый (II): "Ключем бо естъ штворяючи всѣм оумъ, къ познанїю въ преправый разѹмъ." The prefix *пре-* is either from Church Slavonic or from Polish. This word is most likely a Polonism (Polish *prawy* "right, correct, fine, etc."). The prefix *пре-* is prevalent in many southwestern dialects of the Ukrainian language. SUM XIV–XV and Tymčenko (Tym) record quite a few Polonisms with the prefix *пре-*.

власне (II), see 3.1. The word features the Czech metathesis; see above, cf. the equivalent from the Church Slavonic language on fol. 48: "[имена] властнаа. ꙗко, царскїй, ѿ цара" with *властнаа* (< *власть*) "referring to power."

Посланїе спѹдешмѹ

потребное (II'): "вѣдати што естъ потребное, потребнѹю речъ толькѹ знати, розѹмѣлемъ зарѣчь пилнѹ потребнѹю." In theory, this word could also have come from Church Slavonic, but most likely it was adopted from Polish, cf. Ševel'ov 2002: 398. SUM XIV–XV lists many examples of the use of the nouns *потреба*, *потребизна*, the predicative forms *потребно*, *потреба*, *потреб*, and *потребизна*, etc., while the adjective *потребный* occurs much more rarely. Forms with *ѣ*, including *потрѣбизно*, are rarely encountered. Tymčenko (Tym: listed under the entry for *потребный*, etc.) also lists only examples with a root of *e*, not *ѣ*.

потреба (II'): "потреба еи и иным шповѣдати." Here *потреба* functions as a predicative form. The *Leksis* renders the translation of the Church Slavonic *требованїе* with the Polonism *потреба* (Nimčuk 1964: 80).

працѹючи (II'): "и тыи сѣтъ два скѹтки наѣки, в' которой и ꙗ працѹючи розѹмѣлемъ зарѣчь пилнѹ потребнѹю. ..." Here we are dealing once again with a Czech metathesis, cf. Machek (1997: listed under the entry for *práce*), and the Old Polish form *proca*. SUM XIV–XV lists only one example of the use of the noun *праца*; no verb is given. Tymčenko (Tym) features quite a few entries with the root *прац-*; under the entry for *працовати* he cites an example from Zyzanij's *Leksis*, which records the noun "праца" (Nimčuk 1964: 66, 81), "коханьеса впраци [*sic*, i.e., в працї]," "кохаючїйса впраци [*sic*, i.e., в працї]" (Nimčuk 1964: 81), the verb "працѹю" (Nimčuk 1964: 81), the deverbative noun "працоване," and the adjective "працовитый" (Nimčuk 1964: 71).

-крот (III): "кѹтомѹ тыж без неї если кто и читает. многокрот вѹнпачи вырозѹмна певен не бывает." Cf. the Church Slavonic *-кратъ*. SUM XIV–XV does not list any entries for *кротъ*, *многокротъ*, or *двакротъ*, etc. Tymčenko (Tym) lists

only later examples under the entries for *кромъ*, *кромъ* and also records *многокромъ*; he also cites one example from the *Palinode*.

працею, працѣ (III^v): “и еден дорогого [sic] добродѣтел’ною працею переходѣмо. преч зависть и ненависть ѿложивши, мою малѣю працѣ любезно пріймѣте. ...”

Толкованіє Молитвы

кroleве (90^v): “Пристоит теда абы едины над дрѣгих не подносилис а нѣ о собѣ болше розѣмѣли, так кroleве ѡкъ и пѣве над подрѣчных своих. ... ѡкъ тыж и мѣдрїи и ѣченїи в’ писмѣ над простакѣв.” This word is frequently encountered with a Polish metathesis, which is not unusual, since the *królъ*/*krіlъ* was first and foremost a Polish institution in the Ruthenian context. According to SUM XIV–XV, Ukrainian documents very rarely record the Church Slavonic form *крал*[b], whereas the pleophonic form occurs 333 times, and the form with a Polish metathesis (the word *крулѣ* is one of the recorded forms) 172 times (all figures are doubtful, however, as the word was often abbreviated, while editors tended to interpret these forms as pleophonic). The *Leksis* contains the examples “Царь, кроль,” “царство, королевство,” “царствѣю панѣю кролюю” (Nimčuk 1964: 87), i.e., exclusively forms with a Polish metathesis.

кroleвства (90^v): “Тѣтъ са тыж наоѣчаемѣ перебачати королевства и панства тогосѣтнїи.” According to SUM XIV–XV, the word *кroleвство* is recorded 18 times, whereas the pleophonic form *королевство* occurs only 8 times. This word does not appear in Tymčenko’s dictionary (Tym).

преложеннїи (90^v) “those who rule”: “Тѣтъ са тыж наоѣчаемѣ перебачати королевства и панства тогосѣтнїи, и богатства несталии. Просачи и жадаючи о вѣчнїи и нетленнїи заплаты. Которїи то заплаты на мысли маючи богатїи и преложеннїи не могоутса гордїти.” SUM XIV–XV lists an entry for *преложити*, but with other meanings. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *преложенство*, *преложити*, and *преложонїй*, each time appending Polish equivalents. The word *преложонїй* with a Polish *o* after *ж* is taken from Galjatovs’kyj, and the word *преложенство* is from the *Apocrysis* (1597–99). The prefix *пере-*, cf. *переходѣмо* (3^v), *перепѣщаетъ* (92), etc., occurs more frequently in verbal stems, in the “Common Ruthenian” parts. The *Leksis* lists Polish and East Slavic forms of the prefix, cf. “гоненїє, пренаслѣдована” (Nimčuk 1964: 41), but “перемочи,” “перешкода” (Nimčuk 1964: 62, 69), etc.

потребы (91): “жадаемѣ не толко ѡ самый хлѣб але и ѡ всѣ тѣлѣ нѣжднїи потребы.”

працѣ (91), працѣ (92): “з’ своеи працѣ живитиса”; “Прїймѣте дрѣзи мои въз’любленїи вдачне, тоую мою малоую працѣ.”

преложенства (91): “Тѣт нас ѣчит хс̄ избавител нашѣ. абысмѣ са молили не ѡ панства тогосѣтнїи, анѣ ѡ жаднїи преложенства.”

потреба (91^v): “и што на тепер потреба ѡ тое кажет просити а не ѡ болше.”

власне (91^v): “бо ѡкъ тѣло ѿ того хлѣба насѣщного кор’митса и посилокѣ берет, такѣ власне дїша словом бжїим кор’митса измоцнаетса.”

-крот (91^v): “припоминаемо тых тѣт бгоу мовачи, ѡкъ мы ѿпоущаемо дол’жникѣм своим, которїи многокрот против нас выстоупоуют, так и ты нам ѿпоусти.”

потреба (92^v): "Потреба нам вѣдати ѡ искоушеніи, иж бѣ не искоушаєть нѣкого." Again, the word is used as a predicative form.

власный (92^v): "а діаволь єсть власный искоуситель."

3.5. The Polish reflex of the early **tj/*kt'* occurs in the following examples (cf. also the above-mentioned word forms with the root *прац-* < **portj-*, without any non-West Slavic equivalent in the Ruthenian context):

Послание сп҃сѣшмѣ

моцно (III^v): "за Наѣкѣ моцно са имаймо, и еден дорогого [sic] добродѣтел'ною працею переходѣмо. преч зависть и ненависть ѡложивши, мою малю працѣ любезно пріймѣте." According to SUM XIV–XV, the adverb *моцне*, *моцнѣ* occurs 5 times in Ukrainian documents, and the adverb *моцно* 10 times. The noun *моц* is recorded 30 times, the noun *моч* 5 times, and the adjective *моцный* 7 times. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *моцарскій*, *моцарство*, *моцарь*, *моцно*, *моцность*, *моцный*, *моцование*, *моцоватися*, and *моц*, providing Polish equivalents each time. Under the entry for *моцно*, his earliest example is taken from the works of Vyšens'kyj, and under the entry for *моцный*, from the *Apocrisis*. The *Leksis* contains the word *моцѣ* as a translation (in fact, an interpretation) of the Church Slavonic *мощи* ("relics"), cf. "мощи, сила, моцѣ нѣакаа, и тыж тѣла стых называются" (Nimčuk 1964: 56); cf. also "могѣтство, моцарство" (ibid.). This same mechanism is repeated elsewhere, cf. "немоц'ный, немоц'ный."

Толкованіе Молитвы

обещаючи (91^v): "Не кажет тыж са нам роспростирати на том свѣтѣ много лѣт собѣ обещаючи жити." See 3.2.

змоцнаєтса (91^v): "бо ѣкѣ тѣло ѡ того хлѣба насѣщного кор'митса и посилокѣ берет, такѣ власне дѣша словом бж҃им кор'митса измоцнаєтса." According to SUM XIV–XV, *змоцнити* and *змоцняти* are recorded once each in early Middle Ukrainian documents. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *змоцненье*, *змоцнитель*, *змоцняти/змоцнити*, *змоцнитися*, etc. The *Leksis* contains the words "змоц'наю" and "змоц'нене" (Nimčuk 1964: 66).

3.6. The Polish reflex *e < ѣ* occurs rather frequently:

Епі҃грамма На Грамматікѣ

певное (II): "А предреченное ей шпство, подаєть певное искѣство." SUM XIV–XV records 14 examples of the use of the adjective *певный* in early Ukrainian documents, while Tymčenko (Tym) lists only later examples under entries for *певне*, *певность*, and *певный*. The stem also occurs often in the *Leksis*, cf. "вѣдати певне," etc. (Nimčuk 1964: 33).

Послание сп҃сѣшмѣ

певен (III): "кѣтомѣ тыж без неї єсли кто и читает. многократ вѣнпачи вырозѣмена певен не бывает." Only the vowel in the root comes from *ѣ*. SUM XIV–XV still does not list any example of the predicative use of the short form (see the entry *певень*, *певный*).

еден дрого́го [with hypercorrect *o* in the initial syllable, see above] (III^v): “за Наѣкѣ mocno ca имаймо, и еден дрого́го добродѣтел’ною працею переходѣмо.” SUM XVI–XVII records an example of *едень* from a document of 1597 from Kremianets, one example from Ivan (Ioan) Uževyč’s *Conversation* (Розмова) (29^v), and some examples from the seventeenth century. The word *едень*, in the sense of a numeral, appears in the Ostrih Chronicle of 1509–1633 (130^v), while the pronoun *едень другого* is recorded in Stefan Zyzanij’s popular *St. Cyril’s homily about the Antichrist* (Казанье сѣго Кирилла Патріархи іеруслимського, в антихристѣ) of 1596. SUM XIV–XV lists 243 examples of the use of the numeral and pronoun *еден*; the nominative case is recorded in this form only in a Kyiv document, that is, in a region where the form *еден* never became predominant. Tymčenko (Тым) does not list any entry for *едень* (concerning these forms, cf. also Ševel’ov 2002: 218–19).

преч (III^v): “преч зависть и ненависть ѿложивши, мою малѣю працѣ любезно пріймѣте.” Although, as Ševel’ov (2002: 330) writes, “the existence of the form **прѣць* raises doubts,” there is hardly any doubt that the form with the *e* in the root is a Polonism. According to SUM XIV–XV, the word *пречь* does not appear in any early Ukrainian documents, but it is recorded by Tymčenko (Тым: 215), although he cites only later examples.

Тупограф Младенцемъ

певным (IV^v): “досконалым и певным быти а нѣ в’ чом непартати.”

Граматіка словенска

певное (1): “Граматіка єсть, из’вѣст’ное вѣж’ство, еже бл҃гѣ гл҃ати и писати. Толкованіе. Граматіка єсть пев’ное вѣдане, жебысмы добре мовили и писали.” The word *певное* is used here as a translation of its Church Slavonic equivalent *из’вѣст’ное*.

ведлугъ (78^v): “Єсть же Предлогѣв зѣ (17). Въ, Къ ..., чрезъ, по, ведлугъ ради, дѣла, дѣла, вѣмѣсто.” Although this preposition does not appear in early Ukrainian documents (SUM XIV–XV), it occurs in sixteenth-century sources. SUM XVI–XVII lists an example from a document of 1540 from Vilnius (Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie IV [1535–47]: 262), while Tymčenko (Тым) cites only later examples pertaining to *ведлугъ* under the common entry for *ведле, ведлугъ*. Zyzanij cites *ведлугъ* among Church Slavonic prepositions; meanwhile, the Polonism in his work elucidates only one of the meanings of the Church Slavonic preposition *no*. The *Leksis* contains numerous Polish *z* reflexes, cf. “вев’лошехъ,” etc. (Nimčuk 1964: 58).

ведлугъ (80–80^v): “По, ведагъ, или, по. По съчинається дателномѣ. // ꙗко, по пав’лѣ оучит, по дѣлѣ мзда, по тебѣ пойдѣ.” Here, the Polonism also serves to explain one of the meanings of the preposition *no*.

ведле (89): “Если хочешъ Вѣршѣ Складати, Веделе тых Метръ Складай Грецьким Поетѣм послѣдѣючи.” SUM XIV–XV does not list this preposition, but SUM XVI–XVII provides an example of the use of *ведле* from the *Description of Kremianets Castle* (fol. 149) of 1552. Tymčenko (Тым) records its use in the Lutsk Castle Record-Book of 1571 (fol. 291). The preposition *ведле* also appears in the *Leksis*, cf. “чиновнѣ, веделе порадкѣ” (Nimčuk 1964: 88)

Толкованіе Молитвы

оупевнаемо (90): “В той точцѣ замыкается ѿ речій. Першаа кды молимо ѿче. Тым’са оупевнаемъ же бѣдемъ выслахани.” According to SUM XIV–XV, this word is recorded twice in early Ukrainian documents, beginning in the mid-fifteenth century. Тумченко (Тум) lists entries for *упевнене*, *-нѣе*, *упевняти*, and *упевнятися*, indicating their Polish equivalents. The words “оупевѣнаю” and “оупевненѣе” also occur in the *Leksis* (Nimčuk 1964: 50, 63).

шлахетство (90^v) (with a secondary *e* in the root, see its loan source Old High German *gislahti*, Middle High German *geslehte*): “всѣ маемъ един заровнъ и тот же титѣл и шлахетство нѣсное.” In addition to the noun *шляхта*, SUM XIV–XV lists the forms *шляхотный* and *шляхотне* (with inserted *o*, as expected in the Ruthenian context), which are recorded rarely, but with somewhat greater frequency than the forms *шляхетный* and *шляхетне*. Тумченко (Тум) already includes entries for *шляхетне*, *шляхетность*, *шляхетный*, and *шляхетство* with inserted *e*, indicating their Polish equivalents each time. His example of the use of the word *шляхетство* is taken from Galjatovs'kyj.

теды (90^v): “Пристойт теда абы едины над дрѣгих не подносилис а нѣ о собѣ болше розѣмѣли, так кролеве ѣкъ и пѣве над подрѣчных своих.” SUM XIV–XV offers only one example of the use of this form, but it comes from a highly unreliable source. Тумченко (Тум) gives only one example, from Galjatovs'kyj. Cf. the Ukrainian *тогда* elsewhere in the *Slavonic Grammar* (91; occurs several more times): “Ѡ телесном тогда хлѣбѣ мыслачи просимо ѡ три речи.”

ведле (91): “Ѡ двѣ речи тѣтъ просимъ. ѡ еднѣ, абы нам дал бѣ ведле волѣ своеи всѣ добродѣтели чинити.”

3.7. Polish reflexes of syllabic *l*:

Граматіка словенска

мовили (1) (< **tylv*-): “Граматіка єсть, из’вѣст’ное вѣж’ство, еже блѣгъ глаголю и писати. Тол’кованіе. Грамматіка єсть пев’ное вѣдане, жебысмы добре мовили и писали.” “In the case of the word *мова*, strong Polish influence (also indicated by the stress) facilitated the rapid spread of a form without *l*’ (Ševel’ov 2002: 529). SUM XIV–XV lists 40 examples of the use of the verb *мовити*. Тумченко (Тум) gives examples of the use of the words *мова*, *мовити*, etc., beginning in the sixteenth century. The words *мова*, *мовленіе*, etc., are also frequently encountered in the *Leksis* (Nimčuk 1964: 29). Elsewhere in the *Leksis*, one encounters genuine East Slavic forms of *молва* and *молвити*, which are listed as Church Slavonic, along with new forms (Nimčuk 1964: 56–57), cf. “мол’ва, гомонѣ, гѣкъ ѿ мовы людской, окрик итьж трвога,” “мол’ваю, гомоню гѣчѣ.”

ведлугъ (78^v) (< **dylg-*). See 3.6.

ведлугъ (80–80^v) (< **dylg-*). See 3.6.

Толкованіе Молитвы

мовимъ (90^v) (< **tylv*-): “кды мовимъ нашѣ тоє значит ижѣ єсмъ всѣ брата.” The verb features the Ukrainian ending.

потлѣмили (91^v) (< **tylm-*): “w тоє кажет просити а не w болше. абысмы стараньем завтрешним и печалми житейскими розлѣмѣ нашего не потлѣмили. и любве противкѣ бѣ не нарѣшали.” SUM XIV–XV does not provide any entries for *потлумити*, *тлумити*, *затлумити*, or *тлумокъ*, while Tymčenko (Тым) lists entries for *потлѣмене* [-нѣ], *потлѣменый*, and *потлѣмляти*, providing their Polish equivalents each time. All his examples date from the seventeenth century. Several later examples are given under entries for *тлумити* and *тлумокъ*. The *Leksis* contains the words *потлѣмляю* and *потлѣмлене*, cf.: “оупражняю, зглажаю, потлѣмляю, нищѣ” (Nimčuk 1964: 66), “скорбѣ оутискѣ потлѣмленье” (Nimčuk 1964: 78).

мовачи (91^v–92) (< **tylv-*): “припоминаемо тых тѣх бѣоу мовачи, ѣкъ мы ѿпущаемо долѣжником своим, которѣи многократ против нас выстоупоуют.”

3.8. Polish reflexes of syllabic *r*:

Епіґрамма На Грамматикѣ

непартали (II) (< **r̥rt-*): “Которѣи прагнѣт быти досконали, в писмѣ и в словах абы непартали.” The word *partać* does not appear in the *Słownik Staropolski*, but it is recorded in the *Słownik Polszczysny XVI w.* (Słownik XVI), which states the following: “*partać*, prawdopodobnie *haftować*: kiedy nie sftawa Hąwtarzowi Złotá / Y iedwabiem nie wádzi byle szłá robotá. Lecz ieſliby y tego nam nie doſtawało / Więc Inem pártác áby sie wždy nie próżnowáło” (Historia prawdziwa która sie sftała w Lándzye Kraków, 1568, attributed to Mikołaj Rej). Consequently, the word appears here in a different meaning. SUM XIV–XV also has no entry for *наптамти*. Tymčenko (Тым) only has an entry for *наптамчѣ*, citing an example from the seventeenth century. Brückner (1989: under the entry for *part*) lists, along with *part*, entries for *partacz*, *partanina*, and *partać*, and comments: “o lichej, tandetnej robocie.” Zyzanij’s grammar features one of the truly rare occurrences of this word; the card file of the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* of the Ivan Kryp’jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies does not list more examples either.

Посланіє спѣдешмѣ

в’згарда (III^v) (< **gʷrd-*): “кѣдыж ѣкъ Катѣн пишет. то што читати а не розлѣмѣти естъ в’згарда и смѣх, до чого абысмы з себе причины не давали, за Наѣкѣ mocno са имаймо, и еден дрогого [sic] добродѣтелною працею переходѣмо.” Although SUM XIV–XV does not include any entries for *взгарда*, *взоржати*, etc., SUM XVI–XVII lists examples of the use of the word *взгарда* from texts dating to 1591 from Volodymyr (*Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rusi* 1/1, 313) and from the 1599 *Anticrisis* from Vilnius (861), while other examples date from the seventeenth century. Under the entry for *взгарда*, Tymčenko (Тым) gives an example from the *Palinode*, indicating the Polish equivalent *wzgarda*, and another entry, *взорда*, under which he lists an example from a later source, as well as entries for *взордѣтель* and *взоржати*, *взордѣти*. No derivatives are recorded of the form *взгарда*. In his *Leksis*, Zyzanij uses the Ukrainized word form “в’зоржати” (Nimčuk 1964: 41). It is highly likely that Zyzanij pronounced *вз[h]apda*, not *вз[r]apda*; see Polish *hardy*, where *h* is widely regarded as proof that the word is a Czech loan into Polish.

Типограф Младенцемъ

партати (IV^v) (< **pъrt-*): “досконалым и певным быти а нѣ в’ чом непартати.” A second example of this word occurs in a context very similar to the first.

Толкованіе Молитвы

покармъ (91^v) (< **kъrt-*): “бо ѡкъ тѣло ѡ того хлѣба насѣщного кор’митса и посилокъ берет, такъ власне дѣша словом бжѣим кор’митса измоцнаетса. просимъ тыж тѣт ѡ хлѣбъ насоущный, ѡ покармъ тот которій есть з нашего сѣщества.” The verb *кор’митса* is used in its original Ruthenian form twice, in close vicinity to the noun, which appears in its genuinely Polish form. SUM XIV–XV does not have any entries for *покармъ*, while Tymčenko (Tym) lists several examples under the entry for *покарм*, one of which comes from the *Apocrisis* of 1597–99. The noun *покарм* also occurs in the *Leksis* (Nimčuk 1964: 28): “брашно, покарм, идло”; used along with this lexical borrowing are genuinely Ruthenian reflexes in the words “накормлюю,” “накормлене” (Nimčuk 1964: 60).

барзо (91^v–92) (< **bъrz-*): “наоучаемо тыж са ижъ бгъ барзо милосердный есть.” This word does not appear in SUM XIV–XV but is frequently recorded in various sources beginning in the sixteenth century. Tymčenko (Tym) points to a Polish source. The word *барзо* also appears in the *Leksis*, cf. “... ѡгоды барзо смачны сѣтъ” (Nimčuk 1964: 58).

3.9. The Polish initial *є-* instead of *о-*:

Толкованіе Молитвы

едины над дрѣгих (90^v): “Пристоит теды абы едины над дрѣгих не подносилис а нѣ о собѣ болше розѣмѣли.” Under the entry for *единъ*, SUM XIV–XV lists the forms *единого*, *единои*, etc. Under the entry for *единый*, SUM XVI–XVII gives examples from the *Instructional Gospel* of 1571 from Volodymyr: 61); a document of 1591 from Berestia (Documents of the Lviv Stauropigion Brotherhood, MS, late sixteenth–mid-seventeenth centuries: 188); and the *Ostrih Apocrisis* (1598–99: 84^v). This word, in the sense of “one of many,” is recorded in a Lviv document of 1588 (Documents of the Lviv Stauropigion Brotherhood, MS, late sixteenth–mid-seventeenth centuries: 93, 4), while other examples date from the seventeenth century. Attention should be paid to the stress (cf. Ševel’ov 2002: 218). The *Leksis* also contains this form with the very same stress, cf.: “трой рѣд пелекан’скій, едины высокѡ, дрѣгѣи середне, третѣи низкѡ лѣтають” (Nimčuk 1964: 61). The form *единъ* may also have been adopted from Church Slavonic.

еднѣ (90^v, 91, 2x): “Тѣтъ ѡ еднѣ реч просимо”; “Ѡ двѣ речи тѣтъ просимъ. ѡ еднѣ, абы нам дал бѣ веде волѣ своеи всѣ добродѣтели чинити. ...” SUM XVI–XVII gives many examples of the use of *една*, *единъ*, etc. This form is also prevalent in many southwestern dialects. The *Leksis* also lists an example of the word “едностаине” (Nimčuk 1964: 65).

едѣнѣ (91^v): “Тѣ ѡ едѣнѣ речъ бѣ масрѣдного просимо.” The *Slavonic Grammar* lists the form *единѣ* (42) with a stress on the final syllable, but here the stress matches the Polish one.

едино́го (91^v–92): “наѣчаемоса тоутъ ижъ нѣ едино́го члѣка нѣмаемъ на свѣтѣ без грѣха. наоучаемо тыж са ижъ бгъ барзо милосердный есть, которій

кающихса и наигрѣшнѣших прїимѣть." Zyzanij's grammar lists the form *єдинáго* (41^v) with this stress. Here the Ruthenian stress corresponds to the Polish one. In the expression "анѣ, ни (нѣ, не) єдиный," the first example in SUM XVI–XVII comes from a work written by Ivan Vyšens'kyj in 1608–9 (229); other examples derive from the Peresopnytsia Gospel of 1556–61 and a Lviv document dated 1587 (Documents of the Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood, MS, late sixteenth–mid-seventeenth centuries: 188, 89).

єдинѣ (92): "Тѣтѣ в двѣ речи просимо. в єдинѣ [*sic*], абы нас не в'водилъ в покѣшенъе, то єсть абы нам не далъ зведенымъ быти покѣсами, шатан'скими и розмаитыми бѣдами, которїи перепѣщаєть на нас дла пробы. а в дрѣгѣю речь просимо абы нас выбавилъ ѿ злого врага нѣшего шатана, которїи нас хочєть потлѣмити в тыхъ искѣшенїяхъ." The stress does not correspond to the preceding form of *єдинѣ*. Zyzanij's grammar also gives the form *єдинѣ* (41^v), with the stress on the final syllable.

єднак (92^v): "тотъ бо вѣмъ насъ покѣшаєть, кгда насъ албо черезъ рѣскоши ѿ бѣ ѿводитъ, албо черезъ трѣдности кѣторїи намъ задаєть ѿстрашѣть. єднакъ же мы и тоє покѣшенє причитаємо бѣ, бо и мїръ нѣчого не можєть оучинити надъ волю бѣжїю. щасливыйъ тыи которїи годнє моватъ тѣю молитвѣю." The conjunction *єднакѣ* 'however' does not occur in early Ukrainian documents (SUM XIV–XV), but, according to SUM XVI–XVII, it appears in the Peresopnytsia Gospel (265) and Uževyč's *Conversation* (34; additional examples come from other seventeenth-century sources). The variant *єднако* occurs in Herasym Smotryc'kyj's *Key to the Heavenly Kingdom* (1587). Other examples appear in seventeenth-century sources.

3.10. The Polish *g* (<кз>):

Граматїка словєнска

кгда (5–6^v, 2х): "Слогъ єсть, снитїє гласнаго съ съгласнымъ. ѡко. ба. или оуєдинєнїє Глас'наго. // ѡко, а и о. ...Слогъ єсть кгдаыа зыйдѣтъ двѣ писмѣ, єдино съгласное а дрѣгоє гласное. ѡкъ то, пѣ. Ал'бо хотъ єдино писмо гласное, или двогласное. ѡкъ то, а ѣ и"; "Кимъ же образомъ двовременнѣ; Егда ѿ двовременныхъ писменъ слогъ дол'гїи, или крат'кїи, сѣставленъ бѣваєть, произволєнїємъ Твор'ца. ... А двовремен'ный єсть, кгда ѿ двовремен'ныхъ писменъ бѣваєть слогъ дол'гїи ал'бо короткїи." SUM XIV–XV lists entries for *зды*, *кзды*, and *кды*, all of which are rarely recorded. SUM XVI–XVII offers examples of the use of *зды* from the Ostrih Chronicle of 1509–1633 (131^v), a Cracow document dated 1583 (Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie IV [1535–47]: 154), and other sources. In his *Leksis*, Zyzanij translates the Church Slavonic *егда* with the Polonism *кзды* (Nimčuk 1964: 45). Tymčenko (Тым) records this word in the form *зды*—he does not provide any entry for *кзды*—and gives an example from the *Palinode*. Morfolohiia (1978: 459, 461) also lists the conjunctions *кзды*, *кздыбы* (*кздижѣ*, *кзди*) as Polonisms and indicates examples from Ukrainian documents written ca. 1400. The conjunction *кзды* (from Polish *gdy* < **kъdy*), in the first example, appears here instead of the nominalized construction; in the second example, it serves as a translation of the Church Slavonic conjunction *егда*.

Толкованіє Молитвы

кды (90–92^v 6х): “В той точцѣ замыкается ѿ. речій. Першаа кды молимо ѿче. Тым’са оупевнаемъ же бѣдемъ выслѣхани”; “А третаа речъ кды мовимъ нашъ тоє значит ижъ есмъ всѣ брата”; “А патаа речъ, кды мовимъ ...”; “Ѡ першоую кды мовимъ ...”; “кдыж и они корматса, але не своимъ хлѣбомъ. анѣ словомъ бѣимъ, але прелестю шатан’скою. бо ѿкъ тѣло ѿ того хлѣба насѣщного кор’митса ...”; “тотъ бо вѣмъ насъ покѣшаеть, кды насъ албо черезъ рѣскоши ѿ бѣ ѿводит, албо черезъ трѣдности кѣторїи намъ задаєт ѿстрашѣет.”

It is worth noting that in the *Slavonic Grammar* the letter *z* occurs in the word *Грецькимъ*, not *с* (*кз*) (e.g., fol. 89), as in numerous other texts dating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

3.11. The Polish combination of a vowel and a nasal consonant:

Посланіє спѣдему

без вонтипливости, вѣнтипливости, вѣнтипачи (III) (see Polish *wątpić, wątpliwość* [vont-]): “которои каждый добре са наѣчивши, может книги словен’скаго ѡзыка добре читати, и без вонтипавости розѣмѣти. поневаж она єсть ключемъ вырозѣмѣню. ѿвораючи, и ѡказѣюли всакии вѣнтипливости ... кѣтомѣ тыжъ безъ неи єсли кто и читает. многократъ вѣнтипачи вырозѣмна певенъ не бывает.” The stem occurs three times on one page. This word is not listed in SUM XIV–XV. SUM XVI–XVII has an entry for *вонтиптити ... вунтиптити* and records an early example dated 1568 (Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie VII [1554–72]: 306). As for the form *вѣнтиптити* with *y*, Zyzyaniy’s *Leksis* gives an example of *вѣ(н)тплю* (59–60). However, almost immediately after the form “вѣнтиплю,” the noun “вонтиплєньє” occurs with *o*, cf. “недоѣмѣваюсѣ, зѣмѣваюсѣ, вѣнтиплю. Недоѣмѣнїє, вонтиплєньє.” In addition, the *Leksis* lists Polishisms, such as “дзвѣенкѣ” (see Polish *dźwięk*) as a translation of the word “звѣк” (Nimčuk 1964: 49) and “нендз’ный” (Nimčuk 1964: 86). Under the entry for *вонтипливость*, SUM XVI–XVII lists examples from a Lutsk document dated 1583 (AluZR 8/III), etc. Apparently, *ukannia* in this word indicates Lavrentij Zyzyaniy’s Galician background.

3.12. The Polish -ę > Ukrainian -ы in the word *заправды* [?]:

Толкованіє Молитвы

за правды (92^v): “нехай такъ бѣдетъ. и за правды такъ єсть.” SUM XIV–XV does not list the word form *заправды*, and under the entry for *праща* there are no equivalent examples. Instead, the locution *по прашѣ* is given. SUM XVI–XVII records examples from the Peresopnytsia Gospel (1556–61), Herasym Smotryc’kyj’s *Key to the Heavenly Kingdom*, and Uževyč’s *Conversation*, and later examples from an *Instructional Gospel* from the Boiko region, which dates to the late sixteenth century (135^v). The *Leksis* records: “аминъ, заправды албо нехай такъ бѣдетъ” (Nimčuk 1964: 24), “заправды” (Nimčuk 1964: 38), and others. In connection with this form, Ševel’ov (2002: 668) writes: “If this word *заправди* ‘справди’ (Trostanets Commentaries on the Gospel, 1560) is borrowed from the Pol. *zaprąwde* (pronounced as -[de]), then the presence of *y* in the Ukrainian language is explained by the fact

that none of the inflected forms of nouns with *-a* end in *-e*." Another (perhaps more likely) possibility is, however, that *за правды* merely copies Polish *za prawdy*, i.e., *za* + genitive case.

3.13. The Polish *ś* < Old German *š*' (< *s*):

Типограф Младенцемъ

кош'том (IV^v): "Тѹю вы ѡ спѣдеи малымъ кош'томъ собѣ набывайте." In the Middle Ages, the German *s* was usually pronounced like *š*', *ž*', which was adopted in Polish, Czech, and other borrowings from Old and Middle German; as a rule, Latinisms also feature *ж* and *ш*. SUM XIV–XV lists one example of the use of the word *кошть* from a document dated 1459. Tymčenko (Tym) lists an entry for *кошть*, indicating the Czech *košt*, the Polish *koszt*, and the German *kost* (see Modern German *Kosten*). The first example comes from the Lutsk Castle Record-Book of 1564. Later, Tymčenko lists entries for *коштован[ь]е*, *коштовати*, *коштовность*, and *коштовный*.

Граматїка словенска

Вѣршѣ (89): "Если хочешъ Вѣршѣ Складати, Ведле тыхъ Метръ Складай Грецькимъ Поетѹмъ послѣдѹючи." SUM XIV–XV does not have this word (German *Vers* < Latin *versus*), but SUM XVI–XVII records examples of the use of the noun *вѣршѣ* from Maciej Strykowski's work of 1582, *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi* (33^v) and Ipatij Potij's *Reply* to the Ostrih Cleric (Volodymyr, 1598–99). Other examples are from the seventeenth century. SUM XVI–XVII records this word in the sense of 'рядок, строфа, розділ' from a text dated 1595 (AluZR 1/I, 483). Tymčenko (Tym) lists only seventeenth-century examples. In his *Leksis*, Zyzanij surprises us by writing "крає гранесїе, початокъ стїха, ал'бо строки" (Nimčuk 1964: 42), avoiding the word *вѣршѣ*. The phrase "рекло слововѣрш" occurs elsewhere (Nimčuk 1964: 73).

Толкованїе Молитвы

шатан'скою, шатан'скими, шатана (91^v–92): "кѣдыжъ и они корматсѧ, але не своимъ хлѣбомъ. анѣ словомъ бѣжимъ, але прелестю шатан'скою. ..." "Тѹт ѡ двѣ речи просимо. ѡ единѣ, абы насъ не в'водилъ въ покѹшенъе, то естѣ абы намъ не далъ зведенымъ быти покѹсами, шатан'скими и розмаитыми бѣдами, которїи переплѹщаетъ на насъ дла пробы. а ѡ дрѹгѹю речь просимо абы насъ выбавилъ ѿ злого врага нѣшего шатана, которїи насъ хочетъ потлѹмити въ тыхъ искѹшенїяхъ." SUM XIV–XV does not list any entries for *сатанѣ* (< Greek *satanās*) or *шатанѣ* (< Middle High German *satān* < Latin *satanās*). Tymčenko (Tym), however, lists entries for *шатанѣ* and *шатанскїи* and offers examples from the *Apocrisis*. Besides this form, Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* lists the word *слово ѡ сатанѣ* (92), cf.: "Иѣкъ пишетъ стѣй апсѣлъ павелъ къ галатѹмъ въ главѣ ѿ. ижъ плотъ вѹюетъ на дѣхъ. а ѡ сатанѣ стѣй апсѣлъ петръ пишетъ, въ пер'вомъ посланїи, в' главѣ ѿ. бѣдѣте трез'выми, бо неприятель вашъ дїаволъ ѣкъ левъ рїкаючи. кроужаетъ кого пожерети."

зашкодиль (92^v) (< Old High German *scado*): "ѣкъ маемо на прикладъ Іова праведнаго. которомѹ ажъ ѿ бѧ в'завши допѹщене зашкодиль, прото бѣ приписѹетсѧ в'вожене въ напасть. не ижъ бы бѣ оуводиль, але ижъ дїаволъ оуводити допѹщаетъ. такъ же тыжъ и тѣло къ искѹшенїю насъ приводитъ." The rare use of this

verb is already recorded in SUM XIV–XV. SUM XVI–XVII gives an example from a Cracow document dated 1524 (Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie III [1432–1534], 260); other examples date to the mid-sixteenth century. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *зашкода*, *зашкодний*, *зашкоженіє*, *зашкожовати*, and *зашкодити*. Most of the examples are from the seventeenth century; one example occurs in the Lutsk Castle Record-Book of 1562 (fol. 62^v). Tymčenko also records entries for *шкода*, also indicating the German *scado*: *шкодити*, *шкодливый*, *шкодник*, *шкодно*, *шкодовати*, *шкодця* and listing many early examples. The stem *шкод-* occurs frequently in the *Leksis*, cf. “вредитель, шкодця” (Nimčuk 1964: 36), “перешкода,” “перешкажаю,” “перешкодця” (Nimčuk 1964: 69), and “оушкоженіє” (Nimčuk 1964: 85).

3.14. Polish Mazuration:

Граматіка словенска

зычимо (52^v): “Молитвенный образ есть, имже нѣчто быти желаемъ. (зычимо) ѡко, да оучѣ, да бѣю.” Here, the word *зычимо* is a translation of the Church Slavonic form *желаемъ*. SUM XIV–XV gives examples of the use of *зычити* only from a letter written by King Casimir of Poland to the bishop of Vilnius and other individuals in connection with negotiations with the Master of the Crusaders; no forms of *жичити* are recorded. Tymčenko (Tym) lists entries for *зычити*, *зычливецъ*, *зычливость*, and *зычливый*; the examples date to the seventeenth century. He, too, has no entry for *жичити*. On the etymology, see Brückner 1989 and Vasmer 1986–87. The *Leksis* includes the forms “заемлю, позычаю” i “заемленіє, позычанье” with the root *зыч-*, and “заемник, позичающий” with the root *жич-* (Nimčuk 1964: 48). All the forms are listed one after the other. Citing this example, Netreba (2004: 233) mentions the “presence [of ж] in place of [з]” in Zyzaniy’s *Leksis*. But she mistakenly gives this word in the form “пожирающий,” whereas it is actually written as *позичающий*, where *ж* is the original sound.

3.15. The Polish *tylko*:

Толкованіє Молитвы

тыл’кѡ (91, 91^v–92, 2x): “Ѡ двѣ речи тѣтъ просимѡ ... а ѡ другоую абы не тыл’кѡ в нас самыхъ, але и по всемъ свѣтъ вола Его стаа выпол’наласа”; “Долги тогда // тѣтъ не иншее што маемо розѡмѣти тыл’ко грѣхи, то естъ выстѣпки.” This typical Polish form occurs twice, along with *тол’кѡ*, cf. 91–91^v: “Тѣтъ нас ѡчит х̣с̣ избавител нашѣ. абысмѡ са молили не ѡ панства тогосвѣтнїи, анѣ ѡ жадными преложенства. анѣ тыж ѡ несталоє богатство мѣзерного свѣта того. але толкѡ ѡ хлѣб безъ которого са не можемъ обыти, и тот же быхмы не пороже или, але // в’ поте лица нашего.” The Polish origin of this form is also indicated by Ševel’ov (2002: 764): “Monuments that have forms with *i* only in the words *kilka* and *tyl’ko* are probably direct borrowings from the Polish.” SUM XIV–XV records one example of the use of *тылько* from the fifteenth century. Tymčenko (Tym) also lists an entry for *тылако* and provides examples from the seventeenth century. The *Leksis* contains the form *толкѡ*, cf. “токмѡ, точію, толкѡ” (Nimčuk 1964: 80).

3.16. Polish *ku*:

Посланиє спѣвемъ

кѣ (III): “кѣ томѣ [sic, i.e., кѣ томѣ] тыж без неѣ если кто и читает. многократ вѣнчпачи вырозѣмѣна певен не бывает.” Ševel'ov (2002: 318) is convinced that the form *кѣ* is a Polonism. According to SUM XIV–XV, this word often appears in early Ukrainian documents. Tymčenko (Тым), however, does not give any entries either for *кѣ* or for *къ*. The form *кѣ* frequently appears in the *Leksis*, cf. “кѣ вечерѣ” (Nimčuk 1964: 41) et al.

4. Conclusions

With the exception of the forms of *члввекъ* (*чловека*)—a Polonism that Zyzanij apparently did not recognize as such—all the phonetically marked Polonisms of the *Slavonic Grammar* occur in a clearly “Common Ruthenian” context. Polonisms in the body text of the grammar are usually translations of Church Slavonic words: the verb *зычимъ* is a translation of the verb *желаемъ* (52^v); on two occasions, the preposition *ведлугъ* explains one of the meanings of the preposition *по* (78^v, 80–80^v). In the well-known translated definition, “Граммати́ка єсть, извѣстное вѣжство, еже блѣгѣ глѣти и писати. Толкованіе. Грамматика єсть певное вѣдане, жебымы добре мовили и писали” (fol. 1), all the Polonisms are also translations of Church Slavonic words and constructions, and the same pertains specifically to Polonisms from the rather inconsistently translated *Interpretations* (*Толкованія*) (5^v–6) in the chapter titled “Ѡ Просвѣдїи.” There, in one place, the conjunction *кѣды* replaces a nominalized construction, while in another it is a translation of the conjunction *егда* (see 3.10.). Finally, the “Common Ruthenian” sentence “Если хочешъ Вѣршѣ Складати, Ведле тыхъ Метръ Складай Грецькимъ Поетѣмъ послѣдѣючи” (89) appears in the middle of purely Church Slavonic sections, but it is a separate piece of advice addressed to the reader.

Thus, when Zyzanij wrote in “Common Ruthenian,” he was always conscious of the fact that he was departing from the Church Slavonic language in the first place. With the exception of the word forms *члввекъ*, *чловека*, all the Polonisms occur in a purely “Common Ruthenian” context. At the same time, the Polonisms are used in the “Common Ruthenian” context without any additional characteristics that would indicate that these are foreign words. They simply occur as fully adopted “Ruthenian” lexemes.

It should be noted that the Polonisms in Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* display a certain variability. Various word forms occur in his grammar and in the *Leksis*, or in other Middle Ukrainian texts. Occasionally, obvious Polonisms coexist with original Ukrainian or more consistently adopted forms. The adverbs *порожне* (91–91^v) vs. *прожнѣ* (1) are indicative in this regard. The former features a Ukrainian form of the root but a Polish ending, the latter a Polish form of the root but a Ruthenian ending; both forms are perfectly “Common Ruthenian.” As concerns the word *печь*, it is very likely that Zyzanij's contemporaries were already transforming this paradigm into the contemporary one with alternation of the vowel *pič*, *peci*, but only forms with a root *e* occur in Zyzanij's work.

As for the persistence of the genuinely Polish forms in Ukrainian, it is worth noting that the word *чловек* is common to many southwestern dialects; the word *людина* occurs in other Ukrainian dialects, while the authentic Ukrainian form *чоловік* acquired a different meaning. The word *обещати* was adapted further to the Ukrainian language (Modern Ukrainian *обицяти*): the form with *ѣ*, which yielded *i*, became dominant in accordance with etymology and the vocalism in the Church Slavonic word. Instead, the *и*, as in words with the stem *миц-*, *моц-*, has been preserved (the word *моць* in the *Leksis* is a translation of the Church Slavonic *моци*). The word form *тиж* (*тыжъ*) has not been preserved in this spelling in Modern Standard Ukrainian, although it should be noted that in many dialects the Ukrainian *теж* may sound the same way or in an approximately similar fashion. Words with the prefix *пре-* are still prevalent in southwestern Ukrainian dialects. Words with the Czech metathesis, such as *власний* with the adverb *власне* and words with the stem *прац'-* (*праця*, *працювати*, etc.), still exist in the contemporary Ukrainian literary language; the word *порожній*, in contrast, occurs only in this genuinely Ukrainian form, while the genuinely non-Ukrainian word form *потреба*, *потрібний* acquired the alternation *i:e* similarly to the word *річ*. The obvious Polonism *-крот* no longer exists in the Ukrainian literary language but occurs in many southwestern dialects. Instead of the Polonism *король* (*кріль*), the pleophonic form *король* is used in literary Ukrainian, but the genuinely Polish form is still used in southwestern dialects. The word *невен* and its derivatives are treated as purely Ukrainian forms, whereas the word form *єден*, or *іден*, in contrast to the word form *єдиний*, which is also based on the Church Slavonic model, is used only in the southwestern dialects of the Ukrainian language. The prepositions *ведлуз* and *ведле* were frequently used in nineteenth-century Galician sources (along with partly Ukraininized *водлуз*), but they did not enter the lexicon of Modern Standard Ukrainian. Today, the adjective *шляхетний* is treated as a common Ukrainian form, although in older Ukrainian documents it still coexisted with the better adapted form *шляхотный*. The adverbial form *теди*—the purely Ukrainian *тогда* appears alongside it in Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar*—is used only in certain southwestern dialects. The words *мова*, *мовили*, and *тлумити* became fully established in Modern Standard Ukrainian. Already by the seventeenth century, the verb *партати* occurs rarely; the example given in Zyzanij's grammar is also extraordinarily important, for even in Polish sources, at least until the late sixteenth century, there are no definite records of this Polish word in the sense listed by Brückner—"o lichej, tandetnej robocie"—cf. the contemporary Polish form *partacz*. Instead of the Polish form *взгарда*, many other sources contain the better adapted word forms *взорда*, *взоржатися*, etc., but that word did not enter the vocabulary of Modern Standard Ukrainian. The noun *покарм*, which did not enter Modern Standard Ukrainian either, was still frequently used in Galicia as late as the nineteenth century. The adverb *барзо* often occurs in some southwestern dialects of the Ukrainian language. The numeral and pronoun *єден*, *єдна* are prevalent in southwestern dialects, as is the conjunction *єднак*. The conjunction *іди* did not enter the Ukrainian literary language, but it is still frequently encountered in certain southwestern dialects;

so are the words *вонтити*, *вонтливість* and the adverb *заправди*. The words *кошт*, *вірш*, and *шкода* are widely used in the Ukrainian literary language in this very form. It is interesting to note that in Zyzanij's grammar, too, the contemporary form *сатан*, which arose without Polish mediation, exists along with the Polonism *шатан*, which is predominant in the grammar. The verb *зичити* exists in Ukrainian in this very form to the present day; however, the original Polish form *жичити* is well-known in Galicia. Along with the Polish form *тыл'kw*, the *Slavonic Grammar* uses the Ukrainian *толkw* (> *тільки*, cf. *тільки* in Modern Standard Ukrainian). The form of the preposition *кѣ*, which is largely alien to the Ukrainian language (Ševel'ov 2002: 318), exists only in its westernmost dialects.

Most of the Polonisms that appear in Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Slavonic Grammar* were already encountered in Ukrainian documents in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and nearly all of them are used in his *Leksis* as well. With the exception of the word *напмату*, all these words are also to be found in other early Ukrainian sources. It would appear that the forms *вѣнтливостъ* and *вѣнтити* with an *ukannia* reflex are typical of Zyzanij. Other forms, meanwhile, are typical of the entire "Common Ruthenian" language of Zyzanij's age. Some of these Polonisms forever entered the Ukrainian language or its dialects, either during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries or earlier.

TOO CLOSE TO “THE WEST”? THE RUTHENIAN LANGUAGE OF THE *INSTRUCTION* OF 1609

O. Early modern Ruthenians (Ukrainians and Belarusians) in Europe

Within the Slavic Orthodox world, early modern Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) culture occupies an exceptional position. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, no other Orthodox group was as strongly affected by European religious reformation and counterreformation, Renaissance and then baroque culture as the Ruthenians of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

For the Ruthenians of the time, the encounter with European culture usually occurred via Polish mediation. As far as language as an integrative element of Ruthenian identity is concerned, the intense encounter with Poles and other Europeans yielded a multitude of new loan concepts and corresponding loan words from Western languages. Owing to the spread of early modern information technologies (the art of printing) and the reformation of the educational sphere, the “common” language (*Gemeinsprache* = “prosta(ja) mova”/“prostyj jazyk”; see Moser 2011: 76-81) that had gradually emerged in the preceding decades soon turned out to be more widely disseminated and more refined than ever before. Not least, this language served as a powerful instrument for defining oneself and one’s group.

At the same time, the encounter with European culture constituted a challenge and even a threat to Ruthenians. In terms of language, not only was it obvious by the second half of the sixteenth century that more and more representatives of the Ruthenian elites had adopted the Polish language and culture, but even the high-variety Ruthenian written language itself had become extremely similar to the Polish language of the Polish elites. Ruthenians felt the threat and stood up for the religious and economic rights of the “Ruthenian nation” in the multinational and multilingual settings of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. They did so, however, in a language that clearly betrayed Polish cultural predominance. Perhaps no document illustrates this better than the *Instruction* and *Lament* of 1609.

1. The *Instruction* and *Lament*

On 2 January 1609, the Ruthenian burghers of Lviv issued a document titled *Ламентъ, або Мова до Кр Езо Мл* (*Lament*, or a *Speech to His Grace the King*). This well-known text was integrated into a so-called *Инъстрѣкція* (*Instruction* 1609), a certification of authority for the burghers’ envoys to the Warsaw Diet (*Sejm*). The *Instruction* dates from a time when Lviv had about seventeen to twenty thousand inhabitants, with a share of about 20 percent Ruthenians/Ukrainians (Kapral’ 2003: 249–50). The Ruthenian representatives claimed in this document that “we, the Ruthenian nation of the Greek religion” (*Народ роскѣи релѣи Грецькое*), “voice a controversy with the Polish nation regarding the same liberty, use of trade laws,

and all kinds of business that have been guaranteed by the Polish Kings of holy memory to Lviv, to us, the Ruthenian [nation] on a par with the Polish nation" (*Коньтровертѣмо, з Народом Полским ѡ ровную волность, И ѡживане Правъ ремесль. И ѡбходовъ Вишляких Лвовови ѡ стое Памѣати Кралеѡвъ Полских, Намъ Веспол заедного члѣка з Народом Полским рѣскомъ фѣндованых*) (Instruction 1609, fol. 1). The spirit of the text is quite well represented by the nine occurrences of the possessive pronoun *нашъ*. The following examples are cited in order of appearance:

1) Просити Его Кр мл, Абы насъ ведле Процесѣ релѣи Нашое Кгецкое / И въ волном ѡживаню Процесѣ з Сакраменты. И иншими ѡбрады / В рынку, И въ ѡлицахъ ѡживати волно Заховати рачиль (1); 2), И дотого Просити, Абы Прешкрипция На добрахъ Стоячих / Наших рѣских Небыла (1); 3) and 4) Если бы кто з Народѣ Нашого рѣского, Хотѣлъ Ново прѣмовати / Мѣсцькое Право, албо цехи Пкиеколевекъ, То ѡбы не презъ инших / Нацѣ Людѣ, Але През самых Старшихъ Наших рѣских Мещанѣ / И Предмещанѣ бывалѣ Залецанѣ (1v); 5) А претожѣ Просити Кр Его Мл, Абы [...] до ровныхъ волностѣ хрстианьскихъ Такъ / ѡховныхъ, ведле Процесѣ релѣи Нашое Кгецкое Пко И свѣцких, / ѡживаниа Припѣстити рачиль (1v); 6) Понекондѣ сѣд Полскѣ кривды Нестерпимые выѡбляючи / нас Спотомствы Нашими Намъ Народѣ рѣскомъ Чинѣт, / И Бѣды Неслыханые, Котрими ѡтажени Естесмо / Над Пѣрмо Египѣскои Неволѣ (2v); 7) То ест Напрод / наветѣ, Божницѣ, Напрод / Старожитнѣ Натѣралнѣ Народ Нашѣ рѣскѣ мае свое вѣчѣм, / И црковѣ Набоженства своего воЛвовѣ (3); 8) and 9) ѡ КсѣндЗа Фѣрлеѣ референдара Его Кр Мл ѡ Певномъ / А нешмылномъ Часу Приволѣнѣспѣ Справы тоеи Нашеи / до Сѣдѣ Кр довѣдовати Бы Тежму едно даровати. / А дрѣгое ѡбѣцати. Асамымъ Завше Пилновати (3v); ѡстатокъ лепшости вишлякоѣ Буд вседержителю врѣки Его Стѣе / И Пилности Посломѣ Нашимъ<ѣ полецае>мѣ (4).

Along with "our business" and "our envoys," the burghers mention not only "our real estate" and "our elder Ruthenian burghers and dwellers of the suburbs" (as opposed to "other nations' people"), but also less "pragmatic" aspects such as "our Greek religion" and "our ancestry." Most notably, the document even speaks of "our ancient natural Ruthenian nation." Elsewhere in the *Lament*, the burghers complain that the Ruthenians lack rights "in their own native Ruthenian land, in this very Ruthenian Lviv" (*Чим бы толко Члѣкъ Живѣ быти могълъ. Того Неволѣнѣ рѣсинѣ / Наприрожоно земли своѣ рѣскоѣ ѡживати, втомто рѣскомъ / Лвовѣ* (3)).

The *Instruction*, and particularly the *Lament*, have often attracted the attention of scholars (a historically contextualized interpretation of the text can be found in Kapral' 2003: 124–127). The entire document was already published in 1904 in Amfrosij Krylovskij's classic study on the Lviv brotherhood (Krylovskij 1904: 35–7 (appendix)). The *Lament* was reprinted several times, for instance by Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj in the sixth volume of his *History of Ukrainian Literature* (which came out only after the breakup of the Soviet Union; Hruševs'kyj 1995: 705). Finally, a few years ago, Jaroslav Isajevyč published a facsimile of the first page of the *Lament* in his study of the Lviv brotherhood (Isajevyč 2006: 72).

In the present study, I want to analyze the language of the *Instruction* and the *Lament* on the basis of a facsimile of the entire manuscript.¹ This is necessary because Krylovskij's edition, which was adopted by his successors, is not entirely reliable. As is typical of many older editions of Middle Ruthenian texts, it includes some questionable interpretations. Among others, the following readings should be amended:

[до Права] Шкотрое [...] [Конътровертѣмо] (1), not в которое (Krylovskij 1904: 32), [Его] Кр [Мл] (1), not [его] кор. [милости] (Krylovskij 1904: 32; several times), А [звласча] (1) with the conjunction, not звласча (Krylovskij 1904: 32), вбы (1^v), not абы (Krylovskij 1904: 33), Нанъ (1^v), not нань (Krylovskij 1904: 33), вѣжають (1^v), not убѣжають (Krylovskij 1904: 33) (cf. Polish *uwieść* 'seduce', *релѣ* (1^v), not *релѣ* (Krylovskij 1904: 34), фѣндыши (2), not фундуши (Krylovskij 1904: 34), Статиса (2^v), not остатися (Krylovskij 1904: 35), Египтскои (2^v), not египетскои (Krylovskij 1904: 35), Перестя (2^v, read: *Переистя*), not перестя (Krylovskij 1904: 35), Члкъ (3), not человекъ in the Russian or Church Slavonic shape (Krylovskij 1904: 36), Горчары (3) much rather than гончары (Krylovskij 1904: 36), зачнѣшого (3), not зачнѣйшого (Krylovskij 1904: 36), Капталіане (3), not каштеляне (Krylovskij 1904: 36), Лимѣтацци (3^v), not лимитаци (Krylovskij 1904: 37), Ксюндза (3^v) rather than ксяндза (Krylovskij 1904: 37).

In my brief study, I shall not elaborate on more general views concerning the early modern Ruthenian or "Middle Ruthenian" language (which, in this particular case, can also safely be called "Middle Ukrainian," since Belarusian aspects play no role in our text).² The *Instruction* is quite close to a more or less prototypical Middle Ruthenian high-variety language. This idiom, which has often been called "Prósta(ja) mova," although contemporaries usually just called it the "Ruthenian language" (which would be "рѣскѣ ѡзыкъ" or "рѣскѣ ѡзыкъ" according to the orthography employed in the *Instruction*), served as a polyfunctional and highly normalized idiom of Ruthenian high culture, possessing virtually all the features of a modern standard language except full-fledged codification (this was, however, a widespread situation in early modern European language communities; see Moser 2011: 40–161). From a later (and clearly anachronistic) point of view, this language suffered from at least two "vices." First, records of other varieties of Ruthenian, as in occasional renderings of contemporary oral speech (in short humoristic plays called *Intermediae* or in chronicles and charters, etc.), clearly demonstrate that this Ruthenian high variety was quite distant from the language actually spoken by Ruthenian (be it Ukrainian or Belarusian) "commoners." Second, this high-variety Ruthenian language was extremely close to the Polish language of its time. As I have argued elsewhere, the prototypical "Prosta mova" differed from Polish only inasmuch

1 I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Roman Šust of the Lviv National University, who kindly offered me a CD with photographs of the original document. I would also like to thank Professor Frank Sysyn of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Ukrainian Free University in Munich for several discussions on Middle Ruthenian.

2 As regards my own views on Middle Ruthenian, see Moser 2011: 40–161. Cf. also Bunčić 2006 and Rabus 2008, etc.

as it was written in the Cyrillic alphabet and retained Ruthenian phonology as well as inflectional morphology. Both the vocabulary and the syntactic organization of the texts were, however, virtually identical to Polish models of the time (*ibid.*). In the following, I want to demonstrate that the language of the *Instruction* is characterized by an extreme closeness to Polish that partly exceeds even that of the prototype variety. The relative brevity of the corpus allows for a statistically based approach. It is precisely the statistical aspect that will yield a clearer picture of the true relationship between the more or less prototypical “Prosta mova” and Polish, two languages that were beyond doubt mutually intelligible almost without constraint.

2. Ruthenian and Polish

The most striking feature of the language of the *Instruction* is its extreme closeness to Polish. In the following, I offer my own tentative translation of the first lines of the *Instruction* into the Polish language of the time:

Инѣстрѣцїа

Пленѣпотенцію, То естъ Зѣполную мочь.
албо порѣченство вшелакое

Мы всѣ восполь едень Заедного Народ
росскїй релѣи Кгрецкое Мещане

И Предмещане, шбѣга ѣрядовѣ И
юрисдицїи замковое И мѣсцкое

Бѣдѣчїе Люде Лвовїане. Подаемо
Посланцом своимѣ [...] (*Instruction*, fol. 1)

Instrukc(y)ja³

Plenipotenc(y)ję, To jest zupełną moc,
albo poruczeństwo wszelakie

My wszy(s)tcy wespół jeden za jednego naród
ruski reli(j)i greckiej mieszczanie

I przedmieszczanie, obojga urzędów i
urysdykc(y)ji zamkowej i miejs(c)kiej

Będące ludzie lwowianie. Podajemy
posłańcom swoim...

The exercise of “translating” the entire text of the *Instruction* into Polish yields the following results: If one transfers the Ruthenian morphemes into Polish by changing them only according to the strict rules of historical phonology and some other, less regular developments (e.g., Ruthenian *комрое/Которые* vs. Polish *który*), then only a handful of stems (not roots!) are not to be encountered in the Polish language of the early seventeenth century: *всѣ* (1), *все* (1); *Прїимити* (1, Pol. *przyjąć*); [*кривды*] *Нестерпимые* (2^v); *вѣчѣм* (3); *набольше* (1^v) (Pol. *najwięcej*), [*щось*] *Болишого* (3) along with *цос Болишого* (3) (Pol. *coś większego*); [*Если бы Прокѣратор Нехотѣл, албо шмылал,*] *И ли[ста] Надражал И Неставал* (3^v); [*пожидовьску.*] *Или [По Сараценскѣ]* (1^v); *всдержителю* (4) (the form is not Polish; if translated, it is rendered as *wszechdzierzyciel*); [*въ ѣбирѣ*] *Сїценническом* (1^v). As for the first three forms, however, identical roots are also to be found in Polish. Regarding *wsz-у(s)tek*, Middle Polish (and, in some phrases, even Modern Polish) has preserved only unexpanded stem forms of the type *wszech*, *wszego*, *wszemu*, *wszem*, *wszej*, *wszech*, *wszemi*; moreover, along with the stem *ѵ(e)c-*, one also encounters *во виистком*

3 I have slightly modernized the orthography.

(1) in the text. Regarding *Прѣмити*, its imperfective aspectual partner in the text is *прѣмовати* (as Polish *przyjmować*), not *прѣмати*. As for the adjective *Сищенническомъ*, it should be pointed out that it refers to an Orthodox priest. The present passive participle *Нестерпимые*, finally, occurs with *кривды*, which is likely to be a Polonism.

Apart from that, it should be noted that one should read [На]кождѣ [рокъ] (1^v) in the text, yet *o* occasionally looks like *a* elsewhere in the manuscript (one would also read *фамоти* rather than *фамати*, e.g., see below). Elsewhere, *a* can clearly be read in the same root: *Каждого ремесла* (2), *Каждому школичныхъ Панствъ Неприятелеви* (3). The morphemic structure more or less coincides with that of the Polish vocabulary of the time. To give just one example, deverbative nouns occur with the reflexive particle *ся*, as in [А нешмылномъ Часу] *Приволаняся* [Справы моеи Нашей] (3^v) (cf. Polish *przywołania się*). The syntax is more or less identical to the Polish syntax of the time. This can be exemplified by the use of topical *o* + accusative case (*Права Ѡкоторое Пред Его Королевскою Млстю Конѣтровертѣемо* (1)), comparative *nad* + accusative case (*Ѡтажени Ёстесмо мы Народ Рѣскѣи, ѡ Народа Полского, Иромъ над Египтскую Неволю* (3)), the omission of *рѣчь*/*rzecz* in *То Сѣрова И Нехрѣстианска* (1^v), or the use of the Polish-Latin accusativus cum infinitivo in *А зажь Панове цехМистрове [...] цос зац-нѣшого ѡсобѣ Надѡска Ви Кр Мл быти розѣмѣют* (3). Constructions like these are not necessarily genuinely Polish—they were common in Ruthenian and Polish and partly originated elsewhere. A study of the phraseology, especially the juridical phraseology, would in all likelihood reveal full coincidence with the Polish language of the time (see phrases such as *Пленѣпотенцію [...] Подаето* (1); *до Права Ѡкоторое [...] Конѣтровертѣемо* (1), *Для лепшое вѣры Печат При Ложилисмо, И рѣками Подписали* (1), etc. Again, this obviously does not mean that all these elements are genuinely Polish. As is well known, such phrases often find their origin in Old and Middle Czech, and in many cases the Czech loans are in turn loan translations from Latin or German.

As mentioned above, the language of the *Instruction* is very close to the typical high-variety Ruthenian language as employed in a broad range of literary and non-literary genres around 1700. It is still not clear to what degree this language might reflect the spoken language of the Ruthenian elites of the time. It is quite obvious, however, that the bookish syntactic organization of such texts was very remote from everyday speech, even that of the elites, and it is even more obvious that this language was very remote from the idioms spoken by the absolute majority of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Ruthenian) commoners (see Moser 2011: 75–161).

3. What remains Ruthenian?

In light of the above observations, one might ask what precisely remains largely “intact,” that is, “truly” Ruthenian in the Ruthenian high variety of ca. 1600. As I have argued earlier (Moser 2011: 112–131), the elements that remain are: 1) the Cyrillic script, 2) the phonological structure of all morphemes, and 3) inflectional morphology. Each of these aspects deserves to be studied against the background of the *Instruction*.

3.1. The Cyrillic script

The Cyrillic script is such an important symbol of Ruthenian identity that in the *Instruction* even a fragment written in Latin is rendered in Cyrillic according to Ukrainian rules (as exemplified by the elements in boldface in the first two lines; **ѣ** means [i], [g] is rendered with **кз**, and Latin *l* is rendered with soft *l'*). Only toward the end does the author render two words in Latin letters:

Анно домѣнѣ, а̃ у̃ п̃з̃, Електи Сѣнтѣ фамоти, Домѣнѣ	
Нѣколаѣсѣ Зароктовскѣ, Инес Валах, Геѣргѣсѣ Раѣхѣ.	
Нѣколаѣсѣ Домплаѣх, Станѣслаѣсѣ Клепар еѣ Леонасѣ	
Лѣнднер, Инѣ консѣлес резидентесѣ.	
Сенѣѣресѣ Механѣкорѣм	
Инѣ кворѣм ѡмнѣѣмѣ кградѣ примо контѣбернѣи Сарторѣмѣ,	а̃
Сенѣѣресѣ сѣнтѣ, Петрѣсѣ, Еѣ Стецко.	
Итем, сѣбѣ, Ао. 86. Сенѣѣрес Сарторѣм, Андрис, еѣ Стецко,	в̃
Итемѣ Инѣферѣсѣ, Ао 1510 Сенѣѣрес Сарторѣмѣ,	г̃
Андрисѣ, еѣ Мѣхно	
Итемѣ Сѣбѣ Ао, Мѣлезимо Кѣѣнѣентезимо Сарторѣмѣ	а̃
Стецко Кѣмѣ Сенѣѣресѣ Андреѣ Рѣтенѣ.	
Итем, а̃ у̃ ч̃г̃ Мѣхно еѣ Матѣс, еѣ алѣбѣ Локорѣм.	е̃
Итем, Ао а̃ у̃ ч̃г̃. Иоанѣ расѣ, Стецко Камѣѣамѣ.	
Сѣбѣ имо квокѣе Анно сѣнтѣ Церѣти Консѣлес, кви hic non	
Сѣнтѣ скрипти. (2; emphasis mine, M. M.)	

3.2. Phonological structure

In general, the Ruthenian phonological structure also remains intact in the *Instruction*, but, as always, comparatively recent loans (recent with regard to early modern Ruthenian) should be analyzed separately.

3.2.1. Polish loans

In most cases, it is impossible to establish whether an element common to Ruthenian and Polish is a loan from Polish (or vice versa) or not, since inter-Slavic loans were often adopted according to morphological rules, not phonological ones (Moser 2007a). One does, however, find some phonologically marked Polish stems in the *Instruction* (in the following list, I treat Bohemisms as Polonisms because I have no doubt that they were adopted into Ruthenian via Polish):

- **с** < ***tj**, ***kt'**: *моуѣ* (1), *ѡбеѣуем* (1), *ѡбеѣати* (3^v), *Злеѣаем* (1), *Залеѣанѣ* (1^v), <*полеѣае*>*мѣ* (4: the manuscript is damaged here, yet Krylovskij's reconstruction is perfectly convincing), [Анѣдрѣ] *бѣлдаговиѣ* (4: that is, the surname has the Polish reflex, although Polish surnames of the type *Mickiewicz* have the Ruthenian reflex) = 7 word forms;
- **š** < 3rd palatalization of velars: *ѡшелаѣкѣ* (1^v), *ѡшелаѣкое* (1), *ѡшелаѣких* (4x: 1, 2, 3, 3), *ѡшелаѣкие* (1), *ѡшелаѣкого* (2^v), *ѡшелаѣко* (4), *ѡшѣстком* (1), *Завѣше* (3x: 3, 3^v, 4) = 13 word forms;
- **е** < **ѣ**: *ѡсполь/ѡспол* (4x: 1, 1, 3, 3) *ѡедле* (6x: 1, 1, 1^v, 1^v, 2, 3^v), *Мѣстечку* (1^v), *Городеѣкѣ* (1^v), *зе* [Лѡѡѡѡ] (1^v), *ѣераѣз* (3), *Пѣѡномѣ* (3^v), [Нѡѡѡѡ] *Сѣмѣѣ* (3^v), *НаСѣмѣѣ* (3^v), *Сѣму* (3^v), *наСѣм* (4^v) = 19 word forms;

- (j) *e-*, **not o-**: *едень* (3x: 1, 1^v, 3), *едного* (4x: 1, 1, 1, 3), *Едно* (2x: 2, 3^v), *Еднако* (1), *еднак* (2) = 11 word forms;
- **g**, **not h**: *Кзрецькое* (3x: 1, 1, 1^v) = 3 word forms;
- **metathesis of Polish origin**: *Крола* (1^v), *Кролець* (2x: 1, 1), *Кр* as in [*Езо*] *Кр* [*Мл*], *Кр* [*Езо* *Мл*], [*Ви*] *Кр* [*мл*], etc. (22x: 1 (5x), 1^v (5x), 2^v (2x), 3^v (9x)); along with only one occurrence of the pleophonic form in [*Пред* *Езо*] *Королецьскою* [*Млстю*] (1),⁴ *Брон* [*Бе*] (5x: 2^v (4x), 3^v), *Брон* [*нас* *Пастыр* *добрѣ*] (3^v; along with more occurrences of *Боронѣть* (1^v), etc.), *Насамѣ* *Прод* (1), *НаПрод* (3x: 2^v, 3, 3) = 35 word forms;
- **metathesis of Polish much more probably than Church Slavic origin**: *Предмещане* (1), *Предмещаномѣ* (1), *Предмещанѣ* (2x: 1^v, 4^v), *Пред* (3x: 1, 1, 1^v), *Предсѣжѣ* (3^v), *презь* (3x: 1^v (3x)), *пренасвятышим* (1^v), *презыски* (1^v), *Презысковѣ* (2^v), *Преложеньствѣ* (3, along with *За переводомѣ* (1^v), *для Перестороги* (3^v)), *древы* (3, in connection with *ѣквѣченѣ*), *Потреба* (2x: 3^v (2x)), *кѣ* *Потребѣ* (3^v) = 20 word forms;
- **Czech metathesis as used in Polish loans from Czech**: *звласча* (1), *Власные* (1) = 2 word forms;
- **(reflexes of) nasal vowels**: *Понекондѣ* (3x: 1, 2^v, 3^v), *меньжне* (3) = 4 word forms;
- **Polish vowel contraction**: *Іѣна* (1^v), [*рады* *НатоНѣ*]*маишѣ* (2^v; this form can hardly be regarded as the reflection of a dialectal contraction) = 2 word forms;
- **e instead of o in тежѣ, пре- (prze-) instead of про-**: *тежѣ* (10x: 1, 1^v (2x), 2 (3x), 3, 3^v (3x)), *претожѣ* (1^v, along with *Протож* (1)) = 11 word forms;
- **reflexes of syllabic liquids**: *Барзо* (2); *мовити* (2x: 1, 1^v), *Мова* (3) = 4 word forms;
- **retained dl**: *быдло* (3^v) = 1 word form;
- **reflex of кѣлѣ- (and reflex of nasal vowel)**: *Ксюндза* (3^v), *ѣ* *Ксюндза* (3^v) = 2 word forms;
- **Polish co**: *за цо* (1^v), *цос* (2x, 3 (2x)) (along with *што* (1, 2, 3^v (2x)), and *що* (1^v), *щос* (3)) = 3 word forms;
- **lack of epenthetic l**: *постановене* (2, along with *вызѣбляють* (3) etc.) = 1 word form;
- **Polish Latinism and Bohemism** *Костелы* (< *castellum*) (3) = 1 word form.

In sum, this makes up to 139 quite indisputable loans from Polish.

Some slightly less certain loans from Polish are:

- **nouns in -ен(ь)ство**: *Набоженства* (3, confirmed by ES 1982ff.), *порѣченство* (of Czech origin, see *и* from the back nasal vowel) (1) = 2 word forms;
- **a Bohemism in Polish**: *нѣСпросиѣшиѣ* (with *s-*) (1^v) = 1 word form.
- **other items that are most likely to be of Polish origin**: *вбора* (2x: 1, 2), *хорых* (2x: 1, 1^v, against the background of Ukrainian *хворий* with preserved *v*),

4 This kind of variation of Polonized and non-Polonized forms is all but atypical for early modern Ruthenian: see Keipert 1988 and Moser 2009b and pp. 90–104 in this volume.

колвекъ (4x: 1 (3x), 1^v), Зсполную (1), Поневаж (3x: 1, 1^v, 3^v), А зажъ (3x: 1^v, 3 (2x), treated as 1 word, cf. Polish *azaż*), поне (3x: 1, 2^v (2)), Посполитое (2x: 1, 3^v), Приходнемъ (2^v), Шкрѣтне (1^v), Иле (2), Поне (2^v), Пану (4x: 1 (4x)), Панове (4x: 1^v (2x), 3 (2x)), Панов (2x: 3^v (2x)), Паны (instr. pl.) (1^v), до Паньствъ (2^v), Панствъ (3) (Polish source of Ukrainian *pan* confirmed by ES 1982ff.), Перѣства (despite the pleophony) (2^v), Лечъ (2x: 2^v, 3), Чти (loc. sg.) (2), зацнѣшого (3), Шчитиве (1), Же (5x: 1, 3 (4x)), шбы (1^v) = 49 word forms.

Altogether, this makes 52 more, for a total of 191 items that are probably of Polish origin.

3.2.2. Latin loans

The following loans from Latin are used in the text (I exclude ancient loans such as *жидове* and *костель* [the latter has been treated above as a Polonism, whereas *жидове* is not counted at all]): Привилѣ (1^v), Привилѣа (2x, 1 (2x)), Привилеиѣ (1^v), Привилеишв (1^v), Привилѣку (1^v), декрет (2^v), декретъ (2x: 1, 3^v), декрета (2), Здекретован (2), ет[ц]/етиц (4x), фѣндованы (1), фѣндованых (2x, 1 (2x)), фѣндацыѣ (2), фѣндацѣ (2x: 1, 2), фѣндыши (2), релѣи (3x: 1 (2x), 1^v), 3 Сакраменты (1), з Сакраментамы (1), Сакраментом (instr. sg.) (1^v), Маестатъ (3), маестату (gen. sg.) (3), юрисдициѣи (2x: 1, 2), Прокѣратор (3^v), Прокураторовъ (3^v), Процесъ (2x: 1, 1^v), Процесѣи (1), Процесиѣх (1^v), Протестацѣи (1^v), Протестацѣю (3^v), Гонер (1^v), Шнера (3, *honera* was used along with *opera* in Latin itself), Инъ контѣмацѣи (2), Инъ контумациѣм (2), [Акта] Електовые (2), [книгъ] Електовых (2), Конѣтроверѣмо (1), контроверѣсиѣи (3^v), Евангелика (3^v), Евангелицих (3^v), Приформовавши (1^v), Инѣформациѣю (3^v), Инѣстрѣкиѣа (1), мунѣмента (1), статус каѣзы (1), пропонуѣт (1), Шнѣи (1), Лѣвде (1^v), Прешкрипциѣа (1), Наѣцѣи (1^v), Каѣциѣа (1^v), Копѣю (1^v), Авѣнтицѣи (1^v), Акта [Електовые] (2), в Канѣцѣларѣи (3^v), картѣ (2), Сѣмы (2), Скасовали (1^v), колациѣми (2), Бѣстиѣи (1^v), Адверсаромъ (2^v), Лѣментъ (3), Натѣралнѣи (3), екземпла (3), Пленѣпотенциѣю (1), Сенаторов (3^v), Сенаторскихъ (3), Инѣстанцииѣи (3^v), Лимѣтациѣи (3^v), Папиѣста (3^v), мандатом (3^v), референдара (3^v), [Неприѣтелев] Коронных (3), Каѣшталаѣне (3), Генвар (4) (cf. a Greek stem in *Клеросом*). These items make up to 88 word forms (*инъ* is counted separately, like all prepositions; in *статус каѣзы* (1), two word forms are counted).

It is highly likely that most of the cited Latinisms entered Ukrainian through Polish. Some of the loans exhibit Polish features that support this view, namely: *j* in *Привилѣ* (1^v), *Привилѣа* (2x, 1 (2x)), *Привилеиѣ* (1^v), *Привилеишв* (1^v), *Привилѣку* (1^v), *релѣи* (3x: 1 (2x), 1^v), *ы* in *юрисдициѣи* (2x: 1, 2), *Наѣцѣи* (1^v), *фѣндацыѣа* (2), *фѣндацѣи* (2x: 1, 2), *Процесѣи* (1) along with *Процесиѣх* (1^v), etc., *š* < Latin and German *s*: in *фѣндыши* (2), *Прешкрипциѣа* (1), *Каѣшталаѣне* (3). Moreover, some Latin loans behave morphologically in the same way as in Middle Polish: *Привилѣ* (nom. sg.) (1^v), *Привилѣа* (nom. pl.) (1^v), *Привилеишв* (gen. pl.) (1^v), *декретъ* (gen. sg.) (2^v), *декрета* (nom./acc. pl.) (3), *мунѣмента* (1), *екземпла* (3) (acc. pl.), *Папиѣста* (nom. sg.) (3^v), *статус каѣзы* (1), *Авѣнтицѣи* (1^v). As for *Инъ контѣмацѣи* (2), *Инѣстанцииѣи* (3^v), see below.

3.2.3. Words based on German roots

Most German words (I again exclude ancient loans such as *-куп-, король-, лихва*, as well as loan translations such as *мѣсто*) were also probably adopted via Polish. In the text, the following elements occur: *Завдячнє* (1), *Печат* (1), *Печатью* (1^v), *рынок* (1^v), *В рынку* (2x: 1 (2x)), *в ринку* (1), *Скринку* (2), *до скринки* (2), *рады* (2^v), *рѣцы* (instr. pl.) (2x: 1^v, 3), *На ратѣиш* (1^v), *Под ратѣишем* (1), *мѣсимо* (1), *Примѣшають* (1^v), *Крамов* (1), *шацѣнкомъ* (1), *цехъ* (1^v), *С цеху* (1^v), *цехове* (2x: 1^v, 3), *цехи* (2x: 1^v, 2^v), *цеховѣ* (2x: 2 (2x)), *цехов* (2^v), *в цехах* (3), *цеховою* (1^v), *цехмистры* (1^v), *цехМистрове* (3), *цехмистровѣство* (2), *Побѣнтовиали* (1^v), *решиты* [, албо *штатокъ*] (2^v), *шкод* (gen. pl.) (2^v), *Жартъ* (2x: 2^v (2x)), *в [самом] Мѣрѣ* (3, originally from Latin), *наветъ* (3), *Ротмистрѣ* (3), *фортельми* (3^v), *ратунку* (3^v), *Гетмани* (3), *сѣ дожебрати* (3^v), *Грошѣ* (3^v, originally Latin), *Папезнику* (loc. sg.) (3^v), *Гарбарѣскую* (3^v), *шпетна* (4^v).

Some of these 48 loans from German are phonologically marked as Polonisms: *š, ž < German s*: *На ратѣиш* (1^v), *Под ратѣишем* (1), *решиты* (2^v), *шкод* (2^v), *шпетна* (4^v), *Грошѣ* (3^v), *Жартъ* (2^v), *сѣ дожебрати* (3^v), *Папезнику* (3^v); *j < džc*: *рѣцы* (1^v, 3); *y after r*: *рынок* (1^v), *В рынку* (1, along with *в ринку* (1)); cf. only soft *ri* in *Скринку* (2), *до скринки* (2) as Polish *skrzynka* with *rz* ([ž] < [rʲ]); *ra < re*, *ar < er*: *ратунку* (3^v), *Гарбарѣскую* (3^v).

3.3. Inflectional morphology

Although Ruthenian inflectional morphology is largely intact, one does find some counterexamples.

3.3.1. Nouns

3.3.1.1. Polish acc. sg. -e

In the following example, one finds a genuinely Polish inflectional ending of a noun ending in *-a*: *Справе пропонуват мають* (1). The noun apparently reflects the Polish accusative form *sprawę* with a denasalized ending. In two other cases, the same ending occurs after [j], cf. *Нащо И Протестацїе Показѣмъ* (1^v), along with the intact Ruthenian ending in *Протестацїю Гарбарѣскую* (3^v), cf. the Polish form *protestac(y)ę*; *Инстанцїе Чинити* (3^v), cf. the Polish form *instanc(y)ę*. These three forms may be regarded as obvious Polonisms. The form *Справе* must be added to our list of clear Polonisms (the other elements have already been counted as non-Ruthenian because of their lexical stem).

3.3.1.2. Polish masculinum personale

In three fragments, the text seems to demonstrate a Ruthenian reflection of the Middle Polish tendency toward the development of the new gender category *masculinum personale*: 1) *В котрых то вѣсках видимо же бывали и сѣтъ / Гетмани, Ротмистрѣ, Полковники, Сотники, Десятники ет[ц]* (3). In this fragment, the form *Гетмани* (Polish *Hetmani*) and, even more, the form *Ротмистрѣ* come into play, although the letter *и* of the ending in *Гетмани* is always problematic in Ukrainian, and the *ѣ* in *Ротмистрѣ*, which certainly renders [ʲi], could perhaps be explained by

the fact that, in accordance with Polish *rotmistrz* (nom.pl. *rotmistrzy*), *Ротмистр(ь)* might have been adopted as a soft stem altogether; Тумченко (Тум), however, has no entry for *ротмистръ/ротмистрь*, and records *мистръ* only with the hard stem. The retained *k* in the last three noun stems demonstrates, of course, that they are not treated as *masculina personalia*.

Two other sentences reveal even more likely candidates for this Polish gender category: 2) *А зажь Панове цехМистрове И ремесниці Лвовские / Шевиць Кравиць, рѣзники, Поворозники, Горчары, етиц етиц етиц / цос зацнѣшого шсобѣ НадВоска Ви Кр Мл быти розѣмѣют* (3); 3) *А того Заживати Намъ Боронѣть Панове Поляцы* (1^v). On the one hand, the nouns with the nom.pl. ending *-ove* come into play; the ending is widely considered to be of wholly Polish origin. On the other hand, the forms *ремесниці* and *Поляцы* with the reflex of the second palatalization of velars are of even greater interest: in all likelihood, they are motivated by the Polish model and can hardly be treated as either Ruthenian archaisms or Church Slavonic elements. At a minimum, I add the two latter forms to the list of clear Polonisms.

3.3.1.3. Latin endings

The form *вѣчѣм* with the Latinized ending (instead of *вѣче*) seems to be a hapaxlegomenon—neither the historical dictionaries nor the card file of the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* at the Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Lviv have an entry:⁵ *Старожитнѣ Натуралнѣ Народ Нашѣ рѣскѣи маєт свое вѣчѣм, / И црковѣ Набоженства своего воЛвовѣ* (3). The use of the Latin ending seems to be a mere idiosyncrasy.

A special case is the Latin loan phrase *in contumaciam* as rendered in Cyrillic script in *Народ рѣскѣи абы был шѣжонѣмъ Здекретован, албо / Инѣ контумаціамъ здан* (2). Elsewhere, the Polish ending is used with the same stem in *Если бы теж Заносили декрета Іхѣи, албо Инѣ контѣмаціе* (2) (see 3.3.1.1.). The latter forms have been counted as Latinisms before. Owing to its ending, the word form *вѣчѣм* must be added to our list of clear Latinisms.

3.3.2. Verbs

3.3.2.1. 1 pers. pres. sg. pl. -my

This ending, as encountered once in *Понекондѣ маемы дома свои дѣдичные в рынку Под ратѣшемъ* (1), was in all likelihood adopted from Polish. Elsewhere, one finds the ending *-мо* as in *мѣсимо* (1) along with *-мѣ*, as in *Показѣмѣ* (1^v). Because of its ending, the form *маемы* is listed as a Polonism (although the phonological shape of the lexical stem is intact).

3.3.2.2. естесмы and 1 pers. sg. pl. -смы

Polish *естесмы* occurs once; the ending *-смы* is used with the past tense or the conditional mood five times. These are the relevant fragments: *Поневажѣ Естесмы и*

5 I would like to thank my colleagues in Lviv for allowing me to consult the card file during my stay there in October 2010.

мы Понекондѣ добро речи Посполитое (3^v), Илесмы змогли дѣти (2), Просити, абысмы ѿшкод, Презысковѣ И Накладовѣ / Адверсаромѣ Неплатячи. Волни Были (2^v), Бысмы были И немотное быдло, Альбо швыцѣ акие / Предсѣжѣ до Ви Кр Мл Волатибысмы Мусѣли (3^v), Просим Справедливости Ётое И ратунку, Абысмы доровных / Волностѣ Знародом Полским Были Припѣчени (3^v). Along with *Естесмы*, the form *Естесмо* occurs three times (1, 2^v, 3): here the stem structure is also genuinely Polish. The genuinely Ruthenian personal ending *-смо* is used once with a past tense form in *Дла лепшое вѣры Печат При/Ложилисмо, И рѣками Подписали* (1). These six forms must be added to the list of Polonisms.

3.2.2.3. становшии

The most plausible interpretation of this form is that it is motivated by the Polish model (*stanowszy* is an irregular form of *staŋąć* in Polish): *И в еден бокъ 3 Народом Полскимъ становшии, Завше вѣрне / И менѣжне вшеляких Неприятелев Коронных, И маестату / Ви Кр Мл громѣтъ* (3).

3.3.3. Adjectives and deadjectival forms

3.3.3.1. Polish comparative suffixes

The suffix *-š-* instead of *-i(j)š-* is used in [C] *пренасвятъшиим [Сакраментом]* (1^v), cf. Polish *przena(j)świętszy*. The Polish form of the comparative suffix *-ejš-* occurs twice in a form of address that is most probably a loan from Polish itself: see *Наяснѣшій Млтивѣ Кр* (3) and *Наяснѣшій Мл Кр* (3^v). Elsewhere, genuinely Ruthenian *ѣ* appears in *нѣ/Спроснѣшии* (1^v), *зацнѣшого* (3), cf. also *горѣ* (3).⁶

3.3.3.2. Middle Polish superlative prefix на-

Preceding [j], the prefix *на-* (instead of *нѣ-* [read: *най*], cf. Middle Polish *naj-* along with *на-*) is encountered in *Наяснѣшій Млтивѣ Кр* (3) and *Наяснѣшій Мл Кр* (3^v). Once more, it occurs in a different context in *пренасвятъшиим* (1^v), cf. *набольше* (1^v) and *нѣ/Спроснѣшии* (1^v).

6 It should be added at this point that the scribe distinguishes *ѣ* and *е* quite consistently (see also 3.3.3.3.). The *е* in *немотное* (3^v) might reflect a Polonized pronunciation; it should be taken into account that this adjective is used together with a genuinely Polish word in *немотное быдло* (3^v). The *е* in the root of the stem *мещан-* is written consistently—obviously, the burghers of Lviv did not “Ukrainize” the *е* in this loan—whereas all forms with the stems *Мѣст-* and *Мѣсц-* reveal the etymologically correct Ukrainian: see *Мещане* (1), *Предмещане* (1), *Мещаном* (1), *Предмещаномѣ* (1), *Мещанѣ* (1^v), *Предмещанѣ* (1^v), *мещан* (4^v), *предѣ/мещан* (4^v) along with *Мѣста* (3), *Мѣстечку* (1^v), *мѣсца* (1^v), *мѣсцькѣи* (1^v), *мѣсцькое* (1), *Мѣсцькое* (1^v), *Мѣсцьких* (2^v), *мѣсцько* (loc. sg. fem.) (2), and *Намѣстника* (3^v). The verb *ѡбещуем* is a perfectly clear Polonism, so that the Polish *е* in the root is no surprise. The situation is more confusing with regard to *летиости* (4) and *Дла лепшое вѣры* (1), along with *дла Лѣпишии вѣры* (1). The scribe might have well been acquainted with both forms: *lipš-* with the genuinely Ruthenian reflex (cf. Modern Ukrainian *ліпший*) and *lepš-* in accordance with Polish *lepszy*. Out of all these possible Polonisms, I add only the three comparative forms to the list of Polonisms.

3.3.3.3. Adverbs ending in -e

Adverbs ending in *-e* occur often, cf. *Завдячне* (1), *Швне* (1^v), *Скрите* (1^v), *Шкрѣтне* (1^v), *вѣрне* (2x: 3 (2x)), *менѣжне* (3), etc. Adverbs ending in *-e* are widely considered to be of Polish origin (which does not apply to adverbs ending in *-ѣ*). As regards the use of *ѣ* and *e*, see 3.3.3.2. Those four word forms, which have not yet been listed for other reasons (*Швне*, *Скрите*, *вѣрне* (2x)), will be added to the list.

3.3.4. Numerals

The ending of the numeral *Чтырѣ* (read: *Чтырей*) in *Чтырѣ Народов всагом Мѣрѣ Мѣста Лвова сѣт фѣднованы* (3) is obviously adopted from Polish *cztery*. The shape of the numeral seems to be genuinely Polish in every respect. It will be added to the list.

3.4. General Statistics

The text consists of 1,722 word forms.⁷ If one extracts the Latin fragment, which has 93 words, a corpus of 1,629 words remains. Altogether, 347 out of 1,629 forms or 21.3 percent are very probably (non-ancient) loans of Polish (191 + 19 morphological), Latin (88 + 1 morphological), or German (48) origin. If the Latin fragment is included, 440 out of 1,722 forms make up as much as 25.55 percent. The following indicator is even more impressive: out of 1,629 word forms (including many frequent prepositions, conjunctions, and even the separately counted reflexive particle, etc.), only 11 stem occurrences (0.68 percent) have no immediate equivalent in Polish that is not identical, apart from the rules of historical phonology (or some other, less regular changes of the type *который/który*).

7 As in other documents (especially manuscripts), spaces between alphabetic strings do not necessarily coincide with word boundaries. For merely technical reasons, I count letter combinations as symbols for numbers as one word form. Although some numbers in the Latin text are also rendered with Cyrillic letters, I treat them as Latin words because, in all likelihood, they were meant to be pronounced in Latin. Other forms that are questionable with regard to word counting are treated as follows: The reflexive particle *сѣ* is always counted separately (because it is mobile, see *Еслисѣ / Гдѣ снѣм покажѣтъ* (1^v)). The same applies to the mobile endings *смы/смо* and even to the particle *бы*: *ПриЛожили сѣмо* (1), *Бы смы были* (3^v), *Если бы* (1^v), *Волати бы смы* (3^v), but *Шкобы* (1^v) and *Абы* (1^v). The pronominal form *му* is counted separately: *Теж му єдно даровати* [...] (3^v). The particle *то* is also counted separately, cf. *въ том то рѣском Лвовѣ* (3). The particle *колевѣ* is also counted as a separate word form: *што колевѣ* (1). Prepositions are treated as separate forms not only in *З народом Полским* (1), *с потомствы* (2^v), but also in *всѣ весель єденѣ За єдного* (1), *для того* (1^v), *защо > за що* (1^v) (all prepositions are clearly written together and paralleled by *Напрод* (2^v etc.), in this case, the preposition is written separately). The forms *Протож* (1), *претожѣ* (1^v) (cf. Polish *przecież*), and *Аажѣ* (3) (cf. Polish *azaż*) are, however, counted as one word (although *Аажѣ* is obviously written separately), and the same applies not only to *зас* (3^v) (cf. Polish *zaś*) and *И лисѣ* [...] > *Или сѣ* [...] (3^v), but also to *НасамыПрод* (1, though written together and paralleled by *Напрод* (2^v etc.), cf. Polish *naprzód* and *nasamprzód*). Less problematic is the negation particle, which I always count separately if it negates a verb, although the particle is usually written together with the verb; I thus treat *Нехотѣтъ* (3) as *Не хотѣтъ* (2). I am perfectly aware that other approaches are also feasible in all these cases. I should also add that, in general, the solutions I propose tend to generate more word forms than others. The percentages would also change correspondingly. The general picture would, however, probably remain the same.

4. Conclusion

The *Instruction* of 1609 (including the *Lament*) clearly attests that the Ruthenian burghers of Lviv struggled to maintain their separate identity (in fact, a national identity in a prenationalist expression). On the other hand, the Ruthenian language of the text again demonstrates the tremendous impact of Polish models on the Ruthenian higher culture of that time. Since the language of the *Instruction* differs only slightly from the prototypical high variant of the Middle Ruthenian language (which tends to avoid such forms as acc. sg. *чнпаше*), this strong Polish impact was obviously not due primarily to the fact that the *Instruction* was addressed to the Warsaw Diet and to the Polish king but reflects a general trend. Apparently, early modern Ruthenians did not regard the closeness of their language to Polish as problematic as long as the Cyrillic alphabet, the Ruthenian phonological structure of the morphemes, and the Ruthenian system of inflectional morphology were preserved. At the same time, it is quite obvious that people capable of using a language such as the one encountered in the *Instruction* would be able to switch to Polish very quickly.

In the age of nationalism, a language like that of the *Instruction* could not serve as a successful immediate model for the elaboration of a modern national written language. Language had by then become an important symbol of the nation. As a typical *Abstand* language (Kloss 1967), modern Ruthenian or, as it was renamed, modern Ukrainian (and modern Belarusian) was to be shaped as a language equally remote from Polish and from Russian.

WAS IVAN UŽEVYČ'S РОЗМОВА-БЕСѢДА REALLY NOT BASED ON A POLISH MODEL?

1. Розмова-Бесѣда in a multilingual context

Some years ago, the distinguished philologist Helmut Keipert proved that the formerly somewhat mysterious Ruthenian-Church Slavonic *Розмова-Бесѣда* was written by Ivan Uževyč, who is well known as the author of a Ruthenian grammar (*Grammatica sclavonica*, extant in two manuscripts of 1643 and 1645) (Keipert–Bunčić 2006: VI), and that the text is a supplement¹ to a very popular multilingual conversation book originally written by Noël de Berlaimont (Keipert 2001). De Berlaimont wrote his conversation book in the 1620s to teach French to students and merchants in Antwerp (Bunčić 2006: 14). It was subsequently translated into several languages, and a number of text variants emerged. There are several Slavic versions: Czech (Leipzig, 1602 and 1611), Polish (Warsaw, 1646), Russian (a manuscript preserved in Copenhagen), and translations into Ruthenian and Church Slavonic (ibid., 15). It is in fact astonishing that prior to Helmut Keipert, no one detected that *Розмова-Бесѣда*—a truly unique Middle Ruthenian text—is a translation of Berlaimont's conversation book, which was very popular in its time: after all, Berlaimont's name is even mentioned in Uževyč's manuscript!²

As Helmut Keipert and his former disciple Daniel Bunčić have demonstrated in their studies, Ivan Uževyč's version is one of those that almost literally translate the Latin text. In particular, Latin *Petro detur iste locus* is rendered as *Петрову даѹме моѡ мѣстѹ* in the Ruthenian version, as compared to *Piotrowi niech to będzie dáne mieysce* in the Polish text (which, in this case, holds even more accurately to the original). Other versions usually offer a free translation: for example, they do not try to find an equivalent for Latin *locus*: see English *let Peter sit there* (seventeenth-century spelling), German *lasst Petern dort sitzen*, French *laissez Pierre seoir la*, Czech *nechažt' tu Petr sedne*, or Russian *Бели тудыѹ Петру сѣсть* (Keipert–Bunčić 2005: XXVII–XXVIII).

In their recent publications, Helmut Keipert and Daniel Bunčić draw a conclusion that looks quite surprising in light of the typical pattern of the early modern period. According to these two scholars, Uževyč did not use the Polish version (Keipert–Bunčić 2005: XXV–XXIX; Bunčić 2006: 126–127). In my review of Keipert's and Bunčić's excellent four-language edition (Latin, Polish, Ruthenian, Church Slavonic) of Berlaimont's conversation book, I already expressed my doubts about this conclusion and promised to return to the topic (Moser 2006c).³

1 With regard to *Розмова-Бесѣда*, it has not been established whether it belongs to the Ukrainian or the Belarusian tradition (see Bunčić 2006).

2 Nonetheless, as late as 2007, the Cracow Slavist Adam Fałowski had every reason to state that “perhaps only a small group of specialists in Ukraine [and not only there] are aware of the source of *Розмова-Бесѣда*” (Fałowski 2007: 435).

3 This article has been written for the express purpose of fulfilling that promise. I will not discuss the Church Slavonic version of the conversation book here, although it is undoubtedly of great general interest. The Church Slavonic version does not, however, contribute anything to the discussion of our major question, for Uževyč obviously translated it from the Ruthenian version.

In my view, there is little doubt that Uževyč worked with the Polish translation of Berlaimont’s conversation book.

2. Arguments against the dependence of the Ruthenian version on the Polish one—and counterarguments

In his excellent monograph on *Розмова-Бесѣда*, Daniel Bunčić himself quotes some sections in which the Ruthenian and Polish text versions are strikingly similar indeed. With reference to those sections, he argues that “such passages” inspire the belief that the Polish version was at least “available to Uževyč” (Bunčić 2006: 125), and that “One might contend that Uževyč translated from the Polish original but consciously wanted to distance himself from it in order to demonstrate how different Ruthenian was from Polish” (ibid., 126).⁴ Nonetheless, both Bunčić and his former mentor Keipert consider this hypothesis unfounded and are convinced that Uževyč did not know the Polish text. I offer a discussion of their most important arguments below.

2.1.1. Argument 1

It is allegedly obvious that if Uževyč had used the Polish original, he would have been unable to translate those sections that do not appear in the Warsaw printing (e.g., 4^v, 5^v, 13^v, 34^r–35^r, 36^v, 67^v–71^r).

2.1.2. Counterargument 1

One does not necessarily have to agree with this argument. Daniel Bunčić himself concedes that Uževyč could have used more than one version: why could this not have been the Warsaw printing and another version? The author could easily have translated the parts omitted in the Warsaw printing from the Latin text of his other version, and he might in fact have known only the Polish section of the Warsaw printing, for example, as a handwritten excerpt.⁵ He was certainly prepared for such an eventuality, as he knew Latin well enough to correct or amend the Polish translation in numerous instances. See, for example, the following section, where the Ruthenian version literally renders the Latin original (RB: 4–5):

nemo enim est vel in Gallia [...] vel in Italia [...] quin [...]	Zadnego bowiem / nie mász we Fráncyey/ [...] we Włoszech [...], żeby [...]	Жадень бовѣмъ не-ѣсть Любъ ве Франныи [...] любъ ве Влашихъ [...] которыйбы [...]
---	---	--

4 “Solche Stellen legen die Vermutung nahe, Uževyč habe bei seiner Übersetzung die polnische Version zumindest vorgelegen [...] Man könnte annehmen, dass Uževyč aus der polnischen Vorlage übersetzte, sich aber bewusst von ihr absetzen wollte, um zu zeigen, wie sich das Ruthenische vom Polnischen unterscheidet.”

5 I developed this last part of my counterargument in the course of an e-mail discussion with Daniel Bunčić.

2.2.1. Argument 2

The editors emphasize that Uževyč indicates eight languages into which Berlaimont’s conversation book had been translated, although the Warsaw printing features only six language versions. Uževyč even lists these eight languages but does not include Polish.

2.2.2. Counterargument 2

One can disagree with this argument as well. First, Uževyč might simply have referred to an eight-language version without paying particular attention to the fact that a Polish version existed as well. Second, he might consciously have sought to mislead his potential West European readers, who were not necessarily aware that he was well acquainted with the Polish version, and most of whom probably would not have known that a Polish translation existed at all. The Ruthenian version is often so close to the Polish one that anyone with a good command of both languages would immediately have treated Uževyč’s achievement as a translator with considerably more reserve than a reader unaware of the Polish text. It is in fact obvious that in the course of his work with the Polish text, Uževyč made many changes. He did so not only to bring his Ruthenian version closer to the Latin text but also to distance it from the Polish one. As the first lines of the text demonstrate (RB: 4–5), he occasionally changed word order (*Łaskáwy Czytelniku* > *Чителнику ласкавий*, [...] *pożyteczna y użyteczna jest* > *такъ есть пожитечная*), morphemes of almost identical word forms (e.g., prefixes: *wychwalona* > *похвалено*), and some word forms (*bárzo* > *такъ*, *y* > *ани*, *że* > *ужъ*).

Amice Lector, hic liber adeò commodus est et utilis,	Łaskáwy Czy/telniku. Tá Książka bár- zo pożyteczna y użyteczna jest/	Чителнику ласкавий Тая книга такъ есть пожитечная
eiusque usus ita necessarius, ut non satis ne à doctis quidam laudari queat	a jey záżywánie ták potrzebne/ że nie dosyć y od uczonych wy- chwalona bydź może	И-ѣнои уживанѣ такъ есть потребноѣ ижъ не-досыть ани ѿ учоныхъ похвалено быти можетъ.

Many of Uževyč’s changes to the Polish text can be regarded as genuine amendments. In the above-quoted passage, however, Uževyč could provisionally have translated Latin *commodus...et utilis* with the single word *пожитечная* under the influence of the Polish text, which offers two all too similar forms. Uževyč had good reason to adopt only one of them.

2.3.1. Argument 3

Bunčić further contends that the Polish version cannot have been available to Uževyč, as he would then have used that version in those individual cases where the Latin version had become “completely incomprehensible” in the Denhagen or Derft printing of 1613, which Uževyč undoubtedly used (Bunčić 2006: 126).⁶

2.3.2. Counterargument 3

At first glance, this argument seems very convincing, but it is important to check the relevant sections in detail:

a) In the following fragment, the fine Polish translation was based on the original Latin version (Keipert–Bunčić 2005: XXXI):

quid tibi tantum prosit stuferus unus aut alter	coż ći za pożytek da/ jeden grosz y drugi
---	---

The Latin version with which Uževyč worked was actually corrupt, but Uževyč simply translated as if that were not the case (RB: 116–117]:

quid tibi tantum presit stuferus unus aut alter	POPULARIS: чемужь тобѣ такъ панует штибрѣ ѣдинѣ або другии (SACRA: почто убо тако царствуєт ти штибрѣ єдинѣ или другии)
---	--

What does this imply? Even though the Latin version with which Uževyč worked was corrupt, it made sense anyway. On the basis of several inaccurate Polish translations of the Latin text, Uževyč may have believed that in this case as well, his Latin text was fine, but the Polish translation was bad. As mentioned above, the fact that Uževyč knew the Polish version does not necessarily imply that he was acquainted with the Latin text of the Warsaw printing. Most importantly, however, Uževyč had no reason to believe that his Latin text was corrupt at all.

b) At first glance, the following example seems convincing (Keipert–Bunčić 2005: XXXII). The Polish version renders the original and correct Latin version very well:

ut disceptādi (read: <i>disceptandi</i>) finem faciamus	abyśmy kończyli targ
--	----------------------

6 “[...] Uževyč hätte bei einigen durch Abschreibfehler völlig unverständlich gewordenen Stellen in der lateinischen Vorlage die gut verständliche polnische Übersetzung zu Rate ziehen müssen.”

In this instance as well, the Latin version with which Uževyč worked was corrupt: the gerund form *disceptandi* had changed into *dispectam dic*, so that the form *disceptam* did not make sense.

ut disceptam [sic!] dic finem faciamus	POPULARIS: повѣжъ абысмы конец учинили (SACRA: а повѣжъ да конец сотворити возможем)
--	---

Uževyč simply ignored the incomprehensible word (*disceptam*) but translated every other word accurately. He could do so with no problem because the word *disceptam* adds almost no information in this particular context, where it is obvious that a deal is being made (RB: 222–223):

[...] percontemur si quadraginta solidos velit decidere. Num eam acceptari sumus? C. Ita prorsus si quam mihi fidem habes neque te poenituerit. [...]	[...] spytaymy jeżeli zá czterdzieści / szelągów będzie chciał / puścić. czy go mamy / wziąć? C. Zgoła tak jeżeli mi / wierzysz/ áni będziesz żałował [żałował!] [...]	[...] спробуймы если сорок соддовъ хочет впустити если вныи вземемъ? такъ згола если ми вѣришь ани будешъ жаловати. [...]
B. ecquid placent triginta libræ pro ambabus partibus ut disceptam [??] dic finem fa- / ciamus ? argentum tibi numerabitur	á podobać się / wziąć trzydzieści libr zá obie sztuce? abyśmy kończyli / targ tálarámić odliczemy.	подобаєт ли ся тридцат золотыхъ за обѣдве штуце повѣжъ абысмы конец учинили гроши тобѣ вѣличимъ.

If Uževyč did not see the original Latin text, then he was not necessarily aware that the Polish version was “better” in this case. As he understood it, the Polish version could simply have been a perfectly appropriate free translation of a corrupt Latin fragment. Proceeding from this assumption, Uževyč would have been quite right to contend that his solution was no worse than that of the Polish translator. After all, he did not know that this Polish translator had had the opportunity to work with a non-corrupt Latin text.

c) The last fragment that is of interest with regard to Bunčić’s final argument (Bunčić 2006: 126–127) features the locution *cognata lustrica* in the Latin version. Bunčić argues that Uževyč did not know that expression, hesitated to translate it, and decided to fill the empty space in his manuscript later (as in other instances, by the way) (RB: 96–97):

C. Precor tibi felici- cem hunc diem cognata lustrica, et tuis sodalibus. M. Et ego tibi Cognata lustrica.	Zyczeń dnia tego szczęśliwego kmoszko/ y temu / towarzystwu. M. Y ja też tobie kmoszko.	Жычу Тобѣ щасли- вого сего дня и твоимъ товаришомъ. М. и я тобѣ
---	--	--

Bunčić argues that the Polish version would have helped Uževyč, who, as Bunčić assumes, simply did not know the Latin expression. However, Uževyč may equally well have hesitated over the most appropriate translation of *cognata lustrica* into Ruthenian; he could also have had difficulty with the translation of the Polish word *kmoszka*. Simply adopting the Polish word would not have been a good decision: although the early modern “Common Ruthenian” language is characterized by a very large number of Polish loans, this word in particular was either used quite rarely or not used at all, as witness the fact that not only the historical dictionaries of the Ukrainian language but also the card file of the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* at the Ivan Kryp’jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Lviv have no such lexical entry as *кмошка*. Uževyč might have postponed a decision on how best to translate *cognata lustrica* for many reasons. One of them might have been that the Polish translation was of little help to him in this particular case.

To sum up, we are not finally convinced by any of the arguments against the assumption that Uževyč used the Polish translation of Berlaimont’s conversation book.

3. Arguments supporting the assumption that Ivan Uževyč worked with the Polish version

3.1. Mistakes and corrections

As one comes to the conclusion that the intriguing and serious arguments put forth by Helmut Keipert and Daniel Bunčić are anything but irrefutable, the general impression emerges that Uževyč was perfectly well acquainted with the Polish version and in fact made extensive use of it. Occasionally, however, Uževyč obviously wanted to offer a better translation than his predecessor. Moreover, he wanted to conceal his acquaintance with the Polish text.

Two examples are of particular interest in this regard. In both cases, Uževyč, temporarily lacking concentration, initially used the same word forms as in the Polish version but subsequently corrected them.

- a) In the first example, Uževyč had already written the Polish word form in one line but then replaced it with a Ruthenian form in the new line, when he noticed that he had just continued as in the Polish version and, moreover, in the wrong line (the translation was as interlinear as possible):

P. Quid hominis est?	P. Co zá czło/wiek jest:	Р: што за чловѣкъ ёсть
I. Non novi	I. Nie znám	І: не-знаю ѿнче
Pater	oycze/	Ъче [RB: 58–59].

- b) In the second example, Uževyč had already written the word form *обозъ* but eventually rejected it, although this word and even some derivatives of it were widely used in early modern Ruthenian (see *обозъ, обозниѸ, обозовый, обозництво* etc.—Tymčenko II: 15). Obviously, this replacement could have been made quite independently of the Polish text, since Uževyč was obviously looking for the best translation of *sive castra sequitur, sive iter faciat* and reached the perfectly appropriate conclusion that these Latin phraseological units should not be translated literally (as far as I know, no early modern Ruthenian phraseological units such as *слѣдовати обозамъ* or *чинити/дѣлати/робити дорогы* existed). Accordingly, Uževyč made a rather successful attempt to create a better translation than his Polish predecessor:

nam sive quis	Abowiem / luboby	албовемя любо кто
mercaturae intentus sit	kto kupecki hán/del	купецтвомъ-ся бавить
sive	prowódził/	любо
in Aula versetur	lub ná Dworze	при-двору-се знайдуеть
sive	się bawił/	любо
castra sequatur,	lub w obozie	ѡ на войнѣ зостаеть
sive	służył/	любо
iter faciat,	lub w drodze já- chał/	в'-дорозѣ
opus esset	potrzebáby Tłu- mácza jakiego/	потреба бы было
interprete aliquo,	przynamniey któ	тлумача неакого
saltem alicuius	rego tych językow.	принамнеи которогоколвек
harum linguarum.		з' тихъ ѡзыковъ [RB: 6–7].

My last argument in this section is based on the following example, where Uževyč had already decided to translate the Latin word form *aperito* literally and had already begun to write *шанкы* as an equivalent of Polish *czapkę* but then noticed that he had already used the verbal form *штыкрый*, which required another noun—one that differed from that of the Polish version, with its rather free translation:

aperito caput	czapkę zdym	Открый ш голову [RB: 30–31]
---------------	-------------	-----------------------------

3.2. Common deviations of the Polish and Ruthenian versions from the Latin original

In the following fragment, the Latin original makes no mention of God, but in the Ruthenian and Polish versions “Jan” (i.e., a person bearing the Polish equivalent of the name *Ioannes*) asks God for his blessing:

Ioannes, consecra mensam. I. Libenter mea mater. Felix faustumque sit vobis pater, ac mea mater, totique sodalitio.	Jáśiu, przeżegnay stoł. I. Chętnie / moja mátko/ Day ci Boże szcę/ście Oycze/ y mátko mojá/ y wszytkiemu towárzystwu.	Ине прежекгнаи стољ хентне пани матко богъ благословит вамъ вамъ ѿче и матко и всему-товариству [RB: 40–41]
---	--	---

Interestingly, Uževyč used the Polonism *прежекзнати* in this fragment. Although the verb *жекзнати*, *жегнати* does occur elsewhere in early modern Ruthenian sources (SUM 16–17 IX: 138; Tym I : 249), there is no entry for *прежекзнати* in Tym I: 212). Neither is there an entry for the Polonism *хентне* (< Polish *chętnie*) (ibid., 461) in Tymčenko’s dictionary (Tym), and Uževyč himself almost consistently translated *chętnie* with other Ruthenian equivalents such as *шхотне* (RB: 26–27), *з-шхоты* (ibid., 38–39), etc. elsewhere. The verb *прежекзнати* occurs twice in *Розмова-Бесѣда* (Bunčić 2006: 486), whereas the simple verb *жекзнати* is not used (ibid., 432). In both cases, the Ruthenian forms are used as equivalents of Polish *przeżegnać*. Likewise, Uževyč uses the adverb *хентне* thrice; in two cases, it renders Polish *chętnie*; in the third case, it is used instead of Polish *z chęcia* (ibid., 518). There are many more striking parallels between the Ruthenian and Polish versions of the text that can hardly be explained as mere coincidence.

3.3. Parallels that can hardly be explained as mere coincidence

Needless to say, any translator always has several options at his or her disposal, even if the translation is meant to be a literal one. Choices have to be made from among several synonyms or quasi-synonyms at the lexical level, and choices have

to be made among various constructions on the level of syntax. Translations from Latin prepared in Austrian gymnasia are usually of very limited esthetic value because the students are primarily obliged to render the Latin text as accurately as possible. Nonetheless, if any two translations show particularly striking coincidences, a good teacher will often manage to deduce that one of his students has copied his or her test from another. If an imaginary teacher of Latin were to have reviewed the Ruthenian and Polish translations from Latin quoted below, it would be astonishing if he did not conclude that the Ruthenian student had copied from the Polish one, sometimes translating even better than the Pole but obviously depending on the latter's work.

Quam rem nobiscum considerantes, non sine magno nostro sumptu, tuo vero magno commodo has linguas ita coniunximus ordineque disposuimus	Którą rzecz z ná- mi uważając/ ne bez wielkiego naszego kosztu/ twego zaś wiel- kiego pożytku/ te języki tak złą [tak!] czyliśmy y po- rządkiem położyli	Которую речъ сами в-собѣ уважаючи не безъ великого нашего кошту твоѣго зась великого пожитку тыи языки такъ злучилисмо и порядкомъ положилисмо
ut post hac tibi nullo sit opus interprete, sed facile iis ipse loqui possis tibique commodare, observata tantum varia diversarum nationum /pronunciatone.	iż potym tobie żadnego nie po- trzeba będzie Tłumacza/ ale łatwie ony- mi sam mówić/ możesz y tobie być pożyteczny/ upatruy tylko rozne rozmái- tych Narodow /wyrażenie.	абысь напотымъ жадного непотребовал тлумача лечь латво оными самъ мовити могъ и тобѣ выгодити упатривъши тылко розмантую розныхъ наций вымову [RB: 6–9].

The fragments are strikingly similar indeed.

The fact that Uževyč, for example, repeatedly used the leave-taking expression *будь ласкав* (five times, not four, as stated in Bunčić 2006: 450), and that this expression always corresponds to Polish *bądź łaskaw*, looks like more than mere coincidence (see the following example, where *будь ласкав* only seemingly renders Polish *bądź zdrów*):

Vale et salve.	Bądź łaskaw Y zdrow.	мѣйся добре и будь ласкавъ [RB: 262–263].
-------------------	--------------------------------	---

As elsewhere, Uževyč changed the word order; nevertheless, Ruthenian *будь ласкавъ* is again based on Polish *bądź łaskaw*.

The indefinite numeral *иле* does not belong to the most widespread lexical Polonisms in Early Modern Ruthenian texts, although it was used occasionally (Tym I: 347). Since Uževyč uses this word thrice in his grammar, it is obvious that he used it even independently of Polish models. In *Розмова-Бесѣда*, however, the word form occurs twice, and in both cases it corresponds to Polish *ile*. Polish *ile*, in turn, is used seven times, and Uževyč translates it four times with *ѡкъ веле*, and once with *ѡкъ*. In the following examples, Uževyč uses the word *иле*, which is undoubtedly a Polonism (although no sound law allows full confidence):

Estne in poculo tuo ce- revisia? F. Est mater, quantum satis est.	á jeste / w twoim kuflu piwo? F. Jest mátko ile potrzebá	Есть ли в' кубку твоём пѣиво Пиво ѣсть матко иле потреба [RB: 56–57].
ne huic parcas hospitio quoties hac iter habebis nam non minus commodè ac libteraliter hic excipieris, quam in quovis diver- sorio Antverpiano.	nie mijay tey gospody ile rázy tędy po/jedziesz/ ábowiem wcze/snieć tu usłuża/ y choynie ucze/strują ániżeli w inszey gospodźie / Antwerpskiey.	не ѡмѣи тоий господы иле-крот сюды поѣдешъ кдѣжъ не-мѣй вчасне и достатечне ту будешъ чостованыи анижли в-которомъ дому антверпским [RB: 256–257].

The adjective *шпетный* was quite frequently used in Early Modern Ruthenian (see Tymčenko II: 501), but its use in the following fragment is very probably based on the Polish version (the word occurs in *Розмова-Бесѣда* only once: see Bunčić 2006: 523). Moreover, the appearance of the Polonism *юж(ь)* in combination with the mobile personal ending of the first person singular *-емъ* in combination with the verb *мовила* was definitely not the only option to translate Latin *iam dixi (tibi)*. Uževyč merely replaced the clitical dative form of the second person pronoun (*ci* > *тобѣ*):

iam dixi tibi plus vicies, nihil addiscis valde turpe est	Južemči mówił więcey nád dwá/dzieściá rázy/ nic nieumiesz/ bárzo szpetna / rzecz jest	южемъ мовила тобѣ венцей нижъ двадцать разовъ ничого не-учишь-ся барзо есть шпетне [RB: 26–27].
--	---	--

The past tense form with the personal ending also occurs in the following example. That is not astonishing, as this past tense form is in common use, and there is little reason to assume that it is a Polonism as such (the model is used in southwestern Ukrainian dialects to this day). In the example quoted below, however, the only difference between the Ruthenian and Polish versions is that Uževyč moved the reflexive particle from the modal auxiliary to the infinitive form to which it belongs. Moreover, it is worth noting that the form *длужей*, which occurs in *Розмова-Бесѣда* eight times (along with *должей* (2), Bunčić 2006: 427), does not occur in the same line as Latin *diutius* but leans toward the Polish model. Uževyč temporarily forgot to “improve” the Polish translation:

Non audiui, non possum diutius morari	Niesłyszałem nie mogę się / dłużey bawić	не-слышалаемъ не-могу длужей бавитися [RB: 22–23].
---	--	--

In the following example, Uževyč adopts the Polonism *веты* “dessert” without hesitation but replaces the Polish conjunction *oraz*, which—as *wrazъ*—occurs in Uževyč’s grammar but not in *Розмова-Бесѣда* (Bunčić 2006: 470). If Uževyč translated from Latin only, why does he offer three equivalents of Latin *unà*? Was this not the result of a desperate search for a better, more literal translation of Latin *unus* “one, common”?

adfer bellaria unà com caseo	przynieś / wety oraz y z serem	принеси вѣты посполу/веспол/заедно з’ Сыром (RB: 86–87).
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Uževyč’s use of modal verbs, particularly his use of *мусѣти*, supports the impression that he used the Polish version. In “*Розмова-Бесѣда*,” one often reads about what people should or must do, which is usually expressed with gerundives in Latin. In the Polish and Ruthenian versions, it is above all the predicative form *(no)mpeba/(po)trzeba* that is used in such cases, in which Uževyč followed the Polish

version in some instances but not in others. More revealing is the use of *мусити/мусѣти*, for this modal verb is used only twice in *Розмова-Бесѣда*, and in both cases it corresponds to Polish *musi(e)ć* (cf. Bunčić 2006: 458; Polish *musi(e)ć* is used twice as often as Ruthenian *мусити/мусѣти*; in both other cases Uževyč translated it with *потреба*; see *ibid.*, 559). Although *мусити/мусѣти* was used quite often in Early Modern Ruthenian (Tymčenko I: 440; see also Modern Standard Ukrainian *мусити/мусити*), it does not appear to have been one of Uževyč’s favorite verbs. Where the Polish version has the predicative forms *potrzebá* (17 examples) or *trzebá* (14 examples), or the modal verb *mieć* (Bunčić 2006: 563; 566; 559), Uževyč never uses the German loanword.⁷

In the first example, Latin gerundives are identically translated with *мусити/мусѣти* and *musi(e)ć*:

F. Morare paulisper, bibendum tibi est. H. Abeundum mihi est.	F. Poczekay / trochę / Muśisz pić. H. Potrzebá mi / odeysć.	ґ: забавъ-ся трошку мусишъ пити ґ. потреба-ми ѡиити [RB: 64–65].
---	---	---

The second example confirms that Uževyč often wanted to find some better equivalents of Latin words than his Polish predecessor, with whose translations he was not always satisfied. Uževyč did, however, adopt the use of *мусити/мусѣти*:

G. Nunc certe mihi pecunia non est ad manum, expendi quicquid pecuniæ habebam, expectandum tibi erit etiam octo dies.	Zaprawdę u / mnie teraz skąpo pie/niędzy wydałem / com tylko pieniędzy miał/ muśisz / czekać lub z ośm.	ґеразъ заправды гро- шеи не-маю в-рукахъ роздалемъ штоколавекъ грошии мѣлемъ мусишъ почекати ѡсмъ днии [RB: 124–125].
---	--	--

For more parallels that can hardly be explained as mere coincidence, see also the last example in section 3.2.

7 The verb *mieć* occurs 108 times in the Polish version, but not only in the modal meaning; in two cases, it occurs where the Ruthenian version uses *потреба* (*ibid.*, 559). I would like to use this opportunity to thank my friends from the Ivan Kryp’jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies for allowing me to check several word forms in the card file of the *Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* during my stay in Lviv on 1–10 October 2010.

4. Conclusion

Helmut Keipert and Daniel Bunčić, the editors of *Розмова-Бесѣда*, have repeatedly argued that Ivan Uževyč made this translation of Noël de Berlaimont's conversation book independently of its Polish version. As demonstrated in this paper, it is more likely that Uževyč made ample use of the Polish version.

Unfortunately, not much is known about Ivan Uževyč's life, but it is very likely that he was born between 1610 and 1620 and passed away before 1678 (Bunčić 2006: 86). Regarding the question of when and where Uževyč wrote his *Розмова-Бесѣда*, Helmut Keipert and Daniel Bunčić have concluded that it was written "in the mid-seventeenth century" (ibid., 95) or "in the 1640s," most likely in Paris (Keipert–Bunčić 2005: VII). If we are correct in assuming that Uževyč worked with a copy of the Polish version of the conversation book from the Warsaw printing of 1646, then the year 1646 can now be considered a new *terminus post quem*.

SOME PHONOLOGICALLY MARKED META-POLONISMS IN KYRYLO TRANKVILION-STAVROVEC'KYJ'S *ПЕРЛО МНОГОВЦЬННОЄ*

1. Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj and his *ПЕРЛО МНОГОВЦЬННОЄ*

In 1985, Nikolaos (back then, Hartmut) Trunte published *Перло многовцѣнноє*, one of the most important works of Middle Ruthenian literature, as a volume in the series "Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven" (Building Blocks for the History of Slavic Literature). In a second volume, he discussed this work extensively (Trunte 1985). Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj most likely hailed from the western Ukrainian region of Volhynia. His *Перло многовцѣнноє* was first printed in 1646 in the northern Ukrainian town of Chernihiv and reissued in the Belarusian town of Mahilioŭ in 1699. It was one of the works that gained broad distribution among all Eastern Slavs: outside Poland-Lithuania, these included not only Ruthenians in the Kingdom of Hungary but also Muscovites. Regarding the latter, the work became widely known even though Patriarch Ioakim of Moscow branded it heretical in January 1690, as Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj had converted to the Union (Trunte 1985: 5). The fact that the language of *Перло многовцѣнноє* is very remote from the "pure" Church Slavonic of the East Slavic recensions did not impinge on the popularity of the book. But neither can its language be identified in its entirety as "prototypically" representative of the early modern Ruthenian written language, the so-called "Common Ruthenian" language ("prosta mova"), as is the case of the language of Kyrylo's equally prominent contemporary Ioanikij Galjats'kyj. There are only some passages of *Перло многовцѣнноє* that, as in "prototypical 'Common Ruthenian,'" correspond to early modern Polish on the lexical and syntactic levels but differ from it on the levels of phonology, graphemics, and inflectional morphology (Moser 2011: 112–131).

Nonetheless, elements explicitly marked as Polonisms are anything but rare in *Перло многовцѣнноє*. This article deals only with those words and morphemes that co-occur with genetically differently marked equivalents as free or stylistically or metrically marked variants. The basis is a selection of all phonologically marked Polonisms in the work (on not phonologically marked Polonisms in general, cf. Moser 2007). Drawing on Dean S. Worth (1974: 22), who once defined "metaslav(on)isms" as "a variant (or potentially variant) morpheme or word whose constituents form (real or potential) ChSl-ESl [Church Slavonic–East Slavonic] pairs" (for a more detailed discussion of metaslavisms, with reference to a Ruthenian text, cf. also Keipert 1988), this article will use the term "meta-Polonisms."

2. Polonisms in Ukrainian and in PM

Despite the obviously important role of Polish elements in Ukrainian, they have not been sufficiently researched. Rosemarie Richardt's doctoral thesis of 1957 (Richardt 1957) delivered quite a valuable account, but it is now outdated in many ways. Since then, some essential articles on the subject of Polonisms have been published and discussed, for instance, by Michał Łesiów (2000). There has been no larger up-to-date study. As Łesiów correctly noted, a new stage of research on

Polish-Ukrainian relations should begin, at the latest, when the new etymological dictionary of Ukrainian is completed.¹ Another essential resource is now available as well, namely the first comprehensive etymological dictionary of Polish that corresponds to the contemporary state of research (Boryś 2005). Historical dictionaries of Ukrainian, such as SUM XVI–XVII,² published in 1994, or Jevhen Tymčenko's two-volume work, published in 2002–3 (Tym), are no less important for this endeavor.

The present work will examine those elements of *Перло многоцѣнное* (hereafter PM) that are explicitly marked as Polonisms on the phonological level. The word pool of PM attests almost all phonological characteristics of Polonisms in the East Slavic languages, but only some of the lexemes or morphemes exhibiting those features function as meta-Polonisms. Generally, Polonisms in PM are by no means concentrated only in specific text passages, which means that those Polonisms do not occur merely as a result of some kind of code-switching from Church Slavonic to "Common Ruthenian." Polonisms are also frequently used in an otherwise entirely Church Slavonic context, as the following citation shows: here, the Germanism *пел҃римства*, which was integrated into Polish, is used in close proximity to the marked Church Slavonicism *гладнѣю* and the dative absolute *Идѣиѣ ми до цѣрства твоего* (which in turn contains the Polish or, rather, Ruthenian non-limitative *до*):³

[...] простри гойнѣю Рѣкѣ свою / Насыти гладнѣю дѣшѣ мою. / На пѣти пел҃римства твоего. / Идѣиѣ ми до цѣрства твоего (35, 262–263).

In the following citation, which otherwise tends to use Church Slavonic forms, the morphologically marked Polonism *естес(ь)* (< Polish *jesteś*) is used (the form *тым'же* is also marked as Ruthenian):

Ты в лѣжеснахѣ Мѣрнихѣ; Дѣхомъ стѣмъ вѣщенна / Тым'же Дѣхомъ стѣмъ, и в' Рождествѣ естес просвѣщенна (64, 14–15).

As Hartmut/Nikolaos Trunte (1985: 238–244) has already shown, many Polonisms in PM occur with a gloss or as doublets with Church Slavonic or vernacular equivalents. The example *вѣк' теразнѣйшій; настолицѣй вѣкѣ*, to which *вѣкѣ* [...] *теперѣшній* is added later, is one such case (cf. also Trunte 1985: 241). Here, an expression that is explicitly marked phonologically as Polish (cf. *teraźniejszy* with *e* < *ь*, *teraz* < *тьнѣ razъ*), a Church Slavonic and a Ruthenian vernacular expression are used as synonyms in a triplet in an almost playful manner:

По вномъ вѣкѣ страшномъ, и кривавомъ, // непокойномъ; показанѣ Іванови стѣмъ; вѣк' теразнѣйшій; настолицѣй вѣкѣ покоа, и всакои

1 Volume 6, extending to the letter *я*, came out in 2012.

2 The comprehensive card file of the Ivan Kryp'jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Lviv could not be consulted for this article.

3 See also *гойный*, which is a Czech loan in Polish (*hojny* < Czech *hojný*).

роскош^и,⁴ в' достаткѣ Пшеницѣ, Вина и шливи. Але той вѣкъ; тмою черности покритій, а то вѣкъ власный нашъ; теперѣшный [...] (214, 203–207).

In the following example, the gloss is remarkable, as the term *вѣнишѣмъ* as well as *зычимъ* (on the latter, cf. Ševel'ov 1979: 695) were borrowed from Polish and adopted into Ruthenian:

Вѣнишѣмъ и зычимъ вашимъ милостамъ; достѣпити всѣхъ внихъ добродѣйствъ предреченныхъ. А на знакъ зичливости нашей, Заспѣваемъ; вамъ Пѣснь веселїа Вѣчного (99, 189–191).

In other instances, a Church Slavonic or Ruthenian synonym sometimes occurs instead of a marked Polonism without being glossed, cf. *кламство* and *ложь* in the first two as well as *потемпюн-*, *проклат-* and others in the remaining examples (in the last example, both lexemes are in turn located in close proximity to each other):

Прето стѣй Павелъ, Апѣлъ Хѣъ, розбиваетъ кламство геретицкое, и показуеъ ѡснѡ, ѡкѡ с посродкѣ ѡстѣпства Антихристѣ вийдетъ з орды геретицко" (218, 320–321).

Подможѣ еще; до кѣпцѣвъ тогѡ свѣта, ѡкѡваа тма тамо и черность; при вазѣ ихъ; невинный клатвы, кривоприсазтва, фалше, ложъ правдѣ мѣсце засѣла, неправедное зобраа; тмою // черности покрито (215, 235–239). [...] таковой идетъ на вѣчное потемпена, мѣкъ вѣчныхъ (193, 9).

А щожъ тобѣ поможетъ сѣатный мїролюбче; твоа проклатаа гордына, и прожнаа слава, и роскошѣ мїра сегѡ. сладкї" покарми, и напши, свѣтлыи ризы, и перфѡми твои (203, 221–204, 223).

Але вы мощно по всей силѣ бѣсѡвскои потоптали. / и Чартѡвъ до вѣчної тмы проклатихъ загнаа (83, 74).

[...] и поженѣтъ ихъ въ море геенское; ѡгнемъ сѣрчанимъ горящее; и димомъ смродивимъ и горкимъ покрито, тогда ѡ проклатихъ; и потемпюнымъ грѣшникѡвъ (244, 21–23).

The noteworthy fact that the toponym *москевскихъ* 'Muscovite' (locative plural) in *в краахъ рѣскихъ, и москевскихъ, и рѣскихъ* (6, 108) appears as a marked Polonism (because of its *e < v*) shows how heavily the author's view of Eastern Europe is influenced by the Polish perspective.

The impact of Polish even extends far into the grammar. The following Ruthenian examples primarily confirm the state of affairs of Polish grammar, namely the notion that the temporal suffix *l* in word final *-dl* had already become silent in Polish preterite masculine singular—at least in the variety of Polish with which Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj was familiar. Interpreting these as archaic participles appears to be practically impossible in the selected examples:

4 Here, I invariably render the *кендима* (κέντιμα) (") as superscript *и*, even when it may well represent *й*.

А если той вѣкъ кривавый прешед, але память егѡ; нехай бѣде при насъ навѣки (214, 194–195).

А по семъ ѡтворена третѧ Печать; тайныхъ сѣдебъ Бжїихъ; и вишедъ Конь черный, а той що сидѣл' на немъ, маеть Вагѣ в' рѣцѣ своей (214, 198–201). [...] и оу великой жалости начнетъ скаржити предъ Бгѡмъ на грѣшника; ѡкъ той не слѣхалъ ради егѡ; гды в' совѣсти невидимо оупоминалъ егѡ; // абы ѡ грѣха пересталъ и що найпрѣдше шедъ на покаанїе, а грѣшникъ таковою радю Агласкю погордѣвъ: и не послѣхалъ егѡ ради; доброго предводителя своего, але за радю бѣсовскю пошедъ навѣки мѣчитиса (238, 914–918).

In other instances, even the entirely Polish substantive ending *-e* in the nominative-accusative singular of masculine substantives with a soft or historically soft stem occurs, cf. *крає* and *фалше* in the following two examples taken from prose works, which means that they certainly cannot be explained by constraints due to rhyme:

Той Палемон' Либа, зебравшиса с килкѣ товаришѡвъ, маючи при собѣ килка сет чѣвка; заихалъ шкрѣтами: в тыи полнѡчны⁵ крає, ѡцѧнем Нѣмецкимъ (5, 76–79).

Подможъ еще; до кѣпцѡвъ тогѡ свѣта, ѡкъваа тма тамо и черность; при вазѣ ихъ; невинный клатвы, кривоприсазтва, фалше, ложъ правдѣ мѣсце засѣла, неправедное зобрана; тмою // черности покрито (215, 235–239).

3. Meta-Polonisms in PM

This part will be concerned solely with meta-Polonisms in PM. Among these, we will also encounter inflectional suffixes that, in contrast to those mentioned earlier, can only be set in relation to their Church Slavonic or East Slavic equivalents on the phonological level.

1) The agent noun *ѡбронцо*, which exhibits the Polish metathesis of liquid consonants, is also marked by the Polish suffix *-c(a)*. Elsewhere, the action noun *ѡборонѣ* occurs with full East Slavic vocalization.⁵ The Church Slavonic form of the root occurs without a prefix in *Идѣицѣ изъ звѣтазтвомъ ѡ браны, / и всѣ Стѣи тамо с нимъ събраны* (109, 29–30):

Прето не встави насъ Пастырѣ предобрѣйшїй, / Снѣ Бжїй ѡбронцо нашъ милостивый и престѣйшїй (110, 84).

Прїйми ласкаве дшѣ мою. / ѣ вѣчнѣю твою ѡборонѣ (42, 473).

2) The stem *прожн-*, which can also be encountered as *прѣжн-* with the Polish reflection *u* from long *o* (*o pochylone*), occurs alongside Church Slavonic *празн-*

5 Тумчѣнко (2002–2003: s.v. *оборона* and *оборонца*) records only the pleophonic forms, such as in the lemma *оборонца*. In the Middle Ruthenian texts, forms with the Polish metathesis are to be encountered quite frequently.

(not *праздн-*); East Slavic *порожн-* is missing (here, we have original **porzdbъnъ* and **porzdbъnъo-*—cf. Vasmer 1986–1987: s.v. *порожний*—of course, the Ruthenians of the early modern age certainly were not aware of these relationships):⁶

Сѣата; сѣатствѣй, всаческаа сѣата, прожност' и марность, всѣ речи под снѣцемъ, нѣчого; певногѣ; все бѣжитъ бѣгомъ непостоаннѣм' (197, 19–20).
А щожъ тобѣ поможе сѣатный мѣролюбче; твоя проклатаа гордына, и прожнаа слава, и роскошь мѣра сего. сладкѣи покарми, и напши, свѣтлыи ризы, и перфѣми твои (203, 221–204, 223).

[...] и не можешъ поймати, сѣата бо сѣатствѣ; всѣ речи под снѣцемъ; прожность и марность (199, 95–97).

[...] вса тѣнь и димъ; лацѣо развѣющѣй, нѣчтоже; тѣло сѣата сѣатствѣй; всѣ речи тогѣ свѣта прѣжностъ (200, 104–105).

[...] тамъ ѡ дѣлехъ злыхъ страшно прѣбѣеть [sic!, with *u < ó* in the vicinity of the *u*], и за слава празнѣи; // згоршителнѣи; не фолѣеть (194, 49–50).

[...] той сътворить сѣдъ з нами; ѡ всѣхъ дѣлехъ нашихъ; злыхъ и добрыхъ, и ѡ слѣвахъ празныхъ; згоршителныхъ (238, 906–907).

3) The root *сром-* occurs alongside Church Slavonic *срам-*; East Slavic *сром-* is missing:⁷

Прето лѣпше ест' спѣвати дѣвны пѣсны; анѣжли свѣцкѣи сромотныи бѣсовскѣи (10, 57).

Абы твоя слава Нбѣногѣ Пана, / Не была сромотною смертю потоптана (121, 116).

Не жаловалесь безгрѣшногѣ Живота твоегѣ <ѡ> / на Крѣстѣ сромотне положити, / А мене ѡ вѣчнои смерти избавити (138, 13).

[...] ѡчи вашѣ плачливыи на падолъ земный ѡбратѣте, / А на сромотнѣю смѣртъ Цѣра вашегѣ пишно смотрѣте. / Кривдѣ и зельживость егѣ сами бачте, / А вы дѣщерѣ сиѡнскѣи горкѣ плачте (146, 270–273).

А нѣтъ та виждѣ в' незааплѣ мѣртѣа и нага [...] на Крѣстѣ // сромотномѣ висаща; посредѣ злѣдѣевѣ (152, 46–47).

[...] пишно смотрѣте, кривдѣ и зельживостъ егѣ; сами бачте, И сромотной и невинной смѣрти егѣ (153, 79–81).

Ты мѣчкѣвъ стѣхъ; мѣжествомѣ ѡбдарила, И презѣ тыхъ дѣвола; с тырани побѣдила. / И презѣ нихъ; власти темныя посрамила (132, 176–178).

Ако до Распатѣа Хѣа ишла срамота: а ѡ распатѣа настѣпаеть слава Хѣа (150, 9–10).

6 Тымчѣнко (2002–2003) lists evidence from different sources under the lemmas *прожный*, *прожно*, *прожноване*, *-ние*, *прожножество* (*пружн-* is missing). Similarly, one can find some lemmas that show the root with full vocalization.

7 Тымчѣнко (2002–2003) verifies lemmas for the derivations *сромота*, *сромотный* and *сромотне*; *сромъ* as well as the Church Slavonic root form *срам-* are missing. The root with full vocalization is represented by numerous lemma entries (*сроматися*, *сромота*, *сромотити*, *сромотне*, *сромъ*, *сромѣтися*, *сромѣжливый*, *сромѣжливость*).

4) Besides the regularly used genuine Polish root form *смрод-*, the Church Slavonic root form *смрад-* also occurs; East Slavic *смород-* (in Modern Ukrainian *смори́д*) is missing:⁸

Радуеть са праведникъ; ѿкъ виходить з домѹ темницѹ; з грѣховногѹ тѣла,
смаднои темници (204, 248–250).

The root forms can also be found in close proximity to each other:

Несподѣванне зо всегѣсъ ма ѿбнажила, / И межи смрѣдливыи Трѣпы
положила, Прїатеल् мѡи; далеко ѿ мене стали, / И нѡсы свѡи; пред
смадрѡмъ моимъ позатикали. Вчера в домѹ моемъ было гоине весела,
Мѹзыкѡвъ играна; / А спѣвакѡвъ веселое спѣвана (189, 25–30).

5) *Злот-* belongs to the earliest documented Polonisms in East Slavic. In PM, the more commonly used Polish form occurs alongside the Church Slavonic form *злат-*; East Slavic *золот-* is missing:⁹

Где мѡи нѣѣ замки коштовне мѹрованїи / и Плаци мѡи свѣтне и сличне
малювани / А шкатѣлы злотоѹ нафасованїи, / Възники под злотоѹ
цѣгованїи (189, 8–11).

Корѣна то не зе злота тѣнногѹ; але з // дарѹ бозкои свѣ//тлости Корѣна
оуведбѣна тѣль ихъ: ѿ тѣнїа премѣненїе (256, 201–202).

Где богатирѡвъ тогѡ свѣта, замки мѡцнии, мѹрованыи, / и палаци
спаналыИ, сличне малюваныи, / и шкатѣлы злотоѹ нафасованїи (197, 29–
31).

Где нѣѣ скарбы бѣгатырей; приходомъ смерти в'незаапѣ разсыпани, и
зебран<ы>. Где шкапы в' злото оубраныИ; // вса съ шѣмомъ погибе (199,
88–90).

Тогда забиваль ѡтець поганин; власногѡ сына своего хрестїанина
правѡвѣрногѡ [...] и тогди са найдовало; злато и ѡвоѡ вѣрныи и
зловѣрныи, которыи дла смерти дочаснои; ѡрѣкалиса Хрѣста (213, 169–173).
А гды ѡтворилесь пред нимъ; Первѹю Печать, Тогда выпѣстились през ню;
Кона бѣлогѡ; и тогѡ що на немъ сидѣль; в' Коронѣ златой з лѹкомъ (211,
117–212, 119).

6) Polish-based *млоденец*, which occurs in a pragmatic instruction, can be found along with Church Slavonic *младенцѡвъ*, while the context is strongly marked by Church Slavonic only in the second example for the Church Slavonicism (but cf. also the Polonism *панїенства*):¹⁰

8 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one can find the lemmas *смродѣ* and *смродливый*, but neither the Church Slavonic nor the East Slavic root form (!).

9 As expected, all three root forms are well represented in SUM XVI–XVII.

10 Tymčenko (2002–2003) has the lemmas *млоденецѣ*, *младенецѣ*, *младенческій* as well as some forms with the pleophonic root, as in *молодецѣ*, *молодикѣ*, *молодиця*.

А при тыхъ штрвахъ, и Вѣршахъ; маеть ѡкій Младенецъ, мовити шрацію сію до слѣхачивъ, поважне (97, 124–125).

А то покладаю в'зглядимъ младенцѡв; жебы шхѣтними были до наѣки; бозкои: и людскѡи (127, 5).

Ты младенцемъ возрастъ, и Красѣта, / Ты паніенства съкровище и высота (129, 64–65).

7) The root *спод-/сřed-* can regularly be encountered in the Polish-motivated form (cf. Polish *środ-* < *śrzod-* with *o* < *e* before hard alveolars owing to Polish “umlaut” or “przegłos polski”), but at the same time also in the Church Slavonic form and, in fact, especially in prefixed forms.¹¹ The Church Slavonic root can be found above all (but not only) in *посредѣ* ending in *-ѣ*, the Polish root predominantly in the suffixed form [c] *посродкѣ*:

А той Антихристъ; маеть повстати и вийти с посродкѣ ѡстѣпства, тоестъ с посрод геретикѡвъ, часъ своегѡ повстане Антихристъ (217, 293–295).

[...] и з самыхъ поганѡвъ нѣкотѣрыи старалисѡ в добрѣю славѣ и несмертелнѣю [...] ѡко шный презацный и славный мѣжъ [...] Палемѡнъ Пѣблиѣсъ Либа; абы могъ быти в' посродкѣ: межи славнымъ^и Богатырами свѣта сегѡ, чоѡ и достѣпивъ (4, 56–61).

[...] добримъ концемъ, и веселою дѣшею преходитъ, праведный, ѡ // міра сегѡ; с плачливогѡ падола [...] с посродкѣ дѣмонскогѡ множества (204, 242–245).

Прето стѣй Павелъ, Апѣлъ Хѣвъ, розбиваетъ кламство геретицкое, и показуеъ ѡснѡ, ѡкѡ с посродкѣ ѡстѣпства Антихристъ вийдетъ з орды геретицко^и [...] (218, 320–321).

Павелъ стѣй повѣдаеъ; же антихристъ вийде; с пѡсред ѡстѣпныхъ сынѡвъ геретицкихъ (219, 347–350).

А що а мѣлъ; посредѣ нечистихъ бѣсѡвъ и немилѡстивыхъ катѡвъ, оумирати вѣчною смертю; то Снѣ Бжій за ма оумѣр; посредѣ Разбѣйниковъ и злѡдѣевъ (20, 228–231).

Насъ покидаешъ [...] / Малѡе стадце свое; немѡщныхъ швечѡкъ своихъ, / Посредѣ гнѣвливыхъ, и ненависныхъ врагѡвъ твоихъ (110, 75–78).

Посредѣ лѣтъ; познанъ бѣдеши, егда вѣ гнѣвѣ ѡвишисѡ (208, 27–28).

А ннѣ та виждѣ в' незапѣ мртѡа и нага [...] на Крстѣ // сромотномъ висаща; посредѣ злѡдѣевъ (152, 46–47).

8) Besides Polish *напрод-*, one can also encounter *напрѣд-* (or *впрѣд-*, respectively) with *и* as a Polish reflex of long *o*; alongside these, one can also find Church Slavonizing *напред-* (the root also occurs elsewhere as *пред-*; for instance, it may occur as a simple preposition):¹²

11 Тумченко (2002–2003) verifies the forms *спродокъ*, *спродковати*, *спродковне* as well as *средокъ* and *средземный*; moreover, *посредокъ*, *посредѣ* (as prepositions) as well as *посродокъ*. In the lemma entries, one encounters *съ посредку* as well as *съ посродку* (but not *посредѣ*).

12 Under *напрудѣ*, Тумченко (2002–2003) refers to *напередѣ*; Church Slavonic *напредѣ* as well as Polish *напродѣ* without the *и*-reflection of long *o* are missing.

Прирожена грѣфа хто хоче познати, / Впроуд мѣситъ Физелюикмѣ Вѣрѣ
дати (2; 16–17).

А напрод то потреба вѣдати; правовѣрномѣ хрѣстіанскмѣ рѣдѣ. ѡкѣ Бѣ
єст' непостижимы" (22, 8).

И напрод мѣсто тоє стое залѣжили / А сами са за фундамента єгѣ положили
(80, 99–100).

Але то потреба вѣдати, напрод' кождомѣ члѣвови; ѡкѣ тролака
Премоудрость; кѣпоименнаа то єсть; под єднымѣ именемъ (127, 7–9).

Ласкавый Чителникѣ; подобает' вам напрѣдъ то вѣдати, длѣагогѣ авторѣ
важилъ са подѣймовати; такѣ великѣю и тажкѣю працѣ (9, 6).

Напрѣдъ покладаю казана ѡ двѣакихъ добродѣйствахъ бѣзкихъ (13, 16).

9) Although it occurs quite often in Early Modern Ruthenian, the form of the preposition *ze* with *e < ѣ* (< *сѣ* [+ instrumental and + genitive] and < *изѣ*) deserves particular attention. It occurs along with Ruthenian *zo* as well as Church Slavonic *съ* ([so]- is also written as *сѣ-*, cf. also *сѣбрали* in the penultimate example in this section and *сѣбраны* in the last example in the following section, where, in all likelihood, *co* was read as well):¹³

[...] и такѣ вѣскрѣситъ праведныхъ; и вѣрныхъ свѣихъ, в' цѣлыхъ тѣлахъ,
бѣзрѣкогѣ зѣ двѣа рѣкама; и нѣтами, єдношкогѣ; зѣ двѣа вѣчима (233,
762–765).

Лѣтше тебѣ з однимѣ вѣкомѣ, и з одною рѣкою, вѣйти до живота вѣчногѣ;
и до црѣства моегѣ, анѣжли зѣ двѣа вѣчима и рѣкама; вѣверженѣ быти вѣ
геенѣ; идеже вѣгнѣ не вѣгасаєтъ (245, 39–42).

Корѣна то не зѣ злота тѣлѣногѣ; але з // дарѣ бозкои свѣ//тлости Корѣна
оувѣдбѣна тѣлѣ ихъ: ѡ тѣлѣнѣа премѣненїє (256, 201–202).

Але выбавъ нѣѣ дѣшѣ мою; зѣ встыдѣ спросногѣ, / ѡдѣй нагогѣ в' Рызѣ
бѣзмрѣтїа свѣтоносногѣ (177, 128–129).

Зо вѣсмѣ змѣвѣмъ и Аспидскимѣ родѣмѣ, / Мїра сѣгѣ з бѣсѣвскимѣ
смродомѣ (185, 138–139).

[...] и зо всегоє ма нѣѣ ѡбнажила, / и межи смрѣдливїи трѣпы положила
(198, 51).

[...] абѣ сѣбрали избраннихъ єгѣ; с под чотырохъ вѣтрѣвѣ поднѣбныхъ, и зо
всѣхъ чтирохъ частей тогѣ свѣта (231, 741–742).

Сѣгѣ ради радѣйсѣ сѣ мною рабѣ смѣтнѣй, / Южѣ та тамо не постыгнѣ
фаранѣ ѡкрѣтнѣй (186, 148–149).

10) *Ze-* also occurs in prefixes, as in *зебран<ы>*, along with Church Slavonic *сѣбраны* and Ruthenian *зобрана* (in the third example in this section):¹⁴

[...] зебравѣшисѣ с килѣ товаришѣвѣ, маючи при собѣ килѣ сѣт члѣва (5,
77–78).

13 SUM XVI–XVII contains a whole range of examples s.v. *ze*.

14 S.v. *зебрати* only a small number of examples are mentioned in SUM XVI–XVII; among others, it lists examples taken precisely from PM.

Где ннѣ скарбы бѣгатырей; приходомъ смерти в'незапнѣ разсыпани, и зебран<ы>. Где шкапы в' золото оубраны"; // вса съ шѣмомъ погибе (199, 88–90).

Подможѣ еще; до кѣпцѣвъ тогѣ свѣта, ѡкѡваа тма тамо и черность; при вазѣ ихъ; невинный клатвы, кривоприсаѣтва, фалше, ложѣ правдѣ мѣсце засѣла, неправедное зобрана; тмою // черности покрито (215, 235–239).

Идѣущѣ изъ звѣтаѣзвѣтомѣ ѡ браны, / и всѣ Сѣи тамо с нимѣ събраны (109, 29–30).

The reflex *e < ѣ* is documented in prefixes of other lexemes, cf. *дѣша зезволитѣ показатися* (258, 263), *зезволит* (11, 76), *зезволилѣ еси* (46, 47–51), *зезволив* (94, 47)¹⁵ alongside unmarked *позволитѣ* (235, 819–820); cf. also *до розервана* (4, 63–65) without any primary underlying *jer* in the prefix.

11) The adjective *пожитечное* with *e < ѣ* is also a meta-Polonism, as it is backed up by its Ruthenianized derivational basis *пожитокѣ* (instead of its “real” derivational basis *пожитекѣ*):¹⁶

Ты вѣ Егѣптѣ Іѡсифови пожитечное радишѣ, / и паки Цѣра своегѣ; изъ Егѣпта до Назарета провадишѣ (74, 166–167).

Все оу твоѣмъ самѡвластїю, и твоѣй моци: але не все на пожитокѣ дѣши твоѣй; що надѣ замѣрѣ то смерть (17, 125).

12) In a context that is substantially influenced by Polish (it is in this passage that the above-mentioned substantive ending *-e* of *краѣ* occurs, and the oblique case of the numeral *сет* with *e < ѣ* is encountered), the Polish-based ending *-ем(ѣ)* occurs in the instrumental singular of a masculine hard-stem substantive in *вѣцѣанѣм*. In all other contexts, *-омѣ* occurs, especially in phonologically marked Polonisms such as *свалтомѣ* (5, 71; 18, 182; with *g*):

Той Палѣмонѣ Либа, зебравшиѣ с килкѣ товаришѣвъ, маючи при собѣ килка сетъ чѣвѣка; заихалѣ вкрѣтами: в тыи полнѣчныи краѣ, вѣцѣанѣмъ Нѣмецкимѣ (5, 76–79).

13) The root of the adverb *вѣцѣале*, with Polish *a < ѣ* due to Polish “umlaut,” can also be classified as a meta-Polonism, contrasted repeatedly by the unmarked form of writing *цѣла*. In both examples, the use of the Polonism can be explained by constraints due to rhyme:

15 S.v. *зезволити*, some further examples can be found in SUM XVI–XVII.

16 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), both *пожитечный* and *пожиточный* can be found as separate lemma entries, but only *пожитокѣ*, not *пожитекѣ*, which is also not included in the dictionary of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century language (SUM XIV–XV).

Тылко знаетъ Триперсоналнве Бжествѣ / Досконале, / Бгѣ поставилъ лѣчбѣ
вцале (71, 94–72, 96).

ѡ Бже мой ѡкѡ оу скарбниці твоей. Положи ихъ вѣчнѣ вцале, / даже зрю в'
нихъ ѡкѡ въ зерца'ле (169, 130–132).

ѡ Бараночкѣ мо' пречѣстыи и пренаѣйшій, то естєсь за грѣхи мои, барзо
израненный; ѡ Главы и до ногѣ нѣсть цѣлости (164, 93).

и такъ въскрсить праведныхъ; и вѣрныхъ свихъ, в' цѣлыхъ тѣлахъ,
безрѣкогѡ зе двѣма рѣкама; и нѣтами, єдновокогѡ; зе двѣма шчима (233,
762–765).

14) In the case of *цѣдный* with Polish-based *ц < *tj*, one is also dealing with a meta-Polonism, which is contrasted by numerous examples of East Slavic *чѣд-*:¹⁷

Ты ѡко косарѣ нѣѣ неросѣданный, / Под нѣги свѣи крадешъ, цвѣтъ барзо
цѣданный (192, 113–114).

А таковый плодъ жизни вѣчнои, аболи роскоши Нѣснои; ѡко гроно вина
чѣдногѡ (262, 382).

А шестий Агѣлъ; виліе Чашѣ гнѣву Бжегѡ, на рѣкѣ великѡю Ефратѣ реченнѡю;
абы висхла рѣка, и дала преи ти вѣйскѣ; великомѣ Бжѣю чѣдовномѣ, из
востока; на слѣгѣ антихристовихъ за правди ѡко ес // то войска чѣдное и
страшное; войска то шгенное, без' лѣчбы (223, 480–224, 484).

15) In both the following cases, the ending of the first person singular present *-e*, which can only represent denasalized Polish *-e*, appears as a curiosity. Both verb forms can be encountered in the introductory parts, which are especially heavily influenced by Polish, the first form in the acknowledgments and the second in the epigraph. As expected, this ending is mainly contrasted by East Slavic *-ŷ* in these and other parts of the text. Concerning the form *вонпле*,¹⁸ we must bear in mind particularly that non-Polish epenthetic *l* occurs in it despite the entirely Polish appearance of its root and ending:

[...] ѡ оубогѣи законикѣ; и лѣнивый работникъ Винограда Хѣа, а богомолца
твой оуставѣчный: не вонпле в' Милѣости ласѣки твоей [...] (8, 159–161).

Єсли що нестройногѡ Поєта моудрый шбачить, / Прѡше нехай ми
пребачить (12, 2-3).

Прето ѡ плачливый гласъ в' Нѣо подношѣ, / А тебе Ѱче стый нѣѣ ѡ
ратѣнокѣ прошѣ (39, 393–394).

А ѡ нѣѣ ктомѣ; ѡ васѣ вѣдати не хочѣ, и даремна бѣде предѡ мною плачливаа
прозба ваша: не оуслышѣ вас; бы и в наболшихъ бѣдахъ, и тажкихъ мѣкахъ
вашихъ; не оузрите над собою млсрдїа моего въвѣки (242, 1026–1029).

17 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), only the adverb *цудне* is encountered as a lemma entry with *c-*; as expected, *цуд-* is thoroughly represented, for example, under the lemma *цудѣ*, under which Tymčenko refers—not without reason—to Polish *cud*.

18 In SUM XVI–XVII, the example that will be cited in the following is registered s.v. *вонтити*. Analogous examples cannot be found; instead, one comes across the expected *вонтилю*.

16) Only in those Ruthenian texts that exhibit a particularly heavy Polish impact would one find a stem form such as *Ксїонженц*(')-, with the Polish shape of both the root and the suffix (see Polish *książęć*-).¹⁹ Elsewhere, these forms are contrasted multiple times by *Кнази*, in etymological analogy also by suffixed *Кнѣжати*:

[...] ясне Велмож<ному> Панѣ а Панѣ Самѣлюви Карѣловичови; Ксїонженцю Корецкомѣ [...] (3, 1–2).

[...] мѣзики спѣваки, не тило в' Крѣлевских' двме, и Ксїонженцихъ, оу панѣвъ свѣцкихъ, Але и в' дѣховнихъ оу Арцибѣскѣпѣвъ и бѣскѣпѣвъ, оу Митрополитѣвъ нашихъ, и Владыкѣвъ [...] (215, 221–222).

Не тило Крѣлеве, и Кнази преможныи, але и стѣтелѣ реченныи; в' гордостѣ; вѣ тщеславїю и сребролюбїю, в' роскошї тогѣ свѣта; потонѣли (215, 212–215).

[...] дѣд' [...] Иѣхимѣ Кназ Кор<ецкїй> [...] (6, 120–121).

[...] то ест власныи продохъ [...] всегѣ домѣ презац<нои> Фамил<їи> Кн<а>ж<ать> Кѣрецькихъ (6; 115).

17) Only once, in the acknowledgments, does one encounter the form *мезтѣвъ* with denasalized *e* in the root, cf. Polish *męstwo*, cf. in turn also *ксїонж-* with a nasal diphthong in the position before the fricative. As expected, the underlying root morpheme (Polish *męstwo* < *męźstwo*) is elsewhere contrasted by East Slavic *мѣжа* and *мѣжествомѣ*:²⁰

а в' славѣ Рїцерскѣ и в' мезтѣвъ Самоеча Иѣїмовича [...] кто не вѣдаеть [...] (6, 122 – 7, 124).

и блюзнать на невинногѣ мѣжа стѣ<огѣ> намѣсника Петрова верховногѣ<ѣ> Апѣстола, подаючи вѣ гадѣ, ложнѣю потварѣ на негѣ оукладають (218, 318–320).

Тѣ мѣнѣкѣвъ стѣхъ; мѣжествомѣ вѣдарила, И презѣ тѣхъ дѣвола; с' тырани побѣдила. / И презѣ нихъ; власти темныя посрамила (132, 176–178).

18) The form of the stem of *пойзрѣ* (cf. also *прейзреню*) with *-j-* is based on a Polish rule of sound change, which is elsewhere contrasted by phonologically discrete *ПОзрѣвши* (*sic*, two capital letters in word-initial position), in which, contrary to spellings of the type *пойзрѣнамѣ*, *ѣ* is written correctly in the stressed position as far as etymology is concerned, as one would expect from the Ukrainian perspective:²¹

19 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one finds the lemma entry *ксїонже* with a reference to its model *książe*; however, examples for oblique cases are missing. The East Slavic root form is encountered in the lemmas *княжа* and *княжачїй*.

20 Tymčenko (2002–2003) verifies the forms *сродокѣ*, *сродковати*, *сродковне* as well as *средокѣ* and *средземный*; moreover, *посредокѣ*, *посредѣ* (as prepositions) as well as *посродокѣ*. In the lemma entries, one encounters *съ посредку* as well as *съ посродку* (but not *посредѣ*).

21 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one can find the lemmas *позрѣньне* and *пойзрене* [-нѣ]; surprisingly, references to the corresponding form are missing in this case.

Аще поизрѣ въ адѣ; тѣ дѣвола и силы егѡ воюешъ (57, 93).
На правицѣ если поизришъ; але тѣтъ тебѣ; стѣи Аггавѣ посмѣваются [...] (202, 175).

Але поизри но Школо себе (215, 225).

Въ мнѡзѣхъ грѣсехъ оутопленни, / И блѡуднимъ поизренамъ
вскверненни (168, 95–96).

Сами же бѣдѣчи срогого и страшногѡ поизрена, шгнемъ дышѣщи; и
глѣѡщи, и Пламенное врѣжѣ имѣщи, на страхъ нечестивымъ члѣвѣкымъ (237,
876–877).

[...] оу предвѣчномъ преизреню своемъ бѡзкомъ (15, 80).

Поизрѣвши на прешлый вѣкъ (3, 6).

19) The stem *чловек-*, which is formed according to Polish and shortly afterwards contrasted by the Church Slavonic form *человѣк-*, was used quite often in Middle Ruthenian writing:²²

[...] ш Чловѣче²³ правовѣрный; и на спснїе вѣчное дѣшѣ твоѣ. Гласъ
жалосный прїйми и реци: Слава тебѣ Хѣ Бжѣ мой чловѣколюбивый (138,
7–8).

20) The verb *вбецалъ* with *c < *tj* also represents a meta-Polonism, because elsewhere, and once in close proximity to the meta-Polonism, one encounters Church Slavonic *вбѣтованнѡю* (this latter form does not, however, allow for any genetic specification based on its phonological structure):²⁴

Аще землю вбѣтованнѡю в' радости шгладаю. / Которѡю намъ Бгъ вбецалъ
за терпенїе дати, / Тылко росказалъ вѣрою тогѡ шаста ждати (183, 86–184,
88).

[...] ты заповѣдал' еси тѣмъ згордителюмъ твѣимъ, бы твою волю творили:
не ѡкъ дармо; вбецалесь имъ зато животь вѣчныѣ и црѣство Нбсное, а мы
имъ нѣчогѡ иногѡ не вбецали (239, 943–946).

21) In the case of *квит-* with preserved *kv-* instead of *cv-* (as a reflex of the second palatalization), which occurs twice in the acknowledgments, one might as well be dealing with a meta-Polonism, for elsewhere one encounters *цвѣтъ* (how the *kv-* and/or *cv-* forms were originally distributed in the language area of Ukrainian is disputed, as is well known):²⁵

22 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one encounters *чловѣкъ* only with *ѣ*; additionally, one can find Ukrainian *чоловѣкъ*. Only the lemma entry *черовеченство*, whose model (which Tymčenko does not note) is most likely Polish *człowieczeństwo*, contains the Church Slavonic form.

23 Here, for once, I carry over the stress as given in the source text, because in Ruthenian, the penultimate stress of the nominative form *człowiek* could also have been transferred to the oblique cases.

24 Tymčenko (2002–2003) only verifies *обѣцати*, *обѣцовати*; the forms with *e* are missing. Additionally, one encounters *обѣтованье*, but not its verbal derivational basis.

25 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one finds the lemmas *квитнути*, *квитнуцій*/ *квитнуцій* (here, Tymčenko refers to Polish *kwiąć*), *квѣтнути*, *квѣтнуцій* und *квѣтъ*. With *cv-*, one finds only *цвѣлый* and

Также слава квитне Карѣла Кн<А>з<А> Кор<ецког> [...] (7, 128).
 [...] иж ми на самой Персонѣ Ваш<еи> К<назкои> мос<ти> не сходитъ,
 котораа высокою наѣкою бозкою: и людскѣю [sic] оукрашона; и
 побожностю Квитнѣчаа [...] (8, 167–169).
 Ты ꙗко косарь нѣѣ неросѣднѣй, / Под нѣгѣ свѣи крадешъ, цвѣтъ барзо
 цѣднѣй (192, 113–114).

22) The form *покармѣ* with the Polish reflex of the *C_бLC-cluster occurs quite often. By contrast, the verb shows the East Slavic reflex, as here in the imperative *Накормы*:²⁶

Всѣхъ нѣѣ заровнѣ берешъ / и до темногѣ гробѣ ведешъ, / И на покармѣ
 рѣбацтѣвѣ кладешъ, / ѿ смерти гнѣвлива; / Сила твоа страшлива (192, 124–
 128).
 [...] же ма в' темный гробѣ положили, / на покармѣ рѣбацтѣвѣ, и тажкою
 землею; кѣсти мѣи покрили (199, 66–67).
 [...] гдѣ ты смѣтнѣй и страшнѣй пойдешъ нагѣ; в' темный гробѣ смердѣти,
 и рѣбацтѣвѣ покармѣмѣ быти. Прето даремне гордишъ са и хвалишъ (203,
 225–227).
 А щожъ тобѣ поможетъ сѣатнѣй мѣролюбче; твоа проклатаа гордына, и
 прожнаа слава, и роскошъ мѣра сегѣ. сладкѣи покарми, и напѣи, свѣтлыи
 ризы, и перфѣми тѣи (203, 221–204, 223).
 [...] не потребѣючи телесногѣ покармѣ (234, 700).
 Прето ѿче нашъ стѣй мою мѣстѣ твою, / Накормы хлѣбомѣ Нѣбнѣмѣ
 гладнѣю дѣшѣ мою (36, 300).

23) The term *шатанѣ* is often encountered with the reflex *š* (Trunte 1985: 242), as characteristic of Polish loans rendering Old High German and early Middle High German *s* (in medieval German, as is known, *s* was most likely pronounced similarly to *š*', and the same applied to Latin as pronounced by speakers of German). The form occurs along with *сатана* (and *чартѣ*, which is also Polish-marked):²⁷

Бѣде то шатанѣ що найпреднѣйшѣй; оу правдивомѣ, тѣлѣ // людскомѣ то^и
 бѣдетъ в' вѣахъ людскихъ, ѿманивши ихъ показоватиса розмаите (217, 297–
 299).
 Дай намѣ днесъ хлѣба сегѣ Нѣбснѣгѣ. / в' Днѣ сей лютый и страшливый / Гдѣ
 шатанѣ хитрѣй и злосливый. Гладѣ вѣчногѣ намѣ зычливый (35, 270–272).
 [...] лѣкавый шатанѣ [...] показуетъ преслестъ свою [...] (195, 64).
 [...] свободити тѣхъ; ѿ темной вѣласти шатанскои (44, 527).
 [...] ѿ шатанскои неволѣ (105, 181).
 Избавъ насѣ ѿ настоащогѣ И градѣющо всего злогѣw> / ѿ тѣмѣ царства
 сатанѣ лѣстивогѣ (30, 111).

цвисты, but not *цвѣтъ*.

26 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one finds the lemma *покармѣ* alongside Ruthenianized *покормѣ* (!); one finds no entry for *кармѣ*, but *кормитель* and *кормля* are well represented.

27 In Tymčenko (2002–2003), one finds only *шатанѣ* and *шатанскѣй*, while neither *сатана* nor its derivations are documented.

Да прїйде царству; не мира сегѡ лестивогѡ, [...] Анѣ тѣла грѣхолоубивого, Анѣ сатаны зрадливого (31, 127–129).

Тилко са сами за Хр҃стомъ до Нбѣ поспѣшаймѡ, / А сатанѣ зрадливого; з грѣхами егѡ минаймѡ (102, 76–77).

Часть втораа тогожѣ Казана, ѡ власном' приходѣ Антихристовѣм'. Которогѡ приход; бѣдетъ по дѣйствѣ сатанинскомѣ (217, 283–285).

The root forms occur in close proximity to each other in:

Зизанѣй²⁸ ложный оучитель; сатанинѣ слѣга [...] дѣха шатанскогѡ (218, 315; 317).

4. Conclusion

Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyj's *Перло многѡцѣнное* displays a whole range of meta-Polonisms. In part, the Polish-based morphemes are represented in specific words that were borrowed as lexemes or lexematic collocations (cf. *покармѣ*²⁹ and *кормити*, *вбронца* and *вборона*, *вца* and *цѣлый*, *с* or *въ* *посродѣ* and *посредѣ*; perhaps this also applies to *квитнѣти* and *цвѣтъ*, but *квѣтъ*, which is not documented in PM, would also be possible). These loans then gathered in shared word clusters with other lexemes that possessed Ruthenian or Church Slavonic roots. Consequently, this results in heterogeneous word families.

In other cases, it is not only single morphemes that differ from each other, but whole word forms only on the basis of rules of sound change (*сморѣ* and *сморѣ*, *злото* and *злато*, *цѣдный* and *чѣдный*, *Ксюнженцю* (dative singular) and *Кнѣжат* (genitive singular), *мѣтѣ* and *мѣжество*, *пойзрѣти* and *позрѣти*, *чловекъ* and *человѣкъ*, *съ посредѣ* and *съ посродѣ*, *напрѣдѣ* opposite *напрѣдѣ* and *напредѣ*). Within limits, this applies to *прожній* and *праздный*, since one was derived from the other by way of opaque stem extension; in general, this could also apply to *сромотный* and *срамота*, as one was derived from the other with the help of a derivational suffix that is widespread throughout the Slavic realm. With a different limitation, this is also true of the substantives *шатанѣ* and *сатана*, because they differ in their inflectional morpheme (*Ø* vs. *a*) and, as a consequence, in regard to their stem class. Similarly, the corresponding adjectives *шатанскій* and *сатанинскій* are peculiar, as the latter features the actually redundant suffix *-ин-* (one would rather have expected *сатанинѣ* only or *сатанскій*).

Even prepositions and prefixes occur in the Polish, Ruthenian, or Church Slavonic-based form, although the motivation for choosing them is not always clear (cf. *зе(-)*, *зо(-)*, *съ(-)*). The same applies to suffixes such as *-ѣк-* in *пожитечный* and *пожитокѣ*, although Ruthenianized *пожиточный* is encountered quite frequently in Middle Ruthenian texts. It would appear that even Polish inflectional endings, as in *ѡцѣанем*, *проше*, *вонтипле*, occur without a specific motivation, although this

28 This is of course the same Lavrentij Zyzanij with whom we dealt in the previous study.

29 I normalize here for once—the actual forms are recorded in the text.

happens only sporadically, and only in those text fragments that are especially heavily influenced by Polish.

Most of the encountered meta-Polonisms, as well as most Polonisms in general, were by no means used only in the versified parts of PM, where one might also explain them by metric constraints. With few exceptions—such as, apparently, the Polish inflectional endings that only occur sporadically—the author (and his contemporaries) most likely interpreted them as an integral part of the Ruthenian language.

THE *SYNOPSIS* AND MACIEJ STRYJKOWSKI'S *KRONIKA*: RUTHENIAN WAYS OF (RE)TRANSLATING RUS'IAN HISTORY FROM POLISH

1. The main source for the "first textbook of Rus(s)ian history"

First published anonymously in 1674 in the Kyivan Cave Monastery under the auspices (rather than the authorship) of Abbot Innokentij Gizel'¹ and soon reissued in two revised and augmented versions in Kyiv, the *Synopsis* was to become the most influential contribution to early modern East Slavic historiography and one of the most important books ever produced in the Slavic East. By 1836, the text had appeared in at least seventeen new editions, not to mention several printed versions of certain excerpts, manuscript copies, and translations into Greek and Latin (Rothe 1983: 46–49; 126–127). Even though the *Synopsis* had originally been written first and foremost as a local chronicle of Kyiv, with its strongest emphasis on an even narrower topic—the historical role of the Kyivan Cave Monastery—it would soon be used primarily as a tool for the historical legitimization of imperial Russian history (Sysyn 2003: 120). It thus comes as no surprise that the vast majority of new editions came out in St. Petersburg during the eighteenth century, beginning with the rule of Peter I. The *Synopsis* had a tremendous impact on forging an all-Rus'ian, ultimately Russocentric East Slavic identity, which was called "Slavenorus(s)ian" in the *Synopsis* (cf. Kohut 2003, Sysyn 2003, Plochy 2006: 258–266).

The *Synopsis* was written originally in Ukrainian Church Slavonic, with sporadic vernacular interference on all linguistic levels. Although the language was increasingly cleansed of this interference and de-Ukrainianized in the later editions, it retained some markedly Ukrainian elements even in the Russian editions of the late eighteenth century (Moser 2007c, 2001: 223–279). The *Synopsis* can thus be interpreted as a perfect symbol of the Ukrainian-Russian encounter in the sphere of high culture between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Yet, in terms of both content and language, the *Synopsis* is of no less interest with regard to its standing in the Ukrainian-Polish cultural and linguistic encounter of the early modern period. Despite its primarily Orthodox foundations and scope, the most important immediate textual source of the *Synopsis* is not a historical work from the Orthodox world but the *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*, a work written by the Polish humanist Maciej Strykowski and originally published in Königsberg in 1582. Although Strykowski not only compiled older historical works from the realm of the Western churches but also relied on various Rus'ian chronicles, it is nevertheless a matter of fact that the "first textbook of Rus(s)ian history," as the *Synopsis* has often been called, is based primarily on a work written by a Polish Catholic.² Moreover, despite the fact that many of Strykowski's references to Rus'ian history were either omitted or significantly abbreviated (cf. Peštič 1958:

1 Like other scholars, I believe that the *Synopsis* is not the work of a single author but a collectively written work coordinated by Gizel'.

2 The author(s) of the *Synopsis* frequently indicate their main source in the margins, but the *Kronika* was even more important to them: in many more cases, they refer to other works when their true immediate source was the *Kronika*.

291–292), a closer comparative look at the *Synopsis* and the *Kronika* soon reveals that with regard to many passages of the *Synopsis*, it is no exaggeration to speak not merely of an adoption (on the sources of the *Synopsis* and on Strykowski's sources, see Rogov 1966) but of an eclectic, sometimes abbreviated and sometimes expanded translation of Strykowski's *Kronika*.

The following passage "On Oleh's rule in Kyiv and his death" ("У владѣннѣи Олѣзовомъ въ Кіевѣ и у смерти егѡ") can be used to demonstrate that we are in fact dealing with a translation.³

<p>[...] A gdy <u>po</u> zwycięstwie <u>wesela używał</u> w Kijowie, <u>kazał do</u> siebie przywieść konia, <u>w którym się nawiecy kochał</u>, y wezwawszy wieszczkow pytał ich, <u>coby</u> o tym koniu <u>rozumieli</u>, <u>ktorzy</u> [przyszedszy] rzekli, iż tobie [wielki Kniaziu] od tego Konia śmierć <u>podiać</u>, przeto <u>go</u> kazał od siebie odwieść y osobno chować. (115)</p>	<p>[...] и [пото^М] егда <u>ѡ</u> побѣдѣ <u>веселашесѧ</u> въ Кіевѣ. Повелѣ <u>пре</u>А себе <u>любимагѡ</u> [своегѡ] Кона привести и призвавъ Вѣлсвы вопросы их', <u>чтобысѧ имѣ</u> <u>мнѣло</u> в томѣ конѣ? <u>Ониже</u> <u>ѡвѣща</u>ша [емѧ], <u>ѡ</u>кѡ <u>ѡ</u> тогѡ кона смерть <u>има</u>ѣ тебѣ <u>быти</u>, сегѡ ради повелѣ <u>Влегѣ</u> <u>кона онагѡ</u> <u>ѡ</u> себе <u>ѡвести</u> и <u>блѡсти</u> [егѡ] <u>ѡсобѣ</u>. (170–171)</p>
--	---

Most passages of the *Synopsis* are much more freely translated from Strykowski's *Kronika* than this one, but they remain translations nonetheless. The corresponding passage from the Hypatian Chronicle (cf. Hyp: 28–29), for example, clearly demonstrates that the medieval Rus'ian chronicle did not serve as an immediate source:

и приспѣ всенѣ и поману Влегѣ конѣ свои . иже бѣ поставилѣ кормити . не всѣда на нѣ . бѣ бо преже выпрошалѣ вольхвовѣ кудесникѣ . ѡ чѣго ми естѣ оумѣрети . и ре [sic] ему ѡдинѣ . кудесникѣ . кнаже конѣ его же любииши . и ѣздиши на немѣ . ѡ того ти оумѣрети . Влегѣ же приимѣ въ оумѣ си рече николи же всаду на конѣ . ни вижю его боле того . и повѣлѣ кормити и . и не водити его к нему [...] (Hyp: 28–29).

2. Translated language

2.1. Vocabulary

2.1.1. Founding towns and building castles

The following sketch is based on an analysis of selected passages on Rus'ian history prior to the rule of Volodymyr I: passages on "the Roxolanian (Rus'ian) people and its dialect," on Kyj, Šček, and Xoriv; on Askol'd and Dyr; on Oleh's death; on Ihor's death; and on Ol'ha's revenge.

3 As in the following passages, underlining is used to mark forms significantly deviating in meaning and/or form, whereas bracketing and small caps mark untranslated forms in Strykowski's text and forms freely introduced into the *Synopsis*, respectively.

The fragment cited above is all quite typical of the general relation between the original and the translation, inasmuch as it shows the translators striving to maintain a Church Slavonic language generally as remote as possible from the Polish original, particularly in terms of vocabulary. Although the frequently used word *рокъ* 'year,' for example, marks the *Synopsis* as a text originating in the Ruthenian (and not the Russian) sphere, Polonisms occur in it rather sporadically. Even though learned Ruthenians of the seventeenth century were for the most part perfectly familiar with these Polish words and even adopted and integrated almost all of them into their own Ruthenian secular written language, the translators were quite consistent in translating Polish lexemes in the *Synopsis* (*нобѣда* for *zwycięstwo* or *повелѣти* for *kazać*, among other examples in the fragment cited above). They also replaced Polish idiomatic expressions, such as *kochać się w czymś, używać wesela, tobie [...] śmierć podić*, with often laconic and simple Church Slavonic forms (the present passive participle *любимый*, the simple verb *веселитися*, and *смерть имат тебѣ быти*, respectively, for the same idioms).

Nevertheless, some non-Church Slavonic elements that are likely to be of Polish origin do occur in the *Synopsis*. As in other related cases, the fact that we are dealing largely with a translated text adds interesting force to the study of these elements, for the analysis must not be reduced to the simple question of their occurrence but should also consider their relation to the original text.

Polish (z)*budować* and *zamek*, for example, are consistently rendered in the *Synopsis* with Church Slavonic *соз(у)дати* or *созградити* and Church Slavonic *градъ* or East Slavic *городъ* (note, however, that *замок* is a perfectly integrated calque in all East Slavic languages!), respectively. Polish *miasto*, however, is most often either omitted in the translation (similarly, Polish *mieszczanie i grodzanie* yields only *граждане* in the translation) or rendered with a related term such as *столица*, although elsewhere it yields *мѣсто* with the non-Church Slavonic meaning 'town.' Similarly, Polish *złożyć/zakładać* 'to found' is perfectly translated in some fragments by *основати* or rendered with quasi-synonyms such as *соз(у)дати* or *созградити/созградити*, while the non-Church Slavonic calque *заложити* occurs elsewhere. Interestingly, this latter form is used in the aorist form (*заложити*, third person singular), which is clearly marked as a Church Slavonic grammatical element in seventeenth-century East Slavic. Consider the following passages:

<p>A tak Holha [...] dobywszy wszystkich ZAMKOW [inszych] Drewlańskich (118)</p>	<p>И тако [...] Олга ѿмсти^в ши Мѹжа своего смерть, прїать въ свою вбл^ас^ть вса Грады древла^нскїа (178)</p>
<p>Wtóry Brat Sceк niedaleko od Kiiowa ZBUDOWAŁ ZAMEK [у MIASTO] na gorze <u>Sciekawice</u> od swego imienia. (111)</p>	<p>Вторый брат' [Щок' или] Щекъ, созда недалече Кїева Градъ на горѣже, [и нарече егѡ] Щекавица [или Шковица] ѿ своего имени, [иже Гора и до ннѣ тако именѣтса.] (162–163)</p>

y posłała do [MIESZCHAN Y DO] GRODZAN, mówiąc, iużem się pomściła śmierci męża swego, wszakże od was nie odstąpię, aż mi iaką taką dań postąpicie (118)	И посла къ [всѣмъ] Граждано ^М гла: ѿкѡ оуже ѡмстила есмь смерть Мѹжа своегѡ, вбаче не ѡстъплю ѡ васъ, дондеже ми кѡюлибѣ дань дасте (177)
A ci panując nad [Ruskimi] narody MIASTA Y ZAMKI [ku obronie zakładać y] BUDOWAĆ poczęli. (111)	идеже владѣюще нарѣдами [и поланскою землею] начаша Грады и мѣста [note the different order of appearance], [ради тишайшого житіа и прибѣжища] созидати. (162)
Sinaus [zaś albo Syniew] osiadł krainy Ruskie nad Białym Jeziorem.[...] <u>Nad tymże</u> [Jeziorem...] ZAMEK <u>SWOY STOŁECZNY</u> Y MIASTO ZBUDOWAŁ (113)	Сінеу ^с вб'ать страны Рѹсскійскіа на ^А Бѣлымъ озеромъ, на ^А нимъ же [себѣ] <u>Городъ</u> и <u>столицѹ</u> созда. (167)
Kyi [albo Kig starszy], ZAMEK Y MIASTO Kijow [od swego imienia] nad rzeką Dnieprem ZAŁOŻYŁ, [gdzie potem była głowa y sławna stolica Jedynowładstwa Ruskiego.] (111)	[Первѣ оубѡ] старѣйшій братъ Кій, вснова [и согради] <u>Городъ</u> и мѣстѡ, [на Гврѣ] надъ Рѣкою Днѣпромъ, [нарекши егѡ] КІЄВЪ (162)
Drewlanie będąc temu radzi, [iż iuż wszystkie Xięstwa Ruskie ich Xiążęciu, z tak wielką Małżonką będą podane, za którym powodem nad Rusaki wzajem, będąc pierwey poddanemi Pany być mieli,] wnet w CHORESTENIE GŁOWNYM MIEŚCIE [swoim], [Miody y tak] <u>wielkie dostatki</u> na <u>sławne</u> wesele zgotowali. (118)	Древланеже семѹ [паче] рады быша, и абіе <u>всѣ</u> оутотоваша <u>извѣбно</u> , къ <u>нарочитом</u> веселію, въ главнѣмъ мѣстѣ Коростенѣ, [или по ннѣшнемѹ званію Искорести]. (175)
A Siostra ich Libeda nad rzeką Libiedą osady swoje ugruntowawszy, tamże ZAMEK Libiec albo <u>Lubiec</u> ZBUDOWAŁA na kopcu wyniosłym. (111)	Сестра же ихъ Либеда, надъ Рѣкою Либеда'ю свои осады положши тамъже и <u>Городъ</u> на пригорку високомъ, согради [ѡ своего имени] Либеда. (163)
[Także też] Korewo trzeci Brat [ich] Korewicę [w udzielnym swoim Xięstwie] ZAŁOŻYŁ, <u>który</u> potem Wyszegrodem zwano. (111)	Третій братъ Коревъ, [или Хоревъ] <u>созда</u> [Градъ такоже ѡ своего имени] Хоревѣцѹ, а по томъ Вышгородъ прозваса. (163)
Rurik starszy Xięstwo Nowogroda wielkiego wziął w udział, а Столицę своię на wyspie Jeziora Ladogi [...] ZAŁOŻYŁ. (113)	старѣйшій Рѹрикъ воспріять себѣ Кнаженіе Великнѡвгоро ^А скве, а столицѹ свою на Островѣ Єзера Лагоды заложѣ. (167)
[Trzecie Xiążę Warackie] Truwor [albo Trubor] wziął Xięstwo [Pleskowskie albo] Pskowskie w udział [...], а столицę своię <u>ZAŁOŻYŁ</u> w Sworzech albo w Izborku (113)	а Трѹворъ воспріять Кнаженіе Псковское, <u>Столицѹ</u> же свою <u>заложѣ</u> , въ Сврцахъ или въ Изборскѹ. (167)

[tak] każdy gołąb do swego domu [y gołębińca], á wroble w strzechę [albo pod dachy zwykle] z ogniem [nazad z woyska Ruskiego] przyleciawszy, w <u>kilkudziesiąt</u> mieyscach ZAMEK [y MIASTO] zapalili [zarazem]. (118)	Голѣбже всакъ къ своему домѣ, и врабѣи къ стрѣсъ съ огнемъ, прилетѣвши на <u>многихъ</u> мѣстахъ Градъ зажгѣша, (177–178)
--	---

As we have seen, the translators adopted the non-Church Slavonic meaning of *мѣсто*. The last example demonstrates, however, that they hesitated to introduce the suffixed form *мѣстыце* < Polish *mieście* (> *miejsce*), which took the neutral meaning ‘place’ after the semantic change of *miasto*/*мѣсто*. Consequently, *мѣсто* appears in the *Synopsis* with both the traditional meaning ‘place’ and the new meaning ‘town.’

2.1.2. Weddings and other delights

Another remarkable element that occurs several times in the *Synopsis* is *веселіє* with the meaning ‘wedding,’ which is adopted from Polish *wesele*. Most Polish terms with a related meaning are meticulously translated by their Church Slavonic elements:

poiął sobie w małżeński stan Olchę (116) za ich xiążę [...] w małżeński stan poszła (117) waszemu się Xiążęciu w małżeński stan niezbraniam (117) chcąc być małżonką (117–118) według ślubu swego (118)	сочетася [...] съ Олгою (172) кназю их [...] жена бѣде ^т (173) въ брачное сочетаніе Кназю вашему не ѿрицаю (Syn: 174) пришествіе [...] въ сѣпрѣжество (174–175) прежде [второго] брака (174–175)
---	---

The translators not only adopted Polish *swadźbę* (*swadźbę*) (acc. sg.; Stryj: 118) as *свадѣѣ* (Syn: 176)—as we would expect, since the word (< *svat-bba*) is as much Church Slavonic as it is Polish—but also introduced Polish-based *wesele*. Once introduced, the word appears even when it is not used in the original. Yet even after the first independent use of *веселіє*, the word *wesele* is “explained” in the translation as *брачно веселіє*. Elsewhere, the translators avoid the polysemy of Polish *wesele* and translate *z wielkim weselem* ‘with great joy’ with *с’ велию радостію*. The following examples are given in order of appearance:

Drewnianie będąc temu radzi, [iż iuż wszystkie Xięstwa Ruskie ich Xiążęciu, z tak wielką Małżonką będą podane, za którym powodem nad Rusaki wzajem, będąc pierwey poddanemi Pany być mieli,] wnet w Chorestenie głównym mieście [swoim], [Miody y tak] <u>wielkie dostatki</u> na <u>ślawne</u> WESELE zgotowali. (118)	Древлянеже семѣ [паче] рады быша, и абіе <u>вса</u> оутотаваша <u>изѣбѣ^дно</u> , къ <u>нарочитомѣ</u> веселію, въ главнѣмъ мѣстѣ Коростень, [или по нѣньшнемѣ званію Искорести]. (175)
---	---

Holha też <u>iako obiecała</u> , z [Kijowską Slachta,] mężami do bitwy przebranemi, na czas naznaczony, do Chorościenia przyiachała (118)	[Великаа Кнѣгина] Олга по <u>ѡбѣщанію</u> <u>своємѹ</u> со оутотованными [многими] людми [не тако кѣ веселію, <u>іако</u>] кѣ бою на оурочное время поиде до Коростена. (175)
á Holha zakrywšy [y zmyšliwšy] gniew w sercu [zamilkła, á] ubrawšy się w <u>świętne</u> szaty, iako na WESELE, (118)	[Тогда] Олга сокрывши въ срѣцы [своємѹ] [жалость и] <u>арость</u> , <u>ѡблечеса въ цвѣтныа дорогоцѣнныа</u> <u>ѡдежды</u> , аки на [брачно] <u>веселіе</u> (176)
A tak Holha [...] wrocila się do Kijowa z wielkim WESELEM z Synem swoim Swentosławem [Czarewiczem]. (118)	И тако [мѡраа и храбра ^А Кнѣгина] Олга [...] и <u>возвратиса въ</u> [напрествлный свой Градъ] Кіевъ с' <u>веліею радостію</u> , съ сынѡмѹ своимѹ Свѣтославомѹ. (178)

2.1.3. More non-Church Slavonic lexemes

The fact that the translators treated Polish non-Church Slavonic forms inconsistently is evident from the following example. Polish *doł* (*dół*) is first integrated into the Church Slavonic text as *долъ* but soon afterwards perfectly translated as *ров'*:

<u>Których</u> ona wysłuchawszy, kazała <u>doł</u> głęboki we dworze wykopać, y <u>wszystkich onych Posłów</u> [weñ żywych] wrzucić, (117) // [...] [potym] sama nachyliwšy się <u>nad dołem</u> , pytała ich, <u>iako się tam macie Panowie Swatowie</u> y kazała [ich] ziemią żywych zawalić. (117)	<u>Ѡна</u> же [посланіе] слышавши, повелѣ [нарочиты ^Х ради сватѡвъ, и ч ^С ть нарочитѹ оустроуити, сирѣ ^Ч ,] <u>долъ</u> глѣбокъ, въ дворѣ ископати, и <u>ихѣ</u> въ вреци, (173) // [...] самаже прекло ^Н шаса <u>над ров'</u> <u>вопропаше свато^В въ здравіи</u> , и повелѣ живых землею загреб ^С ти. (173–174)
---	--

As in the cases above, no formal feature marks the word *добровол(ь)ный* 'of one's own will' as a non-Church Slavonic calque from Polish (for Russian *добровольный* see Witkowski 2006). The translators were probably unaware of the origins of this word and, in all likelihood, found it highly appropriate because its compound structure made it look so Church Slavonic. Polish *dobrowolny* is thus simply calqued as *доброволный*, and soon afterwards *доброволный* is even used to render Polish *wolny*, although it makes sense in this latter context only in the word's literal meaning 'of good will':

<p>[A gdy przyiechali do Ruskich granic] z wielką <u>chęcią</u> od wszech <u>stanow Rosieyskich</u> byli przyięci,</p> <p>á zaraz państwo Ruskie DOBROWOLNIE od ludu WOLNEGO podane na trzy części [trzey bracia] Xiążęta między się podzielili. (113)</p>	<p>[Рѹрикѣ, СінеѸсъ, и Трѹворѣ,] пріати бывше ѿ всѣхъ Рѹссовѣ, с' великою <u>радостію</u>,⁴ [и бѣгодарствіемъ],</p> <p>абіе и Гсѣдствѣ Рѹское доброволнѣ ѿ Нарѣда доброво^Анагѣ поданое на три части междѹ собою раздѣлиша (167)</p>
--	---

Elsewhere, the Ruthenian calque *дорогоцѣнный* < Polish *drogocenny* occurs independently of Strykowski's text (for Russian *драгоценный* see Witkowski 2006), notably with the plephonic form in the first component of the compound noun:

<p>[á] Holha [...] ubrawszy się w <u>świętne</u> szaty, iako na wesele (118)</p>	<p>[Тогда] Олга [...] ѡблечеса въ <u>цвѣтныя дорогоцѣнныя</u> ѡдежды, аки на [брачно] веселіе (176)</p>
--	---

Finally, the form *Монарха* is worth mentioning. It is used in the *Synopsis* as a masculine noun ending in *-a* in perfect accordance with Polish *monarcha*. Interestingly, whereas *наmpiарха*, used in the first edition of the *Synopsis*, was usually replaced with *наmpiархъ* (Moser 2011: 200), this did not apply to *Монарха*. This Polish-based form of the word was even used by Teofan Prokopovych in Petrine times, which might be explained by the fact that the *Монарха* for the Ruthenians was above all the Polish *Монарха*, whereas *Монархъ* was not a Church Slavonic word. It was therefore glossed by the translators of the *Synopsis* as *или Самодержецъ*:

<p>Ktora nieiako białey głowy mдіa плeć, ale iako <u>наупорządnieszy</u> MONARCHA rządziła (117)</p>	<p>И не ѡкѡ Женскѣ сосѹдѣ <u>немощень</u>, но аки <u>крѣпчайшій</u> Монарха [или Самодержецъ, всѣми Кнѣженіи Рѹсскіими <u>бл҃гоуразѹмнѣ</u>] правлалше (173)</p>
--	--

Obvious non-Church Slavonic elements shared with Polish occur rather sporadically. Examples are *къ стрѣѣ* (177–178) for *w strzechę* (118; as a loan from German), which refers to a concrete object lacking a Church Slavonic equivalent, or *поселство* (Syn: 299 et al.; with Polish *e* < *o*) as a diplomatic term, or *посполитый* (Syn: 393) from the concluding parts of the *Synopsis* (which have no parallel in the *Kronika*).

4 In the margin there is a reference to Strykowski and Miechowita.

2.2. Idiomatics

Moreover, some words are used in the *Synopsis* according to their idiomatic potential in Polish rather than in Church Slavonic. This applies particularly to Polish *leżeć* with the meaning 'to be geographically located somewhere,' which is simply rendered by Church Slavonic *лежати* in the *Synopsis*:⁵

Po śmierci Olechowey Ihor [albo Igor] Rurykowicz począł panować na Kijowie, wielkim Nowogrodzie, na [Pleskowie albo na] Pskowie, na Białymiezierze, y na wszystkich Xięstwach y Ziemiach Ruskich, w <u>zachodnich</u> , północnych y na południe LEŻĄCYCH, (116)	По смерти Ѡгловой, [Великій Кнѣз'] Игор' Рѣриковичъ нача [самъ] Кнажити въ Кіевѣ, на великомъ Новгородѣ, Псковѣ, и на бѣломъ ѡзері, и на всѣхъ Кнаженіяхъ и земахъ Руссїйскихъ, <u>Восточныхъ</u> [!], Полѣнощныхъ, и на Полѣднѣ лежащи ^х . (172)
--	--

Elsewhere, the *Synopsis* laconically translates the Polish idiomatic phrase *podbić* [...] *pod moc* into perfect Church Slavonic as *покорити*, but the Polish phrase is very likely to be the source of *подъбиваа подъ Власть*, which appears two lines above:

<u>wiele krain</u> [przyległych] mocą y <u>fortelami</u> [do posłuszeństwa swojego y Ihorowego] PRZYPĘDZIWSZY. [...] [Ciagnał potym z <u>woyskiem Olech na Drewlany z Ikorem</u> , ktorzy też byli narodu Ruskiego, y] <u>PODBIWSZY ich POD MOC swoje</u> , hold na nich ułożył (115)	<u>подъбиваа подъ Власть</u> [себѣ и Игѣрови] <u>всакиа</u> страны силою и [различны ^м] промыслом'. <u>Покорившиже</u> [Древляны], возложи на них' да ^н (170)
---	--

Another idiomatic expression whose appearance in the *Synopsis* is probably due to its occurrence in Strykowski's text is *животъ смертію премѣнити*. Note, however, that in Polish *życiо z śmiercią przemienić* the preposition *z* is used, as opposed to the version in the target language:

trzy Bracia [przerzeczeni] Xiążęta Ruskie, Kyi, Sciek, y Korewo <u>ŻYCIО z ŚMIERCIĄ</u> PRZEMIENILI (111)	Кназіе Руссїйскіи Тріе братіа, Кій, Щекъ, и Коревъ [, или Хоревъ] [...] <u>животъ смертію премѣниша</u> (163–164)
---	---

The idiomatic phrase seems to be typical of sixteenth-century Polish: a Google search for "życiо z śmiercią" with this exact word order yields two examples of the phrase *życiо z śmiercią przemienić* in two sentences from the sixteenth-century "Kronika mistrzów pruskich."

5 Note also the use of Slavonicized but not really Church Slavonic *полѣнощныхъ* and *на Полѣднѣ* instead of traditional Church Slavonic *сѣверный* and *на юзѣ*.

2.3. Ruthenian elements in the *Kronika* and their echo in the *Synopsis*

The Polish-Ruthenian cultural and linguistic encounter has never been a unilateral process. This applies particularly to our context, inasmuch as Strykowski's text reveals a number of Ruthenian elements (most of which were already discussed and analyzed by Maria Karpluk; see Karpluk 1977). The most important question in our context is how the translators dealt with the Ruthenian elements in Strykowski's text.

If Strykowski repeatedly uses Ruthenian name forms such as *Ihor*, *Olech* (with $x < \text{Ruthenian } h$), *Holha* (with the Ruthenian prothesis and Ruthenian h) (see the examples above) or even Ruthenian-based titles such as *Kniaz* (Stryj: 116–117), *Kniazowie* (Stryj: 115) < East Slavic *Князь* (along with *Xiżę*, Stryj: 116–117, *Xiżęqt*, Stryj: 115, etc.) and, curiously enough, *Kniazinia* (Stryj: 117; without an equivalent in the *Synopsis*),⁶ then the translators, as might be expected, decided to ignore these peculiarities and simply chose the traditional East Slavic forms, namely *Игорь/Игорь*, *Олеж*, *Ольга/Олга*, or *Кнзіе* (Syn: 170), and so on. They certainly read these names according to their Ukrainian pronunciation in Kyiv (whereas the Muscovites would have read them according to their Russian rules or, at a certain historical stage, according to the Ukrainian rules as well).

Furthermore, if Strykowski used the appellative noun [*ostatki uciekaiących*] *poboiszcza* (Stryj: 118) instead of *pobojowiska*, the translator was, of course, unconcerned about this East Slavic element in Strykowski's text and also simply translated it as [Ø бѣжаицѣх ѿ] *побоища* (Syn: 176).

In one particular case, the translators were faced with a greater challenge. At a certain stage of his narrative, Strykowski puts into the *Derevlianes'* mouth a piece of invented direct speech that was obviously meant to be as close as possible to sixteenth-century Ruthenian. Interestingly, the translators followed their source in translating this passage as direct speech, but they entirely ignored the Ruthenian language of Strykowski's text and rendered it in Ruthenian Church Slavonic as follows:

<p>y rzekli iey Drowlanie, HOSPODZE KNEINIO, MUŻA TWOIEHO ZABILIJESMO, IŻ ON BYŁ NIEMIŁOŚCIW, KAKO WOLK <u>DRAPIEŻUJ</u> OWCE, (118)</p>	<p>а Древлане рекѣша къ ней: Мѹжа твоєгѡ оубихомъ, ѡкѡ онъ небѣ млсрдѣ къ намѣ, [не аки Гсѣрь съ ПоАдаными,] но ѡко волкъ съ овцами <u>оуправляшесѣ</u>. (176)</p>
--	--

Strykowski writes *hospodze* not only with h (Karpluk 1977: 56) but also with dz , which might be explained by Polish morphonology, but perhaps also by a Belarusian source (as in, for example, Old Polish *gospodza*). The vocative form *knieinio* reveals not only the change $\emptyset < h < g$ but also the change $'a > 'e$ (Karpluk 1977: 48–49), known from many Belarusian dialects. The noun *muża* is marked as East Slavic owing to its u instead of e , and the pronominal form *twoieho* is marked as

6 As for the Ruthenian forms in Strykowski's work and the astonishing variety of Ruthenian-based name forms, see Karpluk 1977, particularly the index.

Ruthenian because of its *h*. Of greatest interest is the preterital verb form *zabilijesmo* (no entry in Karpluk 1977), which is marked as Ruthenian by the component *jesmo* (though not *smo*) instead of Polish *-śmy*. The form *niemiłościw* may be interpreted as both Belarusian and Polish, whereas *kako* (no entry in Karpluk 1977) is East Slavic (compare, however, Ukrainian and Belarusian *jak(o)*), and *wolk* (no entry in Karpluk 1977) reveals the East Slavic reflex of **vьlkъ* (cf. Polish *wilk*). All other forms in the direct speech are not marked as Ruthenian but are either genuinely Polish (*iż, drapieżuj*)⁷ or indeterminately Polish or Ruthenian.

The translators paid no attention whatever to the fact that Strykowski’s text switches from Polish to Belarusian-based Ruthenian. They translated the Ruthenian phrase into Church Slavonic and emphasized their choice by introducing forms of the aorist and the imperfect into the *Derevljanec*’ speech.

2.4. Syntax

With regard to syntax as well, the translators often demonstrated that they were striving to produce a language particularly remote from Polish.

Polish non-delimitative *do* + genitive case is quite consistently rendered with a Church Slavonic construction, as in the following example with *къ* + dative case:

Á widząc iż trudne było mocą [Miasta y] Zamku dostać, [dla twardości z przyrodzenia mieysca,] udała się DO FORTELU PRZEMYSŁNEGO, (118)	Видащиже премѣраа Кнѣгина Олга, ꙗко неоудо ^б взати Града пристѣпами, Вдаса къ хитростномꙋ промыслаꙋ (177)
--	--

In the following instance, the translators avoided the use of the predicative instrumental case. Although it could have been used in this context according to the rules of Church Slavonic (Moser 1998: 77–108), the translators were perfectly right in assuming this case to be much more typical of Polish than of Church Slavonic.

á Olha zaraz Posłów [swoich do Drewlanow] posłała, opowiadając <u>iż iuż do nich IEDZIE, CHCĄC BYĆ MAŁŻONKĄ</u> ICH XIAŻĘCIU, Á IM PANIA, (117–118)	и паки посла Олга гонца, из’авлаа <u>скорое свое пришествіе къ древланомꙋ въ сꙋпрꙋжество Кнзю ихъ, а имъ въ Гѣдирню.</u> (174–175)
---	--

In the following passage, the translators aptly replaced the markedly Polish temporal prepositional phrase *za* + genitive case with a dative absolute construction:

7 The form remains unclear to me. The most widespread form of the verb is *drapieżyć*, not *drapieżować*. Perhaps, in any case, the form renders reduced *drapieżuje*. On the reduction of *e*, see Karpluk (1977: 76–77), who nevertheless cites no forms with *-uj < -uje*.

<p>á ieszcze ZA ŻYWOTA OLECHOWEGO [opiekuna swego] <u>poiał sobie w małżeński stan</u> Olchę Prawnuczkę Gostomiselowę ze Pskowa. (116)</p>	<p>Єщеже живѣ сѣщѣ <u>Улегѣ сочетасѣ</u> Игорѣ съ Олгою [премѣрою и красною вицею], Правнѣкою Гостомысловою ѿ Пскова.⁸ (172)</p>
--	---

Elsewhere, however, the syntactic organization is clearly influenced by the Polish original. In the following example, the use of the conditional form in the indirect speech does not follow the rules of Church Slavonic but those of (Middle) Polish. Although this use is widespread in Middle Ruthenian owing to the influence of Polish, it is in all probability the original version that evokes the use of the conditional in this particular context of the *Synopsis*:

<p>y wezwawszy wieszczkow pytał ich, <u>coby</u> o tym koniu <u>rozumieli</u>, (115)</p>	<p>и призвавъ Вѣлсвы вопросы их', <u>чтобысѣ</u> <u>имѣ мнѣло</u> в томѣ конѣ? (170)</p>
--	--

As many examples cited in this study show, the translators did not necessarily adopt Polish word order, as in the following passage, where the second clause largely accords with Polish word order, whereas the first clause does not:

<p>Rurik starszy Xięstwo Nowogroda wielkiego wziął w udział, á Stolicę swoię na wyspie Jeziora Ładogi [ktorego iest wszere mil 60. á wzdłuż sto, iak Herberstein pisze] trzydzieści y siedm mil od Nowogroda wielkiego] założył. (113)</p>	<p>старѣйшій Рѣрикѣ воспріять себѣ Кнаженіе ВеликнѣновгороАскве, а столицѣ свою на Островѣ Єзера Лагоды [!] заложи. (167)</p>
--	---

As regards Strykowski's organization of participial and adverbial participial constructions, as well as of complex sentences, the translators quite often followed his model. Adverbial participles tend to be replaced with congruent participles:

<p>A ci panuiąc nad [Ruskimi] narody Miasta y Zamki <u>ku obronie</u> [zakładać y] budować poczeli. (111)</p>	<p>идеже владѣюще нарѣдами и поланскою землею начаша Грады и мѣста, <u>ради</u> <u>тишайшого житіѣ</u> и <u>прибѣжшиѣ</u> созидати (162)</p>
<p><u>А</u> Siostra ich Libeda nad rzeką Libiedą osady swoje ugruntowawszy, tamże Zamek Libiec [albo Lubiec] zbudowała na kopcu wyniosłym. (111)</p>	<p>Сестра же ихъ Либедѣ, надѣ Рѣкою Либед'ю свои осады положши тамже <u>и</u> Городѣ на пригорку високомѣ, согради [ѿ своего имени] Либедѣ. (163)</p>

8 In the margin there is a reference to Strykowski and Guagnini.

<p><u>wiele krain</u> [przyległych] mocą y fortelami [do posłuszeństwa swojego y lhorowego] PRZYPĘDZIWSZY. [...] [<u>Ciągnął potym z woyskiem Olech na Drewlany z Ikorem</u>, ktorzy też byli narodu Ruskiego, y] <u>PODBIWSZY ICH POD MOC SWOJĘ</u>, hołd na nich ułożył (115)</p>	<p><u>подъбиваа</u> <u>подъ</u> Власть [<u>себѣ</u> и <u>Игрови</u>] <u>всака</u> страны силою и [<u>различны</u>М] промыслом'. <u>Покорившиже</u> [Древланы], возложи на них' да^H (170)</p>
<p>[Potym] gdy trzy Bracia [przerzeczeni] Xiążęta Ruskie, Kyi, Sciek, y Korewo żywot z śmiercią przemienili, synowie y potomkowie ich po nich długi wiek każdy na swoim udziale [spokoynie] panowali, aż po tym⁹ na ich mieysca [Oskald,] Askolt y Dyr Xiążęta z ichże narodu nastąpili. (111)</p>	<p>Єгдаже Кназіе Рвссійскіи Тріє братіа, Кій, Щекъ, и Коревъ [, или Хоревъ, по дово^Aном' Кнаженіи своемъ надъ Рвссами,] животь смеРтію премѣниша, [...], сыны и Наслѣдники ихъ по нихъ долгій вѣкъ, всак' на своемъ оудѣлѣ, Госпо^Aствоваша. Даже по томъ на ихъ Мѣста Осколдъ, и Диръ Кназіе ѿ ихъ же народа настѣпиша. [w них'же бѣдетъ нижеа.] (163–164)</p>
<p>[Potym] Drewlanie zhardziawszy [w wolności] y [urągając Kiiowianom iż ich Pana zabili], posłali do Olhy dwadzieścia osob zacnych, namawiając ią łagodnie, a potym grożąc y chcąc ią do tego przymusić, aby za ich Xiążę Drewlańskie Niskinie, [a według niektórych Maldita] <u>w małżeński stan poszła</u> (117)</p>	<p>Древлаане же велію дерзость [ѿ оубіеніи Гс^дра своегw Игwра] воспріемше, послаша къ Олзѣ [Кн^гинѣ] двадесать нарочитыхъ Мѣжей [въ Лодіах'], оувѣщающе ю доброхо^Tнw, а потом' и претаще, да [и по нѣждѣ] Кназю их древлаанскѣ Низкинѣ [оубійцѣ Игоровѣ] <u>Жена бѣде^T</u>. (173)</p>
<p>A gdy <u>po</u> zwycięstwie <u>wesela używał</u> w Kijowie, kazał do siebie przywieść konia, w którym się <u>nawiecy kochał</u>, (115)</p>	<p>и [пото^M] єгда ѿ побѣдѣ <u>веселашесѧ</u> въ Кіевѣ. Повелѣ пре^A себе <u>любимагw</u> <u>своегw</u> Кона привести (170)</p>
<p>y posłała do [Mieszczan y do] Grodzan, mówiąc, iużem się pomściła śmierci męża swego, wszakże od was nie odstąpię, aż mi iaką taką dań postąpicie (118)</p>	<p>И посла къ [всѣмъ] Граждано^M гл^A: акw оуже ѿмстила есмь смерть Мѣжа своегw, wбаче не ѿстѣплю ѿ васъ, дондеже ми кѣюлибѣ даń дасте (177)</p>

There are, however, also many deviations. The *Synopsis* tends to be much more laconic than Strykowski. Consequently, the clause structure is considerably simplified, as in the following example:

9 Sic, po at the end of the line.

<p>A [zebrawszy większe wojsko] [z ziem Ruskich] <u>ciągnął</u> [wodną armatą [przez czarne Morze] do Konstantynopola, [ktorego wielką mocą dobywał, ustawicznie morzem y ziemią na basty y na mury sturmując.] (115)</p>	<p>По сѣмъ ходи Шлегъ войною <u>въ [двѣхъ тысящѣхъ] Кораблей</u> къ Цѣриградѣ (171)</p>
---	---

The same applies to the following examples, where the translators skipped one level of subordination by omitting entire subordinate clauses of the Polish original. In the first fragment, two coordinated infinitives are translated by a construction with a participle and the infinitive; in the second, the translators introduced a matrix sentence much earlier than Strykowski by replacing one of two coordinated participial constructions with a paratactic clause:

<p>Oni <u>będąc</u> <u>tey wdzięczności radzi</u>, szli do łaźniey, [А GDY SIĘ PŁOKAĆ, Y WINNIKAMI AIEIE WOCH WOCH WOCH [note the expressivity avoided in the translation] CHWOSTAĆ POCZĘLI,] <u>kazała łaźnią słomą y chrostem w koło otoczyć y zapalić, tak iż wszyscy</u>, [y z sługami swoimi ogniem gwałtownym] zgorzeli, (117)</p>	<p>вниже сь <u>веселіємъ</u> ввійдоша в' баню, а [Олга] <u>повелѣ</u> соломою и хвастіємъ баню <u>шбо</u> <u>лкъши</u> <u>запалити</u>, и <u>исгорѣша</u> [с' банею] <u>всѣ</u> <u>Послы</u>. (174)</p>
<p>A tak Holha pomściwszy się śmierci męża swojego [znacznie], y dobywszy wszystkich Zamkow [inszych] DREWLAŃSKICH [KTÓRE SIĘ IEY ZA TYM STRACHEM, Y PRZEMYSŁEM NIEZWYKŁYM ANI SŁYCHANYM, DOBROWOLNIE PODAWAŁY], wrocila się do Kijowa z wielkim weselem z Synem swoim Swentosławem [Czarewiczem]. (118)</p>	<p>И тако [мАраа и храбра^А Кнѣгина] Олга <u>шмсти</u> <u>вши</u> Мѣжа своегог смерть, <u>пріаѣ</u> <u>въ</u> <u>свою</u> <u>шбл</u> <u>ст</u> <u>вса</u> <u>Грады</u> <u>древланскіа</u>, и <u>во</u> <u>звратиса</u> <u>въ</u> [напрествалный свой Градъ] Кіевъ с' <u>велією</u> <u>радостію</u>, сь <u>сыншмъ</u> <u>своимъ</u> <u>Свѣтославомъ</u>. (178)</p>

In other cases, the translators simply began new sentences instead of adopting Polish subordinate constructions:

<p>A Holha [też] <u>w ten czas do sturmu</u> <u>ze wszystkich stron</u>, [z ogromnym krzykiem y hukiem] <u>przypuściła, gdzie z zapalonego [119] Zamku</u> <u>uciekających wielkość</u> <u>Drewlanow pobito, posieczono, y potopiono</u>, (118–119)</p>	<p>а Олга [горашѣ Градѣ] <u>абіе</u> <u>всею силою</u> <u>нача</u> <u>приступати</u> <u>ш</u> <u>всѣхъ</u> <u>странъ</u> [по^А Городъ]. <u>Тогда ш</u> <u>возгорѣніа града</u> <u>бѣжащих'</u> <u>веліе</u> <u>множествъ</u> <u>Древланъ</u> <u>побиша</u>, (178)</p>
---	---

The translators particularly avoided a number of Polish subordinate constructions with *który*. Instead of relative clauses or constructions with “relativer

Anschluss," one typically finds paratactic translations with anaphoric *онъ же* or without any pronoun:

Y wyzwał do siebie <u>na rozmowę przyjacielską</u> Oskoloda y Dyra [Xiażat Kijowskich], <u>ktorzy nic się nieprzyjacielskiego</u> [od swoich] niespodziewając, w małym poczcie wyiechali [do obozu Olechowego y Ikorowego nad Dniepr]. (115)	[и достигши Града Кіева ста по ^А нимъ,] и вызва [лестію] к' себѣ [на станъ и ^З Града], Усколда и Дира, аки бесѣды ради <u>пріятел'скіа, ониже никакѣва сла</u> [себѣ] чающе, изыйдоша к' немѣ малолюднѣ. (169)
<u>ktorzy</u> [przyszedszy] rzekli, iż tobie [wielki Kniaziu] od tego Konia śmierć <u>podiać</u> . (115)	<u>Ониже</u> ѿвѣщаша [емѣ], акѣ ѿ тогѣ конѣ смерть <u>има^Т</u> тебѣ <u>быти</u> . (170)
<u>КТОРЕГО</u> [wielkiego gwałtu] Cesarz Konstantynopolski niemogąc wytrzymać, [а pomocy na odsiecz znisкад się niespodziewał,] <u>przeiednał</u> [Olecha wielkimi] дарѣми, odkupując pokoy, [а prosząc aby od obleżenia odstąpił:] (115)	<u>єгоже</u> КесаР Грецкій [Лев' премѣры ^Й] немогий стерпѣти, <u>оуматчи</u> дарѣми и <u>миръ кѣпи</u> . (171)
<u>ktorzy</u> usłyszawszy, iż Oskolod y Dyr wrocili się do Kijowa <u>straciwszy Armate pod Konstantynopolem przez potop</u> , zaraz [w naczyniu wodnym] wziąwszy z sobą Ikora Rurykowica, przyciągnął do Kijowa [Dnieprem rzeką] (115)	и оуслышавши Улегѣ акѣ Усколдѣ и Дирѣ <u>ходивше кѣ Цѣриградѣ</u> войною, возвратистасѣ в' Кіевѣ <u>посрамленны в' мало^И дружинѣ</u> , абіе в'зе ^М ши съ собою Игора Рѣриковича, поиде кѣ Кіевѣ (169)
<u>ktorzy</u> gdy do Kijowa przyiechali [w łodziach y naczyniu wodnym rozmaitym Rzeką Dnieprem], kazała [Kniażinia Holha] dla <u>nich</u> łącznią [wielką] nagotować (117)	и <u>єгда</u> <Ø> прійдоша кѣ Олзѣ, повелѣ [толикихѣ] ради <u>гостей</u> [и подорожна трѣда] баню оуготовати (174)

Much less often, relative clauses with *ktory* are rendered as relative clauses with Church Slavonic *уже*:

Potým się wrocil z Carygroda do Kijowa <u>Oleh</u> [czasu Jesieni], y wspomniаł na onego Konia swojego, <u>od ktorego</u> mu Wieszczkowie <u>śmierć podiać</u> <u>praktykowali</u> , [y kazał go przywieść do siebie.] (116)	Єгда же Улегѣ возвратисѣ ѿ Цѣриграда [, и прійде] в' Кіевѣ, воспоманѣ w конѣ своемъ: <u>ѡне^Мже</u> Уласвы емѣ <u>провоувѣщахѣ</u> . (171)
--	--

This last sentence is also interesting inasmuch as it represents one of the rather rare cases of a subordinate clause with *єгда* independently of the original.

In the following example, the temporal clause is omitted, but the first paratactic clause of the original is translated with a participial construction:

<p>[A gdy przyiechali do Ruskich granic] z wielką <u>chęcią</u> od wszech <u>stanow</u> Rosieyskich byli przyięci, a zaraz państwo Ruskie DOBROWOLNIE od ludu WOLNEGO podane na trzy części [trzey bracia Xiążęta] między się podzielili. (113)</p>	<p>[Рѹрикѣ, Сінеѣсъ, и Трѹворѣ,] прїати бывше ѿ всѣхъ Рѹссовѣ, с' великою <u>радоствію</u>¹⁰, [и бл҃годарствіемъ], абіе и Гс҃рдствѣ Рѹское доброволнѣ ѿ <u>Нарѣда доброво^днѣгѣ</u> поданое на три части междѹ собою раздѣлиша (167)</p>
---	---

Elsewhere, temporal clauses are quite frequently translated as participial constructions:

<p>á gdy <u>mu</u> powiedziano, iż <Ø> iuż był zdechl [w jego niebytności], <u>kazał się prowadzić</u> do kości jego, <u>aby</u> ie uyzrzał (116)</p>	<p>и <u>прїемши вѣ^СТ</u> ѡак оуже Ко^Н той издше, [абіе] <u>пойде</u> смотрѣти косте^И его (171)</p>
---	---

In a number of cases, the translators avoided nominalizing constructions with deverbal nouns; in the following example, they achieved their aim by replacing the deverbative noun *zabicie* with the much less specific noun *смерть*:

<p><u>Po zabicu [od Drewlanow]</u> Małzonka swojego Ihora Rurykowica Xiężna Holha z Synem [jedynym] Swentosławem Państwa Ruskie <u>Wielkonowogrodzkie y Kijowskie</u> wzięła w swoją sprawę, (117)</p>	<p>[Великаа] Кнагина Олга, <u>по смерти</u> мѹжа своего Игора Рѹриковича [ѡста^Вшиса] з' сыно^М своимъ свѣтославомъ Игоровичемъ [вдовою]¹¹, <u>всѣ</u> Гс҃дарства Рѹсскійскіи въ свою власть прїа^Т, (173))</p>
--	--

Much less often, nominalizing constructions appear in the translation independently of the original:

<p>To sprawiwszy, zarazem Gońca do Drewlanow wyprawila, <u>DZIĘKUJĄC</u> ім [za to], iż się o nie iako o Wdowę osierociała staraia, (117)</p>	<p>Сіе содѣлавши, абіе посла Гонца къ древланѣ^М [<u>с' чолом'битіе^М</u>] к' бл҃г҃ѡарствіе^М. <u>ѡко ѡ</u> вдовствѣ еѡ и <u>сиротствѣ</u> попеченіе имѣють (174)</p>
---	---

While space limitations allow us only to hint at some aspects of the relationship between the *Kronika* and the *Synopsis*, the syntax in particular deserves considerably

10 In the margin there is a reference to Strykowski and Miechowita.

11 In the margin there is a reference to Strykowski.

more attention. It is very likely that translations from Polish into Ruthenian Church Slavonic such as the *Synopsis* (which was an extremely popular book in the Russian Empire at least until the late eighteenth century) played a major role in Europeanizing Church Slavonic syntax in the East Slavic area on a broader scale, particularly at the turn of the eighteenth century. Inasmuch as the most important point of departure for the development of Modern Standard Russian was Late Church Slavonic, particularly the heavily Ruthenianized Late Church Slavonic of the turn of the eighteenth century, a more careful study of the syntax of texts such as the *Synopsis* against the background of their sources is not only desirable but truly necessary.

3. Conclusions

In this brief analysis I have tried to demonstrate that the language of the *Synopsis* can be studied seriously only against the background of Strykowski’s *Kronika*. In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the interplay between the original and the translation is no less important on other levels of cultural history. Namely, since the late sixteenth century, Ukrainian clerics had “learned about Slavic unity and the joint claim of Muscovites and Ruthenians to ancient Rus” primarily from Polish authors, and, in particular, from Strykowski (Kohut 2003: 64). The following passage shows this even more clearly:

A [potym] <u>drugie</u> NARODY RUSKIE SŁAWAŃSKIE po różnych się krainach [rospostarli y] rosproszyli, którzy rozmaitymi imionami od Rzek, [Kraioŭ] y Xiążąt swoich [rožno] są nazwani, (111)	Ибо <u>тыяже</u> Нарѣды Славенорѡсѣйскѣи, [по времени оумнѣвающейся, и] по различныхъ мѣстехъ вселяющеса, [еще и иными] различными имени ѿ рѣкъ [Лѣсовъ, Примѣтовъ, Поль, ѿ Дѣлъ,] и ѿ Кназей своихъ [Имень, и Нарѣчѣй,] прозваны быша: (153)
--	---

Even “Slavjanorus(s)ianism,” this highly influential ideological key concept of early modern East Slavic cultural history, ultimately echoes Strykowski’s *Kronika* in its own way and thus turns out to be another perfect example of translated traditions.

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF IVAN MAZEPA'S UNIVERSALS AND LETTERS

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 (see, e.g., Rusanivs'kyj 2001: 90, and the scarce information in Peredrijenko 1979: 55–56).

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.¹

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 Kyiv Mohyla College 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 (Tairova-Jakovleva 2007: 15–16).² 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

1 See Ševel'ov 1979: 570: "The prestige of the P[olish] language in those areas which severed their political ties with Poland was not undermined. P[olish] 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]."

2 Orest Subtelny's edition of Ivan Mazepa's letters to Adam Sieniawski gives a good impression of Mazepa's command of Polish and Latin (Subtelny 1975).

handed over to the Left-Bank hetman, Ivan Samojlovyč. From that time onward he “quickly gained the confidence of Samojlovyč and Tsar Peter I, was made a “courtier of the hetman,” and was sent on numerous missions to Moscow.... In 1682 Mazepa was appointed Samojlovyč’s general osaul (Ohloblyn 2008), 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” (Ohloblyn 1960: 19), this might seem to be too bold an assumption. However, Tat’jana Tairova-Jakovleva, 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” (Tairova-Jakovleva 2007: 15–16).

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 Butyč in his editions of Mazepa’s universals (*MU*, *MU II*) or by V’jačeslav Stanislavskyj 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. 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 (see Moser 2011: 687–683).

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 chancery adapt its correspondence with Muscovites to Russian linguistic traditions already at this rather early stage?³

Two universals

In Butyč'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 каждому, кому колвекъ о томъ вѣдати надлежит, ознаямъ: ижъ заховуючи мы права манастиреви Густинскому Прилуцкому от бывшихъ антецесаровъ нашихъ наданые симъ нашимъ унѣверсаломъ оныя ствержаемъ и позволяемъ превелебному в Богу отцу Авксентію Якимовичю, ігумену монастира мененного Густинского Прилуцкого и по немъ будучымъ отцем ігуменомъ и всѣмъ тоей обители законникомъ для уставичной в[аших] милоствах⁴ щоденныхъ хвалы Божой и для вспартя всегдашнихъ росходовъ манастирскихъ селомъ Деймановкою владѣти и з млыновъ Давыденкового о двохъ каменяхъ в селѣ Валкахъ и под мѣстомъ Варвою Івана Точеного и Івана Ляшка о двохъ каменяхъ з ступами на рѣцѣ Удаю, а в селѣ Деймановѣ Хвескового и Костиного жителей тамошнихъ, же о двохъ каменяхъ з ступами на рѣчцѣ Лисогорцѣ стоячихъ вшелякихъ розмѣровихъ и [*sic*] приходячихъ пожитковъ зъ козацкого ведлутъ волностей козацкихъ половину, а з

3 For a general outline of eighteenth-century developments, see Moser 2011: 280–302 and Moser 2009: 289–322. It should not be forgotten at this point that the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were 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 Moser 1998: 9–46, and the literature cited there).

4 In the edition the word is rendered as *милоствах*, which seems to be a mistake.

мужицкого двоух частей заживати. Теды абы ему, отцу ігумену, из всѣм законником монастыря Густынского 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 хочем, а войтови и всей громадѣ села Деймановки прыказуем, жебы без спротивенства вшелякое помененной обывтелѣ належитое отдавали послушенство, варуемъ однакъ, жебы козаки в том селѣ мешкающие при своих козацкихъ волностяхъ ненарушне зоставали, не узнаючи жадной от преречоного отца ігумена и братий долегливости.

Данѣ в [sic] Батуринь, октобрѣ 9, року 1687.

Звишѣ менованый гетман, рукою власною. (MU: 97–98)

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 homestead:

Пресвѣтлѣйшого и державнѣйшого великого государя его царского [sic] величества Войскъ Запорожскихъ гетманѣ славного чина святого апостола Андрея и Бѣлого Орла Кавалерѣ Іоанѣ Мазепа.

Пану полковникови переяславкому, старшинѣ полковой, сотникомъ и всѣмъ старшимъ и меншимъ войскового и посполитого чину в полку томъ знайдуючимся обывателемъ и каждому, кому бы колевекъ о томъ вѣдати належало, симъ унѣверсаломъ нашимъ озмаймуемъ [sic], ижѣ панѣ Денисѣ Деркачѣ, сотникъ бобновскій просилъ нашего такого респекту, абисмо къ вспартю домовихъ его потребѣ надали ему село Сушку в полку Переяславкомъ в сотнѣ Бубновской знайдуючоеся. Мы прето гетманѣ и кавалерѣ респектуючи на роненные его и теперѣ ронячіеся в Войску Запорожскомъ услути, а и впредѣ до оныхъ заохочуючи, а до того углядаючи и на тоє, что онѣ панѣ сотникъ бубновскій чрезъ певное время неволю швецкую терпѣлъ и тымъ самымъ до крайнего на субстанции своей пришлоъ знищеня, надаемъ ему, пану Денису, сотникови бубновскому преречоное село Сушки в зуполную поссесію зъ всѣми кгрунтами, добрами и угодіями здавна и тепер [sic] туда приналежачими, позволяючи от людей посполитих [sic] належитое послушенство и повинности аз [sic] грунтовъ и добрѣ тамошнихъ [sic] користи всякіє и пожитки отбирати, за чимъ абы панѣ полковникъ переяславскій, теперъ наказный, а впредъ совершенный, старшина полковая, сотники и нихто згола, не важилъся, ему пану Деркачу, в том жадной чинити перешкоды, пишно приказуемъ и грозно варуемъ, войтъ зась тамошній съ посолствомъ, опрочъ самихъ козаковъ [?],⁵ повинны въсей послушенство и повинности ему, п. Деркачу, отдавать [sic].

Данѣ в Бѣлой Церкви, апреля 20, року 1708.

Звишѣменованный гетманѣ и кавалер, рукою власною. (MU: 533)

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

5 This bracketed question mark was introduced by the editor.

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*: cf. 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 рѣцѣ* // 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, приказуем, розмѣрових, бывшихъ, будущим, приходячых*; 1708: *користи, Звишѣменованный, абисмо, домовихъ, посполитих*;
- The reflex C(C)'V < *CъjV: 1687: *вспартя* (genitive singular); 1708: *вспартю* (dative singular), *знищена* (genitive singular), but 1708 with the Church Slavonic reflex: *угодіями*;
- The treatment of *jъzъ and съ: 1687: *з млыновъ, з мужицкого, з ступами, из* [= *із* or *і з*?] *всѣм законником, з старшины и чернѣ, зоставали*; 1708: *зъ всѣми кгрунтами, знищена* (genitive singular), *знайдуючимся, знайдуючоеся, згола, зуполную*;
- The loss of *jъ-: 1687: *мѣти, мененного, з помененных, менованый*; 1708: *Звишѣменованный*;
- 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: *манастыра*, 1708: *теперѣ*, but: 1708: *государя*;
- The spelling "що": 1687: *щоденных*; but 1708: *что*;
- The spelling "од-": 1687: *оддавали* (in this case the Russian pronunciation rules could also have yielded the spelling "д" due to the regressive assimilation of *д-*);
- The spelling "менш-" (not *меньш-*): 1708: *менишимъ*;
- 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 двохъ каменяхъ, о 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 двохъ каменяхъ*).

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 (see SUM XIV–XV and Tym), 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,⁶ and all of them were well known from the Ukrainian Church Slavonic traditions. Still, Church Slavonic does not play a particularly important rule 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 *-ого* in the original documents, not *-аго* (*ихъ царского пресвѣтлого 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:

1687: *колвекъ, вспартя, варуемъ, виелякое, виеляких, ведлугъ, теды, перешкода, преречного, власною* [from Czech]; adverbs in *-е*: *меновите, ненарушне*.

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

Function words often coincide with their Polish equivalents, too: the conjunctions *ижъ, же, жебы*, and the negative pronoun *жадна* 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.

6 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. "чръсь"). 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).

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 листѹ поимя / нованій їтитлахъ написано" (ES: 122) or "список с листа белоруского письма" (see *ML*: 248, 270, etc.), 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."⁷

The following two letters to Muscovite addressees are apparently based on original documents.⁸ The first letter was written by Mazepa to Count Vasilij 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 благовѣрнѣа царевны и великіа княжны Софіи Алексѣевны, всяя Великія и Малія и Бѣлая Россіи самодержцевъ, и многихъ государствъ и земель восточныхъ и западныхъ и сѣверныхъ отчичей и дѣдичей и наслѣдниковъ и государей и облаадаателей ихъ царского пресвѣтлого величества ближнему боярину и Большого полку дворовому воеводѣ, ясневелможному князю Василію Василѣвичу Голицину, царственнѣа большія печати и государственныхъ великихъ и посолскихъ дѣлъ оберегателью, и намѣстнику новгородскому, моему велце ласкавому господину, приятелеви и милостивому благодѣтелю, низкое мое засылаю чолобитье.

Толмача сѣвского Диниса Лихининѣа по указу великихъ государей и великое государини, сполне з толмачомъ отъ мене з Переволочной вынайденымъ до Криму посланого, и в Казикерменѣ через бея казикерманского насилно назад заверненого, и ко мнѣ в Батуринѣ генвара 8 прибылого отпустилемъ я к царствующему великому граду Москвѣ з листом моимъ до их царского пресвѣтлого величества, о насилномъ заверненію их писаномъ, з которого листа все мое донесенье вашей княжой велможности вѣдомо будет. А же тот толмач Денисѣ Лихининѣа з ним и от мене выправованный другий толмач в Кримъ проѣхати не возмогли, и способъ тот о провѣдованнѣи [*sic*] кримьского поведеніа не восприялъ желаемого совершенства; тебѣ развѣ з языковъ, якихъ Господь Богъ подати намъ изволил поведеніе и намѣреніе неприятельское вѣдомо будетъ, о

7 Izmail Sreznevskij, however, does not list the meaning "translation," "translate," etc., s.v. "съписати," "съписъкъ" (Srez). 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.

8 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.

якіє языки я ватагу полевому Іосипу Куликови з великим прилежанієм старатися приказалемъ; и вперед всяко кому годно прикажу. При сем одаюся милостивой вашой княжой велможности благодѣтельской ласце.

З Батурина генвара 10 року 1689.

Вашой княжой велможности зычливый всего добра приятел и низкий слуга

Івань Мазепа гетман Войска ихъ царского [sic] пресвѣтлого величества Запорозкого. (ML: 273–74)

The second letter is dated the very same day and was addressed to the Russian tsars, Ivan and Petr Alekseevič, and Tsarina Sof'ja Alekseevna:

Божією милостію пресвѣтлѣйшимъ и державнѣйшимъ великимъ государемъ царемъ и великимъ княземъ Іоанну Алексѣвичю, Петру Алексѣвичю, и великой государынѣ благовѣрной царевнѣ, и великой княжнѣ Софіи Алексѣевнѣ, всеа Великія и Малыя и Бѣлыя Россіи самодержцемъ, московскимъ, киевскимъ, владимерскимъ, новгородскимъ, царемъ казаньскимъ, царемъ астраханьскимъ, царемъ сибѣрскимъ, государемъ псковскимъ, и великимъ княземъ литовскимъ, смоленьскимъ, тверскимъ, волиньскимъ, подолскимъ, югорскимъ, пермскимъ, вятцкимъ, болгарскимъ и иныхъ, государемъ и великимъ княземъ Новагорода низовскіє земли, чернѣговскимъ, резаньскимъ, полотцкимъ, ростовскимъ, ярославскимъ, белоозерскимъ, удорскимъ, обдорскимъ, коньдйскимъ, витепськимъ, мстиславскимъ и всея сѣверныя страны повелителемъ и государемъ иверскія земли, карталинѣских и крузинѣскихъ царей и кабардинѣское земли, черкаских и горских князей и иныхъ многихъ государствъ и земель восточных, и западных, и сѣверныхъ отчичемъ и дѣдичемъ, и наслѣдникомъ, и государемъ, и облаада телемъ, вашему царскому пресвѣтлому величеству.

Івань Мазепа гетманъ з Войскомъ вашего царского пресвѣтлого величества Запорожскимъ падъ до лица земного пред пресвѣтлымъ вашего царского величества маестатомъ, у стопы ногъ монаршихъ смиренно челомъ бю. По преможному вашомъ царского пресвѣтлого величества указу, яко я первѣ по предложенью ближнего боярина и Болшого полку дворового воеводы ясневелможного его милости князя Василія Василѣевича Голицына, царственныя болшіе печати и государствѣнныхъ великихъ и поселскихъ дѣлъ оберегателя и намѣстника новгородского, по вѣрной моей ку вамъ великимъ государемъ и великой государынѣ службѣ прилѣжное мое прикладаемъ старанье, о высланью в Крымъ такового посылища, который бы о всякомъ тамошнемъ повоженью вывѣдаться могъ: якожь тимъ моимъ прилѣжнымъ стараньемъ и вынашол и высалъ былъ толмача Данила переволочаньского который до такого дѣла былъ способенъ; такъ и потомъ по милостивой вашой царского пресвѣтлого величества грамотѣ з присланнымъ з Сѣвска толмачемъ Денисомъ Лихининымъ, тоежь мое ложилемъ прилѣжное старанье: же оного переволочаньского толмача в одностайную посылку совокупивши выправилемъ былъ обоихъ оныхъ до Сѣчи Запорозкой, якожь власне на Сѣчь а некуда инуда тотъ путь надлежить, и писалемъ до атамана кошового, и до всего Низового Войска, пиано вашимъ царского величества монаршимъ указомъ приказуючи, абы

они з Сѣчи ихъ обоихъ толмачовъ выслали до Казикермена, и жебы от себе писали до бея казикерменьского, чтобъ бей ихъ толмачовъ не задержавши, пропустилъ до Перекопу и внутръ Крыму. Где атаманъ кошовый и Войско Низовое (:любо нѣкоторые тамъ же упорными голосами своими в томъ перешкожали:) ихъ толмачовъ з Сѣчи Запорожкой до Казикермену порядне при провожатыхъ отпустили и до бея казикерменьского о отпускъ оныхъ до Крыму писали. Которыи толмачъ когда прибыли до Казикермену, и дѣла свое о иску и розмѣне и окупу неволниковъ объявили, теде тотъ бей казикерменьский списавшись о томъ з беемъ перекопскимъ, не допустилъ имъ толмачамъ ехати в Крымъ но насилно ихъ завернулъ назадъ до Сѣчи, отколя атаманъ кошовый и Низовое Войско отпустили ихъ в города малоросийскіе и прибыли они толмачъ в Батуринъ генваря 8 числа, где о своемъ поездѣ и о насилномъ з Казикермена поворотѣ такъ словесно сказали, яко вышей тутъ написалося. Я теде 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 казикерменьского на Запорожьѣ 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 найнижайший слуга,

Иванъ Мазепа гетманъ Войска вашего царского пресвѣтлого величества Запорожского. (ML: 271–73)

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 *i* and *u* 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-*), *вельце 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 *кз* in *кзрузиньскихъ*, 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 Vasilij Golycyn is also written in keeping with Ukrainian traditions: *при сем отдаюся милостивой вашей княжой велможности благодѣтелской 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 < *jъzъ* in *з Батурина*, again *генвара* with hardened *r* and the markedly Ukrainian form *року*, 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 пресвѣтлого 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 < *jъzъ* in *з Батурина* and the Ukrainian form *року* (this time *генваря* does not show hardened *r*). Instead of *зычливый* *всего добра приятел и низкий слуга* in the signature of the letter to Golycyn, 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 Golycyn is characterized by numerous markedly Ukrainian features. The following spellings are of interest: *и* instead of *ы* in *государини* and *Кримъ*, *Криму*, *кримьского*, *и* instead of unstressed *e* in *Диниса* (along with *Денись*), *о* after sibilants in *царствующему*, *вашой*, *княжой*, *з толмачомъ*, hardened *r* in *генвара*, *з (< *jъzъ)* in *з языковъ* and *з которого листа* as well as *з (< съ)* in front of vowels, voiceless consonants, or sonorants, as in *з Переволочной (съ + genitive case)*, *з великим прилежаніемъ*, *з листом*, *з ним*. 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 бѣя казикерманского насилно назад заверненого*.⁹

Several lexical elements, some of which are genuinely Polish, confirm the Ukrainian character of the letter to Golycyn, such as the form of address *велможности* (dative singular) and the lexemes *сполне* (note the adverbial *-e*), *вынайденымъ*, *выправованный*, *листъ* (*ъ*) (*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 *теды*.

9 This construction was adopted into Russian at that time; see Moser 1998: 245–60

The letter to Golycyn 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 великих государей и великое государини* with Russian *указъ* (the word is not attested in SUM XIV–XV or Tym) 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 *-ia* in *поведенiа*, also according to the rules of the Second South Slavic Influence; the form *изволилъ* with the Church Slavonic prefix *из-* (which probably cannot be interpreted as *з* with a prothetic *i-* here; cf. Polish *zwolić*); the present passive participle *желаемого* (ending in *-ого*, not *-аго*, though); the form *развѣ* with Church Slavonic *раз-* instead of the North Slavic (including East Slavic) *роз-*; and, finally, the spelling forms with the Church Slavonic *i* from the *CьjV- group in *поведенiе, намѣренiе and прилежанiемъ*. At the same time, no markedly Russian elements, such as the spelling *ево* instead of *его*, the adjectival ending *-ой* in the nominative masculine singular, etc., occur in documents like these.

The narrative part of the letter to Ivan and Petr Alekseevič and to Tsarina Sof'ja 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 [tym] than [tim] < тѣмъ); *е* for unstressed *и* in *некуда*; *ѣ* for *i* 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*;¹⁰ *о* after sibilants, as in *вашомъ, вашой, кошовый, кошового, толмачовѣ, повнѣйшого и обширнѣйшого, вынашол* (although *о* was often written phonetically in this last position in Middle Russian, too), *з < *jъзъ* in *з Сѣвска, з Сѣчи* (several times), *з Казикермена*, as well as *з* for *сѣ* in front of voiceless vowels and sonorants, as in *з присланнымъ [...] толмачемъ, з симъ листомъ, з ними*; finally, hardened *r* in *внутрь*, but retained soft *r'* in *генваря*. Even *в* for etymological *l* occurs in the spelling of *повнѣйшого*. East Slavic continuants of the *CьjV- group are reflected in the spellings *старанье, Запорожье, донесенья* (genitive singular), *по предложенью, о высланью, о [...] повоженью, стараньемъ*; the typically Ukrainian spelling is encountered in *з Запорожя*, while the Church Slavonic reflex *i* occurs exclusively in the Russian name *Василія Василіевича*. The word *зде* is written with *-е*, not *-ѣ*. The following morphological features are noteworthy: the locative ending *-и* of the soft neuter stem in *о высланью and о... повоженью* (some hard-stem masculine nouns show the locative singular ending *-и*; cf. *о иску* with a velar consonant and *о...окупу* in the same syntagm);¹¹ the short adjectival form *способенъ* in the predicate (which was in general already quite rarely used in Late Middle Ukrainian texts); the comparative form *вышей* (but not *выше*; see Morfolohija 1978: 377; cf. Polish *wyżej*); the forms of the personal pronouns

10 This spelling is typical of North Ukrainian; see Ševel'ov 1979: 432.

11 As for the locative of hard-stem masculine nouns, see Morfolohija 1978: 98–101.

мене and себе; the long neuter form of the pronoun *мое(жь)* and its instrumental form *тимъ* [tym]; the personal form in past tense verbs, as in *прикладалемъ*, *ложилемъ*, *выправи́лемъ былъ*, *писалемъ*, etc.; and the remote past tense form, as in *вынашол и выслалъ былъ* and *выправи́лемъ былъ*. Two prepositional constructions are noteworthy at the syntactic level: the frequent non-limitative *до* + genitive, as encountered in *до такого дѣла былъ способенъ*, *писалемъ до атамана кошового* and *выправи́лемъ былъ обоихъ оныхъ до Сѣчи Запорозкой, и до всего Низового Войска*, as well as *о* + accusative case with the meaning of topic, as in *до бея казикаерменъского о отпускъ оныхъ до Крыму писали*.

A number of lexemes are characteristic of the Ukrainian (and often Polish) traditions, such as: *премно́мъ* (locative singular masculine); the title *ясневелможного его милости* (genitive singular) and the epithet *милостивой* (genitive singular feminine); and *о...повоженъю, вывѣдаться, вынашол, способенъ* (cf. the remark for *способъ* above), *одностайную, выправи́лемъ, пи́лно, перешкожали, неволниковъ, листь, обширнѣйшого, донесенья*. Markedly Polish forms are *поселскихъ* (дѣлъ) (genitive plural, along with *посылицика, посылку*, cf. *посолскихъ дѣлъ* in the letter to Vasilij Golicyn), *теды*, and *ку*. Along with the genuinely Czech Polonism *власне, порядне* is encountered as another adverb ending in *-е*. The conjunction *яко(жь)* 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 to 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 *чтобъ*, which was encountered in Ukrainian as well as in Russian. Finally, the noun *искъ* as in *о иску* might be a loan from Russian (there is no entry for *искъ* or even *поискъ* in SSUM or Тум).

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 *царствѣнные бо́лшие печати* from Vasilij Golicyn's title with the Slavonicizing adjectival ending *-ые* (but not *-ыя*) and *в приказ Малыя Россіи*, with the Church Slavonic ending *-ыя*, 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 *посылицика* (genitive singular) is likely another genuinely Russian form. Finally, not only the lexeme *указъ* (ь) but also the prepositional phrase *по премно́мъ вашомъ царского пресвѣтлого величества указу* are probably based on the model of Russian.¹²

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.

12 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 предложенъю князя Васи́лѣя Васи́лѣвича Голицы́на* is less problematic; cf. Polish *po przedłożeniu* with an unambiguous form of the locative case.

Later letters to Muscovite addressees

As evidenced, e.g., by Tat'jana Tairova-Jakovleva's original-based edition of Ivan Mazepa's letters to Aleksandr Men'sikov from the years 1704 and 1705, the language of the letters to Muscovite addressees remained basically the same (Getman 2007). 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, from 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.¹³ This confirms, first and foremost, that Mazepa's letters to the tsars were still written in a language that was alien to Muscovites and 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 Levyckyj, 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 hetmanacy:

Пресвѣтлѣйшій Державнѣйшій / Великій Государь.

Неточію веселыми устами, но й сердцемъ идущею / радостно цѣлую богомъ украшенный, восвоися воз/вратившийся, ваши Ц. Пр. В. монаршіи стопы, / которій ради предидущей славы и помножения / всему православному россійскому 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 божією, добре здравствовали // и благополучное вовесть преславного ибгохрани/мого своего царствія имѣли правленіе.

Покорственно осемь вамъ В. Г. доношу, же по/милостивомъ вашемъ Ц. Пр. В. указу, посылаѣ / янарочно человека [*sic*] своего въ Мулянтскую и / Волоскую землю, для досмотрѣнія при берегу Чор/ного моря приличныхъ пристанищъ и сладкихъ водъ, / который чрезъ немалое бытія своего время, добре / положенія краевъ тамошнихъ досмот/рѣвшись, возвратился назадъ, и отповѣдалъ / мнѣ, гдѣ есть отъ гирла Дунайского, до устя рѣки / Днѣстра, а отъ того устя 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,

13 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 *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.

гдаѣ обрѣтаются выгоднии / станы иночлеги. Которого челоуѣка любо на/
лежало мнѣ послати въ царствующій градъ / Москву однако тую оноу
посылку отложишемъ // радитого же владитель Мулянский по моему /
предложенію тамошнихъ странъ искусного [*sic*, for искусного?—ММ] и во
всемъ / того морского состоянія вѣдомого квамъ В. Г.: / выправилъ челоуѣка,
который отихъ всѣхъ до извѣстія надобныхъ вещей достаточные вамъ / В.
Г. донести можетъ. А якии тотъ мой по/сылный челоуѣкъ принесъ мнѣ от
владѣтеля мул/тянского письма, тыи я тутже посылаю / квамъ В. Г. его же
премилосердно монаршой / благостынѣ всепокорно мя вручаю.

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

зъ Батурина септемврій. (ES: 147–48)

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), *блазопривѣт/ствую*, *здравствовали*, *богохрани/мого* (but still not *-аго*), *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 *человика* and *владитель* 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 *положения* and *устя* (2х) have already been encountered in the above-cited documents.¹⁴ 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*), *выгоднии*, *належало*;¹⁵ the twice-occurring adverb *добре* (ending in *-е*); the locative ending *-и* after the velar consonant in *брезу* (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 *отложишемъ* 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 гѣдру влиств гетман ікавалера / івана степановича мазепы / ...написано," ES, 149) might even confirm these doubts. It should be noted, however, that the language

14 The spellings *влейи* and *искусного* are, however, likely to be mere typographical errors.

15 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 Sreznevskij, *Materialy*, but both words are included in Witkowski 2006.

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 Serhij 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.), Vasilij Dolgorukij (4 February 1707), or Aleksandr Men'sikov (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 1708 (DM: 237). Some of the letters to Peter, particularly those dealing with the affair of Vasyl' Kočubej 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 *поверз* (as a past active participle), *ущедраеши*, *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 праведеном мѣрилѣ высокодержавною своею десницею содершишъ, Ваше Царское Величество, милость [*sic*] и суд, когда правдою себѣ служащих и вѣрно работающих милуеши и ущедряеши, неправеднѣ же напастующих и клеветующих лжу судиши и отмщаеши [...] Нетребѣ мнѣ заѣ, ко утвержденію 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 смертнѣю кончину [...]. (DM: 243)

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*).¹⁶ The later hetman, who in this function was responsible for the hetman's internal and external correspondence as

16 Between 1687 and 1699 Vasyl' Kočubej had been one of his best-known predecessors, while under his own hetmancy Semen Savyč was to become one of his most famous successors.

well as for the universals,¹⁷ 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 Javors'kyj of 1 (12) June 1721 (Orlyk 1862: 1–28), 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—that 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.

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

17 Based on Pylyp Orlyk's diary, Tairova-Jakovleva describes how Orlyk wrote one of Mazepa's letters (Tairova-Jakovleva 2007: 195): "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 Pechersk 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.)

Russian evolved and spread throughout the elites of the empire, including those of Ukraine. Generations later, however, when late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century awakers 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.

HOW IT ALL BEGAN: UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN “SURZHYK” IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SOURCES FROM THE HETMANATE

1. Approaches to “Surzhyk”

In his quite detailed and convincing entry on “Surzhyk” for the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of the Ukrainian Language*, Oleksandr Taranenko (2004: s.v. *suržyk*) defines “Surzhyk” as

a colloquial name for the non-normative individual speech of a certain person or the sociolect of a certain group that is based on the mixture and *interference* of two or more languages,...yet ‘Surzhyk’ is most frequently interpreted as a certain structural and functional component of Ukrainian *prostoriččja* with a considerable admixture of *Russianisms*, which became the colloquial language and, as a matter of fact, the dominant means of communication for the majority of the Ukrainian-speaking population of the country owing to the enduring Ukrainian-Russian language contact and *bilingualism* in its asymmetric (diglossic) form.

The eighteenth century is regarded as the first period during which the foundations for the development of “Surzhyk” were laid, and Taranenko emphasizes that these first manifestations of more intense language contacts occurred primarily among representatives of the administration, with the Orthodox Church, schools, and the army also playing a considerable role in the process. In his article, Taranenko also differentiates between several varieties of “Surzhyk” according to its relation to the Ukrainian or the Russian standard language, respectively:

- 1) “Surzhyk” as a language used quite spontaneously by speakers without a satisfactory knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian;
- 2) “Surzhyk” as a language used quite consciously by individuals who generally know standard Russian and Ukrainian but lack the ability to make active use of those languages, particularly Ukrainian, in concrete communicative situations (in their “pure” form);
- 3) “Surzhyk” as a result of insufficient knowledge of one of the two languages (Taranenko 2004).

At any rate, according to this model, “Surzhyk” is characterized as a language that is used by default, as a language that comes into play only when another language—a standard language such as Ukrainian or Russian, in our case—is not mastered perfectly. Oleksandr Taranenko’s article demonstrates how significantly linguists’ attitudes toward “Surzhyk” have changed in recent years, especially if one compares it with the entry on “Surzhyk” in the first edition of the *Encyclopedia of the Ukrainian Language*. That contribution consisted of only about twenty short lines, in which “Surzhyk” was roughly defined—and judged—as

...a language in which elements of different languages are artificially combined without adherence to literary norms. [The expression is] used mainly with reference to Ukrainian *prostoriččja*, which is needlessly adulterated with borrowed Russian elements (as a result of Ukrainian-Russian interference)...

This is an impoverished language, lacking national color, beauty, and expressivity (Lenec' 2000).

In the period between Lenec's and Taranenko's definitions, Michael Flier presented his study on "Surzhyk: The Rules of Engagement," which was based on materials from Oleksandra Serbens'ka's well-known publication "Anti-suržyk" and some belletristic materials. This study fostered a significantly better understanding of and a less biased attitude toward "Surzhyk." Certainly, one may "like" the Russo-Ukrainian variant of "Surzhyk" or not, but obviously "Surzhyk" as such is not merely a "bad" linguistic phenomenon to be condemned and combated by linguists. Actually, as Flier (2000: 129) points out, "the essence of 'Surzhyk' is neither arbitrary nor artificial." A merely puristic approach to "Surzhyk" prevents us from reaching a true understanding of this linguistic phenomenon and, in the long run, of the actual linguistic situation in Ukraine today.

On the other hand, one might argue that the purists' attitude is not necessarily based merely on false assumptions. Speakers of "Surzhyk" without a sufficient command of the standard languages are nowadays—as the Ukrainian standard language gains ground again, while still competing with Russian (in its Ukrainian variety)—very likely to be exposed to various forms of linguistic discrimination because speakers of both Ukrainian and Russian look down on "Surzhyk" if they recognize it as such. Moreover, most "Surzhyk" speakers themselves realize that their language lacks prestige and that their linguistic behavior appears to be problematic outside their particular "Surzhyk" speech community. The Ukrainian purists' efforts to work out possible ways of replacing "Surzhyk" with Modern Standard Ukrainian can therefore also be understood as advice on a long-term strategy for moving out of spheres of low linguistic and, consequently, social prestige in order to acquire a more useful and more powerful linguistic tool. Moreover, those speakers who come to realize that their frequently rebuffed language must be exchanged for a "cultivated" one and that "Surzhyk" is inappropriate for them in many social contexts are precisely the ones who constitute an ideal target audience for those actively involved in Ukrainian language planning and language management. Those linguists who suppose that "Surzhyk" can also be characterized as a historically conditioned result of a certain language policy that has led to the suppression of the development and spread of the Ukrainian standard language might now, under the new political circumstances, feel the need to promote the Ukrainian standard language. Many of those linguists know from their own experience that in the past, loyalty to the Ukrainian standard language could often be maintained only at a high price, whereas nowadays the tables may be turned. They also realize that "Surzhyk" still testifies to a certain degree of either Ukrainian language loyalty on the part of those speakers whose ancestors once departed from Ukrainian or, alternatively, of a certain interest in mastering the Ukrainian language on the part of those speakers whose ancestors once departed from Russian. Still, "Surzhyk" is not Russian, no matter how heavily it might be Russianized or even based on Russian, so that "Surzhyk" speakers may be able to acquire standard Ukrainian with less effort than, for example, those who are exclusively Russophone. From the

Ukrainian perspective, this would definitely be a positive development, whether or not speakers of "Surzhyk" speakers continue to use it in situations that they deem appropriate (with family members, friends, and so on).

At present, it is virtually impossible to predict the future of "Surzhyk" or, as I would rather express it, of the whole broad spectrum of Ukrainian-Russian "code mixing" and "code switching" (Auer 1999) that is labeled "Surzhyk," although some assumptions might seem to be more realistic than others. As for contemporary "Surzhyk," we can be quite certain that Ukrainianists are beginning to attain a far better understanding of its structure(s) and functions than ever before because they have begun collecting original data. On the other hand, an aspect of "Surzhyk" that has remained almost a matter of mere speculation is the question of its rise and dissemination during the early decades of the Ukrainian-Russian encounter.

2. "Surzhyk" in the eighteenth century?

It is probably quite reasonable to assume that the Russo-Ukrainian encounter as such has always yielded a range of individual varieties of "Surzhyk" over time whenever speakers of Russian and speakers of Ukrainian have tried to find a common language, whatever the reason may have been in any particular case. Needless to say, the sphere of oral communication will always remain a matter of speculation as regards past centuries, and the eighteenth century in particular. Certain written sources of that period do, however, offer at least certain possibilities of reconstructing some aspects of oral communication.

We know, of course, that many contemporary linguists regard "Surzhyk" as merely a matter of oral communication. Other linguists disagree, however, and tend to regard any variety of Ukrainian-Russian code-mixing as "Surzhyk," whether oral or written, regardless of the degree of mixing. Moreover, one could argue that "Surzhyk" need not necessarily be defined against the background of well-established standard languages or only with reference to a situation in which both the Ukrainian and the Russian standard languages are fully established. During the period that will be discussed here, there was no Ukrainian standard language, although spoken and written varieties of Ukrainian had existed for centuries. The Russian standard language was just being elaborated, and it had not yet been disseminated among the population of the Russian Empire, not even among ethnic Russians. The Russian language as such, however, is as old as Ukrainian.

As was correctly pointed out by Taranenko (2004), "Surzhyk" is rather a "colloquial name" than a well-defined linguistic term. Consequently, I take it as fundamental that not only a number of linguists but also most ordinary speakers of Ukrainian (and of Russian) are basically inclined to label any sort of Ukrainian-Russian code-mixing as "Surzhyk." If a "glottonym" is "colloquial" by origin, and if its colloquial meaning is widespread in the speech community, then the "colloquial meaning" of the "colloquial term" should be taken seriously. Accordingly, if certain varieties of Ukrainian with a certain admixture of Russian elements, as encountered, for instance, in some contemporary newspapers, are considered "Surzhyk" by ordinary speakers of Ukrainian, then the label would appear to be perfectly justified. To be sure, I do not disagree with those linguists who believe that the "colloquial

name" "Surzhyk" covers a fairly wide range of Ukrainian-Russian varieties and that these varieties should be differentiated from the linguistic point of view. Yet, if some of these linguists argue that "true Surzhyk" 1) belongs exclusively to the sphere of oral communication, and 2) can be regarded as "true Surzhyk" only if certain additional criteria are met, such as a certain degree of mixing extending to certain linguistic levels and the existence of well-established standard languages, then one should be aware of all the dangers that could arise from such an attempt to redefine a "colloquial name" rather arbitrarily. Thus, the label "Surzhyk" should either be used in its traditional meaning or dismissed¹ and replaced with more appropriate terms in the scholarly context. One of the necessary consequences would be the introduction of several terms for "Surzhyk" according to its different meanings, but their general meaning would remain "a mixture of Ukrainian and Russian," according to the popular meaning of the popular term.²

Thus, once we accept that any kind of Ukrainian-Russian code mixing can ultimately be labeled "Surzhyk," we can argue that a certain kind of Russo-Ukrainian "Surzhyk" is already to be found, for instance, in translations prepared in Muscovy from various languages—very often, from Polish—by Eastern Slavs from Ukraine, beginning at least in the second half of the sixteenth century (cf. Moser 1998 and the literature cited there), regardless of the fact that neither the Ukrainian nor the Russian standard language had yet been created at that time. The mixing of Russian and Ukrainian elements (as well as Church Slavonic and Polish elements, respectively) in such texts occurs at all linguistic levels, including syntax (*ibid.*).

With regard to our focus, the situation in the Ukrainian-speaking area is of greater interest. The Ukrainians' need to find a common language with the Russians increased as ties with the Russian administration grew closer in the years after 1654, and even more after 1667. When the Russian impact proved enduring in certain territories of Left-Bank Ukraine—a process that began generally in the course of the eighteenth century, when the Russian standard language as such was being formed and slowly gaining ground, whereas the traditions of Ukrainian as a written language significantly declined—some elements of "Surzhyk" may already have taken on a significantly more stable aspect than those merely individual varieties that had occasionally been developed in earlier times.

Whenever Ukrainianists thought about examples of earlier stages of "Surzhyk," they were very likely to recall Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's character Voznyj in *Natalka Poltavka* (cf. Masenko 2004: 105, among many others), whose speech behavior essentially reminds us in many respects of that of contemporary "Surzhyk" speakers (the quotation is rendered in modernized Ukrainian orthography according to its source; the spelling is therefore extremely unreliable!). As an example of Voznyj's language, one might quote the following words:

1 Elsewhere, I have put forward several arguments for dismissing the "pseudo-term" "Jazyčije" (Moser 2011: 641–666).

2 Many of my arguments are a reaction to the lively discussions during the International Symposium on "Trasyanka and Surzhyk. Products of Byelorussian-Russian and Ukrainian-Russian Language Contact" organized by Gerd Hentschel at the University of Oldenburg on 15–18 June 2007.

Бачив я многих – і ліпообразних, і багатих, но серце моє не мають – теє
то як його – к ним поползновения. Ти одна заложила ему позов на вічні
роки, і душа моя єжечасно волаєть тебе і послі нишопной даже години
(Kotljarevs'kyj 1982: 220).

To be sure, Voznyj's language is above all a result of literary stylization, no matter how realistically it might reflect the language of certain strata in early nineteenth-century Ukraine. Moreover, this stylization dates from a time when the influence of Russian in some Ukrainian-speaking areas had already become rather intense, at least among those in steady contact with Russian, such as representatives of the administration or of the army.

Trying to look back a bit further, it may be appropriate to remind the reader that our knowledge of eighteenth-century Ukrainian language history admittedly remains rather limited, despite Vitalij Peredrijenko's (1979) important study. In his book, Peredrijenko focused on elements of the vernacular in various texts but paid only scant attention to other topics important for this period, such as the Russian impact on Ukrainian. Moreover, in a classic volume devoted to *Kul'tura russkoj reči na Ukraïne* (Ižakevyč 1976), the eighteenth century is not discussed at all. In striving to come to grips with the crucial question of Ukrainian-Russian language contacts in the eighteenth century, one might recall that we have at our disposal a particularly interesting corpus of eighteenth-century chancery documents from such areas as the Hetmanate (Moser 1998a).³ In this realm, Ukrainian had been established as the lingua franca of the Cossack polity in the previous decades and had developed all the qualities of a full-fledged chancery language.

It was mainly during the seventeenth century that Late Middle Ukrainian became considerably emancipated from Polish influence in the Cossack polity. A look further back into the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, however, provides evidence that Ukrainian-Russian "Surzhyk" is definitely not the first or the only mixed code in the history of the Ukrainian language. Other language contacts, such as those resulting from the equally intense Ukrainian-Polish encounter, had certainly also yielded various "Surzhyks" in the course of time—suffice it to mention the so-called "prosta mova" (Moser 2011: 75–131). During the eighteenth century, it was Russian that increasingly penetrated certain communicative spheres previously dominated by the Ukrainian (or "Ruthenian") language of the time. Speakers of Ukrainian varieties loosened their ties with Polish in the Russian Empire and established new ones with Russian. One of the results of this Ukrainian-Russian contact was the rise of new Ukrainian-Russian mixed codes. Initially, these mixed codes were most probably limited to social strata exposed to more or less intense contacts with Russia and the Russian language, as partly reflected in the sources. But as the Ukrainian elite began to adopt more and more elements of Russian, Ukrainian commoners were most likely to follow them, to

3 In another study, I discussed a different corpus, namely private letters written by eighteenth-century Cossack wives. The discussion followed lines similar to those of the present article and yielded similar results (cf. Moser 2009).

some extent at least, after a certain time. A number of abstract terms that they heard from the elite would become part of their vocabulary, and whoever came into contact with the elite would try to accommodate to their language at least to a certain degree, according to the complex rules of “politeness” (which did not permit one to address a notable person in the same language as one would use to address a peer). Because of the growing prestige of the newly formed Russian language, Russian spread in the environment of the Cossack elites and in the towns, where Ukrainians soon constituted only a minority of the population. Subsequently, a range of Russian elements could spread from town to countryside, thanks largely to those peasants who regularly spent time in the towns, where they sold their products at market and engaged in other business. The eighteenth century laid the foundations for these processes.

3. Charters from the Hetmanate as sources of eighteenth-century Ukrainian-Russian “Surzhyk”

After the Battle of Poltava, it was only a matter of time until the administration of the Hetmanate began to be Russified. An important first step was the establishment of the first “Malorossijskaja kollehija” in 1722, which was led by Russian officers until it was closed in 1727. Thereafter, the process of Russification intensified until the liquidation of the Hetmanate in 1764 and in subsequent years, when the second “Malorossijskaja kollehija” was created (it was closed in 1786) (Ohloblyn 1962/1996). Moreover, from the end of its second decade, the eighteenth century witnessed other events that increasingly deprived the Ukrainians of their cultural traditions. The Chernihiv printshop was closed in 1721, and only the printing of canonical church books was permitted at other printshops. At the same time, a range of ukases issued by Peter I and the Holy Synod banned the use of Ukrainian Church Slavonic in favor of Russian Church Slavonic (Jefremov 1924: 268–274;⁴ Ohienko 1995: 119–127; cf. also Moser 1998a: 379–387).

It has already been pointed out by various scholars, such as Larysa Masenko (2004: 105), that a number of eighteenth-century manuscripts from Left-Bank Ukraine can be regarded, in a way, as “Surzhyk” documents. It seems, however, that the language of these texts has not been thoroughly studied until now. In 1998, I analyzed a corpus of several dozen eighteenth-century chancery documents (DM 1976, DD 1993) and concluded that up to 1722 the Ukrainian chancery language was still in use, and Russian loans occurred only rarely, if at all. Between the establishment of the first “Malorossijskaja kollehija” and the creation of its successor institution in 1764, the chancery language of Left-Bank Ukraine was gradually Russianized, so that by the 1740s the language of many chancery documents was already quite close to Russian. After 1764, hardly any documents deviated significantly from Russian, except for some orthographic peculiarities (Moser 1998a).

4 Cf. Peter’s famous ukase of 1720 (quoted from Jefremov 1924: 268): “вновь книгъ никакихъ, кромѣ церковныхъ прежнихъ изданій, не печатать; а и оныя церковныя старыя книги съ такими же церковными книгами справлявать, прежде печати, съ тѣми же великороссійскими печатъми, дабы никакой розни и особаго нарѣчія въ нихъ не было.”

In the course of a gradual process that started in 1722, the emerging Russian literary language, which was based on Church Slavonic to an extremely high degree, had obviously become the target language of the scribes in Left-Bank Ukraine. This shift was also supported by a specific policy concerning the leading chancellors of the Hetmanate. The general chancellors often studied at the Kyivan Academy, where Church Slavonic and then the emerging Russian literary language were taught, before taking up their posts in the Hetmanate (Panašenko 1993: 7; see also pp. 135–136 in this volume). Still, it should be added that virtually no document written by a Ukrainian scribe in Left-Bank Ukraine during this period is written in a language that could be identified as “pure Russian.” Moreover, one should not forget that the newly emerging Russian literary language was itself, to a considerable degree, a mixed language, or, in other words, a kind of “Surzhyk.” In this respect, not only does Church Slavonic come into play, but also many other languages that had a strong impact on Russian in the eighteenth century or that had influenced Russian and Russian Church Slavonic primarily in the second half of the seventeenth century and the first two decades of the eighteenth—languages such as Polish and Ruthenian, that is, Belarusian and—Ukrainian! As a consequence, analyzing eighteenth-century “Surzhyk” in Ukraine turns out to be a rather complicated task.

As for Ukrainian-Russian “Surzhyk” in Ukraine in particular, it would appear that the most interesting chancery documents date from the period between 1722 and 1764, when the Ukrainian-born scribes of the Hetmanate chanceries gradually tried to master the new Russian literary language (as did their Russian counterparts) while simultaneously contributing to its formation. This was also the period in which they increasingly Russianized their texts, while still adhering to some of the older Ukrainian linguistic traditions.

The following observations are based on the assumption that most of the texts from the following corpus reflect the scribes’ incomplete command of Russian and that the outcome is some kind of “Surzhyk,” which in all likelihood triggered the rise of certain oral varieties of “Surzhyk” in the Hetmanate because of its status as a prestigious language of the Ukrainian elite.

During the initial phase, the scribes of the Hetmanate added some Russian elements to their Ukrainian texts, thereby signaling the authority of Russian tsarist state power through the adoption of certain elements of that language. The linguistic foundation of the texts, however, was still Ukrainian, especially in those parts of the documents that could not be enriched by too many chancery formulas, which many scribes had already acquired by that time, that is, in the narrative passages of the texts. Obviously, these scribes, who did not know Russian equally well, tried to enrich their texts with Russian elements to varying degrees. But from the 1720s onward, the situation began to change significantly. Thereafter, many chancery documents were written in Russian, although they still contained many Ukrainian features. The scribes found it both attractive and necessary to learn Russian, but it was still virtually impossible for them to adopt Russian and master it perfectly,

given the poor schooling in the Russian Empire at the time. Most likely, it would be reasonable to assume that the language of these scribes reflects that of their linguistic milieu to a considerable degree. These scribes were professionals: when they wrote their chancery documents, they certainly did not choose a linguistic code according to their own taste alone. Their language was more or less the one in which they were expected to write, the language whereby the authorities of the Hetmanate officially emphasized their status. The more this language differed from the commoners' Ukrainian, the better it might seem to be, all the more so under the specific historic and societal circumstances of the eighteenth century. This language was obviously not that of the Ukrainian peasants, nor was it the language used by the Russian peasants. It was a rather highbrow language, the emerging official language of the Russian Empire and its elites—a language with its own legacy, its own rules, and its own structure. The Cossacks of the Hetmanate wished to be part of this new imperial Russian elite culture, while their senior representatives strove to be recognized as noblemen and wanted to share the new state language with the other elites of the Russian Empire. In the end, however, these people always maintained their Ukrainian—or, as contemporaries put it, “Little Russian”—local peculiarities, both consciously and unconsciously. Precisely the same appears to hold true for their language as well.

In the following, the language of three Hetmanate charters dating from 1726, 1746, and 1760 will be discussed in detail. In our conclusions, we summarize these materials in a table.

3.1 A report from 1726

The first charter that we will look at was written by a certain Petro Janovs'kyj in an unknown place in the Hetmanate in 1726:

Сияте(л)ному графу Петру Петровичу То(л)стому <,> ве(л)мо(ж)но(му) его мѣсти

Донося(т) житель тиницкіе козаки со(т)ни Ба(х)мацко(й) [...] о обида(х) свои(х), чинячихся ш(т) Гарасима чигири(н)ця старости Кочубейского того жь села Тиниць, а в че(м) ихъ доношеніе, тому слѣдую(т) пункты:

1. Сего 726 году априля 13 дня занял оной староста статокъ нашъ обивате(л)скій на жита(х) и де(р)жалъ в запе(р)тѣ в дворѣ то(м), где живеть.

2. И когда хто з козаковъ пришолъ проси(т) своей ста(т)чини просити <,> то онъ вкидалъ козаковъ в кухню мѣсто ту(р)ми и мнѣ накидалъ козаковъ <,> а по(д)кома(н)дни(х) его не було з на(ми) бо свои(м) статокъ ворочалъ.

3. Да того жь дня оной староста упившиися <,> поеди(н)це(м) хотѣлъ би(т) виводи(т) <,> и ти(л)ко вивели Па(р)хома Павле(н)ка, и покладалъ бити киями <,> да писаръ соте(н)ний на то(т) часть находи(в)ся, и договаровалъ к старостѣ, что не изволь битъ козаковъ, буди ихъ вина е(ст) <,> нехай атаманъ вибеть, и онъ писара бранилъ и вдаривъ в сѣнця(х) палицею <,>. На тое писаръ видя его пьяно(г)[о], випустилъ з(ъ) кухнѣ всѣхъ насъ не бити(х) <,> а ему говорили ми всѣ: „Де(р)жи худобу нашу, а насъ не бий.“ И пошли безъ сору з двору о(д) его. А онъ тогди жь порвалъ писара за волосы <,> и киемъ затылъ кидкома.

4. Того ж дня пото(м) приказаль староста дворови(м) свои(м) поимати Кліма Савче(н)ка <,> и, приведши в дво(р), бивъ дово(л)но киями и вкинувъ в ту(р)му.

[...] По се(м) доношении прося(т) вашего сияте(л)ства учини(т) рѣшеніе.

Мѣсто атамана и козаковъ тиницкихъ по прошенію и(х) я, Петро Яновскій, писарь соте(н)ни(и) ба(х)мацки(й), руку приложи(л) (DD 1993: 70).

Petro Janovs'kyj uses several Russian expressions at the beginning (*Сияте(л)ному графу Петру Петровичу То(л)стому <,> ве(л)мо(ж)но(му) его мѣсти*) and at the end (*По се(м) доношении прося(т) вашего сияте(л)ства учини(т) рѣшеніе*). The subscription *Мѣсто атамана и козаковъ тиницкихъ по прошенію и(х) я, Петро Яновскій, писарь соте(н)ни(и) ба(х)мацки(й), руку приложи(л)* includes the construction *по прошенію и(х)*, which might be of Russian or, just as likely, of Polish origin (cf. Polish *po proszeniu*), but also contains Ukrainian orthographic interferemes such as the reflection of the hardened *r* < -r' in *писарь* or the use of *и* instead of *ы* in *соте(н)ни(и)*; moreover, in Russian, *писец(ъ)* rather than *писарь(-ь)* would have been used. The letter *ы* is not attested at all in this document—other texts testify to the fact that this orthography without *ы* or with its extremely limited use is quite typical of many Hetmanate documents of this period, cf. a report from Kozelets dating from 1748 (DD 1993: 77). In *мѣсто* one might note the missing prefix *в-*—the preposition *место* and *місто*, respectively, with the reflex *м-* < *м-*, is quite commonly used in both Russian and Ukrainian dialects, yet in the Middle Ukrainian context the legitimization of its use by the Polish standard form *miasto* 'instead of' is probably of greater relevance.⁵

The document itself is labelled *доношение*, which is a Russian word (although it exhibits the derivational suffix *-ние*, which is not typical of vernacular Russian and, furthermore, renders the suffix in its genuinely Church Slavonic form, with *i* as a reflex of the "tense jer").

The scribe continues: *Донося(т) жителѣ тиницкіе козаки со(т)ни Ба(х)мацко(й) [...] о обида(х) свои(х), чинячихся ш(т) Гарасима чигири(н)ця старости Кочубейского того жъ села Тиницѣ, а в че(м) ихъ доношеніе, тому слѣдую(т) пункты*. Here, the Russian influence is particularly apparent in the verb *донося(т)* and again in its derivation *доношеніе*, and further in the noun *обида(х)* (loc. pl.), in the pronoun *того жъ* (gen. sg. masc.), and in the verb *слѣдую(т)*. As in the spelling *в че(м)* instead of *в чо(м)* (cf. also *вашего сияте(л)ства* from the Russian formula above), which would have been common in earlier Ukrainian chancery documents, those elements that correspond to Church Slavonic should most likely be treated as loans from the new Russian literary language rather than mere Slavonic elements. Still, Ukrainian orthographic interferemes testify not only to differences from Russian orthography, as in *жителѣ* or *пункти*, but also to crucial differences from Russian pronunciation, which were certainly still vital. This applies in particular to the spelling of *чигири(н)ця*,

5 All less frequently used Polish words have been checked in SJP.

which testifies to the softness of *c'*, and to the genitive singular form *Тиницѣ*, where *ѣ* renders [i] and reflects the palatalized character of the preceding [*c'*], whereas the emerging standard Russian language, and most dialects of Russian, required hard [c] and *ы*.

At the beginning of his "narratio," the scribe continues: *Сего 726 году априля 13 дня занялъ оной староста статокъ нашъ обивате(л)скій на жита(х) и де(р)жалъ в запе(р)тѣ в дворѣ то(м), где живетъ*, where the pronoun ending *-ой* in *оной* (as opposed to *обивате(л)скій*) clearly demonstrates the degree to which the scribe tried to compose his text in Russian⁶ whenever he felt safe in doing so, although the word *статокъ*, on the other hand, is encountered in Russian only on the western periphery (Dal' 1880–1882/1978: s.v. *става́тъ*) and is likely to be a Ukrainianism here. Furthermore, the scribe selects the hard ending *-тъ* in *живетъ* and the other corresponding word forms in the document, which again underlines his willingness to adopt Russian forms. For the same reason, Janovs'kyj introduces his second numbered paragraph with the Russian conjunction *И когда* [...] (cf. his parallel use of *тогда*, not *тогда*), not with *И кгда*, *И коли* or other conjunctions that were usually chosen in previous Middle Ukrainian documents. The spelling *хто* is not only typical of Ukrainian but also appears in older Russian chancery texts because many Russian dialects have also dissimilated *кѣ* > *хѣ*. The spelling *з* of the preposition (< **ъзъ*), on the other hand, can be regarded as a Ukrainian element. In *пришолъ проси(т) своей ста(т)чини просити*, one of the mistakenly doubled infinitive forms with the unshortened ending *-ти* seems at first glance to be written in contravention of the rules of Russian, but it should be kept in mind that in the eighteenth century some Russian writers still used *-ти* when they wanted to signal high style, which was always associated with Church Slavonic to a considerable degree, while on the other hand shortened *-тъ* is also typical of many Left-Bank dialects of Ukrainian. Now we also find *ста(т)чини*, a derivative of *статокъ*—the ending of the genitive singular again demonstrates the Ukrainian coincidence of *и* and *ы*.

Other elements occurring in this text may be of Russian or of Ukrainian origin. We note that the past tense suffix in *пришолъ* shows the etymological spelling of the past tense suffix, while *о* after the postdental in the same verb form was also frequently written in the Russian literary language of the time. In [...] *то онъ вкидалъ козаковъ в кухню мѣсто ту(р)ми и мнѣ накидалъ козаковъ*, the word *мѣсто* is again used as a preposition; here we also find the traditional Ukrainian and Belarusian spelling *ту(р)м-* (cf. Polish *turm-* < German *Turm*) instead of Russian *тюрьм-* (Vasmer 1987/1950–1958: s.v. *тюрьма*). Subsequently, in *а по(д)кома(н)дни(х) его не було з на(ми)бо свои(м) статокъ ворочалъ*, we find at least three clearly Ukrainian elements: first, *було* instead of *было*; second, the spelling *з* instead of *с(ъ)* (in front of *н-*); and third, the conjunction *бо* in the initial position of the sentence (cf., however, Church Slavonic and Russian *ибо* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv—DD 1993: 74–75). Again, *статокъ* is used. The word *ворочалъ* instead of its genuinely Church Slavonic

6 The genuinely Russian *-ой* ending was still widely used in eighteenth-century documents until it was replaced by *-ий*, but only in the unstressed position.

cognate (воз)вращать may be of either Ukrainian or of Russian origin. In *Да того жъ дня оной староста упившися<,> поеди(н)це(м) хотѣлъ би(т) виводи(т) <,> и ти(л)ко вивели Па(р)хома Павле(н)ка, и покладалъ бити киями*, the first part of the sentence is written in accordance with Russian, whereby *оной* shows the Russian ending again, and the Russian pronoun *того жъ* (gen. sg. masc.) is used. The conjunction *да*, on the other hand, may be of Ukrainian dialectal (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *та*) or of Russian origin. The adverb *поединцемъ* (with retained *je-*) is Ukrainian, although it seems to be derived from Polish *pojedynkiem* (Russian *поединок* is likely to be a loan from Polish, cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *поединок*), and the spelling *ти(л)ко* with *i < o* (or should it render *tyl'ko*, which would have meant a Polonism?) is Ukrainian, not Russian. As for *покладалъ*, Dal' (1880–1882/1978: s.v. *покладать*) notes that this verb is widely used only in the southern and western regions of the East Slavic linguistic area, that is, in Ukrainian and Belarusian. In *да писаръ соте(н)ний на то(т) часть находи(в)ся*, the pronoun *то(т)* seems to be a loan from Russian—the reduplicated form is usually encountered only in the westernmost Ukrainian dialects. On the other hand, in *писаръ* we find hardened *r* again. Moreover, *находи(в)ся* can hardly be interpreted as a gerund form—quite clearly, we are dealing here with the phonetically orientated spelling of the past tense suffix. In *и договаровалъ к старостѣ*, the verb is most probably a Ukrainian element with the seemingly traditional spelling *-ова-* of the imperfectivizing suffix *-'ива-*, cf. Ukrainian *договоріти, договрювати* ‘to keep on and on at someone’ (there is no entry for *договоровати* in SRJa XI–XVII or in SRJa XVIII, cf. Russian *договаривать*).

The indirect speech rendered in this document is certainly of particular interest because it may contain vestiges of the original oral speech. It is introduced by the conjunction *что* in the traditional spelling, just as in Russian, and the first part of the indirect speech is still written mainly in Russian, as may be reflected in the word form *изволь* with *из-* (the usual preconditions for Ukrainian *із-* instead of *з-* are not fulfilled), by the infinitive *бити* (with the preserved etymological *и* and the shortened infinitive ending), and the conditional conjunction *буди*, which is typical of the older Russian chancery language (Russian *буде(ть)*) but seems to have been adopted in corrupt form owing to phonetic interferences here. Still, one might ask how this latter word was actually pronounced: [búd'ɪ], just as in Russian, or [búdyɐ], as it might have been pronounced in a Ukrainized form?

Subsequently, in *нехай атаманъ вибеть, и онъ писара бранилъ и вдаривъ в сѣння(х) палицею*, the imperative of the third person is introduced by the Ukrainian particle *нехай*, yet the hard verb ending *-ть* in the third person singular form *вибеть* is again selected according to the rules of Russian. On the other hand, in Russian the spelling *выбьеть* with the use of *ь* as a signal for the pronunciation of (C')j in the old *-bj-* group and in Church Slavonic *избіеть* would rather have been expected. The genitive-accusative form of the Ukrainian lexeme *писара* testifies to the hardening of *r' > r* not only in the final position but also before *-a*, which is indeed typical of many Ukrainian dialects, especially those of the Hetmanate region. In *бранилъ*, the scribe chose a Church Slavonic word that had already been fully integrated into Russian but not into Ukrainian. On the other hand,

the prefix *в-* < *у-* and the tense suffix in the masculine singular past tense form *-въ* < *-ль* in *вдаривъ* are spelled in accordance with Ukrainian phonological rules. The noun in *в сѣнця(х)* is Ukrainian, which is also reflected by the notion of soft *с'* (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *сінці*). As for *палицею* (inst. sg.), it should be noted that the ending, which is preserved in most Ukrainian dialects and in the Ukrainian standard language, was still much more common in Russian high-style documents of the eighteenth century than today.

In the following sentence, the long ending in the demonstrative pronoun *мое* and again the form *писарь* are noteworthy.⁷ Immediately afterwards, the gerund *видя* is used in the markedly Russian form—the interpretation as an archaic nominative singular masculine participle referring to *писарь* is highly improbable—whereas in the following fragment, *выпустилъ з(ъ) кухнѣ всѣхъ насъ не бити(х)*, we again find, along with several Ukrainian orthographic interferemes (*-ѣ* [-i] in the genitive singular masculine form *кухнѣ* and *и* instead of *ы* in *бити(х)*), the Ukrainian form of the preposition *з(ъ)*. The next fragment *а ему говорили ми всѣ* is “neutral,” if we ignore the orthographic peculiarity in *ми*. As in other cases, however, it is difficult to establish whether *всѣ*, for instance, was spelled [fs'e] as in Russian or [ŭs'i] as in Ukrainian. The same holds for *ему*—Ukrainian *йому* had also previously been rendered most often in exactly this conservative spelling *ему*.

Basically, the direct speech in *„Де(р)жи худобу нашу, а насъ не бий”* seems to be rendered authentically in Ukrainian. It contains the Ukrainian word *худобу* (acc. sg.—Dal' (1880–1882/1978) remarks that the word is used in the “southern and western” regions) and the phonologically Ukrainian form *бий* (instead of Russian *бей*), which is highly unlikely to be a Church Slavonic word form in this context. In *И пошли безъ сору з двору о(д) ego* we note the phraseological unit *без сору*, cf. Russian *без сору без спору*, but afterwards we see the Ukrainian form of the preposition in *з* (< *jъzъ) *з двору*, whereas it should be remembered that the [u]-ending in the genitive of the masculine noun can of course also be found in older Russian without any quantitative meaning. The syntagm *о(д) ego* with *ego* as a personal and not a possessive pronoun after the preposition is particularly interesting: first, it contains the spelling *о(д)* in a position in which voiced *д* can by no means be explained as a consequence of assimilation processes, and second, there is no prothesis in *ego* after the preposition, which is quite typical of a range of Ukrainian dialects.

As for the fragment *А онъ тогди жъ порвалъ писара за волоси <, > и киемъ затылъ кидкома*, it should be noted that the adverb *тогди* (along with *когда*) as such is widespread in Ukrainian as well as in several Russian dialects (in the form *тогда*). The verb *затылъ* is Ukrainian—it is not attested in Dal' (1880–1882/1978, where neither *затыть* nor *тятъ* occurs); the adverb *кидкама*, which is a genuine dual form, is not attested in the Russian dialectal dictionaries (SRNG) either, whereas *кидькома́* has even been integrated into the Ukrainian standard language.

7 In Russian, *мо* predominates. Kiparsky (1963–1975/2: 146) writes: “Eine mit *je* erweiterte Form *мое* muß im 17. Jh. häufig gewesen sein, denn Ludolf kennt nur die letztere.” Yet Ludolf is not always reliable. Some Russian dialects use *мое*, but the form is not widespread in Russian.

In *Того ж дня пото(м) приказаль староста дворови(м) свои(м) поимати Клима Савче(н)ка <,> и, приведши в дво(р), бивъ дово(л)но киями и вкинувъ в ту(р)му*, the Russian pronoun occurs again in *Того ж дня*. On the other hand, the Ukrainian spelling of the tense suffix in *бивъ* and the Ukrainian form of the stem of *в ту(р)му* are noteworthy. Incidentally, the meaning of directions is usually expressed by prepositional phrases with *въ* + accusative case, not by *до* + genitive case, as was quite common in Middle Ukrainian sources and as is still widespread in some varieties of Ukrainian today.

The charter from 1726 is written neither in Ukrainian nor in Russian but in a mixed code that most likely reflects a certain type of chancery “Surzhyk” of the time. Russian elements occur even in fragments that render the indirect speech of Ukrainian witnesses of the time.

3.2 A report from 1746

The next charter of interest was issued in Chyhryndubrova (*Чигриндуброва*) in 1746, that is, more or less one generation after the previous report, by the *sotnyk* (captain) Oleksandr (Aleksandr) Butovs'kyj:

В полковую Лубенскую канцелярию

Покорное доношение

В(ъ) битность мою сотнѣ мое(й) в мѣстечку Еремѣевцѣ по случаю опредѣле(н)но(й) закрытия Днепрови(х) границъ дистанции Лубенского полкуо стоящей под мѣстечкомъ Еремѣевкою мнѣ кома(н)ди <,> усмотрѣвъ в ономъ мѣстечку Еремѣевцѣ чинячиесь абшитованни(мъ) прилуцкимъ полковнико(мъ) Галаганомъ нестерпимие козакамъ сотеннимъ обиди <,> а именно: собравъ всѣхъ еремѣевски(х) курѣнчиковъ <(:> которые били отобрани по силѣ ея императорскаго величества указу по(д) сотню <(:> зъ ружемъ, какъ надлежитъ воинскому человѣку, не дожидаетъ свѣдствия <,> посилаетъ по дворамъ козачимъ и ихъ двори разорает(т), скотъ беретъ, <,> лѣси рубаетъ <,> з хатъ дверѣ и вѣкна вибираетъ <,>. [...] и что ему понадобилось, в дворъ сво(й) возить приказуетъ <,>. И хто с того принуждения ему, Галагану, бить по(д)даннимъ подпишется <,> тое все забратое вертаетъ <,> что видя, многіе козаки подписали(с) <,>. Також сѣна в(ъ) прийдучую зиму козацкіе заготовленніе на и(х) дѣдовски(х) и о(т)цевскихъ грунта(х) ради своихъ лошаде(й), которыми службу ея императорскаго величества нинѣ и всегда о(т)правують, брать приказуетъ <.>. Риболовлѣ и всѣ плавлѣ козачіе себѣ о(т)няв <,> и сами(х) ихъ козаковъ, если которо(й) природное свое козацтво,> албо грунтъ, на которомъ живеть, козачо(й) свѣдѣлствуетъ, не смотря на то, принуждаеть, чтобъ били по(д)даними ему <,> – чего я не токмо zde в(ъ) християнствѣ, но и по инши(х) земляхъ будучи не видалъ <,>. Чтобъ противъ зѣми козаковъ о(т) всего ихъ добра вигонено без жадного указу з суда било <,> или писать наси(л)но в по(д)данство <,> о(т) якого разорения намъ не безопасно, чтобъ тѣ еремѣевскіе козаки (если Днепръ станеть) по и(х) древнему обикновению яко побережние не токмо по ини(х) места(х), но и за Днепръ // в(ъ) полскую область чтобъ не учинили побегу <,> и чрезъ то в службѣ ея императорскаго величества учинится можемъ умаление, какъ уже за о(т)нятемъ еремѣевски(х) и липовски(х) многи(х) козаковъ насилиемъ себѣ въ по(д)данство в нарядѣхъ козачи(х)

в(ъ) здешней Чиргриндубровско(й) сотнѣ касаючи(х)ся к службѣ ея императорскаго величества немалая остановка учинилась <, >. И козакамъ крайнее разорение <, > с чего видимое его, Галагана, старание, что(б) всѣ еремѣевские и липовские козаки били ему по(д)анными <, >. А понеже в(ъ) козачо(й) службѣ интересъ ея императорскаго величества состоитъ <, > а зъ мужиковъ <(> кромѣ консистенско(й) дачи (:)> токмо една по(д)аническая приватная работа происходить, в грамотѣ же всемилостиви(й) шей, которою ему мѣстечко Еремѣевку жаловано мужиковъ, <(:) кроме козачи(х) волносте(й) <(:)> якъ и в протчиихъ жалованныхъ грамота(х) все волности козачие виключаю(т)ся <, >. А онъ полковникъ самъ през себе тое дѣлаетъ < > Того ради даби мнѣ за умолчание иногда не о(т)вѣтствовать < > а паче за разорение козаковъ нимъ, Галаганомъ, не подпасть штрафу <, > чрезъ сие тое доношение полково(й) Лубенско(й) канцелярии покорно прошу <(:) не пишучи к нему, Галагану, понеже к(ъ) нему, якъ и нинѣ дово(л)но извѣстно <, > нѣсколько разъ писано било <, > такожъ и я с писмами посилаю – то того онъ не слушается <, > и чинитъ не переста(в) < > о недопускании впредъ явленнымъ полковникомъ Галаганомъ ихъ въ обиду и разорение до учинения о томъ слѣдствія к тамошнему атаману еремѣевскому Якову Бардасю с товариствомъ з полковой Лубенско(й) канцелярии указомъ предложить.

Сотникъ чиргриндубровски(й) Александръ Бутовский (DD 1993: 73–74).

The headings of this document are all written in Russian, cf. *В полковую Лубенскую канцелярию, Покорное доношение* (in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv we read *Поко(р)нѣйшее доношение* with *o* after the postdental, cf. DD 1993: 74). Ukrainian elements are still present in the whole text, but they have apparently shifted into the background as compared with the previously analyzed report.

The Ukrainian origin of the text is mainly apparent in certain orthographic deviations. Apart from the use of the Latin letter *g* for [g] in *Галаган* – owing to the general pronunciation of *z* as [h],⁸ we see this in *и* instead of *ы* in *битность*, *закрития*, *Днепрови(х)*, *нестерпимие* [...] *обиди* and the like (the scribe does not use *ы* at all!), *ѣ* for *і* in *сотнѣ* (gen. sg.), *дверѣ* (acc. pl.), and *и* instead of *ѣ* in *кома(н)ди* (loc. sg.!). Among the orthographic peculiarities that reflect more serious deviations from Russian in pronunciation, the following deserve attention: *вѣкна* with the Ukrainian reflex *i* of *o* in the new closed syllable and the prothesis,⁹ *всемилостиви(й)шей* (loc. sg. fem.) with *и* in the superlative suffix instead of *ѣ*, *стоящей* (loc. sg. fem.) and *козачо(й)* (loc. sg. fem.) with *o* after postdentals (along with *всемилостиви(й)шей* (loc. sg. fem.), but compare *сіяте(л)нѣшо(з)[о]* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv (DD 1993: 74), the phonetic spelling of the past tense suffix in *о(т)няв*, *не переста(в)*, and the preposition *зъ* (< *съ*) preceding voiceless *p* in this spelling. Another interesting spelling is found in *о(т)нятемъ*, along with *ружемъ* (instr. sg.). In most cases, nouns of this type are spelled according to the Church Slavonic traditions, as in *доношение*, *насилемъ* and the

8 As far as I know, there are no such orthographic traditions in southern Russia, where *g* changed to the velar fricative [g].

9 The prothesis of *o-* is also widespread in many Russian dialects.

like. Furthermore, we find the preposition *з* < **jъzъ* in *зъ мужиковъ, з хатъ, з суда,* and *з полковой Лубенско(й) канцелярии*—if the preposition precedes a voiceless consonant, it can also be spelled *с* as in *с того принуждения*, which might look like perfect Russian at first glance but is not—because in a Russian text of the same period we would rather expect *изъ* and not *съ* (in a report of 1748 from Kozelets we already find *и из(ъ) себе* [...], but along with *з(ъ) той Генеральной канцелярии*—DD 1993: 77).

The nouns *козацтво* and *товариствомъ* (instr. sg.) are written according to the rules of Ukrainian, not those of the emerging Russian standard language, for which forms of the type *козачество* and *товарищество*, respectively, were usually already selected in the eighteenth century. The verb *свѣдѣтельствуетъ* (cf. also *освѣдѣтельствовавъ* in a document of 1748 from Kozelets—DD 1993: 77) is written according to the Ukrainian traditions: it does not read *свидѣтел(ь)-*, since it was introduced into Russian on the basis of the wrong etymologization of *съ-вѣд-* as *съ-вид-*.

As for morphology, we note the locative singular ending *[-u]* with velar stems such as in *мѣстечку* or the long ending of the demonstrative pronoun in *мое* (several times, cf. its use in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv—DD 1993: 74–75, along with *мо*). The genitive or accusative of the reflexive pronoun is always *себе* (as in Ukrainian and in Church Slavonic) and never *себя*—it should be noted, however, that *себе* was still in use in Russian high-style documents of the eighteenth century, where it appeared because of Church Slavonic traditions. The masculine personal pronoun is used with the prothesis, although it is not preceded by a preposition, cf. *а паче за разорение козаковъ нимъ, Галаганомъ, не поднасть штрафу*, in accordance with Ukrainian but not Russian rules. Furthermore, we note that the present stem of the corresponding verbs always ends in *-uj-*, not in the markedly Russian *-увај-*, cf. *приказуетъ* (in a report of 1748 from Kozelets, the infinitive form *присма(т)рива(т)* already occurs—DD 1993: 77).¹⁰

In the vocabulary, we note the Ukrainian adjectivized present active participle *прийдучую* (acc. sg. fem.), the Ukrainian noun *грунта(х)* (loc. pl.), the Ukrainian verb *о(т)правують* (cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *отправовать*); the pronouns *иниш(х)* (along with *ини(х)*, but not *други(х)*), *жадного* (gen. sg. masc.), *якого* (gen. sg. neut.; along with *какъ*, cf. also a report of 1748 from Kozelets with *какіе возмо(ж)но способи*—DD 1993: 77); the adverb *такожъ* (which could be interpreted as a combination of Church Slavonic *тако* + East Slavic shortened *-жъ*, and not as Ukrainian); the conjunctions *албо* (along with *или*) and *якъ* (along with *какъ*); and, finally, the preposition *през*. Interestingly, the numeral *една* appears in the genuinely Polish form, which was widespread in Ukrainian. One of the Ukrainian loans is *хатъ* (gen. pl.), cf. Vasmer's (1987/1950–1958) remark that *хата* is of “western and southern” origin. Another element most probably taken from Ukrainian is *волности*, as in *волности козацие* (cf. also Witkowski 2006: s.v. *вольность*). Again, we find the

10 The form *приказовати* is—obviously, very rarely—attested in older Russian sources as well (cf. SRJa XI–XVII).

dissimilated initial group in *хто*, which is not only typically Ukrainian. Whereas in the previous document we could read *ворочаль*, we can now find the typically Ukrainian form *вертаєть*, which has only been attested for the Smolensk area in Dal' (1880–1882/1978: s.v. *ворочать*). In other documents from this period, we can find still more intriguing Ukrainian features. In a report of 1748 from Kozelets, for example, *у* is written instead of *въ* as in *у силѣ*, and in *подлѣнного* we find *ѣ* for etymological *и* in a word that the scribe must have considered to be a Russian element (DD 1993: 77).

We can now proceed to discuss the Russian elements of this text. Probably the most striking features are the elements of Russian chancery phraseology of the time, namely expressions such as *покорное доношение*; *в(ъ) битность мою* (Russian *бытность* is itself, however, a loan from Polish, cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *бытность*); *по случаю* + gen. case; *усмотрѣль [...]* *чинячиесь [...]* *нестерпимие [...]* *обиди*; *а именно: [...]*; *по силѣ ея імператорскаго величества указу*; *какъ надлежитъ*; *не дожидаетъ слѣдствія*; *с того принуждения*; *И хто ему [...]* *битъ по(д)даннимъ подпишется*; *что видя* + a description of the action given by the eyewitnesses; *службу ея імператорскаго величества нинѣ и всегда* [*о(т)правують*—the verb is Ukrainian]; *не смотря на то, принуждаетъ, чтобъ били по(д)данными ему*; *писать наси(л)но в по(д)данство*; *о(т) якого* [the pronoun is Ukrainian] *разорения намъ не безопасно*; *по и(х) древнему обикновению*; *чтобъ не учинили побегу*; *черезъ то* (causal *через* is a loan from the neighboring Western languages to Russian, but by the eighteenth century it had become quite common in Russian as well, cf. Moser 1998: 245–259); or *в службѣ ея імператорскаго величества*.

Other formulas and elements of the Russian chancery language are: *за [...]* *насилиемъ себѣ въ по(д)данство*; *в нарядахъ козачи(х) [...]* *касаючи(х)ся к службѣ ея імператорскаго величества* with (*касаться* + *къ* + dative case); *крайнее разорение*; *видимое его*, *X_{gen}*, *старание, что(б) [...]*; furthermore *А понеже в(ъ) [...]* *службѣ интересъ ея імператорскаго величества состоитъ*; *только одна* [the numeral is a loan from Polish] *по(д)даническая приватная робота* [not genuinely Church Slavonic *работа*] *происходитъ*; *в грамотѣ [...]* *всемилостви(й)шей*; *якъ* [the conjunction, however, is used in the Ukrainian form, along with *какъ* elsewhere] *и в протчихъ жалованнихъ грамота(х)*; *все волности козачие виключаю(т)ся* [not genuinely Church Slavonic *исключаются*, as would have been more common in eighteenth-century Russian]; *того ради даби [...]* *не подпастъ штрафу*; *черз сие тоє доношение X_{dat}* *покорно прошу*; *якъ [!]* *и нинѣ дово(л)но извѣстно*; *нѣсколко разъ писано било*; *с писмами посилавъ* [instead of *посылалъ*]; *то того онъ не слушается* <,> *и чинить не переста(в)* [instead of *пересталъ*]; *о недопускании впредъ X-омъ ихъ въ обиду и разорение*; *до учинения о томъ слѣдствія к X_{dat}* *с товариствомъ з X_{gen} sg fem* (adjective referring to a place name) *канцелярии указомъ предложить*.

This scribe had obviously already acquired considerable experience in the Russian chancery language before he wrote this report. He had also become perfectly used to numerous Russian elements at all linguistic levels. As for phonology, there is now a hard *c*, as reflected in *границѣ*, or *e* after the postdental, as in *человѣку* or *чего* (more than once; this also corresponds to Church Slavonic

traditions). Moreover, *e* instead of *ѣ* is particularly interesting because this spelling reflects a phonetic and not an orthographic Russian influence—in the Russian literary language, *ѣ* and *e* had to be differentiated until the orthographic reform of 1917/1918. In the stressed position, as in *здеишей* (loc. sg. fem.; cf. *здѣсь, здѣшнихъ* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv—DD 1993: 74), *все* (волности), and *Днепръ*, the *e* instead of the *ѣ* is indeed most likely to be of Russian origin, whereas in the unstressed position, as in *мѣста(х)* (loc. pl.) ‘places,’ *побѣзу* (cf. Ukrainian *побізі*), and *крѣме* (along with *крѣмѣ*) (cf. also *засѣдатель* in a document of unknown origin from 1785—DD 1993: 84), the spelling could also have occurred because of the northern Ukrainian merger of unstressed *ѣ* and *e* (but *мѣста(х)* in the meaning ‘places’ is probably based on Russian).

The spelling *зѣми* may be a true curiosity: here, the scribe might have wanted to reflect the Russian spelling [z’im]- instead of the Ukrainian spelling [zy’m], yet note Ukrainian dialectal *зіма* along with standard *зима*. In another document of 1748 from Kozelets, we can only read *зиму* (DD 1993: 77), as also found elsewhere in the present document).

Soft adjective endings, as in *крайнее* (with the full pronominal ending) or *древнему* or *тамошнему*, are spelled as in Russian, but also according to the older Ukrainian traditions (spellings such as *-нѣму* or *-нѣому* were previously uncommon). The suffix of the present active participle is either genuinely Church Slavonic, as in *стоящей*, or genuinely East Slavic, as—rather surprisingly—in the Russian loan *касаючи(х)ся*.

In old and new Church Slavonic words, the spelling is usually chosen in accordance with the emerging rules of the new Russian literary language, cf. for the prefix *со-* as written according to the traditions of the “Second South Slavic Impact” *состоитъ*, and for the reflection of the assimilation of Church Slavonic prefixes *происходитъ*. The spelling of the reflex of *jer* preceding *j* based on Church Slavonic occurs not only in deverbative nouns but also in the pronoun *сие*. Attention should also be paid to the conservative spelling *в прѣтчихъ*. Some of the metathetic forms, such as *впрѣдъ*, *предложитъ*, *чрезъ*, are not necessarily to be treated as Church Slavonic word forms: it can be observed, for instance, that in Ruthenian translations from Polish, *впрѣдъ* was often used as an equivalent of Polish *wprzód* (which, by the way, might also explain the hardness of the final consonant), while *предложити* often “translated” Polish *przedłożyć*, and, finally, *чрезъ* often functioned as a Ruthenianized equivalent of Polish *przez*, if the latter was not merely rendered as *презь*. The past passive participle is written with *-нн-*, as in *абиштованни(мъ)*, *по(д)даннимъ*, *заготовленни*, *явленнимъ*, *опредѣле(н)но(й)* (genuine participle, gen. sg. fem.) and the like.

Turning to morphology, we always find the hard verb ending *-тъ* where it is encountered in Russian, cf. *дожидаетъ*, *живетъ* and the like. All infinitives end in *-тъ*, none in *-ти*, cf. *возитъ*, *о(т)вѣтствовать*, *чинитъ*, cf. also *поднастъ* and the like. The reflexive particle is always shortened after vowels, as in *чинячиесь*, *учинилась* or *понадобилось*. With the reflexive particle, the spelling is *-тся* as in *учинится*, just as in Russian (the *jer* of the infinitive ending could sometimes be

omitted in such cases), whereas in a report of 1748 from Kozelets the infinitive form *являться* occurs (DD 1993: 77). The genitive case of masculine nouns in *-[u]* without a partitive meaning is used again—as mentioned above, it was also quite common in earlier Russian sources. In *з суда*, the ending *-а* seems to be motivated by Russian, whereas *-и* would have been expected in Ukrainian. Again, the clearly Russian adjective ending *-ой* of the nominative masculine singular case occurs in *которо(й)* and in *зрунтъ [...] козачо(й)*. We find the form *собравъ*, which in this case is likely to be a gerund referring to a masculine singular subject (the interpretation as a mere Church Slavonic past active participle is highly improbable), not a past tense form; and we find the obvious gerund *видя*, which refers here to a plural noun (cf. also the idiomatic expression *не смотря на то*, but also another gerund in the form *пишучи*, as was common in both Ukrainian and Russian).

Incidentally, the Russian gerunds are already quite typical of Hetmanate documents of this time, cf. also a report of 1748 from Kozelets (in DD 1993: 77). The genuinely Church Slavonic adjectival and pronominal genitive endings occur in *императорскаго* and in *ея*, both times with reference to the empress (!). The past passive participle reads *винонено*, not *виженено* or *вигнано*, as in most Ukrainian dialects. As noted above, the prefix *ви-* in *включая(т)ся* is used instead of *из-/ис-*, as in Church Slavonic-based Russian *исключаются*.

The past tense form of 'to be' is *было*, *били*, not *було*, *були* (and not *было*, *были*). The dative form of the reflexive pronoun *себѣ* was selected in accordance with Church Slavonic and the emerging Russian literary language.

In syntax, we find *по* + dative case in *по случаю*, in *по и(х) древнему обикновению* (Ukrainians might also have regarded both nouns as locative forms in *-и*, and even the adjective ending *-ему* could have been interpreted as a locative form in Ukrainian), and, unambiguously, in *по дворамъ козачимъ* (along with the clear locative in *по инши(х) земляхъ*).

With respect to the vocabulary, Russian elements predominate; many of them occur within the quoted chancery phraseologisms. Among the Russian elements, some of which originate in Church Slavonic, we find: *всемилостви(й)шей* (loc. sg. fem.), *величества* (gen. sg.), *покорное доношение*, *случаю* (dat. sg.), *указу* (dat. sg.), *опредѣле(н)но(й)* (gen. sg. fem.), *усмотрѣль*, *лошаде(й)* (gen. pl.—cf. Ukrainian *лошá*, *лошáк*), *обиди* (acc. pl.), *именно*, *ружель* (instr. sg.; cf., however, the spelling), *надлежитъ* (not *на-*), *воинскому* (dat. sg. masc.), *дожидаетъ*, *слѣдствия* (gen. sg., occurs more than once), *понадобилось*, *принуждаетъ* and *принуждения* (gen. sg., with Church Slavonic *жд* < **dj*), *заготовление* (past passive participle), *императорскаго*, *свѣдѣтельствуе(т)* (as for the suffixation), *не видалъ*, *безопасно*, *древнему* (dat. sg. masc.), *обикновению* (dat. sg.), *мѣста(х)* (loc. pl., with *e* instead of etymological *ѣ*, cf. Ukrainian *мѣсто* 'town', but *мѣсце* 'place'), *область* (with the Church Slavonic metathesis), *касаючи(х)ся* *к* + dative case, *остановка*, *видимое* (present passive participle), *состоить* (with *со-*, as if it were based on the Second Church Slavonic influence in this word), *по(д)даническая* (with *-ическ-*), *происходитъ*, *жаловано* (in the Russian meaning) and *жалованнихъ грамота(х)*, *дѣлае(т)* 'does, makes,' *о(т)вѣтствовать*, *извѣстно*, *слушается*, *недопускании* (loc. sg.). Instead of *с писмами*, we would rather have expected *з листами* in a Ukrainian document.

In this document we find *скотъ*, which coincides with the Russian form, and not *бидло* (< Polish *bydło*), as widely used in Middle Ukrainian (cf., however, archaic Polish *skot*). Western loans such as *абиштованни(мъ)* (instr. sg. masc.) and *штрафу* (dat. sg.) or *интересъ* and *приватная* are not at all surprising in eighteenth-century documents from the Russian Empire. It should be kept in mind that many of them had been adopted into Russian via Polish and Ukrainian or Belarusian prior to Peter I.

The adverbs *всегда* and *иногда* are noteworthy—above, we encountered *тогда*. Another non-Ukrainian form is *протчихъ* (loc. pl.). Among the prepositions, we find *не смотря на, ради* (which is also used as a postposition); among the numerals, *нѣсколко*; among the conjunctions, *какъ* along with *якъ*. The conjunction *если* is a Polonism in Russian that was also frequently used in Middle Ukrainian (Moser 1998; in a report of 1748 from Kozelets, *ежели бѣ* is attested, DD 1993: 77). Among the archaic forms that were still common in eighteenth-century Russian, *только* (occurs more than once, cf. *тільки* in the previous document, but *только* in a report of 1748 from Kozelets —DD 1993: 77), *понеже*, and *дабы* are of interest. The same holds for *паче*, which is, however, still frequently used in Russian and Ukrainian in the phraseologism *тем паче/тим паче*.

3.3 A report from 1760

A further report, from 1760, is a particularly remarkable document in many respects. Apart from its linguistic significance, it provides invaluable information on schooling in the Hetmanate:

Ясневелможному высокоповелительному гдѣну гдѣну Малія Россіи обоихъ сторонъ Днепра и Во(и)скѣ Запорожскихъ гетману ея імператорскаго величества дѣйствителному камергеру імператорской Санктпѣтербургской Академіи наукъ президенту <,> лейбъ гвардіи Измайловскаго полку подполковнику и обоихъ Россійскихъ імператорскихъ ординовъ святыхъ Апостола, Андрея и Алеѣсандра Невскаго <,> також полскаго Белого Орла и голстинскаго святаго Анны кавалеру <,> Россійской імперіи графу Кирилу Григоревичу его сіятелству Разумовскому.

Покорнѣйшій репортъ

Еще до получения¹¹ в(ъ) аппробацію моего представления высокаго w(т) вашей ясневелможности ордера и о виборѣ в виборних козаковъ и можнѣйшихъ подпомощниковъ о(т) двена(д)цяти до пятнадцати лѣтъ дѣтей, и о о(т)дачи понятнѣ(й)шихъ ко избучению грамоти в школи <,> во всѣ полку Лубенскаго сотнѣ к сотникамъ и сотеннимъ ста(р)щинамъ з полковой Лубенской канцеляріи предложено <,> почему в нѣкоторихъ сотняхъ до тысячи трохъ сотъ малчиковъ <,> какъ сотники и ста(р)шини полковую канцелярию репортовали <,> вибрано и в(ъ) школи о(т)дано <,> а в другихъ сотняхъ, яко-то: Чигриндубровско(й) <,> Жовнинско(й) <,>

11 In DD 1993: 79, this form reads *получення*. This is almost certainly a misprint.

Городиско(й) <,> Смѣлянско(й) и Костантино(в)ско(й) // к приведенію дѣйствительному высокого вашей ясневелможности повелѣнію исполненія избираются <,>. Обучатся те дѣти, по мнѣнію моему, должно ниже слѣдующимъ порядкомъ:

1 <:> Первоначално имѣють учитись букваровъ <,> а потомъ ча(с) ловцовъ <,> а какъ распознаеть литеры и слоги гора(з)дѣ <,>, то что(б) не доку(ч)но имъ над одними тѣми книжками было <,>, будуть до обѣдъ учитись читать <,> а по обѣдѣ навикать помалу писать.

2 <:> Между тѣмъ сискивать такихъ людей, которые хотя не совсѣмъ <,> однакъ о(т)части вѣдають исчисление на бумаге <,> и онихъ опредѣлить к показаннымъ дѣтямъ помалу изучити сколько мощно того щисления <,> а особливо с полковыхъ канцеляри(ст)ъ и сотенныхъ писарей.

3 <:> В воскресные и праздни(ч)ные дни на заутреню литургию и вечерню онимъ дѣтемъ велѣть ходить в(ъ) церкви и изучатись пѣть и примѣчать, кто с онихъ имѣтиметь хорошия голоса <,> такихъ замѣчать до имѣющаго впредь быть случаю о выборѣ в пѣвчие к двору ея императорскаго величества <,> или к до(му) вашей ясневелможности.

4 <:> Которые с избран(н)ихъ дѣтей к грамотно(й) науки явятся не понятные, тѣхъ всѣхъ опредѣля на(д) всяки(ми) двадцатью четирма одного атаманомъ <,> велѣ(т) онимъ атаманамъ имѣть у себе именній ихъ списокъ и во всякое воскресение и праздни(ч)ные дни // собирать онихъ в едно мѣсто и обуча(т) воинско(й) легкихъ командъ и артилерійско(й) эѣрциіи. А како(й) именно первые тѣхъ атамановъ изобучи(т) zde при персональномъ моемъ на(д)сматриваніи, оной и одпусти(т) по со(т)нямъ, что(б) по тому обучали дѣте(й) <,>. И какъ по нѣсколко изобучать <,> то тѣ и другихъ будуть изобучать <,>. И такъ всегда едни другихъ имѣють еѣрцѣтова(т).

5 <:> Понеже при такой эѣрциіи дѣти ружемъ дѣйствова(т) не могу(т), да и по ихъ малолѣтству ружа к тому употребля(т) не надобно <,> для того онимъ подѣланы будуть для той эѣрциіи деревяные саблѣ и ратища з нашитими на концѣ во мѣсто копіевъ волняными булавками, что(б) оними еди(н)ъ другого разить не могъ <,> и деревка во мѣсто ружа подобиемъ тѣмъ, какъ дѣлаются при гарнѣзонахъ салдацкимъ в обученіи эѣрциіи находячимъ ся дѣтямъ.

6 >:>. Что(б) тѣ дѣти едни в школа(х) еженедно, а другіе в воскресные и праздни(ч)ные дни эѣрциіи военно(й) обучени, того на(д)сматривать в селахъ атаманамъ <,> и самимъ со(т)ника(м) и сотеннымъ старшинамъ <,>. И что в томъ буде(т) происходить, атамани должны сотника и ста(р)шину понеделно <,> а сотник полковую канцелярію помѣсячно репортовать. И тако оные дѣти помалу часть од часу обучаясь воинской // и артилерійско(й) эѣрциіи з молодыхъ лѣтъ, ежего(д)но умножатся будуть <,> и когда той доспѣють пори <,> что в дѣйствительную вступлять службу <,>, тогда несумнительная по нихъ можетъ быть надежда <,> яко оные противъ другихъ козаковъ то(й) эѣрциіи не обученныхъ в военныхъ дѣйствіяхъ буду(т) гораздо исправнѣйшіе и вѣжливыишіе – з чего може(т) быть не только отечеству малороссійскому похвала <,> ис того ожидается по(д)за <,>. Но и происходиміе ш(т) коммендующихъ в разныхъ мѣстахъ енералѣтетовъ и другихъ штапъ-офицеровъ на малороссійскихъ козаковъ нарѣканія и биваеміе к ви(ш)шимъ командамъ о негодности козачей предста(в)ления могутъ быть о(т)вращени <,> всенижайше вашу ясневелможность репортую.

Полковникъ лубен(с)кий Іванъ Кулябка.
1760 года мая 4 <: > дня (DD 1993: 79–81)

To all appearances, this text is basically written in the new Russian literary language and contains numerous elements of Russian chancery phraseology of the time. All in all, the author did a good job—he obviously met the requirements he was exposed to (as for the Russian vocabulary, cf. the table in the conclusions). Still, this does not mean that no Ukrainian elements whatever are to be found in this document. If we take a look at the introduction first, Ukrainian features are apparent primarily on the level of orthography. One of the most important features is again the mixing of *и* and *ы*, although this scribe clearly strove to use the letters according to the Russian rules in some instances. Again, *Днепра* is written with *е* instead of *ѣ* in the unstressed syllable, where the reflex *е* is authentic in northern Ukrainian dialects, while it is noteworthy that in *Белого Орла* (genitive singular), the *е* appears instead of *ѣ* in the stressed position in a common Slavic word—in the name of this institution, the pronunciation apparently had to be “as Russian as possible.” In *Санктѣтербургской* (gen. sg. fem.) we find *ѣ* instead of *е*, which obviously reflects the sound value [i] as *и* in “Russian” *Питер* (cf. also *з Санктѣтербурга* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv—DD 1993: 74).¹² The adjective *ясневельможному* is explained by Dal' (1880–1882/1978: s.v. *ясный*) as “почетъ малороссійскихъ гетмановъ или польскихъ пановъ,” yet of course it appears there in the Russianized form *ясневельможный*, that is, above all with an *о* instead of the Polish *е* in the position of the interfix—the *е* can be explained by the fact that *ясне-* is originally an adverb here; the word is a mere combination (“Zusammenrückung,” “сращение”) of *ясне* (adverb) and *вел(ь)можный* (adjective) (cf. also the derived form *ко ясневельможности* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv—DD 1993: 74–75).

The name of the addressee of this document [...] *графу Кирилу Григоревичу его сіятелству Разумовскому* (in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv, we read *Кирила Григорієвича* [...]) is an excellent indication of what had been going on among Ukrainians in the Hetmanate in the meantime. Their leaders had started trying to become Russian. They adopted patronymics and Russianized their family names. Part of this Russification process consisted in Slavonization, and that is why *Разумовскій* (modern Ukrainian *Розумовський*) became *Разумовскій*. But who was he now—[razumófsk'ij], [rəzumófskəj]—or, according to Ukrainian orthoepic rules, [razumóŭs'kyɛj] [...] ? Most likely, all these forms occurred, depending on the person actually pronouncing his name.¹³

The *Покорнѣйшій пенпортъ* (cf. the form *панпортъ* in a document of unknown origin from 1785—DD 1993: 82) is also basically written in Russian. In fact, we are dealing here with a rather highbrow variety of eighteenth-century Russian with

12 It might be worth noting that the use of the genitive plural form *обоихъ* instead of *обѣихъ* with the feminine noun *сторонъ* is nothing unusual in older Russian sources: the forms were used *promiscue*.

13 For the eighteenth-century history of the Hetmanate, cf. Zenon Kohut's (1988/1996) study, which has already become a classic.

quite a complicated syntax and a wealth of idiomatic expressions that are highly typical of the chancery language of the time.

Ukrainian elements, however, still occur at all levels. As for orthography, the spelling of the prefix *од-* before a voiceless consonant in *однусту(т)* and the spelling of the locative ending in *о о(т)дачу* (here, the ending could also theoretically be explained as Church Slavonic), as well as the still more intriguing notion of the locative ending in *на бумази* and, shortly afterwards, in *къ [...] науки* without the second palatalization, should be noted.¹⁴ On the other hand, in *в виборних козаковъ и можнѣйшихъ подпомощниковъ*, the letter *в* is erroneously used instead of *у* according to the rules of Ukrainian,¹⁵ and *однакъ* instead of *однако* seems to be a Ukrainian element as well (there is no entry for *однак* in SRNG). As another Ukrainian element of interest, the epenthetic *l'* in the third person plural present form *являться* is noteworthy. The adjective *можный*, which is most probably a Polonism (cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *можный*), was quite common in eighteenth-century Russian (although *мощно* is found here as the predicative form). The adjective *понятнѣ(й)шихъ* can also be regarded as a (morphologically based) loan from Polish (Witkowski 2006: s.v. *понятность*). In *двадцатью*, soft *с'* is rendered again. Instead of the dative with the noun derived from *учить*, in *ко избучению грамоти* we find a form that should most probably be interpreted as genitive singular, which is more typical of Ukrainian than Russian (another—less probable—possibility would be the interpretation of the ending as *и* instead of *ѣ* in the dative case). In *изучити* the full ending *-ти* occurs, whereas otherwise *-ть* is used almost exclusively.

Perhaps surprisingly, we can still read *з* instead of *изъ* in *з полковой Лубенской канцелярии*, cf. also the spelling *с* in *с полковихъ канцеляри(ст)ъ* и *сотенныхъ писарей* and in many more instances. Interestingly, the masculine noun *канцеляри(ст)ъ* ends in *-Ø* in the genitive plural, which could still be a remnant of the original Polish *a*-stem-noun *kancelarzysza* (cf. also Middle Ukrainian *канцеляриста*), but, on the other hand, we also find the genitive plural form *обѣдъ*, which seems to confirm that the scribe avoided *-овъ* for the sake of *-ъ* (i.e., the zero ending) in order to Slavonicize his text. The genitive plural form *писарей* might demonstrate that the scribe had become accustomed to noting that “good Russian” obliged him to use the soft-stem-ending *-ей* here (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *писарів*, but of course a more complicated situation in both Ukrainian and Russian dialects; cf. also *букваровъ* below), yet he still did not write *писцовъ*. In this document, we find several examples of *друг-* ‘other,’ as in *в другихъ сотняхъ* (cf. *инии(х)* above). In a Russian source of the time, we might not expect the use of *яко-то*, which seems to be modeled after Polish *jako to* but, from the Russian perspective, could have been interpreted as a mere combination of Church Slavonic *яко* and the pronoun *то*.

14 Cf. also *при кладовой драбинки* along with *в постро(й)ке* in a document of 1751 from Hlukhiv (DD 1993: 74–75) and *к явки, в иски* in a document of unknown origin from 1785 (DD 1993: 82, 84).

15 The spelling *щисления* with the phonetic notion of the initial syllable and the spelling *трохъ* with *po* for [r'o] could also be found in Russian sources.

In *Обучатся те дѣти, по мнѣнию моему, должно ниже слѣдующимъ порядкомъ*, the spelling *те*, just like *все* previously, demonstrates that the pronunciation was orientated toward Russian [t'e]—the Ukrainian form would have been [t'i], which would usually have been rendered as *тѣ* (as in literary Russian until 1917/18). Most interestingly, the author used an erroneous construction: by the eighteenth century, the predicative form *долженъ* was usually used with a subject in the nominative. If, however, it was used as an impersonal form, then the subject had to be in the dative form (*те дѣти* cannot be interpreted as an accusative form because of the verb form *обучатся* instead of *обучаѣтъ*). If the scribe had written *должни/должны* instead of *должно*, the sentence would have been well formed. On the other hand, the expression *по мнѣнию моему* is perfectly consistent with the emerging Russian literary language.

In *имѣють учитись букваровъ <, > а потомъ ча(с)ловцовъ*, the form *имѣють* is used as an auxiliary verb in the meaning 'ought to,' as it was most probably adopted from Polish, Ukrainian, and Belarusian in the two previous centuries (Moser 1998: 330–335). Many third-person verb forms are used with the ending *-тъ*, not *-ть*, as is the case with *имѣють, будутъ, вѣдаютъ*—we trust the editors here (but forms with *-ть* occur as well, cf. *распознаѣтъ, изобучаѣтъ, имѣють, могутъ*). It is most likely that this palatalized ending is in fact based on Ukrainian morphology and not on a mere scribal error, since in other positions there is no use of *-ъ* instead of *-ь*. The ending of the genitive plural in *букваровъ* is not typical of the emerging Russian literary language, as we are dealing with an original soft stem here (cf. Modern Standard Russian *букварь—букварей*, Modern Standard Ukrainian *буквар—букварів*, cf. *писарей* above)—in Russian dialects, however, *-овъ* or *-евъ* is used much more frequently than in the literary language. As for the form *ча(с)ловцовъ*, it should be kept in mind that *-овъ* was often used after *с* in the emerging Russian literary language, even if the ending was unaccentuated. Again, *учитись* is used with the genitive, not with the dative case—this time there can be no doubt about it. The infinitive form is also noteworthy—instead of *учиться* we read *учитись* several times (later *изучатись* is also found; cf. however, the infinitive form *обучатся*).

Turning to the following fragment, the noun *литери* is a loan from Polish—in Russian *буквы* would have been used. It is interesting that the diminutive form *книжками* was most probably not meant to be diminutive at all, just like Ukrainian *книжка* [knýʒka] as opposed to Russian *книжка* [kn'íškə]. The expression *помалу* is likely to be a western element in Russian—Dal' (1880–1882/1978: s.v. *помаленьку* ili *пома́лу* [...]) notes that it is used in the Pskov area—and the form *особливо* is also to be explained as Ukrainian interference (cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *особливый*). In the sentence *В воскресние и праздни(ч)ние дни на заутреню литургию и вечерню онимъ дѣтемъ велѣтъ ходитъ в(ъ) церкви и изучатись пѣть и примѣчать, кто с онихъ имѣтиметь хорошие голоса <, > такихъ замѣчать до имѣющаго впредь быть случаю о выборѣ в пѣвчие к двору ея императорскаго величества <, > или к до(му) вашей ясневелможности*, it is interesting to note the degree to which this scribe has become accustomed to the Russian chancery language and its characteristic

constructions with the dative and the infinitive in the modal meaning—according to the Ukrainian traditions, the use of modal verbs or predicative forms would have been much more common. On the other hand, his Russian routine did not prevent the scribe from introducing an unexpected markedly Ukrainian element in *имѣтиметь* with *-меть* as a Russianized version of the Ukrainian temporal marker *-му, -меш*, cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *матиме*. Even so, the ending is Russian.

The gerund *опредѣля* is an example of the not very frequently used gerunds in *-‘а* of the perfective stem, in addition to the more familiar gerund *обучаясь*. If the spelling *воскрес’ние [...] дни* cannot be explained as a misprint, then it is an intriguing scribal error resulting, perhaps, from the fact that *воскресение* and *воскресный* (a hard stem) are not known as meaning ‘Sunday’ in Ukrainian. In this passage, we also note the spelling *празни(ч)ние*, whereas shortly afterwards the etymological spelling *праздни(ч)ние* occurs. The genuinely Polish stem *едн-* occurs repeatedly as the numeral in the meaning ‘1,’ and the reciprocal pronoun is *еди(нь) другого, едни другихъ*—most probably, the scribe thought that this solution would correspond to Church Slavonic, but he was mistaken: in Church Slavonic, the numeral is *јединъ, једина [...]*.

The scribe who produced this charter has already adopted the use of the letter *э*, as in *эжерциѣи*.¹⁶ However, this very stem is spelled in several different ways, cf. once more *эжерциѣи*, but also *ежерциѣи* and *ежерцѣтова(т)* with Ukrainian *ѣ* for [i]. In the bookish participial form *на(д)смаѣриваніи*, we find the formation of the secondary imperfective verb in precise accordance with the rules of Russian. The noun *ружа* (gen. sg.), *ружемъ* (instr. sg.)—the word itself is Russian—is spelled according to the rules of Ukrainian; *j* is not rendered here at all. One might note the Slavonicized form *во мѣсто* (cf. *мѣсто* above) and, on the other hand, the Russian vernacular genitive plural form of the neuter noun *копѣвъ* (cf. Russian *копѣ́*, Church Slavonic *копѣ [...]*, but Ukrainian *спис*). In *волянними булавками* (instr. pl.) the stem of *волянними* seems to be taken from Ukrainian—Dal’ (1880–1882/1978) notes s.v. *волна, стар. и юж.* “—булавка is widespread in both Ukrainian and Russian. The past tense form *могъ* is written in a traditional way, with *-л*. In *гарнѣзонахъ* (loc. pl.), and later in *енералѣтетовъ* (gen. pl.), the spelling of *ѣ* for [i] is typically Ukrainian again, whereas in *салдацкимъ* the rendering of Russian *апан’е* occurs. The reflexive particle is treated as a segment of its own in the spelling *находячимъ ся*, but it always occurs after the verb ending. Interestingly, in *того на(д)смаѣривать [...]*, the complement is used in the genitive—a noun phrase, *надъ* + instrumental case, would rather have been expected here. In the next sentence, the scribe signals that he is perfectly aware of the personal use of *долженъ*, so he writes *атамани должны [...]* *репортовать*, with the ending *-и* according to the Church Slavonic tradition. The adjective *понеделно* ‘weekly’ is not only a Russian word (cf. Russian *неделя*, Ukrainian *тиждень*) but also reflects the Russian phonetic development *e < ѣ*.

16 As opposed to Russian, Ukrainian has very few words beginning with *je-*, almost all of foreign origin. The same holds for *e-* in the initial position. The use of the letter *э* was clearly triggered by Russian in this case (although the letter *э* was already used in Middle Ruthenian texts of Belarusian origin, such as the Lithuanian Statutes).

In the subsequent fragment, the scribe writes *тако* (and, a bit later, also *яко*), just as in Church Slavonic, but he continues with some Ukrainian elements: *помалу*, the spelling *од* instead of *отъ* before a voiceless consonant, and the use of the preposition *з* in *з молодихъ лѣтъ* (*ис* occurs below in *ис того ожидается по(л)за*). Then he even writes *вступлять*, which should most probably be interpreted as a third person plural present form of *вступити* with an epenthetic *l'*, which occurs in Ukrainian, but not in the Russian literary language in this context (cf. *являются*). The deverbative noun *нарѣканія* (acc. pl.), which has also been integrated into Modern Standard Russian, is most probably a Polonism (cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *нарекание*), and the same holds for *негодности* (loc. pl.) (cf. Witkowski 2006: s.v. *годность*).¹⁷ Here, the scribe already writes *козачей* (loc. sg. fem.), not *козачой*. He also selects the Church Slavonic form in the past passive participle *о(т)вращени*.

The ending of the adjectives in the nominative masculine singular form is always *-ый* (*/-ий*) here, as in *лубен(с)кий*, not markedly Russian *-ой*. In the adverb *горазда*, on the other hand, *akan'e* is again reflected in the ending, whereas *разнихъ* can only be interpreted as a reflex of the Church Slavonic metathesis in the initial syllable, since *a* is stressed.

Finally, it should be emphasized that in this document we find the expression *отечеству малороссійскому* (dative singular) '(to) the Little Russian Fatherland.' Thus, although the language of this document testifies to the Russification of the Hetmanate, the text can still be interpreted as a witness of "Little Russian" patriotism.

4. Conclusions

In our analysis, we paid particular attention to a number of elements that are summarized in the following table (cf. the commentary in 3.1–3.3):

Orthography and phonology
Ukrainian <i>g/s</i> : 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: <i>Галаганомъ</i> . 1760: no relevant word forms.
Russian <i>э</i> (purely orthographic): 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: no relevant word forms. 1760: <i>эщерицији</i> , but <i>ещерицији</i> , <i>ещерицтова(т)</i> .

17 In a report of unknown origin from 1785, we still find the loan *звалты* (acc. pl.) (DD 1993: 84).

<p>Ukrainian mixing of <i>u</i>/ы:</p> <p>1726: <i>соте(н)ни(и)</i> (nom. sg. masc.), <i>пункти, битъ (быть)</i>. 1746: <i>закрития, битъ (быть)</i>. 1760: <i>виборних, литери</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian mixing of <i>ъ</i> [i] and <i>и</i>:</p> <p>1726: <i>жителъ</i> (nom. pl.), <i>Тиницъ</i> (gen. sg.). 1746: <i>зъми</i> (!, cf. Russian and Ukrainian dialectal [z'im]-), <i>сотнъ</i> (gen. sg.), <i>дверъ</i> (acc. pl.), <i>кома(н)ди</i> (loc. sg.), <i>всемилюстиви(й)шей</i> (loc. sg. fem.). 1760: <i>Санктпѣтербургской</i> (cf. Russian <i>Питер</i>), <i>еѣерцѣтова(т)</i>, <i>гарнѣзонахъ, енералѣтетовъ</i>; (<i>о о(т)дачи</i>), <i>на бумаги, къ [...] науки</i>.</p>
<p>Russian mixing of <i>ъ</i> and <i>е</i> [also northern Ukrainian, if unstressed]:</p> <p>1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: <i>все (волности), Днепръ, здешней</i> [unstressed: <i>мѣста(х), побѣзу, кромѣ</i> (along with <i>кромѣ</i>)]. 1760: <i>Бѣлого Орла, те (дѣти), понеделно</i> [unstressed: <i>Днепра</i>].</p>
<p><i>е</i> (as in the emerging Russian literary language) vs. <i>о</i> (according to the Ukrainian traditions) after postdentals:</p> <p>1726: <i>в че(м), вашего сияте(л)ства</i>. 1746: <i>стоящей, козачо(й)</i> (loc. sg. fem.), but <i>человѣку, чего, всемилюстиви(й)шей</i> (loc. sg. fem.). 1760: <i>вашей, козачей, почему</i>.</p>
<p>"Ukrainian" [c']/ "Russian" [c]:</p> <p>1726: <i>чигири(н)ця, Тиницъ</i> (genitive singular), <i>сѣнця(х)</i>. 1746: <i>границъ</i>. 1760: <i>двадцятью</i>.</p>
<p>„Ukrainian“ <i>r</i> < <i>r'</i>:</p> <p>1726: <i>писаръ, писара</i>. 1746: no relevant word forms. 1760: <i>букваровъ</i>, but <i>писарей</i>.</p>
<p>„Ukrainian“ <i>v</i>-prothesis:</p> <p>1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: <i>вѣкна</i> [v'ikna]. 1746: no relevant word forms.</p>
<p>Ukrainian <i>i</i> < <i>о</i>:</p> <p>1726: <i>ти(л)ко</i> (or < Polish <i>tylko</i>?). 1746: <i>вѣкна</i>. 1760: no relevant word forms.</p>

<p>Ukrainian в/у: 1726: <i>вдариць</i>. 1746: no relevant word forms. (Kozelets 1748: <i>у силъ</i>). 1760: <i>в виборних козаков</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian vs. Church Slavonic (> Russian) reflexes of *-bj- with в in a weak position: 1726: <i>вибетъ</i>, but <i>доношение</i>. 1746: <i>за о(т)нятемъ, ружемъ</i> (instr. sg.), but <i>доношение, сие</i>. 1760: <i>Григоревичу, ружа</i> (Russian <i>ружья</i>), <i>ружемъ</i> but <i>сіятелству</i>.</p>
<p>Russian akan'e: 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: <i>разорение</i> (or Church Slavonic reflex, cf. <i>робота</i>). 1760: <i>салдацкимъ, горазда</i> (adverb), <i>Разумовскому</i> (the latter form is rather to be interpreted as Slavonic, though).</p>
<p>Russian vs. Ukrainian and Church Slavonic reflexes of *-bj-/-vj- with jers in a strong position: 1726: <i>оной</i>, but <i>обивате(л)скій, бий!</i> 1746: <i>которо(й), козачо(й)</i>, but <i>чигриндубровски(й), Бутовскій</i>. 1760: no <i>-ой</i>, but <i>лубен(с)кій</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian rendering of the temporal suffix in the masculine singular form -въ: 1726: <i>находи(в)ся, вдариць, бивъ</i>, but predominating <i>-лъ</i>. 1746: <i>о(т)няв, переста(в), пославъ</i>, but predominating <i>-лъ</i>. 1760: only <i>-лъ</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian з < *jъzъ: 1726: <i>з</i> occurs frequently (<i>з(ъ) кухнѣ</i> et al.), no <i>изъ</i> as preposition (but as prefix, cf. <i>изволь</i>). 1746: <i>з</i> occurs frequently (<i>зъ мужиковъ</i>), no <i>изъ</i> as preposition (but as prefix, cf. <i>извѣстно</i>). 1760: <i>з</i> occurs frequently (<i>з полковой Лубенской канцеляріи</i>), but <i>ис того ожидается по(л)за</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian од(ъ): 1726: <i>о(д) его, по отъ</i>. 1746: only <i>о(т) всего, о(т)нятемъ</i>. 1760: <i>одпусти(т)</i>, but <i>отобрани</i>.</p>
<p>"Russian" literary/"Ukrainian" -чество/-цтво, -шество/-ство, -ческій/-цкій, -шескій/-скій: 1726: [<i>ба(х)мацки(и)</i>]. 1746: <i>козацство, товариствомъ / по(д)даническая</i>. 1760: <i>отечеству</i>.</p>
<p>Genuinely Polish еди-, as in Middle Ukrainian: 1726: (<i>поеди(н)це(м)</i>). 1746: <i>една</i>. 1760: <i>еди(нь) [!] другого, едни другихъ</i>.</p>

Morphology
Ukrainian ending -[u] in the locative singular of velar masculine nouns: 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: <i>мѣстечку</i> (twice). 1760: no relevant word forms.
Russian lack of the second palatalization in the paradigm of <i>a</i>-stems: 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: with second palatalization: <i>Еремѣвцѣ</i> (loc. sg.). 1760: <i>науки</i> (dat. sg.).
"Ukrainian" <i>мое</i>: 1726: <i>мое</i> . 1746: <i>мое</i> and <i>мо</i> . 1760: no relevant word forms.
Russian pronoun <i>том(ъ) же</i>: 'the same': 1726: <i>того жѣ</i> . 1746: no relevant word forms. 1760: no relevant word forms.
Ukrainian <i>було</i>: 1726: <i>було</i> (yet <i>буть</i> instead of <i>быть</i>). 1746: only <i>били</i> (instead of <i>были</i>), <i>било</i> (instead of <i>было</i>). 1760: only <i>было</i> , <i>буть</i> , <i>бываемие</i> (instead of <i>бываемые</i>).
Ukrainian epenthetic <i>l'</i> in 3rd person plural present tense forms: 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: no relevant word forms. 1760: <i>являться</i> , <i>вступлять</i> .
"Ukrainian" 3rd person present tense ending -ть: 1726: only <i>живеть</i> , <i>вибеть</i> . 1746: only <i>дожидаетъ</i> , <i>живетъ</i> . 1760: <i>имѣють</i> , <i>будуць</i> , <i>вѣдають</i> (along with <i>могутъ</i>).
Russian verbal present stem suffix -ува(j)-: 1726: does not occur, instead: <i>договароваль</i> . 1746: does not occur, instead: <i>приказуетъ</i> . 1760: in the bookish form <i>на(д)смаптриваніи</i> .
Ukrainian infinitive form + -му etc.: 1726: no relevant word forms. 1746: no relevant word forms. 1760: <i>имѣтиметь</i> .

<p>Russian gerund ending in -'а:</p> <p>1726: <i>видя</i>.</p> <p>1746: <i>видя, не смотря</i>, but also <i>пишучи</i>.</p> <p>1760: <i>опредѣля, обучаясь</i>.</p>
<p>Russian shortened vs. Church Slavonic and Ukrainian unshortened infinitive endings (Ukrainian shortened infinitives also exist):</p> <p>1726: <i>просити</i>, unclear <i>проси(т)</i>.</p> <p>1746: only <i>бить, возить, о(т)вѣтствовать, чинить (подпасть)</i>.</p> <p>1760: <i>изучити</i> (Church Slavonic word), but <i>велѣть, ходить</i> [...].</p>
<p>"Un-Russian" infinitive of reflexive verbs -тися:</p> <p>1726: only <i>учинится</i> [sic].</p> <p>1746: only <i>учинится</i>.</p> <p>1760: <i>учитись, изучатись/обучатся, умножатся</i>.</p>
<p>Ukrainian <i>нимъ</i> without preposition:</p> <p>1726: no relevant word form.</p> <p>1746: <i>нимъ</i>.</p> <p>1760: no relevant word form.</p>
<p>Ukrainian <i>од его</i> (without <i>н-</i> after the preposition):</p> <p>1726: <i>о(д) его</i>.</p> <p>1746: only <i>к нему</i></p> <p>1760: no relevant word form.</p>
<p>Syntax</p>
<p><i>по</i> + Russian dative(/"Ukrainian" locative case):</p> <p>1726: <i>по прошению и(х)</i> (could also be <i>по</i> + locative case as in <i>po proszeniu</i>).</p> <p>1746: <i>по случаю, по и(х) древнему обикновению, по дворамъ козачимъ</i> (along with <i>по инши(х) землямъ</i>).</p> <p>1760: <i>по мнѣнию моему</i>.</p>
<p>"Ukrainian" genitive government of <i>учи-</i>:</p> <p>1726: no relevant contexts.</p> <p>1746: no relevant contexts.</p> <p>1760: <i>изобучению грамоти, учитись букваровъ</i> [...] <i>ча(с)ловцовъ</i> [...] only with gen.</p>
<p>Vocabulary (actually used word forms are cited)</p>
<p>1726: Elements of the emerging Russian literary language (including Church Slavonic): <i>доношение, слѣдую(т), обидя(х), когда, буди (буде)</i> 'if', <i>бранилъ</i> [...].</p> <p>// Ukrainian (and Polish) elements: <i>писарь, статокъ, ста(т)чини, ту(р)ми, бо</i> (initial position, cf. <i>ибо</i> in a document from 1751), <i>поединцемъ, покладалъ, нехай, художу, (тогда), затяль, кидкома</i>.</p>

1746: Elements of the emerging Russian literary language (including Church Slavonic):
 покорное доношение, обиди, принуждения, принуждаетъ, какъ (but якъ), или (but) albo,
 свидѣтельствуеъ (yet not свѣдѣ-), именно, случаю, опредѣле(н)но(й), усмотрѣль, лошаде(й),
 места(х) 'places,' указу, дожидаетъ, слѣдствия, всегда, иногда, безопасно, древнему,
 обикновению, остановка, касаючи(х)ся, видимое, состоить, происходитъ, жалованнихъ
 грамота(х), извѣстно, нѣсколко, слушается, надлежитъ (not на-), не видалъ [...], область,
 дѣлаетъ 'does, makes,' (о)твѣтствовать, токмо, протчихъ, какъ, того ради даби, понеже),
 [...].

// Ukrainian (and Polish) elements: прийдучую, грунта(х), о(т)правують, инши(х)/ини(х),
 жадного, якого, якъ, albo/или, през, хатъ, волности, вертаеть, якого, (виключаю(т)ся).

1760: Elements of the emerging Russian literary language (including Church Slavonic):
 покорнѣйшій, получения, обучатся (изобучению), почему, нѣкоторихъ, какъ, повелѣнію,
 исполненія, дѣйствова(т), дѣйствихъ, дѣйствителному, мнѣнію, слѣдующимъ,
 первоначально, должно, должни, распознаеть, доку(ч)но, между тѣмъ, исчисление, изучити,
 опредѣлить, воскресне, замѣчать, случаю, пѣвчье, опредѣля, мѣсто 'place,' како(й),
 на(д)сматриваніи, именно, нѣсколко, ружа, ружемъ (cf. Russian ружьё), употребля(т),
 происходитъ, надобно, подѣлани, дѣлаются, ратища, копіовъ, о(т)вращени, понеделно
 'weekly,' умножатся, когда, тогда, доспѣють, надежда, вѣжливѣйшіе, отечеству, ожидается,
 по(л)за, другихъ 'other' (исправнѣйшіе, мощно, понеже, ежедневно).

// Ukrainian (and Polish) elements: ясневелможному, (можнѣйшихъ), литери, (non-
 diminutive (?)) книжками, однакъ, помалу, особливо, (волняними), нарѣканія, негодности,
 понятіиє.

If we now pose the crucial question of what these data can tell us, we might conclude first and foremost that these documents, composed by the literate elite of the Hetmanate, were written in a language that differed significantly from the Ukrainian chancery language of previous centuries and became quite close to the emerging Russian literary language of the eighteenth century. Quite obviously, these scribes increasingly sought to adopt the new Russian chancery language of the Russian Empire as best they could. During the period under discussion, however, the scribes did not achieve their goal and produced an imperfect variety of Russian still characterized by plenty of Ukrainian interferences at all levels. Among the factors contributing to this result were the inadequate codification of the modern Russian literary language, which was just beginning, and the inability of the schools available to the scribes of the eighteenth-century Hetmanate, including the Kyivan Academy, to improve the situation significantly.

The new Russianized chancery language created in the Hetmanate was certainly regarded as a linguistic symbol of this polity and its structures of power. After the elite of the Hetmanate had adopted various elements of the Russian chancery language—which at this stage, to be sure, was also quite new to the Russians themselves in its eighteenth-century form—it is most likely that provincial officials and, subsequently, peasants became accustomed to a range of abstract terms no longer borrowed from Polish or from Church Slavonic itself but from the emerging Russian literary language, which bore so many striking resemblances to the language that they heard in the Orthodox liturgy. As the documents demonstrate,

the language used in the Russian administrative system was characterized by *akan'e* or the pronunciation of *ě* as *e* and the like, even among Ukrainian scribes in the Hetmanate. When the inhabitants of the Hetmanate realized that the new Russian literary language was also to become the literary language of their society, they increasingly added elements from this Russian "high variety" to their written—and, certainly, spoken—languages and began mixing codes.

Elites always serve as models for their societies in some way—a role that actually defines their status, even in the sphere of language. In our particular case, this might have led to the following scenario: when the elites of the Hetmanate began using *получили* instead of *одержали* or *отримали*, among many other non-Ukrainian words, others probably tried to adopt these forms in the same period (the eighteenth century), at least in contexts where they thought that these higher-level expressions would be appropriate. When the elites, generalizing from the Russian pronunciation of words such as *получили*, subsequently even began striving to imitate Russian *akan'e* as a phonological rule, more and more speakers of Ukrainian followed them as well. As a result, many speakers from Central and Eastern Ukraine tend to apply *akan'e* rules even when speaking Ukrainian (unless they make a conscious effort to avoid it), and their language is characterized by many more elements of Russian origin at all linguistic levels.

In any case, as long as schooling did not provide opportunities for learning "proper Russian," the commoners' Ukrainian roots were strong enough to preserve the Ukrainian language quite well. Consequently, Ukrainian was still vital when the representatives of a new elite found their way back to their national roots in the nineteenth century and dedicated themselves to the elaboration of a modern Ukrainian standard language. From then on, Modern Standard Ukrainian competed with other idioms, including "Surzhyk." In a certain sense, this process is still going on.

Part III

The Long and Winding Road: Ukrainian Becoming a Standard Language

“RUTHENIANS” AND THE “RUTHENIAN LANGUAGE” IN GALICIAN GRAMMARS DATING FROM THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

1. How many millions of whom?

Just as historians to this day have not ceased questioning the identity of Galician Ruthenians¹ of the first half of the nineteenth century, neither can linguists base their work on the assumption that Galician texts of this period are always grounded in a linguistic awareness that is simply to be equated with modern-day categories. Included among Ukrainian linguistic materials are valuable sources that reveal substantial data on how Galician Ruthenians perceived their language as well as their national identity.

Some of the best sources for the study of the linguistic awareness of the Galician intellectual elites are nineteenth-century Galician grammars, the introductions to these publications, and other texts that emerged alongside the grammars or in connection with them. Of course, these texts contain not only information on matters of grammar but also data pertaining to the imagined prevalence of the Ruthenian language as well as its history and all its varieties.

It is worth recalling that in 1848, when the Supreme Ruthenian Council (Головна Руська Рада) sent its well-known appeal to the Austrian emperor, which included these words: “We Galician Ruthenians belong to the great Russian people, which speaks one language and constitutes 15 million, of whom two and a half million reside in the Galician land” (Zorja Halyc'ka 1848: 1),² the original version of this text mentioned only the 2.5 million figure instead of 15 million Ruthenians (Hrycak 1996: 52). Should one infer from this that in 1848 the Galician Ruthenians still imagined only some sort of “Ruthenian people of the Austrian state...who speak the same language”—some kind of Austrian Ruthenians with a separate national identity? Or can one simply identify these 15 million mentioned in the second version of the appeal with the Ukrainian nation in the contemporary sense?

With regard to the first question, existing sources confirm that those Galicians who pondered the linguistic and national identity of the Ruthenians did not usually have the Austrian vista in mind. It is worth recalling the famous definition of the Ruthenian space in the introduction to *The Dnister Nymph* (Русалка Дністровая): “The Ruthenian people are one of the main Slavic branches, in the midst of them, extending throughout grain-producing areas from the foothills of the Beskyd Mountains to regions beyond the Don” (Rusalka 1837: ix).³ The sources listed in

1 Since the term “Ruthenianness” in the present context clearly does not encompass the Great Russian space but is not yet firmly established with regard to Belarusian-Ukrainian issues, in this article I use the terms “Ruthenians” (*русини*), “Ruthenian language” (*руська мова*) et al. Of course, in various contexts one could also use the later terms “Ukrainians” (*українці*), “Ukrainian language” (*українська мова*) et al.

2 “Мы Русины Галицки належимо до великого руського народа, котрый однимъ говорить азикомъ и 15 милѣоновъ выносить, зъ которого полтрета милѣона землю Галицкѣ замешкѣе.”

3 “Нарід Руский оден з головних поколѣнь Славянських [*sic*], в серединѣ меж ними, розкладаєся по хлѣбородних окрестностях з ноза [*sic*] гір Бескидских за Дон.”

The Dnister Nymph reinforce the impression that at issue here was the very same nation that today we call Ukrainian,⁴ but that is not necessarily the case. Although in his 1836 article “Azбука i Abecadło” Markijan Šaškevyč wrote about “the more than eight million” (Steblij 2004: 561) Ruthenians, in another (German-language) article, titled “The Ruthenians” (Die Ruthenen), he confirmed that the Ruthenian space extended “all the way to the boundaries of Lithuania” (“bis an Litauen”) and that the Ruthenians number “up to fourteen million” (“bis auf 14,000,000”) (cited in Steblij 2004: 569).⁵ Obviously, this number, “like the 15 million and more in [the writings of] other authors, also included the Belarusians (nearly 3 million)” (Steblij 2004: 561). Although there is a view according to which “ethnography in those days did not distinguish Belarusians from the general mass of Ruthenians, and their language was perceived as a dialect of Ruthenian (Ukrainian)” (ibid.), nonetheless, Pavel Jozef Šafařík [in Slovak: Pavol Jozef Šafárik], the most influential Slavic ethnographer of his time, distinguished between Belarusians and “Little Russians” (Ukrainians) in his book *Slovanský národopis* (Slavic Ethnography): in the chapter titled “Nářečí maloruské” (Little Russian Dialects), he writes of “13,144,000 people, of whom 10,370,000 are to be found in Russia, and 2,744,000 in Austria, and 2,149,000 in Halyč [Galicia] and 625,000 in Hungary” (“13,144,000 duší, z nichž 10,370.000 do Ruska, a 2,744.000 do Rakauska, a sice 2,149.000 do Haliče a 625.000 do Uher, padá”) (Šafařík 1842: 26). However, in the chapter titled “Nářečí běloruské” (Belarusian Dialects), he claimed that the number of Belarusians stood at 2,726,000 (ibid., 30). Finally, even if the Belarusian and Ukrainian linguistic

4 Here is the relevant passage from *The Dnister Nymph*: “Енеида на малороссійскій язык переложенная М. Котляревским; тричи виданая 1798, 1808 и 1809 в С. Петербурзѣ; Князя Цертелева: Опыт собранія старинных малороссійскихъ пѣсен, С.П. 1819; Малороссійскія пѣсни, изданныя Михаилом Максимовичем, Москва 1827; тойже издаѣ: Украинскія народныя пѣсни Моск. 1834; Запорожска старина, Харьков 1833–1834. IV. Части; Малороссійскія повѣсти изд. Основяненком в Моск. 1834; Малороссійскія пословицы, Харьков 1833; Приказки малороссійскія изд. Гребеньком, С. Петерб.; Войцеховича малороссійскій словарь помѣщенный в трудах моск. общества любителей Россійской словесности, Ча. III, 1818; В извѣстіях росс. Акад. в книжцѣ 7, читаем що Академіѣ куплений словарь “Малороссійскій поручен от Академіи Господину члену оной Николаю Ивановичу Гнѣдичу, и при нем двум любителям словесности, знающим малороссійское нарѣчіе и согласившимся из усердія к общей ползѣ содѣйствовать в сем предприіемомом трудѣ а имено Господину Капнисту и Князю Цертелеву” [In the proceedings of the Russian Academy, book 7, we read that “the Little Russian dictionary purchased by the Academy was commissioned by the Academy to Mr. Nikolaj Ivanovič Gnedič, one of its members, and, along with him, to two amateur writers who know the Little Russian dialect and who agreed out of zeal for the general welfare to assist in this undertaken work, namely Mr. Kapnist and Prince Certelev”], М. – Пѣют також хорошо руским языком ([“The following persons] also sing well in the Ruthenian language:)] Че. Гуляка Артемовскій, Тома Падурра, – и инши. – Про маленько мѣстця лише набилянням о Грамматиках Павловского (Моск. 1818.) Лучкая (Slavo-Ruthena в Будимѣ 1830.) Левѣцкого (в Перемишлях 1834)—о дѣлах (Waclawa z Oleska *Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu Galicyjskiego* (у Львовѣ 1833) и *Лозьньского: Ruskoje wesile* (в Перемишлях 1835.))” (Rusalka 1837: IV–VI).

5 Steblij notes that “...V. Kopitar, in his censor’s findings on the manuscript of the almanac *Zoria* (1834), estimated the number of Ukrainians at 9–10 million; there are nearly 3 million of them in the Austrian monarchy; an anonymous author (1835) and Ja. Holovac’kyj in his letters to H. Petrovyč (1837) and K. V. Zap (1848) at 15 million; P. J. Šafařík (1842) and, following in his footsteps, I. Levyc’kyj (1843) and Ja. Holovac’kyj (1848) at 13,144,000; I. Lozyns’kyj (1846) and I. V. Terlec’kyj (1849) at 15,870,000...” (Steblij 2004: 561).

space was considered to be one and the same, the Belarusian language could not be considered a dialect of Ukrainian: the Belarusian and Ukrainian languages were supposed to function as dialects or variants of one common Ruthenian, that is, Ukrainian-Belarusian, language. Since the parameters of the Ruthenian language were not clear-cut, it is all the more important to determine the notions of the prevalence of the Ruthenian language that appear in the works of Galician grammarians.

2. On the linguistic community in Galician-Ruthenian grammars

2.1. The first scholarly grammar of the Ruthenian language was created by Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj in Przemyśl/Peremyshl in the early 1820s;⁶ he wrote in the language that he regarded as the literary variant of Ruthenian. The grammar remained in manuscript form until 1910, but its introduction, titled "Report on the Ruthenian Language" (ВѢДОМѢСТЬ О РУСКОМЪ ЯЗЫКѢ), was published several times during the first half of the nineteenth century, although only in Polish and Russian translations.

In this introduction (as earlier, in the official letter on the defense of Metropolitan Myxajlo Levyc'kyj's pastoral letter), Mohyl'nyc'kyj argued:

The Ruthenian language (dialect) was always separate and independent of other dialects, particularly from Slavonic, Polish, Russian (Muscovite, long ago)...at all times the Slavonic dialect was different from common Ruthenian (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 25, 27).⁷

Mohyl'nyc'kyj was the first authority to provide scholarly substantiation for the independence of the Ruthenian language from Polish, Russian, and Church Slavonic. His argumentation is based mostly on historical examples confirming that these languages were considered different at least from the beginning of the early modern period.

As for the prevalence of the Ruthenian language, Mohyl'nyc'kyj writes:

In all the Ruthenian lands, known at one time under the names Little, White, and Red Rus', there was one and the same Ruthenian dialect...it may be decisively asserted that in White and Little Rus' alike they speak that same dialect. Anyone who has listened well to Ruthenians from Kyiv, Chernihiv, Bratslav (Little Russia), Lviv, Peremyshl (Red Rus'), Berestia Lytovske, Smolensk, and Polatsk (White Rus') must recognize that truth (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 37, 39).⁸

6 Correspondence with the censorship bodies took place in 1823 (Voznjak 1911: 8–9).

7 "Отдѣльный и самостоячій языкъ (діалектъ) рускій все бывалъ от инныхъ діалектовъ а меновите славенского, полского, російского (московского давнѣйше) различаный [...] діалектъ славенскій от народного руского по всѣ часы различанымъ бывалъ."

8 "Во всѣхъ земляхъ рускихъ, негдашъ подъ именами: малои, бѣлои, червонои руси знаныхъ, едень и тотъ самъ былъ діалектъ рускій ... смѣло твердити можна, яко на бѣлой и малой Руси еднако и тымъ самымъ діалектомъ говорятъ. Хтося ено добрь прислухавъ Русинови от Кіева, Чернигова, Брацлава (Малороссія), Лвова, Перемышля (Червона русь), Берестя Литовского, Смоленска, Полоцка (Бѣла русь), тотъ правду тоту визнати мусить."

Regardless of the (rather interesting) question of whether Mohyl'nyc'kyj himself had really heard speakers from Berestia Lytavske, it turns out that when he wrote about the Ruthenians, he too did not mean only the Ukrainian people according to their traditional name but "Ruthenians" according to perceptions of the early modern period,⁹ meaning the Ruthenians of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This may explain why his list includes no references either to the Transcarpathian Ruthenians or to the Ruthenians of Sloboda Ukraine ("Slobozhanshchyna," a historico-geographic region in northeastern Ukraine that bordered on the Ukrainian Hetman state to the west). Instead, there is explicit mention of the inhabitants of White Rus', who were regarded as belonging to this same people, like all other Ruthenians.¹⁰ After all, in this description White Rus' also extends all the way to Smolensk.

In the "Report," Mohyl'nyc'kyj wrote unambiguously: "Terms: the *Ruthenian language (dialect)* is entirely identical to the terms Little Russian and Belarusian" (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 25).¹¹ That is why he championed the use of the term "Ruthenian" (*руський*), which he also calls the "characteristic name *common Ruthenian* without any kind of epithet" [*"просторускою безъ всего придомку"*] (ibid., 4). Nevertheless, he titled his grammar book not simply a "Ruthenian" grammar but a grammar of the Slavonic-Ruthenian language ("Славено-рускогѣ азыка") [Voznjak 1911: 12]. As regards the history of these linguonyms, Mohyl'nyc'kyj noted briefly:

9 In fact, although Belarusian and Ukrainian are commonly regarded as separate languages, to this day Belarusians and Ukrainians understand each other perfectly. But criteria of this kind are by no means decisive factors in determining individual languages.

10 Elsewhere, the author writes that "Ruthenian writing or the bookish language...was one and the same in the diverse Ruthenian lands, as in Vilnius in Belarus, in Ostrih in Volhynia, in Little Russia, that is, in Ukraine, in Podolia as well as in the Galician Principality, in Kyiv, Lviv, Univ, Striatyn, and Zabłudów" ["писма рускіе або мова книжна [...] въ rozmaityхъ земляхъ рускихъ, яко то на Бѣлоруси въ Вилнѣ, на Волиню въ Острожѣ, на Малоруси то естъ на Украинѣ, Подолію, также королевствѣ Галицкомѣ, въ Києвѣ, Львовѣ, Уневѣ, Стратинѣ, Заблудовѣ выходила, една и тота сама была"] (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 48). Voznjak cites chapters from "Vidomist" to the effect that the "Ukrainian" and "Belarusian" languages are identical (Voznjak 1911: 64–67). In fact, he explains this view merely by indicating the narrow range of knowledge of the Belarusian language on Mohyl'nyc'kyj's part and that of the entire scholarly world. He adds: "As early as 1880, Omeljan Ohonovs'kyj, in his *Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache*, made the same mistake as Mohyl'nyc'kyj before the year 1829, calling the Belarusian language a dialect of Ukrainian. Among Great Russian scholars, such errors in favor of their own language were encountered very often. Therefore Mohyl'nyc'kyj should not be attacked for not having a clear understanding of the Belarusian language and its differences from Ukrainian." ["Ще в 1880 року Омелян Огоновський у своїх *"Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache"* зробив таку саму похибку, як Могильницький до року 1829, й зачислив білоруську мову як діалект до української. Поміж великоруськими ученими такі помилки в користь своєї мови лучалися дуже часто. Тому й не можна накидати ся на Могильницького, що він не мав ясного розуміння білоруської мови й її ріжниць від української"] (Voznjak 1911: 67–68). Later, Voznjak nonetheless writes about Mohyl'nyc'kyj's "great error" ["велику похибку"] (Voznjak 1911: 70). Voznjak is mistaken where Ohonovs'kyj is concerned. Ohonovs'kyj notes: "With regard to the Belarusians, the descendants of the Slavic tribe of Krivichians, they are nonetheless closer to the Little Russians than to the Great Russians" ["Was schliesslich die Weissrussen, die Nachkommen des slawischen Stammes der Kriwitschen betrifft, so stehen sie jedenfalls näher den Kleinrussen, als den Grossrussen"] (Ohonovs'kyj 1880: 18) and expresses the view that the Belarusians were at first only "a branch of the Little Russian people" (ein Zweig des kleinrussischen Volkes) (ibid.). However, he says nothing further on this subject.

11 "Назвиска: языкъ (діалектъ) рускій суть тосамо значные съ назвисками малорускій, бѣлороссійскій."

That language was called *Ruthenian* without any kind of epithet...and not one word was said about *White and Little Russian* (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 39–40).¹²

On this basis, Mohyl'nyč'kyj expresses his objection to the separation of the “Little and Belarusian” languages in rather witty terms:

If, however, the custom of dividing the Ruthenian language into *Little Russian and Belarusian* has become so common nowadays (“Custom is law by another name”) that one can hardly expect it to be neglected; if the Ruthenian expression ‘one’s house, one’s truth,’ is already accepted in our language, then, on citing authentic historical evidence, I simply advise the reader that, if I yield to the examples and to my esteem for more recent Authors (for no Hercules can prevail against a multitude) and retain *Little-White Ruthenian* as the names of the dialect, then those terms should be taken to mean *the same* as the *Ruthenian* tongue or language (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 48).¹³

It should be mentioned that the term *Ukraine* in its traditional, regionally restricted sense appears in Mohyl'nyč'kyj's grammar. For example, as regards the adverb *нак*, the scholar writes that

the above-mentioned dialect [occurs] in White Rus', in the Czech and Serbian dialects, and in the common language among the Ruthenians of the Carpathian Mountain chain, in Red Rus', in Podilia and Ukraine, and then commonly throughout Little Rus' (Voznjak 1911: 45).¹⁴

With regard to the terms *Russnaken*, *Russnakische Nation*, and *Russnakische Sprache*, he writes that these terms were “unknown until now” (“незнанными до тыхъ часъ”), and, in passing, advises avoiding “names that express disdain of some kind” (“погарду яковусь выражающихъ именъ вароватися”) (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 4, 68). The fact that he considered the term “Rusnak” offensive links him to another Peremyshl-based philologist of that period, Ivan Lavrivs'kyj, who wrote a letter in 1823 to the Russian statistician and bibliographer Petr Keppen (Köppen) in which he mentioned the title of Keppen's grammar, which, unfortunately, is no longer extant: “I dare not use the terms Rusnjak or Rusnjak language, for both may be regarded as contemptuous” (Voznjak 1911: 4).¹⁵ Clearly, neither Mohyl'nyč'kyj nor

12 “Языкъ тотъ безъ всякого епифета рускимъ звано ... а о діалектѣ бѣло и малорускомъ ани слыху не было.”

13 “Коли єднакъ звичай дѣлення мовы рускои на мало- и бѣлоруску такъ ся въ теперешныхъ часахъ сталъ посполитымъ (consuetudo altera lex), же трудно и надѣятися, абы го понехано, коли уже приповѣдка руска: “чїя хата, того правда” и на нашой мовѣ ся полнить, то по приведеню историческихъ автентичныхъ доказательствъ читателя єдинѣ остергаю [sic], же если прикладомъ и повазѣ новѣйшихъ Авторовъ улегаючи (бо не Hercules contra plures), назвиска діалекта мало-бѣло-русского заховаю, то имена тые за то само, ще имена: языкъ або мова руска, брати належить.”

14 “[...] поманѣтое нарѣчїе ... на бѣлой рѣси, въ діалектѣ чеськомъ, сербскомъ и въ просторѣчїи межї Рѣсинами ѿ пасма Карпадскихъ [sic] горъ, въ червонной Рѣси, на Подолїю и Оукраинѣ, а затымъ въ цѣлой Малой рѣси посполито.”

15 “Die Ausdrücke: Rusniak, Rusniakische Sprache, darf ich nicht gebrauchen, indem sie beide hierlandes eine Verachtung hindeuten.”

Lavrivs'kyj knew that a number of Ruthenians/Ukrainians used that ethnonym as a self-description and continued to do so. This confirms that during the period in question the Galicians still knew comparatively little about the people of Transcarpathia: although Mohyl'nyč'kyj singles out the "Slovaks in the Kingdom of Hungary" in this context, he says not a word about the Rusnaks of Transcarpathia.¹⁶

2.2. The next important Galician grammar of the Ruthenian language, written by the cultural figure Josyf Levyc'kyj, was published in German in 1834. Although Myxajlo Voznjak, for example, engages in a vigorous polemic with the author of this grammar¹⁷ and unjustifiably criticizes Levyc'kyj for extensive borrowing not only from grammars of the Russian language (Voznjak 1911: 92–109) but also from the then unpublished manuscript of Ivan Mohyl'nyč'kyj's grammar, Levyc'kyj's grammar also deserves attention.

In the introduction to his grammar, Levyc'kyj cites the following data on the prevalence of the Ruthenian language:

The eastern side of the Carpathians and the plain between the rivers Sian, Viar [Vihor], Dnister, Buh, Boh, Dnipro, and Prypiat [in a footnote: Сань, Вѣгорь, Днѣстеръ, Бѣгъ, Бо́гъ, Днѣпръ, Припѣць] are inhabited by a Slavic tribe that calls itself Rusyn in its native language (Rusyn, the Ruthenian people, Rus', the Ruthenian land) [in a footnote: Russininn oder Reussinn: Рѣсска, Рѣсскаа] but calls its land Rus'¹⁸ (Levyc'kyj 1834: i).¹⁹

16 "Unaware at the time of that people, based on the writings of the above-mentioned authors alone, I could easily have judged that in Galicia, besides the people known in Polish as *Rusini*, in Latin as *Rutheni*, and in German as *Ruthener*, there was some other kind of branch of *Rusnaks*, perhaps like the *Armenians* or the *Karaites*, or the *Slavonians* and *Slovaks* (*Slavonier, Slovaken*) in the Hungarian Kingdom and in Slavonia, which is dependent on it" ["Несвѣдомый tedy народа того, ено съ писмѣ помянутыхъ авторовъ, легкобы судити могъ, яко въ Галиціи кромѣ людей, по полску *Rusini*, по латинѣ *Rutheni*, по нѣмецку *Ruthener* званыхъ, ещеся якоєсь иншое поколѣня Руснаковъ, може такъ, якъ Ормяновъ, Караимовъ, а въ Королевствѣ Угерскомъ и завислой от него Славоніи Славеновъ и Словаковъ (*Slavonier, Slovaken*), найдуе"] (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 66).

17 See the following passage: "Levyc'kyj did not write a grammar of this people, only a grammar of some kind of Great Russian-Belarusian-Church Slavonic-Polish-Ukrainian macaronic language, which, it appears, the author himself never spoke. Levyc'kyj combined into one the errors of Mohyl'nyč'kyj and Lučkaj, besides introducing Great Russian words, aspects, and even syntax into the Ukrainian language" ("Не написав Левицький граматики сього народу, тільки граматикую якогось великорусько-білорусько-церковно-славянсько-польсько-українського макаронізму, яким, здаєть ся, і сам автор ніколи не говорив. Левицький заучив в одно похибки Могилянницького та Лучкая, впроваджуючи до того в українську мову великоруські слова, види, навіть складню") (Voznjak 1911: 107).

18 "Der östliche Theil der Karpathen, und die Ebene zwischen den Flüssen: San, Wiar, Dniester, Bug, Boh, Dnieper, Przypiec [in a footnote: Сань, Вѣгорь, Днѣстеръ, Бѣгъ, Бо́гъ, Днѣпръ, Припѣць] werden von einem slavischen Stamme, der sich in seiner Muttersprache *Rusyn* (Рѣссинь, Нѣрѣдъ Рѣсскій, Рѣсь, Край Рѣсскій [in a footnote: Russininn oder Reussinn: Рѣсска, Рѣсскаа]), das Land aber selbst *Rus'* nennt, bewohnt."

19 Some incidental etymological commentaries are rather curious: "The word *Rusyn* is abbreviated from *Russian*; in the plural it should be Russians and abbreviated as *Rusyns*; but because the pronunciation of the vowel *e* in common usage is interchangeable with *ы*, it is thus difficult [to tell] whether an *e* or *ы* will be heard, and since we pronounce it rather as *ы* than as *e* and all substantives that in the singular come from *ъ* become *ы* in the plural, I also write *Rusyny*." ["Das Wort Рѣссинь ist abgekürzt aus Рѣссіанинь; in der vielfachen Zahl sollte es haben: Рѣссіане und abgekürzt Рѣссине; da aber die

If this definition is taken literally, then it is striking that the expanses between the rivers north of the Carpathians enumerated in this passage fail to encompass not only Sloboda Ukraine but also the Kuban and Left-Bank Ukraine. In this description, then, Josyf Levyc'kyj effectively restricts "Ruthenian" (linguistic) space to the eastern Carpathian region and to the boundaries of the Kingdom of Poland as established after the wars of Hetman Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, although he does subsequently mention Ukraine in the broader meaning of the term. Among his sources are Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Eneïda*. With regard to the Ruthenians of Galicia, Levyc'kyj also cites rather detailed additional information (for example, the first known mention of the "Lemkos"):

At present, the Rusyn language (dialect) in Galicia [is spoken] in the entire Sianok area by more than 91,848 [inhabitants]...by 165,282 inhabitants of Stanyslaviv, by 167,669 inhabitants of Stryi (Boikos)...by 108,594 inhabitants of Chortkiv, by inhabitants of Kolomyia (Hutsuls)...in all, by two million. This dialect, with a few small variations in tone and endings, and some expressions that are closer to Slovak, is spoken in Jasło and the Nowy Sącz area of the mountain region by more than 121,939 inhabitants (Lemkos). In the Rzeszów district, however, in Kańczuga and Leżajsk, which to this day is not completely Polonized, there live 10,000 Ruthenians who have preserved little more of their dialect than the church language. In other areas...this dialect is entirely unknown because these extensive lands are populated by Masurians, who constitute a branch of the Poles and speak the Masurian dialect, which, together with Polish, is almost the selfsame language [!] (Levyc'kyj 1834: iv).²⁰

Levyc'kyj then offers some brief information about the "Ruthenian dialect" of Zamostia (Zamość) and Kholm (Chełm), as well as about other Ruthenian-speaking territories of the Russian Empire: "In Russia, this dialect extends through Podilia, Volhynia, Kyiv, and Ukraine, where it is spoken to this day by more than five million inhabitants" (Levyc'kyj 1834: vii).²¹ It is hard to say what the author considers to be the boundaries of the region that he calls "Ukraine," especially when he is mindful

Aussprache des *e* als Vokal im gemeinen Leben mit *ы* verwechselt wird, so, dass es schwer kommt, ob *e* oder *ы* gehört wird, und da wir es mehr mit *ы* als mit *e* aussprechen, und alle Substantiva, die in der E. Z. auf *ъ* ausgehen in der V. Z. *ы* bekommen, so schreibe ich auch Рѣсинны"] (Levyc'kyj 1834: xxi–xxii).

- 20 "Gegenwärtig wird in Galizien die russinische Sprache (Dialekt) im ganzen Sanoker Kreise von mehr als 91848, ... Stanislawower 165282, Stryjer 167669 (Бойки) ... Czortkower 108594, Kolomaejer (Гѣцѣлы) ... im Ganzen bey zwey Millionen. Auch im Jasloer und Sandezer Kreise in den Gebirgsgegenden, von mehr als 121939 Einwohnern (Лѣмки) wird diese Mundart mit wenigen kleinen Veränderungen im Tone und Endungen, und einigen dem Slowakischen sich nähernden Ausdrücken gesprochen. Im Reszower Kreise aber bey Kańczuga und Leżajsk, der bis auf heutigen Tag noch nicht ganz polonisiert ist, leben 10000 Ruthenier, die ausser der Kirchensprache wenig von ihrem Dialekte beybehalten haben. In den übrigen Kreisen ... ist dieser Dialekt ganz und gar unbekannt: weil diese Strecke Landes von Mazuren bewohnt ist, die einen Zweig der Polen ausmachen, und den mazurischen Dialekt, der mit dem Polnischen fast die nämliche Sprache ist [!], sprechen. ...)."

- 21 "In Russland erstreckt sich diese Mundart über Podolien, Volhynien, Kijow und die Ukraina, wo sie von mehr als 5 Millionen Einwohnern noch heutigen Tages gesprochen wird."

of his above-cited description of the "Ruthenian-speaking" space: to what extent does Levyc'kyj perceive Sloboda Ukraine or at least Left-Bank Ukraine?

Levyc'kyj knew more than Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj about the inhabitants of Hungary: living in Vienna, he most certainly associated with them in the milieu of St. Barbara's Greek Catholic Church:

It is also worth recalling the Hungarian inhabitants of Mukachiv, Uzhhorod, and Priashiv (according to the newest diocesan data, they number over 500,000), who speak a Rusyn dialect, very strongly mixed with Hungarian and Slovak words, call themselves Rusyns (Ruthenians), and are called Oroszemberek (Russi homines) by the Magyars... (Levyc'kyj 1834: ix).²²

Levyc'kyj offers the following ethnonymic footnote about the Hungarian Ruthenians:

These Hungarian Rusyns sometimes call themselves Rusnaks, but we Galicians are, and call ourselves, Rusyns, [and] our language is Ruthenian (Levyc'kyj 1834: ix).²³

Emulating Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Levyc'kyj declares here and there that there is no basis for the term "Rusnak oder Russniak (Russnaken)" (Levyc'kyj 1834: xxii), "which term is completely unsubstantiated," and adds that it sounds unflattering and shameful when applied to a Ruthenian (*ibid.*, xxv): "it sounds evil to the ears of the Ruthenians (Rusyns) and implies contempt."²⁴ Unlike Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Levyc'kyj knew that the Ruthenians of Transcarpathia "called themselves" *Rusnaks* of their own accord ("sich selbst nennen") and may therefore have been aware that this name had no offensive coloration for them.

Levyc'kyj mentions the idiom that he calls the "Belarusian (Minsk) dialect" only in a footnote, claiming that Łukasz Gołębiowski's work *Lud polski* contained "examples of Minsk (Belarusian) dialects that are spoken in Lithuania to this day" (*ibid.*, 7).²⁵ Unfortunately, no information is provided about the contemporary association of this "dialect" and its bearers with the general "Ruthenian" space (see section 3.2.). Since Levyc'kyj writes only about the eight million bearers of this language (*ibid.*, ix) and in fact names only Ukrainian regions of the Ruthenian-speaking space, it may be assumed that he most certainly did not consider the Belarusian language a variant of the Ruthenian, or "Little Russian," language. It is

22 "Auch der ungrischen Bewohner von Munkács, Unghvár, Eperies (nach den neuesten Diöcesan-Angaben über 500000 an der Zahl), darf hier wohl erinnert werden, die einen wiewohl sehr stark mit ungrischen, slowakischen Wörtern vermischten russinischen Dialekt sprechen, sich selbst Russinen (Ruthenier) nennen, und von den Magyaren, Oroszemberek (Russi homines) genannt werden."

23 "Diese ungrischen Russinen nennen sich zuweilen Russnaken; wir Galizianer aber sind und heißen Russinen Руссины, unsere Sprache языкъ Русскій."

24 "[...] welcher Ausdruck keineswegs gegründet ist" [...] der in den Ohren eines Rutheniers (Russinen) übel klingt, und eine Verachtung in sich fasst."

25 "Beyspiele des Minskischen (weissrussischen) Dialekts, welcher in Lithauen noch heutigen Tages gesprochen wird."

worth recalling that Levyc'kyj often uses the expression *russinisch* in his German-language text. On the eve of the Revolution of 1848, this name was quite widespread and was gradually superseded by the term *ruthenisch* only in later years.

2.3. As early as 1836 Ivan Vahylevyč, a former member of the “Ruthenian Triad,” had already informed Mixail Pogodin, the prominent Slavophile and professor of Russian history, about a dictionary that he was planning to publish. It would be similar to the one written by the Serbian linguist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, “together with a grammar and a description of the rituals and beliefs of the people, with the difference that he analyzes some words philologically and indicates their similarity to the words of our fellow countrymen” (Voznjak 1911: 143).²⁶

In the brief introduction to his not very successful grammar, Vahylevyč writes about the geographic distribution of the Ruthenian language:

The Little Russian language is divided into two dialects, Galician and Kyivan; the boundary between the two is formed by the Seret and Buh Rivers. There is a third dialect, the Carpathian, in the mountainous parts of the Stryi, Sambir, Sanok, Jasło, and Nowy Sącz administrative districts in Galicia and, in Hungary, in the Sáros, Ungvár, Bereg, and Zemné [Zemplén] districts; however, because this dialect does not have any center, and because elements of the first two dialects appear in it, differing only in admixtures from related languages, the term ‘dialect’ can have no place here, and I have used it only for reference (Vahylevyč 1845: i).²⁷

Even compared to the descriptions of his predecessors, Vahylevyč’s notions of the boundaries of the Ruthenian language and its bearers were still rather hazy. To the two “dialects” of the “Little Russian language” he adds a third, “Carpathian” dialect that extends past the Carpathian Mountains. As for the “Kyivan dialect,” no detailed information is offered about its prevalence: among the cited materials on “Kyivan dialects,” examples from the Chernihiv region are listed.

In another Polish-language text, titled *Treatise on the South Russian Language* (Rozprawy o języku południowo-ruskim), which is extant in manuscript form (see Section 3.3), Vahylevyč notes:

I called the language South Russian instead of the standard Little Russian and Russian, just as it is called in Rus’ to some extent, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, for the adjective Little Russian is too particular, proper to Ukraine; but the others—Latin *Ruthenicus*, German *Russniathisch* [sic] and

26 “[...] разом з граматикою, описом обрядів і повірок народу з тою ріжницею, що він якібудь слова розбирає фільольгічно та вказує на подібність їх зі словами наших однородців.”

27 “Język małopolski dzieli się na dwa narzecza: halickie i kijowskie; granice obu tworzą rzeki Seret i Bug. Jest trzecie narzecze karpaccie w górnych częściach obwodu stryjskiego, samborskiego, sanockiego, jasielskiego i sandeckiego w Galicji; w Węgrzech zaś w szaryskiej, uchwarskiej, bereskiej i ziemneńskiej stolicy; że zaś narzecze to niema żadnej średnicy i z powodu, że żywioły obu pierwszych narzeczy w niém się pojawiają i tylko różnicę stanowią przymieszki z pobratymczych języków; więc nazwa narzecze, tu miejsca właściwie mieć nie może, i tylko użyłem ją dla przeglądu.”

Russinisch—may be appropriate in those languages, but in any Slavic language they are illogical and even bizarre (Voznjak 1911: 147; cf. Svjencik'kyj 1866: 163).²⁸

It is hard to say where Vahylevyč found the term *Russniathisch*, but it is interesting to note that, unlike his predecessors, he associates the term *Little Russian* only with “Ukraine” in the former restricted sense but uses the term *South Russian* as a general name for the Ukrainian language.

In a letter to the Russian philologist Aleksandr Vostokov, dated 1845, Vahylevyč admitted that he was not very satisfied with his introduction to the grammar, declaring that “one article, ‘On Dialects’ (О нарѣчїяхъ)” among his articles “about the South Russian language (о Южнорусскомъ языкѣ)...is published in abbreviated form instead of a foreword to the Grammar” (cited in Voznjak 1911: 171).²⁹ Myxajlo Voznjak notes that Vahylevyč drew all his examples from Platon Lukaševyč’s collection of songs and other works of “Little Russians” (ibid.).

Vahylevyč’s description of the “Little Russian language” is quite atypical. Whereas other grammars usually seek to emphasize the superior status of the languages they describe, Vahylevyč not only declared that the “Little Russian language” is a “separate, intermediate language in Slavdom” and “as such has greatly influenced the Polish and Russian bookish languages” but also asserted that “it could be regarded as a subdialect of both, understanding by this that it is subordinate in relation to both” (Vahylevyč 1845: ii).³⁰ It is worth noting that Vahylevyč, who subsequently became a supporter of a pro-Polish group, proceeds from the premise that the “pure Ruthenian language” (“чиста руська мова”) had been “corrupted” as a result of Polish influence:

For the fact that in ancient times it was written in Ruthenian, and not in Polish-Ruthenian, as certain scholars have fancied, and that this bookish language is pure Ruthenian and only began to be corrupted later, need not be argued (ibid., xxii–xxiii).³¹

2.4. Arguably, the best Galician-Ruthenian grammar dating from before the Revolution of 1848 was written by Josyf Lozys'kyj in the early 1830s³² but finally

28 “Nazwałem język południowo-ruskim, zamiast używanego mało-ruski i ruski, tak jak go po części nazywają na Rusi, aby uniknąć wszelkiego niedorozumienia [sic], bo przymiotnik mało-ruski jest za szczególny, właściwy Ukrainie; inne zaś: łaciński: ruthenicus, niemieckie russniathisch [sic] i russinisch, mogą mieć miejsce w tych językach, lecz w każdym słowiańskim są nielogiczne a nawet dziwaczne.”

29 “[...] въ сокращеніи напечатана мѣсто предисловія въ Грамматику.”

30 “[...] osobnym środkowym językiem na Słowiańszczyźnie [...] jako taki wiele wpłynął na języki książkowe, polski i ruski [...] możnaby go uważać jako podrzeczce obu, rozumiem przez to, że w stósunku [sic] do obu jest podrzędnym.”

31 “Bo że w dawnych czasach pisano po rusku, a nie po polsko-rusku, jak o tem marzyli niektórzy uczeni, i że ów język książkowy jest czystym ruskim i dopiero później psuć się zaczyna, niepotrzebuje dowodzić.”

32 The first version was sent to the censors in 1833, the second in 1837, and the third in 1843 (Voznjak 1911: 109).

published in revised form in Peremyshl only in 1846. This is how Lozyns'kyj describes the Ruthenian-speaking space:

If the differences between two or three dialects can be subsumed under the common rules of a single grammar, then they should not be considered different dialects, even if some words are pronounced differently and others have a different meaning, says Dobrovský. According to that principle, the Ruthenian (Little Russian) language extends from the middle of northern Hungary and Galicia through all of southern Russia all the way to the Kuban River. *Little Russia* in the broadest sense of the word encompasses the following gubernias in Russia: Volhynia, Kyiv (Ukraine), Chernihiv, Poltava, Kharkiv, part of Voronezh, Katerynoslav, Kherson, Tavriia with the lands of the Black Sea Cossacks, Podilia, and part of Bessarabia; in the Kingdom of Poland, part of Podlachia and Lublin counties; in Lithuania (White Rus'), the gubernias of Białystok, Hrodna, Minsk, Mahilioŭ, Vitsebsk and, partly, Vilnius; in Galicia and Volhynia (Red Rus'), the districts of Peremyshl, Lviv, Zhovkva, Zolochiv, Ternopil, Berezhany, Sambir, Sanok, Stryi (Boikos), Stanyslaviv, Kolomyia (Hutsuls), Chortkiv, and part of Rzeszów, Jasło, Nowy Sącz, and Chernivtsi, or Bukovyna; in the Kingdom of Hungary, the komitats (counties) of Bereg, Ungvár, Ugocsa, and Máramaros with a larger and Zemplén and Sáros with a smaller proportion of inhabitants. In addition, there are Ruthenian settlements in other Hungarian komitats, in Muntenia and Wallachia.³³ Altogether, that nation may be estimated at 15,870,000. (Here I also calculated the Belarusians, whom P. Šafařík tallies separately.) Of that number, 2,149,000 fall to Galicia, 625,000 to Hungary, 216,000 to Poland, and the rest, 12,880,000, to Russia. All of them are of the Greek confession, but in Galicia and Hungary there are only 2,774,000 Uniates (united with the Roman Church), and 216,000 in the Kingdom of Poland (Lozyns'kyj 1846: vii–viii).³⁴

It is obvious that Lozyns'kyj already had a more comprehensive grasp of the Ruthenian-speaking space than his predecessors, thanks to the availability

33 A reference to Šafařík's *Slovanský národopis* (1842).

34 "Jeżeli odmiany w dwóch albo trzech narzeczach pod wspólne prawidła jednej Grammatyki podciągnięte być mogą, to ich nienależy za różne narzecza uważać, chociażby się niektóre słowa inaczej wymawiały, a niektóre inne znaczenie miały, mówi Dobrowski. Według tej zasady rozciąga się język ruski (mało-ruski) od środka północnych Węgier i Galicyi przez całą południową Rosyję aż do rzeki Kubani. *Mała Ruś* w obszerniejszym znaczeniu słowa obejmuje w Rosyji gubernije: Wołyńską, Kiowską (Ukrainę), Czerniechowską, Półtawską, Charkowską, część Woroneżską, Jekaterynosławską, Chersońską, Tawrycką z ziemią czarnomorskich kozaków, Podolską i część Bessarabii; w królestwie polskim część powiatu Podlaskiego i Lubelskiego; na Litwie (Biała Ruś) gubernije: Białostocką, Grodzieńską, Mińską, Mohylewską, Witebską i po części Wileńską; w Galicyi i Lodomeryi (Czerwona — Ruś) cyrkule: Przemyśki, Lwowski, Żółkiewski, Złoczowski, Tarnopolski, Brzeżański, Samborski, Sanocki, Stryjski (Bojki), Stanisławowski, Kołomyjski (Hocule), Czortkowski i część Rzeszowskiego, Jasielskiego, Nowo-Sandeckiego i Czerniowieckiego czyli Bukowiny; w Królestwie Węgierskiem komitaty (hrabstwa: Bereg, Ungvár, Ugocza i Máramaros z większą, a Zemplin i Száros z mniejszą częścią mieszkańców). Prócz tego znachodzą się osady ruskie i po innych komitatach Węgier, w Multanach i na Wołoszczyźnie. Ogółem można ten naród na 15.870,000 liczyć [Policzyłem tu razem i Białorusinów, których P. Szafařík oddzielnie liczy], Z tej liczby wypada na Galicyę 2.149.000; na Węgry 625.000; na Polskę 216,000, a reszta 12.880,000 na Rosyję. Wszyscy są wyznania greckiego; lecz Unitów (złączonych z kościołem rzymskim) niema tylko w Galicyi i na Węgrach 2.774,000, a w Królestwie Polskiem 216,000."

of Šafařík's *Slovanský národopis* (1842). It is worth emphasizing, however, that Lozyns'kyj, unlike Šafařík, considered the Belarusians to be constituents of one Ruthenian nation.³⁵ Like his Peremyshl-based predecessors, he rightly maintained that Little Russian ("małoruski") was another name for the Ruthenian language, which emerged quite late owing to the need to distinguish it from Russian.³⁶ He does not mention the term *Russnakisch* and makes disparaging remarks about the newly created words *rusiński/russinisch* (Lozyns'kyj 1846: xvii). As regards the Belarusian language, Lozyns'kyj agrees with Mohyl'nyc'kyj: "Judging by certain variants of it in so-called Lithuanian or White Rus', it was divided again into Little and White Russian."³⁷ But "those insignificant changes," as he maintains, "are not sufficient grounds for claiming that those two dialects are different" (ibid.).³⁸ Elsewhere, Lozyns'kyj once again notes briefly that "the names Little-[Russian] and Belarusian mean one and the same dialect" (ibid., xxiii).³⁹

The fifteen million Ruthenians who, according to Josyf Lozyns'kyj, constituted a larger nation than "the numerically smaller Poles, Czechs, and Serbs" ("mniej liczni Polacy, Czesi, Serbowie"), were supposed to create a new literary language "so that the people would advance in civilization" (ibid., xxix).⁴⁰ At the same time, Lozyns'kyj notes that there is "a need to take language from the mouths of the common people" (ibid., xxxiv).⁴¹ Indeed, he himself adhered to this view more consistently than many of his contemporaries.

2.5. Here, finally, I turn to some interesting descriptions of the Ruthenian-speaking world that feature in the early works of the first professor of "Ruthenian language and literature," Jakiv Holovac'kyj,⁴² particularly in the text of his *Treatise on the South Russian Language and Its Dialects* (Розправа о ѡзыцѣ южнорускѡмъ и его нарѣчїяхъ) (Holovac'kyj 1849), which was published in the same year as his *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language* (Грамматика Рѣскаго Азыка) (Holovac'kyj 1849b). For purely chronological reasons, both the *Treatise* and the *Three Introductory Lectures on Ruthenian Language and Literature* (Три вступительніи преподаванїа о рускѡй словесности) may be read as a supplement to the grammar, since the

35 Myxajlo Voznjak held Lozyns'kyj in high regard. He alludes without comment to the fact that Lozyns'kyj regarded Ukrainian and Belarusian as identical languages (Voznjak 1911: 111).

36 "Język ruski prócz właściwej nazwy swej, otrzymał jeszcze nazwę *mało-ruskiego*, a to dla tego, że pisarze widząc go różnym od używanego na północy narzecza (wielkoruskiego), i chcąc go osobno oznaczyć, nazwali go według nazwy kraja (Mała-Ruś), w którym jest używany" (Lozyns'kyj 1846: xvii).

37 "Sądząc po niektórych odmianach onegoż w tak zwanéj litewskiej czyli Bjalej-Rusi, podzielili go znowu na *mało-* i *bjalo-ruski*."

38 "[...] te nieznaczne zmiany nie są dostatecznym powodem do twierdzenia, jakoby te dwa narzecza różne były."

39 "[...] nazwy mało- i bjalo-ruski jedno i to samo narzecze oznaczają."

40 "[...] aby naród w cywilizacyi postępował."

41 "[...] potrzeba brać język z ust ludu prostego."

42 For his earlier views, see the chapter in Myxajlo Voznjak's book titled "The Development of Views on the Ukrainian Language in Jakiv Holovac'kyj before the Appearance of the *Treatise on the South Russian Language*" (Voznjak 1911: 205–17).

latter work contains no information on the prevalence and history of the language described in it.⁴³

Relying on schemas based on the tradition established by Josef Dobrovský and citing, in particular, his colleague, the distinguished Russian linguist Izmail Sreznevskij, in his *Treatise Holovac'kyj* divides the Slavic languages into two “halves” comprising four categories. According to this schema, the Ukrainian (“South Russian”) region occupies an extraordinarily important place:

- “A. The East Slavic or Russian Half
 - I. Category: South Russian or Southeastern
 - 1. The South Russian language, with two main dialects (variants): Ukrainian or Little Russian, and Red Rus' [language]
 - II. The North Russian or Northeastern Category
 - 2. The Great Russian language, with four dialects: High Russian, Low Russian, Middle Russian, and Muscovite
 - 3. The Belarusian or Lithuano-Ruthenian language
- B. The West Slavic Half
 - III. Category: Southwestern or Trans-Danubian
 - 4. The Church Slavonic language, or known before all (mostly) as Slavonic (Slavic)
 - 5. The Bulgarian language, with several dialects
 - 6. The Serbian language, with several dialects
 - 7. The Croatian language
 - 8. Carinthian or Wendish, called Carniolan, with two dialects
 - IV. Category: Northwestern
 - 9. The Polish language, with several dialects, to which the Pomeranian language belonged
 - 10. The Lusatian language, or Serbian, also called Sorbian and Wendish, with two dialects: Upper Lusatian and Lower Lusatian; the former is closer to Czech, the latter to Polish
 - 11. The Czech language, which includes the Moravian dialect
 - 12. Slovak” (Holovac'kyj 1849: 12).⁴⁴

43 As Myxajlo Voznjak notes, the grammar was based on Holovac'kyj's university lectures given in 1849 (Voznjak 1911: 217).

44 “А. Восточно-словенская або руская половина. I. Розрядъ: Южнорускій або юговосточный. 1. Языкъ южнорускій съ двома головными нарѣчїями (видонзмѣненїями) Украинскимъ або Малорускимъ и Червонорускимъ. II. Розрядъ Сѣвернорускій або сѣверно-восточный. 2. Языкъ великорускій съ чотырьма нарѣчїями: верхнерускимъ, нижнерускимъ, середнерускимъ и Московскимъ. 3. Языкъ бѣлорускій або литовскорускій. Б. Западно-словенская половина. III. Розрядъ: Юго-западный або задунайскій. 4. Языкъ церковно-словенскій, або такъ передъ усьма (преимущественно) названный Словенскій (Славянскій). 5. Языкъ болгарскій съ килькома рѣздорѣчїями. 6. Языкъ сербскій съ килькома нарѣчїями. 7. Языкъ хорватскій. 8. Корутанскій або виндскій, зовемый краинскій съ двома нарѣчїями. IV. Розрядъ: Сѣверозападный. 9. Языкъ польскій съ килькома нарѣчїями, до котрыхъ належавъ и языкъ Поморянъ. 10. Языкъ лужицкій або сырбскій, зовемый такожъ сорабскимъ и вендскимъ съ двома наречїями: верхнелужицкимъ и нижнелужицкимъ; перше ближеше чешкому, друге польскому. 11. Языкъ чешкій до котрого належить и моравскій яко нарѣчїе. 12. Словацкій.”

Although Holovac'kyj's schema requires more extensive commentary, I shall limit myself here to reviewing only the most important points.

1. The East Slavic languages (the "East Slavic" or "Russian" half) make up half of this description, including two of its four categories: (I. The South Russian language, with two main dialects; II. The North Russian or Northeastern category); the second half is comprised of all the West and South Slavic languages (Southwestern or Trans-Danubian; Northwestern). The importance of the group that Holovac'kyj called the "East Slavic or Russian half" is quite considerable, as it also pertains to the Ukrainian language, called the South Russian language, which is assigned first place in this schema.

2. The Belarusian language is clearly distinguished in this classification from the "South Russian category." On the contrary, the "Belarusian language, or Lithuano-Ruthenian," is part of the "Northern" or "Northwestern category," along with the Russian language (see also the author's interesting remarks on the Russian dialects). Here and there, Holovac'kyj explicitly objects to the fact that "some writers erroneously assign [the Belarusian language] to the South Russian [category]," citing Josyf Lozyns'kyj (Holovac'kyj 1849: 54).⁴⁵

3. According to Holovac'kyj, the "South Russian language" ("Языкъ южнорускій") has "two main dialects (variants), Ukrainian or Little Russian, and Red Rus'."⁴⁶ In the *Treatise*, however, the terms "Ukrainian language" ("языкъ украинскій") and "Little Russian language" ("языкъ малорускій") signify not only variants of the "South Russian language" ("языка южноруского") but also the "South Russian language" in general.

About its prevalence, Holovac'kyj writes as follows:

The South Russian, Little Russian language (or, as they say in our parts, "Ruthenian") extends along both sides of the Carpathians, through all of southern Russia on both sides of the Dnipro; from the Ondava and Poprad [Rivers] in Hungary and the Wieprz River in Poland to the middle Don, even as far as the Kuban near the Caucasus, from the mouth of the Dnister and the Dnipro, from the Black Sea all the way to the Prypiat and not far from the sources of the Desna, Seim, and Donets.... In Russia, the area of the Little Russian language encompasses the Volhynia, Kyiv, Chernihiv, Poltava [sic], and Kharkiv gubernias, approximately one-quarter of the Voronezh, Katerynoslav, Kherson, and Tavriia gubernias, and the land of the Black Sea Cossacks, Podilia, and part of Bessarabia; in the Kingdom of Poland, it encompasses part of the Podlachia and Lublin gubernias; in the Principality of Galicia and Lodomeria, the districts of Peremyshl, Lviv, Zhovkva, Zolochiv, Ternopil, Berezhany, Sambir, Sanok [sic], Stryi, Stanyslaviv, Kolomyia, Chortkiv, and part of Rzeszów, Jasło, Nowy Sącz, and Chernivtsi, or Bukovyna; in the Kingdom of Hungary, the districts of Bereg, Ungvár, Ugocsa, and Máramaros, as well as most of Zemplén and a lesser part of Sáros, not to mention settlements scattered throughout

45 "[...] декотрі писателѣ до южноруского хибно причисляють."

46 "[...] сь двома головными нарѣчїями (видаизмѣненїями) Украинскимъ або Малорускимъ и Червонорусскимъ."

other districts. Beyond that border, the Little Russian language can be heard throughout Hungary in scattered villages of Rusyns located in districts before and beyond the Tysa (two villages: Kucur and Kerestur as far as Bačka, and one [village of] Šid as far as the Srem district beyond the Danube), in Moldavia, Wallachia, Bessarabia, and Tavriia (Holovac'kyj 1849: 14, 17–18).⁴⁷

It turns out that Jakiv Holovac'kyj knew the geographic extent of the Ukrainian language better than Josyf Lozyns'kyj. From his description, one learns not only of the existence of Ukrainians in the Kuban and Voronezh regions but also about the Ruthenians/Ukrainians beyond the Tysa and Danube Rivers.

The boundaries of the “Little Russian” language are also described in rather thorough detail:

In the east, the Little Russian language is adjacent to the Great Russian along the boundary of her river all the way to Khotsimsk on the Beseda River; in the west and north, to the Belarusian language along the boundary from the Liomonov as far as the junction of the Priseka with the Buh in the Białystok district; in the west, to the Polish language along the boundary from the Buh to Szlatowa and Pólnocna, then to the Hungaro-Slovak language as far as the junction of the Trnava with the Ondava; in the south, to the Hungarian language along the boundary from the Ondava as far as Holm (Kholm), and to the Wallachian language as far as the Dnister estuary into the sea, then to Turkish, German and Greek settlements, and finally to Circassian settlements in the Kuban and Turkish settlements from the Kuban as far as the Eia River (Holovac'kyj 1849: 18).⁴⁸

47 “Языкъ южнорускій, малорускій (або якъ у насъ кажутъ “рускій”) розширяєся по обохъ убочахъ Карпатѣвъ, по цѣлой южнѣй Россіи зъ обохъ сторонъ Днѣпра; ѳъ Ондавы и Попрада въ Утрахъ а Вепрѣ рѣки въ Польщѣ по середіѣ Донъ, ба ажъ по Кубань пѣдъ Кавказомъ, ѳъ устья Днѣстра и Днѣпра, ѳъ Чорного Моря ажъ по Припѣть та не далеко къ жереламъ Десны, Семи и Донця. ... Область Малоруского языка займає въ собѣ, въ Россіи: губерніи Волинскую, Кіевскую, Чернѣговскую, Пѣтравскую [sic], Харьковскую, около четвертины Воронѣжской, Екатиринославскую, Херсонскую, Таврическую и землю Чорноморскихъ Козакѣвъ, Подѣльскую и часть Бесарабіи; въ царствѣ польскѣмъ часть губ. Пѣдлярской и Люблинской; въ Королѣвствѣ Галицко-Володимірскѣмъ, окроти: Перемишльскій, Львѣвскій, Жовковскій, Золочевскій, Тернопѣльскій, Бережанскій, Самбѣрскій, Сянѣцкій [sic], Стрыйскій, Станиславскій, Коломыйскій, Чортковскій, и части Решѣвского, Ясѣльского, Новосѣдечского и Черновецкого або Буковины; въ королевствѣ Угорскѣмъ: столицѣ Бережскую, Угварскую, Угочскую, и Мармарошскую въ большѣй части и Земненскую и Шарішскую въ меншѣй части, не упоминаючи уже о селеніяхъ по другихъ столицахъ розметаныхъ. За тою границею Малорускій языкъ чути можна по Угорщинѣ въ розкиданныхъ селахъ Русинѣвъ, въ столицахъ передъ и за Тисо [sic] знаходящихся (два села: Куцура и Керестура ажъ въ Бачьскѣй, а одна Шидъ ажъ въ Сремскѣй столицѣ за Дунаємъ), въ Молдавіи, Волощинѣ, Бесарабіи и Тавріи.”

48 “Малорускій языкъ стыкаєся на востоцѣ ись великорускимъ по чертѣ ѳъ рѣки еѣ ажъ до Хотымска на Беседѣ; на западѣ и сѣверѣ съ бѣлорускимъ по чертѣ ѳъ Люмонова ажъ до устья рѣки Присѣки въ Бугѣ въ области Бѣлостоцкѣй; на западѣ съ польскимъ по чертѣ ѳъ Буга до Шлятовы и Пивничной, потѣмъ съ угорско-словацкимъ ажъ до устья Тернавы въ Ондаву; на юзѣ съ мовою мадырскою по чертѣ ѳъ Ондавы ажъ до Гола (Холма), пакъ съ волоськимъ языкомъ ажъ до устья Днѣстра въ море, потѣмъ съ турецкимъ, та нѣмецкими и грецкими поселеніями, наконецъ съ черкескимъ на Кубани и турецкимъ ѳъ Кубани ажъ до Сѣ).”

Holovac'kyj emphasizes:

The people inhabiting southern Rus', Galicia, and the northeastern corner of the Kingdom of Hungary within the boundaries described above speak one and the same language, which they and their neighbors call Ukrainian, Little Russian (South Russian), or Ruthenian (Holovac'kyj 1849: 27–28).⁴⁹

His description speaks definitely and unequivocally of a people who can be identified as Ukrainians in the present-day sense and of the Ukrainian language, which is occasionally mentioned by its present-day name.⁵⁰

3. On the history of the language and the linguistic community

3.1. Apart from references to Cyril and Methodius (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 94), Ivan Mohyl'nyč'kyj's historical description seems to begin with the tenth century. Yet Volodymyr the Great is mentioned only in passing, and the author focuses mainly on the disintegration of Kyivan Rus':

Founded by Volodymyr the G[reat], the Rus' monarchy, whose capital was the city of *Kyiv*, disintegrated because of the constant disunity and discord of the Rus' princes into two most eminent parts, that is, the *northern* and *southern* parts, the northern *Great Rus'* (*Russia*) part, the southern *Little Russia* (*Russia minor*) part, as it was called.... A substantial part of *Little Russia*, also known by the name of *Red Rus'* (*Russia rubra*), remained under the rule of the Rus' princes,

49 "Народъ заселяющій южну Русь, Галичину и сѣверо-восточный закутокъ угорского королевства въ вышеописанныхъ границахъ, говоритъ однимъ и тымже языкомъ, котрый называея у себе и у сусѣдѣвъ Украинскимъ, Малорускимъ (южнорускимъ) або таки Рускимъ (Руськимъ)."

50 It is interesting to see how Holovac'kyj connects the geographic aspects of this language with praise for it: "Simply by virtue of the geographic location of the people, the Little Russian (South Russian) language occupies the middle position among the northern, southern, and western Slavs; in linguistic features as well, it holds the middle position among them. In pleophony, it corresponds to the Great Russian and Belarusian languages; the median *ы*, and *а*, and *ѣ* inst[ead] of *я* is reminiscent of southern Slavdom; *з* (*h*) inst[ead] of *г* and *ѣ* = *и* puts it closer to Czechoslovak. The South Russian language is mellifluous, full, dignified, strong, and free. I think it occupies the happy middle ground between hardness and excessive softness among northern, southern, and western Slavdom...it is not partial to narrow vowels, like Great Russian, but to broad ones (except for the Galician dialect). There are seven vowels (*а*, *е*, *і* (*ѣ*), *и* (*ы*), *о*, *у*, *ѣ*, (*і*), of which five are refined (*я*, *е*, *ѣ* (*ји*), *іо* (*е*), *ю*). Its distinctiveness among all the Slavic languages is the transitional character of the sound *и*, which passes from a flat (coarse) *ы* all the way to a very soft *ѣ* after various changes." ["Малорускій (южнорускій) языкъ уже по землеписному положѣнью народа займае середину меже сѣверными, южными тай западными Словенами: и по языкословныхъ примѣтахъ держитъ онъ середину меже ними. Повноголосностію сходится ись великорускимъ и бѣлорускимъ; посередѣ *ы*, и *а*, та *ѣ* зам. *я*, пригадуе южну Словенщину; *з* (*h*) зам. *г*, и *ѣ* = *и* закидае на чешкословенске. Языкъ южнорускій *е* красноречивъ, новный [*sic*], поважный, сильный, свободный. Онъ, думаю, держитъ тоту щасливу середину меже твердостію и злишною мягкостію, меже сѣверомъ, югомъ и западомъ Словенщины ... онъ не любуе собѣ въ вузкихъ самогласныхъ якъ великорускій але въ широкихъ (опрѣчь галицкого нарѣчія). Самогласныхъ *е* сѣмъ (*а*, *е*, *і* (*ѣ*), *и* (*ы*), *о*, *у*, *ѣ*, (*і*), изъ сихъ пять изъощряется (*я*, *е*, *ѣ* (*ји*), *іо* (*е*), *ю*). Особливостію его меже всѣма языками словенскими *е* поступенность звука *и*, котрый переходить ъгъ глухого (грубого) *ы* ажъ до мягесенького *ѣ* по рѣзныхъ перемѣнахъ"] (Holovac'kyj 1849: 30–31).

whose capital was the town of *Halych*. The present-day principality of *Galicia* takes its name from that town (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 8).⁵¹

Mohyl'nyc'kyj, who actually equates Little Russia with Red Rus' ("Маларусь, властивъ Червона Русь") (ibid., 9), emphasizes that Danylo Romanovych bore "the name of the Galician king" (ibid.) but adds that "the Grand Principality (*Kingdom*) of Galicia and part of the Podilian land, which fell by destiny to the Kingdom of Poland, did not comprise all of *southern Rus'*" (ibid.).⁵² He places even greater stress on the subject noted in the heading of this chapter: "The Rus' people comprised a substantial part of the former Kingdom of Poland" (ibid., 7).⁵³

Mohyl'nyc'kyj then names the lands that, "later known under the names of *Ukraine*, *Podilia*, and *Volhynia*, as well as *White* and *Black Rus'*, conquered by the Lithuanians along with *Kyiv*, were annexed to the Kingdom of Poland along with *Lithuania*" (ibid.),⁵⁴ in order to express loyalty to the Austrian monarch at the conclusion of this description:

Through God we owe the liberation from those calamities to the rule of the *Austrian Monarchs*! For that liberation and the unceasing paternal solicitude for the welfare of the Ruthenian people, from generation to generation we show and will continue to show unwavering gratitude and loyalty to the *Austrian Emperor* felicitously ruling over us and to his most illustrious *House* (Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 25).⁵⁵

When Mohyl'nyc'kyj writes that the "[s]eparate and independent Ruthenian language (dialect) was always distinct from other dialects, to wit, Slavic, Polish, Russian (previously Muscovite)" (ibid.),⁵⁶ it might be suspected that he is speaking as a genuine "primordialist," but that is by no means the case, for he adds the following:

51 "Заложена Володимиромъ В. монархія Руска, которой столицею было мѣсто *Кієвъ*, чрезъ неустанный дѣлъ и незгуду княжать рускихъ распалася на двѣ знакомитшіе части, то есть; на часть *полуночну* (сѣверну) и *полудневу*, часть *полуночна Русь (Россія) Велика*, часть *полудешна Мала Русь (Russia minor)* звана была. ... Знакомита часть *Малои Руси*, также подъ именемъ: *Червонои (Краснои) Руси (Russia rubra)* звана, осталася подъ панованемъ княжать рускихъ, которыхъ столиця была мѣсто *Галичъ*. Отъ того мѣста нинѣшное королевство *Галиціи* имя веде."

52 "[...] имя короля Галицкого носиль [...] припаое реченымъ способомъ до короны полскои Великое Княжество (*Королѣство*) Галицкое и часть землѣ подолскои не цѣлу *Русь полудневу* складало."

53 "Рускій народъ складалъ знакомиту часть бывшего Королевства Полского."

54 "позднѣйше подъ назвискомъ: *Украины, Подоля и Волиня*, также *Бѣлои и Чорнои Руси* знаные, вразъ съ *Кієвомъ* чрезъ литовцовъ завоеваные, съ Литвою до Короны полскои вошли."

55 "Освобождене то и непрестанное отеческое старане о благосостояніи народа руского сердца нашіе отъ рода и въ родъ непорушеновъ вѣчностію и вѣрностію ку пануючому намъ шасливе *Императору Австрійскому* и преславному *Домови* его займе и займовати буде."

56 "Отдѣланный и самостоячій языкъ (діалектъ) рускій все бываль от инныхъ діалектовъ а меновите славенского, полского, російского (московского давнѣйше) различанный."

In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, all the ancient Slavic dialects, that is, those spoken and written by the peoples now called *Russians*, *Ruthenians*, *Czechs*, *Moravians*, *Poles*, *Serbs*, *Bulgarians*, and *Carniolans*, were not identical but more similar to one another than they are today. The more closely we approach antiquity, the lesser the difference and the greater the similarity we observe among the dialects of those peoples (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 37).⁵⁷

In this context, Mohyl'nyč'kyj cites the Russian writer and historian Nikolaj Karamzin, whom he also regards as a distinguished authority on linguistic questions. But he resolutely polemicizes against a view that was prevalent in this period (and, to some extent, even nowadays), according to which the Ruthenian language is a mixture of Polish and Russian:

Some *Polish*, *Russian*, and *Czech* writers assure us that the *Ruthenian* language (present-day and bookish) allegedly owes its current status and linguistic form to Polish and the influence of the Polish language and literature on the Ruthenian language and literature, or, in other words: the Ruthenian language is a mixture of a Polish dialect and some kind of (God knows) simple, barbarous dialect, a Ruthenian dialect that is not used anywhere today... At the time, the Ruthenian dialect existed *alongside* Polish. Having said that, I do not deny by any means that at that time and subsequently the Ruthenian language, just like other languages, was to be formed and perfected (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 48–49).⁵⁸

The grammarian from Peremyshl, who focused his attention only on the level of lexical stock, indicates that words common to Poles and Ruthenians often exist in other Slavic languages as well (*ibid.*, 51). Noting that other European languages can hardly be called “pure,” he cites in passing foreign borrowings from Karamzin’s *History of the Russian State* (“Исторія государства Россійского,” as Mohyl'nyč'kyj calls it)—words that “are by no means used in ancient Slavic scripts and are proper only to Ruthenian or Polish dialects” (*ibid.*).⁵⁹ Finally, although some of Mohyl'nyč'kyj’s arguments are less than convincing, his conclusions are entirely correct:

In the close union in which the Polish nation abided for 400 years with the Ruthenian nation, the Ruthenians adopt certain Polish words from the Poles

57 “Всѣ давныя діалекты славенскіе, то есть которыми народы, теперь назвиска: *Россіанъ*, *Русиновъ*, *Чеховъ*, *Моравцовъ* *Поляковъ* [*sic*, without a comma], *Сербовъ*, *Булгаръ*, *Краинцовъ* носячіе, въ XI. XII. XIII. столѣтіи говорили и писали, не равнѣ болѣе, нежели теперь, собѣ подобныя были. Имъ вышшея къ старожитности посумено, тымъ менше разницѣ а болѣе подобенства межѣ діалектами тыхъ народовъ постережемо.”

58 “Нѣкоторые писатели *полскіе*, *россійскіе*, *чеськіе* увѣряють насъ, якобы мова *руська* (поточна и книжна) нынѣшное свое состояніе и форму мовѣ *пол'ской* и впливовы словесности *полскои* на словесность *руську* винна, або, що то само значить: мова *руська* есть мѣшаниною діалекта *полского* съ *яковимсь* (Богъ знае) діалектомъ простымъ, варварскимъ, теперь уже нигде неуживанымъ діалектомъ *рускимъ* ... Языкѣ тебѣ *рускій* *обокъ* *пол'ского* существовалъ. Тое мовячи, никусь не перечу, абься тогды и потому языкъ *рускій* такъ, якъ инныя языки, не мѣлъ формовати и досконалити.”

59 “цѣлкомъ въ давныхъ славенскихъ писмахъ не уживан[ыи] и рускому або полскому тылко діалектови властив[ыи].”

living among them, and the Ruthenian language became enriched. But the Poles, too, through associations and diverse alliances with the Ruthenians, could enrich their language with Ruthenian words, and the Polish language was perfected... (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 54).⁶⁰

This description does not actually contain any information about the linguistic history of Kyivan Rus', but with regard to later periods Mohyl'nyč'kyj stresses that the "Ruthenian language existed in the Ruthenian lands subordinate to the Kingdom of Poland, not only as the common spoken language of the people but also as the language of government, and as the court language at the court of the Lithuanian grand dukes and distinguished Ruthenian families" (ibid., 14).⁶¹

In particular, Mohyl'nyč'kyj notes the "Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, originally written in *Ruthenian*" (ibid.), and points out that "trials in the Ruthenian lands were held in the Ruthenian language" (ibid., 16).⁶² He writes that the reader of a "history of the fatherland" ("отечественной истории")⁶³ might find "ample [sources] in public book repositories, offices, and private homes" (ibid., 20).⁶⁴ As concerns the decline of the Ruthenian language, the scholar identifies the following causes:

The fate of the Ruthenian language under Polish rule, until the collapse of the Kingdom of Poland itself, was indivisible from the fate of the Ruthenian people. The events that the Ruthenian people experienced from the times of Sigismund III also had an impact on the folk language. It reached the point where highborn Ruthenians began to deny their own tribe and be ashamed of their fathers' language" (ibid., 24).⁶⁵

According to Mohyl'nyč'kyj, the decline of the Ruthenian language paralleled the decline of Poland.

On the one hand, the grammarian devotes an entire chapter to the proposition that "the Polish language owes its current purity, abundance, and linguistic structure to the Ruthenian language" (ibid., 54), while on the other he emphasizes that "in truth, the *Little Russian* dialect greatly fostered the growth, richness, and

60 "Въ стисломъ овомъ союзѣ, въ яковомъ народъ полскій черезъ 400 лѣтъ съ народомъ рускимъ зоставалъ, могли пріймати русины отъ осѣдающихъ межъ ними поляковъ нѣкоторые слова полскіе и богатилася мова руска. Но могли также поляки чрезъ переставанія и розмаитыи союзы съ русинами свой языкъ богатити словами рускими и досконалилася мова полска [...]"

61 "[...] языкъ рускій бывалъ въ земляхъ русскихъ, Коронѣ полской поддѣляхъ, не тылко просторѣчимъ народа, но также языкомъ правленія, а на дворѣ великихъ Княжатъ Литовскихъ и знакомитыхъ фамилій русскихъ языкомъ дворскимъ."

62 "Статутъ Вел(икого) Княжества Литовского, оригиналѣ по руски написанный [...]. Суды въ земляхъ русскихъ языкомъ рускимъ отбывалися."

63 Mohyl'nyč'kyj may have borrowed this expression from Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*. He also writes quite frequently about "national history" (народна історія) (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 23).

64 "[джерел] подостаткомъ въ публичныхъ книгохранилищахъ, канцеляріяхъ и домахъ приватныхъ."

65 "Доля языка руского подѣ панованемъ полскимъ ажъ до упадку Королевства Полского нераздѣльна была отъ долѣ народа руского. — Пригоды, яковыхъ народъ рускій отъ часовъ Зигмонта III досвѣдчалъ, и на языкъ народный впливали. Пришло было до того, же родовитые Русины власного племени запиралися и мовы отцевъ своихъ встыдатыся почали."

beauty of the *Russian* language" (ibid., 63).⁶⁶ With regard to the Russian language, he adds that

Some contemporary Russian writers, imitating foreign ways, particularly French ones, have begun to corrupt the *Russian* language, rich, expressive, and suited to all branches of scholarship, whose power and perfection we admire to this day in *Lomonosov's* writings"⁶⁷ (ibid., 63).⁶⁸

Ivan Mohyl'nyč'kyj was already acquainted with early achievements in the creation of a new Ukrainian written language in the Russian Empire: among the texts that were said to demonstrate the continuity of the Ruthenian language since the days of the Lithuanian Statute, from Pamva Berynda's *Slavic-Ruthenian Lexicon* (Лексиконъ славенороссій) and the Pochaiv *Bohohlasnyk* of 1790 to Mohyl'nyč'kyj's own times, he mentions the 1808 edition of Ivan Kotljarevskyj's *Eneida* and the 1818 edition of Oleksij Pavlovskyj's grammar (ibid., 44). Unfortunately, there are no comments about them in Mohyl'nyč'kyj's work, with the exception of some critical remarks about Pavlovskyj's orthography.

3.2. In his grammar, Josyf Levyc'kyj asserts that from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, the "literature" of the "Ruthenian nation (or tribe)" was identical to that of the Russians (Levyc'kyj 1834: x).⁶⁹ He adds, however, that "both tribes used the so-called church language" (ibid.),⁷⁰ and among the exemplars of that particular "church language" he names "Nestor's chronicle" ("Chronik von Nester, einem Basilianer-Mönche russinischen Stammes") (ibid., xi), along with the Ostroh Bible of 1581 (ibid.) [!]. Levyc'kyj calls Volodymyr the Great the ancestor of the Ruthenians (ibid., i) and later mentions the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia⁷¹ and the beginning of the Polish-Latin age (ibid., ii) but says not a word about other regions of Kyivan Rus'. The issue of linguistic continuity remains blurred, especially as Levyc'kyj sees no trace of a "non-ecclesiastical" linguistic stratum during the Middle Ages. In raising this question, Levyc'kyj goes only as far as the early modern period, beginning with

66 "Мова полска свою нынѣшнюю чистость, обфитость и складъ мовѣ русской винна [...] вправдѣ причинялся діалектъ малороссійскій купа до возрасту, богатства и красотѣ діалекта російскаго."

67 Mohyl'nyč'kyj was familiar with the 1813 edition of Aleksandr Šiškov's *Opinion regarding the Old and New Style of the Russian Language* (Разсуждение о старомъ и новомъ слогѣ російскаго языка; St. Petersburg, 1803). In the debate between Šiškov and Karamzin he inclines toward the views of the conservative admiral from St. Petersburg.

68 "[...] богатый, добитный, до всѣхъ отраслей наукъ способный языкъ російскій, которого силѣ и досконалости до днесъ дивимся (! дивуемся [this notation was clearly added by Muxajlo Voznjak]) въ писмахъ Ломоносовыхъ нѣкоторые нынѣшные писатели російскіе наслѣдованемъ чужоземщины, меновитѣ зась французизны, псути почали."

69 "[...] die Literatur dieser Nazion (oder dieses Stammes) war ... mit der Literatur der Hochrussen, die nähnliche."

70 "Beyde Stämme bedienten sich in der Schrift der sogenannten Kirchensprache."

71 On "Kyivan Rus' in the works of the western Ukrainian Romantics," see Naxlik 2000.

Francysk Skaryna, as though writers in the sixteenth century had grasped that the “scholarly bookish language” could not be introduced to the “common people” and therefore began to adapt it to the “folk dialect” of their own regions. It was only then, claims Levyc'kyj, that “literature”—apparently “Ruthenian literature” as the common literature of the Ruthenians and the Russians—was “divided”: “But when the scholars of those centuries proved unable to introduce the scholarly bookish language to the people in spite of all their endeavors, various writers began to draw closer to the folk dialect of those regions in which they wrote. The basis for the division of literature was thus laid” (ibid., xii).⁷²

Levyc'kyj switches from writing about “literature” to language per se only in discussing the second half of the seventeenth century.⁷³ But there he also asserts that the one and only “Ruthenian dialect” (“der Russinische Dialekt”), which also encompassed “Lithuania,” was renowned for its use in the highest strata of society earlier than the seventeenth century: “Until the seventeenth century, the Ruthenian dialect was the language of all the nobles and most eminent houses in Lithuania, Volhynia, Podilia, Ukraine, and Galicia; subsequently, all court proceedings were held and all privileges for the above-mentioned lands granted in this dialect”⁷⁴ (ibid., x).⁷⁵

Further in his grammar, Levyc'kyj writes about sixteenth-century Ruthenian works, and, as compared with Mohyl'nyc'kyj, his rather considerable grasp of eighteenth-century Ruthenian sources is striking. Unlike Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Levyc'kyj cites several collections of Ukrainian folk songs (ibid., xix). He also cites Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Eneida* as one of his Ruthenian-language sources but offers no comment on it. Clearly, Levyc'kyj was not very impressed by the work, although his short reader (twenty selections), which begins with two charters of Lev Danylovych, the ruler of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia (1292 and 1302), includes brief excerpts from *Eneida*.

3.3. Ivan Vahylevyč's grammar contains no information on the history of the Ruthenian language and its speakers, but in the introduction he mentions a text titled “Treatise” (“Rozprawa”), which, as he claims, he began writing in 1841 and had nearly completed (Vahylevyč 1845: i). The work was never finished, and it refers to events that took place after 1848 (cf. Svjencic'kyj 1866: 164). Myxajlo

72 “Als aber die Gelehrten jener Jahrhunderte unter dem Volke die gelehrte Büchersprache, ungeachtet aller Bemühungen nicht einführen konnten, fingen verschiedene Schriftsteller sich mehr dem Volksdialekte jener Gegend zu nähern an, in welcher sie schrieben. Hiermit wurde der Grund zur Theilung der Litteratur gelegt.”

73 Unfortunately, the author provides no information on the early part of this period.

74 As is generally known, this is not entirely correct where Galicia is concerned.

75 “Bis zum 17. Jahrhunderte war der Russinische Dialekt, Sprache aller Fürsten und vornehmsten Häuser in Lithauen, Wolhynien, Podolien, Ukraina und Galizien; dann wurden in diesem Dialekte alle Gerichtsbarkeiten abgehalten, und für genannte russinische Länder alle Privilegien ertheilt.”

Voznjak cites the contents of this text, which also contains a chapter titled "Southern Rus'" ("Południowa Ruś") (Voznjak 1911: 147).⁷⁶ Vahylevyč eventually refers to this chapter, calling it a "chronicle of southern Rus'"⁷⁷ (ibid., 148). Vahylevyč's idealization, in the spirit of the times, of the medieval past of Ruthenian-speaking culture is manifested in his works in *The Dnister Nymph*, his Polish-language translation of the "Tale of Ihor's Campaign" (Слово о полку Ігоревѣ), and other works. In his "Treatise," Vahylevyč emphasizes the singular role of medieval "Southern Rus'" as compared with "Northern Rus'" (see Brock 1996: 400–401). However, the grammar contains sentences with significant historical content,⁷⁸ such as the following:

Volodymyr the Great transformed expansive Rus'.... St. Volodymyr expanded, enlightened, enriched, and glorified Rus'.... The immortal Volodymyr and Jaroslav.... our Kyiv and Halych were destroyed by Batu... Lviv was founded...by Danylo Romanovych.... The Galician castle, an ancient, majestic edifice, collapsed... Bohdan, Konaševyč, and Xmel'nyč'kyj were famous commanders.... Xmel'nyč'kyj was courageous.... There are many beautiful verses in the tragedy *Pereiaslav Night*.... Maria Theresa was wise.... Joseph II gave the Galician Ruthenians a new life.... Part of Little Russia belongs to the Hungarians... The Principality of Galicia belongs to the Austrians⁷⁹ (Vahylevyč 1845: 135–38, 143, 155; the order of these extracts differs from that of the original).⁸⁰

Clearly, Vahylevyč's historical conception encompassed Kyivan Rus' as well as the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia and the Cossack period, as well as Austrian times. Particularly noteworthy are the words "our [!] Kyiv and Halych" ("нашъ Кієвъ и Галичъ"). Vahylevyč emphasizes that "now there is no south Russian upper class; it belongs to the Polish or the Russian people"⁸¹ (Voznjak 1911: 148)⁸² and

76 On the *Treatise*, see Svjenc'kyj 1866; Voznjak 1936; Dzendzelivs'kyj 2000; cf. Brock 1996: 412.

77 "Uprzednio podałem kronikę południowej Rusi."

78 This is correctly noted by Hryhorij Dem'ian (Dem'ian 1996: 53), who offers a somewhat different selection of examples in contemporary Ukrainian translation.

79 "Володимиръ великій преобразовалъ обширнѣю Рѹсь ... Володимиръ сватый роспротранилъ, просвѣтилъ, обогатилъ и возвеличилъ Рѹсь ... Безсмертныя Володимиръ и Ірославъ ... нашъ Кієвъ и Галичъ были разбиты Батіємъ ... Львовъ заложенный ... Даниломъ Романовичемъ ... замокъ галицкій, стара велична бѣдова народнои славы, розвалила ... Богданъ, Конашевичъ і Хмельницкій были славны начальники ... Хмельницкій хоробрый ... Въ трагедіи Переяславскаа ночь много прекрасныхъ стиховъ ... Маріа Тересіа была мѣдра ... Іосифъ вторый далъ галицкимъ Рѹсинамъ новое бытіе ... часть малой Рѹси приналежитъ къ Оутрамъ ... княжество галицкое приналежитъ Ракѣзамъ."

80 Cf. also "Peter was great" (*Петръ былъ великъ*) (Vahylevyč 1845: 138).

81 "[...] teraz nie masz południowo-ruskiej wyższej klasy; należy ona do narodu polskiego lub ruskiego."

82 However, it is interesting to note what Vahylevyč did with the examples from his original model, the grammar written by Nikolaj Greč: "The author replaced Tsarina Catherine with Empress Maria Theresa, Tsar Peter the Great with Prince Volodymyr, the military commanders Rumjancev, Suvorov, and Kotuzov [sic] with Ukrainian figures in the sentence 'Bohdan, Koneševil' [Konaševyč], and Xmel'nyč'kyj were glorious military leaders,' Great Russian cities with Ukrainian ones or, at the very least, with Austrian ones, but not always consistently and aptly." ["Царицю Катерину замінив автор цісаревою Марією

criticizes Russophile linguistic usage, particularly in the milieu of the Galician-Ruthenian Matycja, the then increasingly Russophile literary and educational society (Svjencic'kyj 1866: 164).

3.4. Compared to his predecessors, Josyf Lozyns'kyj also provides exhaustive information about the past of the Ruthenian-speaking community. Although his history of the Ruthenians reaches back to the age of the East Slavic tribes, his catalogue encompasses only those tribes that lived on Ukrainian territories. It excludes the Viaticians and Ilmen Slavs as well as the “Belarusian” Polochane and Krivichians:

Our ancestors, under diverse names, such as Polianians (from the fields of the Kyiv gubernia), Radimichians, Derevlians (from the forests of Volhynia), Dulibians, Buzhanians (from the Buh River), Lutichians and Tivertsians (on the Dnister), the White Croats (near the Carpathians in Galicia), the Siverians, etc., inhabited the above-mentioned lands (Lozyns'kyj 1846: viii).⁸³

Lozyns'kyj then provides a narrative of medieval history, emphasizing “Red Rus’, the southeastern part of Rus’ under the name of the Principality of *Halych*, so called after *Halych*”⁸⁴ (ibid., viii–ix).⁸⁵ With regard to the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (*Rzeczpospolita*), Lozyns'kyj concentrates notably on ecclesiastical aspects, and in connection with the linguistic history of the early medieval period he mentions the Lithuanian Statute of 1588 (ibid., xiv). The scholar places significantly more emphasis on the linguistic consequences of the Union:

Concerning that period, much has been written for and against the Union. The result of the various oppressions was the conversion of many Ruthenians to the Latin rite and the abandonment of their ancestral language; the Polish language became widespread, and the Ruthenian language was exiled to the thatched roofs of the common folk, the petty nobility, and the Greek-rite clergy. Those oppressions also helped increase the ranks of the Cossacks in Ukraine, who were already well known around the year 1516. Their origins go back to the

Тересою, царя Петра Великого князем Володимиром, полководців Румянцева, Суворова й Котузова [sic] українськими особами в реченню: *Богдань, Конешевиль и Хмельницькій были славны начальники, великоруські міста українськими або що найменше австрійськими, та не всюди консеквентно й щасливо.*” (Voznjak 1911: 167).

83 “Przodkowie nasi pod rozmaitemi nazwami jako to: Polanów (od pól w Gub. Kijows.), Radymiczów, Drewlanów (od lasów na Wołyniu), Dulibów, Bużanów (od rzeki Bug), Lutyczów i Tywirców (nad Dniestrem), bjałych Chorwatów (w bliskości Karpatów w Galicyi), Siewierzanów i t.d. wspomniane kraje zamieszkiwali.”

84 However, Lozyns'kyj also frequently refers to Karamzin’s *History of the Russian State* (see, e.g., Lozyns'kyj 1846: xiii).

85 “Czerwona Rus’, południowo-wschodnia część Rusia pod imieniem Księztwa *Halickiego* tak nazwana od *Halicza*.”

thirteenth century. In the year 1627, the first Slavic dictionary appeared in Kyiv (Lozys'kyj 1846: xv–xvi).⁸⁶

Lozys'kyj mentions Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's wars and states that in 1656 Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič was already being titled "Autocrat of all Great and White Russia" ("всеѣ великіа и бѣліа [sic] Росіи [sic] Самодержецъ"). He adds that "here we already have the division of Rus' into Great, Little, and White Rus'" (ibid., xvi).⁸⁷ At one point, the scholar mentions the Battle of Poltava and the abolition of the Hetmanate in 1784, and, further on, the partitions of Poland.

It is worth noting that Lozys'kyj also discusses the Transcarpathian Ruthenians, and his information tallies with some historical myths about contemporary Ruthenians:

The Ruthenians lived in Hungary even before the arrival of the seven Princes or Scythian chieftains (854), and their numbers were increased by the newcomers at Alma (886). They adopted the Christian faith when SS. Cyril and Methodius preached in Pannonia (867). In the times of the Greek schism under Cerularius (1053), they also fell away from Rome, but in 1252 they united once again. That union was lasting and weakened only later, under the Rákóczi princes, but in 1649 it was consolidated again and for all time. These Ruthenians were forever united with the Hungarians and shared their lot with them (Lozys'kyj 1846: xvii).⁸⁸

Citing another of Šafařík's works, *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten* (History of the Slavic Language and Literature in All Dialects), Lozys'kyj correctly notes:

It is an incontrovertible truth that at one time there was only one Slavic language, but whenever a people multiplied and spread, often encountering or mixing with other peoples, *various dialects* of it emerged; accordingly, the closer those dialects were to their fountainhead, the less they differed, and only with time did those changes become as significant as we see them nowadays (Lozys'kyj 1846: xviii–xix).⁸⁹

86 "O tém czasie pisano wiele za—i przeciw Unii. Skutkiem ucisków rozmaitych było przejście wielu Rusinów na obrządek łaciński, i porzucanie mowy ojczystej; język polski upowszechniał się, a język ruski wygnany został pod strzechę ludu prostego, drobnej szlachty i Duchowieństwa obr. greckiego. Te uciski posłużyły także do pomnożenia Kozaków na Ukrainie, których imię około r. 1516 głośne już było. Początek ich sięga 13. wieku. W r. 1627 wyszedł w Kiowie pierwszy słownik sławjański."

87 "[...] tu już jest podział Rusi na wielką, małą i białą Ruś."

88 "W Węgrzech mieszkali Rusini jeszcze przed przyjściem siedmiu Książąt czyli wodzów scytyjskich (854), a przez przybyśców pod Almą (886) zostali pomnożeni. Wjare chrześcijańską przyjęli wtedy, kiedy SS. Cyril i Methodiusz w Panonii uczyli (867). Za czasów schismy greckiej pod Cerulariuszem (1053) odpadli także od Rzymu, lecz w r. 1252 znowu się zjednoczyli. Unia ta trwała ciągle i tylko później [sic] pod książętami Rakockimi była nadwężona, ale w r. 1649 na nowo i na zawsze utwierdzona została. Ci Rusini zawsze z Węgrami złączeni byli i ich losy dzielili."

89 "Niezaprzeczoną jest prawdą, że kiedyś tylko jeden był język sławiański, a gdy się naród rozmnażał i rozchodził, często z innymi narodami stykał lub mieszał, powstały *rozmaite narzecza* jego; im bliżej więc były te narzecza źródła swojego, tém mniej się różniły, a z czasem dopiero stały się te zmjany tak znacznemi, jak ich teraz widzimy."

The grammarian says the very same thing about the Ruthenian language and the “church dialect” (“narzecza cerkiewnego”). The latter, according to Lozyns'kyj, became the “model for Ruthenian writers” (“wzorem dla pisarzy ruskich”). But Lozyns'kyj concludes incorrectly that “Nestor himself also wholly imitated it” (“i sam Nestor naśladował go zupełnie”) (ibid., xix). He continues: “thus all writers followed the rules of the church dialect or Old Slavic, and from that moment we had two languages: *bookish*, which was used for writing, and *vernacular*, which the common people spoke” (ibid., xix).⁹⁰ Referring once again to Karamzin, the scholar asserts that “the oldest monuments of the Ruthenian language” (“najdawniejsze pomniki języka ruskiego”)—here he singles out the Primary Chronicle, “Pravda Rus'ka,” and the Tale of Ihor's Campaign—“cannot reveal the true *vernacular* to us” (“nie mogą nam wykazać prawdziwej mowy narodowej”) (ibid.). However, according to Lozyns'kyj, Ruthenian words were nevertheless being used increasingly often, although it was only in the sixteenth century that “more writing began in the Ruthenian *vernacular* in connection with the Union.”⁹¹ But “that language was losing its purity, and in almost all writings a great admixture of Polish is to be seen” (ibid., xix–xx).⁹² Of course, Lozyns'kyj also indicates the formerly high status of the Ruthenian language:

In Lithuanian Rus' it was the language of the court, the scholarly, judicial, legal, and diplomatic language; it was used for the conduct of all affairs. The Lithuanian Metrica is proof of this.... It is also witnessed by many chronicles and other documents, privileges, and sundry writings. Nevertheless, a multitude of Polonisms can be seen everywhere (Lozyns'kyj 1846: xx).⁹³

According to Lozyns'kyj, the sixteenth century was “the golden age of the Polish language” (“wiekiem złotym języka polskiego”), while the Ruthenian language was “exiled...to the thatched roofs of the common folk” (“wygnany...pod strzechę wiejską”) (ibid., xx–xxi). His argument that the influence of Polish and Russian in the Russian Empire was far more dangerous to Ruthenian than to other languages because Polish and Russian were always understandable to Ruthenians deserves attention (ibid., xxi).

Lozyns'kyj notes that “we also have various collections of Ruthenian songs:... Certelev's of 1819, that of Waclaw of Olesko of 1833, Maksymovyč's of 1827 and 1834, Sreznevskij's of 1833, Vahylevyč and Holovac'kyj's of 1837...tales (stories)...

90 “[...] tym sposobem trzymali się wszyscy pisarze prawideł narzecza cerkiewnego czyli starosławjańskiego, a tak mieliśmy od owej chwili dwa języki: *księgowy* w którym pisano, i *narodowy* którym naród mówił.”

91 “[...] zaczęto także z powodu Unii pisać więcej w *narodowym* języku ruskim.”

92 “[...] ten język utracił swą czystość, i we wszystkich prawie dziełach widać wielką mieszaninę polszczyzny.”

93 “Na Rusi litewskiej był on językiem dworu, językiem naukowym, sądowym, prawniczym i dyplomatycznym; w nim odbywały się wszystkie sprawy. Swjademctwem tego jest Metryka litewska ... Swjadkiem tego jest także wiele kronik i innych dokumentów, przywilejów i pism rozmaitych. Wszędzie jednak widać mnóstwo polonizmów.”

the Little Russian stories of Hr[yhorij] Osnov'ianenko.... Little Russian proverbs publ[ished] by Hrebinka..." (ibid., xli).⁹⁴ He also mentions the activities of several "admirers" of the Ruthenian language from the Russian Empire:

It is consoling to our language that even in Russia it is not being neglected, and here it behooves me to cite the names of some of its admirers, who are as follows: Maksymovyč, Sreznevskij, Hrebinka, Kvitka (Osnov'ianenko), Zabila (Topolja), Metlyns'kyj (Mohyla), Kostomariv (Halka), Borovykovs'kyj, Špyhovs'kyj [Špyhoc'kyj], and many others⁹⁵ (Lozyns'kyj 1846: xxi).⁹⁶

But Lozyns'kyj was quite skeptical about the achievements of Ukrainian literature as of the first half of the nineteenth century, commenting that "a few minor works do not make a literature. Meanwhile, literature to which one can refer from the grammatical standpoint should include works that are exemplary and classical, but we do not yet have such works for the Ruthenian language" (ibid., xxv).⁹⁷

3.5. With regard to the early history of the written Ruthenian language, Jakiv Holovac'kyj noted that "we adopted already existing Slavic liturgical books that were completely understandable to the people" (Holovac'kyj 1849: 20),⁹⁸ even though they were written in what Holovac'kyj calls the "old Bulgarian or Church Slavonic bookish learned language" ("книжнообразованный языкъ староболгарскій або церковнословенскій") (ibid., 19). Further on, he writes that "our first writers (ecclesiastical, for the most part) utilized it in religious works and translations" (ibid., 20).⁹⁹ At the same time, Holovac'kyj, unlike his predecessors, notes that "the vernacular was also penetrating it, not so much in writing of religious content but especially in secular, civil, and legislative works, chronicles, charters, contracts, etc." (ibid.).¹⁰⁰ He emphasizes that "even old Church

94 "[...] mamy także już rozmaite zbory pieśni ruskich:...Certelewa 1819, Waclawa z Oleska 1833, Maksymowicza 1827 i 1834, Srezniewskiego 1833, Wagilewicza i Głowackiego 1837...kazki (powieści)...Малоросійскія повѣсти Гр. Основаненька.... Приказки малоросійскія изд. Гребенькомъ...."

95 Thus far, there is no reference to Taras Ševčenko, although the first edition of the *Kobzar* had already appeared in 1840.

96 "Pocieszną jednak dla naszego języka jest rzeczą, że i w Rosyi nie jest w zaniedbaniu, i tu niechaj mi się godzi przytoczyć imjona niektórych czcicieli jego, a te są: Maksymowicz, Śrezniewski, Hrebinka, Kwitka (Osnowjaneńko), Zabila (Topola), Metliński (Mohyla), Kostomariw (Hałka), Borowikowski, Szpyhowski [Шпигоцький], i wiele innych."

97 "...kilka dziełek nie stanowi jeszcze literatury. Literatura zaś, na którąby się we względzie grammatycznym odwołać można, powinna zawierać dzieła wzorowe, klasyczne, a takich dzieł dla języka ruskiego jeszcze nie mamy."

98 "[...] мы приняли уже готовіи книги богослужебні словенскі, котрі совсѣмъ понятні были народови."

99 "[...] першіи наші писателѣ (по большій части духовніи) управляли го въ духовныхъ сочиненіяхъ и переводахъ."

100 "[...] при нимъ проколююався и народный языкъ не такъ въ письмахъ духовного содержания, но особенно въ свѣтовыхъ, горожанскихъ, законодательныхъ дѣлахъ, лѣтописяхъ, грамотахъ, договорахъ и пр."

Slavonic manuscripts of Scripture written in Rus' were not free of the Ruthenian language" (ibid., 21).¹⁰¹ The scholar adds, not without a hint of local patriotism, that "as is generally known, all scholars agree that the Carpathian Mountains are the cradle of the Slavs" (ibid., 49).¹⁰² To be sure, he is not satisfied to describe only the territory that he calls "our Galician-Peremyshlianian Rus'" ("наша Галицко-Перемышльська Русь") (ibid., 23). Among the written sources from Kyivan Rus', he cites not only "southern" texts but also those from Novgorod, albeit with special emphasis on the Hypatian, or Volhynian, Chronicle (Ипатьевская або Волинская летопись) (ibid., 20).¹⁰³ As for the question of the autonomy of the Ruthenian language vis-à-vis Polish, Holovac'kyj cites the 1829 Polish-language edition of Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj's *Report*, noting that "the Polish language did not transform the south Russian language and did not exert an influence on its formation; on the contrary, the Polish language owes its formation, correctness, and rapid growth to Ruthenian influence" (ibid., 21–22).¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, he asserts that "Rus' was more educated in previous ages even before the Tatar invasion" (ibid., 23).¹⁰⁵ And, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, "when Rus' entered into a closer alliance with Poland, the latter also...did not exert much influence on the vernacular" (ibid., 24).¹⁰⁶ Instead, "the annexation...of Galician Rus' and, later, of White (Lithuanian) [Rus'] with all of southern Rus' strongly influenced the development of the Polish language and literature" (ibid.).¹⁰⁷ According to Holovac'kyj, at that time there took place "a convergence of three Slavic dialects, Polish, south Russian, and Belarusian" (ibid.)¹⁰⁸ that also isolated the Polish language from the powerful influence of the Czech "language...to which it is so similar" (ibid., 25).¹⁰⁹ Holovac'kyj concludes: "[T]hus, that convergence and union of the Slavic peoples always had a good, salutary influence on the formation of the Slavic languages and literatures" (ibid., 25).¹¹⁰

Holovac'kyj remarks inadvertently that "it is generally known how southern and White Rus' later influenced Great Russian literature, the youngest among

101 "[...] даже старіи церковнословенскіи рукописи священного писанія писані на Руси не слободні отъ руцины."

102 "[...] звѣстно всѣмъ учении на то згаджаются, що Карпатскіи горы суть колыскою Словянъ."

103 *The Treatise* also contains information about a trade agreement dated 1351, purportedly written in a "mountain dialect" (гірським наріччям) (Holovac'kyj 1849: 44).

104 "[...] языкъ польскій не перетворивъ южнорусского языка и не влиявалъ на образованье его, але на отворотъ польскій языкъ виненъ свое образованье, правильность, и свой борзій [sic] взрость влиявови рускому."

105 "Русь була образованѣйша въ давныхъ вѣкахъ ще до нашествія Татаръ."

106 "[...] коли Русь въ близішій союзъ прийшла ісь Польщею, такожъ сія ... не багато впливала на народный языкъ."

107 "[...] натомість прилученє ... Галицкои Руси а потѣмъ бѣлои (литовскои) ісь цѣлою южною Русью сильно вплинуло на розвитє польского языка и словесности."

108 "[...] сближенє трехъ нарѣчій словенскихъ польского, южнорусского и бѣлорусского."

109 "[...] сь котрымъ такъ схѣдний бувъ."

110 "[...] такъ то сближенє и полученє Словенскихъ народѣвъ мало завсѣгди добрый спасительный впливъ на образованье словесностей словенскихъ."

the Rus' [literatures]" (ibid.),¹¹¹ although he gives no detail about the association between the "southern Rus'" ("южноруської") and Belarusian languages on the one hand and Russian on the other. He says, however, that "the bookish Ruthenian language began to change under the influence of Polish, which had begun to penetrate and root itself ever more deeply since the seventeenth century" (ibid., 26);¹¹² meanwhile, the Peresopnytsia Gospel and other texts (of the common folk tradition) were written, he claims, in a "mountain dialect" (ibid., 45).

Holovac'kyj was the first Galician grammarian to pay special attention to the "glorious" Cossack period. Commenting on the Cossacks, he writes that "those martial societies of knights gathered from all of southern Rus' spread Cossack liberty throughout, imposing one coloration on the people of southern Rus' as a whole" (ibid., 29).¹¹³ He was also the first Galician grammarian to write a deferential description of recent achievements in the creation of the modern Ukrainian language:

In short, this is a natural, pure, full-voiced language, strong in a manly way, expressive (laconic) in the mouth of a well-to-do farmer or a young Cossack, and, under the pen of Kotljarevs'kyj, Topolyns'kyj, and others, soft, warm-heartedly tender, caressed in maternal conversation, girlish song, or under the pen of the warm-hearted Osnov'janenko.... In most recent times, some writers have undertaken a bookish reworking of this dialect and started publishing their works written in the pure vernacular. Kotljarevs'kyj was the first to point the way, having refashioned the *Aeneid* and written several operas; after him, this field was successfully worked by Osnov'janenko in the tale, Artemovs'kyj and Hrebinka in the fable, Mohyla, Halka, Ševčenko, and Zabyla in dumas and ditties, etc.; everyone knows what our writers have accomplished in that regard (Šaškevyč, Ustyjanovyč, Mox, Levyc'kyj et al.) (Holovac'kyj 1849: 31, 39–40).¹¹⁴

Finally, among the protagonists of the Ukrainian language movement Holovac'kyj mentions Taras Ševčenko, although he does not attribute any independent or leading role to him.

In his *Three Introductory Lectures*, the scholar places even greater emphasis on Kotljarevs'kyj than he does in the *Treatise*. He characterizes the turn of the eighteenth century as follows:

111 "[...] звѣстно, якъ пѣзнѣйше вплывала южна и бѣла Русь на великорускую словеснѣсть наймолодшу меже рускими."

112 "[...] зачався переробляти книжний языкъ рускій пѣдъ вплывомъ польщины, котра ѳъ XVII вѣка зачала все глѣбше вѣдаться и вкорѣнювати [...]"

113 "тотіу воинственній товарищества лицарѣвъ сѣбранныхъ зо всеи южнои Руси, розширяли всюда козацкую волю, накидали одну барву на народнѣсть цѣлои южнои Руси."

114 "Словомъ єто природна, чиста, повноголосна мова, мужеско-сильна, выразиста (лаконическа) въ устахъ статного господаря або козака-молодца, тай пѣдъ перомъ Котляревского, Тополинского и др, а мягка, сердечно-нѣжна, пещена въ бесѣдѣ материнской, дѣвочѣй спѣванцѣ, або пѣдъ перомъ сердечного Основяненъка. ... Въ найновѣйшихъ часахъ зачали декотріу писателѣ книжно обрабляти сесе нарѣчїе и выдавати свои сочиненїя чистонароднымъ языкомъ писанїу. Котляревскїй первый показавъ дорогу перелицевавши Енеиду и написавши килька оперъ; за нимъ щасливо управляли сю ниву Основяненъко въ казцѣ, Артемовскїй и Гребѣнка въ байцѣ, Могила, Галка, Шевченко, Забѣла въ думахъ и думкахъ и пр; що нашїу писателѣ въ томѣ възглядѣ учинили (Шашкевичъ, Устыяновичъ, Мохъ, Левицкїй и др.) всѣмъ вѣдомо."

In the meantime, there was a great struggle in Russian and Polish literature between the so-called classicists and romantics.... Little Russia did not need to take part in it, for Kotljarev's'kyj had already defined it as a folk [literature], and he himself showed the way. Great individuals always precede important epochs and, according to a superior spirit, as it were, they show the people the way toward which it should aspire.... All that will remain forever in its beauty, in its freshness, because it is of the people. (Holovac'kyj 1849a: 26)¹¹⁵

One way or another, in 1849 Holovac'kyj was still a representative of the first generation of early Galician Ukrainian populists.

4. On the dialectal division of the Ruthenian language

4.1. Ivan Mohyl'nyč'kyj distinguished the “*spoken* vernacular of the common people and the vernacular in written works from the dialect known as *bookish*” (Mohyl'nyč'kyj 1910: 38).¹¹⁶ According to him, the latter had remained “almost *identical* from the thirteenth century to the present” (ibid., 39),¹¹⁷ whereas “certain minor alterations are entering *popular speech*, but they are so unremarkable and so rare that one may boldly assert that in *White and Little Rus'* one and the same dialect is spoken” (ibid.).¹¹⁸ The regional differences in the Ruthenian-speaking space boil down only to “two or three letters in the current language of that same people” (ibid.);¹¹⁹ the Belarusian merge of *e* with *ѣ* is singled out (see also ibid., 82), but there is generally no “notable grammatical alteration” (“знакомитої граматическої перемѣны”). The dialectal division of the Polish language, according to Mohyl'nyč'kyj, is much stronger:

Therefore, whoever is aware of the recesses of the Polish language must certainly acknowledge that the current language in the former palatinates of *Great Poland*, in the *Cracow* palatinate, in *Samogitia*, and in *Kashubia* shows greater differences than the Ruthenian language in *Lithuania*, *Podilia*, *Ukraine*, and *Galicia* (ibid., 47).¹²⁰

115 “Тымъ часомъ переборола ся въ літуратурѣ [sic] російскѣй и польскѣй великая борьба такъ названыхъ классикѣвъ съ романтиками. [...] Малорусь не потребовала участювати въ нѣй, бо еи Котляревскій вже рѣшивъ за народную, и самъ дорогу показавъ. — Великіи люди заєдно предшествоють важнымъ епокамъ и указують якбы вѣщимъ духомъ направленіе народови, куда му стремити ся належить. ... Все то позостане завсѣгды въ своей красѣ, въ своей свѣжости, бо є народне.”

116 “[...] діалектъ народный *устный* народа посполитого (Volkssprache) и діалектъ народный въ писмахъ, діалектомъ *книжнымъ* (Büchersprache) званный.”

117 “от XIII столѣтія ажъ до теперъ праве *єднаковий*.”

118 “въ просторѣчїи заходятъ нѣкоторые малые перемѣны, но такъ незнакомитые, такъ рѣдкіе, же смѣло твердити можна, яко на Бѣлой и Малой Руси *єднако итьмъ самымъ* діалектомъ говорятъ.”

119 “[...] двѣ або три писмена въ мовѣ поточной того самого народа.”

120 “Хтоколевкѣ бовемъ свѣдомый есть закутовъ языка полского, тотъ запевне признати мусить, же мова поточна въ давныхъ воеводствахъ *великополскихъ*, въ Воеводствѣ *Краковскомъ*, на Жмуди, *Кашубахъ* далеко болше єдна отъ другой, нежели мова руска въ *Литвѣ*, *Подолію*, *Украинѣ*, *Галициї* розличаєся.”

Further on, the scholar also mentions the considerable dialectal differentiation of the German language compared, as he believed, to the uniformity of the language spoken by the people “living in Lithuania and in Volhynia, Podilia, Ukraine, and Galicia” (“въ Литвъ, на Волиню, Подолу, Украинѣ, въ Галиціи мешкающихъ”) (ibid.). There is, of course, no information about dialectal phenomena in the Ruthenian-speaking space either in Mohyl'nyc'kyj's *Report* or in his grammar. Quite often, instead, purely southwestern forms are simply cited as being “Ruthenian,” for example, when the grammarian comments that *-овъ*, the ending of feminine nouns in the instrumental case, is used “in Ruthenian popular speech” (“въ просторѣчїи рѣскомъ”) (cf. Voznjak 1911: 18; this ending is also cited in paradigms in the grammar: Mohyl'nyc'kyj 1910: 225 and elsewhere), or when he lists the form of the numeral one (*едень*) without comment (ibid., 126). It is also interesting to note what Mohyl'nyc'kyj wrote about the reflex of the suffix and ending with **-bje*:

In the Ruthenian dialect that ending is customarily expressed in *two ways*. In popular speech and even some ancient writings [it is expressed] by *ня*. To this day, the Ruthenian says: *везеня, стараня, мешканя*. Those words have similar endings in the translated Go[spel] written in 1617. (ibid., 104).¹²¹

Mohyl'nyc'kyj notes, however, that “the use of the ending...*не* or *нѣ* or the insertion of the softening *ь* above *н*” is “generally” (“посполито”) widespread. As for the forms “*бѣвъ, бѣла, бѣло*,” he claims that this is the “actual oral pronunciation of that time in *Pokutia and Podilia*” (ibid., 142)¹²² (the author was a speaker of the Sian region dialect, in which the forms *byty, byl* are widespread),¹²³ and in this case Mohyl'nyc'kyj focused almost exclusively on the region inhabited by Galician Ruthenians.

4.2. Josyf Levyc'kyj's grammar also contains very little information about dialectal phenomena.¹²⁴ Here and there his text includes information on the features of the Belarusian language, for example, about *cekannja* (Belarusian *c' < t'*) (Levyc'kyj 1834: 30), which he associates with the development of *ć < t'* in Polish (Levyc'kyj writes about the “*m* in *ц*”),¹²⁵ or about *akan'e* (the pronunciation of unstressed “*о*”

121 “Въ рускомъ діалектѣ оконченіе тото двоякося выражати звыкло. Въ просторѣчїи устномъ и нѣкоторыхъ наветъ давныхъ писмахъ чрезъ *ня*. До нынѣ мовить русинъ: тото *везеня, стараня, мешканя*. Подобнѣ кончатся тые слова въ толкованомъ Ев(анге)ліи, въ року 1617 писано(мъ).”

122 “[...] властивый выговор оустныи време́не того на *Покѣстю и Подолу* есть.”

123 In a letter to Petr Keppen, another Peremyshl-based figure, Ivan Lavrivs'kyj, included several items containing rather inaccurate information about the dialects of Austrian-ruled Galicia and Bukovyna, going so far as to claim that “in Hungary there are three or more” Ruthenian dialects (Voznjak 1911: 4).

124 One should keep in mind Myxajlo Voznjak's suspicion that Levyc'kyj borrowed his data on dialects from a now-lost manuscript of Ivan Lavrivs'kyj's grammar, although there is no proof of this. Voznjak's chief argument is that Levyc'kyj also borrowed from other sources, and that “not much independent research and [not many] observations remain in Levyc'kyj's grammar” (Voznjak 1911: 105–6).

125 To this point, Levyc'kyj provides no information about *cekannja*. When he writes about what corresponds to the pronunciation of the Polish *ć* in the words *ciato, ciasto*, he notes that in the “Belarusian” we have “тело, тесто, тетка” (Voznjak 191: 19).

as “a”) in the “Minsk dialect” (ibid., 31). With regard to the Ukrainian linguistic space, Levyc'kyj occasionally notes that some forms are used in Galicia (e.g., in the endings *-obь*, *-ebь* in the instrumental case of feminine nouns; see ibid., 36).¹²⁶ Here and there he comments on dialectal elements in the Galician space, for example, when he objects to the comparative degree *вѣнкийй* because he (rightly) considers it a “Polonism” (ibid., 82). Elsewhere, the scholar cites the forms *естемь*, *естесь*, *естесмо*, *естесме*, which he does not regard as local variants but as social ones prevalent “particularly among the educated class..., which, when it uses its native language, wants to speak just as they do in Polish” (ibid., 103–4).¹²⁷ At the same time, Levyc'kyj does not object to the future tense form, such as *я бѣдѣ писалъ* (ibid., 118),¹²⁸ and in his model paradigms he occasionally cites typically Galician forms that are considered dialectal today, such as the numeral in the form *едень*, *една*, *едно* (ibid., 94). In Levyc'kyj's grammar one can encounter (albeit infrequently) some knowledge of the language of the Transcarpathians, to wit: “The Ruthenians of the Sanok, Jasło, and Nowy Sącz districts, as well as in Mukachiv in Hungary, use an *e* instead of *o* in the plural, e.g., *мысме* instead of *мысмо*, *былисме* (*бѣлисме*)—*видѣлисме*, *ходилисме*, etc.” (Levyc'kyj 1834: 102).¹²⁹ The reader accompanying Josyf Levyc'kyj's grammar also contains a section titled “Model of the Ruthenian Dialect in Hungary” (*Muster des ruthenischen Dialektes in Ungarn*) (ibid., 55). However, Myxajlo Lučkaj's Church Slavonic work *Church Talks for All Sundays of the Year for Popular Education* (Церковныя Бесѣды на всѣ недѣли рока на поученіе народное) does not offer the best examples of this dialect, even if the word *dialect* is to be understood in the broader sense prevailing in the first half of the nineteenth century.

4.3. Vahylevyč's main ideas about Galician dialects of the Ukrainian language have already been discussed in section 2.3. It should be recalled that he writes about “two dialects” (“*dwa narzecza*”) of the Little Russian language—Galician and Kyivan (“*halickie i kijowskie*”)—but does not consider the “third dialect, the Carpathian” (“*trzecie narzecze karpackie*”) a true dialect for reasons that cannot be treated seriously today (see 2.3). There is an interesting section about the dissimilarity between the language of folklore and dialects, and another section offers Vahylevyč's reflections on something resembling present-day notions of dialectal continuum (it is well known, however, that there are no true transitional Ukrainian-Russian dialects):

126 This form was cited by the Transcarpathian Myxajlo Lučkaj in his grammar titled *Grammatica Slavico-Ruthena: seu Vetero-Slavicae, et actu in montibus Carpathicis Parvo-Russiae, seu dialecti vigentis linguae* (Buda, 1830) (see Voznjak 1911: 80, 85, 87, 102).

127 “[...] besonders bei der gebildeten Klasse ... welche, wenn sie sich ihrer Muttersprache bedient, ebenso wie im Polnischen sprechen will.”

128 “Man gebraucht sehr oft in der künftigen Zeit z. B. *я бѣдѣ писалъ*, *она бѣде спала*. Es scheint das Futurum exactum der Lateiner zu seyn” (Levyc'kyj 1834: 118).

129 “Die Ruthenier des Sanoker, Jasloer und Sandecer Kreises als auch die bei Munkacs in Ungarn gebrauchen in der V. Z. statt *o* das *e* z. B. *мысме* anstatt *мысмо*, *былисме* (*бѣлисме*)—*видѣлисме*, *ходилисме* u. s. w.”

The current language has more local features, being a language of song and story that is universal to some extent. The Galician and Kyivan dialects have so much in common that they cannot be considered two separate languages: the subdialects of both those dialects are links connecting them with each other, as with related languages. (Vahylevyč 1845: ii).¹³⁰

Vahylevyč's attempt at a description of linguistic phenomena culled from manuscripts up to the late fifteenth century (*ibid.*, ii–iii) is quite unsystematic. Among many fanciful observations, however, he notes a considerable number of important dialectal features. These are the most interesting features of the “Galician dialect”:

a) the sounds...*ja* as well as *ę* (А) are transformed into *je*, *опьеть...рьедь...пъеный...* and into *e* after *z* [*sic*], *cz*, *sz*, *szcz...* *жель...чьсь...счестье...dz* from *ž* [*sic*]: *меджі...джжъ...джаворонокъ...dz* from *z*: *дзерно...дзбѣрь* [*sic*] *zwiérz*; *одзеро jezioro*;...*дзеленый...f* from *ch*: *ѣість chwest*; *ѣала chwała...* truncated *w*: *оужъ wąż*; *остокъ wschód*; b) Etymology: [nom. pl.] often *-a* [!]: *сѣда...золоса...*; [dat. pl.] *воіѣмь...ісѣмь...*; [prep. pl. on] “*ѣхъ* or *joch* (*och*)”: *кназѣхъ* (*іохъ*)... *писарѣхъ* (*іохъ*)...*мѣжѣхъ* (*охъ*)...*мечѣхъ* (*охъ*)...*панѣхъ* (*іохъ*)...*канѣхъ* (*іохъ*)... *зернѣхъ...имѣнѣхъ...* In words in the third person singular, present tense, the *t* stands out; the same thing with the plural, but only after *ja*: *ходи chodzi*; *види widzi*; *ходѣ chodzą*; *видѣ widzą*. In the future tense, *ѣти* precedes the word: *имѣ ходити* *będę iść*; *имѣ сидѣти* *będę siedzieć* [*sic*] (Vahylevyč 1845: xv–xvi).

Vahylevyč has quite an obscure notion of the “Kyivan dialect.” Here are its most interesting features:

a) the sounds...primary *ja...ja* from *je*: *житьѣ...счастѣѣ...*; *и* from *i* [*sic*]: *ѣблѣнь...*; *ja* from *ѣ*: *ѣати ѣаѣ*; — *p* from *f*: *ѣлашка...ѣлакѣ flak...chw* and *kw* from *f*: *хѣига...хѣарѣа farba*; *хѣартѣхъ...кѣасола...ž* from *žd*: *ѣѣжати wyjechać* [*sic*]; *ѣыхожати wychodzić...* *n* from *d* [!]: *кожнѣй каždy...* the suffixal *n*: *лишѣнь...*; *либонѣ...*; the *w* is truncated: *проти...* b) Etymology: [it is claimed that in the dative singular, all nouns end in] *-owі*, *-jowі*: *хлопови, панови, князѣови, писарѣови*; ...[the ending] *-t'* [third pers. sing.]: *рѣветъ, печетъ, бережетъ* [*sic*]; *ѣидитѣ, летитѣ...* In the form *ѣty* and *ѣaty* in the third pers. *jet'* is often discarded: *оутѣка...поспѣѣша...* The future tense is created through the addition of the infinitive *ѣти* to the infinitive: *писѣти му...знѣти мѣ...* (Vahylevyč 1845: xvi–xviii).

Vahylevyč singles out the following features of the “Carpathian dialect”:

a) the sounds: the *ja* after...*ž*, *cz*, *sz*, *szcz*: ...*жалѣ...жаба...*; *чѣсь...* *ѣанѣка...*; *ѣи* is pronounced as a hard sound like *oj* and *uj*, from here, it differs from *i* (*и*): *быкъ...* *кобыла...* *рыба, пышнѣй, быти...* the *w* is truncated: *проти...* b) Etymology: *w* is truncated in *рѣковѣ-рѣковѣ...панѣѣ-панѣѣвѣ... ojko, ojka, ojko or ejko, ejka, ejko*:

130 “Język potoczny ma więcej cech miejscowości, jak język pieśni i powieści, który jest poniekąd ogólnym. Narzecza halickie i kijowskie mają tyle wspólnego, że niemożna je uważać za dwa osobne języki, podnarzecza zaś tych obu narzeczy są ogniwa łączące je z sobą, równie jak z pobratymczemi językami.”

хлопойко, панойко; головоїка; ножейка, крылейко, полейко...доброѡ-доброѡв...
синеѡ-синеѡв; добрейкій, острейкій...бѣѡ, моѡ, рекѡ, текѡ, h and k remain; ...
гадамь-гадаишь-гадать-гадаме-гадате...звеме, видиме, гадаеме.... Adverbs are
formed from adjectives with ѣ: добръ... острѣ (Vahylevyč 1845: xviii–xix).

Vahylevyč mentions “local nuances.” Some of his comments are erroneous, while others reiterate already cited features. But some of his observations are interesting:

Now I must still mention certain local nuances. In the Sanok and Peremyshl [districts] on the border with the Polish language: *g* from *k*: *лижга* *łyżka*; *мизга* *miska*...; In the Buzke [district] on the border between the Galician dialect and the Kyivan...*j* from *d*: *двайцать*...; from *дѣѣ*, *dwie* in the feminine gender and neuter it is always linked in the plural by ѣ: *дѣѣ головѣ*...*дѣѣ простиралѣ*...that is the only vestige of the dual number....

In the Sáros district on the border with the Czechoslovak language: an inserted *d*: *седлакъ* *sielanin*.... In the Máramaros Mountains: *u* from *o*: *кѣнь* *kón* [sic]...[diminutive forms:] in *iczko*, *iczka*: *татѣчко*, *мамѣчка*.... In Hungary: *o* turns into *i*: *пліть* *plot*, *кїсть* *kość*; *ja* is pronounced like *je*: *пол’а* [2 dots over the а]...*u* like *i*: *мїжъ* *maż*; *дїѡрова* *dąbrowa*.

Among the Hutsuls in the mountains of Stanyslaviv and Kolomyia [districts] and Bukovyna:...*o* turns into a coarse *i* (*ü*): *вїль*...*плїть*...*je* from *ja* at the beginning of expressions and after vowels: *євѣръ*...; *єблика*... *боєтисе*...*cia* is formed into *са*: *пишеница*, *оулица*...[instr. sing.] *ватромъ*, *рѣкомъ*, *зброемъ*....

In the Chernivtsi [area], *je* from *ja*: *оئےть*...*f* from *chw*: *фала*...*фїсть*.... The first person plural in the past tense is shortened through *т*: *малимъ* *mieliśmy*; *зналимъ* *znaliśmy*. In words ending in *dyty*, *tyty* the *d* and *t* do not change in the present tense: *ходью*...*видью*.... In Volhynia: [third pers. sing.] *оутѣка*, *гада*, *ходи*, *види*.... In Podilia...*ja* and root *a*: *опать*; *жаль*. *Са* replaces *cia*: *пишеница*, *паишеница*. [Third pers. sing.] *ходѣ*, *видѣ*.... In the Chernihiv [area], the sounds *u* and *ju* from *o*: *кѣнь*..., *сюль*.... In the word *czy*, *hty* and *kty*: *текти*, *ректи*, *бѣзти*, *березти*...in the infinitive *y* turns into *ѣ*: *ходить* *chodzić*, *видитъ* *widzieć*.

There should also be languages transitional to the Great Russian: Kursk and Voronezh, but to the Belarusian, the Ovruch [language]; the Black Sea language also has its particular features, but I cannot say anything about them. It would not be superfluous to recall, however, that the Little Russians, the inhabitants of Galicia, instead of *ż*, *cz*, *sz*, *szcz*, say *z*, *c*, *s*, *sc*, which I consider the more delicate pronunciation (Vahylevyč 1845: xix–xxii).

Also meriting attention is Vahylevyč’s argument explaining that he wrote the etymological *o* in newly closed syllables because “those sounds have not yet fully developed into [the sounds] that correspond to them, especially in Hungary and in the Siverian region,” and because he was convinced that only the etymological spelling would allow “our Little Russians [to] free themselves of the alphabetical frenzy” (Vahylevyč 1845: xxii).¹³¹

131 “[...] te głoski jeszcze zupełnie się nie wyrobiły na im odpowiednie szczególnie w Węgrzech, i w Siewerzczyźnie, potem w przekonaniu, że tylko takim sposobem nasi Małorusini oswobodzą się od abecadłowego szalu.”

4.4. Josyf Lozyns'kyj provides far more information about Galician dialects than any of his predecessors. Summing up, he writes that “even in the contemporary vernacular we observe significant Polonization,” noting that “the further west [one goes], the more Polonisms are to be observed,” while “the freest from that fault is Rus' inhabiting Hungary and the Carpathians” (Lozyns'kyj 1846: xx).¹³² Meanwhile, “Rus' living on the Hungarian border and in Hungary is coming somewhat closer to the Slovak dialect” (ibid., 125).¹³³ Lozyns'kyj objects to such “local” forms as “*трусца*” instead of “*труска*,” “*знаме*” instead of “*знаємо*,” “*його* (*joho*)” instead of “*єго*” (in modern Ukrainian, of course, it is *єго* that is considered the “local” form), “*це* or *ца*” instead of *са* [in reference to the reflexive particle and the contradistinction, e.g., *знає ся* // *знається* <-ця>] because, according to him, even though “there is a need to take language from the lips of the common folk, it must be encompassed in definite and uniform rules” (ibid., xxxiv).¹³⁴ Further on, Lozyns'kyj writes about the evolution of *a* after palatalized consonants: “In Galicia, in the lower environs of Peremyshl, as well as among the Hutsuls,” people pronounce “*wzjel*, *krutjet*...*żjel*, *czies*,” while “some contract that *e* even more...pronouncing it like *i*, e.g.,...*Marysi my imje*” or “*koszuli dla Mołodoho*.” However, “in the words *дла*, *вса*, the *a* retains its characteristic sound” (ibid., 124).¹³⁵ Citing Lučkaj, he lists the Transcarpathian verbal forms “*знаме*, *знате*, *бѣдеме*...third person singular [...] *бѣзат* [...] instead of *бѣзайѣ*” and notes that the Transcarpathian Ruthenians “have preserved many old Slavic words that others rarely use, e.g., *пѣть*, *хижа*, *имати*, *желати*, *ждати*.” He also emphasizes the use of truncated adjectives (*чорнѣочи*, *зелене сѣно*) (ibid., 125–26). Lozyns'kyj also mentions the characteristic pronunciation of the retained *ы* in Transcarpathian dialects: they pronounce “*вѣти*, *вѣл*, instead of *выти*, *выл*,” as well as the pronunciation of “*оден* instead of *еден*...*што* instead of *що*..., *гу* instead of *ѡк* [!], *се* instead of *са*, *идѣ домиѣ* instead of *идѣ до домѣ*, etc.” The scholar claims that “finally, some Hungarian words differ by accent and use, e.g., *лем*, *сем*, *кедѣ*” (ibid., 125). About the Ruthenians in the “Russian Empire,” he writes that they use the infinitive ending *-тъ* instead of *-ти* and the shortened form of the reflexive particle *сѣ* instead of *са*, which he regards as borrowings “from the Muscovite dialect” (“z Moskiewskiego narzecza”) (ibid., 126).

It is interesting to note that Lozyns'kyj singles out a separate language “in Lithuanian Rus'” (“na Rusi Litewskiej”) in which there are “many Polonisms; besides that, prepositions end in *e*, and the first case [i.e., nominative] of plural feminine and neuter adjectives (and sometimes in the masculine gender) in *ѣe* (*je*), e.g., *всѣкѣе* (*всѣкѣѣе*) *киевскѣе* *приходи*.... They also pronounce: *сподѣваѣца*, *кохаѣца*, instead of *сподѣватиса*, *кохатиса*; *його* and *йомѣ* instead of *єго*, *емѣ*” (ibid., 126–27), and “the Belarusian...dialect” (“Narzeczce [...] *bjało-ruskie*”), in which they pronounce “*a*...

132 “i w teraźniejszej mowie narodowej spostrzegamy wielkie polonizowanie [...] im bardziej na zachód, tém więcej dają się postrzegać polonizmy [...] najwolniejsza od tego zarzutu jest Ruś w Węgrzech i Karpatach osiadła.”

133 “Ruś po nad granicą węgierską i w Węgrzech mieszkająca, zbliża się trochę do narzecza słowackiego.”

134 “[...] potrzeba brać język z ust ludu prostego; trzeba go ująć w pewne i jednostajne prawidła.”

135 “[...] w słowach: *дла*, *вса*, zachowuje a swoje właściwe brzmieni [...]”

instead of *o*, *ѣ*, e.g., *табѣе, каго, багато...грахов, бареза...*; *je* (*ѣе*) instead of *e* (*е*): *цѣбѣе...*; *цѣ* and *дѣ* (*ć, dź*) instead of *m* and *ð*: *цѣпеньер (менер), цихо (михо)...* The third person present...: *плачецѣ (плаче),...кажѣцѣ (кажѣт)*. Occasionally, that *цѣ* drops off...*нозладае*" (ibid.).

Lozyns'kyj describes the characteristics of another variant of the "Ruthenian" language, spoken "in Ukraine," whose features are listed in his grammar:

a...sometimes instead of o: багато, казак, адже...; instead of край, мѣж, they pronounce as krij, myž...; [the dative and accusative cases of the pronoun] ji instead of ей, ю, and instead of его, емѣ, мое...joho, joti, teje...; лѣче, маже, красче, instead of лѣчиши, мажиши, красиши; ...Instead of the final тса...цѣа: обливаецѣа...; цѣ, цѣа, цѣого, instead of се, са, сѣого; ...The preposition в (ѣ) sometimes like ѣ; e.g., ѣсѣ, ѣслѣд, ѣ лѣс; sometimes вже, в ѣого, вмер, в них, втопил...are pronounced like в; the initial н...is not used, e.g., на ѣого, до ѣого; instead of ит in the third person singular, present tense...sometimes е: моле, ходе, бродѣ instead of молит, ходит, бродит; ... they also say: е вози, гдежто вони е? (instead of сѣт) ...sometimes кае, каѣт instead of каже, кажѣт" (Lozyns'kyj 1846: 127).

In this context, Lozyns'kyj cites *The Little Russian Novels and Tales of Xoma Kuprijenko* (Малороссійскіа повѣсти и разкази [*sic*] Хомы Кѣприенка; Moscow, 1840). Evidently, he derived his knowledge of the language spoken in Ukraine mostly from this publication.¹³⁶

4.5. In his *Treatise*, Jakiv Holovac'kyj writes about the "nation...of one blood, one root," which "has one language, and the latter is divided into many tongues, dialects, and subdialects" (Holovac'kyj 1849: 1).¹³⁷ He comments that "there are dialects in our land, in Galician and Hungarian Rus', which are not entirely congruent with Little Russian (Ukrainian),"¹³⁸ emphasizing that

*it seems strange that the Little Russian language in such extensive lands as Volhynia, Podilia, Ukraine, the lower Dnipro River region, the Black Sea region, etc., is spoken in a single dialect with minor alterations in certain words, while the Galician and Hungarian Ruthenians have a considerably varied speech (ibid., 28).*¹³⁹

136 It is interesting to note what Lozyns'kyj thinks about "transitional dialects": "Those diverse shadings constitute the transition of one dialect to another, e.g., the Novgorod dialect constitutes the transition of the Little Russian dialect to the Great Russian, while the Belarussian or Minsk [dialect] constitutes the transition of the Little Russian dialect to the Muscovite." (Te rozmaite cieniowania stanowią przejście jednego narzecza do drugiego, tak n. p. narzecze nowogrodzkie stanowi przejście narzecza mało-ruskiego do wielkoruskiego, a narzecze bjało-ruskie czyli Mińskie stanowi przejście narzecza małoruskiego do Moskiewskiego) (Lozyns'kyj 1846: 127).

137 "[...] однокровный, однокорѣнный народъ [...] має одну мову, а тая розпадає на багато языкѣвъ, нарѣчій и поднарѣчій [...]."

138 "[...] находятся у насъ въ Галицкѣй и Угорскѣй Руси нарѣчія, котрі не совсѣмъ стѣдні ись Малорускимъ (Украинскимъ)."

139 "[...] дивно здаєся, що Малорускій языкъ въ такихъ обширнихъ краяхъ Волинію, Поділью, Українѣ, Низовію, Чорноморщинѣ и пр. говоритьсѣ однимъ нарѣчїємъ ись малими перемѣнами въ декотрыхъ словахъ, а Галицкіи и Угорскіи Русине мають цимало рѣзгорѣчій."

In particular, Holovac'kyj names the “three dialects of the one south Russian language” (“трояке нарѣчіє одного языка южнорусского”) “in Galicia and among the Hungarian Ruthenians” (“въ Галиччинѣ и у Русинѣвъ уторскихъ”), to wit: “I. Volhynian-Podolian, II. Galician or Dnister River region, and III. Mountain, or Carpatho-Ruthenian” (“I. Волинско-подольське, II. Галицке або Наддністрянське и III. Гірське або Карпато-руське”) (ibid., 37–38). The first dialect “differs little from Ukrainian, or, to put it better, it is the same as Ukrainian, merely a variant of it.... It is the most prevalent of all the south Ruthenian dialects because it extends across all of southern Rus', but it has reached only the periphery of Galicia (“мало що розличаєся ѿть українського, або лучше сказавши, є то саме що українське, лишъ рѣзномова єго. ... Оно найобширнѣйше изъ всѣхъ нарѣчій южнорусскихъ, бо розлягаєся по цѣлѣй южнѣй Руси, а Галиччини ино окрайки зафатило”) (ibid., 38). Citing Izmail Sreznevskij, Holovac'kyj states that “in Little Russia, the Kyivan-Pereiaslav [*sic*] language, disseminated throughout the Zaporozhian and Black Sea land, is regarded as the principal, purest, and exemplary variant of the south Ruthenian language” (“въ Малороссіи уважаєся Кієво-перейасловська [*sic*] мова, розпросторонена по всему Запорожскому и Чорноморскому краю за головну, найчистѣйшую и образцевую рѣзнѣсть южнорусского языка”) (ibid., 40). Holovac'kyj also lists the following:

- a) The Siverian variant, beyond the Seim River, contiguous on one side with the Great Russian and, on the other, with the Belarusian language, and coinciding first with one language and then the other; for example, the Siverians pronounce *ѣ* like *є*: *Чернеговъ, Нежинъ, возметь, ходѣмъ* instead of *кѣнь*; b) the Sloboda variant in Sloboda Ukraine, distinguished by individual words; and c) the Volhynian-Podilian variant, which adopted some things from the Polish and extends across part of Galician Rus'. The Volhynian-Podilian (or Ukrainian) dialect likes the broad vowels *a* and *я*, retains the *є* and *о* for full sonority, and the full ending in the feminine instrumental singular: *ою, ею*; it accepts the parenthetical *л* and *н*, as well as *у* in the words *бувъ, бувши*, etc. (Holovac'kyj 1849: 40).¹⁴⁰

Holovac'kyj's comments on the spread of the “Volhynian-Podilian dialect” to other dialectal territories of Galicia are extremely interesting:

140 “Сѣверскую рѣзнѣсть, за рѣкою Сеймомъ, котра зъ одной стороны дотыкаєся къ великорускому, а зъ другою къ бѣлорускому языкамъ, та збиваєся то на одну, то на другу мову; н. пр. Сѣверцѣ говорятъ ѣ якъ є: Чернеговъ, Нежинъ, возметь, ходѣмъ зам. кѣнь; б) Слободжанскую, въ Слободскѣй Украинѣ, рѣзличающуюся [*sic*] одинокими словами и в) Волинско-подольскую рѣзнѣсть, котра дещо изъ польщины зафатила, и котра займає часть Галицкои Руси. — Волинско-подольське (або українське) нарѣчіє любить широкіи самогласні а и я, удержує для повноголосія є и о, и повне законченіє въ твор. пад. єд. ч. жен. рода: ою, ею; пріймає вставочне л и н, такожъ у въ словахъ бувъ, бувши и пр.”

With songs (dumas, ditties), this dialect spread throughout Galicia long ago; the Mountain People themselves (Hutsuls, Highlanders, Boikos, Lemkos) sing songs of Ukrainian (Cossack) origin in the local pronunciation, even as in lyrical songs (kolomyikas, shalalaikas, etc.) and ritual songs they maintain their local dialect (Holovac'kyj 1849: 39–40).¹⁴¹

The following question arises: is something like a “folkloric koine” on a “Volhynian-Podilian” foundation being described here? It is interesting that Holovac'kyj also perceives a factor of linguistic prestige in this context. He writes: “Even to this day, in some parts the people consider the Ukrainian dialect seemingly more beautiful, more noble” (ibid., 42).¹⁴² According to him,

when a young fellow goes beyond the Seret River or the Buh, he adopts the local speech, but after returning home he begins to toss out words in their manner, so people make fun of him: look at this nobleman, he’s learned to say *теля, шапка* (instead of *тельє, шьєнка*) (ibid., 42–43).¹⁴³

Holovac'kyj notes that the Volhynian-Podillian dialect is spoken by “approximately 300,000 people in Galicia. In Russia (taking all the Little Russian dialects, with their insignificant variations, as one) it is spoken by 10,370,000; together with those others, that totals 10,670,000 and is thus the most widespread in southern Rus” (ibid., 47).¹⁴⁴

The scholar knows a good deal about the variant that he calls the “Galician or Dnister dialect” (ibid., 41). According to him, it “is spoken by the Ruthenian community throughout Galicia, from the upper reaches of the Lomnytsia and Bystrytsia [Rivers] and in the Chornohora [Mountains] all the way to the sources of the Strypa and Lypa [Rivers] and the Holohory highlands” (ibid.),¹⁴⁵ totaling “approximately 1,360,000” speakers (ibid., 48). The Galician dialect, according to Holovac'kyj, “is marked by the narrow vowels *ε* and *e*, a truncated instrumental

141 “Съ пѣснями (думами, думками) розширилося се нарѣчье ще давно по всѣй Галичинѣ; самѣ Горяне (Гуцулы, Верховинцѣ, Бойки, Лемки) спѣвають пѣснь украинского похождения (козацькѣи) по тамошнему выговору, коли тымчасомъ въ лиричнымъ спѣванкахъ (коломыйкахъ, шалалайкахъ и др.) и обрядовыхъ пѣсняхъ заховують свое помѣстне нарѣчье.”

142 “[...] ще до сеи поры въ декотрыхъ сторонахъ уважають въ народѣ Украинске нарѣчье буцѣмъ красче, благороднѣйше.”

143 “[...] коли паробок зайде за рѣку Середъ або Бугъ, та перейме тамошню бесѣду, а повернувши до дому стане закидати по ихному, то посмѣвкуются ему: Ось диви, якій менѣ шляхтичъ, вже навчився: *теля, шапка* (вм. *тельє, шьєнка*) говорити.”

144 “[...] около 300 тысячъ Народа въ Галиціи. Въ Росіи (взявши въ одно всѣ незначні рѣзнодорожныя малорусскіи) бесѣдує нимъ 10,370,000; разомъ съ тотыми буде 10,670,000 а тымъ самымъ є оно наибольширѣйше на южнѣй Руси.”

145 “[Ним] [...] говоритъ мѣръ рускій по цѣлой Галичинѣ ѿтъ вершинъ Лѣмницѣ, Быстрицѣ и Чорногоры ажъ до жерель Стрыпы, Липы и верховинъ Гологорскихъ.”

case in *овь, евь*,¹⁴⁶ and the elimination of the parenthetical *л, н*, etc." (Holovac'kyj 1849: 43).¹⁴⁷ He notes that

in certain places there are still individual variations, but they are so frequently repeated that it is impossible to separate and identify them by locale; e.g., they say *медь* and *мѣдь*, *камень* and *камѣнь*, *лень* and *льонь*, *его* and *іого*, *него* *ннього* [sic],¹⁴⁸ *трошки*, *трішки*, *глыбокій* and *глубокій* (and *гѣбокій*), *Хведько*, *хвалити*, and *Федько*, *фалити*, *хустка*, and *фустка*: in some places *з* is pronounced hard, like *дз*: *дзерно*, *дзелений*; *с* like *ц* (*мс*), *цей*, *цело* instead of *сей*, *село*;¹⁴⁹ and in

146 See also: "In the Galician and mountain dialects, they like to truncate the instrumental case singular: e.g., *ночевь, костевь, смертевь, церквовь*...instead of...*церквою*." ("Въ галицкомъ и горскомъ нарѣчїю люблять творительный падежъ единств. числа скорочати: н.пр. *ночевь, костевь, смертевь, церквовь* ... зам. ... *церквою*") (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 81); "In the Galician and Hungarian dialects, in the feminine singular of the instrumental case, they change the ending *ю* to *овь, ею* to *евъ* [ъ ѣ sic]; e.g., *доброю, добровь, птичею, птичевь*." ("Въ галицкомъ и оуторскомъ нарѣчїю перетворяють въ творительномъ падежѣ въ женскомъ родѣ единственного числа законченїа *ю* на *овь, ею* на *евъ* [ъ ѣ sic]; н.пр. *доброю, добровь, птичею, птичевь*") (ibid., 94); "In the Galician and mountain dialects, the truncated instrumental case is used: *мновь, тобовь, невъ*." ("Въ галицкомъ и горскомъ нарѣчїю оуживаеся скороченный творительный падежъ: *мновь, тобовь, невъ*") (ibid., 123); "The instrumental...in those dialects is...*товъ* *сесевъ* instead of *тою, сею*." ("Творительный ... въ тыхже нарѣчїахъ ... *товъ* *сесевъ* зам. *тою, сею*") (ibid., 125).

147 "[...] отъзначаеся вузкими самогласными *є* и *е*, скороченымъ творит. пад. на *овь, евь*, вымѣтованьемъ вставочного *л, н* и пр."

148 The grammar states: "In some parts of Galicia they say (іо) or (о) instead of (е), (є), in the words *іого, нього, іомѣ, слюзы*: *всію, ліонь*, instead of *его, ємѣ, слезы, все, лень*, and in the instrumental case: *злодѣюмъ, камѣнюмъ, ткачомъ* and the vocative *засѣлю* instead of: *злодѣемъ, камѣньемъ, ткачемъ, засѣле*. In those cases, the pronunciation is designated by two dots (ë, 'е'), or they write (іо ѡ. о)" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 7). See also this description: "But there are other cases in which the (е) and (є) are replaced by (о, іо), either in the universal Little Russian pronunciation or only in certain areas as a local pronunciation.... In such cases, they change the adjective with a soft ending (е) to (іо); e.g., *синіого, синіомѣ, синіои, синіою*. However, they also say *синего, синемѣ, ор синого, синомѣ*, etc.... Occasionally, the root (е) in the general pronunciation is retained, and only in some locales is it changed to (о) or (іо). In the following cases, in some places they change (е) to (о): а) ...e.g., instead of *бѣжемъ, ткачемъ, товаришемъ, плащемъ*...*бѣжомъ, ткачомъ, товаришомъ, плащомъ*... б) [in the instrumental and vocative cases]...in some places they say *дѣжою, кѣчою, дѣшою, пѣчою; дѣжо* [!], *кѣчо* [!], *дѣшо* [!], *пѣчо* [!]. In the following cases, in some locales they change the (е) and (є) to (іо): а) ...*коваліомъ, злодѣюмъ, гребеніомъ...корѣніомъ, насѣніомъ...поліомъ, моріомъ, горіомъ*... б) [in the instrumental and vocative cases] *господиніовъ, ѡблоніовъ; господиніо* [!], *ѡблоніо* [!]; *качатіомъ, теллатіомъ*... с) In certain words: e.g., they say *всію, всіого, всіомѣ, всіои; іого, ніого, сіого, сіомѣ; ліонь, слюзы*" (ibid., 21–22). See also: "In the Galician and mountain dialects...the (е) and (є) are sometimes changed in the vocative case to (іо); e.g., *засѣлю, долио, змію* instead of *засѣле, доле, зміє*" (ibid., 72); "In the Galician and mountain dialects, in the instrumental case singular, they change the (е) to (іо) and say *племеніомъ, лошатіомъ, кѣратіомъ*, etc." (ibid., 84–85). "In certain locales, especially in the mountain and Dnister regions, they also use *омъ* instead of *емъ*; e.g., *плечомъ, означиомъ*" (ibid., 75); "In the Galician and mountain dialects that (е) is changed to (о, іо): *рожою, кашою*" (ibid., 68); "In the Galician and mountain dialects they end the instrumental case singular in a truncated fashion: in names with a hard ending in (*овь, оѣ*) and with a soft ending in (*евъ, еѣ*) or (*евъ, еѣ*); e.g., *ноговь, долевь, стаевъ*. In some regions that (е) and (є) are transformed into *іо*, e.g., *доліовъ, стаіовъ*" (ibid., 72). See, finally: "In the Volhynian-Podilian dialect, sibilant consonants are mostly used instead of hard ones; e.g., *мѣжъ* instead of *мѣжа*; *колачъ, колача, колачами*, etc. But in the dative and instrumental singular they remove the soft-ending declension *а*; e.g., dat. *колачеви*, instr. *колачемъ, плащеви—плащемъ*" (ibid., 61).

149 See the grammar: "(3) is pronounced in some places as (дз); e.g., *дзвонь, дзелений, дзерно*; just like (с) similarly to (тс) or (ц), e.g., *цей, цело*; but in the pure pronunciation of Ruthenian, one should write and say *звонь, зелений, зерно; сей, село*" ((3) вимовляють гдєкѣда *ѡкъ* (дз); н.пр. *дзвонь, дзелений, дзерно*; такъ *ѡкъ* (с) подобно до (тс) або (ц) н.пр. *цей, цело*; но чистомѣ выговорѣ рѣскомѣ

certain places in Pokutia *m* [is pronounced] like *к*: *кежко*, *кѣсто* instead of *тяжко*, *тѣсто*. The Hutsuls, being mountain people, have adopted much from the mountain dialect; in the lower Sian region, all three dialects seem to blend into one another. Sometimes a certain feature of one dialect shifts into another, e.g., the diminutive *ойкії*, *ейкії* (instead of *онькій*, *енькій*) is spoken practically throughout the district of Zhovkva and part of Zolochiv, and, contrariwise, the Ukrainian *a* instead of *ae* (*просыха* instead of *просыхае*) is prevalent in the region of the Galician dialect in the Zhovkva and Zolochiv districts¹⁵⁰ (Holovac'kyj 1849: 55–56).¹⁵¹

Holovac'kyj also offers much information about the “mountain dialect” that “is spoken (except for the Hutsuls, who speak Galician with certain variations) by all the mountain Ruthenians from the Poprad River all the way to the upper reaches of the Bystrytsia and Tysa [Rivers],” or, in greater detail, “along the very mountain ridge and on both sides of our mountains and valleys, along the river plains of the upper Dnister, Váh, Sian, and Wisłok, and, in the Hungarian foothills, along the rivers Ondava, Laborec, Vuh (*Ung*), Latorytsia, and Bodrog all the way to the valleys of the Tysa,” altogether by “approximately 1,060,000” speakers (Holovac'kyj 1849: 43–44, 48).¹⁵² According to Holovac'kyj, this dialect “has preserved many ancient old-world Slavic words, aphorisms, and images” and “is somewhat similar to the Slovak and Czech languages, as Galician is to Serbian [!]

повинно са писати и говорити: звѣнь, зеленый, зерно; сей, село (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 9).

150 See the addendum in the grammar: “In certain parts they pronounce (л) like (в) even at the end of nouns; e.g., *дѣвъ*, *вѣвъ*, *оревъ*, instead of *дѣль*, *вѣль*, *орель*. But that is a local pronunciation; one must write and read *дѣль*, *вѣль*, *орель* [this is repeated on p. 25, where the word *горѣвка* is added]” (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 10).

151 “[...] въ денекотрыхъ мѣстяхъ суть еще сукромѣ рѣзности, але они такъ зѣ густа повторяются, що роздѣлити ихъ и мѣстнѣсть означити не можна; н. пр. кажутъ: *медь* и *мѣдь*, *камень* *камѣнь*, *лень* и *льонь*, *его* и *іого*, *него* *ннього* [sic] *трошки*, *трішки*, *глыбокій* и *глубокій* (и *глыбокій*), *Хведько*, *хвалити* и *Федько*, *фалити*, *хустка* и *фустка*: з вымовляють декуда твердо нибы *дз*: *дзерно*, *дзеленый*; с якъ *ц* (*те*), *цей*, *цело* зам. *сей*, *село*; а декуда на Покутью *т* подобно якъ *к*: *кежко*, *кѣсто* зам. *тяжко*, *тѣсто*. Гуцулы, яко горяне, перехопили богато изъ гѣрського нарѣчіа; над нижнимъ Сяномъ неяко сходяться всѣ три нарѣчіа съ собою. Часомъ деяке зная одного нарѣчіа переходить въ друге н. пр. уменш. *ойкії*, *ейкії* (зам. *онькій*, *енькій*) говорится ледви не по цѣломъ Жовківськомъ окрузѣ и части Золочѣвского, а на отвѣротъ украинске *a* зам. *ae* (*просыха* зам. *просыхае*) розширено въ области Галицкогo нарѣчіа въ Жовківськомъ и Золочѣвськомъ округахъ.”

152 “[Ним] говорятъ (крѣмъ Гуцулѣвъ, котрі Галицк. говорятъ изъ декотрыми ѣмѣнами) всѣ горяне рускі ѣтъ Попрада ажъ до вершинъ Быстриць и Тисы [...] самымъ хребтомъ и по обохъ убокахъ гѣръ нашихъ долѣвъ порѣчьями гѣрѣшного Днѣстра, Вагра, Сяна, Вислока, а на уторськомъ пѣдгѣрью понадъ рѣками Ондавою, Лаборицею, Вутомъ (*Ung*h), Латорицею, Агомъ ажъ до долинъ Потисскихъ.”

153 “[...] заховало богато слѣвъ, изреченій и видѣвъ стародавнихъ, старослѣвскихъ словенскихъ [...] дешо оно збиваеся на языкъ словацкій и чеській, такъ якъ галицке на сербскій.”

154 “[...] любить широкиі самогласні *a* и *я*, скороченный творит. падежъ на *овъ*, *евъ* ... розличае (грубе) *ы* и *и*, особливо любить по гортанныхъ *з*, *к*, *х* грубе *ы*, якъ въ давнѣмъ рускомъ и церковнословенськомъ языкахъ.”

of "these three dialects," the boundaries of the mountain dialects described above [ibid., 46–47]:

The Volhynian-Podilian dialect is distinguished from the Galician along this boundary: from the Dnister below Zalishchyky to the north near Borshchiv and Kopychyntsi, past Budzaniv near Mykulyntsi to Ternopil, and then upriver along the Seret to the village of Hliadky, from there to the west above Ozerna and Zboriv (between Nesterovtsi and Hodoryshche, past Oliiv and Lopushany between Nyshche [*sic*] and Kruhove) to Zolochiv, from Zolochiv downriver along the Buzhok (between Khylykivka and Horodyliv, Zhulychi and Pochapy) to Bilyi Kamin, from there along the Buh (between Utishkiv and Humnyske) to Buzke, from Buzke along the river to Kamianka and Dobrotvir westward to Velyki Mosty on the Rata River, and then upriver along the Rata (between Prystan and Liubel) to the town of Rava Ruska, from Rava to Narol to the Tanev River, etc. In Galicia, this dialect covers the smaller half of the Chortkiv district and about half of the Ternopil, Zolochiv, and Zhovkva districts.

The Galician dialect occupies the middle part of Galicia, i.e., the southern half of Zhovkva and Zolochiv [districts], the western part of [the districts of] Ternopil and Chortkiv, Bukovyna (since there are Rus' there), all of Kolomyia, Stanyslaviv, Berezhany, Lviv, Stryi (except the southwestern corner), the northern part of Sambir, and the eastern edge of Peremyshl [districts]. Boundaries: From the upper reaches of the Rata River southward between Yavoriv and Yaniv past Vyshnia to Khyriv, from Khyriv eastward between Staryi Mist and the town of Sambir to Drohobych, from there southward between Oriv and Ulych to Skole and to the Opir River, and along the mountain ridge past Kamianka, Briazhka, Lypa, Mizun, and Niahryn to the upper reaches of the Limnytsia [Lomnytsia], from there along the border to the upper reaches of the Bystrytsia, crossing from there to the Hungarian side, taking in Mokra and Brustury (Hungarian), Yasinia past Rakhiv, Poliana to Vyshiv to the upper reaches of the Bila Tysa and the Bukovynian borders (Holovac'kyj 1849: 47–48).¹⁵⁵

155 "Волинско-подільське нарѣчїе ѡддѣляея ѡтъ галицкогo по сѣй чертѣ: ѡтъ Днѣстра понизше Залѣщикъ на сѣверѣ коло Борщева, Копачинець по при Будзанѡвъ пѡдѣ Микулинцѣ икъ Тернополю и далѣй горѣ Середѡмъ до села Глядокъ, ѡтти на западъ повыше Озѣрнои и Зборова (помеже Нестерѡвцями и Годорищемъ попри Олѣвѣ, Лопушаны помеже Нѣщемъ [*sic*] и Крутовѡмъ) къ Золочеву, ѡтъ Золочева долѡвъ рѣкою Бужкомъ (помеже Хильчичами и Городиловомъ, Жуличами и Почапами) пѡдѣ Бѣлый Камень, ѡтти по Бузѣ (помеже Уцѣшковѡмъ и Гумнисками) до Бузька, ѡтъ Бузька по рѣцѣ до Камянки и Добротвора, ѡтъ Добротвора на западъ до Мостѡвъ Вел. на рѣцѣ Ратѣ, и далѣй горѣ Ратою (помеже Пристанѣмъ и Любелю) до мѣста Равы Рускои, ѡтъ Равы до Нароля икъ рѣцѣ Таньвѣ и т. д. Нарѣчье се займае въ Галичинѣ меншу половицу Чорткѡвского, околo половины Тернопѡльского, Золочѣвского и Жовкѡвского обводѡвъ. – Галицке нарѣчїе займае середнюю часть Галиціи т. е. южную половину Жовкѡвского и Золочѣвского, западную половину Тернопѡльского и Чорткѡвского, Буковину (позакилько тамки Руси), цѣлый Коломыйскій, Станиславскій, Бережанскій, Львѡвскій, Стрыйскій (окрѡмъ югозападнаго угла), сѣверную часть Самбѡрского и восточный окраекъ Перемышлаского. Границѣ: ѡтъ вершинѣ Раты на полудне помеже Яворовѡмъ и Яновѡмъ по при Вишню къ Хирову, ѡтъ Хирова къ востоку помеже Старымъ Мѣстомъ и городѡмъ Самборѡмъ икъ Дрогобичи, ѡтти на югъ помеже Оріовымъ и Уличномъ до Сколего и до рѣки Опора, и хребтомъ гѡръ поза Камянку, Бряжку, Липу, Мѣзуню, Нягринѣ до вершинѣ Лѡмницѣ, ѡтти границею до верхѡвъ Быстрицѣ, вѡттакъ перейшовши на уторску сторону, зачеркнувши Мокру, Брустуры (уторскі), Ясинѡвъ по при Рахово, Поляну къ Вышееву къ верху Бѣлои Тисы и границямъ Буковинскимъ."

In addition, Holovac'kyj names twenty features that he considers typical of these dialects. The most important of these materials are compiled in the following list, which has been slightly altered and modernized (Holovac'kyj 1849: 48–55):

Volhynian-Pod[ilian] or Ukrainian Dia[lects]	Galician	Mountain
[1. reflexes of * <i>dj</i>]: <i>меже</i> (мѣж), <i>чужій, хожу</i> (ходжу)	<i>ж</i> , sometimes <i>дж</i> : <i>меже</i> , <i>чужій</i> (чѣжій) ¹⁵⁶	<i>“дж everywhere”</i> : <i>медже</i> , <i>чуджый</i> (чюджый)
[2. reflex of * <i>Cьj-e</i>]: <i>насѣннѣя</i> ¹⁵⁷	<i>Насѣньє</i>	<i>насѣньѣ</i> [!]
[3. reflex of * <i>CLьC</i> , * <i>CLьC</i>]: <i>кровавый, тревати</i>	<i>кєрвавый, тервати</i>	<i>кръвавый</i> (кръвачный), <i>тръвати</i>
[4. reflexes of the weak Jer in the group <i>CьjC</i>]: <i>бюю, бѣєшь</i>	<i>бюю, бѣєшь</i>	<i>бію, бієшь</i> ¹⁵⁸
[5. retention of <i>ы</i>]: <i>гину</i> , <i>кидати, хижа</i>	<i>гину, кидати, хижа</i>	<i>гыну, кыдати, хыжа</i>
[6. primary and secondary epenthetic <i>l</i>]: <i>сплю, сплять</i> , <i>здоровля</i>	<i>спью, спяять “(along the Prut спя),” здоровьє</i> (лѣє) ¹⁵⁹	<i>спью, спяять, здоровья</i>

156 On alternation in verbal paradigms, see also: “In the Galician dialect the root *ѡ* is retained next to *ж*: *гладжѣ, гладжень*” [“Въ галицкомъ нарѣчїю при *ж* оудержѣють корѣнное *ѡ*: *гладжѣ, гладжень*”] (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 142).

157 Cf. the grammar: “In collective and verbal nouns ending in *енѣ, ельє*, that (e) also shifts to (ѣ) because in the Ruthenian pronunciation *нь, ль, (and рь)* in such instances it is pronounced strongly (with emphasis), as though it were divided in two, and thus it seems to support the (e) and contract it, e.g., *спасенѣе, каменѣе* [*sic, e*], *весельє, перѣе* are pronounced like *спасѣнь-нѣе, камѣнь-нѣе, весѣль-льє, пѣрь-є*” [“Въ именахъ собирательныхъ и глагольныхъ, законченыхъ на *енѣ, ельє*, такожъ переходить тоѣ (e) на (ѣ), бо въ рѣсской вымовѣ такѣ *нь, ль, (и рь)* сильно (сѣ притискомъ) высловлюєся, ꙗкобы на двое дѣлилося, а тымъ самымъ здаєся сперати (e) и стискати его; н.пр. *спасенѣе, каменѣе* [*sic, e*], *весельє, перѣе* вымовають мовѣ бы: *спасѣнь-нѣе, камѣнь-нѣе, весѣль-льє, пѣрь-є*”] (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 15).

158 Cf. also the verbal forms from **Cьj-*: “The roots *би- ни-* in the verbs *бити, пити* also change into *ѣ*: *бюю, пюю* замѣсть *бію, пію* (as they speak in the Sanok district).” [“Коренѣ *би- ни-* въ глаголахъ *бити, пити* переменяють и въ *ѣ*: *бюю, пюю* замѣсть *бію, пію* (ѣкъ тоѣ въ Саноцкомъ окрѣзѣ говорять)”] (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 139).

159 The grammar cites the form *здоровьє* without additional comment (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 13). Elsewhere, the author writes: “Here and there, (л) is also inserted into neuter nouns in (вѣ and а): pronouncing *здоровьє, здоровл, воробл* зам. *здоровьє, здоровья, воробл*”; see also: “According to Little Russian pronunciation, (н) is inserted into words ending in (ма), pronouncing: *имна, сѣмна, тѣмна*, and thus it seems that only the inserted (e) was added in oblique cases: *им-е-не, сѣм-е-не*, etc.” (ibid., 85). The absence of the epenthetic *l* is also mentioned: “In the mountain and Dnister dialect, they sometimes drop the inserted -л- in labial consonants and say *спью, сплять, люблю, любать, спачій, любациій*, instead of *сплю, сплять, люблю, люблать, сплалчій, люблациій*” (ibid., 184–85).

- [7. reflex with *o* in newly closed syllables]: “*ô* (like *i*, does not soften the preceding)” *дѡмъ, сѡль, вѡнъ, зѡркій; (дѣмъ [...])* “*ô* (like softened, because of that the preceding is softened)” *дѡмъ, сѡль, вѡнъ, зѡркій; (дѣмъ [...])* “*ô* like the coarse (“трубе”) *і (и, ѱ, ор ы)” дѣмъ, сѣль, винъ, зыркый*
- [8. prothetical consonants]: “likes the aspirated *в* (occasionally drops *в*):” “likes the aspirated *ѱ* (*j*) or without aspirates”: “likes the aspirated *ѱ*: *горобецъ, гострый, говестъ, горати* (or even *острый, овестъ, орати*) *воробецъ, вострый, вовестъ, ворати* “likes the aspirated *ѱ* (*j*) or without aspirates”: *ѱострый, ѱовестъ, ѱорати* [sic]
- [9. reflex *а* after soft consonants]: *мясо (мнясо), жаль*¹⁶⁰ *мѣсо (мнѣсо), жель* *мѣсо “(without н),” жяль*
- [10. epenthetic *н*]: *памнѣть* *памѣть*¹⁶¹ *Память*
- [11. reflexes < -еньк-, -оньк-]: *бѣленькій, хатонька, бѣленькій, хатонька, дѣвонька* *бѣленькій, хатонька, дѣвонька*

160 See the grammar: “In the Dnister dialect, the letters (а) after a consonant and (а) after *ж, ч, ш, щ* are pronounced as a soft *е* or *ѣ*; e.g., *жель, чель, шепка, щестъе, затѣвѣе, ресный, петь*; but, according to the general Little Russian pronunciation, one should say and write *жаль, часть, шатка, щастъе, затавѣа, расный, пать*, etc.” (Holovac’kyj 1849b: 6); “In dialects the consonants (*ж, ч, ш, щ*) are sometimes used as soft ones, sometimes as hard ones. Thus, in the mountain and Galician dialects, they pronounce [them] as soft ones or thin consonants; e.g., the gen. case of *ножь* [is] *ножа, (ножѣ), dat. ножюви, instr. ножюмъ, loc. въ ножѣ, (и); nom. pl. ножѣ, gen. ножѣвъ, (ѣвъ), dat. ножамъ, (ножемъ), instr. ножами, (ножами), loc. ножалъ, (ножель-ѣхъ)*. Also declined in similar fashion are other nouns that end in (*ж, ч, ш, щ*), e.g., *мѣжъ, бѣжъ, товаришъ, колачъ, плѣшъ, кнышъ, хрѣщъ, плащъ*, etc.” (ibid., 61). The shift ‘а’ > ‘е’ is also frequently mentioned in chapters on morphology: “In accordance with the pronunciation of the Galician dialect, (а) is pronounced after a consonant and (а) (*ж, ч, ш, щ*) as a soft (е, ѣ); e.g., *поле, gen. полѣе, pl. nouns, also полѣе, dat. полѣемъ, instr. полѣями, loc. полѣехъ...* the same: *сердце, оконце, плече, збѣже, дѣтище...*” (ibid., 79). “In the Galician pronunciation, they also transform (а) after a consonant and (а) after (*ж, ч, ш, щ*) into a soft (е, ѣ) or (е, ѣ), e.g., *костѣмъ, (емъ), костѣми, костѣхъ, (ѣхъ), мышѣмъ, мышѣми, мышѣхъ, зѣщѣмъ, -ѣми, -ѣхъ*. Sometimes that (е, ѣ) is changed to (о, ѱ) and pronounced *костіовъ, костіомъ, костіохъ*, etc.” (ibid., 81). “From the standpoint of dialectism, only those changes in the Galician and mountain dialects that truncate the instrumental case to *евъ, (іовъ)* appear in this declension; in the dative, instrumental, and locative plural they pronounce after a consonant and (а) after (*ж, ч, ш, щ*) as (ѣ) or (ѣ); e.g., *костѣмъ, костѣми, костѣхъ, -ѣхъ, мышѣмъ, мышѣми, мышѣхъ*” (ibid., 82). “In the Galician dialect (а) is pronounced after a consonant and (а) after (*ж, ч, ш, щ*) as (ѣ). And here that rule stands in the pronunciation; e.g., *тѣма, сѣма, тела, лоша* are pronounced as *тѣмѣ, сѣмѣ, телѣ, лошѣ*, etc.” (ibid., 85). “In the Galician (or Dnister) dialect they pronounce the (а) after a consonant in the nom. singular, dative, and instrumental plural as (ѣ), and in the locative of that same number as (ѣ, ѣ) or (ѣ), e.g., nom. case *господинѣ, дѣлѣ, зорѣ, пѣснѣ, ѱзѣ, instr. pl. господинѣми, дѣлѣми...loc. господинѣхъ, дѣлѣхъ, зорѣхъ, пѣснѣхъ, ѱзѣхъ*. Occasionally, that (ѣ, ѣ) is changed to (ѱ), which they then pronounce as *пѣснѱохъ, плѣчѱхъ*, etc.” (ibid., 72). “As is generally known, the ending -*ох* in fact derives from -*ах* (< -*ах*).” See also the author’s commentaries on verbs: “In keeping with folk dialects of various locales, the following changes appear in conjugations: а) In the Dnister dialect they pronounce -а after *ж, ч, ш, щ* and -а- after a consonant as -ѣ-: *...лежѣтъ, мовѣтъ...лежѣвъ, лежѣли, мовѣвъ, мовѣли...лежѣвшій...*” (ibid., 184–85).

161 The grammar notes the following about the epenthetic *н*: “Occasionally, (м) before soft [letters] takes on a smooth (н), e.g., *имна, памнѣтъ, мнясо*.” (Holovac’kyj 1849b: 13).

[12. verbal paradigms in the present tense]: <i>чую, чуєшъ; спѣваю, -аєшъ, -ає, -а; -аємъ, -аємо, -аєте, -ають; ходитъ, носитъ; ходять,носять</i> ¹⁶³	<i>чую, чуєшъ; [спѣв]аю, -аєшъ, -ає; [спѣв]аємъ, -аємо, -аєте, -ають; ходитъ, носитъ (ходи); ходѣтъ, носѣтъ ("along the Prut" ходя,нося "like Slovak").</i>	<i>чуу, ч,еишъ [this is how Holovac'kyj records the shortening]¹⁶²; спѣва-у, -аєишъ (-аишъ), -тъ (in Hung. спѣватъ); [спѣв]аѣ, -аѣ, -аутъ; ходитъ, носитъ; ходять,носятъ</i> ¹⁶⁴
[13. forms of the imperative]: <i>бери, ходи, возьми, берѣмъ, ходѣмъ, возьмѣмъ (or берѣмо, ходѣмо, etc.: берѣтъ, ходѣтъ, возьмѣтъ (or берѣте, ходѣте)</i>	<i>"also thus "; берѣтъ, ходѣтъ, возьмѣтъ</i>	<i>берь, ходь, возь, берме, ходьме берьте, ходьте, возьте ("(similar to Czech)")¹⁶⁵</i>
[14. <i>єго</i> versus <i>їого</i>]: <i>въ єго, въїого [sic], до їого, ѓтъ їого</i> ¹⁶⁶	<i>въ него (въ нїого), до него, ѓтъ него</i>	<i>въ нїого, до нїого, ѓтъ нїого</i>
[15. a prothetical <i>н</i> in pronouns]: <i>въ єго, въїого [sic], до їого, ѓтъ їого</i> ¹⁶⁷	<i>въ него (въ нїого), до него, ѓтъ него</i>	<i>въ нїого, до нїого, ѓтъ нїого</i>

162 Cf. also: "In the mountain dialect and certain areas of the Peremyshl land, they like to shorten...they say *бешъ, бе, беме, бете*, which sometimes also function with other verbs, e.g., *чѣишъ*, they say *чешъ*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 160).

163 Cf. also: "In the Volhynian-Ukrainian dialect they pronounce the third pers. in both numbers and the second pers. pl. in the imperative mood softly: *ходитъ, носитъ, ходѣтъ, носѣтъ, ходѣтъ, носѣтъ*. Also, in the second conjugation in the third pers. sing., they drop the *-є*; e.g., *зна, спѣва, просыха*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 184–85).

164 Cf.: "Above the Prut in the Pokuttia region...in the third person pl. in the present tense of the indicative mood they drop *-тъ* in third conjugation verbs, pronouncing *ходѣ', носѣ'* (or *ходьѣ, носьѣ*).... In the mountain dialect, they also like to shorten tense endings, and so they say (dropping the aspirated *-й-* or *-є-*) in the present tense, e.g., *спѣва-ѣ, спѣва-ешъ* (or *спѣваишъ*) *спѣватъ, спѣваме, спѣвате, спѣваѣтъ*; in the imperative mood [they say] *ходь, нось, ходьте, носьте* instead of *ходи, носи, ходѣтъ, носѣтъ*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 184–85).

165 The grammar also discusses various forms of the infinitive: "e.g., instead of *могти, бѣгти, лѣгти, некти, втекти, товкти* (as they are often used in Ukraine), it is usually said in Ruthenian: *мочи, бѣчи, лѣчи, пѣчи, втечи, товчи*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 28). Elsewhere, the author writes: "In certain parts they say *ходи, носи, ходѣ, носѣ*, instead of *ходитъ, ходѣтъ* [the soft *-тъ* ending is not mentioned here]" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 36).

166 Cf. also: "In the mountain dialect after (ж, ч, ш, щ) instead of (о) they use (е); e.g., *свѣжій, свѣжаѣ, свѣжее*, gen. *свѣжего, свѣжеи*, dat. *свѣжемъ, свѣжѣй, (свѣжѣй)*...etc.... In the mountains of southeastern Galicia, they say *свѣжего, свѣжеи, свѣжею*..." (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 93–94).

167 The grammar notes: "In Ukraine they do not insert that (н) after prepositions, but a pronoun is used alone: e.g., *до єго (їого) говоришь, на єи подивився, о (объ) ихъ дѣлає*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 123).

[16. forms of the verb <i>*byti</i>]: <i>бути, бувъ(ємъ), була,</i> <i>бути, бувъ, була, бувати,</i> <i>бувши</i> ¹⁶⁸	<i>бути, бувъ(ємъ), була,</i> <i>бувати, бувши</i>	<i>быти, бывъ(ємъ), была,</i> <i>бывати</i>
[17. fem. nouns in the instr. sing.] <i>рукою, моею</i> (rarely <i>рукой</i> , etc.)	<i>руковъ, моевъ</i> (sometimes ою, only in songs):	<i>руковъ, моевъ</i> (and <i>рукою</i>)
[18. truncated endings of plural adjectives]: <i>чорній (і)</i>	<i>Чорнѣ</i>	<i>Чорны</i>
[19. personal forms in past tense verbs, etc.]: <i>я, ты,</i> <i>вѣднѣ спѣвавъ; мы, вы, они</i> <i>спѣвали</i> ¹⁶⁹	<i>спѣвавъ-ємъ, спѣваламъ-омъ</i> <i>спѣвавъ-єсь-ласъ;</i> <i>спѣвалисьмо, спѣвалисьте-ли</i>	<i>спѣвавъ-ємъ</i> etc. <i>спѣвавъ-єсь-ласъ,</i> <i>спѣвалисьме, спѣвалисьте-ли</i>
[20. dat. pl.]: <i>хлопцямъ,</i> <i>дѣвчатамъ, воламъ,</i> <i>волоныкамъ</i> ¹⁷⁰	<i>хлопцѣмъ, дѣвчатѣмъ,</i> <i>воламъ, волонѣкамъ</i>	<i>хлопцѣмъ, дѣвчатѣмъ,</i> <i>волѣмъ, волонѣкѣмъ</i>

168 Initially, the author of the grammar writes about "the past tense of the root *бы-*, from which the past tense of *бывъ* (*быль*) and the indefinite mood *быти* are derived (people also say *бѣвъ, бѣти*)" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 55), and continues: "the verb *бѣти* (*быти*)" and the forms "бѣвъ (*бывъ, былъ*), бѣла, бѣло (*была, было*)" (ibid., 155, 158). Holovac'kyj is evidently uncertain about which form should be regarded as correct. Elsewhere, he writes about the geographic dissemination of these forms: "In the western districts of the Galician-Ruthenian land and most of Hungarian Rus', they use *быти, бывати* in the indefinite mood, *бывъ* in the past tense..., in the eastern districts of Galicia as well as in Volhynia, Podilia, and Ukraine (i.e., all of southern Rus'), everywhere they say *бѣти, бѣвати*..." (ibid., 160). Holovac'kyj adds: "In the mountains of southeastern Galicia, in the first person sing. of the conditional mood they say *быхъ* instead of *бымъ*; *бывъ быхъ, была быхъ, было быхъ*, and in the plural, *были быхмо*..." (ibid., 160–61). On the forms of the verb *бути*, cf. also: "In the present tense of the root *є-*, from which [derive] all persons in the present tense and the participle in that tense, the following are formed: *ємъ, єси, єсть, єсьмо, єсьте, сѣтъ, сѣцій*" (ibid., 154–55). There, attention must be focused on the forms *ємъ*; cf.: "the verb *єсмъ* (*ємъ*)" (ibid., 154), *єсть* and *сѣтъ* with the soft sign (versus *єсть*) and *єсьмо, єсьте* with the soft sign; cf. also: "In the mountain dialect the ending *-є* instead of *-о* is used in the plural; e.g., *єсме, сме, бѣдеме, бѣдьме, бѣлисьме*, but in Ukraine the third person plural ends in *-ы: сѣтъ, бѣдѣтъ*. Those endings are used in all other verbs in similar cases" (ibid., 160).

169 Cf. also the incorrect interpretation of the form *мали'мъ* (which probably derives from the shortened *мали ми*): "Along the Prut in Pokutia they shorten the first person past tense of the indicative mood and say: *мали'мъ ходили'мъ* instead of *мали сѣмо, ходили сѣмо*" ("Надѣ Прѣтомъ на Покутъю скорочають первое лице минувшого времени изъавит. наклоненія и кажѣтъ: *мали'мъ ходили'мъ* зам. *мали сѣмо, ходили сѣмо*") (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 184–85).

170 Cf. the detailed description in the grammar: "In the Galician and mountain dialects, in the dative and in-strumental cases they change (*є, е*) to (*іо, о*); e.g., *короліови, сторожови, корольомъ, сторожомъ*.... In the dative plural, here and there in those same dialects: *воломъ, гостѣмъ, конѣмъ*...and in the locative plural: *на волѣхъ, на конѣхъ, ог на волохъ, на коніохъ*" ("Въ галицѣмъ и гѣрскѣмъ нарѣчію перемѣняють въ дательномъ и творительномъ падежахъ (*є, е*) на (*іо, о*); н.пр. *короліови, сторожови, корольомъ, сторожомъ*. ... Въ дательномъ падежѣ множеств. числа говорится гдѣкъда въ тѣхже нарѣчіяхъ: *воломъ, гостѣмъ, конѣмъ* ... а въ предложномъ множественного числа; *на волѣхъ, на конѣхъ, або на волохъ, на коніохъ*") (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 65).

[21. individual word forms]:¹⁷¹

<i>той, сей, се</i>	<i>тотъ (тототъ) сесь</i>	<i>тотъ, сей, сесь</i>
<i>уже, уже, лишъ</i>	<i>уже, уже, лишъ</i>	<i>юже (ю), ужъ, лемъ (немъ)</i>
<i>хай, нехай, для</i>	<i>най, нехай, для (длє)</i>	<i>няй, нъей, дъля, дъля</i>
<i>нынѣ, сегодне</i>	<i>нынѣ, сегодне</i>	<i>днесъ, днесъ, днеська</i>
<i>къ, икъ (икъ менѣ)</i>	<i>къ, ко</i>	<i>дъ (дъ мѣнѣ)</i>
<i>ничого, нищо</i>	<i>нѣчого, нѣцъ</i>	<i>ничъ, ништо</i>
<i>дуже</i>	<i>дуже, барзъ</i>	<i>барзъ</i>
<i>черезъ</i>	<i>черезъ, безъ</i>	<i>черезъ, чрезъ, брезъ, безъ</i>
<i>все, усе</i>	<i>все, всіо</i>	<i>вишитко</i>

In addition to localized features, Holovac'kyj lists others that, according to him, occur "sometimes" ("часомъ") or "in some places" ("инкѣда"):

A weak consonant before a strong one is pronounced strongly; e.g., *скобка* is pronounced as *скопка*, *вторый...фторый*, *впасти...фпасти*, *въ хлѣбѣ...фхлѣбѣ* [with regard to *в > ф*, these statements are dubious], *пѣдъ столомъ...пѣдъ столомъ*, *гладкій...латкій*, *легко...лехко*, *легше...лехше*, *ногтѣ...нохтѣ*, *везти...вести*... At the end of a word, the consonant is pronounced appropriately strongly... *лобъ* is pronounced like *лѣтъ*... (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 29, 31).

Holovac'kyj observes that "in certain locales, in the comparative and superlative degrees, especially before (c, з), they change (ш) into (ч); at the same time, (c) is changed to (ш) and (з) to (ж); e.g., *вышчій, крашчій, нижчій, ближчій*. Sometimes even before (н, ст); e.g., *тончій, крашчій, гушчій*, etc." (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 102); cf. also: *ниже* along with *нише* (ibid., 31).

Holovac'kyj also discusses various morphological phenomena of a dialectal nature, noting in particular that "occasionally they use the masculine ending (ѡвъ) in the genitive case plural, e.g., *бабѡвъ, паннѡвъ, землѡвъ*..." (ibid., 72), and that "fifth-declension nouns ending in (ма) are sometimes declined as third-declension nouns ending in (е). That happens especially in the Galician dialect, which likes to pronounce (а) as (е), and in pronunciation it thus approaches the third declension. Therefore, in certain places they say: *има (имѣ)*, gen. *има*, dat. *имѣю*, instr. *имѣемъ* or *иміомъ*, in the plural *има*, dat. *имамъ*, instr. *имами*, loc. *въ имлахъ*" (ibid., 84).¹⁷² His comments on the particle used in forming the third-person imperative are also interesting: "The third person of the imperative mood in both singular and

171 Holovac'kyj notes in his grammar: "In Ukraine, they say: *вѣзьме, тѣлько, скѣлько* instead of *возьме, тѣлько, кѣлько*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 19); "In Ukraine they say: *вѣчи*, gen. *вѣчь*. – *Око*, in the sense of weight (3 pounds), is declined correctly: plural number—*ока, ѡкъ, окамъ*, etc." (ibid., 78). Holovac'kyj also writes about the (lexically connected) vestiges of the dual number: "In the old Ruthenian language, the dual number was also used to express two persons or things. Only a certain trace of it is left now, e.g., in the forms *двѣ нозѣ, обѣ рѣцѣ*" (ibid., 53). Cf. also: "To this day in Pokutia they say *боле*, which means *добре* [good]. *Красійи* (*красчійи*) is the actual comparative degree of the adjective *красный*" (ibid., 101).

172 As is generally known, this paradigm shift is not only a Galician phenomenon.

plural adopts in the third person in the indicative mood the particle *нехай* (or the shortened *най*, *най*, *ней*; in Ukraine *хай*), which comes from the verb *нехати*....” (ibid., 157). It is worth mentioning that Holovac'kyj occasionally points out “Ukrainian forms”; see his attitude to adjectival possessive pronouns: “In Ukraine they sometimes pronounce *наській* instead of *нашъ*, *наша*, *наше*..., and, instead of *ихъ*—*ихній*, *ихнаа*, *ихніое*” (ibid., 117).

Quite often the grammarian lists forms that are considered dialectal in present-day linguistics. These forms are usually preserved in the dialects spoken in Galicia.¹⁷³ With regard to forms of the personal pronoun, Holovac'kyj writes: “In the Galician and mountain dialects...also partly in Ukraine, in the genitive, accusative, and dative cases singular they like to change *є* to *іо*: and in certain locales they say *іоґо*, *іомѧ*, *ніомѧ* instead of *єґо*, *ємѧ*, *неґо*, *немѧ*” (ibid., 123). In the paradigm, he not only frequently shows a preference for traditional and Galician forms but also adds the specifically western Ukrainian dialect forms *мѧ*, *ю*: “*єґо* (*іоґо*), *ємѧ*, *мѧ*, *іомѧ*, *єй*, *ѡй*; accusative case *єю*, *ю*; *о нимѧ* (*нѧмѧ*)” (ibid., 121). Shortened forms of the instrumental case *тобовъ*, *собовъ*, *чїєвъ* [*sic*, with *ѡ*], and *невъ* appear without comment alongside *тобою*, *собою*, *чїєю*, and *нею* (ibid., 121, 128). Forms of the genitive cases of the possessive pronouns *моєґо* (*мого*) *моєи* (*моєй*) are also cited without comment in the paradigms (ibid., 125). However, where he notes that “in the mountain dialect they sometimes say in truncated fashion *ма*, *ме*, *мыхъ*, *мымѧ*...” (ibid., 126), Holovac'kyj obviously regards these forms as unacceptable apart from narrowly dialectal usage. With regard to demonstrative pronouns, the traditional forms *сей*, *сїа*, *сїє* and *мой*, *маа*, *моє* predominate, but in parentheses Holovac'kyj adds not only *са*, *се* with a zero-reflex of the weak *ѡ* before *ј* instead of the Church Slavonic *і* and the “short” (not truncated) forms *ма*, *мо*, but also the Galician and “mountain” reduplicated forms *сесъ*, *сеса*, *сеce* and *мотъ*, *мота*, *мото* (ibid., 123–24).¹⁷⁴ Among the indefinite pronouns, in addition to the forms *здекто* and *здеицо*, he cites the form *дехто* as well as the typical dialectal forms *дахто*, *даицо* and the forms *ледакто*, *леда ицо* (ibid., 120). Among negative pronouns, along with *ничого*, Holovac'kyj adds *ничъ* in parentheses (ibid.) and, together with the form *весь*, the form *всїоу* (nom. masc. sing.) (ibid., 115).

173 All that Holovac'kyj knew about the Belarusian language he took from Šafařík's *Slovanský národopis*. Among the features of the Belarusian language, he mentions *akannia* and *iakannia*, palatalization before *є*, *з* < *г*, prothetical consonants in the forms “*ґето*,” “*вузкій* (*вузкій*),” “*вутка* (*утка*),” “*вулиця*,” *tsekannia* and *dzekannia*, and the alternations of *у/ѡ/ѣ* and *л/ѣ* (of course, Holovac'kyj writes only about *у* and *ѡ*). Holovac'kyj lists correct examples for *ы* < *і* but does not discern their regular pattern, which, as is known, differs significantly from the situation in the Ukrainian language (Holovac'kyj 1849: 55–56). The most important features of the Great Russian language are also taken from Šafařík's work (ibid., 54–55).

174 Only later does Holovac'kyj add: “In the Galician and mountain dialects they usually use *сесъ*, *сеса*, *сеce*, *мотъ*, *мота*, *мото*, here and there *сей*, *мой*; here and there in the Peremyshl [district], instead of *сей*, *сїа*, *сїє* they say *сой*, *соса*, *сосо*, gen. *сого*, *сои*, dat. *сомѧ*, etc.” (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 125).

In the list of numerals, Holovac'kyj frequently lists purely Galician forms in parentheses: "одинъ (єдень)," ¹⁷⁵ "чотыре (чтыри)," "одинадцать (єднайцѣть)," "дванадцать (дванайцѣть)," "тринадцать (тринайцѣть)," "чотырнадцать (чтырнайцѣть)," "двадцать (двайцѣть)," "двадцать один (двайцѣтьєдень)," "двѣстъ (двѣста)," or the reverse: "деватьдесать (деваносто)" (ibid., 106–8).¹⁷⁶ Among indirect declensions of numerals, we encounter the forms *трохъ*, *четырохъ* (sic, with an *e*), *тромаъ*, *чотыромъ*, *трома* (and *чотырма*) (ibid., 112).

In the verbal paradigm, Holovac'kyj opted for the form "най (нехай) бѣде(-ть)" (ibid., 159) to indicate the third-person imperative form, although he was aware that "in Ukraine" they say *хай*. As forms of the future tense, he cites *бѣде читати* (*читати мѣ*) or *бѣде читавъ* (-лъ) without comment; this also pertains to forms of the past tense, such as *ходивъ емъ* (ibid., 147–48). Also at issue here is word order, which was already known from Ivan Vahylevyč's grammar (see above): "The verb 'мѣ (i.e., the shortened *имѣ*) is used in some locales for expressing the future tense, and in the mountains of eastern Galicia they place [it] before the verb; e.g., *мѣ ходити*, *метъ платити*, *мемо жаловати*, *мѣтъ смѣтиса*; in the northern districts of that land and in Ukraine, *мѣ*, *мешъ*, etc., comes after the verb; e.g., *ходитимѣ*... *плакатимѣтъ*" (ibid., 156–57).

Considering the historical conditions of the period, Jakiv Holovac'kyj possessed considerable knowledge about the dialects of the Ukrainian language, even though his works clearly attest to the fact that his notions of Russian-ruled Ukraine and its language were still quite vague as compared with his knowledge of the linguistic space "in our Galician and Hungarian Rus'" ("у насъ въ Галицкѣй и Угорскѣй Руси") (Holovac'kyj 1849: 28). That is not at all surprising, of course, for despite the Galicians' correspondence with leading Ukrainian and Russian philologists in Russian-ruled Ukraine, the divides between the Austrian and Russian empires were considerable, and not only in the political sense.

5. Conclusions

When John-Paul Himka wrote that the Galician Ruthenians' search for identity was akin to "Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions" (Himka 1999), he noted the following:

...perhaps of greatest interest in the case of the Galician Ruthenians, at least from the perspective of the national-construction literature, is that in the nineteenth century the Galician Ruthenians elaborated two very distinct and mutually exclusive constructions of their nationality (Ukrainian and Russian), could well have been drawn into a third (Polish), exhibited tendencies toward a fourth (Rusyn), and had at least the theoretical possibility of formulating a fifth (a hypothetical nationality, with serious historical underpinnings, that would

175 The following are listed as ordinal numerals: "первый (першій)," "дрѣгій (вторый)" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 106).

176 Concerning the use of numerals, Holovac'kyj adds that "in mountain locales and in Hungarian Rus' they also say *єдинъ двадцать*, *два двадцать*...and *четыредесать*, *чотырдесятый* instead of *сорокъ*, *сорокій*" (Holovac'kyj 1849b: 109).

have included the peoples now called Ukrainians and Belarusians) (Himka 1999: 113).

It is a given that Galician grammarians of the first half of the nineteenth century were not concerned with true Icarian flights. All of them sought to describe what they considered a distinct language of the distinct "Ruthenian" people. Their texts contain no suggestion whatever that the Ruthenian language is a dialect of either Polish or Russian (although Ivan Vahylevyč writes that the Ruthenian language can serve as a "subdialect" of Polish and Russian; see 2.3). The separate identity of the Ruthenian people was self-evident to them. None of them even dreamed of postulating a distinct "Austro-Ruthenian" linguistic or national identity uniting Galicians, Bukovynians, and Transcarpathians vis-à-vis other Ruthenians. Instead, most Galician grammarians still reckoned with the fact that the Belarusians belonged to a single Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian, in present-day terms) nation, and that their language was a variant of the common Ruthenian (Ukrainian-Belarusian) language. Thus the fifth variant, as proposed by John-Paul Himka, which he regarded as only a theoretically possible formulation,¹⁷⁷ was in fact the most prevalent among nineteenth-century Galician grammarians—only Jakiv Holovac'kyj objected to it. That is no surprise because, with the exception of Holovac'kyj, Galician grammarians still had little knowledge of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, and the Cossack myth was not all that important to them at the time (again, with the exception of Holovac'kyj), whereas their notions of Ruthenianness continued to be based mostly on terms derived from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At the same time, our grammarians were deepening their acquaintance with the linguistic situation of their day. Even then, when the Belarusians were treated as part of the Ruthenian nation, and their culture and language were clearly not considered exemplary in non-Belarusian circles, the Ruthenian identity expressed in Galician grammars of the first half of the nineteenth century was already very close to Ukrainian identity in the present-day sense, but not identical with it. Finally, there was still a strong emphasis on Galician matters in their grammars, but the path to the creation of a common Ukrainian language was already paved in the nineteenth century. These grammars also attest to the fact that the Galicians' linguistic awareness always extended beyond Galicia.

177 Cf. also: "...I have never encountered so much as a trace of such a 'Ruthenian' conception in the writings of Galician-Ruthenians" (Himka 1999: 152). A very interesting commentary on John-Paul Himka's article appeared in a volume published in his honor: Yaroslav Hrytsak, "Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions' Reconsidered," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 35–36 (2010–11): 81–89. I am grateful to Jaroslav Hrycak for showing me his text before it went to print.

UKRAINIAN DIALECTAL MATERIALS IN GALICIAN SOURCES OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

1. Dialectal materials in Galician sources of the first half of the nineteenth century

Most Galician Ukrainian sources of the first half of the nineteenth century have yet to be studied by linguists or literary scholars. However, the scholars associated with the Šaškevyčijana series (Šaškevyčijana 1996ff.), published by the Ivan Kryp'jakevyč Institute of Ukrainian Studies, are working diligently to broaden the perspective beyond the framework of the Ruthenian Triad. The Przemyśl-based cultural activist Volodymyr Pylypovych has recently published many interesting Galician Ukrainian sources, including *Lirvak z-nad Sjanu* (LS). The aim of this brief article is to show that:

- 1) certain elements of southwestern Ukrainian dialects occur in some texts where they could hardly be expected to appear;
- 2) obviously, not all elements considered dialectal by present-day researchers were perceived as such by Galician authors; and
- 3) certain little-known texts may be considered almost equivalent to amateur ethnographers' notes on some dialects and are thus undoubtedly of particular importance as sources for historical dialectology.

Data pertaining to Ukrainian dialectology, particularly those gleaned from the works of Fedot Žylko and the second volume of the *Atlas ukraïns'koï movy* (Atlas of the Ukrainian Language), will facilitate better understanding of all dialectal phenomena and the principles underlying their use in Galician sources.

On the whole, it is still maintained in present-day Ukrainian studies that at least until the Revolution of 1848–49 all Galician Ukrainian texts, with the exception of the works of the Ruthenian Triad, were written in the artificial, bookish language known as *jazyčije*. In his time, Žovtobryx (1963: 82) described the language of Galician writing as follows:

The bookish Ukrainian language in Galicia, in school textbooks and creative works alike, was far removed from the one that was spoken by the common people; it was a mixture of Church Slavonic, Old Ukrainian, and Polish and Russian dialectal elements. This linguistic mixture, the artificial “jazyčije” alien to and poorly understood by the common folk, was unquestionably a serious obstacle to raising the culture of the Ukrainian population and slowed down the development of literature and the literary language in the western lands of Ukraine.¹

I have already presented my arguments against the (pseudo-)term *jazyčije* in other articles (Moser 2004; Moser 2011: 641–666), so there is no need to reiterate

1 “Книжна українська мова в Галичині і в шкільних підручниках, і в художніх творах була далека від тієї, якою розмовляв народ, вона становила суміш церковнослов'янської, староукраїнської, елементів діалектних, польських і російських. Ця мовна мішанина, штучне ‘язичіє’, чуже й малозрозуміле народові, становило, безперечно, серйозну перешкоду для піднесення культури українського населення, гальмувало розвиток літератури й літературної мови на західних землях України.”

them here. However, it would not be amiss to recall that standing behind *jazyčije* is an interesting, variegated, and complex set of linguistic creations underpinned by various linguistic ideologies. Hence they present various prospects for the continuing construction of a new literary language for Galician Ukrainians.

2. Dialectal elements in the pastoral letters of Greek Catholic bishops and in panegyrics on them

In seeking evidence of dialectal elements in Galician literature of the first half of the nineteenth century, few scholars would examine such texts as the pastoral letters written by Greek Catholic bishops and metropolitans, as well as panegyrics on those hierarchs, because those familiar with such writings recognize that their literary qualities, which are closely associated with the Greek Catholic Church and its hierarchy, are usually distinguished by their particularly traditional language, based on Church Slavonic.

Generally speaking, until the mid-nineteenth century the pastoral letters of Greek Catholic bishops and metropolitans were published almost exclusively in Polish and partly in German and Latin. Before the Revolution of 1848–49, there are very few examples of “Ruthenian”-language pastoral letters. In 1841 and 1843 the “Ruthenian”-language pastoral letters of Metropolitan Myxajlo Levyč'kyj of Lviv were published in a rather pure version of the Late Church Slavonic language, which was almost entirely free of vernacular interferemes (Moser 2005: 160–61; Moser 2011: 482–484). In Przemyśl, however, Bishop Ivan Snihurs'kyj published two pastoral letters written in an entirely different language: the first of them dates to 1844, while the second was published in the very year that this distinguished bishop died. The first pastoral letter, which laments the consequences of drinking, contains the following interesting passages:

Съ жалюмъ и смуткомъ признати належить, що найчастше противъ
призначеню твому дѣлаєшь, идучи за склонностями и отдаючися
налогамъ, котрыи годность отъ Сотворителя тобѣ удѣленну оскверняютъ,
а тебе самого, поддугъ словъ Ѹломника (48, 13), безрозумнымъ скотамъ
подобнымъ чиняты. ... Гсѣдь Бгъ далъ му способъ до житя, а онъ остатній
грошъ, на котрый колька днѣй а може и колька лѣтъ тяжко робиль,
котрыйбы зъ обовязку для добра жены и дѣтей, для поправки своего
господарства обертати повинень, а часомъ остатное орудіе своего ремесла
або господарства єдного дня марно пускає (Snihurs'kyj 1844).²

2 “It must be admitted with regret and sorrow that one most often acts against one’s designation, following inclinations and giving oneself up to excessive drinking, which defile the dignity granted to you by the Creator, and which turn you yourself, according to the words of the Psalter (48, 13), into something resembling cattle not endowed with reason.... The Lord God offered him the living path, but he squanders in vain his last grosz, for which he worked hard for several days or perhaps even a few years, which he is duty-bound to use for the benefit of his wife and children or for the improvement of his farm, and sometimes squanders the last tool of his trade or farm.”

This text contains quite a few interesting elements of the folk, and dialectal, language. Take, for example, the form *съ жалѡмъ* with an *o* after the softened alveolar consonant. Although the morphologically determined replacement of *e > o* in the forms *до него, (к) нему* never entered the Carpathian, Dnister, and Podilia dialects, and as a result these dialects do not have a soft group of adjectives (Ševel'ov 2002: 830), they contain forms such as *жалѡмъ*, which emerged by analogy with hard noun forms. These morphologically determined forms are not mentioned by Ševel'ov, but Žylko (1958: 55–56) shows that they are prevalent in all the southwestern dialects (see also Žylko 1966: 183: “in the majority of the southwestern dialects”; see also AUM 1988: maps nos. 180 and 185 for neuter nouns). The following sentence features a shortened enclitic form of the pronoun *му*, which is also typical of the southwestern dialects (Žylko 1958: 57; on enclitic forms of the pronoun, see AUM 1988: map no. 207 (*ми, ту*)). Finally, forms of *єдного* are used. This Polonism with the reflex *є* instead of *o < *je* at the beginning of the word is so widespread in the southwestern dialects (see AUM 1988: map no. 225) that it should be interpreted rather as a folk element of these Ukrainian dialects, even though there is little doubt about its Polish origin. With regard to the nontruncated form *остатное*, the following observation is worth noting: “The old ending *-oe* is common...to the Volhynian-Polisian [dialects], partially those along the Sian, and to the Carpathian [dialects], with the exception of their western part” (Prylypko 1966: 107; see also the map on p. 105 and AUM 1988: map no. 217; the zones with *-oe* are located first and foremost near Przemyśl).

Unfortunately, there is no information about the actual author of this pastoral letter. Ivan Snihurs'kyj, like Tomaš Polians'kyj, the real author of the second pastoral letter (1847), was born near Sambir in 1784. After completing his theological studies in Lviv and Vienna, he was the parish priest of St. Barbara's Church in Vienna from 1813 to 1818. In 1818 he was appointed bishop of Przemyśl, where he actively contributed to the intellectual and spiritual growth of the Ukrainians of the Sian River region (LS: 428).

In contemporary Ukrainian studies, Josyf Levyc'kyj is known primarily as a typical representative of *jazyčije*, a fact duly noted in Ukrainian encyclopedias. A more thorough examination of his works reveals, however, that this assessment is not entirely just. His translations of the works of Goethe and Schiller, which began appearing in Przemyśl in 1838 with the publication of “Der Erlkönig,” were created on the basis of the folk language, a point that will be discussed later in this article.³ No less interesting is the fact that even his early panegyrics differed fundamentally from traditional examples of this type of language. In 1838 Levyc'kyj published his “Verse in Honor of His Excellency the Most Reverend Bishop Мухайло Левуc'кyj” (“Стихъ во Честъ Ёго ПревосходительствѸ ПреосвященнѣйшомѸ КурѸ МихаилѸ ЛѣвицкомѸ”), which contains the following verse:

3 On Levyc'kyj's translation of Schiller's “Die Bürgschaft,” see Moser 2012.

Реви о! Днѣстрѣ мой сумненько,
 А берегъ пѣновъ пѣдѣнмай;
 Шуми ко чорному⁴ быстренько,
 И такъ жаль твоѣй розказывай.⁵

It must be admitted that these lines are written in a much more vernacular language than other sections of the work. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that they appear not in a secular work but in a panegyric on a Greek Catholic metropolitan. From the dialectological standpoint, attention should be focused, for example, on the form *пѣновъ* with its *-овъ* ending instead of *-ою*. With regard to these forms, Žylko (1958: 54–55) notes: “In most dialects, the instrumental singular case of first-declension nouns lost the intervocal *й*, while the *y* following a vowel was converted to *й*: *-ойу* > *-оѣ*, *-ейу* > *-еѣ*.... In addition, under the influence of second-declension nouns, the ending *й* in some dialects changed to *-ом*.... At the same time, both these endings are possible parallels in some dialects” (see also Žylko 1966: 80, as well as AUM 1988: maps nos. 170 and 171). On the basis of map no. 21 in Žylko’s *Narysy* (1966), Ševel’ov (2002: 868) adds: “From the Carpathian region these forms spread to the east and south, reaching the line that passes (approximately) north of Przemyśl, southwest of Rava-Ruska, south of Lviv through Zoločiv–Terebovlja, east of Kam’janec’-Podil’s’kyj.” In Levyc’kyj’s note concerning the phrase *ко чорному*, we see the form *розумѣся*. Žylko (1958: 61) also indicates the absence of *m* before the particle *ся* in some southwestern dialects. Such forms are especially typical of the dialects spoken in the lands situated along the Dnister River (Marčuk 1969: 170).

Josyf Levyc’kyj was born in the village of Baranchytsi (present-day Baranivtsi) near Sambir. In 1825 he graduated from the Vienna Theological Seminary and later became chaplain to Bishop Snihurs’kyj. From 1835 to 1844 he was the parish priest in the village of Shklo (Sklo) near Yavoriv, and in 1844 he was appointed to the Hrusheva parish near Drohobych. After returning to Przemyśl in 1848, in 1854 he was assigned to the parish in the village of Nahuievychi, the birthplace of Ivan Franko, where he died in 1860 (LS: 225).

Antin Mohyl’nyc’kyj, who eventually gained renown as the author of the poem “Скитъ Манявскій” (The Maniava Hermitage), made his poetic debut in 1838—the same year as Josyf Levyc’kyj—with the publication of his first poem, a panegyric titled “Пѣснь радости. Съ пригоды поставленія въ Церквѣ Митрополічой Львовской С. Великомученика Георгіа, дна ѿ. Марта, аѿли [1838], Єгѡ високопочтеннагѡ господина Васіліа Поповича” (Joyful Song...). The poem contains the following lines:

4 Levyc’kyj remarks in a footnote: “розумѣся: ко чорному морю” (“toward the Black Sea, of course”).

5 “Roar sadly, o my Dnister! / And lift the shore with foam; / Thunder swiftly toward the black / And thus recount your sorrow.”

Хоть ты напастують морскїи дивогляди,
 Вѣхри ся противлять Твой [sic] силѣ
 Зъ горнаго Сїона прїйдесть часть побѣды:
 Церковъ утверждена на скалѣ!⁶

From the dialectal standpoint, the most interesting feature of these lines is arguably the form *дивогляди*, which, clearly, is written this way in order to demonstrate that these lines contain a pure, or almost pure, rhyme. Since *силѣ* and *скалѣ* create an impure rhyme, it seems that Mohyl'nyč'kyj found it important that at least *диво[гл'їди]* or *-[гл'їди]* and *но[б'їди]* rhymed purely or nearly so (it should be kept in mind that in this same work Mohyl'nyč'kyj writes *гляньте* with the unmarked я). Žylko (1958: 49) wrote about this phenomenon in the southwestern Ukrainian dialects: "...in many of the southwestern dialects, the phoneme *a* (regardless of derivation) not only changes its articulation after soft consonants in the direction of *ä* but also corresponds to the phonemes *e, u, i*, and their variants...." On the early *a*, see Žylko (1966: 178): "This characteristic is prevalent in the Dnister, western Volhynian, Sian, and Hutsul dialects.... This change of [a] is also observed in some Volhynian-Polisian dialects." About the early *e*, he writes: "This feature is common to the Dnister, Sian, and Bukovinian-Pokutian dialects" (see also Žylko 1966: map no. 20, and AUM 1988: maps nos. 41–49). Ševel'ov (2002: 691–96) dates this penetration upward and forward approximately to the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. He writes (691): "In many local dialects the sound *e*, which emerged as a result of alternation, further penetrates upward and forward, transforming itself into *y* and even *i*, particularly in unstressed syllables and/or before a softened consonant."

Attention should be drawn to the movable *ся* in the line *Вѣхри ся противлять Твой [sic] силѣ*, which "clearly distinguishes" the "preponderant majority" of the southwestern dialects "from all the Ukrainian and other East Slavic dialects and languages" (Zales'kyj 1969: 95; see the map on p. 99; AUM 1988: map no. 248).

Mohyl'nyč'kyj was born in 1811 in the village of Pidhirky, near Kalush. In 1832 he entered the gymnasium in Buchach and completed his high-school education in Chernivtsi. From 1837 to 1840 he studied at the Lviv Theological Seminary. In 1841 he was appointed administrator of the parish of Khytar and Klymets in the Stryi mountain region and eventually moved to Komariv near Halych, where he wrote most of his poetical works. In 1859 he was appointed deacon of Bohorodchany, and a year later he was elected to the Galician Diet. In 1873 he was buried in the village of Yablunka near Bohorodchany (LS: 59).

3. The status of "dialectal" elements

In secular Galician literary works, dialectal elements appear even more frequently than in church-related ones. This is the case, for example, with Levyc'kyj's translation of Goethe's ballad "Der Erlkönig" ("Ерлькенігъ / Гетого переведень на

6 "Even though sea monsters attack you, / And eddies resist Your force / From mountainous Zion will come the time of victory: / The church founded on a rock."

мало Русскій языкъ / и названъ / Богинею / Їосифомъ Лѣвицкимъ // зо Шкла") (Levyč'kyj 1838a), which contains the following verses:

Кто ѣде въ вѣтеръ такъ пѣзно въ нѣчь?
Вотець жене то а съ нимъ паничъ;
Вѣнь го все тулить при пазухахъ,
Вѣнь го тримає що силъ въ рукахъ.

[...] "Чи хочешъ хлопче со мновь пѣйти?
Всѣого достаткомъ дарую ти;
Дѣвчата мои нѣй ночують съ тобовъ,
Спѣвають, танцюють, колишуть ноговь."⁷

There is no doubt whatever that these verses are grounded in the folk language and therefore can hardly be considered *jazyčije*. This poem contains quite a few dialectal elements. Here I shall note only the enclitic forms of the pronouns *ти* and, particularly, *зо* (as opposed to the former, the latter is not used in Church Slavonic; see, however, Polish *go*; the pronoun *ти* may be interpreted as either a traditional or a dialectal form). The same may be said of the hard endings in the forms *ночують*, *спѣвають*, *танцюють*, and *колишуть*, which, however, are so typical of the southwestern dialects that it would be hard to interpret them as traditional Church Slavonic forms rather than folk forms in this context. About the hard *-m* in the third person singular and plural and in the imperative mood, Žylko writes: "This feature is common to the western and southwestern isogloss Berdychiv–Koziatyn–Zhashkiv—along the Hirskyi Tikych [River] and Syniukhy to Pervomaisk" (see Žylko 1958: 59, and map no. 6; see also AUM 1988: maps nos. 240 and 242). Elsewhere in Levyč'kyj's translation of "Der Erbkönig" we encounter the *-овъ* ending in the instrumental case; here it appears in the forms *со мновь*, *съ тобовъ*, *ноговъ*. Also noteworthy is the particle *нѣй*, which is also typical of many southwestern Ukrainian dialects. The *Atlas ukraïns'koï movy* (AUM 1988: map no. 254) shows that the form *нѣй* appears in the Sian and southern Carpathian dialects, whereas the form *най* is predominant in other southwestern dialects of Galicia. In another section of Levyč'kyj's work we encounter the sentence *зъ лицаь ми премиль*, in which one finds remnants of the present-tense copula, added to another part of the sentence (see Žylko 1966: map no. 21), which are typical of the "Sian, Bukovynian-Polisian, and other vernacular" dialects (Žylko 1958: 60).

It goes without saying that the three members of the Ruthenian Triad—Markijan Šaškevyč, Jakiv Holovac'kyj, and Ivan Vahylevyč—were merely the writers of this period who were most successful at using the folk language in their literary works, but they were by no means the sole representatives of the populist trend

7 "Who is walking so late in the windy night? / A father is hurrying, and with him is his son; / He clasps him to his breast, / Clutches him with all his might. [...] Boy, do you want to come with me? / I will give you everything you want; / My girls will spend the night with you, / They will sing, dance, and rock you with their feet."

before 1848–49. However, other sources remain mostly unresearched, which explains why certain elements associated with the Ruthenian Triad are sometimes interpreted none too convincingly. For example, Oleksa Horbač (1988: 47–48), who compared Šaškevyč's translation of the Gospel with other Ukrainian translations of the Holy Scriptures, emphasized that Šaškevyč, who was born in the vicinity of Brody, sought to avoid the most explicit characteristics of his native dialect. For that reason, Horbač explains, Šaškevyč's writings rarely feature reflexes of the 'a > 'e change, as in *щоб пожедаї єб*. Therefore, in the instrumental case he uses the traditional *-ою* (*дорогою, з матір'ю* rather than *-ов/-ев*).

On the other hand, Horbač writes further, these texts contain certain unmistakable southwestern dialectal elements, for example, forms of the dative and prepositional cases with *-u* instead of *-i* in such forms as *души, в тѣни, в кораблі, в сердици* (see AUM 1988: maps nos. 172–175); enclitic pronouns such as *зо, му, ю, ти, тя*; the hard *-т* in the third person of verbs, as in the forms *мовит, назвут, идѣт* [!]; the movable *ся*, as in the phrase *що ся уродило*; past tense forms with personal endings, such as *зівая-єм, щоби-сь, бо-сьмо видѣли, чули-сте*; and remnants of the present-tense copula in forms such as *не менша-сь*. As we have already seen, all these elements—and many others could be enumerated—appear almost consistently not only in Šaškevyč's works but also in other manuscripts and published texts of this period. The same applies to the instrumental case in *-ов/-ев* as well as *e < a* after softened consonants and sibilants, for which even a separate letter, *ѣ*, was used in Galician primers and catechisms beginning in the 1830s (Moser 2005: 220). As for the forms of the dative and prepositional cases with *-u* instead of *-i*, they appear in this form practically without exception, which is also determined by the fact that this ending is characteristic of the southwestern dialects (Žylko 1966: 78; see also AUM 1988: map no. 19). That makes it difficult to explain why Šaškevyč avoided using these elements, whereas he did not steer clear of other dialecticisms mentioned above. As it turns out, Galicians generally did not consider these frequently used elements to be dialecticisms: "Ukraine" in the then-current sense of the word and the development of the Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire were still far off, and Galicians were not yet very familiar with those processes. Thus, they sought initially to construct a literary language based on Galician dialects. Furthermore, certain dialectal elements were so widespread in Galicia that, clearly, they were perceived as supraregional characteristics of the new literary language, even though they do not appear in central and eastern Ukraine.

4. Little-known texts as sources of historical dialectology

In spite of the dialectal elements noted above, it is correct to say that the authors of most Galician Ukrainian texts avoided introducing many examples of them. Nevertheless, in addition to texts that may be understood as stemming from their authors' desire to establish a new literary language, there are certain other texts whose authors did not shy away from vernacular features at all. In his analysis of the language of Josyf Lozyns'kyj's compilation of songs and wedding rituals titled *Ruskoje wesile* (The Ruthenian Wedding), which was published in 1835, Myxajlo

Xudaš (1992: 40) made the following correct observation: "...it may be stated with perfect certainty that this is the first published written monument of the Sian dialect from the early nineteenth century..." Of course, a considerable number of other texts were written and published in Galicia, in full or in part, whose importance is equally great, if not greater. I am referring to such works as Hryhorij Il'kevyč's *Галицкіи приповѣдки* (Galician Proverbs, 1841) and Vasyľ Havryševyč's *Руководство ко умноженію садовины* (Handbook on Increasing Garden Produce, 1844). These two publications, like other ethnographic notes or books of practical advice, of which there are few exemplars, contain much interesting material pertaining to the field of historical dialectology.

Even more interesting are texts with no apparent connection to any attempts to create a new literary language for Galician Ukrainians but written in the Ukrainian language for wholly pragmatic reasons and oriented toward Ukrainian speakers. Sources of this important type include Ukrainian-language texts written by Polish revolutionaries who wanted Ukrainians to continue accepting the Polish literary language but resorted to the Ukrainian language the better to convince Ukrainian peasants of the viability of the Poles' political aspirations. A few years ago, I published a lengthy article about the Ukrainian-language works of Polish revolutionaries (Moser 2003; Moser 2011: 562–601). Here I will mention only one of these texts, *Narode ruskij*, which was most likely published in 1837, the same year as *The Dnister Nymph*. The author of this manifesto is unknown. Like all other documents created by Galician Polish revolutionaries before 1848–49, this particularly interesting text was written in Latin script, and for that reason alone it is not grounded in the tradition of Ukrainian or Church Slavonic orthography. On the contrary, many features of the folk language, that is, of Ukrainian dialects, are reflected in this script, which is not native to the Ukrainian language. In this sense, the texts written by Polish revolutionaries appear to continue the role performed by such texts as Jakub Gawatowicz's seventeenth-century *Intermediae* and other texts written in Latin script without making a conscious connection to Ukrainian literary traditions, such as the so-called *lustracje* (inventory lists). Such texts are particularly valuable and comparable to notes made by amateur ethnographers on Ukrainian folk dialects.

Narode ruskij!

Wilniśmo tohdy, koły robymo szczo хочzym i razem ne krywdymo nykoho, užywajuczy wolnosti swoiey. U narodi u towarystwi czy chto skrywdyw czyły ni, ne može sudyty sam skrywdženyi, a ne krywdytel, bo koždeyby z nych za sobow bilše potiehnuw, sudia musyt buty tretij, a to czy takij, kotrohoby ony oba obrały, abo narid sam, kołyby – oba ne zhodyłysia na sudia swoich. ... odže tohdy stane sia takož i jich wola, a inszyi kotrych mensze a jinakže hotiet, budut musyły zrobyty wolu takosz i jich.... Pry obraniach pownomocnykiw, musyt každy maty prawa, hołos swij daty, a takož powynno buty wilno obrały koho chotiat mnohostew hołosiw, ne bohactwo ne starszyna ne rižnycia rodu, any żadna pryczyna ne powinna dawaty perszynu. De tak obyrajut pownomocnykiw (posliw, deputowaniw) tam wilnyst u narodi....

Odže...czy lipsze luczty sia z tymy, szczo u ślipoti biut sia protiwn wilnocy,
bo taki moskali, czy z tymy sia brataty, szczo biut sia wilnost [sic], to je: z
polakamy.... Rusyny! bratowe moji! dusza moja do was z mene howoryła,
prykonayty sia o prawdi, kotrum kazaw, szczo bysmy ne były ostatni z narodiw,
kotri wilnist chotiat! (Studyns'kyj 1907: 129–33).⁸

All the southwestern dialectal characteristics in this text are recorded rather consistently.⁹ The text also features, for example, *o* after softened alveolar consonants in the forms *wsio*, *sercom*, *trioch*, and *ślozmy*. The *'a*-raising after softened consonants appears in *szlechtu* (Studyns'kyj 1907: 132), along with *szlachty*, *żednyj* (130), and *żadna*, *potiehnuw* (130) along with *tiahnuty*, *hotiet* (third person singular, etc.; see Żylko 1958: 50); see also *neszczystmy* and *desit* in the position between two softened consonants. As in the form *hotiet*, the third person has a hard ending. The endings *-ow*, *-ew* in the instrumental case are completely consistent: see *prishow*, *za sobow* (together with the form *meże soboju*), *z rossyiuw*, *mnohostew*, etc. (see Żylko 1958: 54, 57). Just as in other researched sources, personal forms of the present tense appear in the word *bymu*, in forms of the past tense and the conditional mood: see *wilniśmo*, *małysmo*, *szczobysmo ne były*, *kotrum kazaw* (Fontański and Chomiak 2000: 108; Żylko 1958: 59–60; AUM 1988: map no. 245). The text also features the future tense with *bydy* + a participle with *-a*, which occurs in many southwestern and some western Polish northern dialects as well (Żylko 1958: 60; AUM 1988: maps nos. 244 and 247). The enclitic form of the pronoun *mu* is used, as well as the shortened form of the reflexive pronoun *swoho*. Elsewhere we find the strictly dialectal form *nit* (no), etc.

Conclusions

Galician texts of the first half of the nineteenth century are far more interesting for historical dialectology than one might think, considering the literature generated by contemporary Ukrainian studies. In order to make full use of the data provided by these sources, it is crucial not to limit oneself to learning about their authors, their biographies and places of residence, thereby projecting the results of present-

8 "Ruthenian people!

We are free when we do what we want and together do not harm anyone in making use of our freedom. Whether someone has harmed [anyone] or not among the people, in society, the injured party himself cannot judge, and neither can the injurer, since each of them would pull more for himself; a third person must be the judge, and such a one as both of them would select, or the people themselves, if both do not agree about their judges...therefore, their will shall also be done, but others, of whom there are fewer and who want something different, will also have to carry out their will.... During the selection of plenipotentiaries, each one must have the right to cast his vote, and there must also be [the right] to elect freely whomsoever they desire by a majority of votes; neither wealth, seniority, nor differences in family background nor any reason should give priority. Where plenipotentiaries (envoys, deputies) are elected this way, there is freedom among the people....

Therefore...is it better to unite with those who struggle in blindness against freedom, for such are the Muscovites, or to fraternize with those...who are fighting freedom [sic], that is: with the Poles.... Ruthenians! My brothers! My soul has spoken from me to you; become convinced of the truth that I have expressed so that we not be the last among those nations that desire freedom!"

9 The examples cited below are taken from the text as a whole, not only from the cited fragment.

day linguistic geography into the past. It is also worth taking a second look at all the Galician Ukrainian texts created during this period, since certain clear-cut southwestern "dialectal" elements were obviously perceived at the time not as dialectal elements *per se* but as elements worthy of inclusion in the Galician version of the new Ukrainian literary language. It should be added that these elements do not always correspond to the materials gathered by the first codifiers of the Ukrainian language in Galicia.

THE SLAVIC IDEA AMONG GALICIAN RUTHENIANS (UKRAINIANS) IN THE PRZEMYŚL EPARCHY (FROM 1830 TO 1848–49)

1. The Slavic idea among Galician Ukrainians

Extrapolating the idea expressed by Miroslav Šesták (1992: 37), who described the concept of “Slavdom” as “the variable complex of all manifestations and forms of social consciousness based on the idea of the kinship or unity of Slavic nations,”¹ one may also consider his formula as a suitable definition of the concept known as the “Slavic idea.” Beyond the borders of the Russian Empire, several variants of the “Slavic idea” were prevalent in the nineteenth century: 1) Slavophile (Russo- or Muscovophile), 2) Pan-Slavic, and 3) Austro-Slavic.

Besides political ideas, the linguistic factor was of fundamental importance to the rise and spread of the Slavic idea. In the past, this concept drew its strength, and continues to do so to this day, primarily from the kinship and similarities among the Slavic languages.² Despite certain common phenomena in folklore and elsewhere, there are precious few characteristics that might lead scholars to construct a substantiated argument emphasizing Slavic unity. In the nineteenth century the Slavs, with the exception of the Russians, were linked by a shared condition: they were not backed by independent states. Furthermore, the concrete political, cultural, and economic struggles of the Slavic peoples differed significantly from one another, which frequently gave rise to serious inter-Slavic disputes. In the Austro-Hungarian Empire, for example, the Poles were the main adversaries of the Galician Ruthenians (Ukrainians). Despite this antagonism, considerable numbers of ethnic Ruthenians from Galicia became involved in the Polish revolutionary movement (on the Ukrainian-language literature produced by Polish revolutionaries, see Moser 2003; Moser 2011: 562–601), while others adamantly opposed it. Given the partitions of Poland and the Polish experience in the Russian Empire, the Poles did not cultivate excessive pan-Slavic sympathies. Thus, in Galicia, the real bedrock of powerful pan-Slavic illusions was significantly weaker than in other Slavic communities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where cultural and political ambitions were mostly channeled against Germano-Austrian or Hungarian hegemony, and solidarity among the Slavs seemed advantageous.

Until now, the spread of the Slavic idea among Galician Ukrainians during the first half of the nineteenth century has been studied only in the context of the activities of the Ruthenian Triad (Rus'ka trijcja) and the Supreme Ruthenian Council (Holovna Rus'ka rada), particularly by the Ukrainian scholar Feodosij Steblij, the author of the article “Die slawische Idee bei den Ukrainern in Galizien vor, während und nach der Revolution 1848” (The Slavic Idea among the Ukrainians in Galicia before, during, and after the Revolution of 1848) (Steblij 1992). The

1 “[...] den veränderbaren Komplex aller Äußerungen und Formen gesellschaftlichen Bewusstseins, die auf der Idee der Verwandtschaft oder der Einheit slawischer Nationen basieren.”

2 The “Slavic idea” is grounded not only in kinship among the Slavic nations but also in their mutual contacts. See, e.g., Moser 2004c.

Slavic idea was central to the activities of the Ruthenian Triad: the epigraph to *The Dnister Nymph* (*Русалка Дністровая*), published in 1837, consisted of several lines from the poem *Slávy dcera*, written by the Slovak poet and scholar Ján Kollár, and the opening sentences of this literary collection mention the “renaissance” of other Slavic peoples. The Ruthenian Triad translated Serbian folk songs, and one member, Markijan Šaškevyč, translated Václav Hanka’s forged medieval manuscript “Rukopis královédorský.” Jakiv Holovac’kyj, another member of the Ruthenian Triad, had met Kollár in 1835, when he was studying at Pest University. The third member of the Galician literary group, Ivan Vahylevyč, along with Jakiv Holovac’kyj, corresponded with leading cultural figures in all the Slavic lands: Ján Kollár, Pavol Jozef Šafárik, and Václav Hanka, as well as with the prominent Russian historian and Slavophile Mixail Pogodin. Shortly after the Revolution of 1848–49, Holovac’kyj became one of the pioneers of Galician Russophilism (KH 1905; Moser 2002a); Vahylevyč, for his part, had joined the ranks of the Polonophiles even earlier. Clearly, certain varieties of the Slavic idea were harmful to Ruthenian (Ukrainian) national and linguistic identity.

2.1. The Slavic idea among Galician Ukrainians in the Przemyśl eparchy

This article examines several manifestations of the Slavic idea in the Greek Catholic eparchy of Przemyśl (Peremyshl). This region had always been on the periphery of the Ukrainian-speaking space and in close proximity to Poland; for centuries, Poles and Ruthenians lived here side by side. In the first half of the nineteenth century, however, Przemyśl became the source from which sprang some crucial impulses for the development of a new type of Ukrainian literary language—the Galician variant—and for the preservation of Ukrainian culture in general (Moser 2005a; Moser 2011: 384–601, 641–666). Despite the importance of Przemyśl, scholars specializing in Ukrainian studies have not devoted sufficient attention to this question.³

The educated stratum of Galician Ruthenians always cherished certain notions about the kinship and spread of the Slavic languages, as well as about the place of the Ruthenian language among them. The creation of historical works, collections of folk songs, and especially grammars of the Ruthenian language helped fundamentally to hone these ideas. The first important Galician Ukrainian grammarian of the modern age was the Przemyśl-based canon Ivan Mohyl’nyč’kyj, a distinguished reformer of public education and the author of a famous primer and catechism (Moser 2011: 420–453). Mohyl’nyč’kyj’s grammar was the first to be written in a variant of the Ukrainian language. The preface to this grammar was

3 The situation has improved in recent years. The Przemyśl-based Ukrainian scholar Volodymyr Pylypovych has published a number of interesting articles in various anthologies. The first two volumes are especially important: *Lirvak z-nad Sjanu: peremys’ki druky seredyny XIX stolittja* (LS) (2001) and *Dux i revnist’: Vladyka Snihurs’kyj ta inši peremyšljany* (DR) (2002). In the context of this article, I am most interested in the autobiographical and biographical notes, letters, and journalistic pieces contained in these two publications. The simplified orthography of these books does not present an undue impediment in the given context.

an important text titled “Information about the Ruthenian Language” (Вѣдомость о рускомъ языкѣ), published separately in Polish and Russian translations, in which the independence of the Ruthenian language (to him, that term meant Ukrainian and Belarusian) is argued in scholarly fashion for the first time. Mohyl'nyckyj's model was the Russian grammar of Mixail Lomonosov, as well as the Polish grammar written by Onufry Kopczyński; Moly'nyckyj's work thus arose in a broader Slavic context. His catechism was reviewed in the influential *Wiener Allgemeine Literaturzeitung* by the Slovene linguist and philologist Jernej (Bartholomäus) Kopitar, one of the founders of Slavic studies (Kopitar 1816). Since the second edition of Mohyl'nyckyj's primer differs fundamentally from the first, the changes in the second edition may have resulted from the Przemyśl canon's reaction to Kopitar's review, in which the Slovene scholar indicated the need to rely more consistently on the Ruthenian vernacular (Moser 2011: 420–453).

Between 1815 and 1848–49 Przemyśl was a very important, if not the most important, center of the Galician Ukrainian cultural renaissance. The situation there was completely different from the one in Lviv, where Metropolitan Myxajlo Levyc'kyj was surrounded by a group of arch-conservative hierarchs at St. George's Cathedral who obstructed the Galician Ukrainian renaissance based on the culture of the common people. In Przemyśl, Levyc'kyj's subordinate, Bishop Ivan Snihurs'kyj, actively fostered populist currents because he understood that the most ancient linguistic manifestation of the “Slavic idea” among Slavs of the Orthodox and Greek Catholic rites (and, to some extent, among the Czechs and Croats)—the use of Church Slavonic as the traditional literary language of all Orthodox Slavs—no longer suited the needs of the nineteenth century. While the Old Ruthenians of St. George's Cathedral published a primer for public schools in 1847, in which even purely secular passages were written in Church Slavonic, and even folk vernacular passages in Mohyl'nyckyj's primer appeared in a Church Slavonic translation (Moser 2003a; Moser 2011: 454–461), in Przemyśl at this very time, specifically 1844 and 1847, Bishop Snihurs'kyj published, among other things, two pastoral letters in a language closely resembling the vernacular (Moser 2011: 484–493). The first grammars of the Ukrainian language were published in Galicia during his episcopate, one by the writer, ethnographer, and grammarian Josyf Levyc'kyj (1834) and the other by the Greek Catholic priest, ethnographer, and grammarian Josyf Lozyns'kyj (1846), whose manuscript dates to the early 1830s. In the 1840s and early 1850s it was Levyc'kyj (1801–1860) and Lozyns'kyj (1807–1889) who consistently voiced the harshest criticism of the Galician Russophiles, even after Holovac'kyj went over to the Russophile camp and Vahylevyč joined the Polonophile camp. Both these influential figures established contacts with representatives of various Slavic nations. In particular, they obtained crucially important linguistic advice from the aforementioned Slovene philologist Jernej Kopitar (employed as a censor in Vienna), who sent them Slovene-German and Czech-German school grammar books on which their subsequent “Ruthenian-German” grammars were supposed to be modeled. When these books did not reach their destination, they were resent from Ljubljana by the Slovene Roman Catholic priest and philologist Fran Serafin Metelko, and from Prague by Václav Hanka (DR: 186). On that level, the Slavic idea worked flawlessly.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the attitude to the Russian language and culture in provincial Przemyśl was even chillier than in Lviv. Nevertheless, Josyf Levyc'kyj cited excerpts from the works of the Russian poets Gavriil Deržavin and Ippolit Bogdanovič that were supposed to serve as epigrams to his panegyrics on Greek Catholic notables. He did this at the very same time—starting in 1837 at the latest—as he wrote his own works in the Ruthenian folk language, among which his translations of Schiller and Goethe deserve attention (Moser 2012, see pp. 221–224 in this volume). For a long time, there were no obvious Russophiles in Przemyśl. It is probably no coincidence that in the late 1850s, when the Greek Catholic Church, under pressure from the Austrian government, was expected to issue pastoral letters condemning Russophilism, Bishop Hryhorij Jaxymovyč of Przemyśl released his letter before the Lviv metropolitan issued one of his own (Moser 2005; for the text, see DR 116: 120).

2.2. The rise of national and Slavic identities

In their autobiographical and biographical notes, various cultural figures in Przemyśl recount how they became acquainted with the Galician-Ruthenian populist movement and the various manifestations of the Slavic idea. According to these accounts, they usually came to the realization of their national Ruthenian and supranational Slavic identities after moving to Lviv or Vienna to embark on their studies in institutions of higher learning and seminaries. Until 1848–49, seminarists and students from Przemyśl most often arrived in these urban centers with no clearly formulated national consciousness. Justyn Želexivs'kyj (1821–1910), who later taught at the gymnasium in Przemyśl and eventually became a Russophile, described the situation in the theological seminary of St. Barbara's Church in Vienna:

Among the theology students from Galicia I found two parties that hated and persecuted each other, that is, the Ruthenians and the Liakhs [Poles]. Raised and educated in the Polish spirit in Peremyshl and disliking discord, I wanted to become neutral and therefore only told everyone that I was a Pole of the Ruthenian rite—in this way I wanted to gain the approval of both parties. But after observing that issue more closely and reflecting on what it was about for both the Ruthenians and the Liakhs, I began to incline toward the Ruthenian side. I understood the real issue but still did not have confidence and decisiveness. Seeing the populist fervor of my colleague Marko Stanica, a Croat, how he championed his own, how he defended it, how he rejoiced whenever he saw good for his people, how his heart was heavy when the common language encountered some obstacle in education, and seeing all that among the Croats and the Czechs as well, I completely joined the Ruthenian party and began concerning myself with my own language and nationality like them (the Croats and Czechs) (DR: 174).⁴

4 “Межи слухателями богословія із Галиції дві застав-ем там партії, которій дуже ненавиділися і прослідовали т. є. русини і ляхи. Вихований і проваджений в духу польским в Перемишлях, а нелюблячи незгоди, хотів-ем зробитися нейтральним, і для того казав-ем всім тільки, що я єст поляк руского обряду – хотів-ем тим способом обі партії собі з'єднати. Но присмотрившись

Želeixivs'kyj's national consciousness emerged only after he began noticing his colleagues' concern with this issue, which was the subject of constant arguments between the Poles and Ruthenians. The devotion of the Croats and Czechs to their native languages and cultures so amazed him that he finally resolved to become a conscious Ruthenian.

Almost identical information is to be found in the autobiography of the Przemyśl priest-activist Antin Dobrjans'kyj (1810–1877), who became acquainted with supporters of the Polish revolution some ten years earlier, when he was studying at St. Barbara's theological seminary in Vienna. Thanks to his friendship with them, he concluded that “it was necessary to know the history of the people and the history of literature fundamentally, but since it was not taught in schools at the time, pupils began to study the one and the other zealously and with ecstatic energy in private.”⁵ During his time in Vienna, Kopitar took Dobrjans'kyj to the Court Library, where he showed him “works that even later he was unable to see in Galicia” (“сочиненія, яких в Галичині потім і увидіти било єму неможливо”) (DR: 201–202) and presented him with a few Slavic works. Dobrjans'kyj later became a teacher of Church Slavonic in Przemyśl, where in 1837 he published a Polish-language grammar titled *Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego, jakiego Rusini w Cerkwi swojej używają* (Grammar of the Old Slavic Language, Which the Ruthenians Use in Their Church). Later still, he became a Russophile.

Lviv was another center where leading Przemyśl figures became acquainted both with the Slavic idea and with national ideas. In his autobiography, Josyf Lozyns'kyj writes that after moving to Lviv, he read a Russian-language book on the history of the church, acquired a thorough understanding of the Church Slavonic grammars written by the Serbian pedagogue Avram Mrazović and the Czech Slavist Josef Dobrovský, and attended Professor Mikołaj Michalewicz's lectures on Polish grammar, which inspired him to write his own grammar of the Ruthenian language. Therefore, as Lozyns'kyj writes, “at that time I already loved to read books dealing with the Slavic dialects or peoples” (DR: 183–84).⁶ Eventually he became one of the most original Galician Ruthenian scholars of the nineteenth century, whose contributions to Ukrainian linguistics have not been adequately studied to the present day. Moreover, Lozyns'kyj, like Jakiv Holovac'kyj and Josyf Levyc'kyj, the other leading representative of the Przemyśl eparchy, wrote articles informing Slavic readers about the situation of the Galician Ruthenians. The articles appeared

ближше тій річі і розмісливше о що то іде, так русинам, як і ляхам, зачав-ємся скланяти на руску сторону. Поняв-єм вправді річ, однако же не мав-єм еще певности і сталости. Увидівши ревність для народности мого сожителя (kollega) Марка Станіци кроата, як той за своєм обстає, як боронит, як радує где що увидит доброго для народу свого, як му то тяжко на серци, сли народная мова має яку перешкоду во образованю, и видівше тоє всьоє на кроатах еще інших і чехах, прилучив-ємся зовсім до партії рускої, і зачав-єм подобні як і вони (кроати і чехи) своєю мовою і народністю займватися.”

5 “[...] нужно было знати основно історію народу і історію словесности, а понеже ей тогда в школах отнюд [sic] не учено, то питомці стали усердно і з вострогом [sic; the word was added by the author] одушевленієм учитись приватно оной і другой.”

6 “[...] і тогда уже любив-єм читати книги о словеньских нарічіях або народах розправляючи.”

in the German *Jahrbücher für slawische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft* (Yearbooks of Slavic Literature, Arts, and Scholarship), published in Leipzig by the Sorb Jan Petr Jordan. The Slavic world was keen to learn about the Galician Ruthenians. After publishing Lozyns'kyj's first article, Jordan asked him "to write articles for him constantly about the Ruthenians, who are oppressed by the Poles..." (DR: 194).⁷

Thus, as the Galician Ruthenians took their first tentative steps into the Slavic arena, the Przemyśl activists were at the forefront of this process. In 1849 Lozyns'kyj published an interesting article titled "On Change of Nationality" (О зміні народности), in which he analyzed the commonalities and divisions among the various Slavic peoples:

Nationality is based first and foremost on the origins of a people from one and the same generation.... The Slav is distinguished both physiognomically and spiritually from the German, Italian, Frenchman, etc.... Less notable are the differences between individual generations of one and the same people, as for example between the Great and Little Ruthenians, Poles, Czechs, etc., and the greatest difference between them consists only of a different dialect (DR: 335–36).⁸

There is no need to comment on Lozyns'kyj's trivial and outdated idea that the Slavs are distinguished from non-Slavs by some kind of common external appearance. What is interesting, however, is that Lozyns'kyj emphasized the differences among various Slavic dialects without indicating whether he considered the language of the "Little Ruthenians" (whom he juxtaposes with "Great Ruthenians"!) to be closer to Polish or to Russian. Most important, he had no doubt that it was a language in its own right and not just a variant of either Polish or Russian.

Lozyns'kyj had a rather sober-minded attitude toward dreams of Slavic unity. On the one hand, he intimated that non-Slavs sometimes offered assistance to certain Slavs against other Slavs: "In 1340 the Galician land submitted to the Polish state, but in the year 1772 it once again found itself under benign Austrian rule, and it is the first Ruthenian region to enjoy a constitution" (DR: 339).⁹ On the other hand, he also mentioned that Galicia was not the only place where Slavs were oppressing other Slavs: "In the Russian state, the Poles are now experiencing grief..." (DR: 341).¹⁰

7 "[...] дабим му всегда статїи о русинах, від поляків угнетених, писав."

8 "Народність основується на самийперед на походженю народа з єдного і того самого покоління. ... Слав'янин розрізняється значительно в лиці як і в духовних здольностях від німця, італіяна, француза і т. д. ... Меньше в очі впадаючими суть розличія межі поєдинчими поколіннями того самого народа, як н. пд. межі велико-і мало-русинами, поляками, чехами і т. д. і найбільша ріжниця межі ними лиш во різнім нарічю (бесіді) тихже состоїт."

9 "Галицька земля піддалася 1340 польській державі, но року 1772 дісталася знову під лагідное панованіє австрійское, і єсть першою рускою областю, котра конституцією тішиться."

10 "Во російскім государствѣ дізнают поляки тепер скорби."

Indeed, given the history of inter-Slavic contacts, it was already possible in the nineteenth century to marshal sufficient arguments against elaborate utopias based on the Slavic idea. But such arguments had no influence on the thinking of those Slavs who knew perfectly well that it was no easy task to preserve and develop linguistic and cultural independence even in the Slavic states. It suffices to recall the leading members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in the Russian Empire—the Ukrainians Mykola Kostomarov, Pantelejmon Kuliš, and Taras Ševčenko—who dreamed of a Slavic federation, and the fate that befell them (see pp. 309–311 in this volume).

Another important cultural figure in Przemyśl, Ivan Xryzostom Sinkevych (b. 1814), recalled that initially he was a staunch Polish revolutionary in Lviv, where he became acquainted with Kasper Cięglewicz (on Cięglewicz's Ruthenian-language activities, see Moser 2003 and Moser 2011: 562–601). According to Sinkevych, the utter lack of information not only about the Ruthenian Ukrainians but also about Slavs in general accounted for Cięglewicz's great success among the Galician Ruthenians. "In the gymnasium, all we knew about the Slavs was that the Slavs were Slaves; in textbooks, there was only one page on Ruthenian history, strictly speaking, the history of Russia in particular" (DR: 239).¹¹ Sinkevych joined the Galician Ruthenian populist movement only under the impact of the events of 1848–49. "From Saul [I] became Paul" ("із Савла зділався Павлом") (DR: 241), he wrote, explaining that after reading the text of the Polish-language document titled "On the Elimination of Everything That Would Oppose the Polish Language and Polish Nationality" (O usunięciu wszystkiego co by się sprzeciwiało polskiej mowie i polskiej narodowości), which was included in the petition brought by a Polish delegation to Vienna, he "saw that the notorious phrase 'równy z równym' ('equal to equal') was only bait" (DR: 240–41).¹² There is no denying that the history of the Galician Ruthenians (and Ukrainians in general) is a vivid illustration of how ideas about the brotherhood of the Slavic peoples invariably turned into dangerous fictions.

When the priest, writer, and civic activist Teodor (Bohdan) Lysjak (1817–1900) was studying in Lviv, he began writing poems in Polish. Jan Nepomucen Kamiński, the distinguished Polish writer, actor, director of the Polish theater in Lviv, and editor of *Gazeta Lwowska* and *Rozmaitości*, introduced him to the collections of folk songs compiled by Waclaw Zaleski and the poems of Tomasz Padura (DR: 252). Later,

during my stay in the Seminary, the aspirations of Ukrainian as well as of Galician writers resounded in our hearts with a loud reverberation.... True, even the sons of priests among the students brought mostly the Polish language from their parents' homes, but there was a very considerable number of students who, coming from a burgher's or a peasant's home,

11 "[...] в гімназії ми знали о Славянах лиш то, що Slaven d.i. Sklaven, о руской-же історії, собственно-же спеціальної історії Росії була всего в учебниках одна картка."

12 "[...] увидів, що пресловутая фраза: równy z równym була лиш приманкою."

brought their mother tongue with them, and they had not forgotten that language and used it among themselves (DR: 253).¹³

Indeed, until 1848 hardly anyone came to study in Lviv or Vienna already armed with a mature Ruthenian consciousness. In a biography—not an autobiography—of the cultural and political figure, journalist, and composer Teodor Leontovyč (1812–1886), the unidentified author describes him as follows:

He was raised as a Ruthenian child and therefore knew, not according to some theory from books but with his soul, that he is neither a Pole nor a Muscovite. He remained this kind of Ruthenian until his death, and for this Ruthenianness he struggled fearlessly always and everywhere (DR: 209).¹⁴

It is hard to say whether this information is reliable or simply an element of the national “hagiography.” But there is no doubt whatever that the “spiritual Ruthenianness” of Leontovyč’s childhood years differed fundamentally from that which he experienced after 1848 and in later years.

2.3. The Spring of Nations: The Slavic factor in the struggle for equality

The Spring of Nations, the series of political upheavals that swept across Europe in 1848–49, introduced a fundamental change into the Galician Ruthenians’ general attitude toward the Poles and the Slavic idea. Even though the two peoples involved were both Slavic, Polish-Ruthenian relations became exacerbated, and national identity generally became even more important than previously. The Lemko priest and folklorist Ivan Birec'kyj (1815–1883), who, like other Galician Ukrainian intellectuals, was very familiar with the renowned works of Šafárik and Kollár, wrote as follows about the brotherhood of Ukrainians and Poles:

Whether we take the matter historically or statistically, two nationalities must necessarily be considered in Galicia, that is, the Ruthenian and the Polish. Although they originate from a single tribe, nevertheless since time immemorial they differ by language, religion, situation, customs, and rites.... If every Ruthenian knew Polish, and every Pole living in Ruthenia knew Ruthenian, then there would be neither division nor discord, for we would be bound by the ties of fraternal affection and common constitutional rule (DR: 281–83).¹⁵

13 “в часі пробування в Семинарії відбулося голосним відгомоном в серцях наших стремліне українських, а також галицьких писателів. ... Правда, що і питомці-поповичі винесли з дому родичів переважно мову польську, але число питомців, що вийшовши з-під міщанської чи селянських стріхи, винесли мову матірню, було дуже поважне, а они мови тої не забули і єї межи собою уживали.”

14 “Він виховався рускою дитиною і тому не по якійсь теорії з книжок, а душею знав, що він не єсть ні поляком, ні москалем. Таким русином лишився він і до смерті і за таку рускість боровся завсідги і всюди неустрашимо.”

15 “Czy to historycznie czyli statystycznie rzecz weźmiemy, koniecznie w Galicji dwie narodowości, chociaż z jednego szczepu słowiańszczyzny pochodzą, jednakże od niepamiętnych czasów językiem, wyznaniem, położeniem, zwyczajem i obyczajem się różniące, uważać trzeba t. j. ruską i polską. ...Každy Rusin umie po polsku, a Polak na Rusi żyjący, umie po rusku, nie było by

According to Birec'kyj, contacts between Poles and Ruthenians had always played an important role in the shared history of these two nations, but there was no brotherhood or democratic interaction between them. As soon as leading Ruthenian intellectuals began to be enthralled by their own national cause, the Poles thwarted their aspirations. As early as 1840, Birec'kyj was corresponding with Holovac'kyj in broken Ruthenian, occasionally using individual Latin letters: "All that concerns the Ruthenian people and its glory, all that delights me.... I know what kind of obstacles our enemies are creating for us" (KH 1909: 26).¹⁶ In another letter from Bachórz dated 1842, Birec'kyj told Holovac'kyj about the progress and extent of Polonization in his parish:

"Well! To tell the truth, that place is not for me.... I seem to be in a Ruthenian parish, but my Ruthenians are such that they do not even know how to speak Ruthenian; whether he is in the Lord's House singing with the cantor or listening to the Word of God in Ruthenian, everything must be said in Polish! They still speak with one another in their own language, but only if there is not a single Liakh around, for they immediately make fun of them, and so parents barely teach their children Ruthenian; the only ones who still speak their mother tongue are old people, but young people mostly jabber in Liakh. Nor will you hear a Ruthenian song in our [parish], for the *Krakowiak* has replaced it, but even that is rarely heard, unless in a tavern, since everything is aristocratic" (KH 1909: 64–65).¹⁷

In a subsequent letter to Holovac'kyj, Birec'kyj described the apathy toward national and political questions in Bachórz in 1848, noting that "Here and there among our priests you will find a Liakh, but not a harmful one.... In our town, our spirit being what it is, there is little zeal" (KH 1909, 284).¹⁸ By his phrase "a Liakh, but not a harmful one," Birec'kyj obviously meant that he usually considered Poles a harmful element. In his view, the "ties of fraternal affection" between the Poles and Ruthenians had already turned into pure fiction.

Since in point of fact it was difficult to reconcile the Slavic idea with existing inter-Slavic political conflicts, throughout the nineteenth century Slavs opposing one another were increasingly often accused of abandoning Slavdom. These

więc ani rozdziwienia ani niezgody, bo by nas łączył węzeł braterskiej miłości i wspólnego rządu konstytucyjnego."

- 16 "Всѣ, де иде о народѣ русскімъ, и о его славѣ, всѣ тоє мя тѣшитъ ... знаю, якіи перешкоди роблять намъ вороги наши."
- 17 "Отъ! правду сказати, не для мене то-тоє єсть мѣсце, ... я нѣбы въ русскій Парохіи а мои Руссини такіи, що и по русски не знають; чи вінъ Ти въ Дому Божимъ зъ Дякомъ заспѣває, або слова Божого по русски послушає, по польски все треба казати! Медже собою ще говорять по своєму, но щобъ ани одного Ляха не було, бо тиі заразы ихъ высмѣвають, и за тоє родичи свои дѣти мало по русски навчають; що ще своимъ матернимъ говорятъ языкомъ, то старыи люде, а молоджага найбільше по ляц'ку швангоче. Ани въ насъ русской не зачуєшь пѣснѣ бо краковякъ вже ихъ мѣсце занывъ, але и той не часто ся відзываетъ, хибай у коршмѣ, бо и нема коли бо все панцьке."
- 18 "Медже нашими священниками найде ся декуды и Ляшокъ, но не шкодливыи. ... У насъ духъ якъ духъ але ревности мало."

ideas appear in an interesting text titled "Odezwa do Arystokratów" (Appeal to the Aristocrats) by an author writing under the pseudonym "I. Pankevych," who emphasizes the "innocence" and simplicity of the Slavs, particularly Orthodox Slavs. He directs the following words at the Poles:

We ask you not to buff us constantly with French polish because we are Slavs, and what are you? We love our native land and respect the customs of our fathers, its innocence and simplicity, and you? (DR: 299).¹⁹

As Teodor (Bohdan) Leontovych notes, during the Revolution of 1848 other Slavs were already recognizing the national identity of the Galician Ruthenians and their demands. The Poles, however, opposed not only the Ruthenians but all of Slavdom:

What good does it do you, Ruthenians, that you have been recognized as an autonomous people by all the Slavs and by Europe, if *Dziennik Narodowy* has not yet recognized you?!" (DR: 303–4).²⁰

In his polemic, Leontovych emphasized that there could be no doubt concerning the brotherhood of the Ruthenians and Poles, but they were different brothers, much more closely connected to their common mother than to each other:

No one with any common sense will say that there should not be any brotherhood, any spiritual ties, any kinship between those two peoples; why, these are sons of one mother, "Slava," who, recognizing themselves in her, cannot acquaint themselves with each other.... The Ruthenians are a different Slavic tribe from the Polish one because they have their own language, their own nationality, their own literature...the Ruthenians...want to be a nation and rejoin the ranks of the Nations of Europe!!! (DR: 310, 313).²¹

Themes of Slavic kinship were also raised by the Ruthenian priest, civic and political activist, and historian Vasyl' Podolyns'kyj in his famous *Słowo przestrogi* (A Word of Warning), which was written in Sanok during the Spring of Nations. He too emphasizes that, although Poland is the sister of Rus', Mother Slavdom should be respected more, and above all one should respect oneself:

19 "Prosiemy was, nie oblyskiwać nas ustawicznie lustrem francuskiej polityry, bo my Sławianie, a wy co? my kochamy ziemię ojczystą i szanujemy zwyczaję ojców naszych, jej cnotę i prostotę, a wy co?"

20 "I cóż wam Rusini z tego, że was uznali jako naród samoistny wszyscy Słowianie, uznała Europa, kiedy was Dzien[nik] Nar[odowy] nie uznał jeszcze?!"

21 "Żeby zaś znowu między tymi dwoma narodami, żadnego braterstwa, żadnego węzła duchowego, żadnego powinowactwa nie było, nikt ze zdrowym rozsądkiem twierdzić nie będzie, wszak to są synowie jednej matki 'Sławy', którzy poznając się w niej, siebie zapoznać nie mogą ... Rusini stanowią szczep słowiański różny od polskiego, jeżeli mają swój język, swą narodowość, swą literaturę ... Rusini ... chcą być narodem i stanąć znowu w rzędzie Narodów Europy!!!"

My gentlemen, I love Poland like my own sister, and I love Slavdom more as a mother, but I love Rus' most tenderly because in it I love my own self. This is a profession of my belief, and I guarantee you that almost all freethinking and non-freethinking Ruthenians agree. In my opinion, it would be more diplomatic on your part, gentlemen, if you adopted a similar belief, for you should not flatter yourselves that Slavdom would allow itself to be transformed for the sake of a few individuals' whims. We accept Poland and want to suffer for her, and we shall certainly suffer, like tender-hearted, high-born Poles, but let her also be tolerant, let her respect us and not permit anyone to offend us, let her be federative and not identically egoistical, for we do not love aristocracy, not even a linguistic one (LS: 375).²²

Even loyalty to Poland seemed possible to Podolyns'kyj, but only within the framework of a genuine federation, free of traditional Polish hegemony. In discussing Ruthenian-Polish issues, he used the Slavic idea to attack the Poles. According to him, they relied too much on the French and even on the "fanatically anti-Slavic" ("sławianobójczych") Germans. Thus, in his view, the Poles were traitors to Slavdom, while the Ruthenians were among the finest Slavs because they did not trust the lords:

The Ruthenians are distinguished in character from other Slavs by their melancholy and nostalgia; emotionally they long for that which they themselves do not know—but they know already...they have begun to comprehend that they are pining for freedom and nationality, that is, for Rus'!... Therefore, the Ruthenian spirit of freedom and nationality within the Polish borders, aroused in the Ruthenians by the Poles, has not yet developed within them, for every Ruthenian still thinks about his Rus' with timidity, for he still cannot find a powerful and solid point on which he might base his Rus', like the Poles, for example, who, like drowning men clutching a razor blade, usually based their political hopes directly on the smooth tongues of the French, directly on the fanatically anti-Slavic Germans, and even on those who, for the sake of those political hopes, kissed them galore. The Ruthenians, on the other hand, having

22 "Moi panowie, kocham Polskę jako siostrę rodzoną, ale więcej kocham sławiańszczyznę bo jako matkę, a najczulej kocham Ruś bo w niej kocham samego siebie. Oto jest zeznanie wiary mojej, a ręczę wam, że i omal nie wszystkich wolno jako i niewolniczo myślących Rusinów. Mojem zdaniem jest, że i panowie byście dyplomatyczniej zrobili, gdybyście przyjęli podobną tej wiare, wszakże nie powinniście sobie podchlebiać, żeby sławiańszczyzna, którakolwiek dla kaprysów kilku osób przeistoczyć się dała. Pozwalamy na Polskę i za nią to ponosić chcemy i pewnie poniesiemy co i najtkliwsi rodowici Polacy, ale niechże ona będzie tolerantną, niech nas szanuje a nie pozwala nikomu nas obrażać, niech będzie federacyjną a nie identyczną samolubną, bo my arystokracji nie lubimy ani nawet językowej."

no such claims against those peoples, do not trust the lords, for they know that the lord thinks like a lord....²³

Podolyns'kyj then characterizes the various Ruthenian political camps. In his view,

They do not dare to base their political hopes solidly on anyone but have hesitantly divided their principles four ways: I) The purely Ruthenian party desires a free independent Rus' and is heading toward it directly, without hesitation, or through Slavdom. II) The Polish-Ruthenian party desires a free, independent Rus' and is heading toward it through the mediation of a federated Poland, or a Slavic Poland in federation with Rus', with the idea that once it matures and the necessity arises, it will become wholly Ruthenian.... III) The Austro-Ruthenian party desires a Rus' free only of the Poles but not necessarily of serfdom, and if it must be so, then let there also be that misfortune—freedom. In that party there is also liberalism, which expects Ruthenian freedom from Austria, just as the Poles expect Polish freedom from it in Galicia. IV) The Russo-Ruthenian party also wants a Rus', perhaps a free one, but is heading toward it through a preliminary union with Russia, and is thinking of being free only once Russia becomes free.... God only knows when those plans of the Ruthenians will be realized; all I know is that this will happen no sooner than the resurrection of Slavdom as a whole, federated and liberal, in which I firmly believe, Ruthenian-style (LS: 376–78).²⁴

Thus, Podolyns'kyj regarded a Slavic federation built on democratic foundations as the supreme political ideal. Owing, however, to the circumstances that emerged in 1848–49, when the identity of the Galician Ruthenians came

23 "Tęsknota i rzewność charakterem są Rusinów odznaczającym ich od innych Słowian, z rozrzwieniem tęsknią sami nie wiedząc za czem—lecz wiedzą już ... poczęli pojmować, że tęsknią za wolnością i narodowością t. j. za Rusią! ... Otóż duch ruskiej wolności i narodowości w granicach polskich—wzniecony przez Polaków w Rusinach jeszcze się w nich nie wyrobił, bo każdy Rusin sam dla siebie z nieśmiałością jeszcze duma o swojej Rusi bo nie może jeszcze znaleźć punktu mocnego a rzetelnego na którymby swoją Ruś oprzeć mógł jak np. Polacy swoje nadzieje polityczne zwykle jak tonący na brzytwie opierali wnet na gładkich językach Francuzów, wnet na sławianobójczych Niemcach, a nawet na tych, którzy za te nadzieje polityczne już ich się dosyć nacałowali. Rusini zaś nie mając takiej pretensji do tamtych narodów, panom zaś nie ufając, bo wiedzą że pan po pańsku myśli. ..."

24 "Nie śmiań stanowczo swoje nadzieje polityczne na nikim oprzeć, lecz z wahaniem podzieliły ich zasady na cztery strony: I. Partia czysto ruska—chce Rusi wolnej niepodległej i zmierza do niej wprost bez ogródki lub przez sławiańszczyznę. II. Partia polsko-ruska—chce Rusi wolnej niepodległej, a zmierza do niej za pośrednictwem Polski federacyjnej lub Polski sławiańskiej w federacji z Rusią z tą myślą, że kiedy dojrzeje a będzie potrzeba wtedy się zupełnie zruszczy ... III. Partia austriacko-ruska chce Rusi wolnej tylko od Polaków a nie koniecznie od niewoli, a jeżeli tak być musi to niech będzie i to nieszczęście wolność. W tej partii jest i liberalizm, który od Austrii równie oczekuje wolności ruskiej jak i Polacy od niej oczekują wolności polskiej w Galicji. IV. Partia rosyjsko-ruska chce także Rusi może i wolnej, a zmierza do niej za poprzednim złączeniem się z Rosją i myśli być wolną bodaj aż wtedy kiedy Rosja wolną będzie. ... Kiedy się te ich myśli ruskie urzeczywistnią Bogu tylko wiadomo; a ja tyle ino wiem, że to nie prędzej nastąpi jak wskreszenie sławiańszczyzny ogólnej, federacyjnej a liberalnej, w którą mocno po rusku wierzę."

under threat, their rights were of much greater concern to him than any cosmopolitan or Pan-Slavic idea:

Therefore, dear gentlemen, if I knew that there would come a time when all people, or at least all Slavs, would be speaking only one language, then, even if this were to come about only in a few hundred years, I would already be starting to Polonize, Germanize, Russianize, or even Sinoize my children and my people; but because my mind does not entertain such a possibility, my Ruthenian conscience does not permit me to betray the Ruthenians for the sake of strengthening another Slavic tribe with my own clan, for in doing so I would also be betraying the rest of Slavdom.... Why, then, do some people demand that we alone should be cosmopolitans when they themselves do not wish to be cosmopolitans!... And so, if Ruthenians are Poles, and the Ruthenian language is the Polish language (and there are many more of those who speak it than others), then introduce the Ruthenian language into schools and offices, and let it seem to you that you are speaking Polish (LS: 379).²⁵

If one group of people expects another to be cosmopolitans, then the same should be expected of those making such a demand. If the Ruthenian language were truly a variant of Polish—and this was precisely what many Poles claimed in the nineteenth century—then it should have become a language of instruction and officialdom in Poland. Podolyn's'kyj concludes his polemic with the words: “Let it seem to you that you are speaking Polish” (“A niech wam się wydaje, że po polsku mówicie”)—a message vividly demonstrating that he was unquestionably one of the most interesting Ruthenian or, rather, Ukrainian cultural and political thinkers of the nineteenth century.

2.3. The Przemyśl activists and the Slavic Congress

Despite everything, the notion of an “imagined Slavic community” (for the nation as an “imagined community,” see Benedict Anderson 2006) remained attractive, especially to intellectuals in the Przemyśl eparchy, and considerable political hopes were invested in it. In 1848 the above-mentioned Ivan Birec'kyj wrote a letter to the Czech cultural activist Karel František Zap in which he discussed the impending Slavic Congress in Prague and the backwardness of Galician Ukrainians:

25 “Dlatego to moi panowie, gdybym wiedział, że przyjdzie taki czas gdzie wszyscy ludzie, a przynajmniej wszyscy Sławianie jedną tylko mową mówić będą, a choćby to aż za kilkaset lat nastąpić miało, dziś już rozpocznę polszczyć, niemczyć, moskiewczyć a bodaj i chińczyć dzieci swoje i naród swój; ale ponieważ mózgowica moja nie dopuszcza możliwości takiej, więc sumienie moje ruskie nie pozwala mi zdradzać Rusinów dla zasilenia swoim rodem drugiego szczepu sławiańskiego, bo tu bym zdradził i resztę sławiańszczyzny. ... Dlaczegoż więc tylko od nas zażądali niektórzy, żebyśmy my byli kosmopolitami, a sami nimi być nie chcą! ... Jeżeli Rusini są Polakami więc i mowa ruska jest polską mową (a mówiących nią jest o dużo więcej od owych), wprowadźcież więc tę ruską mowę po szkołach i po urzędach a niech wam się wydaje, że po polsku mówicie.”

My heart rejoiced with great happiness upon seeing your name among the signatories of the appeal summoning all Slavic brothers to the mother of Old World cities, Prague, on 31 May. I do not doubt that all Slavic representatives will hasten to you upon that call, but who will go to represent the Galician Ruthenians? Who will utter a gracious word on our behalf? Hardly any of our people will be aware of your meetings, as there is no one to embrace the Ruthenian cause; there is no one among our people to speak with you about the general affairs of great Slavdom.... Although the Ruthenian has been free since time immemorial, like all the offspring of the Slavic mother, as a result of political intrigues and the evil rule of his princes he forfeited his people's freedom and had to serve his own brother, the Liakh.... In the end, bitter fate condemned both brothers to end up under foreign enslavement.... It is true, dear brother, that we are very weak now, but do we not have our own Slavic brothers to render us assistance and help us in our need?... You know how sincerely the Ruthenian loves all Slavs, and you will find affectionate words to speak of us in friendly fashion. Focus attention on us in the same sense as I am writing to you here sincerely and justly, without even mentioning my name, for if things continue as they are now among us, we will certainly fall victim to brotherly discord (Žáček 1958: 144–46).²⁶

Where other Slavs and Galician Ruthenians are concerned, a leading role in the dissemination of the Slavic idea was played by the Czechs and Slovaks (in those days, the latter were considered to be Czechs). The most important sources of knowledge about the Slavic world were the works of Pavol Jozef Šafárik and Ján Kollár. During the Spring of Nations, the Czechs gave the most consistent support to the Galician Ruthenians, especially as compared to other Slavic peoples. Despite all odds, the Galician Ruthenians managed to send a delegation of their own to the Slavic Congress in Prague, but the Hungarian Ruthenians did not. One of the Ruthenian participants, Hryhorij Hynylevyč of Przemyśl (1809–1871), who was a delegate from the Supreme Ruthenian Council, sent a letter to the Przemyśl-based clergyman Stefan Dobrjans'kyj from Prague: "The Czechs seem rather favorably disposed to our cause, as I was able to deduce from the words of [František] Palacký, Šafárik, and other of the more well-known figures of that nation..." (DR: 463).²⁷

26 "Радостію многото возрадовалось серце моє, обачивши ім'я твоє межде підписами відозви, взиваючої всіх братів словенських на 31-го мая до старосвіткої городів матери Праги. Не сумніваюсь, що всіх словен заступники на голос той до Вас поспішатся, але хто ж поїде зо сторони русинів галицьких? Кто промовит за нами слово ласкавое? Тяжко хто з наших буде притомний нарадам Вашим, бо нема кому обняти справу рускую, нема кому з наших поговорити купно з вами о общих справах великой Словеньщини. ... Хоць русин свободен був із первовіка, як і всі матери словенської чада, но через крамоли і злое князів своїх панування потеряв свою народню свободу і мусів рідному брату своєму ляхови служити. ... Наконец лихая доля осудила, що оба брати в чужую дістались неволю. ... Правда тое брате любезний!, що ми тепер дуже слабій, але чи не маємо рідних братів словенських, котрі подати нам повинні руки помочи, і спомагати нас в потребі? ... Ти і тое знаєш, як сердечно русин любить всіх словен, ти найдеш ласкавих слів, поговорити приязно о нас. Зверни увагу в тім смислі на нас, як тутки щиро і справедливо ти пишу, не обявляючи навет імени моего, бо если так буде пізнійше як є тепер у нас, нехибно станемось поталою братної незгоди."

27 "Чехи здаються досит нашій справі прихильні бути, як-ем міг повзяти з уст Паляцкого, Шафарика і інших знакомитших мужів того народу ..."

At the congress in Prague, Hynylevyč was not only impressed by the “image of the Slavic picturesqueness...of the Serbs, Croats, Dalmatians, Slovenians, Moravians, [and] Poles” (DR: 464) but also experienced moments of genuine Slavic unity:

All the Slavs speak to one another in their own tongue, and somehow we understand one another; and in a year or two, it seems to me, there will no longer be anything to prevent one Slav from understanding another²⁸ (DR: 464).²⁹

Hynylevyč's experience in Prague—in actual fact, of course, the Slavs had considerable difficulty in understanding one another (see Moser 2005c)—showed him that the attractiveness of the Slavic world lay especially in its great diversity. Once again, the mature national consciousness of other Slavs so impressed the Ruthenian that he adopted it as the model for his own nation's linguistic and cultural rebirth:

I therefore request and appeal to you: practice Ruthenian as much as you can; speak with one another in Ruthenian, accustom your children to this pleasant language beloved by the Slavs.... It was not only the Poles who reproached us, but the Czechs, too, are surprised that we have so neglected our tongue. For my part, I would like it if all our people, especially priests, were in Prague in order to learn how to respect and love their own nationality, as each of the Slavic peoples here, who are neither so historical nor so large—fifteen million—loves its own nationality. The Serb, Croat, Slovene et al. does not ask whether he is understood by a Czech or a Ruthenian; he simply speaks his own language, although he has the capacity to make himself understood in another language. Why do our Ruthenians speak Polish or German not only with Poles but also with one another? (DR: 465).³⁰

3. After the revolution

Initially, the Revolution of 1848–49 left fewer traces in Przemyśl than in Lviv, where a real center of Galician-Ruthenian cultural and linguistic life had been established.

28 Even at the Prague congress, the Church Slavonic language played its traditional role as a unique symbol of the Slavic idea: “For Pentecost [Зелені Свята], we are thinking of celebrating our Holy Liturgy in the ancient Czech Church of SS. Cyril and Methodius. The academicians [Ruthenians from Vienna: Hynylevyč's note] are preparing for the singing, and the Czechs are delighted that after several hundred years they will be hearing the liturgy in Slavonic” (DR: 466).

29 “Каждий слав'янин еден до другого в своїм язиці промовляє і якомсь ся розуміє; а най-но рік, два, а в зрозуміню одного слав'янина з другим, здає ми ся, не буде вже жадної трудности.”

30 “Тому прошу і взиваю Вас, вправляйтеся, кілька лиш можете, в рускім; бесідуйте межі собов по-руски, призвичайте діти Ваші до так милого і від слав'ян улюбленого языка ... Не тільки поляки нам закидали, але і чехи ся нам дивують, що так наш язык занедбали-смо. Жичив бим собі, щоби всі наші, особливо священики, в Празі були, аби ся навчили шанувати і любити свою надоровість, як ту кождий з слав'янських народів, хоть ані так історичних, ані так великих – п'ятнайцят міліонів – свою народовість любит. Серб, кроат, слованьчик і т. п. не питає, чи го чех або русин розуміє, він тільки своїм языком мовит, хоть має спосібніст і іншим языком з другим ся порозуміти. Для чого тільки наші русини не тільки з поляком, але навіть самі з собою по-польски або по-німецки бесідуєют?”

It was headed by the Supreme Ruthenian Council and the new Department of Ruthenian Language and Literature at Lviv University, chaired by Jakiv Holovac'kyj. In October 1849, Josyf Levyc'kyj wrote a letter to Holovac'kyj:

In a word, the Ruthenians are very cool to their own cause—these are not Poles!—if it were to come about all by itself, and well, perhaps they would not be opposed, but there are many who are completely against the Ruthenian nationality (KH 1909: 397).³¹

After the revolution, the same political disappointments awaited the Galician Ukrainians as most other Austrian Slavs. Once it became clear that Galicia's political destiny was to be resolved in the Poles' favor, Russophilism began to develop vigorously even in Przemyśl, which had been such a vibrant center during the early stages of the Galician-Ruthenian populist movement prior to the revolution. It was only after the victory of the Ukrainian idea in the 1860s and 1870s that the Galician Ruthenians finally grasped that the Slavic idea was of secondary importance to Ukrainian linguistic, cultural, and political life.

31 "Словомъ Русины дуже холодныи для своѣй справы—то не Поляки!—кобы ся саме сробило та добре, можебы ся непротивили але много есть со всѣмъ противныхъ народности русскѣй."

**“AUSTRO-RUTHENIAN”?
THE VIENNA *ВѢСТНИКЪ* AS A NEWSPAPER
“FOR THE RUTHENIANS OF THE AUSTRIAN STATE”**

1. The Vienna *Вѣстникъ* and its milieu in the year of its founding

While *Зоря Галицка* (Galician Star), the first newspaper for the Galician Ruthenians, appeared in the revolutionary year 1848, the Transcarpathian Ruthenians, who were well behind the Galicians in the nineteenth-century awakening, had no press of their own for a long time. The first newspaper for both Galicians and Transcarpathians was the *Вѣстникъ* (Herald), which began publication in Vienna on 19 February 1850 (according to the Gregorian calendar) under the leadership of Galician Ruthenians. It continued the *Галичо-Рѣсскій Вѣстникъ* (Galician-Ruthenian Herald), which had been appearing in Lviv since 1849 and had generally been written in a language based on variants of the Galician Ruthenian vernacular.

The first editor in chief of the Vienna *Вѣстникъ* was Ivan Holovac'kyj. He was a brother of Jakiv Holovac'kyj, who, as a former member of the “Ruthenian Triad” and an editor of the *Русалка Днѣстровая* (Dnister Nymph) of 1837, is well known as one of the most important pioneers of the Galician Ruthenian awakening. At the end of 1852, Ivan Holovac'kyj was dismissed from the editorial office, returning briefly in April 1853, only to retire for good shortly afterwards (Studyns'kyj 1905: LXVII). Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, who was working as an executive in Vienna, was the second member of the editorial staff who had a decisive influence on the language of the newspaper. He became editor in chief after Ivan Holovac'kyj and remained in charge until the appearance of the last issue of the *Вѣстникъ* on 10 (22) December 1866 (for further information about him, see Zavadka 2000). Bohdan Didyc'kyj, one of the leading Galician Russophiles, was also a member of the editorial staff. Later, from early 1853 to mid-1854, he was editor in chief of *Зоря Галицка*.

All three men belonged to the first generation of secular Galician Ruthenian intellectuals, of whom there were still very few in the first years after 1848/49. Until the revolution, practically all cultural figures in Galician Ruthenian society had been members of the Greek Catholic clergy.

Julijan Vysloboc'kyj worked as a *Ministerialkonzipist* (an official drafting documents for a ministry) in Vienna. He was the Ruthenian editor of the *Allgemeines Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für die slawischen Sprachen Oesterreichs* (General Imperial Legal and Governmental Paper for the Slavic Languages of Austria) and had participated actively in the German-Ruthenian dictionary project *Legal and Political Terminology for the Slavic Languages* (“Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen. Deutsch-ruthenische Separatausgabe”; see Moser 2002 on both these publications).

Bohdan (originally Teodozij) Didyc'kyj, born in 1827, had at first shown commitment to the Polish national movement. After studying in the Faculty of Arts at Lviv University, he went on to Slavic studies in Vienna (Čornovol 2006) and became a gymnasium teacher. In 1866, he anonymously published the article “How a Little Ruthenian Can Learn Great Russian in an Hour” (“Въ одинъ часъ научиться

Малорусину по великорусски") (Didyc'kyj 1866), in which he described the differences between Ruthenian and Russian as a few features that, if kept in mind by Ruthenians, would enable them to learn Great Russian in a mere hour (it is well known that in actual fact, Didyc'kyj himself never attained a perfect command of Russian).

Ivan Holovac'kyj had been a student of medicine in Vienna and, after his work at the *Вѣстникъ*, would become a ministry official in Vienna. From the times of Franz Miklosich until 1892, he taught Russian in the Institute of Slavic Studies at the University of Vienna (Hafner 1985: 64). In 1860, Holovac'kyj published a curious Russian reader titled *Russisches Lesebuch. Poetischer Teil* in Vienna (Holovac'kyj 1860). The book featured Russian poems in which Holovac'kyj indicated stresses as an aid to learning the language, adding variants of phonetic transcription as well as translations into German.

Julijan Vysloboc'kyj (1819–1871) and Bohdan Didyc'kyj (1827–1908) had not actively participated in the Galician-Ruthenian awakening before the revolution of 1848/49. However, Ivan Holovac'kyj, who was born in 1814, had already attracted attention with his publication of two remarkable almanacs (Vinok 1846, Vinok 1847) at the Mechitarists' printshop in Vienna. At this time, Holovac'kyj was still an ardent supporter of the Galician-Ruthenian awakening based on the vernacular. This is particularly apparent from the first almanac, while the second already hints at Holovac'kyj's later conversion to a Russophile attitude (a small but significant indication of this is the orthographically conservative use of *ѣ* in the title of the second almanac). Ivan's brother Jakiv, who had collaborated on both almanacs, became the world's first professor of Ruthenian language and literature when he obtained an appointment at the University of Lviv in 1849. He also became a committed Russophile in the early 1850s, apparently a little later than Ivan, and emigrated to Vilna in the Russian Empire in the mid-1860s (cf. Moser 2002a, Moser 2011: 602–626).

In its first year of publication, the Vienna *Вѣстникъ* bore the subtitle "Journal devoted to the political and moral education of the Ruthenians of the Austrian state" ("Повременное письмо посвященно политическому и нравственному образованию Русиновъ Австрійской державы"). Among other things, the newspaper functioned as an "official publication," as noted in the *Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies* (Encyklopedija 1993–2003/1: s.v. *Vistnyk*) and as the history of its beginnings makes apparent. As the bibliographer Levyc'kyj (1888: 51) points out, the initiative for its establishment goes back to the Czech Anton Beck, who considered it important that Austrian government newspapers be published in all the Slavic languages of the empire.

Not only articles but also laws in Ruthenian translation, as well as other public documents such as pastoral letters of Greek Catholic bishops, appeared regularly on the front page of the *Вѣстникъ*, which was later divided into official and unofficial sections. Some articles from the editorial office, especially those by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, concern topics such as a coincidental encounter with the emperor (see below) and general affairs of state. Their tone is markedly patriotic. Moreover, the

initial selection of the newspaper's production site reveals its ties with the Austrian administration. In the first issue, the editors disclose that *Вѣстникъ* was originally to have been printed not at the Vienna Mechitarists' printshop but by the Vienna State Printing Office ("Wiener Staatsdruckerei"). That was rendered impossible by the latter's "official tasks"—probably a reference to the extremely time-consuming production of the *Allgemeines Reichs- Gesetz- und Regierungs-Blatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich*, which was published in all recognized national languages of the monarchy (Moser 2002) (see section 4.1. below for the full text of this message).

The newspaper was not only funded but also controlled by the Austrian government. Soon after the editorial office undertook its duties, it was reprimanded by the ministry of internal affairs, partly for technical difficulties—the "paper was not ready by the appointed time"—and a letter of 26 June 1850 from the ministry to the editorial office added unambiguously that no further excuses for delayed publication would be accepted.¹ Other points of criticism, ultimately deemed more important, were apparent from the orders given in the letter. It included a severe reprimand to Ivan Holovac'kyj, noting "a number of failings...whose elimination is imperative...if the paper is to prosper and fulfill its purpose." The sole authority for writing lead articles was then assigned to Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, and "nothing [was to] appear in the paper without his approval." "All correspondence intended for the paper" was to be handed over to the ministry and—this aspect is of particular interest for our purposes—"examined there with regard to linguistic purity and tendency." What was considered "inappropriate to the paper's purpose" would be "removed," and what was "fit for inclusion" would be sent back (all citations from the official letter in Voznjak 1912: 78–79).

The assumption of control over the editorial office of the *Вѣстникъ* by the ministry of internal affairs and the de facto disempowerment of Ivan Holovac'kyj were carried out in a manner and a tone conveying unambiguous disapproval of the state of affairs at the *Вѣстникъ* on the part of authorities hostile to Russophilism, who were inclined to demand a radical change of course. Their attitude may well have been justified by some of the paper's contents. Although no conspicuously Russia-friendly attitude was apparent, shortly before 26 June 1850 the paper published an anti-Polish article in which the loyalty of the Ruthenians—the "Tyroleans of the North," as they were called there (the common expression was "Tyroleans of the East")—was contrasted with the fundamentally incendiary nature of the Poles, which had allegedly been manifested on many occasions.² This would soon become a frequent trope in the Polish-Ruthenian confrontation.

1 Similar complaints had already been made earlier by patrons of the newspaper: its initiator, Anton Beck, who was also a member of the editorial office, had done so in mid-April 1850 (Voznjak 1912: 74).

2 Issue 50 of 8/20 June 1850: "[...] Отъ непримирительного, жадными попу́щеніями не позыскаемого польского сторонництва Рѣсины еще са невдачности не научили. Все що са имъ дае, приймають якъ добродѣйство и не забываютъ. Мы правда не можемъ важности достойно оцѣнити всѣхъ тихъ взглядовъ, котри до рѣшенія рѣсского вопроса причинитиса могутъ, но то, що сьмо тѣтъ притолили, повинно бы теперь, где о бѣдѣ тихъ Тироличковъ сѣвера рѣчь ходить, заслужити такожъ на мѣстце въ перевѣсъ" (Vistnyk 1850: 197–198).

Another cause of official displeasure was the more frequent publication of the “Всячина” (Miscellaneous) section in the civil script (Graždanka) than in the old ornate Cyrillic lettering (cf. also Moser 2005: 151–153).

To quote the letter:

In the historical parts and the features alike, Cyrillic letters must be used throughout, and the Russian script must be completely abandoned. No changes are to be made in the ornamental type of the headlines (cited in Voznjak 1912: 78–79).³

The reference to the civil script as “Russian script,” which would recur in the context of the so-called “Second Alphabet War” of 1859 (see Moser 2011: 474–478), finally makes the object of the ministry’s concern unambiguously clear. The same applies to the official term “linguistic purity,” a criterion with which ministries of internal affairs normally grapple only if a language problem entails political implications considered potentially dangerous to the state. What “linguistic purity” might have concerned the ministry in the given context, particularly a ministry led by a Polish Galician, Count Agenor Gołuchowski?

In the course of the nineteenth century, both Austrian authorities and representatives of Galician Poles often reproached Galician Ruthenians for their alleged Russophilism⁴ simply because they used the “civil script.” In fact, however, this feature was quite misleading. For example, *Русалка Дністровая*, which had nothing to do with Russophilism, was printed in an adapted civil script for the simple practical reason that the traditional civil script, beautiful as it may have been, featured numerous graphemes that had become superfluous. In the *Вѣстникъ* itself, the comparatively few parts that were printed in civil script were not fundamentally less vernacular or more Russian-oriented than those that remained in ornate Cyrillic. Nevertheless, the Austrian authorities generally regarded the use of the civil script among Ruthenians with suspicion, seeing it as an indication of rapprochement with Russia. By contrast, the use of an adapted civil script by the Austrian Serbs was considered unproblematic, since it had become unequivocally clear that Modern Standard Serbian would bear no close resemblance to Russian.

Was the diagnosis made by the ministry of internal affairs accurate nevertheless?⁵ Was the language used in the *Вѣстникъ* based on Russophilism?

3 “In dem ganzen Satze sowohl geschichtlicher Theile, als Feuilleton ist sich durchaus nur der cirillischen Lettern zu bedienen und es hat die russische Schrift gänzlich wegzubleiben. In den Titel-Zierschriften ist keine Änderung vorzunehmen” (cited after Voznjak 1912: 78–79).

4 On Russophilism in Galicia, see Studyns'kyj 1905 as well as Wendland 2001 (and, additionally, Moser 2004b).

5 There had already been internal reprimands as well, such as a letter of 3 May 1850 from Julijan Vysloboc'kyj to Ivan Holovac'kyj that addresses (apart from issues regarding the civil script raised by Count Agenor Gołuchowski) an orthographic problem—the rendering of [g]—which has lost nothing of its actuality today: “Honorable editors...I earnestly entreat that you order the use of r [instead of] r for the Latin and German sound (g). The new type has this letter, and it will greatly contribute to the easier pronunciation of foreign words” [“Всечестный Редакторы [sic]! [...] Прошу конечно, з, л за нѣмецкїи и латиньскїи звукъ (g) оупотребляти казати. Въ новыхъ черенкахъ есть

How were questions of language choice discussed in the newspaper, especially in its first months of publication? How did the stated purpose of the paper, which was conceived for the "Ruthenians of the Austrian state" and not only for the Galician Ruthenians, affect its language? And, finally, what images of Ruthenian identity were introduced into the discussion of language?

These questions are the subject of the present article, which is based mainly on a review of the content of the *Вѣстникъ* from its first issue, published in Vienna on 7/19 February 1850, to issue 60 of 1/13 July 1850 (pp. 1–240), that is, until shortly after the reprimand issued by the ministry of internal affairs. Some questions concerning the linguistic world of the *Вѣстникъ* were addressed long ago by Kyrylo Studyns'kyj (1905). In contrast to his contribution, mine will focus not on arguments expressed in letters to the editor by Galicians who took sides in the subsequent discussions on language but, firstly, on the actual linguistic shaping of the *Вѣстникъ* and, secondly, on the arguments of those contributors who opposed a vernacular-based Ruthenian written language. Bukovynian concerns will not be treated here because they were hardly raised in the *Вѣстникъ* and, indeed, even less by the Bukovynians themselves.⁶

With regard to the founding of *Русь*, conceived as an anti-Russophile newspaper, which began publication in Lviv in 1867 at the initiative of Count Agenor Gołuchowski (Encyklopedija 1993–2003/7: s.v. *Rus'*), Kost' Levyc'kyj writes that the earlier discontinuation of the *Вѣстникъ* in connection with the appearance of the new paper signaled the "beginning of the end of 'Austrian Ruthenianism' as well as Austrian benevolence toward us" (Levyc'kyj 1926: 102).⁷ What needs to be added is that 1867 was also the year of the Austro-Hungarian compromise (*Ausgleich*), which resulted in a much greater (and not only administrative) separation of Transcarpathian and Galician Ruthenians, and that Galicia gained its de facto autonomy in the same year. From this point on, there seemed to be little point in producing a newspaper for all Austrian Ruthenians.

Ivan Žeguc (1965: 51–52) asserts that the *Вѣстникъ*, which had already managed to acquire some 1,500 subscribers by mid-April 1850 (according to Vistnyk, no. 49, 6/18 April 1850), was of "decisive importance to the Ruthenian awakening in Hungary." Given its intended purpose, the Vienna *Вѣстникъ* might perhaps have come to play a role as important as the one ascribed to it here. Indeed, immediately after 1848/49, when the political and administrative fusion of Eastern Galicia (which included Bukovyna until 1849) with the Kingdom of Hungary, which had been demanded on various occasions, did not come about, the most important institutionally regulated linguistic and cultural contacts between Galician and Transcarpathian Ruthenians were generally arranged by detour via the Viennese center, with the Galician Ruthenians always enjoying superior status.

тая буква и причинить ся много до латвійшюи вымовы чужихъ слѣвъ"] (Voznjak 1912: 78).

6 The Ruthenian awakening in Bukovyna began even later than in Transcarpathia but soon proceeded with greater success, essentially keeping pace with developments in Galicia (for a more detailed account, see Dobrzans'kyj 1999).

7 "[...] початок кінця «австрійського рутенізму» [австрійської ласкавости супроти нас] [...]."

The same applies to Ruthenian translations of the *Allgemeines Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatte für die slawischen Sprachen Oesterreichs* and the *Deutsch-ruthenische Separatausgabe* of the *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen*.

But did the *Вѣстникъ* truly contribute to the formation of an “Austro-Ruthenian” linguistic and national identity? And, taking linguistic aspects into consideration first and foremost, what kind of Ruthenian “awakening” did contributors to the newspaper support and Transcarpathian Ruthenians particularly speak up for?

2. First programmatic thoughts on linguistic convergence

The notion that the Vienna *Вѣстникъ* should satisfy not only the needs (including the linguistic needs) of the Galician Ruthenians but also those of the Transcarpathian Ruthenians was raised in the very first issue of the newspaper, to wit, in a letter to the editor written from a Galician perspective.⁸ Perhaps, as Kyrylo Studyns'kyj (1905: XXII)⁹ assumed, the following contribution was in fact forged by Ivan Holovac'kyj, who insistently introduced the Transcarpathian perspective into the language discussion conducted in the newspaper. The letter reads as follows:

Долина. Если Вѣстникъ рѣскій дла того переселился до Вѣднѣ, дабы намъ скорше и важнѣйшихъ вѣстей доносилъ, мило пріймаемъ сію вѣсть. Найбарзѣй насъ обѣщаніемъ симъ оутѣшаетъ, что запорученнѣ равноправность народностей заступати неомешкаетъ, бо мыслимо, же допѣро тогда правъ и справедливости панованье забезпечити можна. Тѣшитъ насъ, же разомъ съ оугорскими братьями до того дѣла беретеса, и съ ихъ сторонѣ вѣсти намъ оудѣлати гадаете, звацца теперь по наданомъ и повсюдѣ оголошеномъ свободномъ оуставѣ. – При томъ было бы нашимъ желаніемъ, дабы мова наша чемъ разъ большой оглады набирала, такъ дабы всѣ нарѣчія рѣскіи, то есть: галицке, оугорске и бѣковинске на взгладѣ были. Дла того сѣжѣ, дабы мѣсто бѣти; быти, мѣсто що; что, якъ оугорскіи Рѣсины мовалятъ, писати. Но сіе все заставаемъ вашемѣ розсѣжденію (Vistnyk 1850: 3–4).

Dolyna. If the Ruthenian *Vistnyk* moved to Vienna in order to report to us more promptly and convey more important news, we gladly welcome these tidings. What makes us happiest about this promise is that it does not hesitate to support the equal rights granted to the nationalities, for we think that only then can the rule of rights and justice be guaranteed. We are glad that you are embarking on this endeavor together with the Hungarian brethren and intend to provide us with news from their lands, especially now that the free constitution has been granted and proclaimed everywhere.—In this regard, we would wish that our language acquire ever-increasing refinement, so that all the Ruthenian dialects, that is, the Galician, Hungarian, and Bukovynian, would be taken into consideration. I therefore consider that instead of *бѣти*, one should write *быти*;

8 Dolyna is a small town near Ivano-Frankivsk (Stanyslaviv).

9 Transcarpathian concerns and the positive reception of the newspaper in Transcarpathia became regular subjects of discussion: see also no. 9, 25 February/9 March 1850 (Vistnyk 1850: 34). The editorial in no. 10, 28 February/12 March 1850, reports an increase of 450 subscribers from the Kingdom of Hungary, etc.

instead of *що*, [one should write] *что*, as the Hungarian Ruthenians say. But we leave this to your consideration.

What the author interprets as “ever-increasing refinement” is thus, in his understanding, above all an increasing leveling of the Ruthenian dialects. Interestingly enough, he considers the “Galician, Hungarian, and Bukovynian” dialects to be “all the Ruthenian dialects,” making it appear at first glance that the author envisaged Ruthenianness as such from a purely “Austro-Ruthenian perspective.” This limitation is quite surprising, given that the Supreme Ruthenian Council (Holovna rada Rus'ka) had spoken of fifteen million Ruthenians in its address of 15 May 1848 to the Ruthenian people (Zorja Halyc'ka 1848: 1) and had cited population figures indicating that the Galicians were already thinking in terms of an all-Ukrainian perspective extending beyond their region and beyond the Austrian state, although the first draft, in a still regionally limited sense, had mentioned only 2.5 million, referring exclusively to the Austrian Ruthenians (Hrycak 1996: 52; see pp. 171–173 in this volume).

The overt ideological orientation of this letter, whether actual or forged, was wholly in keeping with the patriotic profile of the paper, so it is not surprising that the editorial office of the *Вѣстникъ*—perhaps in the person of Ivan Holovac'kyj himself, possibly reacting to his own contribution—emphatically approved it for publication:

Редакція Вѣстника дуже хорошо честному г. дописователю за его внимательни замѣчання; стараніємъ ей буде, желанію родимцівъ, въ которыхъ имени г. дописователь выражается, по возможности силъ и обстоательствъ оудоволити, и ихже оупованія достойною статиса. Надѣмса, що г. дописователь и надалъ вспирати насъ буде своими дуже практическими оувагами (Vistnyk 1850: 3–4).

The editors of *Vistnyk* warmly thank the honorable contributor for his attentive remarks; they will endeavor to satisfy, insofar as our powers and circumstances allow, the wishes of our countrymen in whose name the honorable contributor expresses himself, and to prove worthy of their trust. We hope that the honorable contributor will further support us with his very practical remarks.

If the editors had indeed gone on to write *быти* instead of *бѣти* or to edit other articles in that fashion, this could have been interpreted as a concession to the Transcarpathian Ruthenians, as the rejected forms *бути*, *були*, *бували*, etc. were not widespread in the Transcarpathian dialects of Ukrainian. Even now, they are uncommon in southwestern Ukrainian dialects, and the same holds true north of the Carpathian Mountains. But the editors do not even raise the issue of leveling dialects in a manner that would satisfy the Transcarpathian Ruthenians, whose numbers were much smaller than those of the Galicians.

The contributor's second suggestion provides an insight into the rationale of the editors' response. His surprising contention that “instead of *що*, [one should write] *что*, as the Hungarian Ruthenians say” flies in the face of actual usage in that

region: no nineteenth-century Transcarpathian Ruthenian would have uttered [čto] in his authentic dialect, even though the form [što], along with [ščo] and [šo], is indeed common among the Transcarpathians. It is quite true, however, that *что* was *written* by linguistically conservative authors in Transcarpathia as well as in Galicia, contrary to vernacular usage. Thus the author of the letter is not actually concerned with intra-Ruthenian dialectal leveling but with something fundamentally different—either with the preservation of Church Slavonic orthographic traditions or with an attempt to establish linguistic forms extending far beyond the Ruthenian or Ukrainian language area and, most importantly, bringing the Ruthenian written language closer to the Modern Standard Russian of those days.

Incidentally, the language of Ivan Holovac'kyj's response, in which, surprisingly, one encounters *що*,¹⁰ as in most of the other contributions by Galician authors, is quite compatible with this tendency to approximate Russian forms. An exception to that tendency, however, appears in conservative forms of orthography, such as *хорошо* in the compound with Ruthenian *дакже*, as well as the stems in *внимательни замѣчанія, по возможности [...] обстоятельство, оунованія or практическими*, which were arguably less influenced by Church Slavonic than by Russian.

The *Вѣстникъ* and its milieu were thus engaged in a discussion on language from the very first issue. The encounter of Galician and Transcarpathian authors played a formative role in this debate. Indeed, the contributions of Transcarpathian authors—Oleksandr Duxnovyč, Mykola Nod' (Nagy), Ivan Rakovs'kyj, and Mykola Myhalyč¹¹ are known by name—invariably stood out because their language was particularly conservative or showed a constant tendency to approximate Russian. Galician contributions were usually closer to the vernacular, as evidenced not only by the editorial office, which was controlled by the ministry of internal affairs, and particularly by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, who was favored by the ministry, but also by letters to the editor from Galicia.

3. Masthead

A glance at the front page of the first Vienna issue of the *Вѣстникъ* shows immediately that the civil script and traditional ornate Cyrillic occur side by side.¹² The masthead is in the civil script, but the full original title, “Вѣстникъ. Повременное письмо посвященно политическому и нравственному образованію Русиновъ Австрійскои державы. Рочникъ 1850,” shows that the

10 Even in publications whose language was especially close to Russian, forms such as *що*, *як*, or the unstressed infinitive ending *-ти* were also retained in subsequent years (on this, see also Moser 2002a).

11 For the sake of consistency, all personal names are ukrainized in this article, even those of authors whose names could just as well be rusynized from a different point of view.

12 When *y* and *я* are used instead of not *ŷ* and *а*, the text appears in the civil script. In the *Вѣстникъ*, headlines are often printed in the civil script, while the text proper appears in ornate Cyrillic. For the staff of the Warsaw National Library, which supplied the microfilm in the collections of the Austrian National Library, the typeface was clearly decisive, prompting them to describe the text in one instance as “w języku starocerkiwnosłowiańskim.” The retarding influence of ornate Cyrillic is clearly overemphasized in numerous linguistic studies by Ukrainianists (on this, see Moser 2007).

language of the newspaper was oriented neither on the vernacular nor on the Russian linguistic model. Only the stem of *Рочникъ*, in which, however, the reflex of *o* in the newly closed syllable remains unmarked (just as in *Русиновъ*), shows traces of the vernacular. Moreover, the genitive singular feminine adjectival ending *-[oji]* in *Австрійскоу* (Russian *-ой*, Church Slavonic *-ія*) indicates a certain distance from Russian and Church Slavonic.¹³ Many other forms are also clearly non-vernacular: *Повременное* (*письмо*, cf. the corresponding *Письмо часове* in the *Зора Галицка*, which clearly ties in with the vernacular)¹⁴ and *нравственному*, with both forms clearly marked as Church Slavonic by the metathesis of liquid consonants, while the second form displays a Church Slavonic structure of word formation; *посвященно* with the Church Slavonic reflex *щ* of **tj* and the genuinely Late Church Slavonic spelling *-нн-*; *политическому* with the Church Slavonic form of the suffix after the sibilant; *образованію*, with a Church Slavonic lexical stem and the Church Slavonic-based spelling of *i* instead of *Ø* in the position of former weak *ь* before *j*.

By 1850, the Galician Ruthenians had already made great strides in the development of a new vernacular-based Ruthenian written language, and in a great many cases, vernacular-based alternatives to Church Slavonic or Russian forms appearing in the *Вѣстникъ* were already in use. Not only had Ivan Holovac'kyj published the *Vinok* almanacs in 1846–47, but the early volumes of the newspaper *Зора Галицка*¹⁵ and the *Вѣстникъ*'s predecessor, *Галичо-Рѣскій Вѣстникъ*, had already shown that despite the inconsistencies generally unavoidable in this process, it was possible to develop a full-fledged, polyfunctional written language on the basis of the vernacular.

The accomplishments of the Transcarpathian Ruthenians were much more modest at that point. Oleksandr Duxnovyč's efforts were limited to the use of the vernacular in classical low-style spheres, as in his comedy *Добродѣтель превышаетъ богатство* (Virtue Is More Important Than Riches). Even his first important publication, the primer *Книжица читалнаа для начинающихъ* (Reader for Beginners) of 1847, was by no means written exclusively in vernacular-based Ruthenian, as is often claimed (see Moser 2011: 627–640). Duxnovyč was thus neither a Ukrainian nor a Rusyn awakener but a quite consistent nineteenth-century Russophile. For all writings not expressly addressed to simpletons, he recommended from the outset that the author distance himself as much as possible from the vernacular, as he himself did.

To be sure, opponents of the Russophiles must have realized that the subtitle of the *Вѣстникъ* was not vernacular-based. In all likelihood, this was one of the reasons why the subtitle was simply removed from the masthead in the course of 1850 (not as late as 1852, as stated in Žovtobryjux 1963: 142). The newspaper was henceforth titled *Вѣстникъ, для русиновъ австрійскоу державы*, so that no Church Slavonic or Russian

13 As a rule, *[j]* is written as *ѣ*, which is why I interpret the ending *-ѣу* as a notation of *-[oji]*, not of *-[oj]*.

14 Both forms are loan translations of German *Zeitschrift*, as are Modern Standard Ukrainian *часопис* or Polish *czasopismo*.

15 This newspaper also turned Russophile some years later, and the editors were reprimanded about that tendency by the censors as early as 1852 (Studyns'kyj 1905: CXXVIII).

expression remained in the masthead. Beginning in 1857, the newspaper featured the subtitle “часопись политическая,” which was finally changed to “часопись урядова” in the years 1858–64 as well as 1866, while in between, in 1865, the subtitle read “часопись урядова политична и литературна” (Žovtobryxh 1963: 142). Thus there was a gradual approximation of forms well known from Modern Standard Ukrainian. Aside from word order, only soft-stem *часопись* deviates from Modern Standard Ukrainian (*часопис*); it should be noted in this connection that soft-stem *-пись* forms were widely used well into the 1930s.

Particulars about the newspaper were printed on the front page from the very first issue: on the left, “Выходитъ що тыждня во вторникъ, четвергъ и суботу. Предплату приймають всѣ ц. к. почтовіи уряды” (“Published weekly on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. Subscription accepted at all Imperial and Royal Post Offices”); on the right, “Цѣна предплаты съ почтовою посылкою чвертьрочне: 1 р. 15 к., полрочне: 2 ” 30 ”, цѣлорочне: 5 ” серебромъ” (“Quarterly subscription price by mail: 1 gulden 15 kreutzers, semi-annual: 2.30, annual: 5 silver guildens”). These particulars stand out linguistically from the title and subtitle, as they contain no noteworthy conservatism, apart from the name of the weekday *вторникъ* (already used in the *Галичо-Рѣскій Вѣстникъ*—but cf. *второкъ* and *въ второкъ* in *Зора Галицка*; see the bibliography). Metathesis, as in the prefix of *предплата*, is based neither on Church Slavonic nor on Russian, which uses the prefix *пред-* as a loan element from both Church Slavonic and Polish. The morpheme *пред-* is widespread in southwestern Ukrainian dialects, where it is usually either a genuine Polonism (in Galician Ukrainian) or a Slovakism (in Transcarpathian Ukrainian). In the *Галичо-Рѣскій Вѣстникъ*, *предплата* occurs along with *передплата*.¹⁶ One now encounters such markedly Ruthenian forms as *що, тыждня* (where the *ѣ* is correct according to the rules of etymological orthography, cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *тижня*), *приймають* (with the hard ending), *уряды, чверть-, -рочне* (but not *-рѣчне*, with the adverbial ending *-е*, which must be considered a Polonism), and *серебромъ* with pleophony. The nominative plural adjectival ending occurs in the non-truncated form *-иу*, which is authentic in some Galician Ukrainian dialects. Here, however, the adjective is equivalent to a masculine noun in the nominative plural, as could be the case even in Church Slavonic texts; hence *-иу* is not marked in this instance as gender-neutral (which would make the form non-Church Slavonic). The Church Slavonic motto of the newspaper, which coincides with Russian, is centered below the masthead and printed in ornate Cyrillic: “Соединенными силами” (“Viribus unitis,” the motto of Emperor Franz Joseph I). In “Ч. 22, Вѣдень, вторникъ 7/19. Лютого 1850 года” (“No. 22, Vienna, Tuesday, 7/19 February 1850”), one again encounters the non-vernacular *вторникъ*. Non-vernacular *года* (genitive singular) also appears instead of the previously used *-рочне*. The occurrence of vernacular-based *Лютого* (genitive singular, notably with *-ого*, not *-аго*, as in Church Slavonic

16 “Выходитъ тричи на тыждень, въ Вторникъ, Четверъ и Суботѣ. Передплата стоить въ Львовѣ цѣлорочне 8 рен. сер. – полрочне 4 рен. – чвертьрочне 2 рен. серебромъ [...] приймає са такожъ мѣсачнаа предплата по 40 кр. сер. [...]” (Halyčo-rus’kyj Vistnyk 1849: 1, ч. 1, Львовѣ, дна 2/14 липца 1849).”

or in the standard Russian of the period) and Ruthenian *Вѣдень*, not Russian *Вѣна*, indicates that even within the mastheads, the distribution of vernacular and non-vernacular elements is random.

With regard to the non-vernacular features, it is important to note that in our particular case, almost all of them, especially on the lexical level, are typical not only of Church Slavonic but also of Russian. Because of the prominent Church Slavonic component in literary Russian, many Russian elements were supported by genuinely Ruthenian Church Slavonic traditions. This was one of the major reasons why just at this time, in the wake of the Revolution of 1848/49, many Ruthenians who would have liked to establish Church Slavonic as their standard language increasingly began to regard Russian as a kind of modernized Church Slavonic and embrace the notion that they should adopt Russian as their literary language for the long term.

At the end of the first single issue of the *Вѣстникъ*, we read the following: “Редакторъ Иванъ Ѳ. Головацкій. Печатано въ типографіи ОО. Мехитаристовъ” (“Editor Ivan F. Holovackij. Printed in the printshop of the Mechitarist Fathers”). No vernacular form appears here. The form “печатано,” supported by Russian and Church Slavonic, was not adopted in Modern Standard Ukrainian. No derivation of genuinely German *druck-* is used, although such forms had been common in Ruthenian since the early modern period.¹⁷ As for the conservative *типографія*, its spelling is obviously not Church Slavonic but Russian. Most importantly, it should be pointed out that Ivan Holovac'kyj hinted at his patronymic by using its initial, as opposed to the later editor in chief Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, who always signed his name “Василь Зборовскій.” There was no tradition of using patronymics among Ukrainians who had not adopted them in the Russian imperial context; among nineteenth-century Austrian and Hungarian Ruthenians, only Russophile circles used them. It is indeed symbolic that Ivan Holovac'kyj only abbreviated his patronymic here and did not write it out in full. He was just as oblique in expressing his Russophile linguistic convictions in the *Вѣстникъ*. There is little doubt that had there been no Austrian censors, Holovac'kyj and others would often have often been much more direct.

4. Contributions by members of the editorial office

4.1. First editorials

The language of the first contributions to the newspaper is as mixed as that of the masthead. The first contribution, printed in the civil script, reads as follows:

Сегодня розпочинає „Вѣстникъ для Русиновъ австрійскої державы“ во Вѣдні издаваемый первое свое четвертьрочь, и займе мѣстце Галичо-русского Вѣстника во Львовѣ выходившего. Желаячи якъ найобширнѣйшого розпространѣнія сеї часописи и уповаючи въ благосклонность почтенныхъ краєновъ, дабы всечестніи родимці, желаючи безперерывно

17 In the *Зоря Галицка*, the Greek and Church Slavonic noun *Тѣломъ*... in the traditional spelling was used instead of the verb.

получати сію часопись, изволили якъ найскорѣй присылати надлежащую предплату, понеже по уплывѣ сего мѣсяца буде лишь только экземпляровъ печататися, сколько замовлено.

Для тихъ честн. и всечестн. господиновъ, котори уже на Вѣстникъ Галицкій во Львовѣ предплатили, дозволяемъ яко основательнымъ нашимъ читателямъ тую значительную пользу – же кто тамъ отъ 1. Сѣчня предплатилъ на полъ року, получити буде, мимо уже минувшого на тотъ рахунокъ мѣсяця, нашъ Вѣстникъ отъ нынѣ черезъ цѣлый рокъ безъ всякої дальшої доплаты, а кто на чвертьроку тамже предплатилъ, пользуется тою користею черезъ полъ року.

На конецъ чинимо извинительну увагу, що Вѣстникъ не мѡгъ быти печатаный въ ц. к. статской типографіи для того, же она власне теперъ множество урядовыхъ дѣлъ совершати мае, що такожъ причиною было, же сѣмо съ розпочатьемъ Вѣстника о колька дней спознилися. – Редакція Вѣстника (Vistnyk 1850: 1).

Today the *Herald for the Ruthenians of the Austrian State*, which is published in Vienna, begins its first calendar quarter and takes the place of the *Galician-Ruthenian Herald*, which came out in Lviv. Desiring the broadest possible distribution of this newspaper, and hoping for the good will of our honored fellow countrymen, we ask that all our most honored fellow countrymen who wish to receive this newspaper on a regular basis be so kind as to send their due subscription as soon as possible, for after the elapse of this month only as many copies as ordered will be printed.

To those honorable and highly honorable gentlemen who have already subscribed to the *Galician Herald* in Lviv and who are our core readers, we offer the following significant bonus: those who have prepaid for half a year, beginning on 1 January, will receive our *Herald* for half a year, starting now, with no additional payment, although a month of that subscription has now elapsed; those who have prepaid for a quarter of a year will receive this bonus for half a year.

Finally, we offer our apologies that the *Herald* could not be printed at the shop of the Imperial and Royal State Printer because it must complete a multitude of official tasks just now. This is also the reason why we were several days late in launching the *Herald*. The editors of the *Herald*.

The language of this editorial statement is typical of many contributions to early issues of the *Вѣстникъ* and is therefore worth discussing in detail.

In the sphere of orthography and phonology, one notes the following: The reflex of closed *o* sounds in newly opened syllables is almost never marked, cf. only one instance of *мѡгъ* alongside numerous instances of *o* alone, as in *Русиновъ, чвертьрочье, екземпляровъ, только, сколько*. According to Ruthenian rules rather than Church Slavonic or Russian ones, we find *o* and not *e* after sibilants, as in *Галичо-руского, выходившого, найобширнѣйшого, минувшого, дальшой*. The non-Church Slavonic reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis is noted, as in *розпочинае, розпространенія, розпочатьемъ*, while Church Slavonic *раз*, which is also the most common form in Russian, occurs in many other articles. The Church Slavonic reflex of word-medial metathesis occurs in the root of slightly

Ruthenianized Russian *розпространенія*, as well as in the forms *благосклонность* and *безпрерывно*, all supported by Russian equivalents (*распространение/разпространение, благосклонность, непрерывно/беспрерывно*).¹⁸ The non-Russian and non-Church Slavonic adverb *власне*, with the genuinely Czech metathesis—the form was adopted via Polish—stands in contrast to genuinely Ukrainian pleophonic *черезь*, which is supported by Russian. The alveolar affricate appears to be soft, as in *мѣсяця* or *родимцѣ*, but hard elsewhere, as in *мѣсяца*, with hard *c* before *a* or *на концеѣ*. Forms with hard *c* are authentic in certain positions in many southwestern Ukrainian dialects, but, given the co-occurrence of *мѣсяца* and *мѣсяця*, it seems likely that the spellings suggesting hard *c* did not emerge independently of the Russian model (Russian *c* is always hard). The vocalization of *ь* in the prefix according to the tradition of the Second South Slavic influence can be found in *совершати*, which also appears in this form in Modern Standard Russian (*совершать*). The preposition in *во Вѣдні* seems at first glance to be an explicit conservatism, but the practices of the little-known Galician Ukrainian panegyrics of the first half of the nineteenth century suggest that such written forms were often used merely to express—in conservative, allegedly “grammatically correct” fashion—the genuinely Ukrainian syllabic character of the preposition in this position (see Ukrainian *у Відні*). In *во Львовѣ*, the vocalization of *ь* in the prefix is of course based on regular sound change, cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian (*у*)*ві Львові* alongside *у Львові*. In *розпространенія, сїю*, Church Slavonic *i* is written in the position of weak *ь* before *j*, while the reflection of the vernacular reflex *Ø* can be found in some marked Ukrainian stems (*чвертьрочье* and *розпочатьемъ*). The present active participle *надлежащую* has the Church Slavonic suffix *-щ-* < **tj*, as in Russian, while the adverbial participles have genuinely East Slavic *-чи*, see *желаючи* and *уповаючи* (no markedly Russian adverbial participles of the *желая* type are used). Passive preterite participles are sometimes spelled with *-нн-* according to late Church Slavonic traditions (*почтенныхъ*), and sometimes with *-н-* (*печатанный*)—the distribution does not follow the rules of Russian.

Regarding substantival morphology, the vernacular genitive and locative ending *-[u]*, as in *на полъ року* and *на чвертьроку*, as well as the de facto phonetic rendering of the ending with Ukrainian *-ѣ* for *-[i]* in the nominative plural *родимцѣ*, are worth noting. In *дней*, the genitive plural ends in *-ей*, which is not a Russianism but is thoroughly supported by Galician traditions and some southwestern Ukrainian dialects (see Modern Standard Ukrainian *днів*). As for the instrumental singular form *розпочатьемъ* and the dative form *читателямъ*, they deserve attention because in some other publications of the period one may encounter written forms of the type *розпочатьёмъ/розпочатьомъ* (instrumental singular), or *читателёмъ/читательомъ* (instrumental singular or dative plural), as widely used in southwestern Ukrainian dialects. The instrumental form *користею* is therefore quite a surprise, as one would rather have expected Russian and Common Ukrainian *користью* or Church Slavonic *користію*, but not the reflection of a markedly dialectal ending (*-еју/-еѹ*); the latter

18 The metathesis in *предплату* and *предплатилъ* also recurs (see above).

ending is spelled as *-еѣ* in *Русалка Днѣстровая* and as *-евъ* in many other Galician publications of the period.

Regarding adjectival morphology, one notes first of all that mostly Ruthenian *-ого* occurs in the genitive singular masculine, not *-аго* as in Church Slavonic and pre-revolutionary standard Russian (cf. *Галичо-руського, виходившого, найобширнѣйшого*, etc.). The genitive singular feminine ends in ruthenianizing *-ои* [-oji], as in the masthead (*австрійської, сеи, всякої, дальшої*). The nominative/accusative plural ends in *-иі*, as in *всечестніі родимціѣ*; in other articles, this ending is to be encountered in feminine and neuter substantives, which means that it is gender-neutral. Long forms of adjectives are prevalent, but truncated forms sometimes occur, as in *извинительну увагу* or *котори*. The pronoun *тотъ* is here reduplicated, but this is not necessarily a Russianism, as reduplicated forms are widespread (instead of Modern Standard Ukrainian *той*) in southwestern Ukrainian dialects. Following a marked Ruthenian tradition, we find forms of the type *тихъ*, not *тѣхъ*, in the oblique case; the long form *тую*, which is not used in Church Slavonic or Russian, also occurs.

Regarding verbal morphology, the following features are noteworthy: In contrast to Russian, the third person singular present tense of verbs with the present theme vowel *e* never ends in *-тъ*, cf. *розпочинає, займе, буде, має*. The same applies if the verb form is followed by a reflexive particle, even in the lexically Church Slavonic form *пользуєся*. First person plural present tense ends either in neutral *-мъ* in *дозволяємъ* (the ending *-т* is quite common in many Ukrainian dialects) or in markedly Ukrainian *-мо*, as in *чинимо*. The reflexive particle *ся*, which has never ceased to be movable in western Ukrainian dialects, functions largely as a postfix in this article, as well as in most other contributions. The shortened form of the postfix *-сь* never occurs. The editorial message features several marked western Ukrainian preterital forms with personal endings, as in *же сьмо о колька дней спозналися*. The infinitive always ends in *-ти*, a difference from Russian that was later often retained even by the most radical Russophiles (cf. Studyns'kyj 1905: 130). A category not preserved in any Ukrainian vernacular variants is the present passive participle, such as *издаваемый*, which is also marked as non-vernacular by the Church Slavonic prefix (such participles are not vernacular-based in Russian either, but they are part of literary Russian). The other participles—with the exception of preterite passive participles—are also not rooted in the vernacular, but the present active participles at least have a morphosyntactic analogue not only in Russian and Church Slavonic but also in Polish (the *znający* type) and were therefore probably more familiar to Galicians than present passive or preterite active participles, which are not used in Polish either.

In the syntactic sphere, temporal *черезъ* + accusative in *черезъ цѣлый рокъ* “all year long” and *черезъ полъ року* “half a year long” (cf. Polish *przez* with the same meaning), not “after a year” and “after half a year,” as in Russian, is noteworthy. The use of the long form of the preterite passive participle in the predicate, as in *не мѡгъ быти печатаный*, is impossible in Russian, as is *о* + accusative in *о колька дней спозналися*. The construction *якъ* + adjective or attribute in the superlative

with the meaning “as possible” is marked by the vernacular, supported by Polish, and different from Russian, cf. *якъ найскорѣй* “as soon as possible” and *якъ найобширнѣйшого розпространенія* “as broad a distribution as possible.”

Above all, the vocabulary often relies on Russian or Church Slavonic models but also features some vernacular-based elements, which are then further supported by Polish in many cases. In the sphere of function words, the final conjunction *дабы* and the causal conjunction *понеже* are marked as Church Slavonic, while the following words are vernacular-based: *якъ* in the aforementioned construction with the superlative; *же* and *що* as conjunctions; *яко* “as” (also possible in Church Slavonic); *мимо* as a preposition with the meaning “except for”; the aforementioned temporal preposition *черезъ*; additionally, the causal compound conjunction *для того, же*; *що* as a relative pronoun referring to a whole sentence and *котори* as a common relative pronoun (as opposed to genuinely Ruthenian *котри*; cf. Russian *который*); the adverb *такожъ* and the indefinite numeral *колька* [kil'ka]. In the pronoun *кто*, no dissimilated initial consonant is noted—the non-dissimilated form is authentic in some peripheral southwestern Ukrainian dialects. The form *первое* without the comparative suffix is widespread in Ukrainian dialects. The forms *только*, *сколько* are unmarked if one takes into account that only the reflex of *o* in the newly closed syllable has remained unexpressed. The compound *лишь только* can probably be interpreted as a Russianism.

Regarding the remaining lexis, the following stems are not rooted in the vernacular: *издаваемый* (as mentioned, regarding the prefix *из-*, cf. *выходившого* with genuine *вы-*); *изволили* (regarding the prefix, cf. *дозволяемъ*); *извинительну* (also regarding the prefix; see also the word-formation structure); *розпространенія*, *благосклонность*, and *безпрерывно* regarding the Church Slavonic metathesis; *уповаючи*, *почтенныхъ*, *господиновъ*, *получати* “to receive”; *надлежащую* (not *на-*), *основательнымъ* and *значительную* regarding the word-formation structure; *читателямъ*, *пользу*, *пользуеся*, *множество*; the aforementioned *совершати* with vocalized *o* in the prefix. All listed lexemes are also common in this form in Russian, only the prefix of *розпространенія* is Ruthenianized, and the verb *уповати* is also a marked functional Church Slavonicism in Russian. Only the word forms *господиновъ* (genitive plural) and *получати* in the meaning “to receive” (instead of “to link”) can be considered Russianisms without an obvious support in Church Slavonic. The lexeme *желаючи* is not located outside the frame of the vernacular: it is quite common in many Ukrainian dialects. Here, too, we find *печататися*, not *друковатися* (let alone *друкуватися*).

The following word forms and lexemes are both vernacular-based and often further supported by Polish (from which some forms have in fact been adopted): *розпочинає*, *чвертьрочье*, *мѣстце*, *найобширнѣйшого*, *часопись* (cf. *повременное письмо* from the masthead), *краяновъ* (genitive plural), *родимцѣ*, *предплату* (accusative singular), *предплатилъ* (Polish *przedpłacić*), *по уплывъ*, *замовлено*, *Сѣчня* (genitive singular), *рахунокъ*, *рокъ* ‘year,’ *чвертьроку*, *користею* (instrumental singular), *увагу*, *власне* (a Bohemism), *урядовыхъ*, *причиною* (a Polonism that is also common in Russian), *спозналися*, etc. Of interest is the use of the modal auxiliary

verb *мати* in the entirely vernacular form in *совершати має*. The stem of *быти* and *было* remains unmarked, so that the anonymous author of the aforementioned letter to the editor would have had no reason to lament this form, although he would not have been satisfied with *що*.

The next contribution to the *Вѣстникъ* was most probably written by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, who offered a remarkable interpretation of the motto “Соединенными силами” with reference to the Ruthenians. This article, printed in ornate Cyrillic, reads as follows:

Гл҃бокомысльна приповѣдка нашего молодого Цѣсара, котор҃ѹ на челѣ сеи часописи ставлаемо, показѣ п҃уть, к҃да намѣ конче треба ити, що бы розвин҃ѣти силн҃ѹ, однолит҃ѹ, народнор҃ѹск҃ѹ жизнь. Безѣ неѣ ни Р҃усины народомѣ ни Австріа державою быти не може. – Еѣ одной маемѣ подаковати, що вѣ нынѣшнѣмѣ рѣзнобарвномѣ кр҃ѹзѣ новорожденной Австріѣ, на вздорѣ всакимѣ перепонамѣ, с҃жено и намѣ становити особн҃ый, рѣвноправн҃ый р҃ѹск҃ѣй народѣ. –

Знакома казка о Равноапостольномѣ князю нашомѣ Владимірѣ Великомѣ, который смертелною зложенн҃ый недѣлюю призывалѣ своихѣ дванадцать сынѣвѣ, и подавши имѣ жмитѣ тоненькихѣ пр҃ѹтѣвѣ велѣлѣ ихѣ разомѣ переломити. Не оуспѣлѣ жаденѣ. Такѣ, рече имѣ оумирающ҃ѣй князѣ, и сѣ вами: держѣтеса разомѣ, повинѣйтеса др҃ѹгѣ др҃ѹгѣ, а жадна сила земна не одолѣе вамѣ.

Тожѣ само состоаніе и вѣ Австріѣ: и тѣтѣ племенѣ, рѣзnorodныхѣ силѣ чимало: а Цѣсарѣ одинѣ, оуставѣ одинѣ, рѣвноправнѣсть одна. На сей подставѣ вольно кождѣй части вмагатиса и вѣ силѣ рости, що бы разомѣ тимѣ сильнѣйшѣ становити цѣлость. Лишѣ кр҃ѣпкіѣ члены, повинѣючиса однѣѣй головѣ, становлятѣ кр҃ѣпкого м҃ѹжа.

Нарочно выбралисѣмо с҃ю приповѣдкѣ, и кладемѣ ю на заглавіѣ нашего „Вѣстника“, ѣако наконецн҃ѹю цѣль стремленіѣ еѣго.

И намѣ Р҃усинамѣ, возб҃лдившимсѣ по долговѣковомѣ снѣ до народного сознаніа, побѣдившимѣ счастливо с҃ю роковн҃ѹю хвилю, котора нашѣ жизнь или смерть рѣшала, треба конче всѣ совок҃ѹпити силы, що бы перестати разѣ быти потырою др҃ѹгихѣ, що бы на подставѣ рѣвноправности, зарѹченной словомѣ великодѣшного Цѣсара, отрѣпатиса сѣ пылѣ давного и гл҃бокого пониженіа, а розвинѣвши свою питомѣ народно-р҃ѹск҃ѹ жизнь, статиса сильн҃ымѣ огнивомѣ вѣ кр҃ѹзѣ австрѣйскихѣ народовѣ, и быти достойнымѣ членомѣ сильной державы.

Нехайже намѣ всѣмѣ Р҃усинамѣ, галицкимѣ, оугорскимѣ и бѹковинскимѣ, ѣако роднымѣ братьямѣ одной р҃ѹской матери, свѣтитѣ безпрестанно ѣкѣ досѣ такѣ и надалѣ с҃ѣ п҃ѹтиводительна звѣзда на стезѣ народного житѣя, и веде насѣ счастливо до наконецной, непремѣнной цѣли! – (Vistnyk 1850: 1).

The profound motto of our young Emperor, which we place at the head of this newspaper, shows the way that we must certainly follow in order to develop a strong, unified, national Ruthenian life. Without it, neither can the Ruthenians be a nation nor Austria a state. We have it alone to thank that in today's diverse circle of newborn Austria, against all odds, we have been destined to form a distinct Ruthenian nation with equal rights.

There is a well-known legend about our Prince Vladymyr the Great, the equal of the apostles, who, laid low by a deadly disease, summoned his twelve sons, gave them a bundle of thin rods, and told them to break them all together. Not one succeeded. The same goes for you, said the dying prince: keep together, obey one another, and no earthly force will overcome you.

The same applies to the situation in Austria: here, too, there exists a multitude of tribes and diverse forces, but the Emperor is one, the constitution is one, equality of rights is one. On this basis, every part can freely strive to develop its strength in order to form an even stronger entity together. Only strong members obeying one head make a strong man.

We have chosen this motto deliberately, and we place it at the head of our *Herald* as the ultimate goal of its efforts.

We Ruthenians, having awoken to national consciousness after centuries-long sleep and having happily overcome the fateful moment that decided whether we would live or die, must decidedly join all our forces so that we will no longer be the object of abuse by others; so that on the basis of equality of rights, vouchsafed by the word of our generous Emperor, we can shake off the dust of our old and deep humiliation and, having developed our own Ruthenian national life, become a strong link in the circle of Austrian nations and a worthy member of a strong state.

May this guiding star continue to shine on the path of our national life for all of us Galician, Hungarian, and Bukovynian Ruthenians as fraternal kin of one Ruthenian mother! May it happily lead us to the ultimate immutable goal! (Vistnyk 1850: 1).

Although this article was written in the ornate Cyrillic script, as opposed to the previous one, the civil script is not a reliable indicator of a more Russianized language either in general or in particular with regard to the *Вѣстникъ*. The much more frequent use of *ô* for rendering the reflex of *o* in the newly closed syllable is a first indicator that the language of this article is closer to the vernacular than that of the previous one. Only a few features deviate from the vernacular—perhaps the word form *на чель* with *e* after the sibilant (in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects, *e* after sibilants has been retained, but *o* occurs elsewhere, as in *нашого*, etc.); *жизнь* (cf. along with *жытья* [genitive singular]); *состояніе* with *o* in the prefix according to the traditions of the Second South Slavic influence; *на заглавіи* with the Church Slavonic metathesis and the ending *-i* instead of *[-u]*, which was then normally used in western Ukrainian in substantives with this suffix; also, in both the latter forms, the use of *i* in the position of weak Jer before *j*; *стремлений* with the Russian reflex *e* of weak *ь* in the liquid consonant cluster; *новорожденнои* with Church Slavonic *жд* < **dj* and *Равноапостольномъ* with the Church Slavonic reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis, which, however, are unmarked owing to their status as ecclesiastical terms (cf. *рѣвноправность*); furthermore, *оуспѣлъ*; the aorist *пече*, which occurs in a historicizing context; the Russian reciprocal pronoun *дрѣзъ дрѣзѣ* and the present active participle *оумирающий* in reference to Volodymyr (Vladimir) I, as well as *возбѣдившимся* (with vocalized Jer in the prefix, cf. the contrasting *взмагатица*); *сознанія* (genitive singular, with the Church Slavonic *со-* instead of

30- in the prefix);¹⁹ the preterite active participle *побѣдишииъ, совокуити* (with vocalized Jer according to the traditions of the Second South Slavic influence [in -во-]); *звѣзда* (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *зірка* and dialectal *івізда*), *на стезѣ* (see Modern Standard Ukrainian *стежка*; *на стезі* is still marked as high style) and *непремѣннои* (with the Church Slavonic metathesis of liquid consonants) from the ceremonial, hortatory conclusion.

Otherwise, almost all the previously observed vernacular features are to be encountered in this contribution. Truncated forms of adjectives and pronouns occur more often, cf. *Глѣбокомысльна, которѣ*; sometimes they are even used in the same phrasal constituent as the long form, cf. *силнѣ, однолитѣ, народнорѣцкѣю жизнь*. Forms with full vocalization are also used more frequently, cf. *головѣ, перестати* (in contrast to *безпрестанно*, which, in light of Polish *bezprzestannie*, can be recognized as a form of metathesis probably not motivated by Church Slavonic), etc. Other features encountered here are the vernacular reflex *ж* (but not marked Ruthenian *дж*) < **dj* in *сѣжено*, etc.; the non-Church Slavonic reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis in *рости, рѣвноправнѣсть*; epenthetic *l* in the third person plural present, as in *становлять*, as typical of Ukrainian; the genitive ending -[u] in *сѣ пылѣ*; the locative singular ending in -[u] in a soft masculine noun in *о [...]* *кнѣзю*; the phonetic spelling of the prefix in *зложенный* (as opposed to the spelling of the preposition in *сѣ вами*); hard-stemmed *давного*, which is typical of southwestern Ukrainian dialects; adverbs such as *конче, доси* or *надаль*; the final conjunction *що бы*; the negative pronoun *жаденѣ*; the particles *Нехай(же)* for forming the third person imperative; the numeral *дванадцать* with *два-* (not *двѣ-* as in Russian) and the soft alveolar affricate; the indefinite numeral *чимало* and a number of other lexemes that distance this text from Church Slavonic and Russian, such as *приповѣдка, рѣзобарвномѣ, казка, жмѣть, хвилю, на подставѣ*.

This contribution, in which Emperor Franz Joseph's motto "Viribus unitis" is adapted to Ruthenian circumstances, is also highly remarkable in content. Here again, the Galician, Hungarian, and Bukovynian Ruthenians are said to constitute "all Ruthenians."²⁰ They alone are mentioned as blood brothers descended from a common Ruthenian mother. They are exhorted to become a link in the circle of Austrian nations and worthy members of a strong Austrian state—according to the editors, this is the ultimate goal on the path of Ruthenian national life (*на стезѣ народного житѣя*).²¹ Thus, with reference to the present, the editors do not look beyond the Russo-Austrian border: the Austrian Ruthenians alone are defined as "Ruthenians" and mentioned as such. Nevertheless, the same article mentions "our Prince Vladymyr the Great, the equal of the apostles," making it clear that this restriction could not have been hard and fast in the editors' minds. After all, Volodymyr had not resided in Halych but in Kyiv and ruled over a territory

19 The vowel in the prefix is regular here.

20 The punctuation is conclusive here. In *нама всѣмъ Рѣсинамъ, галицкимъ, оугорскимъ и бѣковинскимъ*, after *всѣмъ Рѣсинамъ* we are in fact dealing with an apposition, not an attribute.

21 Similarly, as demonstrated above, Ukrainian dialects were regarded as existing exclusively under an "Austro-Ruthenian" roof.

considerably larger than Galicia and Transcarpathia; indeed, the extent of his rule over those territories, particularly Transcarpathia, is highly questionable. Yet the article does not consider what relation the territory ruled by Volodymyr may have had to the Great Russians. Whom, then, did the editors have in mind when writing of “our Prince Vladymyr the Great?” Whatever the answer to this question, the historical point of reference ultimately makes it clear that the editors of the *Вѣстникъ* looked beyond the Ruthenians on Austrian territory, taking a view corresponding to that of the Supreme Ruthenian Council, which included the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire. In fact, we know that Ivan Holovac'kyj's and Bohdan Didyc'kyj's looked farther still, placing the Ruthenians in an all-Russian context, with the Great Russians dominant. Such a view could not, however, be expressed openly in the *Вѣстникъ*.

4.2. Articles about Ruthenians in Vienna

Like other Galician Ruthenian newspapers, the *Вѣстникъ* reported on current events in the Austrian state as well as in foreign countries. One of the most important functions that differentiated this state-supported newspaper from others was that it reported directly from the capital, Vienna, bringing its Ruthenian readership into closer contact with the metropolis as a stable point of reference. This was evidently intended to foster a kind of Austrian civic consciousness, which of course was to be expressed in absolute loyalty to the imperial dynasty. From a Ruthenian perspective, another important task of the *Вѣстникъ* was to create a common national identity for the Galician, Bukovynian, and Transcarpathian Ruthenians and report on the progress of the national movement in Ruthenian-settled areas with regard to Ruthenian-language schooling and related topics. Although there were also subscribers to *Зора Галицка* in Transcarpathia, and contributions from there were regularly sent to the editorial office of the Lviv newspaper (particularly from Oleksandr Duxnovyč, especially during the Russophile period of *Зора Галицка*), only the *Вѣстникъ* was unambiguously defined as a newspaper for all Ruthenians in the Austrian state, and it alone featured periodic reports on Transcarpathian affairs, as well as reports written from a Transcarpathian perspective.

The first issue of *Вѣстникъ* already includes a report on the “Ruthenians in Vienna.” The headline is printed in the civil script and the text proper in ornate Cyrillic (Vistnyk 1850: 1–2):

Австрія. Русины въ Вѣдні.

Ктобъ подѣмалъ съ далекихъ братій нашихъ, же тѣ въ средоточію нѣмецкого житѣя, знаходится многочисленна рѣскаа громада. И правда, ходивши не єдну недѣлю по твердыхъ камѣнахъ столицѣ, трѣдно спостерегти своихъ, тажко по лицахъ познати. Но єсли заведе брата нашого дѣло ѣке до головної почты, а ще въ свато або въ недѣлю, и оучѣ тѣ съ поблизкои церкви св. Варвары наши пѣніа церковни, то забуѣдєса и самъ собѣ не вѣритъ, ѣкѣ намъ са здарило на саме Богоавлєніє: церковь переполнена набожнымъ народомъ, а на лицѣ каждого съ притомныхъ маляются глѣбоки чѣвства розвиваючи въ дѣшѣ цѣлѣ минѣвшіость. [...]
[This is followed by general reflections on the significance of youth in one's life.]

[...] Воаки наши котрого бѣдѣ полкѣ, що ино до тои столицѣ са дѣстануть, оуже первой недѣли полненъка ихъ церковь. Хотай слѣжба ихъ часто встримѣе, а мешкають по большой части дѣже о подалѣ, набоженство славянскѣе, слово солодкое рѣское оустами горливого пароха промовлене, стромажѣе съ далекихъ сторонѣ всѣхъ нашихъ братіи въ домѣ Божій якъ єднѣ родинѣ въ єдно собранье. – Молодѣжъ рѣска розсыпана по розлетлыхъ передмѣстахъ тѣтъ совокѣплаеса, и въ прекрасныхъ гласахъ производить спѣвъ чѣдесный. Родимѣцѣ наши знаходачииса на слѣжбѣ въ оурадахъ и инныхъ мѣстцахъ совокѣплаются въ церковь сватой. Всѣ погладають на себе якъ на давныхъ знакомыхъ, бо вѣра отецъ нашихъ важе всѣхъ въ любѣ громадѣ тои церкви сватой.

Austria. Ruthenians in Vienna.

Who among our remote brethren would think that here, in the midst of German life, there is a multitudinous Ruthenian community? And indeed, on frequent Sunday walks along the hard stones of the capital, it is hard to single out one's own people; it is hardly possible to recognize them by their faces. But if an errand leads one of our brethren to the Main Post Office, particularly on a holiday or a Sunday, and if he hears our church singing from St. Barbara's Church nearby, he will be puzzled and doubt himself, as happened to us on Epiphany itself: the church is overcrowded with a pious congregation, and every face is marked by deep feelings that develop his entire past in his soul. [This is followed by general reflections on the significance of youth in one's life.] ...As soon as our soldiers of whatever regiment arrive in the capital, their church is already full on the first Sunday. Although their military service often detains them, and most of them live far away, Slavic worship and the sweet Ruthenian word from the mouth of a devoted priest brings together all our brethren from distant parts in the house of God, gathered as one family. – Ruthenian youth, dispersed among the remote suburbs, gather here and produce wonderful singing with their excellent voices. Our fellow countrymen who serve in offices and elsewhere gather in the holy little church. They look at one another as old acquaintances, for the faith of our fathers binds them all into the dear community of this holy church.

The importance of St. Barbara's Greek Catholic Church to the cultural life of Ukrainians in Vienna, as described here, continues to the present day. It is noteworthy that here, along with Greek Catholic belief, linguistic factors above all—the “wonderful” Ruthenian chant and the “sweet Ruthenian word from the mouth of the devoted priest”—figure as attractions of the church and as the major features characterizing the Ruthenians.

In all likelihood, this article was written by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, and it is again quite close to the vernacular. Among the elements not rooted in the vernacular, the following may be mentioned: *въ средоточію* with the Church Slavonic metathesis of liquid consonants and the writing of the reflex *i* of weak *ь* before *j*; the compound *многочисленна*; the Church Slavonicisms *пѣніа*²² and *Богоавленіе* with the reflex *i* of weak *ь* before *j*, which are also rooted in Russian (note, however, *собрание*,

22 In contrast to Ukrainian, the stem as such cannot be regarded as a Church Slavonicism in Russian.

житѣа or по [...] камѣнахъ with the reflex Ø); въ прекрасныхъ гласахъ with the Church Slavonic liquid metathesis; the Church Slavonicism производитъ with the Church Slavonic prefix -из- (cf. in contrast non-etymological съ in съ далекихъ братіи or съ поблизкои церкви instead of (и)зъ); the Church Slavonicism совокѣпляются with vocalization of Jer in the second prefix according to the traditions of the Second South Slavic influence; and, finally, the highly archaic genitive ending -Ø (< ѣ) in отецъ нашихъ. It should be noted, however, that the lexemes пѣніа and Богоавлєніе are directly associated with the church, while in въ прекрасныхъ гласахъ (прекрасний is also used in Modern Standard Ukrainian) and Молодѣжъ рѣска [...] совокѣплася, и въ прекрасныхъ гласахъ производитъ спѣвъ чѣдесный, as well as in вѣра отецъ нашихъ, the author clearly strives for a Church Slavonic stylization in order to stress the ceremonial atmosphere of the Greek Catholic Mass. Only the word *средоточіе* would appear to qualify as a “loan of necessity” (*Bedarfsentlehnung*) from Church Slavonic and/or Russian, as there was no authentic Ruthenian equivalent. For the stem form *знаком-* (cf. marked Ukrainian *знайомий*), one finds evidence only from the seventeenth century onward in historical dictionaries of Russian (cf. Slovar' 11–17: s.v. *знакомый, знакомство*); it was not alien even to western Ukrainian, as a glance into Zenon Kuzelja and Jaroslav Rudnyc'kyj's dictionary of 1943 (Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987: s.v. *знакомий*), will confirm, and it was used in western, central, and eastern Ukraine well into the twentieth century. The word *многочисленна* is somewhat less alien to Ukrainian than one would think at first glance, considering that, despite the dominance of *богато* or *багато*—or *вельо* in the southwestern Ukrainian dialects—the traditional form *много* is still used (cf., for instance, *мнiро* in the Podlachian dialects: see Lesiv 1997: 365, cf. also Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk 1953–1963: s.v. *много*; in the *Русалка Днѣстровая* as well, *много* is used dozens of times).

The long form of the adjective, as seen here in *рѣскаа громада* and *слово солодке рѣское*, is not uncommon in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects, but, given the clearly predominating truncated forms, we are most probably dealing here with a form deliberately chosen for the adjective “Ruthenian” (but cf. *Молодѣжъ рѣска*). For the Ruthenians as for others, especially in the years ca. 1848/49, the concept of nationality bore something of a sacred aura.

These features notwithstanding, the language of the article about the Greek Catholic Mass in St. Barbara's Church is based essentially on the vernacular. Among others, the following forms deserve mention: *тѣ, знаходится* with *з-*, *не єдну недѣлю* (the numeral with the Polish pronunciation is firmly rooted in numerous southwestern Ukrainian dialects); *по [...] камѣнахъ* with the new *Jat'* and the marked Ruthenian notation of the reflex Ø of weak *ѣ* before *j*; the genitive ending in -[i] following soft *с'* in *столицѣ*; the infinitive *спостерегти* in one of the marked western Ukrainian variants (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *спостерегти*, but Russian *-стеречь*); the indefinite pronoun *яке*; the movable reflexive particle in *якъ намъ ся здарило*; the almost always truncated forms of the adjective endings; the indefinite pronoun *котрого бѣдѣ*; the diminutive adjective in *полненька ихъ церковъ*; the verb *встримѣ*; the adverbs in *дѣже о подаль*; the *ѣ* rendering the reflex of *e* in the newly closed syllable in *Молодѣжъ рѣска*; the deverbative noun *спѣвъ*,

which occurs alongside the aforementioned Church Slavonic (or Russian) *пѣніа*; the recurring rendition of the soft alveolar affricates in *Родимѣѡ* and in *мѣстѣахѡ* (but cf. *по лицахѡ* and *на лицѣ* earlier).

4.3. News from Vienna and the world

It was not only individual articles in the *Вѣстникѡ* that reported on events from Vienna; there was also a section titled “Вѣденскіи Новости” that featured brief reports received in the capital from various parts of the monarchy. Not all of them directly concerned Ruthenian affairs. The first issue of *Вѣстникѡ* featured the following items (I have selected mainly those related to Ruthenian affairs):

** Довѣдаѣмса съ певного жерела, же въ минстерствѣ богослуженіа праюеса надѣ роздобытьемъ полѣпшенъа состояніа нашихъ священниковѣ въ обще. [...]

** Йкъ чѣти, мае Галиціа съ певностію подѣлена быти на два Намѣстничества; только въ ѡкій способъ ще не извѣстно. [...]

** Зѣ Оуторѣ полѣчилисьмо нынѣ письмо ознаймлающе намѣ, же тамѣ при надаванью оурадовѣ въ рѣскихъ сторонахѣ на нашихъ честныхъ родимцевѣ много брано взглядѣ.

** Въ днахѣ поводи тѣтейшой оудаваласа министрѣ Бахъ съ намѣстникомѣ Емингеромѣ особисто и многократне на мѣстѣа потопомѣ загроженіи, где оудивительною щедротою оказовали попеченіе свое дла доткненныхъ жителей тихѣ низинѣ.

** Съ радостью доведѣмса нынѣ, же оуторскіи братья наши сильнѣ розвивають дѣлательность въ границахѣ дозволенныхъ щодрою рѣкою Его Величества. [...]

** We learn from a certain source that in the Ministry of Religious Affairs, work is being done for the general improvement of the situation of our priests....

** As we learn, Galicia is certainly to be divided into two districts; however, it is not yet clear in what way....

** We have just received a letter from Hungary informing us that in the distribution of offices in the Ruthenian lands, special attention has been paid to our honorable fellow countrymen.

** During the local flood, Minister Bach, with Governor Eminger, personally and frequently visited the places threatened with inundation, where they offered their support with striking generosity to the affected inhabitants of those lowlands.

** We are glad to learn that our Hungarian brethren are developing extensive activity within the limits permitted by the generous hand of His Majesty....

Further issues of the *Вѣстникѡ* include, inter alia, the following “News from Vienna” (p. 7):

** Чѣмо, що Львовское правительство полѣчило возваніе, дати свое мнѣніе о заокръгленію Галичины черезъ присоединеніе части сѣверной Оуторщины. – Запевне бѣде при томѣ взглядѣ матиса особенный на однороднии племенности (no. 2, 9/21 February; Vistnyk 1850: 7).

** Словарь правнико политичной терминологии теперь споро печатаеса. Первиі два аркѣши нѣмецко-ческого изданія оуже готови. Те изданіе бѣде дла прочихъ до поровныванья слѣжити, абы тимъ способомъ наибольше согласіе всѣхъ изданій осазнѣти (no. 4, 14/26 February; Vistnyk 1850: 15).

** We hear that the government in Lviv has received a request to offer its opinion on the rounding of the boundaries of Galicia by the annexation of part of northern Hungary.—Special attention will undoubtedly be paid to related tribes (no. 2, 9/21 February; Vistnyk 1850: 7).

** The dictionary of legal and political terminology is now being printed rapidly. The first two sheets of the German-Czech edition have already been finished. This edition will serve all others for comparison in order to achieve the greatest uniformity of all editions (no. 4, 14/26 February; Vistnyk 1850: 15).

Issue 23 for 4/16 March 1850 reports that two Ruthenians from the Stauropegion Monastery in Lviv have received appointments at the Court and State Printshop ("Hof- und Staatsdruckerei") (Vistnyk 1850: 47); a contribution on the printing facility itself appears *ibid.*, 92), etc.

Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms are not a rarity in these reports. One regularly encounters such word forms as, in this case, *состоянія*, *въ обще, извѣстно*, *полѣчилисьмо* "we have received" as a lexical Russianism, *письмо* instead of *листъ*, *оудивительною* (instrumental singular feminine), *печеніе*, the probably artificial word *дѣлательность* (cf. Polish *działalność* and Russian *дѣлательность*), *изданіе*, or *согласіе*. Occasionally, the frequency of such elements is as high as in the first of the reports just quoted, where *правительство*, *полѣчило* "has received," *возваніе*, *мнѣніе*, *присоединеніе*, *особенный*, and *племенности* (accusative plural) are striking. News reports such as these were most likely written by Ivan Holovac'kyj, and perhaps also by Bohdan Didyc'kyj.

On the other hand, one also finds numerous vernacular forms in brief reports, most of which were probably written by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, for example, *Довѣдемся съ певного жерела* (but not *джерела*), *працюеса*, *полѣпшенья* (genitive singular), *щодрою* (instrumental singular feminine; see Modern Standard Ukrainian *щедрий* with *e* in the root after the sibilant), *осазнѣти*, *поровныванья* with *по-* (not *с-* as in Russian *сравненіе*) and the non-Church Slavonic reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis; *те* with the truncated nominative singular neuter ending; *чѣемо* "we hear" with the markedly Ukrainian ending, *затевне*, *матиса*, etc. Sporadically, one finds expressions that are probably loan translations from German, such as *брано възглядѣ* (cf. German *Rücksicht nehmen* "to take into consideration" or *оудавалса* (cf. German *sich begeben* "to move").

If the report concerns the emperor himself, the language of the articles is no more heavily pervaded by Church Slavonic elements than elsewhere, and markedly vernacular forms are not avoided, as one might expect on account of Ruthenian literary conventions prevailing before 1848/49, cf. the following contributions from no. 16 for 14/26 March and no. 17 for 16/29 March 1850, which were most likely written by Julian Vysloboc'kyj:

Его Величество пересмотрѣють близко що дна то касарни то больницѣ и пр. и загощѣють по большой части такъ несподѣвано, же не ма часѣ приготооватиса до принатїа Монархи, якъ то звычайно бывае, коли ожидають где высокѣ особы. То однакожь привело розмаитїи пѣблични заведенїа въ такїй образцевый порадокъ, же повсюдѣ видно таке старанье, такѣ чистотѣ, якъ коли бы що години ожидано найвышшого госта. В. З. (Vistnyk 1850: 61–62).

Вѣдень 28 марта. Его Величество нашѣ милостивѣйшїй Цѣсарѣ люблать найчастїе около 4–5 години по полѣдню перехожоватиса вздолжь баштѣ. Вчорайшого дна малисьмо то щастье встрѣтити Его Величество на томже самомѣ ходѣ, а поклонившиса низенько, якъ же насѣ оурадовала подака Его Величества, оказана намѣ не только шапочкою но такожь веселымѣ възрѣнїемѣ, и же такѣ скажѣ промовляющимѣ лицемѣ. [...] В. З. (Vistnyk 1850: 65).

Almost every day, His Majesty reviews either barracks or hospitals, etc., and mostly visits so unexpectedly that there is no time to prepare for the reception of the Monarch, as is usual when someone of high standing is expected. This, however, has brought such exemplary order to various public institutions that everywhere one sees such diligence and cleanliness as if a guest of the highest rank were expected at any hour. V. Z. (Vistnyk 1850: 61–62).

Vienna, 28 March. His Majesty our Most Gracious Emperor most often likes walking along the parapets at about four or five in the afternoon. Yesterday we had the good fortune to meet His Majesty on just such a walk. As we bowed low, how gladdened we were by His Majesty's thanks, rendered to us not only with his little hat but also with a cheerful look and, so to speak, an expressive face.... V. Z. (Vistnyk 1850: 65).

Numerous forms here are deliberately styled in a Ruthenian manner, such as *що дна* and *що години*, по большой (части) and *найвышшого* with *о* after the sibilant; *несподѣвано*, *такѣ* [...] *же* for forming adverbial clauses of manner with the meaning of measure and degree; *не ма часѣ* with the genitive ending [-u]; *якѣ*, *звычайно*, *коли*, *где* as indefinite pronouns; *розмаитїи*; the truncated endings of adjectives and pronouns in the first passage or *люблать* with epenthetic *л* in the third person plural present, as typical of Ukrainian; *найчастїе* (not *найчастѣ(й)ше*); *години* (genitive singular); *перехожоватиса* (but not *-ува-*); *вздолжь*, *вчорайшого*, *малисьмо*, *щастье* with the reflex *О* of *ь* before weak *ж* and non-etymological spelling; *якѣ*, *подака*, *же*, *такожь*, *промовляющимѣ* and others in the second passage. Only isolated forms, such as *пересмотрѣють* (Ruthenianized Russian *пересматриваютѣ*), *больницѣ* (accusative plural), *заведенїа* and *образцевый* or *возрѣнїемѣ*—the latter referring directly to the emperor—are not rooted in the vernacular. The use of third person plural verbs referring to the emperor, as a sign of third person-related politeness practiced in many languages of the Austrian Monarchy, is worth noting.

Elsewhere, in a report on one of the emperor's hospital visits, Russianisms and/or Church Slavonicisms play a somewhat more prominent role, cf. *посѣщали* (with

щ < *tj), *вчера* with *e* after the sibilant (which is known, however, from Galician dialects), *слѣчайно*, *больницѣ* (accusative singular) and *больничніи*, *изъавили*, *оудовольствіе* or *обожденіемъ* (instrumental singular):

Его Величество Цѣсарь посѣщали вчера слѣчайно ц. к. больницѣ войсковѣю. Въ часѣ проходѣ черезъ избы больничніи розмавлали Е. В. ѣкъ найпріятнѣйше съ недѣжими воинами въ ихъ народныхъ ѣзыкахъ. При отходѣ изъавили Е. В. свое оудовольствіе надѣ добрымъ догладомъ и обожденіемъ съ слабыми (Vistnyk 1850: 178).

Yesterday His Majesty the Emperor happened to visit the Imperial and Royal Military Hospital. As H.M. walked through the hospital wards, he spoke most pleasantly with the sick soldiers in their national languages. As he left, H.M. expressed his satisfaction with the good care and treatment of the infirm.

This report also features Ruthenianizing elements, such as *Въ часѣ проходѣ* with the Ruthenian compound preposition and the genitive ending *-[u]* of the noun, *розмавлали*, *недѣжими*, the construction *ѣкъ найпріятнѣйше*, *оудовольствіе надѣ* instead of Russian *оудовольствіе отъ*, *въ народныхъ ѣзыкахъ* instead of Russian *на народныхъ ѣзыкахъ*. Were these elements inserted deliberately to distance the language to some degree from Russian, as the first professor of Ruthenian language and literature, Jakiv Holovac'kyj, increasingly did in the years immediately after the Revolution of 1848/49 (see Moser 2002a; Moser 2011: 602–626)? And is it not most likely that this article was written by Jakiv's brother, Ivan Holovac'kyj?

Other reports in the *Вѣстникъ* were sent from various cities and towns of the monarchy, such as “Ппара” (“Prague”), “Торстѣ” (that is, East-Slavicized Croatian and Slovenian *Trst* “Trieste”), “Медіоланѣ” (“Milan”), or “Германстадтѣ (Сибинѣ)” (Romanian *Sibiu*, i.e., German *Hermannstadt* = Hungarian *Nagyszombat*).

These are followed by “Зарпаничніи новости” (News from Abroad), a section that does not differ linguistically from the brief reports from Vienna.

In the “National Affairs” (“Справы народніи”) section on pages 2 and 3 of the first issue, one finds a report about a “Slavic Ball in Vienna” (“Славянскій балъ во Вѣдніи”) (the headline was again printed in the civil script). The language of this contribution draws heavily on Russian; the author was probably Ivan Holovac'kyj. This section reported mainly on partial successes of the Ruthenian national movement and often featured articles by Galician and Transcarpathian contributors.

4.4. Contributions by members of the editorial staff to the entertainment section

The “Miscellaneous” (“Всячина”) section featured a great variety of entertaining or instructive articles. Both articles about Ruthenians in Vienna cited above were included in that section. In no. 2 for 9/21 February 1850, a “story” (“Казка”) titled “Woe to the one who does not know how to live in his own house” (“Лихо тому, кто не умѣе жити въ своемъ дому”) appears entirely in the civil script (Vistnyk 1850: 6–7). Another sample story from that section is titled “The Invalid Petro from

Novosilka" ("Инвалидъ Петро зъ Новосѣлки") (Vistnyk 1850: 91). Adages also appear in the "Miscellaneous" section. As a rule, these are not popular proverbs but apparently translations or perhaps original contributions by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj. Nevertheless, these adages are largely based on the vernacular, although they also sporadically exhibit Russianisms, such as the verb form *огорчать* (third person present plural) in the following adage from no. 3 for 11/23 February 1850:

Живи такъ, щобъ о тобѣ ничего злого не могли сказати: тогды, если що и скажутъ, то тебе не огорчатъ (Vistnyk 1850: 12).

Live so that no one can say anything bad about you; then, even if they do so, they will not aggrrieve you (Vistnyk 1850: 12).

In no. 10 for 28 February/12 March 1850, a new series that filled numerous issues of the first volume of the *Вѣстникъ* was introduced. Julijan Vysloboc'kyj presented his first "Letter to Beautiful Ruthenian Ladies" ("Листъ до красныхъ Русинокъ"), in which he reported on fashionable novelties from Vienna, only to conclude in moralizing fashion and offer practical advice on housekeeping. The first letter was followed by many others. It would appear that we are dealing here with one of the first, if not the very first Galician Ruthenian publication focusing particularly on women (the first periodical for women, *Лада*, under the editorship of the radical Russophile Severyn Šechovyč, did not begin publication until 1853). The "Letters to Beautiful Ruthenian Ladies" are vernacular-based on every linguistic level. This also applies to the following article, which contains not a single marked non-vernacular form:

Всячина. Листъ до красныхъ Русинокъ! [...] На весенныхъ променадахъ здыбаемъ дамъ много въ зеленыхъ сукняхъ подобной барвы якъ дубове листѣ – матеріи найбільше еднobarвни безъ цвѣтовъ и цянокъ [instead of цяткохъ?], часто однакожъ съ передо нашивани отъ горы ажъ до долу въ два ряды шнурочками або гафтами тои же самои барвы; межи которыми нашивками помѣщени бывають гузики, якъ коли бы спинали цѣлу сукню чи шляфрочокъ. [...] Написаль емъ Вамъ о модахъ, но надбюса, що Васъ яко добрыхъ господаынъ займе дуже, найновѣйша нѣмецка господарска придумка, котра Вѣденкамъ въ теперѣшныхъ часахъ много грошей ошадила: – вынайденъе найтаньшого ночного свѣтла.[...] Василь Зборовскій (Vistnyk 1850: 40).

Miscellaneous. Letter to Beautiful Ruthenian Ladies! ...On spring promenades we encounter many ladies in green dresses whose color resembles that of oak leaves—the material is most often plain without flowers and dots but frequently embroidered on the front from top to bottom in two rows, with cords or embroidery of the same color; between these embroidered rows there are usually buttons that appear to keep the whole dress or dressing gown together.... I have written for you about fashion, but I hope that you, as good housewives, are very interested in the latest German household appliance, which has saved Viennese ladies a great deal of money these days: the invention of the most inexpensive night light.... Vasyľ Zborovs'kyj (Vistnyk 1850: 40).

Here, the text has *бывають*, not *бѣвають*, which would have satisfied the contributor mentioned at the beginning of this article. However, forms such as *здыбаемъ*, *барвы* (genitive singular) and *однобарвни* (with the genuine Polish initial *je-* of *едно*, which was integrated into many Galician Ukrainian dialects), *ажь до долу*, *межи*, *якъ коли бы, чи* (as the disjunctive-copulative conjunction “or”), *що, дуже, въ теперѣшнихъ часахъ, котра* (along with *которыми*), *ощадила*, or *вынайденъ* (cf. *винайдення* in the *Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk* 1953–1963),²³ the consistently truncated adjectival endings, and the prevailing vernacular reflex *Ø* of weak *ь* before *j* endow the text with an explicitly Ruthenian character that is also supported by Polonisms and Germanisms in the names of textiles (*въ [...] сукняхъ, гафтами* [instrumental plural], *шляфрочокъ*), etc. The word form *цянокъ* (genitive plural) most likely stands for *цятокъ* (from *цятка* “spot/dab/dot”). In *цвѣтовъ* (genitive plural), which appears here instead of the expected *квѣтовъ*, one finds the reflex of the second palatalization of velars. The fact that this text also appears in the civil script confirms the observation that the use of the civil script in the *Вѣстникъ* bears no direct relation to the number of Russianisms in its copy.

4.5. Final remarks on contributions made by members of the editorial staff

To summarize, the contributions signed by Julijan Vysloboc'kyj with his pseudonym Vasyľ Zborovs'kyj are mostly quite close to the vernacular, while the comparatively frequent use of Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms may point in most cases to the authorship of Ivan Holovac'kyj, and in particular cases perhaps to that of Bohdan Didyc'kyj. Political news in the *Вѣстникъ* often features more Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms than stories and entertaining contributions in the “*Всячина*” section, such as the “*Листы до красныхъ Русинокъ*.” But it is certainly impossible to determine in every case whether such Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms were, so to speak, “loans of necessity” (*Bedarfsentlehnungen*) that could not be avoided in allegedly more sophisticated spheres of reference. Thus it would appear that one cannot satisfactorily account for the presence in some contributions to the *Вѣстникъ* of such words as *согласіе*, *присоединеніе* or *извѣстно* and not, for instance, *съгода* (*згода*), *приеднанье* (*приеднання*) or *вѣдомо* (*відомо*), forms that would have been completely unsurprising in many Galician Ruthenian writings of the *Vormärz* and the revolutionary period. Certain fluctuations in the first volumes of the *Вѣстникъ* confirm the notion that Russianisms and Church Slavonic elements were not generally used of necessity: thus, we encounter first *изданіе* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 1), then *выдати* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 63); first *правительство* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 31), then *оурядовый* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 201); first *состояніе* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 1), then *станъ* (*Vistnyk* 1850: 230) (all these stems occur in news items). In some articles, Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms are strikingly frequent, but there are very few contributions in which they do not appear at all. The contributions examined for the present article show a certain chronological development toward the use of the vernacular.

23 The word is marked “пашт.” (coll.), which means that we are most probably dealing with a Galicianism.

We know that at this time, Ivan Holovac'kyj already considered Russian to be his quasi-native standard language. He used it not only in correspondence with Russians, writing in a flawed variant of that language with occasional, mostly involuntary Ruthenianisms, but also, for instance, with his brother Jakiv, who became a dedicated Russophile around 1850. In a letter dating from late 1850, Ivan Holovac'kyj wrote to Jakiv:

Г. Р. увѣряетъ, что когда пограничныя отношенія между Россією и Польщею установлены будутъ, тогда и переписка и пересылка лучше пойдеть – теперь еще все нерозрѣшенно – одинъ указъ противорѣчаетъ другому, и никто не знаетъ, чего держати ся. – Вотъ Тебѣ списъ книгъ выписанныхъ Г. Р. вмѣстѣ съ цѣнами [...] (Studyns'kyj 1905: 515).

G. R. gives assurances that when border relations are established between Russia and Poland, correspondence and mailing will work better—now everything is still unsettled—one order contradicts another, and no one knows what to do. Here is a list of books for you compiled by G.R. along with the prices....

Later, Ivan Holovac'kyj approximated Russian even more closely and increasingly avoided deviations that could be interpreted as Ruthenianisms, such as, in this passage, the writing of reflexive particles separately, the infinitive ending *-ти* in an unstressed position, and the non-Church Slavonic reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis (*нерозрѣшенно*, if this is not merely a matter of handwriting), as well as obvious beginner's errors, such as *противорѣчаетъ* (instead of *противоречитъ*) or *списъ* instead of *списокъ*. Orthographic peculiarities such as the writing of *-нн-* or *-н-* in the preterite passive participles without observing Russian rules were long characteristic of Jakiv Holovac'kyj's writings (Moser 2002a).

In the second half of the nineteenth century, even the most ardent Russophiles among the Austrian Ruthenians were still far from a perfect mastery of Russian. Moreover, when it came to the *Вѣстникъ*, Ivan Holovac'kyj was not allowed to write in a language too obviously close to Russian. Consequently, only a few of his contributions to the newspaper come close to the "Russo-Ruthenian" variant increasingly used by the Russophiles (especially from the 1850s on)—a language based on Russian but mixed with elements of the Ruthenian linguistic heritage, owing partly to language interference and partly to the authors' wariness of Austrian censorship (Moser 2002a). Over the years, the most ardent Russophiles gradually reduced their deliberate use of Ruthenianizing features to a minimum, such as the forms *якъ*, *що*, or infinitives ending in unstressed *-ти*.

Apart from some Church Slavonic elements that are also used in Russian, we can also find pronounced Russianisms, such as *полѣжити* in the meaning "to receive," in the writings of Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, who was obviously not a Russophile. It is apparent that some Ruthenians did not perceive all Russianisms as such but regarded some of them as characteristic of a high-style variant of their own Ruthenian language. Generally speaking, those Ruthenians who favored the

Ruthenian nation- and language-building process had no easy task, as they had to distance their language from Polish as much as from Russian. Vysloboc'kyj's language in the *Вѣстникъ* remained generally committed to a clear Ruthenian vernacular basis. There is every indication that it reflected his own convictions: as late as 1853, when Russophile Galician Ruthenians had already begun to correspond with one another in Russian to the best of their ability, Vysloboc'kyj still wrote to Jakiv Holovac'kyj in the same language as he did in the *Вѣстникъ*. That language was based on Ruthenian and very deliberately differentiated from Russian, although Russianisms or Church Slavonicisms, such as *Господине* (in the non-Russian vocative case) or *изданія* in this passage, were never absent:

Всечестнѣйшій Господине! – Осьмѣляючи ся переслати Вамъ безъоплатно екземпляръ термінологіи югословенского изданія, поручаю ся ласкавой памяти Вашой и взаимной любвѣ и пишу ся всеунижайшимъ слугою. – Ю. Выслобоцкій. – Вѣдень 23 Черв. 1853 (Studyns'kyj 1905: 529).

Right honorable Sir! Taking the liberty of sending you a free copy of the terminology of the South Slavic edition [i.e., *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slavischen Sprachen Oesterreichs. Deutsch-illyrische Separatausgabe*], I commend myself to your gracious memory and to our mutual affection. I sign as your most humble servant. Ju. Vysloboc'kyj. Vienna, 23 June 1853.

The materials from the *Вѣстникъ* already examined confirm that the variants of Galician Ruthenian characteristic of that period should not be dismissed prematurely as “Jazyčije” but require a more differentiated assessment (Moser 2004; Moser 2011: 641–666). As we shall see, the contributions of Transcarpathian authors support this observation.

With an eye to our opening remarks, the following conclusions may be offered. As one would expect, not a single one of the vernacular forms in the articles and news reports from the *Вѣстникъ* discussed so far, all written by members of the editorial staff and thus by Galicians, is of Transcarpathian origin; they are all consistently Galician, and only some of them are also native to Transcarpathian dialects. No significant effort at dialectal leveling can be detected on the part of the Galicians, apart from the fact that initially, as we have seen, *бывае* and *быти* were indeed consistently written instead of *бѣвае* and *бѣти*, perhaps in response to the demand from a correspondent that appeared in the first issue of the newspaper.

As for content, all news reports by members of the editorial staff were also obviously written from a clearly Galician perspective. Thus, the news reports cited here from the first issue of the *Вѣстникъ* make explicit mention of “our Hungarian brothers” (“оугорскіи братья наши”), clearly stressing Ruthenian solidarity, but this also permits the conclusion that in a narrower sense, the “we” from whose perspective the news reports were written were the Galician Ruthenians and no one else.

5. Contributions made from a Transcarpathian perspective

The first contribution from the pen of a Transcarpathian Ruthenian appears in the very first issue of the *Вѣстникъ*. Its title, "Возгласъ Русина уторского ко братьямъ своимъ" ("The Appeal of a Hungarian Ruthenian to His Brethren"), is printed in the civil script. The archaic word *Возгласъ* (with the vocalization of *ѣ* in the prefix according to the rules of the Second South Slavic influence and the metathesis of liquid consonants in the root)²⁴ already indicates the linguistic character of the main text. The article was written by Mykola Nod' (Hungarian *Nagy*), who was chaplain of St. Barbara's Greek Catholic Church in Vienna, became its administrator eight years later, and was appointed parish priest and dean of the seminary at St. Barbara's in 1861, a year before his death (Wytrzens 1988: 153). His contribution, printed in ornate Cyrillic, reads as follows:

Ижъ быстраа рѣка мые и несе находящїиса предъ собою предметы, такъ влече съ собою хитрость време́не вса во глѣбинѣ дно неимѣющѣю забвенїа. – Едино сокровище противитса несытомѣ семѣ забвенїа горла, и се Народно́сть. – [...] Се видаще, и оусердно такъ, ѡкъ исто размыслающе чили не возкликнеме? О насъ три и чтырикратно блаженныхъ!! [...] Рѣсины! (сице нарекѣ васъ, прїйшоль бо часъ егда именемъ рѣсина не соромимса) сѣтъ части време́не, которїи ко́гда перелетать, вѣчность ихъ больше не принесе; про насъ нынѣ настала сїа доба; о благополѣчїи бо нашемъ на высочайшомъ мѣстѣ вса дѣлаемаа дѣются, что, и где потребно, и дачто и ѡкимъ способомъ бы май лучше дѣлаемо было; не лишѣмъ же предложити помощи о блаженствѣ нашемъ трѣждающимса. Се „Вѣстникъ“ комѣждо разтворенный, ѡкъ май лѣпшїй способъ на предложенїе сицево. – Оусилуимса! – ко́ждый по силѣ своей. Нїколай Но́дь, капланъ вѣданьскїй (Vistnyk 1850: 3).

As a quickly flowing river washes and carries objects before it, so the cunning of time takes everything with it into the abysmal depths of oblivion.— One treasure alone withstands this insatiable throat of oblivion, and that is Nationality [*sic*, capitalized, with author's emphasis].—...Seeing this, as truly thinking people, shall we not cry out mightily? For ourselves, blessed three or four times!! ...Ruthenians (that is how I shall call you, for the time has come not to feel ashamed of the name Ruthenian)! There are periods of time that as soon as they have elapsed, eternity will not bring them back; such a time has come for us now. In the highest sphere, everything that can be done is now being done for our weal, whatever and wherever necessary, and whatever could be done most easily. Let us not cease to offer support to all those working for our weal. See, *Vistnyk* is open to all as the best medium for such a suggestion.— Let us work, everyone according to his strength! Nikolaj Nod', Viennese chaplain (Vistnyk 1850: 3).

Mykola Nod's contributions to the *Вѣстникъ* in particular are markedly archaic in linguistic character. Sections such as [...] *влече съ собою хитрость*

24 It is unlikely that this metathesis was motivated by Slovak, as sometimes occurs in the westernmost Transcarpathian dialects, see Slovak *rozhlás*.

времене вса во глѣбинѣ дно неимѣющѣю забвеніа or *Сіе видѣще, и оусердно такъ, ѿкъ исто размыслающе [...]* are heavily reminiscent of eighteenth-century Slaveno-Russian rhetoric, not only because of their archaic word forms but also because of their complex participial constructions and artificial word order. Archaic functional words such as *сице*, *сицевое*, or *комѣждо* are as characteristic of Nod's contributions as are morphological and syntactical archaisms, for instance, the archaic consonant stem genitive singular ending in *времене*, adjectival forms in neuter plural without a substantival referent, as here in *вса дѣлаемая* (moreover, the present passive participle is itself archaic as a morphological form). In another of Nod's contributions to the *Вѣстникъ* (no. 2 for 9/21 February 1850), "Слово къ Молодому Клиру Унгварскому" ("A Word to the Young Clergy in Uzhhorod"), he writes *и сице размыслящѣ, прійшошь ми до рукъ Вѣстникъ вѣднѣньскій, котораго широкое поле способное намъ порѣчае мѣсто* ("while I was thinking about that, there came into my hands the Vienna *Vistnyk*, whose broad field grants us an appropriate place") (*Vistnyk* 1850: 6–7). Here, the present active participle in the archaic short form *размыслящѣ* refers to *ми*, but at first glance it looks like a particularly archaic dative absolute.

Ruthenianizing features are reduced to a minimum, and it cannot be ruled out that some of those that remain are due to linguistic interventions on the part of the editorial office: *мые*, *порѣчае* without *-тъ*; *прійшошь* with *-j-* and with *о* after the sibilant (the latter, however, coincides with prerevolutionary Russian traditions); pleophonic forms such as *соромимся* or *перелетѣтъ*; *которіи*—instead of the "correct" *которыа*—in the nominative plural referring to a feminine noun; *на высочайшомъ* with *о* after the sibilant; *ѿкъ*, *кождый*, *отъ лишиѣмъ* with the marked Ruthenian imperative ending, etc.

The ending of the first person plural *-ме* in *возкликнеме* and *Оусилѣймеса*, the indefinite particle in the form *да-* in *дачто*, as well as the superlative particle *май* in *май легше*, *май лѣпшій* must be understood as Nod's own attempt to partly vernacularize his language: all these elements are characteristic of Transcarpathian dialects first and foremost and are nowadays occasionally interpreted as typically "Rusyn." Lack of interest in developing a common vernacular-based Ruthenian language with the Galicians could hardly have been signaled more explicitly than by these forms: where Nod' did not draw on a decidedly archaic form of Church Slavonic or on Russian, he often used precisely those vernacular forms that distinguished Transcarpathian speech from that of most Galicians.

The fact that the Galicians were expected not to use the forms *бѣло* or *бѣти* (which clearly predominate in Ukrainian language area), whereas the Transcarpathians made extensive use of the first person plural present ending *-ме*, the superlative particle *май-*, or the indefinite particle *да-*, which are only in use in a comparatively narrow dialectal area,²⁵ created a paradoxical situation that left no scope for dialectal leveling. The linguistic attitude of Nod' and other

25 Cf., however, *дащо* in *Русалка Днѣстровая* as well (*Rusalka* 1837/1972: V)).

Transcarpathians could only be interpreted as the opposite of a constructive contribution to the development of an "Austro-Ruthenian," let alone a Ukrainian, linguistic identity. Yet that attitude can hardly be understood as a defense of local ("Rusyn") linguistic identity as such, for the Transcarpathian elements that they employed with varying consistency did very little to modify the generally Church Slavonic or Russian character of their language. If the Galicians had wished to develop a common language with the Transcarpathians in this situation, the only realistic way to do so would have been to further develop and harmonize Church Slavonic traditions or to adopt Russian, and yet Church Slavonic and Russian were so remote from the vernacular variants spoken in both realms as to be incomprehensible to the commoners.

The language of another Transcarpathian contributor to the *Вѣстникъ*, who published his articles under the pseudonym "Паноніанинь" (Pannonian), only confirms these impressions. In early issues of the *Вѣстникъ*, the "Pannonian," i.e., Ivan Rakovs'kyj,²⁶ used distinct Church Slavonic conservatisms and Russianisms just as Mykola Nod' did, but he employed Ruthenianizing elements in his texts even less often, as evidenced in the following article from no. 17 for 16/29 March 1850:

О равноправности всѣхъ народностей. Никто не перепретить намъ, яко равноправность народностей есть най-важнѣйшій предметъ нашего гражданскаго житія. На ней основается Оустава нашея Державы, она есть опредѣленною котвою (анхорою) нашего госѣдарственнаго корабля, нею сохраняется неповредительнаа цѣлость Его Величества Цѣсарскаго, и отъ неа ожидаютъ народы стажаніе благополѣчіа своего. [...] Что бѣдетъ намъ стоати равноправность народностей на писмѣ, когда таа въ житіи благодѣтельныа своа плоды не покажетъ? Паноніанинь (*Vistnyk* 1850: 66–67).

On equal rights for all nationalities. No one will deny our opinion that equal rights for the nationalities are the most important subject of our civil life. The

26 Kyrylo Studyns'kyj (1905: XXV) asserts that, as some others also believe, Mykola Nod' was the one behind the pseudonym "Паноніанинь." The bibliographer Ivan Levyc'kyj (1888: 51), for his part, assumes that it was Ivan Rakovs'kyj. Most notably, Jurij Bača (1961: 59) advances some important arguments for the correctness of Levyc'kyj's thesis, namely: 1) Rakovs'kyj's contemporary Ivan Dobe attributed the pseudonym to him in the *Вѣстникъ* in 1850; 2) "Паноніанинь" frequently mentioned the *Landesgesetzblatt* (a collection of laws for individual crownlands), whose Ruthenian version for the Kingdom of Hungary was edited by Ivan Rakovs'kyj between 1850 and 1858 (cf. also Studyns'kyj 1905: CXXIX); 3) the views of Mykola Nod' and those of "Паноніанинь" on Church Slavonic did not coincide.

In his article on the poems of Mykola Nod', which are clumsy and archaic, as one would expect, Günther Wytrzens (1988: 154) additionally points out that "Паноніанинь" regularly wrote from Buda, but that "nothing is known" about a stay of Nod's in "the Hungarian metropolis." Apart from writing from Buda, it should be added that "Паноніанинь" also wrote from Uzhhorod (Ungvár), and that Ivan Rakovs'kyj in particular had close ties with both cities. Ivan Rakovs'kyj later turned out to be one of the most radical Galician and Transcarpathian Russophiles, above all in the mid-1850s, and especially during his tenure as acting editor as editor of the *Церковная газета* (Church Newspaper) in 1856–57 (Studyns'kyj 1905: CXXIX–CXXXV). The latter was the first newspaper addressed exclusively to the Ruthenians of the Kingdom of Hungary and oriented in linguistic terms entirely on Modern Standard Russian.

Constitution of our State is based on them, they are a certain anchor of our ship of state, the unshakable integrity of His Majesty the Emperor is protected by them, and the nations expect the growth of their weal from them.... What good will equal rights for the nationalities do us on paper if they do not show their beneficial fruits in life? The Pannonian.

In contrast to Mykola Nod', Ivan Rakovs'kyj writes *най-*, not *май-*; *основається*, not *основаєса*; *покажетъ*, not *покаже*; also *нашего*, not *нашого*. He uses the Church Slavonic *нашеѧ Державы*—not, for instance, *нашей* or even *нашої*—in the genitive singular, as well as *своѧ плоды*—not *свои*—in the accusative plural. In general, however, he avoided archaic elements not used in the literary Russian of his time, with the result that his language bore a striking similarity to Russian.

In no. 18 for 18/30 March, Ivan Rakovs'kyj, again under his pseudonym “Паноніанинъ,” reported on the progress of the Ruthenian national movement. Here he used some local Transcarpathian elements such as *ничъ, есме, осомнѣваемеса, отъѣѣме*, as well as Ruthenianisms that Transcarpathians shared with Galicians, such as *едень, маеть* (vernacular as regards the stem but not the ending, cf. ChSl. or Russ. *имѣтъ, имѣтса, имѣти* in the same article), *инше, ѡкъ*; *же* as a conjunction, and *про насъ* ‘for us.’²⁷

The following article in no. 27 for 11/23 April 1850 was sent in by a Transcarpathian contributor from Upper Spiš. The author draws a naïve analogy between the beginning of spring and the awakening of Ruthenian national life in the Spiš region:

Зъ Выжнаго Спиза 24. марта. Їкъ междѣ тихими сего великодного св. Поста днами по долгой а лютой зимѣ оуже и тѣ подѣ нашими быстрыми горами Татранскими топлатса безмѣрныѧ снѣги, наставаеть радостнаѧ весна и оживлаетса природа и весь возрастъ земный, въ радость и веселіе живѣщихъ на земли: такъ междѣ покойнѣйшими года сего временами много оутѣсенна прежде Народность наша, аки по долгомѣ снѣ оублажаема, по всакихъ странахъ Вышнаго Спиза даже въ радость и веселіе всѣхъ вѣрныхъ Рѣсиновъ препорождаетса. ‘W ‘N [*sic*, see below] (Vistnyk 1850: 106).

From Upper Spiš. 24 March. As even here, under our jagged Tatra Mountains, the boundless snows melt, the happy springtime begins, and nature and all that grows on earth awakens to new life during the quiet days of this holy Easter Fast, after a long, hard winter, to the delight and joy of everyone living on earth, so our Nationality, severely oppressed in times more silent than this year, as if been blessed after a long sleep, is reviving in all regions of Upper Spiš, to the delight and joy of all loyal Ruthenians. ‘W ‘N (Vistnyk 1850: 106).

27 We know that later still, Ivan Rakovs'kyj also had his writings edited by the Russian Orthodox priest Vasilij Vojtkovskij, who lived in Pest as spiritual counselor to Grand Duchess Anna Pavlovna, the Russian wife of Archduke Joseph (Studyns'kyj 1905: CXXIX). Involuntary non-Russian interferences can therefore also be expected to occur with high probability in Rakovs'kyj's written language.

On the basis of his observations about the content, Jurij Bača (1961: 60–62) convincingly argues that the author of the series of articles titled “Зъ Выжнаго Спижа” (From Upper Spiš), which were often signed with the pseudonym “Орель Татранскій” (The Tatra Eagle), was in all likelihood the former priest of the village of Jarabina/Orjabyna, Mykola Myhalyč (“Николай Мигаличъ,” with *Николай* as the traditional Church Slavonic equivalent of vernacular *Mykola*). The article cited above supports Bača’s argument: the peculiar notation of the author’s initials can be read as an inverted “N. M, [sic, comma],” which perfectly matches “Николай Мигаличъ.”

For our purposes, it is more important to note that the language of this Transcarpathian article draws heavily on Church Slavonic, along with a multitude of archaic elements, such as *возрасть* ‘growth’ (not ‘age,’ as in Russian); the conjunction *аки*; the present passive participle *оублажаема* or hypercorrect *-ыа* in the masculine nominative plural *безмѣрныха снѣги* alongside sporadic Ruthenianizing elements such as *ѡкъ*, the verb *топлатса* with epenthetic *l* also in the third person plural, etc. Furthermore, from a Church Slavonic or Russian perspective, the form *наставаеъ* without alternation of the imperfectivizing suffix is striking, cf. Russian *настаетъ*. This form can probably be explained by intense Transcarpathian language contacts with Slovak, see Slovak *nastáva jar*.

Articles by Oleksandr Duxnovyč are usually somewhat less archaic than those by other Transcarpathians, but this does not imply by any means that his language was closer to the vernacular; it simply drew very heavily on Russian. This is clearly apparent from his contribution to the language discussion, which will be discussed in the next section.

In no. 16 for 14/26 March 1850, there is a report that Duxnovyč’s comedy *Добродѣтель превышаетъ богатство* (*Virtue Is More Important Than Riches*, which is here described as *простонароднымъ выраженіемъ сочиненна* (“written in the language [literally, “expression”] of the simple folk”), has just been printed in Przemyśl:

Прашовъ 2/14 Марта. Дрѣжество тѣтейшее народнои літературы выдало теперъ читальню книжицю, подѣ написомъ Добродѣтель превышаетъ богатство, игра въ трехъ дѣйствіяхъ, отъ А. Д. Книжица она простонароднымъ выраженіемъ сочиненна, теперъ въ Перемышльской печатни бѣквами писменными издаеса; а цѣна ей бѣде на 12 кр. ср. (Vistnyk 1850: 63).

Prešov, 2/14 March. The local society for national literature has now edited a little book for reading titled *Virtue Is More Important Than Riches*, a play in three acts, by A.D. This little book, written in the language of the simple folk, is now being published in cursive²⁸ in a printshop in Przemyśl. Its price will be 12 silver guldens.

28 That is, not in the traditional Cyrillic script, but with letters typical of the cursive (and partly identical with the civil script), such as *я, у*, etc.

Given the language of the first part of this report, it is highly probable that it was not composed in Prešov but by a Galician member of the editorial staff: see the forms *мѣтейшое* with *о*, *народнои* with the vernacular adjective ending in the feminine genitive singular, *она* as a demonstrative pronoun with a truncated ending, *выдало* with *вы-*, and *книжицю* and *книжиця* with soft *с'* (cf. also *книжиця* in the title of Oleksandr Duxnovyč's primer of 1847), *подъ написомъ* with the masculine hard stem noun and *издаеса* and *бѣде* without *-т-* (all marked non-vernacular elements are quoted from the title page of Duxnovyč's book; see also *издаеса* along with *выдало*).

Even the language of Galician authors of letters to the editor who contributed to radical Russophile periodicals shortly afterwards and argued explicitly in the *Вѣстникъ* against a written language based on the vernacular was neither as conservative nor as close to Russian as that of the Transcarpathians. The contributor from Mostyska who hid behind the pseudonym "Михайло изъ Розвадова" (Myxajlo from Rozwadów) was most probably Myxajlo Hnidkovs'kyj.²⁹ He appears as "Hchw. Gnidkowski Michael gk. Pfarr [*sic*, at the end of the column, instead of *Pfarrer*] in Mościska u. Kopanka" ["The Most Reverend Gnidkowski Michael, Greek Catholic chaplain of Mościska and Kopanka"] in the German-language list of subscribers to the Russophile periodical *Семейная Библиотека* (*Family Library*) that Jakiv Holovac'kyj established in 1855 (the list appears in Studyns'kyj 1905: 243–247, here 244). It can hardly be assumed that there were many persons with the same first name in Mostyska who were both sufficiently committed and able to contribute an article to the *Вѣстникъ* such as the one cited here from no. 22 for 30 March/11 April 1850:

Мостици 20 марта. Красни Рѣсинки подгорскихъ сторонъ нашихъ благодарятъ васъ за оудѣланіа описовъ веснанныхъ одѣній [*sic*] красавицъ вѣденскихъ. Просать еще васъ красенько дайте имъ знати, яки капелюхи, что кроя и цвѣтовъ касается, оу Вѣдни носить. Сей предметъ для того ближе познати желають, заводатъ бо наши Рѣсинки товарищества женски, котрыхъ цѣлею есть, въ опредѣленныхъ домахъ чи то въ мѣстахъ чи по селахъ, подъ надзоромъ едной изъ помежи стоваришенихъ тай въ ей домъ рѣски дѣвицы и дѣшевно просвѣщати и въ женскихъ рѣкотрѣдахъ объѣчати. Въ таковыхъ объѣченіа домахъ и не такъ предорого воспитаніе малозаможнымъ родителемъ прійдетъ, тай дѣтоньки въ рѣсскихъ домахъ, подъ рѣскимъ окомъ, по рѣски звычайно и обычайно виховани бѣдѣть. Помагай имъ Господи Боже. Михайло изъ Розвадова (Vistnyk 1850: 91).

Mostyska [literally "Mostyščī"], 20 March. The beautiful Ruthenian ladies of our mountainous regions thank you for having provided descriptions of the spring dresses [preferred] by the beauties of Vienna. They ask you kindly to let them know what kind of hats are worn in Vienna, regarding cut and color. They want to know more about that subject because our Ruthenian ladies are establishing women's societies whose goal is to morally enlighten Ruthenian girls and teach

29 Ivan Levyc'kyj (1888: 51) did not manage to establish the writer behind this pseudonym.

them women's needlework in certain houses, be it in towns or in villages, under the supervision of a representative of the society and in her house.... In such houses of instruction, education will not be particularly expensive even for parents of limited means, and the little children will be brought up in Ruthenian [perhaps "Russian"] homes, under a Ruthenian [perhaps "Russian"] eye, according to Ruthenian customs and traditions. May God help them. Myxajlo from Rozwadów (Vistnyk 1850: 91).

Hnidkovs'kyj's contribution shows numerous marked vernacular elements, including, among others, *оу* instead of etymological *въ* in *оу Вѣдни*; the suffixed forms *красенько* and *дѣтоньки*; the conjunction *чи* (*то*); the noun in *въ мѣстахъ* 'in the towns'; the compound preposition *изъ помежи*; and the compound conjunction *май*. Interestingly, however, Hnidkovs'kyj delivers the expressions of gratitude for Julijan Vysloboc'kyj's above-cited women's column with the words *благодаратъ васъ*, that is, he uses the correct accusative case governed by the Russian (Church Slavonic-based) verb *благодарить*, which was typical only of those Galician Russophiles whose command of Russian was above average. Other elements, such as the playful combination of the vernacular and Russian word form in *звычайно и обычайно*, the Russianism *красавиць* (genitive plural), the word form *опредѣленныхъ* (but not *опредѣленныхъ*), etc. show that Hnidkovs'kyj must already have developed quite an active interest in Russian by 1850. His frequent use of *рѣсск-* with *-сс-*, along with *по рѣски*,³⁰ confirms this impression. Also noteworthy in this letter to the editor are the use of *что*, which is uncommon in other Galician contributions; the verb *касається* "concerns" (instead of *(до)тыкатися*, which is frequently used by other authors); and the co-occurrence of *воспитаніе* and *виховани*. Verbs with the present theme vowel *e* here show the *-ть*, which is also untypical of Galician contributions: see *касається*, *приїдесть* (in most Galician dialects, as is well known, *t'* or *t* never occur in the third person singular of verbs with the present theme vowel *e*, or before *-sja*).

Later articles by Myxajlo Hnidkovs'kyj from the first months of the Vienna *Вѣстникъ* would be increasingly distant from the vernacular, cf. section 6 below. However, they are by no means as conservative in style as the contributions of the Transcarpathians.

Incidentally, a survey of Myxajlo Hnidkovs'kyj's articles in particular confirms once again that many Galicians took hardly any notice of the Transcarpathian Ruthenians. In his remarkable article on "The Austrian Ruthenian" ("Австрійскій Русинъ") in no. 34 for 29 April / 11 May 1850 (Vistnyk 1850: 135–136), he merely compared the loyalist Galician Ruthenians to the Poles, whom he depicted as oppressors and rebels, but said nothing at all about the Transcarpathian situation and the role of the Hungarians there.

30 This spelling could also be the result of an intervention on the part of the editorial office.

6. Early contributions to the language discussion

The lively Ruthenian language discussion that took place in the aftermath of the revolution was also conducted, not least, in the Vienna *Вѣстникъ*. It is striking indeed that not a single contribution to the newspaper from the first months of 1850 makes a clear commitment to the vernacular. Only in no. 107 for 1850 does the Greek Catholic priest, ethnographer, and folklorist Teodor Lysjak write in that spirit. After he had characterized Church Slavonic as “our old grandmother” (“наша старенька бабуса”), comprehensible “neither in Galicia nor in Hungary, nor in Ukraine, nor in the world” (“ани въ Галичинѣ, ани въ Уграхъ, ани на Украинѣ, ани на свѣтѣ”), he was promptly lectured in a commentary by Ivan Holovac'kyj, who maintained that Church Slavonic was the most important unifying linguistic factor for all Ruthenians in view of the allegedly strong dialectal differentiation of Ruthenian and the diverse loans in different dialects (Studyns'kyj 1905: XXIII–XXIV).

The opponents of a vernacular-based written language had already put forward their most important arguments in earlier contributions to the *Вѣстникъ*. The Transcarpathians in particular had taken a leading role in this discussion.

By contrast, no one openly debated the role of Russian.

An intriguing article from no. 30 for 18/30 April 1850 by one of the Russophile members of the editorial staff—*русскій* is consistently written with -cc—also makes no overt mention of Russian in the particular Ruthenian context. On the contrary, it is more of an appeasing commentary on a proposal advanced by the South Slavs of the Austrian realm that all Austrian Slavs should adopt Russian as their common language because of their “fragmented literatures, which are increasingly deviating from their common roots.” According to the editorial, this proposal had caused shock in Austria, but it would soon become apparent that the nightmare was a mere nightmare that should neither be fought nor feared. Allegedly, most of the Slavs had already developed their written language to a state of such perfection—a state that was distant from Russian in any event—that none of them could even think of adopting a foreign language, even if it was Slavic. Interestingly enough, the author argued that the Cracow newspaper *Czas* (Time) had already voiced its objection to the proposal, as if there were any chance that the Poles, of all people, would embrace it. The author added, however, that among the fraternal Czechs and Southern Slavs as well, the vast majority would certainly stand by their mother tongue and reject this “fruitless, wholly impractical notion.”

Вѣдень 15/27 цвѣтня. Оуже отъ колькохъ недѣль розводатся дневники надѣь предлогомъ южнославенской часописи, дабы всѣ австрійскіи Славяне принали російскій ѡзыкъ до своихъ роздробленныхъ и чимъ разъ больше отъ вспольного корена отдаляющихса словесностей. Икъ звичайно мысль одна верженна мимовольно родить дрѣтѣю, и нимъ человекъ оуспѣе остерегчиса, оуже стоить она одѣшвеннымъ великаномъ на пострахъ однимъ, а въ оутѣшеніе дрѣтимъ. [...] люде [...] оувидать що мара всегда марою, съ которою и боротись и боатись ей годѣь.

Не тѣтъ мѣстце розводитиса о отношеніи російского ѡзыка къ прочимъ Славянамъ, изъ которыхъ многіи оуже такъ высокого и со всѣмъ

отрѣбного достигли совершенства, же о отступленіи своего родинного языка а принатиі иншого якого нибѣдь (хоть бы и славанского) ани гадки припѣстити не можна; въ томъ принаймнѣй смыслѣ выступилъ Краковскій „Часть“, отрицающіа всакого сочувствіа въ поиманѣтомъ предлозѣ. Не сомнѣваемса, що и междѣ побратимчими Чехами и Югославенами переважная множайшость познае истиннѣу користь свою въ матерномъ языцѣ, и отречеса сей бесплодной, со всѣмъ непрактической мысли. Въ прочемъ кождый знае свое наилучше; пѣсть они жѣратса своею головою – а мы своею. [...] (Vistnyk 1850: 118–119).

Vienna, 15/27 April. For several weeks now, our dailies have been quarreling about the proposal of a South Slavic newspaper that all Austrian Slavs adopt the Russian language for their fragmented literatures, which are increasingly deviating from their common roots. As usual, the expression of one thought inevitably gives birth to another, and before one even understands what is happening, it already appears as an animate giant that frightens some and delights others.... People...will see that a nightmare is always a nightmare that should neither be fought nor feared.

This is not the place to quarrel about the relation of the Russian language to other Slavs, many of whom have already have already attained such a high and wholly distinct perfection that they will not even consider renouncing their native language and adopting any other, even if it were Slavic; at least the Cracow newspaper *Czas* has already voiced such an opinion, rejecting any sympathy for the aforementioned suggestion. We do not doubt that the great majority of our Czech and South Slavic brethren also recognize the genuine benefit of their mother tongue and will reject that fruitless, wholly impractical notion. After all, everyone knows his own best; let them worry about their own affairs, and we will worry about ours.... (Vistnyk 1850: 118–119).

In a brief passage not cited here, the author explains that the *Зора Галицка* had already come out as a defender of “our south Russian [probably not “south Ruthenian”] language” (“нашого южнорусского языка”), albeit with insufficient arguments. In the spirit of utmost loyalty to the Ruthenian language, the author argues that without questioning the virtues of Russian, whose “melodiousness in pronunciation” and “rich vocabulary” nobody can deny, one should ask oneself and every single Ruthenian whether “our south Russian [perhaps “south Ruthenian”] language” (“нашъ южнорускій языкъ”) is not itself distinguished by similar or even greater melodiousness. He adds that although the Ruthenian vocabulary has not yet been sufficiently developed, exhausted, and fleshed out, the Ruthenian language is pure because it is unique. Here the author refers to what he considers the unbiased testimonials of the “learned Russians” Myxajlo Maksymovyč, Izmail Sreznevskij, and Osyp Bodjans'kyj—he does not reveal that both Maksymovyč and Bodjans'kyj were in fact “Little Russians” (i.e., Ukrainians), while the Russian Izmail Sreznevskij had shown an atypically positive attitude toward Ukrainian, at least in his earlier years.

It soon becomes apparent that the article is only superficially concerned with South Slavic or general Slavic problems, and that its actual focus is on relations between the Ruthenians and the Russians and their languages. According to the

author, the Ruthenians have always been neighbors of the Russians but have always wanted to remain Ruthenians nonetheless. He maintains that in the future, “rejecting any defamations” (ironically, in this very phrase, *отрицааса всакихъ клеветъ*, one finds a particularly glaring Russianism in the adverbial participle),³¹ the Ruthenians wish to “love, to use, develop, and perfect” “our Russian [perhaps “Ruthenian”] language” (“нашъ рꙋсскій ѡзыкъ”):

Не входячи въ преимꙋщества росїйского ѡзыка, котормꙋ благозвꙋчїа въ выговорѣ и словесного богатства никто заперечити не може, кто лише имѣлъ способность его ближе познати: пытаемо самыхъ себе и каждого Рꙋсина, чи не отличаеса и нашъ южнорꙋскій ѡзыкъ въ своемъ родѣ такимъ самымъ а може еще и большимъ благозвꙋчїемъ, и хотя еще досель не розвинꙋтымъ, не вычерпаннымъ, не обробленнымъ, но тимъ чистѣйшимъ ибо самороднымъ богатствомъ? [...] мы отзываетса до свидѣтельствъ самыхъ даже оученыхъ Россїанъ, котори певно въ величанїи и похвалахъ нашего ѡзыка не глѣдали ани користи, ани чꙋвствомъ благимъ не поводоवालїса; ихъ сꙋдъ есть певно высшїй надъ всакїи прїстрастїа, онъ есть ровнодошнїй, безстороннїй. Стоитъ только трꙋда, заглянꙋти въ акое нибꙋдъ сочиненїе Максимовича, Срезневского, Боданского и др. [...] На щожъ намъ чꙋжихъ Боговъ глѣдати, коли мы своего маемъ?

Впрочїхъ дало бы са тое изъ исторїи такожъ довести, що нашъ народъ всегда становилъ только сꙋсѣднїй, ѡзыкамъ, нравами и сꙋдбою побратимчїй росїйскомꙋ народꙋ, и желаемо и надалъ зостати тимъ чимъ отъ поконвѣка былїсмо, т. е. Рꙋсинами, и хочемо мїловати, плекати, образовати, оусовершеншати по возможности силъ и обстоательствъ питомый, нашъ рꙋсскїй ѡзыкъ, отрицааса всакихъ клеветъ, и помовокъ выдꙋманнхъ врагами правды и общественного ладу (Vistnyk 1850: 119).

Without elaborating on the virtues of the Russian language, whose melodiousness in pronunciation and rich vocabulary cannot be denied by anyone who has had the opportunity to become more closely acquainted with it, we ask ourselves and every Ruthenian whether our south Ruthenian [perhaps “South Russian”] language is not distinguished by the same or perhaps even greater melodiousness, and even if its richness has not been developed or exhausted or elaborated, it is even purer because of its uniqueness.... We refer to the testimonials even of learned Russian themselves, who certainly did not expect any profit from the laudation and praise of our language and were not guided by any positive bias; their judgment certainly stands above any passions; it is disinterested and unbiased. One need only glance at any work by Maksymovych, Sreznevskij, Bodjans'kyj et al.... Why should we look to alien Gods [*sic*, with a capital] when we have our own?

Incidentally, one could also conclude from history that our nation has always been merely a neighbor to the Russian nation with respect to language, customs, and destiny. We also want to remain in the future what we have been from the beginning, that is, Ruthenians, and we want to love, use, develop, and perfect our native Russian [perhaps “Ruthenian”] language to the fullest

31 Since the adverbial participle refers to a plural noun, it can by no means be explained as a Church Slavonic archaism.

extent of our energies and circumstances, while rejecting any defamations and slanders invented by the enemies of truth and social order (Vistnyk 1850: 119).

The article is bizarre, since its language, which shows as much affinity to Russian as many other contributions to the *Вѣстникъ*, blatantly contradicts its content. The text features many forms that are common in Russian but might also be regarded as Church Slavonic, such as *преимущества* (accusative plural), *благословіа* (genitive singular), etc. One also encounters undeniable Russianisms, such as the aforementioned adverbial participle *отрицался* or the grammatical particle *нѣсть* for forming the third person imperative.

Ultimately, the article does not take an entirely clear position in the language debate. What remains particularly vague is the relationship that the author assumes between the language that he calls “our Russian [perhaps “Ruthenian”] language” and the Russian language. Was it already perceived as so close that “a Little Russian” could manage to “learn Great Russian within half an hour,” as was later claimed by a former member of the *Вѣстникъ* editorial office, Bohdan Didyc'kyj—who may very well have been the author of this very article? Or did the author truly regard the Russians and Ruthenians as neighboring but different peoples? And what kind of difference could that have been, considering that in his view, the Ruthenians were “united as brothers” with the Russians by language, customs, and destiny, and that their language was “south Russian,” according to a glottonym that clearly belonged to the Russian imperial context? In the final analysis, can this author’s commitment to an autonomous “south Russian” identity be taken seriously, considering that he himself acknowledges the emotions evoked by the Slavophile appeal of the South Slavs?

Doubt is in order here. It seems grotesque of the author to write, on the one hand, that “After all, everyone knows his own best; let them worry about their own affairs, and we will worry about ours” [“Въ прочемъ кождый знае свое наилучше; пусть они жѣрятся своею головою – а мы своею”] when, on the other hand, he uses the aforementioned glaring Russianism *нѣсть* in this very context. It also seems awkward that the author so closely associates the rejection of the proposal to make Russian the written language of all Austrian Slavs with the Polish newspaper *Czas*, which is implicitly presented as the organ of a people “not united as brothers” (immediately afterwards, the author mentions the Czechs and South Slavs, who are united with the Ruthenians as brothers—as are the Russians, but not the Poles).

True, the author may have hesitated to be explicit, since the expression of an open commitment to the Ruthenians’ use of Russian was hardly imaginable in the official newspaper *Вѣстникъ*—an immediate relaunch with a different editorial staff would have been the highly probable consequence. Contributions to the *Вѣстникъ* generally shifted discussions about Russian to a different level; on the surface, it appeared as if only Church Slavonic, not Russian, was the focus of debate.

Issue 38 for 9/21 May 1850 contains a letter from Uzhhorod with the title “A Word about Our Language, Which Is to Be Made Consistent” (“Слово въ дѣлѣ уравниемаго языка нашего”). The letter is signed “Паноніанинъ” and was

therefore in all likelihood written by Ivan Rakovs'kyj (see above). In his contribution, Rakovs'kyj also concedes that there are allegedly Slavs “who advise complete unification [of the Slavs] based on the adoption of one language” (“которіи совокѣпное всѣхъ соединеніе въ воспріятіи единого ѡзыка совѣтѣють”), but he does not even mention Russian in this context. Rakovs'kyj then downplays the issue, writing that at present, it is not so much the language question as the success of the national movement per se that is of major importance. As for cultivating the language and making it consistent, these are the primary tasks of the two leading Ruthenian newspapers, the *Вѣстникъ* and the *Зора Галицка*. Incidentally, the author argues that “our national language” (“Народный ѡзыкъ нашъ”)—Rakovs'kyj does not add any specifying glottonym—“differs very little from...the Bible language, which is named the Old Slavonic language.” According to the author, “If we take away the dual number of nouns and verbs, which is already rarely encountered among us, as well as the preterite forms of verbs such as *обрѣтохъ*, *обрѣтохомъ*, etc., which would appear to have been established in the spirit of the Greek language, then all other linguistic declensions, conjugations, and constructions are readily comprehensible to our people, even if we do not adapt them to our folk dialect in every respect.” Rakovs'kyj further contends that although it is surely important to remain loyal to the language of the simple folk (“простонародный ѡзыкъ”),³² if that principle were to be applied consistently in every area, one would ultimately be faced with almost as many cultures of writing (“словесностей”) as there are regions or even villages. Where, after all, is there a people with an everyday language identical to its cultivated and learned language?

When Rakovs'kyj goes on to write that it is not necessary “for us” to strive for a written language fully aligned with the vernacular, it is not at all clear whom he means by “us”: all Ruthenians, only the Austrian ones, only the Transcarpathian ones, or all Eastern Slavs? What would “our” written language be, Rakovs'kyj asks further on, if it rested on this “poor” foundation (cf. Csopey 1883: s.v. *худо́бный* ‘poor,’ from *худо́ба*)? According to Rakovs'kyj, the development of every written language requires sources that the people themselves just could not give “us”:

Оунгварь 28 Цвѣтна (10 Маа). Иѣкъ распространно разсѣанный естъ народъ Славанскій, такъ различнаа имѣеть своа нарѣчіа. Семѣ дивитиса нѣтъ что. [...] Сѣтъ даедні, котри про то, же народъ Славанскій не имѣеть согласіе междѣ собою въ ѡзыцѣ, не обинѣаются [*sic*] распространати тое мнѣніе, ѡко онъ нигда не доспѣеть на высочайшій иныхъ народовъ просвѣщенства степень; иніи же изъ самихъ Славанъ желающіи единокрѣное ихъ совокѣпленіе предношають, дабы всѣ споразмѣлиса въ избратіи единого дла словесности и писемности ѡзыка; мы ѡкъ тѣхъ мнѣніе, которіи народъ Славанскій на позадній отъ иныхъ народовъ просвѣщенства степень осѣждають, здѣ опровергати не сѣдме за важное дѣло, такъ и тѣхъ

32 Jurij Bača (1961: 98) seeks to interpret these words, in a hardly convincing manner, as evidence for the notion that Rakovs'kyj realized the fundamental need to speak in the vernacular. However, as Rakovs'kyj's actual attitude to language shows, this statement would appear to amount to little more than lip service.

Славянъ стремленія, которіи совокупное всѣхъ соединеніе въ воспріятіи единого языка совѣтуютъ, достигати не хотимъ наше все попеченіе само о томъ ходитъ, да бы мы, которіи токмо нынѣ начинаемъ двигатися зъ подѣ всеобщаго оутисненія нашего, и до свочѣствія приходити, народность нашѣ и перевозасаднаа просвѣщенства нашего начала оукрѣпили. Двѣ часописи имѣемъ, „Вѣстникъ“ и „Зорю Галицкѣ“, аже бытіе наше обвѣщаютъ свѣтѣ, и sprawy наши народны представляютъ; сихъ задача есть, да бы въ едно и языкъ нашъ спрощевали, и на сколько возможно оуравняли. [...]

Народный языкъ нашъ съ весьма малымъ различіемъ тойже истинный съ именованнымъ библическимъ, иже называется старославянскимъ азыкомъ. Ежели изъемаеме рѣдко оуже встрѣчающіася оу насъ дывовеннаа именъ и глаголовъ числа, такъ равно и времена глаголовъ преходащаа, аки на примѣръ „обрѣтохъ, обрѣтохомъ“ и проч., аже по дѣлѣ греческаго языка заведенна видатся, всаинаа [sic] склоненія, сопряженія, и сочиненія азыкословна, хотя бы есме и не приспособляли ихъ со всемъ нарѣчію простонародномъ, оудобно сразумѣтелнаа бывають народѣ нашемъ. Оузнаемъ добрѣ тѣю важность, юже на простонародный языкъ намъ обернѣти подобаеть, однакожъ принуждени есми и то исповѣсти, же ежели бы мы себе во всемъ простонародномъ языкѣ приспособляли хотѣли, тогда майже толико словесностей имѣли бы есме, колико областей и селѣ находится. [...] Но и гдѣ избрѣтаеця народѣ, иже бы повседневный свой языкъ равенъ имѣлъ съ обдѣланнымъ и оученнымъ азыкомъ? Откуда и намъ не есть нѣждно къ томѣ смагатися, да бы есме совсемъ простонароднѣ писемность нашѣ провадили. Объемъ понатій простонародія нашего, и соотвѣтнихъ имъ выражений есть весьма тѣсный; акаа же была бы словесность наша исключительно на сей хѣдобной основанна подставѣ? Развитіе словесности требѣеть источниковъ, которыхъ народѣ самъ не возможеть намъ дати [...] Паноніанинъ (Vistnyk 1850: 150–151).

Uzhhorod, 28 April (10 May). As widely dispersed as is the Slavic people, so different are its dialects. This is no wonder.... There are some who, because the Slavic people has no mutual accord regarding its language, do not hesitate to spread the opinion that it [the Slavic people] will never reach the highest level of enlightenment attained by other peoples; others among the Slavs themselves, desiring their one-language unification, propose that all agree on the choice of one language for literacy and literature. We neither consider it important to refute the opinion that assigns the Slavic people a lower level of education than that of other peoples, nor do we wish to comment on the efforts of those Slavs who advise complete unification based on the adoption of one language. Our only concern is that now, as we are just beginning to move out of a state of general oppression and develop self-consciousness, we should strengthen our nationality and the basic foundations of our education. We have two journals, the *Вѣстникъ* and *Зора Галицка*, which tell the world of our existence and present our national issues. It is their task both to unify our language and to make it as consistent as possible....

Our national language differs very little from the language called the Bible language, which is named the Old Slavic language. If we take away the dual number of nouns and verbs, which is already rarely encountered among us, as well as the preterite forms of verbs such as *обрѣтохъ, обрѣтохомъ*, etc., which would appear to have been established in the spirit of the Greek language,

then all other linguistic declensions, conjugations, and constructions are readily comprehensible to our people, even if we do not adapt them to our folk dialect in every respect. We are prepared to acknowledge the importance of the argument that we must pay attention to the language of the simple folk, but we also have to admit that if we wished to adapt ourselves to the language of the simple folk in every respect, we would get almost as many literatures as the regions and villages we have.... But where would one find a people with an everyday language identical to its cultivated and learned language? That is why it is not necessary for us, either, to strive to base our literature solely on the language of the simple folk. The scope of concepts of our simple folk and the scope of corresponding expressions is extremely narrow; what would our literature be like if it were based exclusively on this poor foundation? The development of literature requires sources that the people *itself* will not be able to give us.... The Pannonian (Vistnyk 1850: 150–151).

Rakovs'kyj's arguments are stereotypical, but not all of them are wrong. A modernized standard language could in fact never be identical to a vernacular: it could only be elaborated on the basis of a vernacular. What Rakov'skyj forgot to add was that the Church Slavonic language also could not be used as a modern standard language because it had never been elaborated for that purpose. His even more unconvincing and, indeed, absurd argument is the allegation that "our [Ruthenian] vernacular" is, except for its most archaic features, in essence identical to Church Slavonic. Based on the latter assumption, Rakovs'kyj continues to construct his awkward elucubration in a language that draws very heavily on Russian and Church Slavonic, with only a slight admixture of local Transcarpathian Ruthenian elements:

Предпомаи́тьмъ старославянскимъ ꙗзыкомъ знакоми́тнаа [sic] сочиненіа разнаго содержанія оу Сербанъ, Краинцевъ и Чеховъ частократно еще и сими днами произдаваются, и не есть народа славянскаго, который бы въ почтеніи и поважаніи не имѣлъ предименованный ꙗзыкъ старославя́нскій. Про что таже мы отда́латиса бѣде́ме отъ него, которымъ по бо́лшей части еще наро́дъ нашъ нескажено бесѣ́детъ? [...] Многоу́тъшнымъ чѣвствіемъ исполна́ется сердце наше, же очеви́дно оуже изслѣ́дити може́ме, ꙗко „Вѣстникъ“ право́пись свою къ старославенско́му ꙗзыку́ знакоми́тнѣ приспособла́ти начина́етъ, такъ равно и „Зора Гали́цка“ бо́лше дописе́й сообра́щаетъ, иже на правилахъ старославянскаго ꙗзыка основа́ются; вса сіа поавле́ніа благонаде́жно запо́рѣчають намъ, же не далеко́ есть вре́мя, гдѣ всту́питъ заимное споразу́мѣніе дла словесности и писемности междѣ нами Рѣ́синами Австри́йскими (Vistnyk 1850: 151–152).

Even today, remarkable works of various content written in the aforementioned Old Slavic language are often published by the Serbs, Carniolans, and Czechs, and there is no Slavic people that would not hold the aforementioned Old Slavic language in honor and esteem. Why, then, should we distance ourselves from that language, which still serves as the unspoiled conversational language of most of our people?... Our heart is filled with a feeling of great joy as we plainly see the *Вѣстникъ* appropriately beginning to adapt its orthography to

the Old Slavic language, while *Зора Галицка* is publishing more contributions based on the rules of the Old Slavic language; all these developments are a reliable indication that the time of mutual agreement on written culture and literature among us Austrian Ruthenians is not far off (Vistnyk 1850: 151–152).

Rakovs'kyj's appeal was decidedly strange. While some Serbs did indeed adhere to Church Slavonic or "Slavenoserbian" traditions, nothing is known of "Carniolans" (Slovenes) or Czechs publishing any modern books in Church Slavonic. If this was an obvious error, Rakovs'kyj's other absurd claim that the Ruthenians spoke genuine Church Slavonic even in the mid-nineteenth century did not gain credibility through his mere repetition of it. Was he unaware that he was completely contradicting himself? If the Ruthenians actually spoke Church Slavonic, why would they not proceed to develop their literary language on a genuine vernacular foundation?

While Rakovs'kyj was pleased to see the *Вѣстникъ* using a traditional etymological ("Old Slavic") orthography, his appraisal of *Зора Галицка* was limited to letters to the editor (obviously, he had in mind only letters from Russophiles). Rakovs'kyj's main message was clear enough. In his view, a mutual understanding between "us Austrian Ruthenians"—officially, "we" still meant Austrian Ruthenians and no one else—could be attained only on the basis of Church Slavonic.

Ivan Rakovs'kyj thus literally confirmed what had already been implied in the first issue of the Vienna *Вѣстникъ*—that according to the openly voiced opinion of some Ruthenians, especially Transcarpathians, Church Slavonic alone could promote mutual understanding between Transcarpathian and Galician Ruthenians. What remained unspoken was that the language referred to as "Old Slavic," etc. was not Church Slavonic but Russian, while in the view of the Russophiles, there could be no question at all of elaborating an all-Ruthenian (all-Ukrainian) or even an Austro-Ruthenian language.

The language that Rakovs'kyj used in this article so obviously confirms the impression that Russian was at issue here, even though it was referred to officially as Church Slavonic, that no elaboration is required. True, one does sporadically encounter vernacular elements, such as *нѣтъ* 'there is not' (alongside *не есть*; the form coincides with Russian [n'et] but is also used in Transcarpathian dialects [n'it]), the pronoun *даедні* "some," the adverb *нигда* "never," etc. The form *произдаваютсѧ* is obviously modeled on Church Slavonic and Russian but is highly dubious because of the missing alternation of the present stem (Russian *произдаются*).

Oleksandr Duxnovyč, the most important protagonist of Transcarpathian Ruthenian nation-building, finally joined the language discussions in no. 29 (cf. on him, among others, Duxnovyč 2003):³³

33 Duxnovyč occasionally returned to the language issue in other contributions to the *Вѣстникъ*; see, e.g., no. 35 for 2/14 May 1850.

Прашовъ 26 цвѣтна. Чтобъ словесность цѣли оуспѣшно слѣжила, ей потребно быти свойственною, т. е. такою, чтобы органомъ ей каждый мнѣніа и понатіа свои такъ изаснилъ, абы они отъ слышающаго и читающаго естественно выразѣлись; и то полѣчитса, когда знаменованіа словъ сродныи бѣдуть, именительно же отъ корене вещи происходими; и прото на колико возможно, остерѣгатиса потребно отъ словъ чужихъ, или чужаго произношеніа, отъ выражений окрѣжныхъ, помѣстныхъ, провинціальныхъ, ꙗко сѣть примѣромъ: *мешканье, замешкалость, досвѣдченье, творенье* и пр. тіи бо сѣть польского выраженіа; такъ сѣть оу насъ въ оупотребленіи: *талпаловати, говзеръ, фель-веръ, бантовати, фалатъ* и проч. мадарскаго, *сарака* волоскаго, *мѣситъ* нѣмецкаго происхожденіа.

Что тыкается провинціалисмовъ, отъ сихъ, по мнѣнію нашemu, таки только оупотреблати подобаеъ, котори разпространѣйшии сѣть, но и тогда внимающе на близость корене, такъ н. п. *лишь, лише* и *лемъ; що, што, шо, же и что; быти* и *бѣти; еденъ* и *одинъ о* и *о*; провинціалисмы тіи по обоимъ сторонамъ Бескида разширно въ оупотребленіи сѣть; енакоже междѣ народомъ великѣ чинать разлѣкѣ, и многажды виною распри бывають; едни дрѣгимъ посмѣваются, но часто же и презирають ними. Прото доколи така распра въ одномъ племени бѣдетъ, не можна желаемого совоклѣпеніа нашей словесности надѣатиса. Мы хотай цѣла наша епархіа лемъ оупотреблаеъ, енакожъ подвержемса большой части, и послаъ семѣ *лишь, лише* писати бѣдеме; но мѣсто галицкаго *що, бѣти* останемса съ нашимъ *что, быти*, которое намъ и разпространѣйшее и по благозвѣчію приємнѣйшее видитса быти; такожде и васъ молимъ, чтобъ и вы сколько оустѣпили, и если не больше, хотай едно *що* и *бѣти* перемѣнили, ꙗкъ тое оуже въ I числѣ Вѣстника и сами Галичане желали.

Прото не зирайме на провинціалисмы и помѣстніи разности выражений, но пишѣмъ одною всѣмъ разѣмѣтельною, писменною бесѣдою, и то на которѣю вы братіа Галичане склоннѣйшии бѣдете; – мы – меншаа часть на все лѣчшее пристанемъ, и васъ оуважати бѣдеме; но просимъ и оумолаемъ васъ, оуважайте и вы на насъ и Бѣковинцовъ братовъ своихъ, и оусилѣйтеся ихъ приклонити къ себѣ лѣчше въ мирѣ и любви, нежели ихъ оупоромъ отдаляти и оскорблати (Vistnyk 1850: 140).

Prešov, 26 April. A literature, in order to fulfill its task successfully, must be appropriate, that is, of such a kind that everyone can use it as an organ to express his opinions and concepts in such a way as to be naturally comprehended by the hearer or reader. This will work out if the terms for words are genuine, namely, if they stem from the root of the thing. Therefore one must avoid, as much as possible, foreign words or foreign pronunciation; regional, local, or provincial expressions such as *мешканье* [from Polish *mieszkanie* "condominium"], *замешкалость* [from Polish *zamieszkałość* (?) "population"; the word is in fact rare in Polish], *досвѣдченье* [from Polish *doświadczenie* "experience"], *творенье* [from Polish *tworzenie* "creating"?],³⁴ etc., for these are Polish expressions; similarly, we use *талпаловати* ["to shoe a horse," from Hungarian *talpal* "hoof"], *говзеръ* [from Hungarian *hóhéř* "hangman," ultimately of German origin], *фельверъ* [from Hungarian "half-caste"], *бантовати* [from Hungarian *bánt-*, as in *bántani* "hurt"], *фалатъ* ["a piece," from Hungarian *falat*], etc. ([of] Hungarian [origin]),

34 This is a strange form, and one wonders which Slavs would have had a problem with it.

сарака [from Romanian *sarac* “poor”] ([of] Vlach [origin]), *мѣситъ* (of German origin).

As for provincialisms, we should, in our opinion, use only those that are most widespread, but even then we should pay attention to the closeness of the roots, such as *лишь*, *лише* and *лемъ* [“only,” with *лемъ* used only in the Lemko area]; *що*, *што*, *шо*, *же*, and *что* [“what, that,” with *що* and *шо* used in Modern Standard Ukrainian and many Ukrainian dialects, *што* used in many Transcarpathian dialects, *же* used in some westernmost Ukrainian dialects, and *что* used in Russian (but pronounced [što])]; *быти* и *бѣти* [to be, with *бѣти* used in most Ukrainian dialects, and *быти* in some westernmost dialects]; *едень* и *одинъ* [with *едень* used only in some westernmost dialects], *о* and *ѡ* [Duxnovyč apparently had in mind the different reflexes of *o* in newly closed syllables; however, the most widespread reflex in the Ukrainian language area, even in the former “Austro-Ruthenian” area alone, was [i], as in Modern Standard Ukrainian]; these provincialisms are widely used on both sides of the Beskyds but cause great division among the people and often give rise to disputes; some laugh at others and often even despise them. Therefore, as long as such disputes exist within one tribe, one cannot hope for the desired unification of our literature. Although our whole eparchy uses *лемъ*, we are nonetheless prepared to give in to the majority, and we will then write only *лишь*, *лише*; but instead of Galician *що*, *бѣти*, we shall hold to our *что*, *быти*, which seems to be both more widespread and more pleasant as regards melodiousness. Also, we ask you, too, to give in to the same degree and at least replace only *що* and *бѣти*, if more seems impossible, as the Galicians themselves desired in the first issue of the *Вѣстникъ*.

Let us therefore pay no attention to provincialisms and regional differences of terms but write in one written language comprehensible to all, and that will be the one that you Galician brethren prefer; we, the smaller part, will agree to all that is best and will respect you, but we request and entreat you: show consideration to us, as well as to your brethren, the Bukovynians, and try to win them over to yourselves rather by peace and love than by alienating and offending them with stubbornness (Vistnyk 1850: 140).

At first glance, this article may appear to be a perfectly sincere appeal for Galician-Transcarpathian linguistic convergence, as already anticipated by Duxnovyč in no. 29 (Bača 1961: 85). In this article, apart from the forms *быти* vs. *бѣти* and *что* vs. *що*, already discussed in the first issue of the *Вѣстникъ*, Duxnovyč brings up *лемъ* as opposed to *лишь*/*лише*. His apparent willingness to accept an allegedly Galician form instead of one that is in fact provincial (by no means used in all parts of the Transcarpathian region) takes on a very different cast if one considers that *лишь* is also, and above all, commonly used in Russian, while *лише*, which is more common in Modern Standard Ukrainian, is given only as a second variant of *лишь*. While Duxnovyč writes that the ultimate goal is “one written language comprehensible to all” (“одною всѣмъ разумѣтельною, писменною бесѣдою”), he never specifies what kind of language it could be. Moreover, his text reveals that the “we” to whom he refers are ultimately, in a narrow sense, the Transcarpathian Ruthenians alone (cf. also “вы братія Галичане”).

In general, Duxnovyč's actual linguistic usage shows more clearly than his vague programmatic statements what he meant by "one written language comprehensible to all." Leaving aside the comparatively rich but often tendentious literature on Duxnovyč's linguistic development, it should be recalled that he used a vernacular-based language only in writings of a markedly popular character, as in some sections of his primer and, particularly, in his comedy *Virtue Is More Important Than Riches* (Moser 2011: 627–640).

Duxnovyč's above-cited contribution to the *Вѣстникъ* contains numerous Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms, including some obvious loans from Russian such as *полѹчитсѧ* "it will succeed" and some awkwardly (indeed, mistakenly) used forms with a Church Slavonic or Russian basis such as *слышающого* (masculine genitive singular). At the same time, Duxnovyč introduces some more or less markedly Transcarpathian elements, such as *бѣдеме*, *взираиме* or *прото*, none of which demonstrates commitment to the development of a common Galician-Transcarpathian language.

In detail, Duxnovyč's orthography seeks to be even more etymological than that of the Galicians. He writes *что* and *чтобы* or *чтобѣ*, and even the reflex of *o* in newly closed syllables ("ѡ" with him, "ѡ" in most contributions to the *Вѣстникъ*) does not appear in the article. Duxnovyč does occasionally write *o* after sibilants, as in *слышающого* and *читающого* (masculine genitive singular) or *большой* (feminine dative singular, instead of *большѡй*), but he also uses *e*, as in *нашей* (feminine genitive singular), *нашемѣ* (masculine dative singular), *лѣшее*, *разпространѣйшее* (neuter nominative singular), etc. The reflex of weak *ь* before *j* is, as in *мнѣніѧ* и *понятіѧ* or *братіѧ*, etc., noted exclusively as *i* (but not in the "Polonisms" *мешканье*, *досвѣдченье*, *творенье*). The vocalized Jer in the prefix according to the traditions of the Second South Slavic influence is found in the Church Slavonic expressions *возможно* and *совокѣпленіѧ*, both of which are supported by Russian. In Duxnovyč's text, the reflex of the word-initial liquid metathesis appears exclusively in Church Slavonic form, as in *выразѣмѣлисѧ*, *разпространѣйшии*, *разширно*, *разлѣкѣ*, *распрѣ*, *разности*, *разлѣтельнойно*, etc. The Church Slavonic metathetic forms *потребно* (cf., of course, also Polish *potrzeb-* and Ukrainian *потреб-*), *презирають*, *по благозвѣчію*, *въ оупотребленіи*, *оупотребляти* and others occur alongside individual pleophonic forms such as *остерѣгатисѧ* (with the "Ukrainian" *ѣ* here, see Ukrainian *остерігатися*), *волоскаго*, *сторонамѣ* (dative plural), *перемѣнили*, all of which have counterparts in Russian. Duxnovyč writes Church Slavonic *жд < *dj* in *происхожденіѧ*, *междѣ* or *такожде* alongside *ж* in *чѣжихѣ* (exactly as in Russian), and he uses Church Slavonic *щ < *tj* in present participles: *слышающого*, *читающого* (masculine genitive singular), *внимающе* (masculine nominative plural). The initial *je-*, as in *еднакожѣ*, *едни* (nominative plural masculine), as well as *въ едномѣ племени*, could be explained as a Polonism or Slovakism but, in all likelihood, Duxnovyč used it because he knew initial *je-* from Church Slavonic. The spelling *свойственою* with *-н-* alongside естественно with *-нн-* is striking, as is the postvocalic writing of *ѧ* in *провинціальныхѣ*, which is still being discussed by specialists in the Ukrainian language (*матеріалізм* vs. *матеріялізм*).

Regarding morphology, the following features are of interest. No genitive or locative ending in *-[u]* is to be encountered, cf. *Бескида* (genitive singular) or *въ оупотребленіи* (locative singular). The genitive singular ending in *корене* is the most archaic option, although it can also be explained on a dialectal basis; the locative form *въ [...] любови* is not paralleled in Russian but, as an exception, in Ukrainian. If Duxnovyč writes the feminine instrumental singular with the traditional ending *-ою*, as in *виною, свойственною, and такою*, and thus avoids a markedly Transcarpathian form, Russian high style again provides a counterpart. Surprisingly, feminine adjectives and pronouns are truncated, as in *така распра, цѣла наша епархія, or великѣ чинать разлѣкѣ*; long forms occur sporadically, as in *менишаа часть* and *на которѣю*. In the neuter nominative-accusative, the long form alone is used (*которое, лучшее*); the (non-Russian) long form of the demonstrative pronoun (*мое*) is used along with the short form (*то полѣчитса*). The endings in the nominative/accusative plural are either truncated, as in *таки* (masculine accusative plural) or *катори* (masculine nominative plural), or non-truncated, as in *мнѣнія и понатія свои or знаменованія словъ сродныи бѣдутъ, именительнo же отъ корене вещи происходими, etc.*; in the plural, the endings are gender-neutral (as opposed to the above-cited writings of Rakov's'kyj or, particularly, Nod'), as is the plural form of the pronoun *они*. In the masculine or neuter genitive singular, Church Slavonic *-аго*, as in *чѣжого произношенія, мадарскаго [...] волоскаго [...] нѣмецкаго происхожденія, чѣжого произношенія* and *мѣсто галицкаго що* predominates, as compared with the vernacular *-ого*, as in *польского выраженія or желаемого совокѣпленія*. The marked Ukrainian *n*-prothesis of the personal pronoun without a preceding preposition in *презирають ними* is striking; it is not clear whether this Ruthenianism was intended (be it by Duxnovyč or by the editors of the *Вѣстникъ*) or the result of interference. In the first person plural present tense forms of verbs, unmarked *-мъ* occurs alongside marked Transcarpathian *-ме*, cf. *подвержемса, останемса, молимъ, оуважати бѣдемъ vs. писати бѣдеме, не взираиме*, etc. The typically Ukrainian first person plural imperative form, as in *взираиме* and, particularly, *пишѣмъ*, deserves mention. Generally, however, features backed by Church Slavonic prevail, such as the dative form of the reflexive pronoun in *къ себѣ* and especially third person singular verbs with the present theme vowel *e*, which invariably end in *-еть*: cf. *оупотребляетъ, бѣдетъ, тыкается*, etc. In *внимающе*, the ending of the present active participle in the masculine nominative plural is entirely conservative; the present passive participle *происходими* is non-vernacular as a category. Lastly, the form of the numeral in *по обоимъ сторонамъ* is defective from a contemporary perspective; it should, however, be taken into account that rules for the use of Russian *обоимъ* and *обѣимъ* were only established in the course of the nineteenth century. In all likelihood, the use of the dative with *по* also follows the Russian model.

Regarding syntax, the use of the present copula (*тіи бо сѣть польского выраженія; такъ сѣть оу насъ въ оупотребленіи*) and of the predicative instrumental case (*виною распри бывають*) can most likely be explained by Duxnovyč's penchant for high-style eighteenth-century Russian; the same may apply to his use of *отъ* + genitive to indicate the agent in a passive construction: *абы они отъ слышающого*

и читающо҃го естествоно выра́зѣли́са. Duxnovyč's use of *внимающе* in the following example is often regarded as incorrect: [...] *таки только оупотребляти подобаетъ, котори разпротраннѣйшии сѣть, но и тогда внимающе на близость корене*; the form *внимающе* refers to the non-expressed logical dative subject of the main clause, although it is generally recommended that adverbial participles be used in agreement with a nominative subject. The nominative with infinitive in *которое намъ и разпротраннѣйшее и по благозвѣчю приѣмнѣйшее видится быти* is again taken from Slaveno-Russian writing traditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Regarding function words, several vernacular forms occur alongside Church Slavonic and Russian forms: see *чтобъ/чтобы* (alongside *абы*), *или, но* (this form, however, is used in some Western Ukrainian dialects as well), *когда/тогда, которое, межѣ* or archaic *такожде, единакоже* and *колико* (alongside *скільки*, as in Russian) vs. vernacular *абы, доколи, хотай, якъ, протю* (typically western Ukrainian), *бо* (used, however, as an enclitic form, as in Old East Slavic, not in the initial position), *кождый*, the western Ukrainian vernacular reciprocal pronoun in *едни дрѣжимъ*, the Ukrainian form of the predicative in (*не*) *можна*, etc. The spelling of the conjunction *если* can be regarded as "more etymologically correct" than in Russian (Russian *если* is in fact a loan from Polish, but Duxnovyč was probably not aware of that). The predicative *подобаетъ* "it behooves [someone to do something]" is another marker of Duxnovyč's penchant for eighteenth-century Russian. As for the impersonal predicative *потребно*, Duxnovyč may have favored it because it also looks Church Slavonic.

In general, the vocabulary of Duxnovyč's text is based almost exclusively on Church Slavonic or Russian: *знаменованіа, именительно, примѣромъ* (instrumental singular, not *прикладъ*; *приміром*, however, is also common in contemporary Ukrainian), *происхожденіа, оупотребляти, разпротраннѣйшии, внимающе* (alongside *оуважати*), *многожды, презирають, распра, совокѣпленіа* (genitive singular), *подвержемса, по благозвѣчю, оумоляемъ*, etc. Marked Ruthenianisms are clearly relegated to the background, cf. *тыкается* and *оуважати*, with the latter used repeatedly (alongside *внимающе*).

The language of Duxnovyč's article ultimately confirms that he contributed nothing to the development of a common written language, which he allegedly considered desirable, for all Austrian Ruthenians. If he claimed that "I am bending my efforts on behalf of the Carpatho- or Beskydo-Ruthenian language used by the peoples in Galicia and Hungary" ("Я стараюся о мовѣ карпато- или бескидо-рѣской, народами в Галичинѣ и Оугорщинѣ оупотребляемой") in no. 29 of the *Вѣстникъ* (cited in Bača 1961: 85), this should not be taken too literally. In this case as well, the content of his statement is reduced to absurdity by its form (cf. *оупотребляемой*, which is distant from the vernacular in terms of lexis and morphological category). Duxnovyč's true concern was a language suitable for "all Russians."

In no. 58 of the *Вѣстникъ* for 27 June/9 July 1850, "Михайло зъ Розвадова," whom we have already unmasked as Mykhajlo Hnidkovs'kyj, also asked which of the "Slav(en)o-Russian" [or "Slav(en)o-Ruthenian"?] "dialects" should be used by the

Austrian Ruthenians (“Котрого славорусского нарѣчія подобаетъ австрійскимъ русинамъ нынѣ оупотреблати?”). While the author writes of “Slav(en)o-Russian dialects,” he soon introduces the term “Russian [perhaps “Ruthenian”] Old Slavic language” (“старославанскій ѡзыкъ рѣсскій”). He, too, implies that medieval Rus’ian and Church Slavonic were pure, and thus identical, while Ruthenian variants were subsequently contaminated by various foreign influences, but Church Slavonic remained pure.

Hnidkovs'kyj elaborates above all on foreign loans incorporated into variants of the western Ukrainian vernacular. He argues that in the Kingdom of Hungary, Ruthenian has too many Magyarisms; in Bukovyna, it has too many Germanisms and Romanisms—although the Bukovynian variant is, in his opinion, at least purer than that of Hungary; and in Galicia, Ruthenian is subjected to an all too powerful Polish impact. In Hnidkovs'kyj's view, only the isolated Ruthenians of the mountainous Carpathian region, who rarely come into contact with foreigners, speak “pure Ruthenian, which is close to the Church Slavonic dialect.” Hnidkovs'kyj adds that in parts of Galicia bordering on “Little Russia” (“Малороссія”), people actually speak pure “Little Russian” (“Малорѣсскимъ ѡзыкомъ”), but they have been influenced by Polish or Great Russian (here “російскій,” “по-російски” alongside “сѣвероросійскій”). Hnidkovs'kyj contends that the language of western Galicia has been generally disfigured by Polish influence, and that the language of the region from the middle Dnister to the Prut is a “pathetic Ruthenian language oppressed by slavery” (whatever Hnidkovs'kyj had in mind here, he must have meant the speakers, not the language).

Which of these allegedly so radically different dialects could now serve as the most appropriate basis for literary Ruthenian? Hnidkovs'kyj argues that it would have to be a pure and exemplary dialect of the “Slav(en)o-Russian” [“Slav(en)o-Ruthenian”?] language understood by all. However, as he contends, not a single one of the aforementioned dialects could be considered at once generally comprehensible and pure and exemplary. He adds that even Little Russian in Podilia and in Ukraine are increasingly approximating “North Russian” (a remarkable discovery!).³⁵

35 “Мостици 14. черв. Обстоательства на старославанскій ѡзыкъ рѣсскій въ Оутрахъ, Бѣковинѣ и въ Галиціи отъ давна впылающеіи не всюды единого и тогожъ самого рода натрѣчеваемы, и сего ради отличающеіи (!) другѣхъ отъ другѣхъ сказы въ немъ просоизводили. Въ Оутрахъ находимъ рѣсскій ѡзыкъ не такъ дѣже мадарскими дла рѣсчины весьма чѣжими и гортани рѣсской цѣло невѣснскими реченіями переполненный [...] Въ Бѣковинѣ придобѣмъ въ бесѣдѣ рѣсской реченіа нѣмецкого и романского ѡзыковъ; но тѣ позосталъ едначе рѣсскій ѡзыкъ не такъ дѣже что до матеріи ѡкъ что до формы чистѣй, ѡкъ онъ въ Оуторчинѣ; чѣжи бо ѡзыки не такъ борзо и не такъ ласо съ собою сватаются. Въ Галичинѣ пробывають тѣ поединчи родини, тѣ громады, а тамъ и цѣли рѣсски предѣлы то въ дальшемъ то въ ближшемъ сосѣдствѣ тѣ съ полскими родинами, тамъ съ полскими громадами, а онѣ съ полскими повѣтами, а даже и подъ едною стрѣхою рѣсскій ѡзыкъ съ полскимъ то мирно гостили, то единъ другомъ повиновалася; сего ради въ Галичинѣ что село, то иное (нарѣчіа рѣсского гѣло [?]). Въ карпатскихъ Галичины предѣлахъ, где рѣсинъ николи або дѣже рѣдко съ иноплемениками стыкался, и где по болшей части въ камералныхъ добрахъ мѣстцевы власти нѣмецкимъ переправляли ѡзыкомъ, съ рѣсиномъ рѣсского оупотреблати принѣждени были ѡзыка, бесѣдуютъ еще до нынѣ чистымъ рѣсскимъ къ церковнославанскому нарѣчію сближеннымъ ѡзыкомъ. По обводамъ Галиціи

Hnidkovs'kyj, who is clearly anti-Polish, offers no solution to this dilemma, but his own awkward language gives something of a hint, as it includes not only a variety of vernacular elements but also numerous Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms: *обстоятельства, сего ради*, the nominative plural present active participle *отлицающиса* (here with the reflex of the third palatalization, which is unusual in Russian), *предѣлы, даже, съ иноплемениками, по болейшей части* with *e* after the sibilant, *власти* (nominative plural), *оупотребляти, принѣждени, вѣще, въ сожитіи, премногими, чѣжеязычными* with *e* after the sibilant, *живетъ* with *-тъ*, *рабствомъ*, the strange creation *просоизводили* (see Russian *производили*), etc. Hnidkovs'kyj's own language thus demonstrates that in his view, as none of the Ruthenian dialects could serve independently as a model for the elaboration of a Ruthenian literary language, only the consolidating traditions of Church Slavonic could ultimately prove effective in that capacity. Although Hnidkovs'kyj clearly distinguishes "South Russian" from "North Russian" and apparently refers only to the Ukrainian language area—notably, in both the Austrian and the Russian Empire—his line of reasoning is strikingly concordant with the stereotypical Russophile credo. It is thus no coincidence that Hnidkovs'kyj's article almost consistently features the spelling *русскій* with *-сс-*.

A certain consensus is obvious in all the early contributions to the language discussion in the *Вѣстникъ*. According to this view, a variant of Church Slavonic with a certain admixture of Ruthenianizing elements, as in the following contribution by Ivan Rakovs'kyj, could certainly have been considered a desirable language:

Красноизобразіе нѣкогo особвеннаго краеваго азыка ни въ смыслѣ закона, ни взоромъ конца народностемъ подлежащаго ніакое не можетъ имѣти преимущество надъ дрѣтими азыками. Оурадовый азыкъ въ свое благопристойное время не можетъ иный быти, якъ нѣмецкій по всей Державѣ, иже израдною своею обдѣланностію, и наѣсковою распространностію вса иныа превосходитъ поединичныа азыки (Vistnyk 1850: 201 (issue 51, 10/22 June)).

The beauty of the language of a particular region [краевый азыкъ as a loan translation of the Austrian German administrative term *Landessprache*] cannot serve as an argument for the advantageous treatment of one language over another, either in the legal sense or as a model of goals for the nationalities. No language other than German can be the official language throughout the State in its time of prosperity, for it outdoes all other individual languages with regard

отъ Малороссіи бесѣдуютъ чистымъ что до корене реченій Малорѣскимъ азыкомъ, но тѣмъ тамъ ваще то по російски то по полски скроенымъ рѣсского азыка нарѣчіемъ. Рѣсскій въ западныхъ Галичины обводахъ азыкъ въ ежедневномъ сожитіи съ полскимъ нарѣчіемъ сказиса по примѣрѣ полского нарѣчіа премногими чѣжеязычными выразами, а особенно полскимъ кроемъ. По надъ середній Днѣстеръ къ Прѣтови живетъ рѣсскій но глѣбочѣнно рабствомъ приголомшенный азыкъ бѣдный. – Котрымъ же изъ mezi всѣхъ сихъ нарѣчій по рѣски писати? Простый на се отвѣтъ: Еднимъ, всѣмъ срозѣмѣлымъ чистымъ, взоровымъ, славорѣского азыка нарѣчіемъ. Но изъ всѣхъ выше поманѣтыхъ ни едно не есть всѣмъ намъ легко срозѣмѣле, чисте, взорове славорѣское нарѣчіе. И самъ малорѣсскій на Подолію и на Оукраинѣ живущій нынѣ азыкъ на сѣверороссійскій дѣже замагаетъ (Vistnyk 1850: 230–231).

to its [state of] elaboration and scholarly breadth (Vistnyk 1850: 201 (issue 51, 10/22 June)).

Even by mid-nineteenth-century standards, however, this kind of language was decidedly outdated.

Another example of a quasi-appropriate Common Ruthenian language in the spirit of the *Вѣстникъ* discussions is the following extract from no. 59 for 27 June/9 July 1850:

[...] Вчера закончилися наряды присутствующихъ тѣхъ повѣренниковъ италіанскихъ. [...] Повѣренники отвѣчали на тое съ покорнымъ благодареніемъ, препорѣчаа съ полнымъ оупованіемъ правительствѣ всѣ желанія своего народа [...] (Vistnyk 1850: 230).

...Yesterday the meetings of the Italian plenipotentiaries who are now visiting [Vienna] ended. The plenipotentiaries replied to that with humble gratitude, submitting all their people's desires to the government with complete confidence.

But what would have been the use of such a language, which would merely have been conceived—and was in fact conceived—as an awkward variety of Russian or, to call it by its right name, as bad Russian?

7. Conclusion and prospects

If the Austrian authorities accused the editorial staff of the *Вѣстникъ* of Russophilism soon after the appearance of its first issues, their accusations were well founded. In fact, the language of many contributions was linguistically very close to Russian. Notably more remote from Russian were the texts of Julijan Vysloboc'kyj, whom the ministry promptly appointed as the new editor in chief. Also more remote from Russian were various letters to the editors from Galician readers, which have been quoted here only as exceptions.³⁶

The language of Transcarpathian authors such as Mykola Nod', Ivan Rakovs'kyj, and Mykola Myhalyč is characterized above all by a striking conservatism. At first, Church Slavonic rather than Russian still constituted the linguistic basis of such texts, even of those authored by Ivan Rakovs'kyj, who would switch to Russian soon afterwards as radically as he could. Oleksandr Duxnovyč's articles were no less distant from the vernacular.

No linguistic leveling of Galician and Transcarpathians variants of Ruthenian took place in the pages of the *Вѣстникъ*. If the Galicians and Transcarpathians

36 Cf. the following contribution from no. 19 for 2 March/4 April 1850: „П е р е м ы ш л ь д н а 25. марта. Д н а 20 марта т. р. оукончилася першій кърсъ на тѣтейшій лицѣальной гимназіи складающійся зъ осми классъ. Въ той гимназіи, яко при границѣ мазурской землѣ преподаеся религія для Рѣсинѣвъ по рѣски, для Полакѣвъ и друтихъ по нѣмецки. Языкѣ Галицко-Рѣсскій преподавалася въ кождѣй классѣ по 2 годинѣ що тыждень” (Vistnyk 1850: 75). This heavily vernacular-based article was probably written by Josyf Levyc'kyj. Owing to (correct) etymological rather than Russophile considerations, Levyc'kyj already wrote *Рѣсскій* with -cc- before 1848, without regard to any Russophile context (but he also wrote the etymologically incorrect *Рѣссини*).

had actually wished to contribute to such a development on a merely “Austro-Ruthenian” basis, the fact that the southwestern dialects of Ukrainian are quite differentiated might soon have become problematic. Given, however, that the Transcarpathian contributors openly rejected any notion of developing a vernacular-based Ruthenian written language together with the Galicians from the outset, it soon became clear that nothing would be done to promote that goal. Moreover, the Transcarpathian authors emphasized their attitude through the linguistic character of their contributions, demonstrating an obvious preference for Transcarpathian dialectal features, which they sporadically inserted into their predominantly Church Slavonic- or Russian-based texts.

As the situation of the Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire was still disastrous in 1850, especially after the dissolution of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius, it is not surprising that neither the Galician nor the Transcarpathian intellectual leaders had any thought of building upon the traditions of Ukrainian language development in the Russian Empire at that point (that process began in Galicia some ten years later, shortly after the death of Taras Ševčenko in 1861).

As a result, only Church Slavonic and Russian were regarded as variants that could serve as a linguistic bridge between Transcarpathia and Galicia in the context of the *Вѣстникъ*. The ideological background was the myth of “Old Rus’ian” purity and a naïve attitude to the Russian language, paralleled by skepticism with regard to the allegedly “contaminated” and all too diverse Ruthenian/Ukrainian.

As if fettered by the early contributions to the language discussion that appeared in the *Вѣстникъ*, the newspaper proved incapable of putting forward a convincing and future-oriented linguistic model for the Ruthenians of Austria even after its relaunch in 1850. Neither the Old Ruthenians nor the Russophiles nor the (few remaining) populists could be satisfied with its language. In later years, the newspaper drew more heavily on the vernacular, but by then the Transcarpathians had already ceased to contribute to it, and the *Вѣстникъ* soon became a purely Galician organ.

The *Вѣстникъ* was also unable to bridge the differences between Transcarpathian and Galician Ruthenians in any other respect. Even though the editors and other authors regularly conjured up a common identity for the Austrian Ruthenians, both Galician and Transcarpathian authors persisted, for the most part, in drawing very clear distinctions between the two groups. Lastly, the Bukovynians received hardly any attention, at least in the first issues of the *Вѣстникъ*, and none of them contributed anything to the paper.

As a result, the “Austro-Ruthenian” project of the *Вѣстникъ* failed in almost every respect.

In the last issue of the *Вѣстникъ*, no. 40 of vol. 18 for 22/10 December 1866 (“Часть неурядова”), Julijan Vysloboc'kyj (who still referred to himself as Vasyľ Zborovs'kyj) took his final leave as editor in chief after sixteen years. Vysloboc'kyj's words are of interest, as they show how much the language of the newspaper had been adapted to the vernacular in the course of that period (conservatisms, such as *понеже* or *въ навечерію* with *i* from weak *Jer* before *j* in this extract, were still

frequent). They are no less intriguing in content:

Пращальна хвиля надъїшла, хвиля розлѣки сближаєса! – А понеже кожда розлѣка мае щось подѣбного до смерти, бо насѣває мимовольно гадкѣ вѣчного розстана са съ дорогими намѣ особами, – то не дивота, сли и мы въ навечерію нашої розлѣки съ долголѣтними, вѣрными сотрѣдниками на нивѣ отечественной словесности; съ многолѣтними покровителями и неотстѣпными читателями „Вѣстника“, – сталѣмивши въ собѣ всѣ політичніи мысли, сегодня одноѣ лишь чѣвствѣ отдаємоса и одно щирорѣске слово изъ глѣбины стисненого сердца выдѣбываємо: „Пращайте!“ [...] „Пращайте“ Василь Зборовскій.

The moment has come to say goodbye; the moment of leave-taking is approaching!—And since every leave-taking has something like death in it, for it inevitably makes one think of the eternal parting from persons dear to us, it is no wonder if we, too, on the eve of our leave-taking from longtime, loyal collaborators in the field of native literature; from longtime supporters and inveterate readers of the *Вѣстникъ*, suppressing in ourselves any political thoughts, devote ourselves to one single emotion and squeeze one single genuine Ruthenian word from the depths of our aching heart: “Farewell!”... “Farewell!” Vasyl' Zborov's'kyj.

The *Вѣстникъ* had ultimately outlived its purpose. With the situation of the Austrian Ruthenians fundamentally altered by the Austro-Hungarian *Ausgleich* and Galician autonomy, the time was ripe for new developments in the sphere of periodicals as well (after the first new populist periodicals, *Правда* (Truth), established in 1867, proved to be an enduring organ of the new Ukrainian movement).

The “Austro-Ruthenian” conception of the *Вѣстникъ* had been doomed to fail from the outset.

SOME NOTES ON CODE-SWITCHING IN THE LETTERS OF TARAS ŠEVČENKO

1. General Remarks

Taras Ševčenko's attitude to the Russian language is undoubtedly one of the crucial issues in Ukrainian studies. Professor George G. Grabowicz has repeatedly written on this subject from the perspective of literary scholarship (see, among many other contributions, Grabowicz 1979–80), emphasizing that a full understanding of Ševčenko's writings is impossible without an unbiased approach both to the works that he published in Ukrainian and in Russian.

Although linguists have also dealt with Russian elements in Ševčenko's language, they have usually listed Russian elements from his works alone. The aim of the present paper is to describe an aspect that has apparently not been taken into account up to now: the phenomenon of code-switching between Ukrainian and Russian in Ševčenko's letters.

2. Russian Elements in Ukrainian versus Ukrainian-Russian Code-Switching

Whereas scholars, among them Petro Tymošenko (1964) in his intriguing study, have already pointed out that Russian elements occur rather frequently in Ševčenko's letters in particular, the mechanisms of the introduction of these Russian elements have not yet been analyzed. In fact, it seems that in many instances these Russian elements do not occur randomly as interferemes or as loan elements, but rather bear witness to the fact that time and again Ševčenko switched between the Ukrainian and Russian languages.

As I sought to demonstrate in a recent book on Ševčenko's language (Moser 2008a, 2012a), the difference between the mere use of genuinely Russian interferemes or loan elements and the process of code-switching can be fixed most clearly on the level of inflectional grammar and use of particular functional words. Whenever Ševčenko used clearly Russian inflectional endings, such as *-ov* in the genitive plural of masculine nouns instead of *-iv* (*-ивъ* in Ševčenko's Russian-based orthography), and whenever he introduced elementary functional words such as *что* versus *що* (*шо*) or *какъ* versus *якъ*, it can be inferred with a very high degree of probability that in these contexts he switched to the Russian language and vice versa. A closer look at Ševčenko's letters reveals that such code-switching scenarios follow certain mechanisms of an essentially topic-related character. From the outset, it must be emphasized that code-switching occurs in Ševčenko's letters not only inter- but also intrasententially.

While some features of inflectional grammar and some forms of functional words make the assumption of code-switching extremely plausible, there are also, of course, many more doubtful cases. Whenever clear linguistic indications are absent, code-switching cannot be taken for granted. Quite often the interpretation of certain items in Ševčenko's Ukrainian texts as Russian interferemes and loans seems to be more plausible.

As regards the code-switching mechanisms in Ševčenko's letters, some of them are rather clear-cut, while others raise more doubts. Indeed, matters are even more complicated owing to the fact that Ševčenko's editors have always manipulated his language according to their own attitudes, beginning with the very first issues of the journal *Osnova* (Osnova 1861–1862) and continuing to the recent past (Ševčenko 2003). Unfortunately, only a handful of Ševčenko's letters have been published as facsimiles, and I myself have not had the opportunity to work with the extant original manuscripts (this is apart from the fact that quite a few of the original letters have been irretrievably lost). At least in some instances the description of Ševčenko's manuscripts (Opys 1961) helps counterbalance the more doubtful editorial interpretations.

In the following paragraphs I intend to demonstrate some of the mechanisms of code-switching in Taras Ševčenko's letters. I will use "[//]" for marking the boundaries of more clear-cut cases of code-switching and "[//?]" for more doubtful ones. While discussing some of the unequivocal examples, I will also briefly touch upon the consequences stemming from recognition of code-switching for lexicographical work with Ševčenko's letters.

3.1. Quotations

Among the clearest examples of code-switching in Ševčenko's works are those that are based on quotations of Russian speakers. In his Ukrainian-language letter to Pylyp Korol'ov of 18 November 1842, Ševčenko switches to Russian only in a sentence consisting of one word. The reason is obvious: he simply quotes his Russian-speaking doctor's words, although the conjunction *що* makes it clear that in fact we are dealing with indirect speech:

Приїхав у це прокляте болото та й не знаю, чи вже й виїду. Хоч лікар і говорить, що [//] нічого [//], одначе, так кивне головою, що аж сумно дивиться. Сьогодні оце трошки легше стало, можна хоч перо в руках удержать (Ševčenko 1964: 21).

As a consequence, one may conclude that it would be extremely misleading to claim, for instance, that Ševčenko "even used clearly Russian forms, such as *нічого* (cf. the Russian standard spelling: *ничего*) in his Ukrainian letters." The use of this Russian form is a rather trivial case of code-switching.

The following example is also a quotation from Russian. The context makes clear that the manipulation in the first edition of the letter in *Osnova*—which offers the quasi-Ukrainized *жизненних*, but leaves the Russian *припасов(ъ)* (Osnova 1861/11: 4)—was a rather unconvincing choice. As a matter of fact, Ševčenko was merely quoting the Russian words of his correspondent (as indicated by his words "як ти пишеш"):

А от без чого не обійдуся. [//] Без жизненных припасов [//], як ти пишеш (Ševčenko 1964: 139).¹

1 While Ševčenko could have written *-ыл(ъ)* in Ukrainian, too, the same cannot be said for *-ов(ъ)*.

Thus, if the editors did not include the words **припаси* and **жизненный* (*Slovnyk* 1964) in the dictionary of Taras Ševčenko's language, they apparently made the right decision. As far as we know, neither of these two words was part of Ševčenko's Ukrainian vocabulary.

3.2. Forwarded Messages

In a letter to Myxajlo Lazarevs'kyj of 18–19 October 1857 Ševčenko asks his addressee to forward his expression of gratitude to Count Tolstoj:

і подякуй його од мене [/]/ за его доброе, человеколюбивое участие, которым я радостно воспользуюсь [/]/, як прийдеться мені до скруту (Ševčenko 1964: 175).

The fact that there is no entry for *воспользовать/возпользовать, человеколюбивый (человѣколюбивый)*, or *участие/участіє* in *Slovnyk* 1964 seems to be justified: here Ševčenko switched to Russian because he wanted to forward his message to Count Tolstoj, a speaker of Russian, in its original wording.

In a letter to Fedir Lazarevs'kyj of 2 August 1852 (the original manuscript has been preserved), Ševčenko switches, surprisingly, to Russian already beginning with the conjunction *что*. It is the dative form of the personal pronoun *мне* (*мнѣ*), however, that confirms the Russianness of the indirect speech most convincingly:²

Та ще скажи, будь ласкав, Залецкому, як вернеться він в Оренбурт [/]/, что все, посланное им мне, получено с благодарностью, [/]/ та як побачиш Костромитенова, то поклонись йому гарненько (Ševčenko 1964: 77–78).

Again, Ševčenko forwarded a message to Bronislaw Zaleski in Russian simply because he corresponded with this Polish acquaintance in Russian.

3.3. Names of Places, Addresses, and Institutions

Quite remarkably, Ševčenko frequently switched to Russian while referring to Russian places, as evident from these examples:

Штернберг пише мені, що він нездужав, але тепер відчунув і вам кланяється, бо він дума, що ви [/]/ в Петербурге (Ševčenko 1964: 22);
А тепер, спасибі вам і моїй нещастій долі, тепер я [/]/ в Петербурге [/]/, неначе в своїй господі (ibid.: 236);
поклоніться землякам моїм, [/]/ в Оренбурге сущим (ibid.: 54);
я опинився [/]/ в Орской крепости (ibid.: 40).

While forms of the type *въ Петербургѣ* prevail in Ševčenko's manuscripts (see Orys 1961: 299, 328, etc.), the editors of *Osnova*, in particular, often manipulated the language significantly. In "я сам їх поцілую, і тебе, і Семена, і всіх добрих людей, сущих [/]/ в Петербурге" (Ševčenko 1964: 212), for example, they introduced the

2 Some seemingly Russian elements are, in fact, typical of Ševčenko's Ukrainian language. See Moser 2008a, 2012a.

Ukrainizing form *въ Петербурґи* (Osнова 1861/11: 7), which would derive from the nominative form *Петербург(ъ)*. In the description of Ševčenko's manuscripts, however, the regular, pre-revolutionary Russian rendering of the locative case is attested as *въ Петербурґѣ* (Орус 1961: 299).

None of these examples has been considered by *Slovnyk* 1964 under the entries *Оренбург, Петербург, Орська кріпость*. What one finds instead is examples of the type *в Петербурзі* (Ševčenko 1964, 45), which, however, do not seem to originate from Ševčenko's originals but from edited letters whose autographs have been lost. In another case, one encounters the form *в Орський Кріпости* in *Slovnyk* 1964, although in reality Ševčenko only wrote the abbreviated form "О. К." (Ševčenko 1964: 53). Against the background of the general picture, *въ О. К.* should, however, be interpreted rather as an abbreviation of *въ Орской крѣпости* with the Russian adjective ending *-ой*.

The following fragment is from a letter to Semen Hulak-Artemovs'kyj of 6 October 1853. While the second switch refers to an item that had to be purchased in a Russian-speaking environment, the first one refers, once again, to a Russian location:

Та ще, прошу тебе, зайді [//] в магазин Даціаро (на углу Невского проспекта и Адмиралтейской площади) [//] і подивися на [//] тетрадь литографированных рисунков Калама, [//] а подивившись спитай, що вони коштують, і напиши мені. Амінъ (Ševčenko 1964: 88).

While many fragments of this kind do not appear in *Slovnyk* 1964, there are some exceptions. The following example is quite revealing:

Сатана...надів чорноморську достатню одежу, щоб почванитися перед московками під Новинським або [//] на Трубе, [//] або [//] на Козихе [//]. Та, правда, в Москві всюди єсть де пощоголять, а особливе такому козакові, як Сатана (Ševčenko 1964: 94).

Slovnyk 1964 shows no entry for *Труба*, but *Козиха* (s.v. "Козиха") is considered without any comment, even though the locative form *на Козихѣ*, which likely figures in the original text, clearly contradicts the morphonological rules of Ukrainian. This is all the more striking because *на Трубѣ* could be interpreted much more easily as a Ukrainian form if one takes into account that the Russianizing interpretation of etymological *ѣ* as [e] cannot always be taken for granted, because in Ševčenko's works the grapheme *jat'* also sometimes renders Ukrainian [i]. Evidently, the methodology of *Slovnyk* 1964 is not always quite clear.

Still, it must be admitted that Ševčenko's code-switching procedures often open up a range of problems with which it is not easy to cope. When Ševčenko writes, for example,

завтра, як Бог поможе, [//?] на пароходѣ 'Меркурий' [//?] попливу за 5 карбованців на палубі в Нижній Новгород" (Ševčenko 1964: 171),

it is difficult to establish how lexicographers ought to deal with such examples (*Osnova* 1861/11: 11], incidentally, has “на пароході”). First of all, -ѣ, which is probably the graphical source of the Russianizing ending -e in Ševčenko 1964 and the Ukrainizing ending in *Osnova*, again cannot simply be identified with Russian -e. Second, Ševčenko uses the word *пароход*(ъ) several times, and not only with the ending -ѣ but also with the ambiguous endings -О and -ами, both of which can all the more so be interpreted as either Russian or Ukrainian. Third, Ševčenko probably did not know the new Ukrainian word *пароплав*, although Тymošenko (1964: 44) asserts that “у цей час в українську літературу проникали вже й слова пароплав, поїзд, залізниця.” And, finally, it was particularly in his letters that Ševčenko used many Russian words outside of any mechanisms of code-switching and without any hesitation. Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether the form *на пароходѣ* should be interpreted rather as part of Ševčenko’s Ukrainian language than as the result of intrasentential code-switching. Still, examples with Russian forms of appellatives rendering Russian locations, as in

Я хочу дещо поправити и выгравировать [//] к выставке (Ševčenko 1964: 253),

with *къ выставкѣ* as a morphophonologically marked Russian form, seem to raise the probability that *на пароходѣ* might have to be interpreted as a Russian form resulting from code-switching (as for *выгравировать*, I regard it as one of Ševčenko’s lexical Russianisms in Ukrainian).

3.4. Receipts

Code-switching into Russian also occurs when Ševčenko writes about receipts, which were typically written in Russian. In the following example, once again it is the genitive plural ending -ов that confirms the Russianness of the fragment. Moreover, the Russian form of the preposition *с*(ъ) (in front of a voiced consonant) and the Russian root form -чет- can be noted:

Передайте під розписку книгареві 100 экз. ‘Кобзаря’, нехай він продає його 1 [крб.] 50 коп[і] [йок] [//] с вычетом 20 процентов за комиссию [//] і нехай заплатити за транспорт. Низенько кланяюсь вашій жінці, а купно і вам (Ševčenko 1964: 273).

The following brief note also reflects a case of code-switching that is triggered by a discussion of a receipt:

По счету Гогенфельдена [//] отдай гроші Федорові. Т. III. (Ševčenko 1964, 279; the form *по счету* is confirmed by *Opus* 1961: 331).

Again, the fact that there is no entry for *счет* or *щом* in *Slovnyk* 1964 seems to be justified. Still, it must be noted that there is no entry for *рахунок*, either.

4. Conclusions

In my recent book on the language of Taras Ševčenko (Moser 2008a, 2012a) I tried to single out several mechanisms of code-switching in Ševčenko's letters, four of which have been briefly discussed here. Four other mechanisms come into play. Ševčenko tended to switch into Russian when he (1) wrote about the works that he had published in Russian, (2) referred to exact dates or points in time ("25 февраля в 7 часов утра [//] получив я твоё письмо" [Ševčenko 1964: 211]), (3) ordered particular items that had to be purchased in certain stores (where they were sold under their Russian names), and (4) sometimes used the interplay of Russian and Ukrainian as a means of expressing distance or closeness to those people with whom he usually corresponded in Ukrainian.

While the mechanisms of code-switching in Ševčenko's letters have not yet been thoroughly analyzed, the editors of these letters have always been well aware of the coexistence of Russian and Ukrainian elements. To some degree they even signal a certain understanding of the fact of code-switching through their normalization of Ševčenko's orthography: sometimes a text would be normalized according to the rules of Modern Standard Russian orthography rather than Modern Standard Ukrainian. Beginning at least with the jubilee edition of 1964, these normalization procedures have had a great impact on linguistic work with Ševčenko texts. If a certain item was interpreted as Russian, the item was usually not included in such important works as the dictionary of Taras Ševčenko's Ukrainian language (Slovnyk 1964). This, however, leaves us with an extremely doubtful general picture of Ševčenko's language. To give just one example: If Ševčenko in one of his letters writes "а на сей раз вручителю сего вручите мои вещи і гроші" (Ševčenko 1964: 233), the editors' decision to treat *вещи* as a Russian element alien to Ševčenko's Ukrainian language triggered the decision not to include it in *Slovnyk* 1964. Still, this is hardly convincing given the fact that the word occurs in an entirely Ukrainian context, and it is even less convincing if we take into account that the contemporary Ukrainian word *речі* is used in Ševčenko's works in the meaning "objects, belongings" only once (Slovnyk 1964, s.v. "річ"). No argument for code-switching seems to fit; it is evident, therefore, that we must treat the word *вещи* as part of Ševčenko's Ukrainian language.

Only the phenomenon of code-switching can justify a decision to exclude Russian elements that occur in Ševčenko's Ukrainian texts from the dictionary of his Ukrainian language. And yet Ševčenko's Ukrainian language itself cannot be fully understood without taking into account these mechanisms of code-switching.

PANTELEJMON KULIŠ, THE GALICIANS, AND THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE (1863–1876)

1. Ruthenians, Little Russians, and the Ukrainian language before 1860

According to the master narrative set forth in Ukrainian studies textbooks, the development of Modern Standard Ukrainian began with Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida* (Travestied Aeneid) of 1798 and continued almost exclusively in Russian-ruled Ukraine, with the work of the Ukrainian national poet, Taras Ševčenko, culminating its first phase of growth. The almanac *Rusalka Dnistrovaja* (Dnister Nymph, 1837) is generally acknowledged as the single noteworthy work of the Galician "Ruthenians"¹ (Ukrainians) before 1848, while other Galician contributions to the further development of the "Ruthenian" (Ukrainian) written language on a vernacular basis remain unappreciated to the present day (cf. Moser 2004d, 2006, 2006a, 2006b, 2007, etc.). Developments in the first two decades after 1848 are also poorly known. The best studies of the subject date from the period before the Second World War, but much of the knowledge accumulated by philologists, most notably Kyrylo Studyns'kyj, has been lost in the meantime.

Modern Ukrainian linguistic historiography takes it for granted that the Galicians participated in the language-planning activities of the "Little Russians" (Ukrainians in the Russian Empire) in a way that led them inevitably to repeat the "Little Russian" stages of linguistic development, which are understood as seamless evolutionary sequences. These teleological conceptions find expression, inter alia, in the notion that those Galician authors who composed their works in an idiom based decidedly on the vernacular were reproached time and again for their use of "dialectal" linguistic material.

In actual fact, the Galicians generally had to fend for themselves throughout the *Vormärz* period, when the age of nationalism dawned in East Central and Eastern Europe. Their efforts to bring about a revival on a vernacular basis inevitably

1 With reference to the nineteenth century, I use the term "Ruthenians" for Ukrainians living in Austria or Austria-Hungary and "Little Russians" for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Throughout the period, Galician Ukrainians and Ukrainians in the Russian Empire demonstrably considered themselves representatives of the same people. Thus, Galician publications—forewords to grammars, polemical pamphlets, ethnographic studies—constantly refer to "Ruthenian or Little Russian" affairs, while there is, to my knowledge, no well-founded basis whatever for the contrary view, that the "Ruthenians" and the "Little Russians" did not constitute one people, and that the variants of the language they spoke or wrote did not constitute one language. The only point in question was whether the White Ruthenians or Belarusians were to be considered part of this people or not (see pp. 171–186 in this volume). Even the Russophiles regarded the "малоросы" ("Little Russians") or "русини" ("Ruthenians") as part of the "русский народъ" ("Russian people"), without denying that they differed from the "великоросы" in various respects. The terms "Ukrainians" and "Ukrainian language" established themselves very late in the nineteenth century in the Russian Empire and Galicia alike. In the Russian Empire, they were not generally used until the 1860s, and from that time on, they were increasingly used in Galicia as well (often only in the compounds "Русь-Україна," "русько-український"). It was only around the turn of the twentieth century that Galicians began commonly to use those terms with reference to themselves. In the highly official context of translations of Austrian imperial law, the term "Ukrainian" ("Ukrainisch") was introduced only as late as 1918; until then, "Ruthenian" ("Ruthenisch") was used (Nakonečnyj 2001; Moser 2005a; Moser 2011: 667–683).

obliged them to begin by falling back on material from their own Galician linguistic heritage.² Indeed, what the “Little Russians” would have had to offer them as a guideline was not particularly impressive. As for the burlesque traditions of the “Kotljarevščyna,” the Galicians initially received them with no great enthusiasm (on the reception of Kotljarevs'kyj in Galicia, see Franko 1898), and those traditions had no particular significance as a model for their language.

To be sure, Kotljarevs'kyj's work was mentioned in all Galician grammars, and a footnote in *Rusalka Dnistrovaja* also paid tribute to it. Except for some mentions of his works, however, Kotljarevs'kyj was unknown in Galicia before 1848. Afterwards, his *Natalka Poltavka* and *Moskal'-čarivnyk* (Soldier-Sorcerer) were apparently more successful than the *Enejida*, although their language had to be adapted to Galician usage (Franko 1898: 4–7). In 1849, a biographical sketch and some extracts from Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's works were published in the Lviv periodical *Halyčo-Ruskaja Pčola* (Galician-Ruthenian Bee), and Jakiv Holovac'kyj joined the discourse that characterized Kotljarevs'kyj as the actual founder of Modern Standard Ukrainian in his inaugural lectures as the first professor of Ruthenian language and literature (Franko 1898: 8–11, see also pp. 198–199 in this volume). After 1849, however, it seems that Galician interest in Kotljarevs'kyj soon dissipated. By that time, “Little Russian” activists in the Russian Empire had also become much less enthusiastic about Kotljarevs'kyj and his school (“Kotljarevščyna”).

Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov'janenko's *Marusja*, a work of the mid-1830s, also did not become known in Galicia until after 1848–49, but it, too, aroused no general enthusiasm. Oleksander Pavlovs'kyj's short grammar, printed in St. Petersburg in 1818, was well known to all Galician grammarians. For understandable reasons, however, as they were called upon to prepare comprehensive grammars conceived as codifications of a polyfunctional standard language, they found Pavlovs'kyj's work less than impressive, regardless of its obvious merits.

By the 1840s at the latest, scholars from the Russian Empire, including both Great Russians and Little Russians (Ukrainians), were regularly giving advice—called for and uncalled for—to the Galician Ruthenian awakeners on how best to maintain their “Ruthenian” culture, generally proceeding from an implicit or explicit assumption of their own cultural superiority. Myxajlo Maksymovyč, the first rector of Kyiv University, a professor of Russian literature and certainly one of the leading “Little Russian” intellectuals of the mid-nineteenth century, was particularly important. His variant of the etymological orthography, adapted for use in “Little Russian” publications in the Russian Empire, was long used in Galicia, where that orthography (the etymological orthography as such) had remained largely untouched until the end of the nineteenth century.³ His collection of folk songs, which ranks among the pioneering works of the Ukrainian awakening and was decisive for the development of Pantelejmon Kuliš and Mykola Kostomarov, among others (cf. Luckyj 1983: 7; see below), also aroused lively interest in Galicia.

2 As I have discussed in greater detail elsewhere, material that was in fact dialectal played a subordinate role in this process (cf., inter alia, Moser 2007: 232–237).

3 *Rusalka Dnistrovaja*, with its highly idiosyncratic orthography, is a notable exception.

However, Maksymovych by no means sent his famous letter of 1840 to Galicia first and foremost because he supported the further development of the Galician Ukrainian written language on a vernacular basis, as some historical linguists in Ukraine and the émigré Ukrainian Vasyl' Čaplenko (1970: 66) would have us believe on the basis of certain rather tendentiously abridged citations. In his letter—which was addressed, incidentally, to Denys Zubryc'kyj, the earliest committed Galician Russophile—he felt compelled, on the contrary, to begin by praising his addressee for his good command of Russian, and only then to assert that there could be no “Little Russian literature” in Russia, but at most individual “Little Russian works,” such as those of Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj, Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov'janenko, Jevhen Hrebinka, and others (cf. comments on this matter in George Grabowicz 1996/2003: 102–103).⁴ Maksymovych went on to argue that these “Little Russian works” were, however, “artificial...in a certain way” and of no more than “regional interest,” rather like “Alemannic reading material” for the Germans. He maintained that Russian alone functioned as the written language in the Russian Empire and was to be regarded as the common linguistic heritage of the Great and Little Russians. The “Little Russian” professor then conceded that “South Russian” was the predominant “living language” of the Galicians, but he hastened to add the remarkably worded opinion that for them, the time of Polish was over, while the time of Great Russian had not yet arrived. In effect, then, Maksymovych was arguing for a Ruthenian vernacular orientation in Galicia, but he considered it—and this is his fundamental message, often disregarded in the scholarly literature—a mere interlude on the way to the desirable Russification:

Здѣсь въ Имперіи Русской, Русскимъ языкомъ сталъ Великорусскій языкъ, которымъ и говоримъ, и пишемъ, и думаемъ, какъ языкомъ общимъ, живое употребленіе и въ Украинѣ (въ образованномъ классѣ народа) имѣющемъ. Потому все, что у насъ пишется по-малороссійски, есть нѣкоторымъ образомъ уже искусственное, имѣющее интересъ областной только, какъ у Нѣмцевъ писанное на Аллеманскомъ нарѣчій. У насъ не можетъ быть словесности на южнорусскомъ языкѣ, а только могутъ быть и есть отдѣльныя на ономъ сочиненія – Котляревскаго, Квитки (Основяненка), Гребенки и другихъ. Южнорусскій языкъ у насъ есть уже какъ памятникъ только, изъ котораго можно обогащать великорусскій или по преимуществу у насъ Русскій языкъ. Народныя украинскія пѣсни и пословицы суть также только прекрасныя памятники устной словесности русской. Но для Русиновъ Австрійской Имперіи живой языкъ южнорусскій; пора языка польскаго для нихъ давно прошла, пора Великорусскаго языка для нихъ еще не наступала. Потому весьма желательно, чтобы они подобно Вамъ усвоили себѣ Великорусскій языкъ; но Ваша Червонорусская словесность – по моему мнѣнію – должна быть на Вашемъ родномъ русскомъ языкѣ – т. е.

4 As the present article shows in detail, Pantelejmon Kuliš qualifies as a prominent addition to the individuals mentioned by Grabowicz (1996/2003: 102–103) who fundamentally changed their views on Ukrainian identity and its meaning in the course of time. In Maksymovych's case, however, I am not sure whether his letter to Zubryc'kyj did not actually conform to his fairly consistent “Little Russian” view of Ukrainian literary culture, bound by loyalty to the Russian Empire.

на южнорусскомъ, и только въ Галиціи она можетъ быть на этомъ языкѣ (Maksymovyč 1840/1863; emphases in the text published in *Halyčany* [The Galician]).

Here in the Russian Empire, Great Russian has become the Russian language, in which we speak, write, and think as a common language that is also living speech in Ukraine (among the educated class of people). Therefore, all that is written here in Little Russian is already artificial in some sense; it is of no more than regional interest, like something written in the Alemannic dialect among the Germans. For us, there can be no literature in the South Russian language; there can only be individual works composed in it, such as those of Kotljarevs'kyj, Kvitka (Osnov'janenko), Hrebinka, and others. South Russian is already something of a mere monument here, one that can be used to enrich the Great Russian language or the Russian language that is mainly used among us. Ukrainian folk songs and proverbs, too, are merely fine monuments of Russian oral literature. For the Ruthenians of the Austrian Empire, however, South Russian is the living language; the time of the Polish language is already long past for them, while the time of Great Russian has not yet dawned for them. It is therefore highly desirable that they adopt Great Russian, like you, but your Red Russian literature should, in my opinion, be composed in your native Russian language, that is, in South Russian, and that is possible only in Galicia.

To the Galicians, who, given the cultural and political milieu of the Austrian Empire, were called upon to develop a polyfunctional standard language on a vernacular basis—a language that, among other things, was also required to be suitable for teaching in gymnasiums and universities, as well as for the translation of Austrian imperial laws, such advice was of very little help, as were the particular “Little Russian” texts published in the Russian Empire, all of which remained within the comparatively narrow confines of fine literature. Ultimately, the Russophiles alone could find satisfaction in Maksymovyč's advice. Thus, unsurprisingly, it was Jakiv Holovac'kyj, at the height of his Russophile period, who printed Maksymovyč's letter in the newspaper *Slovo* (Word) in 1863 and commented on it with enthusiasm (Holovac'kyj 1863).

The first Ukrainian writer from the Russian Empire who made a truly lasting impression on the Galicians was none other than Taras Ševčenko. But his massive impact began to be felt only after his death in 1861: Kyrylo Studyns'kyj, a leading expert on nineteenth-century Galicia, could name only five Galicians who had definitely set eyes on various verses of Ševčenko's before 1861 (see Sereda 2006: 28, cf. Sereda 1999). In Galicia, moreover, Ševčenko became no less important as a character than as a poet. As early as the first anniversary of his death, before his works had become accessible to a broad Galician public, a requiem for Ševčenko was held in Lviv (Sereda 2006: 29). Interestingly enough, in subsequent years the leading Galician Russophile Bohdan Didyc'kyj became one of the most zealous participants in memorial masses for Ševčenko. Indeed, by that time the poet had already been exploited on behalf of the most diverse ideologies. The Russophiles, for their part, celebrated Ševčenko because Russophobe Poles had characterized the mass held for him as a political scandal, since he had been baptized according to

the Orthodox rite. Ševčenko thus became a symbol of the Galician ritual movement, which sought to eliminate the Catholic practice of sprinkling holy water with an aspergillum from the authentic Byzantine rite of the Greek Catholic Church and was closely associated with Galician Russophilism (Sereda 2006: esp. 35–36).

The reception of Ševčenko's works in Galicia took longer than the almost immediate readiness to mythicize the poet. As early as 1861, the merchant Volodymyr Bernatovyč from Russian-ruled Ukraine showed the *Kobzar* to some of the first Galician populists (*narodovci*), most notably Volodymyr Šaškevyč, the son of Markijan Šaškevyč, who had been the renowned leader of the "Ruthenian Triad" and the leading Galician Ukrainian poet of the *Vormärz* period (Sereda 1999: 206). It took until the spring of 1862 for the Lviv merchant Myxajlo Dymet to bring some copies of Ševčenko's poems in the St. Petersburg edition of 1860,⁵ published through the efforts of Pantelejmon Kuliš, to Lviv. That edition, which had already enjoyed an overwhelming success in the Russian Empire, also quickly sold out in the Galician capital (*ibid.*).

Afterwards, it was the populists who best employed the Ukrainian national aspects of the poet's works for their purposes by organizing Ševčenko evenings (Sereda 2006: 42–43). In the years 1867–69, the Galician populist Oleksander Barvins'kyj published a two-volume edition of Ševčenko's poems in Lviv (Romaniv 1997: 92). At that time, if not earlier, Ševčenko's works—many of them published for the first time, as they were banned in the Russian Empire—became truly accessible to a broad public in Galicia as well.

2. Pantelejmon Kuliš and the Galicians between 1863 and 1876

2.1. Kuliš in the pantheon of the Galician populists

Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819–1897) had a leading role in the popularization of the Ševčenko cult, and his funeral oration and writings about Ševčenko in the *Lysty z xutora* (Letters from the Homestead), which first appeared in the journal *Osnova* (Foundation) in early 1861, were fundamental for the mythicization of the poet (Luckyj 1983: 111–113). Kuliš became acquainted with Ševčenko in the summer of 1843 (Luckyj 1983: 19) and remained closely associated with him until the period in which they both became members of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius, when Kuliš persuaded Ševčenko to make many changes (some dubious) to his poems (Luckyj 1983: 32 and elsewhere).

While posterity presented Ševčenko as Ukraine's national poet par excellence, Kuliš soon became infamous among some Ukrainian philologists as a "traitor," while the Soviets characterized him as a "bourgeois nationalist." Reputable philologists, for their part, have invariably stressed Kuliš's outstanding importance for Ukrainian cultural history and the history of the Ukrainian language. In Soviet times, especially from the 1930s on, one was well advised to remain silent about Kuliš, and even in Petro Tymošenko's *Xrestomatija materialiv z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy* (Tymošenko

5 This edition was titled *Kobzar*, but it also contained some poems that did not appear in the *Kobzar* of 1840 (Luckyj 1983: 109–110).

1959–1961), one of the most remarkable and multifaceted publications on the history of the Ukrainian language to appear in the Soviet period, not a single document from the pen of Kuliš—one of the most important polemicists in the history of the Ukrainian language—was cited. Soviet practices remained influential even after the fall of the USSR: Nadija Babyč's (1993) interesting anthology *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy*, for instance, also disregards Kuliš, even though it was compiled in a clearly anti-Soviet spirit. Vitalij Rusanivs'kyj (2001), who leaned heavily on Vasyl' Čaplenko's (1970) monograph in post-Soviet times, does mention Kuliš repeatedly in connection with Ševčenko in his academic textbook on the history of the Ukrainian literary language, but no more than a single page is dedicated to Kuliš himself. There, Rusanivs'kyj briefly notes that Kuliš expanded the range of Ukrainian literary genres, but as for something more concrete, one learns only about Church Slavonicisms in his works. Ivan Ohijenko (1949/1995: 148–153) dedicated a separate chapter to Kuliš and praised him enthusiastically, but Kuliš's contradictory development, especially ca. 1876, which the present article reconstructs on the basis of his letters to Oleksander Barvins'kyj, did not rate even a cursory mention. One of the few linguists who strove for a more complex and fact-based appraisal of Kuliš's achievements was Jurij Ševel'ov (1963, cf. also Ševel'ov 1983/1991), who wrote the following in his concise account of the history of the Ukrainian literary language:

Of special importance in the development of the literary language after Ševčenko was the work of P. Kuliš, who made rich use of ethnographic material and also turned enthusiastically to the historical tradition, especially to the language of the old and middle periods. As a result, his language did not have a clear-cut dialectal character (he personally came from the north and, in secondary details, his language reflected the peculiarities of the northern dialect) but was inclusive of heterogeneous elements and far richer than that of his contemporaries. Basically Kuliš followed the line laid down by Ševčenko. Moreover, he applied its principles to prose as well as to poetry, especially in scientific and journalistic writings. During these years, the Ukrainian literary language spread to new areas—science, journalism, and teaching in the schools.... (Ševel'ov 1963: 502).

Indeed, Kuliš used Ukrainian not only in his *Čorna Rada* (Black Council), the first Ukrainian historical novel, but also in his first scholarly and journalistic works, which were written soon afterwards. Also important was the translation of the Bible that he undertook in 1868. Kuliš demonstrably concerned himself with the creation of a Ukrainian high style (Ševel'ov 1983/1991: 39). Thus, in groundbreaking fashion, Kuliš abandoned the position of Myxajlo Maksymovyč, one of his most important mentors, whose collection of folk songs published in 1827 had made Kuliš a committed Ukrainian activist in his early years.⁶ In fact, Kuliš played a special role in this creative period. Although there is as yet no survey based on reliable data

6 Kuliš attended Maksymovyč's lectures particularly in the years ca. 1840, when Maksymovyč wrote his letter to Denys Zubryč'kyj. During Kuliš's time in Kyiv, he often enjoyed singing Ukrainian folk songs with Maksymovyč (Luckyj 1983: 8, 11).

about his linguistic innovations, the following can be asserted: Ševčenko did not cover such a range of genres in his Ukrainian-language work as Kuliš, while Mykola Kostomarov, the third most prominent member of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius (founded in 1844–45 and disbanded in 1847) after Ševčenko and Kuliš, called quite early for the use of Russian instead of Ukrainian in scholarly writing and never contributed significantly to the development of the Ukrainian literary language as such.

Kuliš also regularly published works in Russian. In 1857 his *Čorna Rada* appeared in Russian as well as in Ukrainian. While the text of his important two-volume *Zapiski o južnoj Rusi* (Notes on Southern Rus', 1856–57) contains rich Ukrainian-language material printed in the “Kulišivka” for the first time (Luckyj 1983: 79), that work as well as several others appeared in Russian only. Most important of all, however, is the fact that in the late 1850s and 1860s in particular, Kuliš was one of the few Ukrainian activists in the Russian Empire who did not limit the functionality of Ukrainian from the outset but made it his basic purpose to establish a polyfunctional literary language, although he always endorsed the political bonding of Ukraine to Russia (Ševel'ov 1983/1991: 66–71). Kuliš certainly played a central role in the founding and publication of the bilingual Ukrainian-Russian periodical *Osnova*, which appeared regularly in 1861–62 (Luckyj 1983: 103–110), and he was among the most important authors of non-fiction Ukrainian-language contributions to the journal (Moser forthcoming a). Furthermore, as early as 1857, he published a primer, the *Hramatka*, which was reissued in an abbreviated version in 1861. He also translated the law of 1861 on peasant emancipation into Ukrainian for the Russian government, but his translation was not published because the government did not approve of Kuliš's language, and he refused to make any changes (Luckyj 1983: 124–125).

Pantelejmon Kuliš had already visited Lviv in 1858 and again in 1861, primarily in order to meet Jakiv Holovac'kyj (Hrynčuk 2007; Ševel'ov 1966: 31; and Luckyj 1983: 138, with no mention of Holovac'kyj), who by then had already become a committed Russophile. However, Kuliš's association with Galicia only became more intensive in the years following the so-called Valuev Directive (“Valuev Circular”) of 1863, which entailed the first official restrictions on Ukrainian publishing in the Russian Empire (on the Valuev Directive and the Ukase of Bad Ems, see Miller 2000; Moser forthcoming a). Between 1864 and 1867, Kuliš worked as an official of the imperial Russian state in Warsaw. From then on, he not only frequently returned to Galicia but also sought contacts with Galicians in Vienna, where he stayed for a longer period during his years abroad between 1868 and 1871. He returned to Russia in 1871, among other reasons, in order to become the editor of the *Žurnal Ministerstva Putej Soobščeniija* (Luckyj 1983: 152)⁷ and rejoin the Russian civil service.

7 When Kuliš returned to Lviv for some time in the early 1880s, he even considered becoming an Austrian citizen (Luckyj 1983: 161). He returned to Russia after his *Vergewaltigung der Basilianer in Galizien durch die Jesuiten* (1882) was confiscated in Austria (Luckyj 1983: 163).

Back in Russia, Kuliš took up work in the early seventies on his *Istoriia vozsoedinenija Rusi* (History of the Reunification of Rus'), which was published in three volumes between 1873 and 1877.⁸ It was in this period that he finally abandoned his earlier enthusiasm for the Cossacks, expressed himself very critically about Taras Ševčenko, and adopted an entirely different view of Ukrainian identity and the Ukrainian language. Somewhat later, Kuliš would change his mind yet again. In 1881 he made another trip to Galicia, where he published his poetry collection *Xutorna poezija* (Poems from the Homestead). In it, among other things, he called upon Ukrainians in the Russian Empire to collaborate with the Galicians. In his *Krašanka rusynam i poljakam na Velykden'* (A Colored Egg for the Ruthenians and the Poles at Easter, 1882), he urged the Galicians to cooperate with the Poles (cf. Ohloblyn–Petrenko 1962/1996, Luckyj 1983: 62, as well as Luckyj 2004). The work met with scant understanding among the Galicians, who were preoccupied with promoting their cultural revival against Polish resistance; moreover, Kuliš, who had never spared contemptuous, sometimes even hateful statements addressed to the Poles, allowed himself in the *Krašanka* to refer condescendingly to the Galician Ruthenians as “calves” (“телята”) (Luckyj 1983: 162).⁹

As he had done in the years immediately after the Valuev Circular, Kuliš regularly kept on sending essays to the Galician populist newspapers and periodicals after his time in Warsaw. By the early 1870s at the latest, he had made it into the Galician pantheon of Ukrainian national heroes, as is particularly apparent from the fact that Omeljan Partyc'kyj's textbook for the first four grades of gymnasium (1871) not only contains a multitude of texts by Kuliš but also features a section titled “From the lives of eminent people” (“Зъ житя деякихъ людей знаменитыхъ”) with a text about Taras Ševčenko's childhood (“Дитинный вѣкъ Шевченка” in Partyc'kyj 1871: 151–157), another one about the most famous contemporary minstrel, Ostap Veresaj (Partyc'kyj 1871: 161–168), and a biographical sketch of Kuliš's younger years (“Молодой вѣкъ Кулѣша,” Partyc'kyj 1871: 157–161), which is based on Kuliš's autobiography (cf. the almost identical text from the autobiography in Luckyj 1983: 6). From this remarkable classic of secularized (auto)hagiography one learns, among other things, the following:

Идеаломъ Кулѣша дуже рано зрбилась освѣта. Съ самого малку писавъ вѣнъ крейдою по стѣнахъ (були стѣны мытѣ) церкви, коней и все про що чувъ, або що бачивъ. Отець грѣмавъ за се на нѣго, а мати втѣшалась. [...] Якъ же вѣдвезено ёго въ городъ, тамъ вѣнъ вчинивъ ся справдешнимъ живописцемъ мѣжъ хлопятами. Слабовитый силою, хоча здоровья доброго, не дуже вмѣшувавъ ся вѣнъ въ ихъ пустоту, а все малювавъ копѣи съ картинокъ, що ёму доставались у руки. [...] Спершу Кулѣшь учивъ ся дуже тупо и бувъ посабдущимъ мѣжъ товаришами. Зупиняло ёго те, що

8 Incidentally, the work was published by the “Товарищество ‘Общественная польза.’”

9 It was also well known to some Galicians that in those years the Poles were financing a printing facility for Kuliš in Lviv and that he was to receive an annual subsidy for a new periodical titled *Xutor* (Homestead) (Luckyj 1983: 161); hence they were in a position to draw their own conclusions about the material basis for this new change of mind.

не розумѣвъ великоруської книжної мови. [...] Переведено його із приготівельної клясы у першу тільки за те, що гарно писавъ. Якъ же почавъ розумѣти московську мову, то легко ставъ першимъ учнемъ, всѣмъ відкрывалося, наче вѣдъ и родився письменнимъ. [...] Вже въ першихъ рокахъ коли бувъ на гимназії, бравъ ся Кулѣшъ за рідну літературу. [...] – Разъ Кулѣшъ, зайшовши до купця по орѣхи, побачивъ пять якихсь книжокъ. То були пять екземплярѣвъ збірника українськихъ народнихъ думъ и пѣсень, що видавъ Максимовичъ у Москвѣ 1834 року; якось они у Москвѣ zostалися купцеві у товарѣ. Нѣ раніше, нѣ навпослѣ книжками вѣдъ не торгувавъ нѣякими. Нѣколи хлопець не чувъ про сю книжку, а проте заразъ купивъ, отдавши всѣ свои грошѣ, – [...] – и всѣ товаришѣ заслухалися якъ почавъ имъ читати про „Сомка Мушкета“, про „Коновченка“, про „Озѣвскихъ братѣвъ“, про „Хмельницкого и Барабаша“. Наконѣць вивчивъ на память усю книжку, щобъ нѣколи зъ нею не розлучатися. – Опѣсля, ходячи по селахъ и розмовляючи зъ народними кобзарями або дѣдами, бравъ Кулѣшъ тымъ, що зачне имъ на память думи казати. Здивують ся було дѣды, нѣколи такого дива не бачивши, а потѣмъ усю душу свою передъ нимъ розкрывають. Величнимъ здає ся нашому народови його рідне слово, якъ стародавнимъ Грекамъ, що мовляли: „божественный Омирѣсъ!“ Инодѣ Кулѣшъ мусѣвъ ховатися або збѣзжати гѣть вѣдъ своихъ простодіудныхъ приятелѣвъ, бо, не чувши зроду, щобъ хто промовивъ до нихъ такимъ сердешнимъ словомъ, починали кружъ його ширити чутку, що се царський синъ промѣжъ людьми ходить. – Разъ вѣдъ зайшовъ до багатого козака въ хату и почавъ йому читати. Буденный день бувъ. [...] И всѣ прийшли, посѣдали на лавкахъ и слухали гостя [...]. Яке бъ то добро можна зробити людямъ ріднымъ словомъ, хто съ простымъ людомъ розмовляє. Що то за духъ праведно людський зрѣсть бы въ тому народови доброму, звичайному, шанобливому, коли-бъ усяке и вчилось у школѣ и слухало, и читало книжки по-своєму: Була-бъ ся земля твержею и честю всѣму великому мирови!

Микола В.

Very early, education became Kuliš's ideal. From earliest childhood, he used chalk to draw horses and all that he saw or heard about on the walls of churches (these were washed walls). His father scolded him for that, but his mother was pleased.... After he was taken to the city, he became a real artist among the youngsters there. Physically weak, although in good health, he took little part in their mischief but kept drawing copies of pictures that fell into his hands.... Initially, Kuliš still had difficulty with his studies and was the most backward among his fellows. What held him back was that he did not understand the Great Russian literary language.... He was promoted from the preparatory grade to the first grade only because he drew beautifully. But when he began to understand the Muscovite language, he easily became the best pupil, and everything opened up for him as if he had been born literate.... During his first years at the gymnasium, Kuliš began working on literature in his mother tongue.... Once, when Kuliš went to the store for nuts, he saw five books of some kind. These were five copies of a collection of Ukrainian *dumy* and folk songs that Maksymovych had published in Moscow in 1834; somehow they had ended up in the stock of this Moscow store. Neither earlier nor later did this store deal in books of any kind. The boy had never heard of this book, but he

bought it nevertheless, spending all his money...and all his fellows listened to him with fascination when he started reading to them about "Somko Mušketa," about "Konovčenko," about the "brothers of Azov," about "Xmel'nyč'kyj and Barabaš." Ultimately, he learned the whole book by heart so as never to have to part with it. Later, walking through the villages and conversing with folk minstrels or elders, Kuliš would win them over by reciting *dumy* to them that he had learned by heart. The elders would be astonished, never having seen such a wonder, and would then open their whole soul to him. Their own native word appeared magnificent to our people, as it did to the ancient Greeks, who would say: "Divine Homer!" Sometimes Kuliš would have to hide or take leave of his friends among the common people, for they had never heard anyone address them with such heartfelt words and began spreading the rumor that he was the son of the tsar wandering among the people. Once he went into the house of a rich Cossack and began reading to him. It was a weekday.... And everyone gathered, sat down on benches, and listened to the guest.... What good one could do talking to the common folk in their mother tongue! What a truly human spirit would rise among these good, common, honorable people if they were to be taught in their own language in the schools and could listen to it and read books in it! This soil would be a fortress and an honor to the whole wide world!

Mykola V.

Kuliš was thus portrayed as a shining example to Galician youth. He also actively created a reputation for himself as a diligent letter-writer who corresponded intensively with the Galicians.

As Kuliš fell out irrevocably with Omeljan Partyc'kyj, and as each of them, evidently in anger, destroyed the other's letters, their intensive correspondence has unfortunately not been preserved. What has definitely survived, however, is Kuliš's correspondence with Oleksander Barvins'kyj, which the latter published in his autobiography and which constitutes the most important source for the present article.¹⁰

To begin with, it is remarkable how Pantelejmon Kuliš judged the Galicians in general before establishing any close contact with them. In 1861, he wrote pointedly about them to Oleksander Konys'kyj: "They have reason, but they do not have a language" ("розум у їх є, та немає мови") (Ševel'ov 1991: 60).¹¹ Given conditions prevailing in 1861, this sweeping assessment is perhaps not wholly incorrect if one wants to rate the Galician Ruthenian language situation only with regard to the extent of the Galicians' progress in elaborating a written language on a vernacular basis—it is a matter of fact that they had fallen badly behind in that regard because of the powerful Russophile movement of the 1850s. Be that as it may, it should be

10 Kuliš's letters to Ivan Puljuj and other Galicians, which may be consulted, e.g., in Kuliš 1984, are of minor importance for our purposes. In Ševel'ov's (1983/1991: 43 et al.) detailed foreword to the edition of Kuliš's Ukrainian-language letters (Kuliš 1984), Kuliš's attitude to the Galicians also receives only a brief discussion.

11 Unfortunately, Kuliš's letters have been orthographically manipulated in all editions. Regrettably, I am obliged to follow the extant printed versions.

emphasized with an eye to some later, much less favorable statements that in 1861, Kuliš still generally credited the Galicians with the power of “reason.”

In an undated letter to the Galicians¹² that was most probably written in 1871 and would become famous, Kuliš wrote the following (as published in Franko 1898a):

Ваша заслуга в тому, що Ви не зробились ні Поляками ні Німцями, да в тому, що у вас в не-мужичих семьях говорять по своєму, да в тому ще, що ви переховали від старосвіщини слова и вирази у нас забуті. Духа поезії в вас вибито, видушено в вас ёго семинарщиною та польщиною, зісталось у вас тільки чуття поезії, и тим ви так кохаетесь у Шевченку. [...] Ми простягаємо до вас руки, щоб вас пригріти коло свого серця и вдихнути в вас живого, нескаліченого духа українського; а ви тим часом, сидівши так довго в тісноті, думаєте, що ваша клітка мусить бути и для нас взором. Ваше цвірінкання не вважаємо ми за поезію і відносим ёго до тих стихотворних думок, які писались у нас за Сковороди, з окрасою Шевченківщини. [...] Поставши з народу и во имя народу появили ми поки що невеличку, а про те суцільню, самостійну літературу, и для самої її поваги не мусимо приймати того, що ви вдержуєте від старовини (етимологія), або що ви примудруєте середнього між етимологією и фонетикою. Коли-ж ви стоїте за свої особини, то сим виявляєте узкість своєї тенденції. Ми хочемо, щоб нас читала не одна Україна, а також и Галичина, чого й доказуємо не одним Шевченком, а ви бажаєте писати для своєї Галичини. Наш народ, яко нива неписьменного слова – від Есмані по Карпати, а ваш – тільки від границі по Карпати. Читати нас у Галичині будуть и мусять, хоч би ми не прийняли нічого ісьного з вашого смаку; а вас тільки тоді читатимуть на Україні, коли ви приймете смак український, піднявшись вище Головащини, Дідищини и всієї нової галичинщини (Franko 1898a: 13–14).

Your merit lies in the fact that you have not become either Poles or Germans, that in your non-peasant families people still speak their language, and, furthermore, that you have preserved words and expressions from the deep past forgotten among us. The spirit of poetry has been beaten down among you; it has been strangled by your seminary language and by Polish; only a feeling for poetry has remained among you, and that is why you love Ševčenko so much.... We extend our arms to you in order to clasp you to our hearts and warm you up; to breathe into you the vital, untainted Ukrainian spirit; but you, for your part, having lingered so long in confinement, think that your cage should serve as a model for us. We do not regard your prattle as poetry, and we relegate it to those versified thoughts that were written among us in the times of Skovoroda, with a bit of Ševčenko for embellishment.... Risen from the people and in the name of the people, we have created a literature that is still small but coherent and independent, and because of our very respect for it, we are under no obligation to accept what you have preserved of the ancient traditions (etymology) or what you have thought up as something halfway between etymology and phonetics. By insisting on your peculiarities, you show the narrowness of your tendency.

12 In George Luckyj's Kuliš 1984, the letter is dated to the early 1880s and assigned to the year 1881, which strikes me as hardly plausible.

We want not only Ukraine to read us, but also Galicia, as we have shown not by Ševčenko alone—you, however, want to write for your Galicia. Our people, from the Esman River to the Carpathian Mountains, are like virgin territory for the not-yet-literary word, but your people extend only from the border to the Carpathians. We will be and must be read in Galicia, even if we should not accept anything at all of your taste, but you will only be read in Ukraine if you adopt the Ukrainian taste by rising above Holovac'kyj, Didyc'kyj, and all that new Galician stuff.

Thus, Kuliš judged some aspects of the Galician language situation quite realistically, although his Galician contemporaries by no means confirmed that Ukrainian was prevalently spoken among non-peasant families, but in fact lamented that their higher social strata generally conversed in Polish. Kuliš's statement about ancient words preserved in Galician but already forgotten in Russian-ruled Ukraine deserves particular emphasis: as Ševel'ov (1966: 100) points out, Kuliš carried over many Galician elements into his own speech as substitutes for Russianisms.

However, Kuliš complained above all that the Galicians were not endowed with "poetic spirit" ("Дух поезиї") and maintained only a feeling for poetry ("чуття поезиї"), which explained their enthusiasm for Ševčenko. Kuliš insisted that only the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire could serve as role models for the Galicians because of their vital, undistorted (literally "uncrippled") "Ukrainian spirit" ("український дух"). His statement that the Galicians preserved a language more or less reflecting the times of Hryhorij Skovoroda, which they only embellished with a bit of Ševčenko ("Шевченківщина"), deserves particular attention, for Kuliš did not associate the non-vernacular Galician elements with Russian, but with homegrown "Little Russian" traditions as exemplified by Skovoroda. Kuliš admitted that the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire had only a small literature to offer but emphasized its independent status. As for Kuliš's statement about the Galicians' "etymology," that is, their etymological orthography, it is noteworthy that his misunderstanding was shared by almost all his contemporaries. In fact, neither the level of vernacularity nor, even less, the degree of literary quality was directly dependent on the selection of orthographic principles. Ševčenko's poetry, for example, remains the same whether his poems are written in Modern Standard Ukrainian orthography, "Kulišivka," etymological orthography, Russian-based phoneticizing orthography (which was in fact Ševčenko's original orthography: see Moser 2008a, Moser 2012a), or Latin-alphabet transcription or transliteration, as long as the texts can be read correctly.

If Kuliš noted in addition that the Galicians simply had to ("мусять") read the literature produced by the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire, he was perhaps justified in doing so, inasmuch as the quality of Galician literature at the time was less than impressive. But Kuliš would have done well to give an equally realistic appraisal of the sparse and often mediocre Ukrainian literature then being written in the Russian Empire. Kuliš's philippic against the Galicians who allegedly had not risen above the level of the Holovac'kyjs, the Didyc'kyjs, and all "the new Galician stuff" ("нова галичинщина") was by no means directed only against the Galician

Russophiles, for he made similar criticisms of the populists—indeed, he did so in the same letter. Clearly, the “new Galician stuff” was Kuliš’s label for literature produced by the populists, whom he lumped together, surprisingly enough, with the Russophiles.

Throughout his life, Kuliš had no doubt that the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire were superior to the Galicians. At the same time, as his creative work evolved through a striking variety of phases and ideological convictions, he strove for a merger of the two groups. For instance, during a critical phase in 1873, he wrote from his estate of Motronivka to Oleksander Barvins'kyj that the latter should try to find a sufficient number of Galicians willing to move to Russian-ruled Ukraine and establish “Ruthenian colonies...throughout Ukraine” (“русинські колонії [...] скрізь по Україні”), which would be “a very good thing for the economy and for a merger of Ukraine with Red Rus” (“вельми добре діло і для господарства, і для спаяння України з Червоною Руссю”) (Barvins'kyj 2004: 168).

In the 1860s and early 1870s, the Galician populists still regarded Kuliš as a legitimate successor to Ševčenko. Also under Kuliš’s influence, they abandoned many linguistic features particular to Galicia in order to attain maximum linguistic unity with Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Jurij Ševel'ov (1963: 52) concisely describes this important process:

In the 60's and the first half of the 70's the Ukrainian literary language as founded and formed by Ševčenko and the *Osnova*—based largely on the south Kievan and Poltavan [*sic*] dialects—exerted great influence on the literary language of Galicia. As a result the attempts of the Galician Russophiles supported by the Russian government to use Russian (usually in a very corrupt and awkward form) in literature became of secondary importance and subsequently ended in complete failure.... Works published there from 1876 to 1905 (aside from those of the Russophiles) accepted the standards worked out by Ševčenko and the *Osnova*, but they naturally [!] picked up numerous Galician elements—some from local dialects and some from the language of the Galician intelligentsia with its many loan words and loan translations from German and Polish. A great deal of direct Galician influence can be seen in the language of M. Drahomanov.

It was not only in his letter “to the Galicians” that Kuliš harshly attacked the populists: their leading figures, such as Vasyl' Il'nyč'kyj, Omeljan Ohonovs'kyj, Omeljan Partyč'kyj, Anatol' Vaxnjanyn, and others were among his favorite targets. In general, according to Kuliš, the “Polish spirit” had “poisoned” the “thoughts and feelings” of the Galicians:

Се лядський дух потруїв ваші думки и чуття, той дух, що й на Україні втворив помосковане панство. Проти сього духу встала наша словесність, и куди б ми її не перенесли, всюди вона, у великій и малій речі, ёго воюватиме. Хоч би нашої Біблії не куплено в Галичині и десяти примірників, то нам байдуже: вона своє діло зробить на тому ґрунті, що не заріс ляцькою зіноваттю; а з тих простих, без книжних передсудів

людей, виростуть діти и цвістимуть чистим розумом и серцем на могилах Ильницьких, Огоновських et tutti quanti. Ото-ж будуть люде, про котрих написано: оправдаєцца премудрость од чад своїх; а ваші розумники – чада схолястичнїї шляхетщини, а не премудрости того народу, що сказав велике слово: у город по гроші, а в село по розум.

Ваша словесність буде насліддям самої библиографії поти, поки Галичина не зілеєцца духом своїм з Україною в єдине тіло (Franko 1898a: 14).

It is the Liakh [Polish] spirit that has poisoned your thoughts and feelings, the spirit that has also created the Muscovized state in Ukraine. Our literature has emerged in opposition to that spirit, and wherever we transfer it, everywhere it will combat that spirit in matters both large and small. Even if fewer than ten copies of our [translated] Bible should be bought in Galicia, we do not care: it will serve its purpose on the soil that has not been overgrown by Liakh weeds; and from those simple people, who do not have the prejudices of the literati, children will grow, and they will bloom with pure minds and hearts on the graves of the Іл'ниць'к'я, Огонов'с'к'я, and the rest of that sort. These will be the people of whom it is written: supreme wisdom will be justified by its children; but your intellectual snobs are the children of a scholastic pack of nobles, and not of the supreme wisdom of the people who spoke the great word: go to town for money but to the village for reason.

Your literature will be a legacy of mere bibliography until Galicia merges spiritually into a single body with Ukraine.

Behind Kuliš's sweeping attack, a personal disappointment may be discerned. In 1871, he had wanted to offer his Ukrainian translation of the Bible to the British and Foreign Biblical Society, but its representative requested an expert opinion from Franz Miklosich, the renowned Vienna professor of Slavic philology. Miklosich had every reason to render a highly critical assessment of the translation, since it was too free and had not been translated from Greek or Hebrew (Ohijenko 1949/1995: 151; Nimčuk 2005: 31). Kuliš's translation of the four canonical gospels of the New Testament still appeared in 1871 but was received very critically by numerous contemporaries, especially in Galicia, and sold badly. Not until 1903 did the celebrated physicist Ivan Puljuj, whom Kuliš had met in Vienna in the spring of 1869 and persuaded to collaborate on his translation of the Bible, win the support of the British and Foreign Biblical Society for the thoroughly revised complete Ukrainian translation. In Russian-ruled Ukraine, Kuliš and Puljuj's translation was only printed for the first time in 1928 by the Ukrainian Baptist Society in Kharkiv (Luckyj 1983: 151–152).

Kuliš was apparently not so indifferent to the initial failure of his Bible translation of 1871 as he himself claimed. It is spitefulness above all that characterizes his quasi-prophetic pronouncement that the "simple people" would surely read his Bible translation and that a new generation would accrue from the graves of the "intellectual snobs" ("розумники") and the children of the "scholastic pack of nobles" ("чада схолястичнїї шляхетщини").

Kuliš had tackled his Bible translation by himself in 1868. From that time on, he

took a particular interest in Galicia and its Ruthenian-language schooling. In 1869, he wrote to Oleksander Barvins'kyj from Vienna:

Сповідки Ваші про гимназіальну педагогію і про інші речі дуже міні потрібні. Я тепер тільки штудірую Галичину, яка вона є, зі всіх боків, а більш мало що роблю. Міні треба добре взнати край і людей, щоб не помилялись у своїй роботі. Яка ж моя буде робота, я ще й сам гаразд не знаю, бо шкода загадувати собі що-небудь статешне, поки Галичина буде міні *terra incognita*. Оце ж я підходжу до неї то звідсіля, то звідтіля, довідуючись правди, хоч би найгіршої. Свого часу поїду сам по деяких місцях (Barvins'kyj 2004: 155).

I urgently need information from you about teaching in the gymnasiums and other things. All I am doing now is studying Galicia as it is, in every respect, and little else. I have to get to know the land and the people thoroughly so as not to go astray in my work. I do not yet know what my work will look like, for it would be pointless to think up anything in particular as long as Galicia remains a *terra incognita* to me. That is why I approach it now from this angle, now from another in order to make out the truth, even if it should be the worst of truths. Someday I shall visit some places myself.

Not only did Kuliš feel hurt by the populists after the failure of his Bible translation, but there were also disputes about financial matters. In all likelihood, this was all the more incomprehensible to him because he seems to have seriously regarded himself and his Bible translation as the only certain means of bringing about Galician emancipation from the Poles.

In 1873, Kuliš wrote to Oleksander Barvins'kyj:

Ви лучче мене знаєте Ваших земляків; то чи не вформували б Ви проекту печатання і продажі Библиї таким робом, що за всяку працю по умові платити, та вже щоб і міні була певність, що одержу справозданне і що моя власність не станеться власністю чужою через те, що я живу далеко. Бажаючи добра рідному краєві і шануючи славу його, Ви мусите допильнувати діла сього так, щоб його зроблено до ладу, і щоб за мою прихильність до Вашого народнього діла не роблено зо мною нічого робом Партицького, Вахнянина і інших. Бо розсудіте самі: потративши доволі часу на переклад Святого Письма, мусив би я ще цілий рік сидіти в Німеччині, закінь німці напечатали б руську книгу. Яка б се була втрата моїй сем'ї, моему господарству і моїй кешені? А через що? Через те, що Галичина не здоліє виставити Україні чесного контингенту до їх спільного діла! [...] бо чи виб'єтеся ж ви, русини, з-під ляхів і їх політичної переваги без Библиї? Ні, задушать вони вас, коли не пійдете нашою стежкою або йтимете нею так, як ішли ваші зрадливі проводирі (Barvins'kyj 2004: 167).

You know your countrymen better than I do, so could you not organize the project of printing and selling the Bible in such a way all my work would be paid according to contract, so that I would finally be assured of receiving a statement of accounts and of avoiding the loss of my property to someone else because I live far away? Wishing the best for your country and honoring its glory, you

must see that this matter is carried out properly, and that nothing be done to me in the manner of Partyc'kyj, Vaxnjany, and others because of my sympathy for your national cause. After all, judge for yourself: having invested a good deal of time in translating the Holy Scripture, I would have to spend another whole year in Germany until the Germans managed to print a Ruthenian book. How great a loss would that be to my family, my household, and my pocket? And because of what? Because Galicia is incapable of providing a decent contingent to Ukraine for their common cause! ...so will you Ruthenians manage to free yourselves from the Liakhs and their political preponderance without a Bible? No, they will suffocate you if you do not walk our path, or if you walk it as your treacherous leaders did.

Kuliš's strange self-delusion comes to light with particular clarity in a letter that he sent to Oleksander Barvins'kyj from St. Petersburg in 1873:

Дивуєтеся Ви, що я й досі не покидаю Галичини з її ледачими передовиками. І не покину. Передовики зникнуть, а Галичина зостанеться. Хіба кидав хто поле через те, що його не вміли люде пахати? Ледачі ратаї бували на всякому полі. Тепер орудує ним у Галичині псевдо-Просвіта, а свого часу орудуватиме правдива Просвіта. Може, я того й не побачу, а проте держатиму свого прапора високо, щоб хоч знали земляки, як я стояв один, коли всі пропадали. На прапорі ж моїм написано: „Докіль Галичина не впоїть у себе народнього смаку українського, будуть її передовики такими недоріками, як оті Просвітяне“. Вони все ще живуть бурсою могилинських часів, і не для них співав народ наш поза присудом бурси, не для них працювали наші писателі. Се люди мертві, а хочуть учити живих. „Вожді сліпі!“ (Barvins'kyj 2004: 170)

You wonder why I have not yet abandoned Galicia with its indolent leaders. And I will not abandon it. The leaders will perish, but Galicia will remain. Has anyone ever abandoned a field because people were incapable of plowing it? There have always been bad plowmen on fields of every description. A pseudo-Prosvita is currently directing the plow in Galicia, but one day a true Prosvita will do so instead. Perhaps I will never see it, but I shall hold my banner high nevertheless, so that my countrymen at least know how I stood alone when all the others made themselves scarce. My banner bears the following inscription: "Until Galicia imbibes the popular Ukrainian taste, its leaders will remain the same bunglers as those Prosvita people." They still live by the seminary of Mohyla's times, and not for them have our people sung beyond the reach of the seminary, not for them have our writers worked. They are dead men, and yet they want to teach the living. "The leaders are blind!"

As we see, Kuliš had nothing good to say about the leading Galician populists. Others may judge whether he was right in his assessment of Galician and non-Galician literary work, but his claim to be the one true enlightener and his categorical rejection of Prosvita are wholly unconvincing. Kuliš could have taken credit for some real achievements, including some pertaining to Galician pedagogy, as he had advised Oleksander Barvins'kyj, who had prepared an influential gymnasium textbook conceived as a literary anthology of both Galician and non-Galician

texts, and as he had provided texts of his own for inclusion in Galician textbooks. However, compared with the teaching aids printed by the Prosvita Association and the Lviv Stauropegion (on textbooks for Galician primary schools, see Moser 2007), Kuliš's textbook, the *Hramatka* of 1857, can hardly be regarded as superior, particularly with regard to its methodology.¹³

Even the question of orthography was not as easy as one might think if one merely follows the master narrative of Ukrainian language history. After all, owing to the lack of Ukrainian-language schooling, the general dearth of a Ukrainian press and, ultimately, the language bans of 1863 and 1876, Kuliš's orthography could not be fully established as the generally accepted orthography in Russian-ruled Ukraine, where in fact many different orthographies were used. Thus the etymologically oriented orthography that prevailed in Galician schools until the early 1890s might ultimately have had its advantages as well, especially in a transitional period.

As for the Ukrainian language more generally, it should be noted that from a present-day perspective, Kuliš's own language was by no means ideal, as it still featured a multitude of elements (especially borrowings from Church Slavonic and Russian) from which the Galician populists in particular would soon distance themselves. Finally, the fact that Kuliš managed to translate the Bible from the original only in collaboration with the Galician Ivan Puljuj, a graduate of an Austrian gymnasium like many other Galicians, ultimately confirms that Kuliš had little reason to depict and judge his Galician contemporaries as generally uneducated or miseducated.

2.2. Kuliš in a dubious light

While Kuliš adopted an awkwardly self-righteous stance vis-à-vis the Galicians, it is striking that he proved to be a decidedly shady character, particularly in decisive phases of Ukrainian linguistic and cultural history—a role that had little in common with the savior image that he projected of himself and that the Galicians accepted for some time.

By 1869 at the latest, Kuliš had begun criticizing the Galicians—showing restraint at first—about their enthusiasm for Ševčenko. In the meantime, he had fashioned a more critical image of his former companion, whose place he would evidently have liked to take for himself.

In a letter dated that year, Kuliš wrote to Oleksander Barvins'kyj from Vienna:

Чом Ваші галицькі поети не мають такого чистого смаку в слові і в почутті речі? Думаю тому, що мало хто з них добре знає таких поетів, як Шиллер, Гьоте, Мицкевич, Пушкін, Байрон, Данте, а всі зависли на Шевченкові, та й шевченкового ґрунту – народньої української словесности і української

13 This applies even more to Taras Ševčenko's *Bukvar' južnoruskij* of 1861; cf. excerpts from both textbooks in Istorija 2004: 68–72; 73–81. On Ševčenko's primer, see Moser 2008a: 422–424, Moser 2012a. On Kuliš's primer, see Moser forthcoming. On Galician primers of the early 1870s, see Moser 2007.

літератури – добре не штудирують. [...] Доки Ваши писателі вертїтимущя в узенькому очерті, доти не захоплять своїми крильми свіжого вітру понад землю. Науки, науки треба галичанам, а перш усього – рідної етнографії і історії (Barvins'kyj 2004: 151).

Why do your Galician poets not have such pure taste in words or in feeling for language? I think it is because few of them know poets such as Schiller, Goethe, Mickiewicz, Puškin, Byron, or Dante well, but all of them got stuck at Ševčenko, and they do not even properly study Ševčenko's foundation—popular Ukrainian written culture and Ukrainian literature.... As long as your writers linger in a narrow circle, they will not be able to take wing in the fresh air above the ground. Education, education is what the Galicians need, and native ethnography and history first and foremost.

At that very time, on the eve of the Ems Ukase, Kuliš showed particular concern for the international character of Ukrainian national and literary culture. Convinced of his mission, he believed himself entitled to accuse the Galicians of failing to acquaint themselves with world literature and lagging behind more advanced cultures in their enthusiasm for Ševčenko. Where Kuliš got the courage to make such criticisms is another question. Although he had not been allowed to complete his studies at Kyiv University because of his non-noble ancestry, he was undoubtedly well-read. As for the Galicians whom he attacked so fiercely, he seemed to ignore the fact that many of them were studying or had studied at the universities of Lviv, Vienna, or Cracow. Kuliš's image of the Galicians was thus undoubtedly an expression of his starry-eyed delusion.¹⁴

Kuliš's standing as a positive figure in the Ukrainian revival had already been shaken in 1864, when he had gone to Warsaw as a well-paid official of the Russian government, which then took drastic measures against the Polish population in reaction to the Polish uprising. Moreover, Kuliš was repeatedly commended at that time for his loyalty to the tsar (Luckyj 1983: 142–143). The fact that Kuliš was hardly among the more pleasant Russian officials in Warsaw is apparent from his letters to the minstrel Ostap Veresaj, who, incidentally, was blind and incapable of reading and writing. Kuliš wrote that he would enjoy acting as a superior to the "clean-shaven Catholic priests"—it would gladden his Cossack heart. Oleksander Konys'kyj, another Ukrainian awakener, reported at the time that Kuliš thought it would be good for Polish children to be instructed in Russian, if not for pedagogical then for political reasons, for that would create a deep chasm between Poles and Ukrainians (Luckyj 1983: 144–145). In a letter to Mykola Bilozers'kyj, Kuliš explained why he was ready to leave for Warsaw: he expressed his conviction that the Ukrainians constituted a nation only in the ethnographic but not in the political

14 Kuliš's habitual readiness to deny any intellectual capabilities to others was by no means limited to Galicians. For example, he did not hesitate to refer to Izmail Sreznevskij, one of the most impressive Russian philologists of the nineteenth century, who had also contributed a great deal to the Ukrainian movement in the first half of that century, as an "old fool" (Luckyj 1983: 26).

sense, and then elaborated that those striving most ardently for separatism were the ones who had contributed least to the study of the language and history of this problematic country. Allegedly, Kuliš wanted to dedicate himself to preventing Ukraine from becoming the plaything of neighboring nations (Luckyj 1983: 144–145). But who would have believed Kuliš's story?

Where Kuliš was headed in the aftermath of the Valuev Circular, that is, at a time when the Ukrainian cause would have been in particular need of staunch activists, is evidenced by a letter that he wrote to Jakiv Holovac'kyj in 1866. There he said, among other things:

Давно мы прекратили переписку. Теперь Вы видите меня на другомъ болѣе серьезномъ поприщѣ. Я служу все тому же русскому дѣлу, которому и Вы съ такимъ же успѣхомъ посвящаете свои труды и способности (Hrynčuk 2007).

We stopped corresponding long ago. Now you see me in a different, more serious field. I am still serving the same Russian cause to which you, too, have dedicated your work and abilities with equal success.

What precisely Kuliš meant by these words must be left open. He must have been well aware, however, that Holovac'kyj, who by then had become one of the most zealous Galician Russophiles, would have understood them as a clear disparagement of the Ukrainian idea and as a commitment to all-Russianism.

In a further letter of 1867, also addressed to Holovac'kyj, Kuliš expressed himself even more clearly. "In the name of Russian unity," he now went so far as to abandon his own orthography because it had been adopted by the new Austrian government newspaper *Rus'*, which was committed to the vernacular and succeeded the *Vistnyk* (see pp. 297–298 in this volume). That orthography had thus fallen into "enemy hands":

Видя это знамя въ непріятельскихъ рукахъ, я первый на него ударю и отрекусь от своего правописанія во имя русскаго единства (Hrynčuk 2007).

As I now see this banner in enemy hands, I shall be the first to strike against it and renounce my orthography in the name of Russian unity.

In the same letter, Kuliš declared his willingness to compose a manifesto making his views public. Thus, he not only increasingly proceeded to discard Ševčenko and the Cossacks but also revised his own views at the very moment when they were to be propagated in one of the most important new populist mouthpieces—a newspaper supported by the government and thus very likely to survive for more than a few months, as had been the case with several previous populist newspapers.

It is interesting to note that Jakiv Holovac'kyj dealt with Kuliš's letter as he had done in 1863 with Myxajlo Maksymovyč's letter of 1840 to Denys Zubryc'kyj: he published it in *Slovo*, the major organ of the Galician Russophiles. The Galician populists were outraged, and the result was an outright scandal. Convinced that Kuliš himself could not have made such statements, the populists demanded that *Slovo* print his manifesto. But Kuliš did not submit a text, apparently because the issue had become too delicate for him.

Kuliš went on to write a letter to Omeljan Partyc'kyj distancing himself from the statements in his letter to Jakiv Holovac'kyj, and the populists published the new letter in *Pravda* (Truth), their major organ. Kuliš convinced the populists that when Holovac'kyj had made a stop in Warsaw on his way to the great Slavic Congress of 1867 in Moscow, he had told Kuliš that the Poles would publish the newspaper *Rus'* in the "Kulišivka" (Barvins'kyj 2004: 96). Kuliš maintained that that had been his only reason for allegedly distancing himself from his own orthography: he had wanted to keep his distance from the Poles. In the same year, an article in which Kuliš was accused of threatening the unity of the "Russian people" ("русский народъ") appeared in the Russian newspaper *Moskovskie vedomosti* (Moscow News) (Hrynčuk 2007), and it is likely that this attack was the major reason why Kuliš was forced to leave his official post in Warsaw in 1867. Henceforth he would no longer correspond with Jakiv Holovac'kyj.

Even more remarkable is Kuliš's conduct in the years 1874–77, when he was completing his *Istoriia vozsoedinenija Rusi*. At the very time when the Ems Ukase of 1876 was issued, Kuliš arrived at an increasingly positive assessment of the Russian imperial attitude toward Ukrainian, while making ever more negative statements about Ukraine's Cossack past and about Taras Ševčenko and his allegedly "попьяная" and "распущенная муза" ("half-drunken and dissolute muse") (Kuliš 1874: 24). All these statements led the Galician populists gradually but ineluctably to alienate themselves from him (Luckyj 1983: 152–155).¹⁵

In 1875, Kuliš asked Oleksander Barvins'kyj to forward the following message to the editors of the Bukovynian almanac *Rus'ka xata* (Ruthenian Home), which finally appeared two years later:

Постарайтесь, щоб у буковинському альманасі не було нічого комуністичного, бо комунізм – дурниця. Та нехай не лають Московщини або руського правительства, а то не будем нічого посилати до Галичини. Лайкою нічого не візьмеш. На лайку ж і розуму, і науки не треба. Усяка баба зуміє виляти всякого царя і найкращий уряд. Пора вже се покинути (Barvins'kyj 2004: 177).

See to it that nothing communist be found in the Bukovynian almanac, for communism is nonsense. And do not let them rant about Muscovite affairs or the Russian government, or else we will not send anything to Galicia. Nothing can be achieved by ranting. For ranting, you neither need reason nor learning.

15 Incidentally, in the same piece of writing Kuliš felt compelled to refer to Kostomarov, the son of a Russian father and a Ukrainian mother, as an "иноплеменникъ" ("person of a foreign tribe") (Luckyj 1983: 155).

Any shrew can rant about the tsar and the government, even the best. It is high time to stop that.

"Communism"—whatever Kuliš may have meant by that term in the given context¹⁶—and the alleged "rants," meaning criticism of the Russian language ("Московщина") or the Russian government, were mentioned here in the same breath. Kuliš now referred to the Russian government as "руське правительство," most likely in the sense of "all-Russian." Earlier, he had consistently referred to Russian phenomena as "Muscovite" ("московські"), clearly differentiating them (by no means in a necessarily pejorative manner) from Ukrainian phenomena. Kuliš's major literary works of that period were not the only indication that he felt the need to change his mind: they were augmented by instructions that he sent to addressees in Galicia and Bukovyna.

In 1875, Kuliš went a step further. By means of a letter sent to Oleksander Barvins'kyj from his estate of Motronivka, he protested against the wish of a group of Bukovynian and Galician publishers to issue some of his Russian-language texts in Ukrainian translation in an almanac:

Ще є в мене артикул: „О значении преподобного Иова, почаетовского игумена, в истории русской жизни“ на аркуш чи й більш друку. Йов Желізо, родом з Покуття, постригся в покутському Угорницькому монастирі; його годилось би згадати в руському альманасі. Тільки воно писано в мене московською мовою, і я не хочу, щоб перекладувано моє писання мовою українською. Ще є в мене артикул: „Галицкая часть русского мира в борьбе с антирусскими силами“ на два аркуші чи й більш друку. Ся штука також годилась би в буковинський альманах, бо виявляє історію і старовину русинську, чи червононоруську, з нового погляду і дає руському елементові підмогу. Та знов не хочу, щоб перекладувано українською мовою; а коли схочуть напечатати, дак нехай якраз так напечатають, як я написав, не переправивши ні єдиного слова і нічого інінько не пропускаючи. Оце ж Ви міні дайте звістку, чи може так статись, як я пишу, чи притьмом хочуть, щоб буковинський альманах був чисто український, без московщини (Barvins'kyj 2004: 177–178).

I also have an article "On the Significance of the Most Reverend Iov, Hegumen of Pochaiv, for the History of Russian Life," amounting to a printed signature or more. Jov Želizo, born in Pokutia, became a monk in the Pokutian monastery of Uhornytsia; he would be worthy of mention in a Ruthenian almanac. But I wrote it in the Muscovite language, and I do not want my writing to be translated into Ukrainian. I also have an article on "The Galician Part of the Russian World in the Struggle against Anti-Russian Forces," amounting to two printed signatures or more. This piece of writing would also be appropriate for a Bukovynian almanac, as it presents Ruthenian or Red Russian history and antiquity from a new perspective and lends support to the Ruthenian [perhaps "Russian"] element. And again, I do not want it to be translated into Ukrainian, and if they should want to print it, then let them print it exactly as I have written it, without

16 At this time, Kuliš was constantly given to associating the Cossacks first and foremost with "communism."

changing so much as a single word or omitting anything whatever. So let me know whether it can be done as I am writing, or whether they absolutely want the Bukovynian almanac to be purely Ukrainian, without Muscovite elements.

At that point, Kuliš did not even attempt to explain why he was speaking out against a translation of his writings. Had he doubted the skills of the editors, he could have done the translation himself, proposed a translator whom he trusted, or suggested editing the translation. But he was not even considering any practical way of publishing his writings in Ukrainian.

To all appearances, then, it was none other than Pantelejmon Kuliš, who had spoken up so courageously for the emancipation of the Ukrainian language in his younger years, who was now suddenly—a year before the Ukase of Bad Ems—unable to comprehend that it could not possibly be in the interest of publishers of Bukovynian or Galician populist almanacs to print Russian-language works written by former activists of the Ukrainian cause in the midst of their struggle against the Russophiles, who flatly denied the Ukrainian language a right to existence. It was therefore by no means surprising that Oleksander Barvins'kyj apparently failed to comprehend Kuliš's point of view.

From Kuliš's further letters, it may be concluded that Barvins'kyj made an effort to persuade Kuliš to reconsider. In 1876, Kuliš reacted with a remarkable response:

Може, Ви й не помиляєтесь, що треба всячину перекладувати нашою мовою, аби до смаку, до вподоби громаді. А се вельми розумно Ви пишете, що мусите печатати по-московськи, коли хто пришле готову працю до Вас. Щоб же самі русини, занедбавши свою рідну мову, писали московською, сього в мене не було й на думці. Багацько є таких, що нею добре пишуть і достають до самого джерела її краси і сили. [...] Тих же, що слідом Квітки і Шевченка зуміли б дошукатись у нашій словесних скарбів, дуже мало на світі (Barvins'kyj 2004: 179).

You may be right in saying that all sorts of things should be translated into our language, as long as they cater to the taste and preferences of the community. And you make excellent sense when you write that you must print in Muscovite if someone sends you a work already written in that language. But I never had the slightest notion that the Ruthenians themselves, forsaking their mother tongue, should write in Muscovite. There are many who write it well and make their way to the very source of its beauty and power.... But of those who, in the wake of Kvitka and Ševčenko, might be capable of grasping the treasures of the language in our literature, there are very few in the world.

Surprisingly, Kuliš found that there were enough Galicians who wrote so well in Russian as to be able to penetrate its "source of beauty and power," even if there were "very few in the world" who, in Kvitka's and Ševčenko's wake (how strongly he must have felt the urge to add himself here), had grasped the "treasures of the language" in "our literature." In the final analysis, Kuliš was trying to blackmail Barvins'kyj: either his text would be printed in Russian or it would not be printed at all.

Kuliš then went on to add some general observations:

Вельми радуюсь, що „в Чернівцях польщина не має ніякого значення“. Оце ж нехай, обік своєї мови, вживають і московську. Ми вибилися із словесного нечевля московщиною. Вона нас навчила шанувати наші народні пісні і думи. Шевченко свій стих виробив скільки на українські пісні, стільки ж і на пушкінському стихові. Про се натякнуто ще в епілозі до перекладу „Чорної Ради“ московською мовою, якогось там 1857 і 56 року. Ні московщина нам, ні ми московщині не завадимо; а польщина шкодила й шкодить рущині вельми (Barvins'kyj 2004: 180).

I am very pleased that “Polish has no significance whatever in Chernivtsi.” In that case, let them use the Muscovite language along with their own. We have extricated ourselves from our linguistic nullity thanks to the Muscovite language. It has taught us to honor our folk songs and *dumy*. Ševčenko fashioned his verse as much on the basis of Puškin’s as on that of Ukrainian songs. This was already pointed out [by Kuliš himself] in the *epilogue* to the Muscovite translation of *Čorna Rada* sometime in 1857 or 1856. The Muscovite world will be no impediment to us, nor we to the Muscovite world, but the Polish world has done great harm to the Russian [perhaps: Ruthenian] world and is still doing so.

In those days, then, Kuliš’s major adversary was Polish culture, and the Polish language along with it. As for the Russian language and culture, in the course of his work on the *Istoriia vozsoedinenija Rusi* Kuliš had already completed his personal reunion with it. Although he now generally recommended that people in Chernivtsi should feel free to use Russian along with Ukrainian, since Russian had proved useful time and again to Ukrainians, it is not clear how much Kuliš actually knew about the situation of the Russian language in Chernivtsi at the time. As for Ševčenko, Kuliš no longer identified him with the context of Ukrainian folk songs and *dumy*; allegedly, the model of Aleksandr Puškin’s Russian poetry had been no less important to him. All of a sudden, Kuliš deemed it necessary to present Ukrainian issues consistently in close relation to Russian ones; by contrast, everything Polish was now seen as harmful to Ukrainians and Russians alike.

In a further letter to Oleksander Barvins'kyj written in the same year of 1876, Kuliš ultimately declared nothing less than the utter bankruptcy of the Ukrainian idea:

А щоб перекладавали мої великоруські писання, дак не знаю, чи буде воно смачне, хоч би хто й з Ваших на се піднявся. Ще молода наша літературня мова українська. Яку маємо *societas*? Де по-нашому пишуть закони і дають суд? Де наши катедри шкільні? Де громадські речники українські? Та й чи буде воно коли, отте все? [...]

Попробував я піро на первих аркушах „Мальованої гайдамаччини“ у мові філософичній, дак ні! Вимовніще б написав я те саме по-московські. Бо Московщина працювала і нас до праці над своєю мовою закликала тоді, як ми потовмившись та попившись відпочивали. Пробуркались, аж уже инший світ настав! Така-то наша доля. Ну, та в нас є багацько такого, що

немає в Москві. Тим же то нам і личить перед добрими людьми хвалитись. Шевченкового стиха в них немає. Як нам ні напинають пупа їх Кольцови і tutti quanti, ні! Що балабайка, то [не] кобза. Бринь-бринь, та й ні про що співати, та й голосної пісні з балабайки не видаси.

У Києві Кониський хоче видати скриню нашої словесности. Се я похваляю і раю йому зверху всього словесного нашого добра покласти найкращі співи народні щодо мови і до форми. Се бо те джерело, з котрого рине вся українська мова літературня, набираючись із обох боків повні: і від народу, що по-нашому розмовляє, і з науки, котра нашу старовину освічує. Така книга, один том віршами, а другий прозою, вельми допоможе Галичині, коли б тільки швидко видавав (Barvins'kyj 2004: 181).

And if my Great Russian writings were now to be translated, I do not know whether anything tasteful would result, even if someone from your milieu were to take on the task. Our Ukrainian literary language is still young. What *societas* do we have? Where are laws written and court sessions held in our language? Where are our faculties? Where are the Ukrainian civil advocates? And will we have all this someday?....

I have tried my pen at philosophical language on the first sheets of the "Painted Hajdamačyna," but no! I could write the same more expressively in Muscovite. For the Muscovite world has worked and has called upon us to work on our own language when we, drunk and weary, took a rest. When we came to, there was a whole new world! Such is our fate. To be sure, we have many things that Moscow does not have. We have a perfect right to brag about that to decent people. They do not have Ševčenko's verse. How their Koltsovs and the rest of that sort do get on our nerves, no! A balalaika is not a kobza. Jingle-jangle, but there is nothing to sing about, and you will not get a resounding song out of a balalaika.

In Kyiv, Kony's'kyj wants to publish an almanac of our written culture. I praise him for that and advise him above all to compile from our literary heritage the best folk songs with regard to language and form. This is in fact the source from which our Ukrainian literary language gushes out, drawing abundantly from both sides: from the people who speak our language and from scholarship, which sheds light on our antiquity. Such a book, one volume in verse, a second in prose, would be of great help to Galicia, if only it were to be published as soon as possible.

Kuliš insisted that his Russian writings not be translated into "our Ukrainian written language" not only because he doubted whether the translations would be of good quality. More importantly, he expressed his concern whether Ukrainian-language writings would find a readership at all and claimed, with even deeper skepticism, that Ukrainian was by no means appropriate as a "language for philosophy" ("мова філософична"), as one could write much more expressively about such matters in Russian. He lamented that nowhere were laws written and administered "in our language" ("по-нашому"), and it suddenly seemed as if he had completely forgotten at least two very basic truths of which he must have been aware and had in fact been aware in previous decades:

First, none of the languages that were then just beginning to be elaborated was or could even theoretically be a "language for philosophy" from the outset or by

nature. The expressive power of any language in the intellectual sphere depended largely on the talents of the language-builders.

Second, even if the use of the Ukrainian language was in fact extremely restricted in the Russian Empire, especially because of the language bans of 1863 and 1876, the possibilities for Ukrainian language-building were comparatively excellent. Kuliš must have known that particularly in Galicia, laws were in fact written and even administered to some degree “in our language” (“по-нашому”), regardless of all the problems involved, and that schooling “in our language” was developing strongly. Populist periodicals were gaining an ever-growing readership. Ivan Verxrats'kyj had already undertaken his groundbreaking studies of Ukrainian terminology. Ivan Franko had published his first works. The ground had already been prepared for the imposing developments of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The community (*societas*) whose existence Kuliš denied had in fact already been shaped to a considerable degree and was being further shaped with great success.

Kuliš now appeared in an even more dubious light, as his statements about the alleged failure of the Ukrainian idea contained no hint of opposition to the Ukase of Bad Ems. Instead, he sounded once again as if he, and no one else, had found the philosopher's stone. But the stone now looked completely different than before.¹⁷ In the eyes of the populists, Kuliš must ultimately have lost face.

Kuliš's highly subjective comparison of Russian and Ukrainian language-building confirmed this impression. By his account, the “Muscovite world” (“Московщина”) had elaborated the Russian language at a time when the Ukrainians (“ми”) had done nothing,¹⁸ and it was the fate of the Ukrainians (“наша доля”) to have missed their chance to participate in the ongoing process of modernization. Kuliš's short-sightedness is apparent here: focusing on the nineteenth century, he failed to inquire why there had been no active Ukrainian language-building in the eighteenth. He also demonstrated his occasional propensity to self-contradiction: in the same letter in which he denigrated the allegedly “drunk” and “weary” Ukrainians, he clearly emphasized and even exaggerated their active contribution to the process of Russian language-building.

Those with an active interest in the development of the Ukrainian language must certainly have regarded Kuliš's avowed concern as outright cynicism. What did he really mean when he wrote that the Ukrainians at least had Ševčenko and their folk songs, and what comfort could those faced with the challenge of creating a full-fledged language capable of competing with Polish, German, and

17 In a letter to Oleksander Kistjakivs'kyj, Kuliš did in fact criticize the Ukase of Bad Ems, but he awkwardly argued that it would endanger the reunion of Rus' and strengthen the “communist” representatives of the Ukrainian movement [!] (Luckyj 1983: 158–159). Luckyj's account of the situation tends to disregard Kuliš's close proximity to the intellectual world of the forefathers of the Ukase of Bad Ems.

18 Kuliš had already expressed similar notions—that the political life of “Little Russia” had already ended long before, while its “poetic life,” expressed in language, clothing, and customs, was degenerating year after year; that “Little Russia” would soon merge with Russia because it was not keeping up with new developments—in a letter written in the autumn of 1844 to Myxajlo Juzefovyč, an old acquaintance who later became one of the initiators of the Ukase of Bad Ems (Luckyj 1983: 24).

other languages draw from that statement? If the Ukrainian written language were actually to be reduced to folklore studies and archaeology, that would have been the end of the Ukrainian project, and its opponents would have been perfectly satisfied—the Polish nationalists and Russophiles in Galicia, each in their own way, and the Russian nationalists in the Russian Empire.

In fact, Kuliš himself had to admit that his views of 1876 were out of keeping with his former convictions. He treated this change of attitude as a mere consequence of aging:

Оце добре вибрали Ви, галицькі русини, собі принцип, щоб тільки визволитись од польского елемента, а на те не вважати, чи московщиною, чи українщиною. [...] Того, що я писав московською мовою, не хочу я перекладувати, бо вже багато де в чім розійшовсь я з самим собою, як звичайно вік із віком розходиться. Пушкин мовляв, що тільки дурень не міняє своїх убеждений (Barvins'kyj 2004: 184).

You Galician Ruthenians have done well to choose the principle of freeing yourselves from the Polish element regardless of whether this is to be done in the Muscovite or the Ukrainian way.... I do not want to translate what I have written in the Muscovite language, for I have already parted ways with myself in many respects, as one age usually parts ways with another. Puškin used to say that only a fool does not change his convictions.

Explanations aside, it was only to be expected that the Galicians would turn away from Kuliš, who had nothing more to offer them, whatever the potential success of his later translations of the Bible and works of world literature.

A further letter of 1876 only confirmed the impression that Kuliš was lost to the Ukrainian cause:

Се Ви добре зрозуміли, що єдиний спосіб увести в практичне життя руську мову дає українщина, та не поривайте очей на наших письменників, що вони вам допоможуть виковати наукові термини. Коли що можна взяти з московської термінології, я брав би сміло: бо її вироблено за приводом українських людей, котрі не так-то потурали московському смаку, а придержувались хіба церковщини вкупі з москалями. Сама же вимова одрізнить зацеплене з московської наукової термінології слово од великорущини. Зазирали б Ви в слав'янську граматику Мелетія Смотрицького. Не думав і не гадав він про Москву; komponував термини перед лицем польщизни, так само як тепер галичане, а Москва прийняла його, прийняли й слав'яне до самої Далмації. Ломоносов учився в мотилинському колегиумі і під його надихом працював над термінологією наук природньо-математичних. Оце ж ми, раз поковавши термини, заходились тепер знов з того ж самого матеріалу ковати. Мусите остерегатись, щоб не були новосковані термини загадками і московцям, і вкраїнцям. Не добре й те, як галицький учень переучуватиметься вдруге термінології, взявшись за московську наукову книгу. Сміх і горе з підгірським уламком руського миру! Рятувати його московщиною не дадуть Ваші власті, напоєні польщизною, або й природні урядники-ляхи;

рятувати українщиною – неспромога; а перевернутись на ляхів – гірко й думати. Нехай вам, русинам, руська доля щастить, що якось не дала зробити з Підгірської Руси нову Польщу. Нам, українцям, нізвідкілля взяти могутньої побудки до ковання термінології, бо маємо її готову про свою розумову нужду. Перше жались наші помоскалитись; тепер прийшли до того, щоб у московському елементі зайняти центральну позицію і регулювати весь руський мир щодо народности яко завоювателі своєї рідної землі у чужоземній польській культури. Такі люде, що писали і пишуть по-українські, покидають більше думку, що українщина встоїть перед силою великоруського елементу. Думають, що вона допоможе тільки заохотити селян до читання книжок та й годі. Звикши годуватись пищею духа людського, селяне перейдуть самі собою до книжок великоруських, котрі вбезпосередньо вельми туго приймаються по Вкраїні. А якби школи по селах були добрі (се вельми трудна річ для Росції), дак і мимо українщини пійшов би наш селянин з темряви до просвіти. От воно що! Так ви собі й міркуйте, що вам, русинам, робити з наукою і беллетристикою [...]

Докіль ми печатались тільки українщиною, дак подавали нашої молодіжці самі тільки поетичні образи і мрії. Як же в „Основи” почали печататись двома мовами, діло пішло спорніщ. Почали наші не тільки виобразно, та й розум задовольнити. Так і Галичина вертітиметься в тісноті, докіль учитиметься з самих тільки українських творів. Вони ж до того ще бувають часом вельми односторонні, а часом ідуть навпаки історії. Українщина виробила собі таку історію, котрої ніколи не було. Оце ж треба з свого манівця вертатись на великий шлях, котрим ійшло народне життє від найдавніших часів. Знаю, що в Вас багато людей, котрі так думають, як ми думали на початку свого діла. Одно другому не шкодить, а допомагає. Коли б я й сам переложив українською мовою своє писання, то й тим би себе не задовольнив. Яке ж воно вийде, коли ваші русини зроблять переклад? Сам себе не познаю тоді в альманасі. Тим же то нехай так печатають, як я пописав. Коли ж навернеться така тема, що лучче писати українщиною, ніж московщиною, тоді й сам я напишу по-українські. Та й не годиться таки пробавляти перекладами. Вони стирають з української мови оригінальність, і література сим робом не пійде ні ступня наперед. Така моя думка, а Ви чиніте, як знаєте. Може я й помиляюсь (Barvins'kyj 2004: 186–188).

You have well understood that the Ukrainian world offers the only prospect of introducing the Ruthenian language into practical life, but do not gaze at our writers in the hope that they will help you coin scholarly terms. If anything can be taken from Muscovite terminology, I would boldly adopt it, for it has been created under the aegis of Ukrainian people who did not so much conform to Muscovite taste as simply adhere to Church Slavonic along with the Muscovites. Pronunciation alone will suffice to differentiate a word drawn from Muscovite scholarly terminology from Great Russian. Just take a look at Meletij Smotryč'kyj's grammar of Church Slavonic. He had no thought or concern for Moscow but composed terms in view of Polish, just as the Galicians are now doing, and Moscow accepted him, and so did the other Slavs all the way to Dalmatia. Lomonosov was educated at the Mohyla College and worked, under its inspiration, on scientific and mathematical terminology. Thus, having already coined the terms once, we have now set about coining them anew

from the same material. You must take care that the newly coined terms not turn out to be baffling to Muscovites and Ukrainians alike. Nor is it good if a Galician pupil finds himself obliged to relearn terminology on taking up a Muscovite scholarly book. Should one laugh or cry at this corner of the Russian world in the foothills [of the Carpathians]? Your authorities, either imbued with Polish or Liakh officials themselves, will not allow you to rescue it by means of the Muscovite world; you are unable to rescue it by means of the Ukrainian world; that you may become Liakhs is an all too bitter thought. May Russian [perhaps "Ruthenian"] fate, which has somehow prevented Precarpathian Rus' from being turned into a new Poland, be merciful to you Ruthenians. We Ukrainians have nowhere to turn for a strong impulse to develop terminology, as we have one already available for our intellectual needs. At first our people feared becoming Muscovites; now they have gone so far as to assume a central position in the Muscovite element and regulate the whole Russian world with regard to nationality as liberators of their native land from alien Polish culture. Those who have written and are now writing in Ukrainian are increasingly abandoning the notion that Ukrainian can withstand the force of the Great Russian element. They think that it [Ukrainian] will only help motivate the peasants to read books, and nothing more. Having become accustomed to the nourishment of the human spirit, the peasants will move on of their own accord to Great Russian books, which, without mediation, are only hesitantly being accepted in Ukraine. But if the village schools were good (a very difficult matter for Russia), then our peasant would also make his way from darkness to enlightenment without the aid of Ukrainian. That is how it is! So think well what *you* Ruthenians should do with regard to scholarship and fine literature....

As long as we published only in Ukrainian, we offered our youth only poetic images and dreams. Once we began publishing in both languages in *Osnova*, things proceeded more propitiously. Our people began to satisfy not only their imagination but also their intellect. Galicia, too, will remain narrow-minded as long as it learns only from Ukrainian works. Moreover, they are sometimes very one-sided and sometimes run counter to the course of history. The Ukrainian world has created a history for itself that never existed. We should therefore return from the wrong track to great road that folk life has been walking since the most ancient times. I know that there are many among you who think as we did at the beginning of our cause. One party does not harm the other but helps it. If I were to translate my writing into Ukrainian myself, I would not be able to satisfy myself. But how would it look if your Ruthenians were to make a translation? Then I would be unable to recognize myself in the almanac. They should therefore print the text as I wrote it. If a topic should turn up on which it would be better to write in Ukrainian than in Muscovite, then I myself will write about it in Ukrainian. After all, it does not pay to waste time on translations. They erase the originality of Ukrainian, and so literature does not advance even a single step. This is what I think, but proceed as you think fit. I may be mistaken, after all.

If the Galician populists had indeed well understood, as Kuliš suggested, that the model of "Ukrainian" ("українщина") was essential to the introduction of the "Ruthenian" language ("руська мова") into "practical life" ("в практичне життя"), then they must have been all the more amazed at Kuliš's tirades, which largely coincided with the admonitions of their Russophile opponents in Galicia.

Kuliš justified his appeals to adopt scholarly terms from Russian terminology (“московська термінологія”) whenever possible by claiming that this Russian terminology was the result of all-Russian effort, to which Ukrainians had contributed most energetically.¹⁹ It would appear that he did not consider the consequences.

If the supporters of the Ukrainian project had merely adopted Russian terms or depended on the work of a certain Vasyl' Voljan, who managed to dupe the Austrian government in the 1850s and publish pompous “Ruthenian” terminological works largely compiled from Russian dictionaries (Moser 2005b; Moser 2011: 684–717), then no one would have taken the Ukrainian language seriously in the long run. Aside from that, Kuliš’s arguments were inept: to begin with, the requirements of terminological work in the second half of the nineteenth century differed very considerably from those prevailing in the times of Meletij Smotryc'kyj or even Mixail Lomonosov;²⁰ furthermore, the notion that a Galician pupil would have to learn terminology anew if he picked up a Russian scholarly book was fanciful: Russian textbooks were of negligible significance in Galicia, nor could nineteenth-century Russian scholarship claim any outstanding importance in the international context. Kuliš’s patently sarcastic expression of concern that newly created terms (“новосковані терміни”) would be baffling to Russians as well as Ukrainians was equally misguided. Kuliš himself must have been aware that newly created terminologies are necessarily cryptic to some extent, regardless of the language in which they are coined.

Kuliš’s strange attitude of superiority to the Galicians remained unchanged. He was obviously unable to see them as anything more than hapless victims in desperate need of inspiration from the Russian Empire, and most particularly from himself. By this point, Kuliš only feared that the Galicians might be turned into Poles (“перевернутись на ляхів”) but was no longer concerned if “our people” (“наши”) were to become Muscovites (“помоскалитись”). On the contrary, he seemed to be completely in agreement with those who had abandoned the thought that the Ukrainian language could hold its own vis-à-vis Great Russian and gave no sign that he considered that important.²¹ If Kuliš tacitly agreed that the only purpose of Ukrainian-language books was to prepare the ground for Russian-language ones to enlighten the uneducated, and if he implied that an improved school system in the Russian Empire would very quickly have made Ukrainian superfluous, then this was even further evidence that he no longer had anything to offer anyone interested in the Ukrainian cause.

More than that, the former hero of the Ukrainian movement had obviously become a Russian chauvinist. If he implied that in the bilingual journal *Osnova*

19 Kuliš had advanced similar views even earlier, e.g., in 1857, to justify his use of Russianisms and Church Slavonicisms in Ukrainian (Ševel'ov 1983/1991: 39–41).

20 It must be added that Lomonosov’s alleged inspiration by the Mohyla College was largely a figment of Kuliš’s imagination: in actual fact, Lomonosov was shocked by the state of Kyivan schools in the mid-eighteenth century.

21 Luckyj (1983: 164) interprets this passage differently, arguing that “Kulish firmly believed that Ukraine would stand its ground as far as Russia was concerned”!

of 1861–62, Russian had been the language of intellect, while Ukrainian had merely served as an organ of imagination, that obscured the fact that Kuliš himself had done a great deal in those days to intellectualize the Ukrainian language. If, however, Kuliš went on to argue that the Galicians were condemned to remain narrow-minded unless they oriented themselves on Great Russian culture, this amounted to a manifestation of his arrogant, now clearly Russian imperial view of Central Europe.

Kuliš's final remark about not wanting his text to be translated ultimately confirmed that he had ceased to consider Russian and Ukrainian as distinct languages, each with the right of existence.²²

In 1876, the year of the Ems Ukase, Kuliš believed that he could see the "great road" ahead—a Great Russian road—with utmost clarity. The supporters of the Ukrainian project did not follow him.

3. Summary

While scholars studying the history of the Ukrainian language have often asked about Galician deviations from the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language or about the Galician contribution to the development of the Ukrainian written language, they have paid considerably less attention to the question of how the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire influenced the Galicians and how the Galicians came to adopt the norms of Ukrainian as elaborated by Ukrainian activists in the Russian Empire. According to the master narrative of Ukrainian language history, the Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire was successively elaborated by leaders in Ukrainian language-building, while the Galicians remained backward because they allegedly wrote in "jazyčije" and remained under the powerful influence of the Galician Russophiles. Only in the last third of the nineteenth century or thereabouts did Galicia happen to become Ukraine's Piedmont.

It is not part of the master narrative of Ukrainian language history²³ that in the course of the nineteenth century, Galicians frequently corresponded with "Little Russian" authorities from the Russian Empire, who are widely acknowledged as heroes of the Ukrainian movement, and that the Galicians largely recognized these "Little Russian" intellectuals as mentors, but that more often than not the "Little Russians" sent messages more encouraging to the Russophiles than to those who favored full-fledged Ukrainian nation- and language-building. Thus, the success story of Ukrainian nation- and language-building in the second half of the nineteenth century deserves even greater attention than it has so far received.

In 1863, the year of the Valuev Circular, the leading Galician Russophile Jakiv Holovac'kyj published a letter that Myxajlo Maksymovyč, a leading "Little Russian" intellectual of the mid-nineteenth century, had sent to the first Galician Russophile, Denys Zubryc'kyj, and other Galician activists in 1840, that is, at the very time

22 In the afterword to the Russian version of *Čorna Rada* (1857) and in his *Zapiski o južnoj Rusi* (1856–57), Kuliš had already repeatedly emphasized the inseparability of Northern and Southern Rus' (cf., among others, Luckyj 1983: 77–78).

23 Admittedly, historians often know more about these processes than historians of languages.

when the Galician Ruthenians had attained their first major literary achievements. The great collector of Ukrainian folk songs, Maksymovych, had told the Galicians that Ukrainian literature in the Russian Empire was ultimately an insignificant experiment of merely regional significance, that there could never be a Ukrainian literary language as such, and that for the Galicians as well, their vernacular could only serve as a bridge to subsequent participation in the larger Russian project. Holovach'kyj could thus feel fully justified in using Maksymovych's letter in his struggle against the Galician populists.

Pantelejmon Kuliš, the most honored idol of the early Galician populists, seriously undermined the populist project in the early years after the Valuev Circular when he abandoned his orthography "in the name of Russian unity." In the years ca. 1876, when the Ukase of Bad Ems was issued,²⁴ Kuliš ultimately demonstrated that he had begun adhering to all-Russian chauvinist views and was at least temporarily lost to the Ukrainian cause.

Kuliš's return to the Ukrainian idea, as it took place in the 1880s in a new form, after he had written to Oleksander Barvins'kyj as late as 1879 that he had

24 Luckyj's (1983: 163–165) apologia of Kuliš does not necessarily convince. It would appear that Kuliš had sufficient opportunities to behave differently in the years ca. 1876. Incidentally, it was only in the 1880s that Kuliš again addressed linguistic matters in his letters to Oleksander Barvins'kyj: "Малоруська правопись мусить стояти на фонетиці найрадикальнішій, сиріч на такий, щоб видко було, як вимовляв автор. Ніхто не скаже, яку вимову, чи полтавську-чернігівську, чи галицько-русинську прийме колись народній смак наш. Нехай же будуть навіть і такі пам'ятники орфографічні, як правопись київська: *iiiii*, або *jiji*, або *iak*, *moia* і т[ак] д[алі]. Коли б сею, як прозвано вже її, уїдливою' правописсю написав хто що добре, то смакувятий чоловік не відкине книжки геть задля правописної вїдливості; а навпослі перепечатано б її, не питавшись у предків, чи зволять на переміни в їх правописі. [...] Спасибі Вам, що до всього дозираєтесь у мойй мові. Коли б що переправили так, щоб міні вподобалося, прийняв би залюбки" (Barvins'kyj 2004: 201) / "Little Russian orthography must be based on the most radical phonetics, that is, on phonetics that clearly convey an author's pronunciation. No one can say which pronunciation our folk taste will someday adopt, that of Poltava-Chernihiv or Galicia-Ruthenia. Even such orthographic monuments as the Kyivan orthography may be allowed to exist: *iiiii* or *jiji* or *iak*, *moia*, etc. If someone should write something good in this 'irksome' orthography, as it has come to be known, then a man of good taste will not throw the book away because of its irksome orthography, and it will be reprinted afterwards without asking the forefathers' permission to amend their orthography.... Thank you for your punctilious attention to my language. Should you change something to my liking, I would gladly accept it." Kuliš was thus back to arguing very decidedly in favor of the phonetic orthography. In his letter, he also extended unaccustomed thanks to Barvins'kyj for proffered advice, but these were most likely ironic, given the conditional instead of the indicative mood in the last sentence cited. In 1889, when Barvins'kyj requested permission to reprint Kuliš's *Čorna Rada*, the author gave his magnanimous consent. He also tackled changes of certain linguistic forms: "Добре чините, що не даєте занепасти руському органуві 'Ділу'. Веселимось і ми, що наше малоруське браташше по тім боці політичної границі рідного краю подвизається в прояву національності своєї. Оце ж, вволяючи Вашу волю, позволяю на передрук моєї 'Чорної ради'. Коли схочете, поправте всюди в ній глаголи на *imu* замість *imь*, як я колись писав, державшись чернігівщини, а не полтавщини, киевщини і галицької русичини" (Barvins'kyj 2004: 209) / "You are well advised to not allow the decline of the Ruthenian organ *Dilo*. We are also glad that our Little Russian brethren on the other side of the political border of the homeland are rising to a manifestation of their nationality. Therefore, assenting to your will, I permit the reprinting of my *Čorna Rada*. If you so desire, you may correct in it all instances of the verb [*to go*] to *imu* instead of *imь*, as I once wrote it, when I drew on the language of Chernihiv, not on that of Poltava and Kyiv and on Galician Ruthenian."

"broken his Little Russian or Ukrainian pen" ("я наконец изломал малорусское, или украинское перо мое"; Barvins'kyj 2004: 190), was of very limited interest to his contemporaries, especially compared to Kuliš's earlier significance. By then, the Galician populists had learned to stand on their own feet. In the years to come, the Galicians were continually met with a certain lack of understanding on the part of leading Ukrainians from the Russian Empire, either because they considered the Galicians ideologically backward (the socialist Myxajlo Drahomanov) or because they harshly rejected their language (Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, Borys Hrinčenko) (Moser 2011a). This anti-Galician bias left a lasting mark that also applies to the master narrative of Ukrainian language history.

Despite repeated assertions of Galicia's role as a Piedmont of Ukrainian identity after 1863 or, particularly, 1876, historians of the Ukrainian language still fail to see that only the Galician and Bukovynian "Ruthenians" were in a position to create a truly polyfunctional Ukrainian standard language, and that their efforts proved largely successful. True enough, this achievement was due in part to Galician cooperation with Ukrainians from the Russian Empire, as evidenced by the funds that the latter provided for the Ševčenko Scientific Society in Lviv and by the outstanding role of Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, the history professor from Russian-ruled Ukraine who worked in Lviv and successfully promoted Galician achievements among the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire after 1905.²⁵

Returning to Pantelejmon Kuliš, Jurij Ševel'ov (1983/1991: 50) interestingly reports that during an interrogation by the NKVD in 1941, he was accused of having preferred the "bourgeois nationalist Kuliš" to the "revolutionary democrat Ševčenko." If Kuliš was judged or condemned by posterity, at times in cultivated circles, in especially contradictory and mostly apodictic fashion (cf. Ševel'ov 1983/1991: 49–75), he was of course himself largely responsible for that. May the NKVD's opinion of him serve as testimony to his many unforgotten achievements.

25 On further developments at the turn of the twentieth century, Ševel'ov (1963: 502–503) wrote as follows: "The real question was what type of literary language was desirable, whether it should be an accurate reflection of one dialect or, while still being based on the popular language, should be more general, using elements from different dialects. It was not only because the Ukrainian language could be used and could develop in the press, and school system, and scientific and political life only outside the Russian Empire, that the second principle triumphed. It was also because a synthesis of the dialects as a basis for the literary language was necessary to its very existence. The populist phase was complete and this development in the literary language marked its end. The chief accomplishments of these years spread from Galicia to Ukraine under Russia. They penetrated beyond the Zbruch steadily but through narrow channels: through books slipped across the frontier, through acquaintanceships made during journeys, through the movement of Ukrainian students who went from central Ukraine to Galicia to study, and, above all, through the Ukrainian political parties which based their underground activities, including publishing, in Galicia. The barriers were removed by the Revolution of 1905."

**UKRAINIAN “LANGUAGE-BUILDING” IN LIGHT OF
UKRAINIAN NATION-BUILDING:
CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHY
OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE**

In the spirit of Johann Gottfried Herder, the protagonists of nineteenth-century European nation-building regarded the maintenance of national languages as one of their most paramount concerns. Indeed, they went so far as to define nations primarily by their languages. Although modern theories of nationalism convincingly posit a somewhat looser connection between languages and nations, language has remained a factor of major importance in a different sense, in that some of the most attractive of these theories describe nations first and foremost as discursively constructed communities (see, *inter alia*, Stukenbrock 2007, Anderson 2006).

A closer investigation of the history of languages reveals that not only modern nations but also modern national languages have never developed “naturally” but were—and still are—consciously planned. Most notably, this applies to language families that constitute so-called dialectal continuums, as the Slavic languages may at least approximately be said to do. Using a purely linguistic line of argumentation, one cannot always explain precisely why “languages” X and Y exist in the geographic area of such a dialectal continuum or why they are in use in areas A and B and not elsewhere. Nor can it be explained on a purely intra-linguistic basis why idioms prevailing in an area between the two “languages” X and Y (within an authentic dialectal continuum, these are required by definition to have a purely transitional character, which is not always the case in the Slavic language area) are not themselves “languages” but are considered “dialects” of “languages” X and Y. Moreover, the modern standard Slavic languages certainly did not develop on a purely linguistic basis. Their evolution has always proceeded in the context of national movements, for which—in Central and East Central Europe, at least—the factor of language has always been of crucial importance (see Kamusella 2008).

Despite this obvious connection, most monographs and textbooks on language history hardly ever refer to the results of modern research on nation-building. Instead, they still tend to tell teleological stories of languages that apparently had to develop as they did, with the very outcome that we observe today. If such traditional teleology has generally become obsolete in the broader field of history, it is still widespread in the philological disciplines, by no means only in the field of Ukrainian studies. The major elements of the prevailing teleological and eclectic master narratives are rooted in the national philologies of the nineteenth century, and in many cases the canons created then have remained unchallenged. As a consequence, basic sources of language history have been marginalized or ignored if they are incompatible with a linear historical account culminating with the appearance of the modern standard language. Even within this reduced spectrum, large segments are often passed over: attention is generally focused on the language of select works of literature, again because of the prevailing spirit of nineteenth-century national philologies.

In the case of Ukrainian, this teleology and eclecticism are particularly regrettable. Ukrainian nation- and language-building took place in diverse political formations and in a variety of multiethnic and multilingual settings. The Ukrainian projects transgressed borders and competed with other nation- and language-building projects in many complex ways. In the course of history, representatives of many generations of Ukrainians have found themselves constrained to decide whether they were Ukrainians or Poles, Russians, Hungarians, Romanians, Slovaks, etc., whether they found it necessary to preserve their native language, and what role they assigned to it, particularly with regard to its coexistence with the Polish, Russian, Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak, and other languages, which Ukrainians often spoke as well. Outside the homeland, Ukrainians have shared the fate of other emigrants: over the generations, they have had to ask themselves even more pointedly whether they wish to preserve their identities and languages or not.

In the case of Ukraine, there is no doubt that modern nation- and language-building has been in many ways a project of emancipation from traditionally dominant groups: in Austria and (after 1867) Austria-Hungary, especially from the closely related Poles as well as the non-related Hungarians; in the Russian Empire, especially from the closely related Russians, but also from the Poles. None of the three dominant peoples just mentioned had completed its own process of nation-building in the nineteenth century. First and foremost, none of the languages of these so-called "historical nations" prevailed as a codified modern standard language among the broad majority of any social stratum.

To make things even more complicated, the emancipatory aspect of Ukrainian nation- and language-building has often attracted intellectuals who initially did not regard themselves as Ukrainian, but as Polish, Russian, etc., and still others who were not ethnically Ukrainian at all.

If all this makes Ukrainian language history a particularly intriguing and fruitful field of research, current textbooks on the "history of the Ukrainian language" usually tell much simpler, less complex, and less interesting stories. Furthermore, their master narratives are constructed in a fashion that urgently needs to be revised.¹

1. An academic textbook as a mirror of the status quo

Vitalij Rusanivs'kyj's monograph on the *History of the Ukrainian Language* (Rusanivs'kyj 2001), approved and widely used as a Ukrainian academic textbook, is now probably the most influential work in our field. The book differs from Soviet works in avoiding class-struggle rhetoric and in taking note of at least some of the contributions of Ukrainian emigrants (especially Čaplenko 1970), but it leaves the major building blocks of the traditional master narrative basically unchanged. As for the nineteenth century—a decisive period for the development of modern nations and languages—the book highlights developments in four chapters that

1 A work that comes very close to being an "ideal" history of the Ukrainian language is Ševel'ov 1989, but, as its title indicates, it pays little attention to the nineteenth century, which is the focus of the present article. Ševel'ov 1966 highlights only selected problems in the nineteenth-century history of the Ukrainian language.

will be critically examined below. Only those points that appear to be symptomatic for the current state of the synthetic historiography of the Ukrainian language (and not isolated shortcomings) will be discussed.²

1.1. "The Ukrainian language as an instrument for the revival of national consciousness" (pp. 146–169)

This chapter consists mainly of observations on the language of the writers Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj, Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov'janenko, and Jevhen Hrebinka, with a strong emphasis on vernacular lexicon and dialectal characteristics. Cautious attempts to invest the work of these writers with significance for language- and nation-building are unconvincing. Rusanivs'kyj asserts, for example, that Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida* of 1798 questioned the triad of "Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality" (p. 153), although the Russian minister of education, Sergej Uvarov, actually introduced this formula into Russian imperial discourse only in 1833. Rusanivs'kyj mentions that Kvitka did not set himself the goal of elevating language to the status of a "general means of the development of a people" but "wanted to awaken the human soul by means of the artistic word" (p. 161). Rusanivs'kyj also correctly observes that Jevhen Hrebinka did not write any Ukrainian-language prose (*ibid.*) and mentions that Hrebinka's translation of Puškin's "Poltava" (1835) displays burlesque characteristics. But the author draws no conclusions from this, nor does he ask the question of greatest interest: What did all this mean not merely with regard to the language of Ukrainian literature but with regard to the building of the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language ("українська літературна мова")?

The book goes on to examine the works of the Romantic writers almost exclusively with regard to their vernacular or historicizing lexicon,³ but the connection between language development and nation-building remains wholly obscure, as does the process of language-building itself. The issue of the initially scant modernization and intellectualization of Ukrainian in the Russian Empire, as well as the related problem of multilingualism—Ukrainian-Russian, Ukrainian-Polish, and other—remain quite incomprehensible,⁴ and the relation of written variants of Ukrainian to older traditions is not discussed convincingly. The central issue—that of the status and prestige that contemporaries ascribed to the Ukrainian language, and the degree to which they might have elaborated it—remains untouched. The author

2 The significantly more comprehensive Soviet Kurs 1958 nevertheless consists mainly of sections with such titles as "The Language of I. Kotljarevs'kyj's Works," "The Language of H. Kvitka-Osnov'janenko's Works," and the like. There are also extensive chapters featuring the language of less prominent writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Almost all this material concerns the Ukrainian language used in literature but not the development of the Ukrainian standard language ("українська літературна мова") as such (the sections written by Ivan Franko's granddaughter, Zinovija Franko, about developments in Galicia stand out as positive exceptions).

3 Items of basic vocabulary such as *веселість*, *віра*, *наука*, and others are isolated as abstract terms (p. 165).

4 In the Soviet Kurs (1958: 194–210), "Russo-Ukrainian literary and linguistic relations in the first half of the nineteenth century (to 1861)" are treated exclusively from a biased Soviet viewpoint that takes no account whatever of Galician developments.

does refer to individual poems that show a certain commitment to the autonomy of the Ukrainian language, but he does not analyze these or other sources. Questions about the mental mapping of the linguistic awakers and their vision of their national language are not addressed. Who would or should adopt the language in the long run, and what social role was it to play in the speech community?

One learns nothing from the exposition about how the "Ruthenians" in Austria and the "Little Russians" in Russia perceived each other and each other's language, and it is not clear whether they actually thought of themselves as a common "people with a common language." Representatives of numerous regions, including Transcarpathia, do not even appear in these sections. Nowhere does one encounter the fact that well into the second half of the nineteenth century, many Galician linguistic awakers, as well as many representatives of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, still regarded the Belarusians as members of their own "Ruthenian or Little Russian" nation, who were accordingly deemed to speak a dialect of the "Ruthenian or Little Russian" language (see pp. 171–186 in this volume).

It is particularly striking that even in this post-Soviet work, the rather weighty Galician contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language remains badly underrepresented. The author cites five lines of verse praising the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language from *Rusalka Dnistrovaja*,⁵ although the preface to the almanac would have been considerably more informative—literary impressions remain in the foreground. As for the Przemyśl clergyman Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj, whose significance for the history of the Ukrainian language is outstanding in that he published a scholarly argument for the autonomy of "Ruthenian" with regard to Polish, Russian, and Church Slavonic in the 1820s (p. 225), readers find one solitary sentence (and even that sentence is not properly formulated).

In general, issues of Ukrainian "corpus planning" do not receive the attention they deserve (p. 168). While this chapter is intended to describe the dawn of Modern Standard Ukrainian, actual deviations from modern standard norms are not highlighted. Readers are not given even a realistic account of the actual orthography of the canonized pre-Romantics and Romantics, who are still generally known only from standardized modern editions. The chapter contains an isolated mention of Josyf Lozyns'kyj, who proposed that Ukrainian be written in the Latin alphabet (this is related to the so-called "First Alphabet War" of 1834) (p. 168, see Moser 2011: 474–78), but there is no further discussion whatever of alternative lines of development such as Lozyns'kyj's (although the corpus of Ukrainian-language works written in the Latin alphabet, including nineteenth-century works, is anything but a marginal curiosity).

The codificatory relevance of the aforementioned grammars and dictionaries is not discussed at all. This applies in particular to Oleksander Pavlovs'kyj's grammar, printed in St. Petersburg in 1818, which possessed hardly any codificatory potential.

5 An almanac published in 1837 by the so-called Ruthenian Triad, the Galician awakers Markijan Šaškevyč, Ivan Vahylevyč, and Jakiv Holovac'kyj. The discourse on the history of language in Galicia traditionally overemphasizes the significance of this slim booklet.

Regrettably, there is not a single sentence about the important Galician grammars of this period.⁶

When it comes to functional domains or language usage areas of Ukrainian, there are occasional remarks to the effect that certain functional styles were not yet developed for Ukrainian (pp. 168–169). At the same time, nothing is said about the advance of written variants of Ukrainian in Galicia into a broad spectrum of language usage areas and genres by the revolution of 1848/49 (Moser 2011: 303–331).

Like other authors, Rusanivs'kyj does not take these Galician written variants seriously because they deviate considerably, in part, from Modern Standard Ukrainian. What these authors overlook is that even if these written variants, generally stigmatized as “jazyčije” (Moser 2004, Moser 2011: 641–666), do not conform to Modern Standard Ukrainian, this does not distinguish them in any fundamental way from other writings of their time. Moreover, these variants must be regarded as part of the history of the Ukrainian language, in that they are neither Polish nor Russian nor Church Slavonic and were considered “Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) by the authors themselves. Few historians of the Ukrainian language have asked why the variants of “jazyčije” were bound to deviate quite significantly from Modern Standard Ukrainian. On the one hand, this was a result of the dialectal situation, as Modern Standard Ukrainian is not based on southwestern Ukrainian dialects, which are also more differentiated than any other dialects of the Ukrainian language. On the other, the process of language-building was often much more challenging for Galician Ruthenians than for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, while Ukrainians in the Russian Empire faced comparatively few difficulties if they used the Ukrainian language in burlesques, poems, or stories on rural subjects. Even before the revolution of 1848/49, the Galicians were primarily engaged in producing texts of a different sort: scholarly works, grammars, translations of Bible texts, panegyrics for dignitaries of church and state, educational textbooks in the mother tongue and the liturgical language, textbooks of elementary arithmetic, catechisms, sermons, pastoral letters, and so on. From 1848/49 at the latest, they also wrote legal texts, political speeches, and polemical pamphlets, as well as newspaper and journal articles of various kinds “in Ruthenian”; they began working on the first dictionary of “legal and political” terminology and on other terminologies. Besides sermons, which were again increasingly given in Ruthenian, political and scholarly addresses were delivered in Ruthenian. The range of genres represented in variants of the Galician-Ruthenian language was thus already as thoroughly variegated as the national programs of the “Spring of Nations” called for. As for the language used in those texts, it could not, of course, be based on Modern Standard Ukrainian, which was then only in the making; it could not even avail itself of models created by Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, as there were none for the aforementioned genres and the respective domains; nor could it be based on variants of the vernacular, for the vernacular had not traditionally been employed

6 To be sure, their object language differs significantly from Modern Standard Ukrainian, but a historical linguistics less geared to teleology cannot afford to ignore them almost entirely.

in these genres and domains, which had previously been served in the dominant languages, such as Latin, German, Polish or, occasionally, Church Slavonic.

In the Galician context, then, Ruthenian had to be developed rapidly for use in many functional domains of the “higher spheres,” but no generally acknowledged institution managed to establish a common standard promptly, although some preparatory work was done (the “Conference of Ruthenian Learned Men”: see Moser 2011a, 44–63; moreover, Jakiv Holovac'kyj prepared a grammar (see pp. 171–218 in this volume) and worked as a professor of Ruthenian language and literature). In the subsequent period of ongoing experiment that produced little accord, it is hardly surprising that in the course of the 1850s more and more Galician intellectuals abandoned vernacular-based variants of Ukrainian altogether and, if they did not go back to using Polish, they looked to the Russian Empire for salvation in their national struggle against the Poles and increasingly attempted to adopt Russian. But the most interesting aspect of this story is that whenever historians of the Ukrainian language pay any attention whatever to these processes, they unanimously reproach the Galicians for not having consistently used the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) vernacular. Yet these same scholars usually make no mention of the fact that almost all the prominent Ukrainian language-builders in the Russian Empire made very broad use of the Russian language; that for decades most of them did not even consider introducing the Ukrainian language into the genres and domains that were of such crucial importance in Galicia; and that all the Galicians, even the most ardent Russophiles, did in fact produce many texts written almost exclusively in the (Galician-based) vernacular when their subjects were taken from peasants’ everyday lives (poems written in folk style, treatises on folklore, or agricultural manuals; see also my study on the leading Galician Russophile Ivan Naumovyč in this volume).⁷

Any forthcoming textbook on the history of the Ukrainian language should try to avoid this traditional anti-Galician bias.

1.2. “Taras Ševčenko, reformer of the Ukrainian literary language” (pp. 170–220)

This section emphasizes that the language of the Ukrainian national poet focused on “the entire Ukrainian language area and the entirety of the Ukrainian territories” (pp. 172–175), but this statement tends to remain a mere slogan. The claim that Ševčenko avoided drawing on minor dialects is insufficiently documented, so it takes on the appearance of circular reasoning. If it was indeed Ševčenko’s language that became the principal basis of Modern Standard Ukrainian, then its great (but not, in fact, complete) similarity to the latter looks tautological. Yet a multitude of fundamental questions about Ševčenko’s linguistic world remain unasked. There is no attempt to explain why Ševčenko composed almost all his prose texts in Russian,

7 The Kurs 1958 (p. 265–266) makes politically biased observations and emphasizes that the Ukrainian language developed in Dnipro Ukraine thanks to the “social forces of the Russian and Ukrainian revolutionary democrats and other progressive activists.” Allegedly, owing to the policies “of the ruling Austrian-Hungarian circles,” such forces made themselves felt only later in the quasi-underdeveloped western Ukrainian lands.

or why his Ukrainian-language works covered only a few genres. Ševčenko's intriguing linguistic behavior as a letter-writer and his use of Russianisms in general also receive insufficient attention (cf. pp. 204–208; see Moser 2008a, Moser 2012a, and pp. 299–304 in this volume).

To support his claim that a Ukrainian-language press had developed in the course of Ševčenko's lifetime, the author refers above all to literary works and folkloristic sketches that appeared in predominantly Russian-language almanacs, journals, and newspapers (pp. 203–204), which are hardly sufficient evidence of the existence of Ukrainian-language journalism in the true sense of the word.⁸ A more convincing indicator, the journal *Osnova* (which was only published in two incomplete volumes and featured numerous Russian-language texts), surprisingly remains unmentioned at this point (pp. 203–204).⁹ The focus on belles lettres remains so overwhelmingly strong that the author pays scarcely any attention to Ševčenko's extraordinary linguistic impact on anyone other than Ukrainian belletrists of succeeding generations.

1.3. "The expansion of the functional boundaries of Ukrainian" (pp. 221–253)

The title of the subsequent chapter raises hopes of new perspectives, but it begins with a discussion of the language bans of 1863 and 1876, that is, the Valuev Circular and the Ems Ukase, from which one actually learns almost nothing about the preconditions and results of these two decrees. The publication of a series of literary works is mentioned as evidence for the notion that the Valuev Circular of 1863 was at first enforced "only weakly" (p. 223), although that decree did not even refer to such works. The translation of the Gospels by Pylyp Moračevs'kyj, which played a major role in the history of the Valuev Circular, is not even mentioned.

When dealing with the period after the language bans, the author finally shifts his attention to Galicia, which is now presented as Ukraine's Piedmont.¹⁰ Regarding the linguistic awakening in Galicia, the author repeats that western Ukraine "was culturally dormant" until the 1830s and then briefly touches on the *Rusalka Dnistrovaja*, only to continue with a brief discussion of the first Galician populist newspapers of the early 1860s (pp. 224–227).¹¹ One now learns that after this point, the Ukrainian language in Galicia was no longer elaborated only for

8 Myxajlo Žvotobryx, one of the most interesting historical linguists of the Soviet period, writes in conclusion that Ukrainian-language journalism was still "very weakly represented" in the almanacs of the 1830s and 1840s (1963: 122).

9 In the *Kurs* (1958: 271–274), the discussion of *Osnova* is ideologically charged to an extraordinary degree.

10 The *Kurs* (1958: 264) speaks of the "particular oppression and discrimination" of Ukrainian in Austria-Hungary. The "bourgeois nationalists" who endeavored to "lead Ukrainian into a rustic primitivization and alienation from Russian" (!) are characterized as having hampered the development of Ukrainian.

11 The populists assumed the unity of the Ukrainian people and, in contrast to the so-called Russophiles, believed that Ukrainians were fundamentally distinct from Russians. In the context of the (second) Galician Ukrainian national awakening, they supported the use of a vernacular-based written language.

literary use, but also as “a vehicle for the general development of scholarship and culture” (p. 226). Even at this point, there is very little use of Galician sources, and the interpretation appears even more distorted if one recalls that the situation of the 1860s had largely been anticipated in Galicia by the years 1848/49 at the latest. The most important new development of the 1860s was that henceforth, under the influence of Taras Ševčenko and Pantelejmon Kuliš, the Galicians largely oriented themselves on the (still rather loose) language norms prevailing among Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Another important innovation was that in the 1860s, the Galicians were much more eager to distance their language from Russian as well as from Church Slavonic than they had been a decade or two earlier.

The textbook briefly and categorically dismisses the Galician Russophiles as antagonists of the populists. Their linguistic ideology is not discussed, nor is there any mention, let alone discussion, of their by no means insignificant contribution to Ruthenian vernacular-based writing in the sphere of folk literature.

Although the phrase “Galicia as a Piedmont” appears in the text, the actual significance of Galician developments for the elaboration of the Modern Standard Ukrainian Language remains obscure.

– One does learn at this point, albeit in a somewhat inappropriate context, about a few Galician grammars¹² and select Galician school textbooks of the 1860s and 1870s that the author liberally but unconvincingly relates to Ivan Verxrats'kyj's work on terminology (p. 228). But Rusanivs'kyj does not discuss what these grammars and textbooks may have meant for the dissemination of Ukrainian language norms, nor does he discuss the role of Ukrainian-language schools or aspects of language acquisition planning in a broader sense. Whenever new Ukrainian terms of the second half of the nineteenth century are mentioned, reference is made only to the writings of authors in the Russian Empire (pp. 232–233).

– The book devotes only a single paragraph to the intensive discussion of orthography that went on in this period, reducing it to very brief characterizations of the proposals made by Myxajlo Maksymovyč, Pantelejmon Kuliš, Mykola Hatcuk, and Myxajlo Drahomanov. One does not learn anything about Galician contributions with comparatively far-reaching consequences, such as Jevhen Želexivs'kyj's adoption of Kuliš's orthography. Rusanivs'kyj merely mentions a statement made by the Galician “Old Ruthenian” Myxajlo Malynovs'kyj against the so-called “phonetic” orthography (pp. 229–230) and goes on to suggest, incorrectly, that the use of the etymological orthography was almost bound to entail the abandonment of the vernacular. Post-1834 suggestions and attempts to use the Latin alphabet for writing Ukrainian go largely unremarked, and the “(Second) Alphabet War” deserves much greater attention than it receives here.

– In a section where many readers may already have forgotten the notion of “Galicia as a Piedmont,” which remains an empty phrase throughout the book,

12 Almost without exception, however, the titles as cited in the text are full of errors. The whole paragraph is introduced with the remark that “with the addition of a few local peculiarities, the Slaveno-Russian [perhaps Slaveno-Ruthenian] literary language” was still in use in western Ukraine in the first half of the nineteenth century (p. 227), although this applies only to some of the Galician texts of the period.

Rusanivs'kyj offers a listing of six Ukrainian multilingual dictionaries dating from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (pp. 231–232), claiming categorically that “the development of grammar and lexicography in Eastern Ukraine positively influenced the growth of scholarly attention to Ukraine in Galicia and Transcarpathian Ukraine” (p. 232). As Galicia and Transcarpathia are consistently presented in this textbook as underdeveloped regions, those lacking independent knowledge would never guess that of these six dictionaries, three particularly comprehensive and important ones were compiled in those very regions: the German-Ukrainian dictionary by Omeljan Partyc'kyj (1867), the Ukrainian-Hungarian dictionary by László Csopey (1883), and the Ukrainian-German dictionary by Jevhen Želexivs'kyj and Sofron Nedil's'kyj (1886).

– When Rusanivs'kyj mentions “scholarly and popular scholarly works” in Ukrainian (p. 232), the only author to whom he refers, besides Myxajlo Drahomanov, is Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, who worked predominantly along popular and journalistic lines (p. 232). Only later does he briefly mention the Ševčenko Society (p. 245), although in fact one might argue that neither the activity of Drahomanov nor, even less, that of Nečuj-Levyč'kyj approaches the significance of that organization for the establishment of the Ukrainian language in the sphere of scholarship and science.

– Rusanivs'kyj does mention that some Galician lexical material made its way into the Ukrainian language of Central and Eastern Ukraine. Interestingly, however, he almost always cites lexemes that have remained largely alien to Modern Standard Ukrainian. Only later, in an account of the discussion about Borys Hrinčenko's anti-Galician article “Galician poems” (Галицькі вірші) of 1891 (pp. 247–248), does Rusanivs'kyj mention some Modern Standard Ukrainian words that are considered to be of Galician origin. If Rusaniv'kyj is at pains to emphasize in this particular context that not only Galicians but also “Dnipro Ukrainians,” “above all” Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj (p. 247), were involved in the creation of such lexemes, then one can only agree with him, but, reading the textbook, one inclines more and more to the conclusion that the author simply wants to minimize the role of Galicia in the history of the Ukrainian language.

– In this book, even Ivan Franko's contribution is initially outlined in a mere paragraph. At the outset, Rusanivs'kyj condemns his use of Galician dialectisms and his original insistence on the legitimacy of Galician norms, going on to describe Franko's gradual approximation to Dnipro Ukrainian as something of a personal cleansing. As Rusanivs'kyj puts it, Franko finally “understood that no writer would find his way into the new Ukrainian literature without mastering the language of Kotljarevs'kyj and Ševčenko” (p. 252). Not much farther along in the text, however, one learns that as late as 1905, Franko spoke up for the Galician share in the development of Modern Standard Ukrainian (p. 265).¹³ As the individual who did most to expand the spectrum of genres in Ukrainian, the text recognizes an author who was outlawed in Soviet times—Pantelejmon Kuliš.¹⁴ By contrast, Ivan

13 The role of the *Literaturno-naukovyj visnyk*, which was published by Ivan Franko and Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, is also briefly pointed out.

14 Ivan Pul'uj, however, who provided Kuliš with significant assistance in his translation of the Bible, is mentioned with a misspelled surname (“Полуй”), and there is no hint of his Galician descent

Franco's no less impressive versatility as a Ukrainian-language prose writer and poet, journalist, and scholar goes almost unacknowledged.

Generally speaking, the formula of Galicia as a Ukrainian Piedmont ultimately remains strangely devoid of meaning.

It is also particularly striking that even in the chapter on the "Expansion of the functional boundaries of Ukrainian," the overwhelming emphasis on belles lettres remains unchanged. For unknown reasons, Rusaniv's'kyj deems Pantelejmon Kuliš's historical novel *Čorna Rada* to be his greatest achievement with regard to the history of language. The rest of the chapter is concerned with writers such as Marko Vovčok, Leonid Hlibov, Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, Oleksa Storoženko, Myxajlo Staryč'kyj, Anatolij Svydnyč'kyj, Panas Myrnyj, and others. Particular attention is again paid to elements that are strikingly vernacular, folkloristic, or redolent of "everyday language" in their works (cf. pp. 236, 238 et al.).¹⁵

1.4. "At the turn of the century" (pp. 254–289)

In this chapter, Rusaniv's'kyj begins by emphasizing—with good reason—the relaxation of censorship regulations for Ukrainian in 1905, as well as the publication of Borys Hrinčenko's four-volume dictionary in 1907–9 (p. 254). But his subsequent discussion of the allegedly new abstract lexicon at the turn of the century is hardly systematic and, in many respects, strikingly anachronistic. It remains wholly obscure what preconditions underlie the creation and composition of this lexicon, and the point is never made that any attempt to modernize a language cannot be restricted to vocabulary alone. The textbook deals far too briefly with the lively discussions about language that took place at the turn of the century (pp. 265–266), as if all the premises and results of those discussions were self-explanatory and self-evident. Once again, attention is focused on the language of belles lettres. On the basis of Rusaniv's'kyj's discussion, the reader will be unable to fathom why he concludes that the turn of the twentieth century was "a highly fruitful period for the development of the Ukrainian literary language."¹⁶

2. Language- and nation-building from a more differentiated viewpoint

To be fair, it must be said that a handbook on the entire history of Standard Ukrainian such as the one discussed here can by no means be expected to be fully exhaustive or to meet every demand. Our criticism pertains, however, not only to issues of selection or focus but also to fundamental questions of methodology. As already mentioned, these questions concern not only the volume under discussion but any comprehensive monograph on the history of the Ukrainian language or any other.

(pp. 233–234).

15 Additionally, Jurij Fed'kovyč is mentioned in a single sentence as a western Ukrainian author who "adopted the views of Taras Ševčenko" (p. 242).

16 The Soviet Kurs (1958: 301–310) includes a section titled "The Language of the Scholarly and Journalistic Style," but it makes only a slight effort to move beyond the all too typical class-struggle rhetoric of the period.

Among the most serious flaws besetting synthetic accounts of the history of the Ukrainian language is that almost all of them tend to treat the term “literary language” (“літературна мова”) as if it meant “the language of literature,” especially with regard to the last two or three centuries. They perpetuate a not particularly convincing canon that was established largely on the basis of literary criteria, and then, even within this limited scope, often forget to ask further questions regarding the actual impact of such belletristic works on the development of the Ukrainian language. At any rate, they clearly overemphasize the importance of fine literature as compared with other genres and domains, which are often slighted or even completely ignored.

Future historical studies of the Ukrainian language will have to recognize the need to devote attention to a significantly larger area than the one defined by the current canons. If we simply refer to the milieu of the Prague School, which created a catalogue of the attributes of a modern standard language several decades ago, then we are in no danger of becoming utopians of theory, for such a catalogue ultimately amounts to little more than a mirror image of the goals and achievements to which language-builders one or more generations earlier usually aspired. If we then modify this catalogue of the Prague school and regard it as a catalogue of prototypical features (never completely attained in practice but only realized to a greater or lesser degree), the result will be a better idea not of when Ukrainian became a modern standard language, but when it was shaped into a standard language according to some specific criteria. What does this mean?¹⁷

Re feature 1: A standard language must be codified. Listing the allegedly most important attempts at codification is insufficient. Research in historical linguistics must take account of the ideological basis of such codification, as well as its actual impact and period of validity. Failed attempts at codification should also receive due attention in order to avoid anachronistic prejudice. Furthermore, it must be recognized that by no means every dictionary or every grammatical description, etc. can be considered an actual attempt at codification in the real sense (as modern dialectal dictionaries and descriptions of dialectal grammar systems also show). We should learn more about our grammars and dictionaries, etc., their authors, and their distribution.

Re feature 2: The norms of a standard language must be obligatory and generally accepted. As scholars dealing with the history of the Ukrainian language, we should not, of course, limit ourselves to searching for evidence of normative forms that were established only in due course. We should not only be able to assess any item of the corpus of the Ukrainian language with reference to its contemporary norms, regardless of what kind and how binding those norms may have been. We should also try to get a better understanding of the distribution of certain forms and variants in the course of time according to regional, social, gender, and other parameters. It would be wildly illusory to think that norms are ever accepted completely or by every member of a speech community.

17 Our five features are based on Aleksandr Isačenko's (1958: 42) summary of the Prague school catalogue. For a more recent discussion of Prague School approaches, see Nebeská 1996/1999.

Re feature 3: A standard language must be used as a polyvalent language in all functional domains of communication of a speech community. Historical linguistics should therefore study when, where, and how particular variants were introduced into given functional domains and genres. The field of administration and the public sphere as a whole is at least as important as that of belles lettres. Also of considerable interest are available personal records and correspondence of “ordinary people” from various regions and social strata. Even when an extensive corpus of literary work already exists in a given language, a train ticket, bank bill, postage stamp, or routine personal note may turn out to be a document of considerable historical and linguistic value.¹⁸

Re feature 4: A standard language must have supraregional validity. A history of the Ukrainian language should not treat the “national linguistic space” as a parameter established a priori but should examine the shares of various regions in the development of the standard language, as well as their interaction and the penetration of the supraregional variety into those regions and/or its rejection. Other questions to be asked are the following: What does supraregionality ultimately mean in a given context? How large must the region to be bridged be? How much uniformity must be achieved by bridging dialectal differences of how much variety so that one can speak of a successful supraregional coordination?

Re feature 5: A standard language must be stylistically differentiated. Questions of stylistic differentiation are problematic to begin with, given that the term “style” is still largely fuzzy and subject to highly diverse interpretations. What is clear is that our questions regarding style should certainly not be reduced to the domain of belles lettres or to the linguistic level of lexicon. All our evaluations should be based on an effort to comprehend what style might have been deemed appropriate at different times, depending on location, social stratum, etc., including oral style (to the extent that it can be reconstructed).

More intensively than heretofore, a modern Ukrainian historical linguistics will take account of the fact that languages have been and are developed not only within specific framing conditions pertaining to the history of ideas but also within those pertaining to history and administration. It will seek inspiration from the more modern approaches of language planning (see Cooper 1989) and language management (see Nekvapil 2007) and will utilize methodological approaches such as those successfully applied, for example, to the study of endangered languages (Bourhis–Landry 2008). *Mutatis mutandis*, the same factors can be decisive for revitalizing present-day endangered languages as for establishing and preserving the vitality of modern standard languages. Consequently, demographic factors must also be incorporated into our research, as well as factors of institutional support and control in areas such as education and administration, the military, religion, economics, the media, and diverse social associations. Another factor to be considered is that of status—of speech communities as well as of languages

18 The goal should be to expand Ukrainian historical linguistics in the spirit of “language history from below” (see Elspaß 2005).

themselves, and its change over time (ibid.). Finally, a history of the Ukrainian (standard) language must not be limited in coverage to the territory of Ukraine—Ukrainian as a language of the diaspora must be an integral part of it.

A study of the history of the Ukrainian language that attempts to follow such guidelines will certainly revive the currently much too limited dialogue with the historical sciences. Combining the results of that dialogue with maximum possible knowledge of the written and oral text sources, as well as their intra- and extra-linguistic foundations, will produce a new, more convincing image of the history of the Ukrainian language and thus make the process of Ukrainian nation-building appear in a clearer light than has been available until now.

POPULISTS EDITING “OLD RUTHENIANS”: “RUTHENIAN” (UKRAINIAN) TEXTBOOKS FOR GALICIAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

1. Textbooks for Galician Ukrainian primary schools and their milieu

It is reasonable to assume that widely used school textbooks have contributed at least as much as grammars to the general dissemination of linguistic norms.¹ Nineteenth-century Galician “Ruthenians” (Ukrainians) learned, on the basis of textbooks compiled for them, to read and write the language that the authors of those textbooks regarded as their mother tongue or, more precisely, as an appropriate high variety of their mother tongue. This high variety necessarily differed from their actual mother tongue, that is, various Ukrainian dialects, as is the case with every standard language, even if the latter is firmly based on the vernacular. Primers and textbooks, especially those for elementary schools, were undoubtedly among the Galician Ruthenian (Ukrainian) books with the broadest readership, as witnessed by the frequency of their new editions. Nevertheless, hardly any research has been done on these textbooks, and existing accounts of the history of the Ukrainian standard language devote no attention to these sources.

The following pages focus on the question of which language was taught to Galician “Ruthenian” pupils as the high variety of their mother tongue and also, in part, on which images of “Ruthenian” identity were conveyed to them by these textbooks. To date, I have mainly analyzed textbooks of the period before 1848, and only extracts from those published in the decades immediately after 1848 (see the studies in Moser 2011: 384–666), but I am now turning my attention to textbooks of the early 1870s, the period in which the so-called “populists” took over responsibility from the Galician Russophiles for designing teaching aids for the Galician Ruthenians.² All four textbooks discussed here were printed in 1871 and 1872; hence they present the opportunity to carry out a synchronic comparison, so to speak. The following textbooks will be analyzed:

- 1) Бѣкварь для школъ народныхъ въ австрійскѣй державѣ. Львѣвъ. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льныхъ книжо́къ Ставропигійскаго Инститѣта. 1872 (Стоить оправный 17 нов. кр.) (henceforth: В 1872). In all likelihood, this is the fifth edition of the textbook. An identical title first appears in editions issued by the Lviv Stauropegial Institute in the mid-1860s. The third edition (1868) had already been corrected by a representative of the early populists, Vasyl' Il'nyč'kyj, the director of the Lviv Academic Gymnasium and chairman of the government commission for the preparation of gymnasium textbooks (Repertuar 1995: 307). In 1870, an edition titled “Букварь для школъ народныхъ, Въ Вѣдни. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льныхъ книжо́къ. 1870

1 This article is a summary of my monograph of 2007 (Moser 2007).

2 On the Russophiles and their language behavior, see Wendland 2001, my review (Moser 2004), and some studies in Moser 2011 (particularly 602–626); see also my study on Ivan Naumovyč in this volume.

(Стоїть опра́влена 16 нов. кр.)" (henceforth: В 1870) had appeared in Vienna. Additionally, numerous common features of both primers can already be detected in Vasyľ Koval's'kyj's "Рѣскій и польскій бѣкварь для оучилищъ народныхъ въ ц. к. австрійскихъ краяхъ – Polski i ruski Elementarz dla szkół ludowych w c. k. austriackich krajach. Въ Вѣдни. 1855. Ц. к. Дирекція накладу шко́льных книжо́къ (Стоїть опра́вний 10 кр. к. м. Kosztuje oprawny 10 kr. w М. К.)" (henceforth: В 1855).

- 2) "Рѣска Чітанка для II. клáсы шко́ль наро́дныхъ въ коро́лствѣ Гали́ціи и Лодо́меріи и въ вели́комъ кнáзьствѣ кра́ковскѣмъ. Въ Льво́вѣ. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льных книжо́къ Ставропи́гійского Инститѹ́та. 1872 (Цѣна съ опра́вою 28 нов. кр.)" (henceforth: Ć 2 1872). A number of textbooks with similar titles had already been published after 1850. It would appear that one of their basic versions was the "Руска перва языкоучебна читанка для первого [другого] ѡтряда шко́ль народныхъ в цѣсарствѣ Австріи," which was first printed in Vienna in 1853, with the Galician Russophile Antin Dobrjans'kyj identified as the author (Repertuar 1995: 121). Another edition of this textbook, titled "Рѣска пѣрвша азыкоѹче́бна Чітанка. Стоїть опра́влена 27 нов. кр. Въ Вѣдни. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льных книжо́къ. 1870" (henceforth: Ć 2 1870), had been published in Vienna in 1870.
- 3) "Вто́ра рѣска Чітанка для трѣ́тєи клáсы шко́ль наро́дныхъ въ коро́лев. Гали́ціи и Володи́мирїи и вел. кна́зьс. Кра́ковського, Въ Льво́вѣ. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льных книжо́къ Ставропи́гійского Инститѹ́та. 1871 (Цѣна зъ опра́вою 39 нов. кр.)" (henceforth: Ć 3 1871). There are multiple predecessors for this textbook as well, in particular a "Рѣска Дрѹга Чітанка для шко́ль народныхъ въ австрійско́й Державѣ. Вѣдень. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льных книжо́къ. 1859 (Цѣна съ опра́вою 47 нов. кр.)" (henceforth: Ć 3 1859), which was most probably compiled by the Galician Russophile Bohdan Didyc'kyj.
- 4) "Рѣска Чітанка для четвѣ́ртои клáсы шко́ль наро́дныхъ въ Галичи́нѣ; зложі́въ Оста́пъ Леви́цкій. Льво́вѣ. Въ цѣс. кор. на́кладѣ шко́льных книжо́къ Ставропи́гійского Инститѹ́та. 1872 (Цѣна зъ опра́вою 55 нов. кр.)" (henceforth: Ć 4 1872). This is an original work of the populist Ostap Levyc'kyj.³

In the following, a comparison with earlier teaching aids, some of which had been printed just two years earlier, will show that the textbooks of 1871 and 1872 discussed here represent the first generation of Galician Ukrainian textbooks on the basis of which courses in the mother tongue would be conducted for several years in an idiom clearly based on the Ukrainian vernacular. These textbooks confirm an important observation that applies not only to Galician Ukrainian textbooks of the early 1870s but also to earlier ones: their language could differ fundamentally from

3 As for peculiar characteristics and differences on the title pages of these textbooks, see Moser 2007: 33–41.

one edition to the next because they were subject to repeated revision according to the changing or varying conceptions of their authors or editors (see Moser 2011: 384–666). Even the language of the textbooks of 1871 and 1872 was not yet fully homogenized or standardized. In particular, it was still characterized by sporadically occurring residues of Church Slavonic or Russian that have not found their way into Modern Standard Ukrainian.

As has often been overlooked, even Galician Ukrainian textbooks prepared by the Russophile generation had included reading passages largely devised according to Galician Ukrainian vernacular traditions. However, especially in reading passages on “elevated subjects,” the texts had very often fallen back on Church Slavonic or Russian linguistic material. Some textbooks of the first half of the nineteenth century had largely switched to Church Slavonic for religious topics, even apart from their Church Slavonic passages from the Bible. If the textbooks were multilingual (as had usually been the case in the first half of the nineteenth century), then abstract secular subjects such as the Galician and Austrian social order had often been conveyed in Polish.

The Galician populists, of course, had a different agenda: most importantly, in abandoning many generic Galician Ukrainian linguistic forms, they did so not in favor of Church Slavonic or Polish but in order to develop an all-Ukrainian written language. In other words, they now began to adopt, to various degrees, those linguistic norms that had arisen among the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire, as they saw them reflected in the works of Taras Ševčenko or Pantelejmon Kuliš.

The textbooks are also remarkable for their content. The passages in textbooks for the first to third grades of primary school are evidently based mainly on German models that were translated into the languages of the monarchy to instill not only a Christian world view but also a kind of all-Austrian patriotism. But all four textbooks also display independent Ruthenian elements in varying degrees.

In 1873, the Austrian ministry of education wanted to present as impressive a depiction as possible of Austrian schooling in the context of a world's fair that took place in Vienna. On the occasion of the world's fair, a so-called *Bericht über österreichisches Unterrichtswesen* (Report on Austrian Schooling) was printed, for which Vasyľ Il'nyč'kyj supplied a contribution on the schooling of Ruthenians (Il'nyč'kyj 1873). In this article, Il'nyč'kyj reported that there were 1,293 primary schools with Ruthenian as the language of instruction in Galicia, noting that that language was used mainly in schools with one or two grades, while in higher primary schools with three or four grades the Ruthenian language figured mostly as a subject, while the main language of instruction was Polish (see also Sirka 1980: 73–84 and Moser 2007: 15–16). Il'nyč'kyj also pointed out that a commission had been appointed in 1869 by the Galician *Landesschulrat* (advisory board including representatives of schools, pupils, and parents) to “break ground for the free development of the living Ruthenian language on a vernacular basis” (“der freien Entwicklung der lebenden ruthenischen Sprache in volkstümlicher Weise Bahn zu brechen”) (Burger 1995: 61). This appeared to be all the more important because compulsory education had been reintroduced only in 1872, following its temporary suspension in Galicia (Sirka 1980: 79).

2.1. The primer of 1872

This classic primer leads the pupil from letters to first words and first sentences, while syllabification initially attempts to make reading easier. In many cases, material taken from previous editions has been altered, usually in the spirit of greater Ukrainization. This is already apparent from the fact that, compared to B 1870, exercise 21 on the letter ж in B 1872 adds the letter combination дж for the generic Ukrainian affricate, as in the now newly introduced forms *віджу* (as opposed to Modern Ukrainian *бачу*), *лагоджѣ*⁴ as well as *ходжѣ* (B 1872: 13). Furthermore, compared to B 1855 (pp. 19 and 20) and B 1870 (pp. 25 and 29), B 1872 phoneticizes the previous spellings *ѡвилѣ* and *кѡнжѣ* in sentences such as *Ангель ѡвилѣ Авраѣмѣ* and *Рюрикѣ кѡнжѣ въ Рѣси* (B 1872: 25; 28). In B 1872, one reads *Не добра бѣла, бо бѣла дитинѣ* (p. 31), in B 1855 (p. 22), and in B 1870 (p. 31) one can still find *бѣла* (additionally, *дѣтинѣ*), which is widespread in numerous southwestern Ukrainian dialects and would, incidentally, have suited the context more appropriately because this reading passage concerns the (now eliminated) homophonic (or, in the Lemko dialects, paronymic) forms (*бѣла* – *была*). One now encounters *бѣ* (B 1872: 54) instead of Church Slavonic *бѣѣ* (cf. also: Polish *bije*) in B 1855 (p. 62) and *бѣтъ* without the soft sign and with *-тъ* in the ending in B 1870 (p. 52). Many other changes are apparent throughout on all linguistic levels. The following comparison of the rhymed “Правила ученикамъ” (B 1872: 82–84) with its predecessor versions shows this:

В 1872: 82–84:

Коли вхѡдишь до шкѡлы,
ѡтчинѣй дѡверѣ повѡли, и
пѣрше са поклони ладно на
всѣ стѡроны; потѡмъ до
лѡвки сѣдай, чѣсно са тамъ
захѡвай, щѡбъ та кѡждый
полюбѣвъ и оучитель
похвалѣвъ.

До забѡвы бѣде хвилѣ по
скѡнчѣнѡмъ добрѡмъ дѣлѣ:
коли скѡнчѣна робѡта,
тогда милѣйша охѡта.

В 1870: 78–80:

Кѡгда вхѡдишь до шкѡлы,
ѡтворѣй⁵ дѡверѣ повѡли,
и пѣрше са поклони
красно на всѣ стѡроны;
потѡмъ до лѡвки сѣдай,
чѣстно са тамъ захѡвѣй⁶,
щѡбъ та кѡждый полюбѣлъ,
и оучитель похвалѣлъ.

До забѡвы бѣдетъ
хвилѣ по докѡнчѣнѡмъ
добрѡмъ дѣлѣ: кѡгда
скѡнчѣна робѡта, тогда
милѣйша охѡта.

В 1855: 108–109:

Коли вхѡдишь до шкѡлы,
ѡтчинѣй дѡверѣ повѡли,
и пѣрше са поклони
ладно на всѣ стѡроны;
потѡмъ до лѡвки сѣдай,
чѣстно са тамъ захѡвай,
щѡбъ та кѡждый полюбѣлъ
и оучитель похвалѣлъ.

До забѡвы бѣде хвилѣ по
оусѡвершѣннѡмъ дѣлѣ:
коли скѡнчѣна робѡта,
тогда милѣйша охѡта.

4 The word *лагодити* also exists in Modern Standard Ukrainian; Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1987 (first published 1943) and URS 1953–1963 codify it without restrictions (further references to “both dictionaries used” pertain to these dictionaries). Jurij Ševel'ov (2003: 94) identifies prefixed *полагодити* (with no stress indicated) as a Galicianism.

5 The equivalents from the textbooks of 1855 and 1872 are actually preferred in contemporary Standard Ukrainian: one says *відчинити двері*, and so on.

6 Only the imperfective instead of the perfective aspect is used here.

When you enter the school, open the door slowly, and begin by bowing graciously in all directions. Then sit down on the bench and behave well there, so that everyone loves you and the teacher praises you.

First finish your work, then there will be time for entertainment. As work is done, leisure will be even more pleasant.⁷

In almost all cases, editorial changes, some of them substantial, were clearly made in favor of the vernacular, never in the opposite direction. In multiple cases, the innovations of B 1872 had already been anticipated in the textbook released two years earlier; in other cases, changes from B 1870 were not incorporated into B 1872 (for instance, the substitution of *когда* for the vernacular *коли* in two instances).⁸ The textbook passages cited above are meant to speak for themselves, but the following changes deserve brief mention: the use of the pluralia tantum form *двері* (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *двері*, Polish *drzwi*) instead of the singular form *дверь*⁹ (cf. Russian *дверь*); the phonetization of spelling in the preterite and conditional forms *полюбівъ*, *похваливъ* instead of *полюбілъ*, *похвалилъ*, etc., as well as in *пéрше* instead of *пéрше* and *чéсно* instead of *чéстно*. In the second verse, a phonological feature characteristic of numerous southwestern Ukrainian dialects is the most noteworthy item: In *До забавы бѣде хвилѣ по скѣнченѣмъ добромъ дѣлѣ: коли скѣнчена робѣта, тогды милѣйша охѣта* (as in B 1872), the word *хвилѣ*, which occurs in this form in all versions, should probably be considered a nominative singular and, if so, it ought to have been spelled *хвила*. However, as the pronunciation of 'a can be elevated in many Galician dialects and can also yield 'i, the (inexact) rhyme for *дѣлѣ* is maintained in the proverb. In these extracts from B 1872, as well as in the predecessor textbooks, the particle is movable, as this is also very common in Galician dialects (Žylko 1958: 59–60). Accordingly, we find *са поклоні, са [...] заховай*,¹⁰ etc. in the text. All textbooks also use enclitic personal pronouns (such as *та* in this instance) without restriction.¹¹

Numerous conservative features from earlier versions, such as the Church Slavonicism or Russianism *оусовершенѣмъ* (locative singular neuter) in this instance, have been replaced (> *докѣнченѣмъ* > *скѣнченѣмъ*), with only a few remaining. Incidentally, it had already been quite common to phrase codes of conduct on the basis of the vernacular in earlier Galician Ukrainian and Transcarpathian Ukrainian textbooks (see Moser 2011: 366–383). In textbooks such as B 1872, however, their linguistic character no longer differs fundamentally from that of the other reading passages.

7 Unless otherwise indicated, I translate only the version of 1872 (or 1871).

8 Neither of the dictionaries used mentions *когда*, nor is the word to be encountered in Žellexivs'kyj 1886.

9 Both dictionaries used codify the word only as a pluralia tantum; the same applies to Žellexivs'kyj 1886.

10 In both dictionaries, the word appears only in the meaning 'to hide oneself,' but cf. Polish *zachow(у)ać się* 'to behave oneself.' This meaning is also recorded in Žellexivs'kyj 1886.

11 The enclitic personal forms *тя* and *мя* as well as *ми* and *ми* are also legitimated by Church Slavonic. The corresponding Polish forms should also be mentioned: *mię*, *cię*, *mi*, *ci*, as well as *go* and *mu*.

Only the table of contents, in which one encounters numerous headings that do not appear in the text proper, shows considerable linguistic deviation from the other extracts:

Содержанье. – I. Звѹки и бѹквы. – Чистогласныи [...], Полугласна ѣ со слитною въ складѣ съ гласными и розличіе гласныхъ е и є [...] Сложеніу гласнѹ [...], самѹ въ собѣ и въ соединенію съ полугласною ѣ [...] Созвѹчнѹ плавно [...] зѣбнѹ, їбнѹ, гортаннѹ, шипачѹ, поднебѣнныи, Созвѹчнѹ съ гласною передѣ нѣми [...] слогѹ изъ гласной съ созвѹчною передѣ и за нею разомъ [...] Знакі просодіи (гласовдарѣнья) [...] Гласныи ѿ, ѣ, ё [...] Ученье изъ возрѣнія [...] Вещества къ поглядѹ [...] (The table of contents largely corresponds to that in B 1855, except that the latter contains hardly any indications of stress.)

Table of contents. I. Sounds and letters. Pure vowels.... The semi-vowel *j* in conjunction with vowels in a syllable and the difference between the vowels *e* and *je*.... Compound vowels...in isolation and in combination with the semi-vowel *j*.... Liquid...dental, labial, guttural, sibilant, and velar consonants, Consonants preceded by a vowel...syllables with a vowel preceded and followed by consonants.... Prosodic features (vowel stress).... The vowels *ô, ê, ë*.... Visual learning.... Objects to look at.

From the language of this table of contents, one could hardly predict that the text proper of B 1872 is written almost exclusively in a vernacular-based variant, with very few Church Slavonic or Russian residues. Interestingly, even when equivalents to the headings in this table of contents appear in the body text, they often differ in form: for example, the headings *Знакі просодіи (гласовдарѣнья)* and *Вещества къ поглядѹ* in the table of contents appear in the text proper as *Знакі просодіи (голосовдарѣнья)* and *Рѣчи до поглядѹ*. The most likely explanation for this anomaly is that the table of contents (already outlined in essence in B 1855) simply was not submitted to the editors of the textbook (the textbook of 1870 does not feature a table of contents) and consequently underwent no linguistic editing.

A “Note to the Teacher” (“Примѣтка для оучителя”), printed in an adapted version of the civil script, appears at the end of the primer of 1872. Aside from its content, this item is of linguistic interest in that it shows which language the editors considered appropriate for a mature intellectual readership:

Перше, зачѹмъ наука въ читанью начнѣся, упредити повинно поученіе поглядѹмъ въ розговѹрахъ съ дѣтьми. Именѹ предметѹвъ на 40 сторѹнѣ привѣденѹ, взѣти изъ найблизшого окрѹженія дѣтѣй, послѹжать доволно до першихъ такихъ розговѹрѹвъ. Учѣтель звертаѣ уваѹу дѣтѣй на всѣ тоѣ, що въ школѣ передѣ очѣма маѹють, абѹ указѹе имъ образкі; каже взирѹти на такѹвыи, и рѣчь кождѹ назвѹти, такъ розмавлѹючи съ нѣми, всѣ привѹдитъ подѣ змѣслы ихъ. Вопросы: що естѣ се? какѹе то естѣ? до чоѹго тоѣ? гдѣ онѹ находитѣ ся? и т. п. послѹжать на нѣтку розмѹвы. [...] Въ томъже часѣ съ наукою читанья по мѹжности и науку пиісанья сполучѹти належитѣ. – Слоги, изъ рѹзу поединчѹ, прибираѹють постепенно и прихѹдѹть до труднѣйшихъ многослѹбныхъ (B 1872: 97–98).

Before reading instruction begins, it must be preceded by visual instruction in conversations with the children. The names of objects given on page 40, which are taken from the children's closest surroundings, are sufficient for initial conversations of this kind. The teacher draws the children's attention to all that they see before them in school or shows them pictures; he tells them to look at them and name each object. Conversing with them in this manner, he brings everything close to their senses. The questions "What is this?", "What is this like?", "What is this for?", "Where is it?", etc. will constitute the thread of the conversation.... Reading instruction should be combined as much as possible with writing instruction. They gradually acquire the syllables, at first only individual ones, and then proceed to the more complicated ones (B 1872: 97–98).

The language of this note, with its comparative abundance of partly adapted Russianisms or Church Slavonicisms such as *розговорахъ* (locative plural), *употребути*, *въ прочемъ* (both elsewhere in this text), etc., some of which even found their way into Zenon Kuzelja and Jaroslav Rudnyc'kyj's dictionary, is in some respects more redolent of the traditions of textbooks of the 1850s than the body text, and some scholars might therefore tend to define its language as "jazyčije." But the use of that exceedingly problematic term for this sample, as compared to much more heavily Russianized variants of "Ruthenian," does not do justice to the frequent earlier use of the vernacular, especially in the 1850s and 1860s (Moser 2011: 641–66). All in all, even the "Note to the Teacher" is definitely Ukrainian-oriented, with Russian and Church Slavonic figuring more as residual elements of an earlier linguistic ethos that has already been superseded. We are by no means dealing here with the superficially Ruthenianized Russian language for which I have elsewhere proposed the term "Russo-Ruthenian" (Moser 2002a, Moser 2011: 602–626).

Thematically, as the "Note to the Teacher" indicates, B 1872 concentrates mainly on the children's immediate experience in everyday rural life and in school. Added to this are some general instructions concerning the Christian faith, as well as a number of proverbs and pieces of folk wisdom. In a section seemingly concerned only with the acquisition of reading skills, one also finds some brief sentences on Ruthenian affairs interspersed with sentences on other subjects. Selecting the former category of sentences and putting them in order, we find the following affirmations:

Рюрикъ княживъ въ Рѹси. Однá Ольга княжи́ла. Вѣрѹ христї́анскѹ Влади́миръ
прина́въ. Рома́нъ сынъ Мстисла́ва. Левъ – князь основа́въ Льво́въ. Гео́ргій
кназь Га́лича. Роксола́на изъ Рогати́на. Чѹпринъ го́латъ Черкѣ́ссы.
Жолко́вскихъ роди́на изъ Жо́лквы. – Во́ды Щавни́цкѹ квасні́. Са́нокъ
лежи́тъ надъ Са́номъ, Са́мбо́ръ надъ Днѣ́стро́мъ. За́мокъ въ Замо́стю.
Пере́йдѣ Проко́пъ въ Пере́мышль. Жида́чѣвъ бѹ́въ го́родъ сѹдо́вый.
Щастли́во гости́ли до Щи́рця. Збо́ро́въ и Зало́зць въ Зо́лочѣвскóмъ.
Оуро́чій Оунѣ́въ. Станисла́вóвъ обнима́ють двѣ́ Бы́стриць. Гости́нець¹²

12 Cf. the meaning given by Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987: "Geschenk; westukr[ainisch] auch

въ Городѣнкѣ. Давнѣйшій Дрогобычъ нѣжъ Добромилѣ. Тѣда [*sic*, no stress indicated] на Теребовлю въ Тернопѣль. За Золотниками Залѣзники. Коломѣя недалѣка Ключева. Чернѣвцѣ надѣ Прѣтомѣ. Оубѣгъ до Оуторѣ въ Оужгородѣ. Каменѣцъ на Подѣлю. За границею¹³ – Житомирѣ [*sic*, soft]. Кѣвъ въ Оукраинѣ. Перекажі въ Переяславѣ.

Rjuryk ruled in Rus'. Ol'ha alone ruled. Vladymyr was the one who adopted the Christian faith. Roman is Mstyslav's son. Prince Lev founded Lviv. Heorhij [Jurij] is the prince of Halych. Roksoljana is from Rohatyn. The Cherkasians [Cossacks] shave their hair. The Žolkovs'kyj family is from Zhovkva. The waters of Shchavnytsia are acidic waters. Sanok is on the San, Sambir on the Dnister. The castle in Zamość. Prokip will go to Przemyśl. Zhydachiv was a town with a lawcourt. They luckily arrived in Shchyrets. Zboriv and Zaliztsi are in the Zolochiv [region]. Univ is wonderful. Stanyslaviv [present-day Ivano-Frankivsk] is washed by two Bystrytsia Rivers [Solotvynska Bystrytsia and Nadvirmianska Bystrytsia]. The country road to Horodenka. Drohobych is older than Dobromyl. That is the direction to Ternopil via Terebovlia. Zalizchkyky is beyond Zolotnyky. Kolomyia is not far from Klichiv. Chernivtsi is on the Prut. He fled to Uzhhorod in Hungary. Kamianets is in Podilia. Zhytomyr is across the border. Kyiv is in Ukraine. Forward the message to Pereiaslav.

These sentences, which are scattered throughout the textbook, present some important key words and notions that could allow teachers to convey the principal facts about Kyivan Rus' and the Kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia to their pupils. The primer mentions the Cossacks, who shaved their hair (stated in the present tense). The hint that the Żółkiewski family, with its famous Grand Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski, comes from Zhovkva emphasizes the fact that prominent aristocratic families of early modern times and Cossack leaders also had their roots in Galician Ruthenia. The places named in the textbook are also remarkable: they include not only Galician towns but also cities in the Russian Empire, namely Kamianets-Podilskyi; Zhytomyr, about which the text explicitly says that it is located “across the border”; Kyiv, about which the text says only that it is located in “Ukraine” (in the narrower nineteenth-century meaning);¹⁴ and Pereiaslav, which offered teachers sufficient pretext to speak of the Cossacks and above all about Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's alliance of 1654 with Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič, which had led to the incorporation of Left-Bank Ukraine and Kyiv into the Russian Empire. Notably, the outlook conveyed by the primer leads the pupil no farther east than Kyiv, marking large Ukrainian-speaking territories (as distinct from Russian and Belarusian ones) on his or her mental map.

On the basis of these sample sentences, teachers could convey to their pupils that the aforementioned places, as well the catchment area of the school, were all

Chaussee, Landstraße” (gift; also, in western Ukr[ainian], highway, country road). In its first meaning, URS 1953–1963 classifies the word as “разг[оворное]” (coll[oquial]); the second meaning, encountered here, is denoted as “обл[астное]” (regional).

13 The derivational basis *границя* is also considered a Galicianism (Ševel'ov 2003: 79).

14 Also remarkable in *въ Оукраинѣ* is the choice of preposition and stress, which later became a political issue.

located in “Rus” and inhabited by “Ruthenians” who spoke the same language as they.¹⁵ That allowed them to create preconditions for the general dissemination of a Ruthenian and—in the form presented here—ultimately an all-Ukrainian national awareness in the children’s imagination. As noted earlier, it was not only the edition of 1872 that offered such possibilities: they were already present in the edition prepared by Vasyl’ Koval’s’kyj, who was widely regarded as a Russophile. Irrespective of Koval’s’kyj’s original intention—given the censorship, he would have had no scope for the inclusion of ethnically Russian territory in the primer—his material could readily be adapted to promote the concerns of the populists.

2.2. The textbook of 1872 for the second grade of primary school

Compared to its predecessors, the textbook for the second grade of primary school grade also features numerous changes. An extract from the reading passage “Добры́й примѣръ” (A Good Example) may serve as an example (Č 2 1872: 114–115). In this anecdote, Emperor Franz I shows himself to be the “father of the rich and poor” in Baden near Vienna. A remarkable aspect of the extract is the form of Ruthenian that the author has the emperor speak:

Č 2 1872: 114–115:

Цѣсарь Франць перебува́въ въ лѣтъ ро́кѣ 1832 въ мѣстѣ Ба́денѣ, чоты́ри ми́лѣ во́дѣ Вѣ́дна [...] Разъ стрѣ́тивъ Цѣсарь чотыре́хъ людо́й, котру́ трѣ́мнѣ на цми́нтарь несли. [...] нѣ́кто не йшовъ за не́ю. Уви́дѣвши то́е Цѣсарь, поки́вавъ голово́ю и сказа́въ до това́риша сво́го: „Бу́въ то пе́вно дѣ́же ѡ́бодѣ́й чоловѣ́къ, коли́ на по́хоронѣ е́го не ма́ нѣ́кого; ꙗ́ отце́мъ убо́гихъ и богаты́хъ, по́дѣ за трѣ́мною е́го!“ [...] Цѣсарь во́дкры́въ набо́жно го́ловѣ [...].

Č 2 1870: 110–111:

Цѣсарь Франць перебува́ль въ лѣтъ ро́кѣ 1832. въ мѣстѣ Ба́денѣ, чоты́ри ми́лѣ о́тѣ Вѣ́дна [...] Разъ стрѣ́тилъ Цѣсарь чотыро́хъ людо́ей, котру́ трѣ́мнѣ на цми́нтарь несли. [...] ни́кто не ишо́ль за не́ю. Оуви́дѣвши то́е Цѣсарь, поки́валь си́вою голово́ю и сказа́ль до това́риша сво́го: „Бу́ль то пе́вно дѣ́же оубо́дѣ́й чоловѣ́къ, коли́ на по́хоронѣ е́го нема́ ни́кого; ꙗ́ отце́мъ оубо́гихъ и богаты́хъ, по́йдѣ́ томѣ за трѣ́мною е́го!“ [...] Цѣсарь о́ткры́ль набо́жно го́ловѣ [...].

Emperor Franz spent the summer of 1832 in the town of Baden, four miles from Vienna. Once the emperor met four people carrying a coffin to the graveyard.... No one was following it. On seeing this, the emperor nodded his head and said to his companion: “This was certainly a very poor man, as there is no one here at his funeral. I am the father of the poor and the rich. I will follow his coffin!”.... The emperor piously doffed his hat....

The language of this anecdote is largely oriented on the vernacular, as shown by the following examples (unless otherwise indicated, both versions are largely identical): *перебу́вавъ* (instead of *перебыва́ль*, as in Č 2 1870); the genitive form

15 On national identity and the concept of homeland among nineteenth-century Galician Ukrainian peasants, see the convincing observations in Jaroslav Hrycak’s recent biography of Ivan Franko (Hrycak 2006: 129–144).

ро́къ; the substantive in *въ мѣстѣ*; the Ukrainian forms of the numeral *чоты́ри*; *чотырѣхъ* with *o* after the sibilant instead of *четы́ри* and *четы́рѣохъ*, as in Č 2 1870;¹⁶ the spellings *вѣдѣ* and *вѣдкрывъ* instead of *ѣтъ* and *ѣткрылъ*, as in Č 2 1870; the relative pronoun *котрѣ* in the generic Ukrainian vernacular form, as well as the substantives *трѣмнѣ* (accusative singular)¹⁷ and *цмѣнтарѣ*.¹⁸ The spelling of the negative particles in *нѣкто* and *нѣкого* (the latter from the emperor's speech), with *ѣ* for [i], which is more appropriate for phonological reasons, is noteworthy, cf. the traditional *никто* and *никого* in Č 2 1870; the dissimilation of the initial consonant of etymological *къто*, which was generally adopted in Galician (but not Transcarpathian) dialects, is not yet consistently expressed in Č 2 1872 (AUM II 1988: map 214). Furthermore, Č 2 1872 now gives *тоѣ* instead of *то*, as in Č 2 1870 (both forms are to be encountered in southwestern Ukrainian dialects). In this reading passage, the rendering of the approximant in *не йшовѣ* (instead of *не ишѣлъ* from the 1870 version) is also worth mentioning. The form *нѣдѣ* from the emperor's speech appears without *j* in the root (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *ни́дѣ*), contrary to *нѣидѣ* in Č 2 1870, which is, of course, also to be found in some Ukrainian dialects.¹⁹ One also encounters *бѣвъ* instead of *былъ*, as in Č 2 1870, *пѣвно*, *дѣже*, and again *чоловѣкъ* instead of *человѣкъ*, as in Č 2 1870—all these forms appear in the emperor's direct speech, which also features the vernacular forms *коли* and *не ма* (Č 2 1870: *нема́*, cf. Polish *nie ma*). The form *ѣго*, which the emperor uses in his speech in both versions of the textbook, is authentic in Galicia, just like *ѣмѣ*; along with these, the Galician dialects also feature forms of the type *ѣго* and *ѣмѣ* (with initial stress; Žylko 1958: 57), as they would have been spelled according to the orthography of Č 2 1872. The only form that characterizes the emperor linguistically as superior to the “common people” is to be encountered in the sentence *ѣ отцѣмъ убо́гихъ и богаты́хъ*, where the noun, which occurs here, surprisingly, in the predicative instrumental with the zero copula, appears in the conservative spelling *отцѣ*- instead of *вѣтцѣ*-. In the earlier version of the textbook, this latter orthographic fact has no special meaning because the form without prothesis and the marking of the reflex of *o* in the newly closed syllable is omnipresent. In the 1872 version, however, one finds, inter alia, the chapter heading *Слѣхай вѣтцѣ́* (Obey Your Father), referring to a biological father, with *вѣтцѣ́* deliberately chosen to replace the form *отцѣ́*, which appears in the 1870 version. There is no doubt that in the special case of the emperor's speech, the editors were just as deliberate in deciding to make no change—a decision that elevated the emperor whose speech was otherwise so “normal” into the exalted sphere after all (cf. also Modern Standard Ukrainian *отець*, as in *духовний отець* “Reverend Father” or *Святіи́й Отѣ́ць* “Holy Father”).

16 Incidentally, the version of 1870 also gives *люде́й* instead of *люді́й*; both forms are to be encountered in Ukrainian dialects.

17 Cf. Polish *trumna* and Modern Standard Ukrainian *труна́*, by comparison, only Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987, but not URS 1953–1963, mention the form “*тру́мна* = *труна́*.”

18 Cf. Polish *cmentarz* and Modern Standard Ukrainian *цвинта́р*; by comparison, only 1943/1987, but not URS 1953–1953, mentions the form *цмѣнтарѣ* with the reference “→ *цвинта́р*.”

19 On its distribution in the dialects, see AUM 1988: map 100.

The reading passage of this textbook that was most sophisticated in content, "МѢСАЦЬ И ЗВѢЗДЫ" (The Moon and the Stars), had not appeared in the 1870 version. It was meant to convey basic knowledge about the solar system as simply as possible. In this passage, the editors of the 1872 textbook were also highly intent on phrasing their explanations in language based on the vernacular.

At the end of Č 2 1872, one finds about forty pages of "Впрáвлена²⁰ граматичнѹ" (Č 2 1872: 145–180; cf. "Оупражнёніа граматичнѹ" from Č 2 1870: 134–160). Like its predecessor, the textbook of 1872 still features predominantly grammatical terms based on Church Slavonic, such as *Самогласнѹ* (accusative singular).²¹ Aside from the terms themselves, however, the grammatical exercises are basically composed in the same Ukrainian language as the reading passages, cf. forms such as *оуживають*, *звычайно*, the spellings *де* and *декотрѹ*, the diminutive form in *въ церковныхъ книжкахъ*, as well as *подыбѹе са*,²² *на́мѣсть*,²³ *до́бре*, *оуважа́ти*, *чи*, and others.

It is particularly striking that the editors of Č 2 1872 already made very clear efforts to adjust their language to the variant of written Ukrainian that was being cultivated and developed in Russia at the same time, under the increasingly more difficult conditions that prevailed after 1863 and then after 1876. The most important indication of this is the verbal ending of the third person plural in soft *-ть*, which is not widespread in Galicia. The textbook now gives the form *люба́ть* and others (Č 2 1872: 102), as distinct from the primer of 1872, which still gives *возлюба́ть* (also without *l*-epenthesis), and Pylyp Djačan's school grammar (Djačan 1865: 89), which also only gives forms of the type *те́рпа́ть*. As opposed to the Ukrainian language of the Russian Empire, however, personal endings in the preterite or conditional, as in *давъ-бысь* (Č 2 1872: 39), are still widely used. In general, Russian and Church Slavonic elements appear even less frequently in the textbook for the second grade of primary school than in the primer discussed earlier.

2.3. The textbook of 1871 for the third grade of primary school

With regard to content, the third-grade textbook is considerably more interesting than the one for the second grade, especially with regard to questions of identity formation. One of the central texts is titled "Любо́вь до вѹтчиныъ" (Love for the Homeland), which was extensively revised as compared with the text *Любо́вь къ оте́честву* (Love for the Fatherland) in the preceding version of 1859. It will be recalled that the latter version goes back to Bohdan Didyc'kyj, but even in the new edition of 1871 it remains wholly open which cultural space is actually to be

20 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 only codify *впрáва*. The entry for *впрáвлення* in URS 1953–1963 gives a different meaning.

21 Numerous forms of these terms had already been anticipated in earlier works.

22 URS 1953–1963 classifies the words *поди́бувати* and *поди́буватися* as "обл[астное]" (reg[ional]), but Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 codify it without restrictions.

23 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 give s.v. *на́мість*: " = замість " and otherwise codifies it without restrictions. URS 1953–1963 indicates only the initial stress and classifies the preposition as "обл[астное]" (reg[ional]).

considered the “fatherland.” The following principal options were available to the Galician Ruthenian pupils: the Austrian (after 1867, Austro-Hungarian) Monarchy, with or without its Transleithanian (i.e., Hungarian) part; the Crownland of Galicia and Lodomeria, with or without its western territory, settled mainly by Poles; the pupil’s local area or village; and perhaps also “Rus’,” although its mental boundaries were quite variously defined.

As the most important criteria for defining the fatherland, the 1859 version gives the place where one was born and grew up, as well as the soil in which one’s ancestors are buried. For most people, this would have been a very small “fatherland.” The version of 1871 begins by augmenting these criteria with the topos of unspoiled nature as a positively connoted element of the fatherland and goes on to add two very important concepts—that of the people (*на́рôдъ*), to which one belongs as to one’s family, and that of the language that the reader heard from his mother in childhood and that he himself, his family, and “all his dearest ones” speak (surprisingly, the word used here for “language” is *мôва*, and not, as was otherwise common in Galician sources of the period, *мъзыкъ*). The textbook of 1871 thus made it apparent that “fatherland” could refer not only the state of Austria but also to the Ruthenian-speaking (Ukrainian-speaking) region alone, or at least parts of it:

Ї 3 1871: 45–46:

Той край, въ котрôмъ на́шô прадѣды, дѣды и батькѣ родѣлиса, жи́ли и умира́ли, и где сѣть гробѣ ихъ, земли́ца та́а на котрôй и мы на свѣтъ Бо́жѣй прѣйшли́ и где мы, е́сли така́ Бо́жа во́ла, и на́шô ко́сти до вѣ́чного спочи́нкѣ зложимо; тѣи по́ла, котрѣ́ намъ хлѣ́бъ ро́даты; тѣи го́ры, лѣ́сы и лѣ́ги, на котрѣ́ намъ такъ ми́ло спо́гладати; – тѣи керни́цѣ пото́ки и рѣ́ки, съ котрыхъ мы во́дѣ пемо́; – той во́здѣхъ, котрымъ во́дыха́емо: – всѣ́ то́е ра́зомъ называ́е са на́ша Во́тчина. [...]

И́къ не ма́е любѣ́ти пе́редъ всѣ́ми и́ншими тыхъ лю́де́й, котрѣ́ жи́ють въ то́й сторо́нѣ, – то́го на́рода до котро́го во́нъ и е́го роди́на налѣ́жать? И́къ не любѣ́ти то́и мо́вы, котро́ю ма́тѣрь до не́го И́къ дѣти́ны промовла́ла, котро́ю во́нъ и е́го ро́дна, всѣ́ котрѣ́ е́мѣ сѣть найми́льшѣ, гово́ратъ? На́вѣ́тъ дѣ́кѣ лю́де любать край, въ котрôмъ родѣ́ли са, ро́дъ, до котро́го налѣ́жать; тѣмъ бо́льше повинни́ просвѣ́щенѣ лю́де ми́ловати сво́ю отчи́нѣ, сво́й край, сво́й на́рôдъ, сво́ю мо́вѣ, не цѣ́рати са ихъ и нико́ли ихъ не покида́ти. [...]

Окрôмъ отчи́ны тѣ́тъ на землі́ ма́емо е́ще дру́гѣ отчи́нѣ въ не́бѣ, и е́сли пе́ршѣ́ любимо, о ско́лько бо́льше повинни́-сьмо тѣ́ю дру́гѣ́ любѣ́ти и о оса́гнене е́й стара́ти са!

Ї 3 1859: 67–68:

Що е́сть о́течество? Е́сть то сторо́на, где мы родѣ́лиса, колы́бель, въ котрôй мы возроста́ли; гнѣ́здô, въ котрôмъ мы согрѣ́тѣи и воспѣ́танѣ, во́здѣхъ, котрымъ мы о́тдыха́ли; землѣ́, где лежа́тъ ко́сти о́тцѣ́въ на́шихъ, и где мы са́мѣ́ ла́жемъ. [...]

Саміи звѣрѣ и птицѣ любитъ край родженіа [?]²⁴ свого; а человекъ, одаренный разумною душею, малъ бы отдѣлѣтиса отъ своихъ, и отстѣпѣти въ томъ преимущество [sic] пчолѣ и мѣраваю? [...] Отворотъ отъ тои природопротивной мысли естъ такъ великій, що дѣже человекъ безъ чести и стыда [...] постыдалъ бы са ѡвно и отвѣрсто до того признѣтиса.

Но кромѣ отечества тѣ на земли маѣмъ ещѣ дрѣгѣе отечество, надзѣмое, вѣчное; и если пѣрвое отъ сѣрдца любимъ, о сколько же повінна любовъ наша большою быти къ тому дрѣгѣму!

That land in which our forefathers, grandfathers, and parents were born, lived, and died, and where their graves are; that piece of earth where we, too, came into God's world and where we, if it be God's will, shall lay our bones to eternal rest; those fields that yield grain for us; those mountains, forests, and meadows at which we look with such pleasure; those springs, creeks, and rivers from which we drink water; the air we breathe; all this together is called our Fatherland [sic, capitalized]....

How can anyone fail to love above all others those people who live in that land; the nation to which he and his family belong? How can he fail to love the language in which his mother spoke to him as a child, that he and his relatives speak, and all who are dearest to him? Even savage people love the land in which they were born and the tribe to which they belong; all the more should educated people love their fatherland, their land, their people, and their language. They should not renounce them and should never leave them....

Besides the fatherland here on earth, we have another fatherland in heaven. And if we love the first fatherland, how much more should we love the second one and strive to attain it!

If one disregards the Church Slavonicism *вѣдѣхъ* (which is broadly used in many southwestern Ukrainian dialects), as well as the Church Slavonic form of the participle *просвѣщеній*,²⁵ then, this text, too, is clearly based on the vernacular, at least as it appears in Č 3 1871, even though its subject is quite abstract.

The text is heavily edited as compared with the linguistically much more conservative version of 1859. The following forms in the 1871 version deserve special attention: *вѣтчѣна*, which also appears in different spellings, such as *отчѣны* (genitive singular) and *отчѣнѣ* (accusative singular), and occurs instead of the Church Slavonic *отѣчество* in Č 3 1859; generic Ukrainian *батьки* 'parents,' which does not have an equivalent in Č 3 1859; suffixed *земліца* instead of *земля* (which does appear elsewhere in Č 3 1871); *прѣйшли* with *j-* after the prefix (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *прийшли*), without an equivalent in Č 3 1859; *до* [...]

24 Instead of *дж*, the two letters appear in the text with a ligature that is usually employed to render the generic Ukrainian affricate *дж*. Perhaps, in this context, the ligature should be interpreted as the Church Slavonic *жд*.

25 Kuzelja-Rudnyč'kyj 1943/1987 at least mention the secondary imperfective *просвѣщаѣти* with the annotation "veralt[et]" ("archaic") and the note " = просвѣаѣти," while in URS 1953–1963 *просвѣщаѣти* also appears with the note "и редк[оупотребляемое]" ["and the rarely used"] *просвѣчувати*." But both dictionaries give only *и*, not the genuine Church Slavonic *иѣ*, as the alternant in the perfective aspect.

спочи́нкѸ²⁶ with final *до* + genitive, without an equivalent in Č 3 1859, as well as *зложимо*²⁷ with the phonetic spelling of the prefix instead of the no less vernacular simplex *лажемъ* in a different context in Č 3 1859. The text also contains the following words, which have no equivalents in the earlier version: *спогладати*²⁸ and *керниці*²⁹ (with the generic southwestern Ukrainian reflex of the original cluster of liquid consonants and subsequent weak *ь*);³⁰ *потόки*, *пемó* with the traditional marking of the Ø-reflex of weak *ь* before *j*, *и́ниими* (instrumental plural), and *рóднѧ́* (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *рідня́*).

The vernacular *на́вѣтъ*³¹ in the generic Ukrainian form—cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *на́віть* vs. Polish *nawet*—replaces the Russian *да́же* (in a slightly different context) of the 1859 version.³² The earlier version does not contain equivalents for *мóвы* (genitive singular) or *мóвѸ* (accusative singular), nor for *цѣрати са* with this peculiar stress on the first syllable,³³ while generic Ukrainian *ни́коли* with the traditional marking of the negative particle already appears in the 1859 version. The form *крóмъ* from the 1859 version, which corresponds to Russian, is replaced by Ukrainian *окрóмъ*.³⁴ Instead of the phonetically spelled form *не́ришѸ* (accusative singular feminine), the earlier version still gives the traditional *не́рвое* (with a different word modified). Predicative *пови́нний-сьмо* is modeled on *пови́нна* of the earlier version (in a different context), which otherwise often tends to use Russian and Church Slavonic *до́лженъ* (in Church Slavonic, however, one would also expect the copula, i.e., *до́лженъ єсть*, etc.). One also finds *до не́го*, not *до нѣго*, as in many Galician dialects.

26 Both Ukrainian dictionaries used give the word without comment.

27 URS 1953–1963 gives the word with the annotation “редк[оупотребляемое]” (“rare”), while the phrase *зложити життя* appears with the annotation “рит[орическое]” (“rhet[orical]”). Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 give *зложити* only in the meaning “zusammen-legen, -setzen; (творити) verfassen; (існує) bestehen; → auch *складати*” [“to pool, assemble”]; (творити) [“to compose”]; (існує) [“to pass”]; → also *складати*]. With reference to the latter meaning, URS 1953–1963 terms the word “rare” in the spelling *з- < съ-* ‘zusammen’ (“together”).

28 Both Ukrainian dictionaries used give the word with no further comment.

29 URS 1953–1963 has a separate entry for *керни́ця* with a see-reference to *крини́ця*. S.v. *крини́ця*, *керни́ця* as well as *кирни́ця* are tagged with the annotation “обл[астное]” (“regional”). Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 do not give *керни́ця*, but there is an entry for “*кирни... → крини...*,” although the western Ukrainian forms are not repeated here.

30 This reflex is to be encountered in practically all Galician and Transcarpathian dialects, cf. AUM 1988: map 71.

31 The word *на́віть* is occasionally considered a Galicianism, cf. Ševel'ov 2003: 86.

32 Church Slavonic *да́же* does not mean “even”; see D'jačenko 1900/1993, which has no entry for the word. In Old Church Slavonic, the word has a different meaning.

33 Both dictionaries codify the stress on *a*, with no further restrictions.

34 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 also give the form *крóми* with the annotation “= *крім*.” Under *окрім*, one also finds “= *крім*.” URS 1953–1963 does not acknowledge *крóми* but most definitely acknowledges *крім* and *окрім*. The latter is stressed only on the second syllable and classified as “разг[оворное]” (“coll[oquial]”). Incidentally, the annotation “обл[астное]” (“reg[ional]”) is included in the variant *окрóме*, which Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 give “separately” only as a synonym of the adverb *окре́мо*.

The last sentence of this reading passage in the 1871 version includes the phrase *о осажнені єї старати ся* (the wording is entirely different in the model text), with the vernacular *осажнені* in the typically Galician prepositional phrase with thematic *о* + accusative case (cf. also Polish *starać się о* + accusative case, but Modern Standard Ukrainian *намагатися про* + accusative case) as well as a vernacular-based spelling of the pronoun (*єї*, which we will encounter again as *єѣ* in the textbook for the fourth grade of primary school). The 1871 version introduces the verb *міловати*,³⁵ cf. archaic Polish *miłować* 'to love' (the suffix of this word appears in the form *-ova-*). As a rule, this textbook, like the one for the second grade, uses *зде*, not *де*.

The linguistic design of sections such as "Австрі́йско-уго́рска мона́рхія" (The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) (Č 3 1871: 80–81; Č 3 1859: 101: *Австрі́йська держа́ва*) or "На́роды Австрі́и" (The Peoples of Austria) (Č 3 1871: 83–85; Č 3 1859: 106–108) is similar. Although the reading passages on Ruthenian historical subjects depict venerable Old East Slavic heroes, they draw on the chronicles without openly propagating a national idea. In these sections, the 1871 version sometimes includes archaic elements that generally turn out to be remnants of the previous version (Č 3 1871: 108 compared to Č 3 1859: 130).

Another new section, compared to the previous version, is titled "Га́лицина" (Galicia) (Č 3 1871: 104–108, with this peculiar stress). It presents basic geographic information about Galicia in a markedly sober tone, with little in the way of emotional, patriotic accents:

Га́лицина (Га́лиція) або Га́лицко-Володи́мѣ́рське коро́лівство вразѣ зъ вели́кимъ кня́жествомъ Кра́ковскимъ єсть одні́мъ зъ найбо́льшихъ кору́ннихъ краѣвъ Австрі́йско-Уго́рскої Мона́рхіи и лежи́ть въ по́внічно-всхо́дній єї ча́сти. Довго́та се́го краю́ дохо́дить 90 ми́ль, а шири́на 20 до 30 ми́ль. [...] Въ Га́лицинѣ жи́є зверхъ 5 ми́ліонѡвъ лю́деї; съ тыхъ бо́льша полови́на сущѣ Руси́ні, ме́нша полови́на сущѣ Поля́кі, пото́му Жи́ді, Нѣ́мці и Во́рме́не. Руси́ні жи́ють въ всхо́дній ча́сти Га́лицко́го краю́, надѣ Днѣ́стромъ и єго́ до́плавами, а тако́жъ надѣ Ся́номъ и Бу́томъ; Поля́кі жи́ють найбо́льше въ за́падній Га́лицинѣ надѣ Ви́слою, Дуна́йце́мъ и Ви́сло́кою, а тако́жъ въ всхо́дній, особли́во по мѣ́стахъ, помѣ́шані зъ Руси́нами.

Halychyna (Galicia) or the Galician-Volhynian Kingdom, together with the Grand Duchy of Cracow, is one of the largest crownlands of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and is located in its northeastern part. The length of this land is 90 miles, the breadth 20 to 30 miles.... More than 5 million people live in Galicia; the greater half of them are Ruthenians, the smaller half are Poles, followed by Jews, Germans, and Armenians. The Ruthenians live in the eastern part of the Galician land, on the Dnister and its tributaries, as well as on the

35 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 give *мілувати* with the root stress only in the meaning "sich erbarmen" (to have mercy), while only the meaning "lieblosen" (to caress) but not "lieben" (to love) is ascribed to the verb with the stress on the suffix. The same applies to URS 1953–1953, where the second meaning is ascribed to "поэз[ия]" ("poet[ry]").

San and Buh; the Poles live predominantly in western Galicia on the Vistula, Dunajec, and Wisłoka, but also in eastern [Galicia], especially in the towns, mixed with the Ruthenians.

The language of this text is clearly based on the vernacular, although it features relatively “learned” content. Incidentally, the absence of such a text based on a more conservative linguistic model in the preceding version of 1859 may have had a salutary effect here.

The last text of the second section, by contrast, includes by far the most extensive Church Slavonic portion of this textbook, namely the translation of the former Austrian “national” anthem (“Тимнѣ австрійскій народный,” Č 3 1871: 148–150; Č 3 1859: “Үмнѣ австрійскій народный”). Moreover, the hymn to the emperor (originally “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser,” 1797, here “Gott erhalte, Gott beschütze / Unsern Kaiser, unser Land,” 1854 version) is written in a slightly vernacularized version of Church Slavonic, which elevates it to the religious sphere. In this textbook, the first verse (to be sung to the melody of “Gott erhalte...,” or the current German national anthem), reads as follows³⁶:

Č 3 1871: 148–150

Бѣже бѣди покровитель
Цѣсарю, Его краймѣ!
Да Онѣ мѣдрый устроитель
Вѣ силѣ вѣры бѣде намѣ!
Мы Его Отцѣвѣ корѣну
Хранѣмѣ отѣ всяка врага,
Австріи Габсбѣургѣвѣ трѣну
Судѣба бѣде все одна [...].

Č 3 1859: 176–178:

Бѣже бѣди покровитель
Цѣсарю, Его краймѣ!
Да Онѣ мѣдрый оустроитель
Вѣ силѣ вѣры бѣде намѣ!
Мы Его Отцѣвѣ корѣну
Хранѣмѣ отѣ всяка врага,
Австріи Габсбѣургѣвѣ трѣну
Судѣба бѣде все одна [...].

The hymn notwithstanding, it is clear that pupils using Č 3 1871, unlike those instructed from the textbooks discussed earlier, absorbed many word forms that were future-oriented and decidedly based on the vernacular, including *хто*, *-ива-*, as in *дога́дывавъ са* or *мѣнишій* without the soft sign, function words such as *ѣтже*, and markedly vernacular forms such as *въ чѣжинѣ* or *мѣвчки*, etc. (cf. Moser 2007: 150). The previous version of 1859, composed by the Russophile Bohdan Didyc'kyj, had been heavily revised. In Č 3 1871, one already encounters *у* for etymological *ѣ*, although it was to be found only in poems, and only if the phonetic value of the vocalized preposition was required for reasons of meter. This textbook also conveyed the non-Galician soft ending *-ть* in the third person present of verbs, as well as in the imperative of the second person plural (contrary to the 1859 model). Furthermore, the reflexive particle almost always occurs after the verb form, even if it is mostly written separately. In the preceding version, the reflexive particle is almost always written in conjunction with the verb, most probably as a

36 Cf. earlier Ruthenian-Church Slavonic versions of the hymn to the emperor dating from 1828 and 1831 in Moser 2011: 312.

consequence of alignment with Russian. In this textbook, personal endings in the preterite and conditional are still used, as in the earlier version.

Although the editor did quite a good job, the new 1871 version of the textbook for the third grade of primary school still displays sporadic traces of its Russo-Ruthenian predecessor of 1859, especially in reading passages on more abstract and sophisticated subjects. It thus comes as no surprise that the populist Omeljan Partyckyj set himself the task of composing a new third-grade textbook (“Читанка руска для третей клясы школь людовыхъ”), which he submitted as early as 1874.

2.4. Ostap Levyc'kyj's textbook of 1872 for the fourth grade of primary school

Ostap Levyc'kyj was one of the earliest populists. In 1863, under a pseudonym, he composed a satirical poem on the Polish uprising that had been put down in the same year. Later, he worked as a teacher in gymnasiums and *Realschulen* (another type of secondary school with a focus on science rather than the humanities) and, among other things, made his mark as a translator (Moser 2007: 151–153). In the early 1860s, he was in contact with such leading populists as Omeljan Partyckyj and Oleksander Barvinsk'kyj. From the outset, Ostap Levyc'kyj's comprehensive textbook, approximately 370 pages in length, combines a national message with the praise to the Lord that is traditionally included in textbooks. The first poem, titled “Величайте Бóга” (Praise God), reads in part:

[...] Рýскiй дѣты, краснiй цвѣты, / Тѣште ся, спѣвайте / Иу рускихъ красныхъ
пѣсняхъ / Бóга величайте! (Ї 4 1872: 1).

Ruthenian children, beautiful flowers, be happy and sing! And praise God in
beautiful Ruthenian songs.

Furthermore, the very first chapter of Levyc'kyj's textbook features Sydir Vorobkevych's/Horobkevych's poem “Рóдна мóва” (The Native Tongue) (Ї 4 1872: 46–47), which is still well-known today:

Мóво рóдна, слóво рóдне, / Хто васъ забувáє, / Той у грúдяхъ не серdéнько
/ А лишъ кáмньн мáє! // [...] У тóй мóвѣ мы спѣвáли, / При грѣ розмовляли;
/ У тóй мóвѣ намъ минúвшóсть / Нáшу розказáли. // Ой, томý плекáйте,
дѣти, / Рóднѣсеньку мóву, / И учѣть ся говорiти / Своймъ рóднымъ
слóвомъ. [...].

Native language, native word, he who forgets you has no good heart but a stone
in his breast! In this language we sang and spoke while playing. In this language
we were told the story of our past. Oh, cherish thus your dear native tongue,
and learn to speak your native language...

The linguistic material of this poem is wholly rooted in the vernacular. The following forms are noteworthy: *можь*,³⁷ a word that was soon perceived as dialectal;

37 The predicative is not given in either of the dictionaries used; only *мóжна* is mentioned.

the compound conjunction *тажь*; generic Ukrainian *мольбы*;³⁸ and the typically Ukrainian *плекайте* (which is also very common in Modern Standard Ukrainian).

The vernacular character of the textbook is also maintained in sections that convey general knowledge. Concerning the Slavic languages, we read the following:

[...] Славяне говорять 7-ми языками, которі однакожь усѣ до себе подѣбні, а дѣлять ся еще на кольканайцять нарѣчей. Тѣ сѣмь головныхъ языковъ суть: російскій, рускій, польскій, чѣскій, словѣнскій, сербскій и болгарскій. Дѣлять же ихъ еще на два окремѣ гурты: на гуртъ пѣвнѣчний и полуднѣвый; до пѣвнѣчного зачисляють ся перші чотырѣ, до полуднѣного послѣдні три языки. Славяне одного и того самого гурту дуже легко порозумѣють одинъ другого; труднѣйше ужѣ о много приходить ся Славянинови зъ гурту одного порозумѣти брата изъ гурту другого. Такъ на пр. Русинъ скорше порозумѣе Россіянина, Поляка або Чѣха, анѣжь Словѣнца, Сѣрба або Болгара – и на вѣдвороть. [...] (Ї 4 1872: 141–143).

The Slavs speak seven languages, which, however, are all quire similar, and they are further divided into more than a dozen dialects. These seven languages are: Russian, Ruthenian, Polish, Czech, Slovenian, Serbian, and Bulgarian. These are further divided into two distinct groups, northern and southern; the first four [languages] belong to the northern [group], the second three to the southern [group]. Slavs of the same group understand one another very easily; it is, however, much more difficult for a Slav of one group to understand a brother from the other group. For example, a Ruthenian will more easily understand a Russian, Pole, or Czech than a Slovene, Serb, or Bulgarian, and vice versa.

One of the most important features of this surprising modified Dobrovskian classification of the Slavic languages—the lacunae, some of which are quite astonishing from a modern viewpoint, do not concern us here—is that it distinguishes Ukrainian (“Ruthenian,” *рускій*) from Russian (*россійскій*) as explicitly as it distinguishes both languages from all other languages of the “northern” branch. No particular closeness of Ruthenian and Russian is constructed.

The language of this text is clearly based on the vernacular: the initial vowel of *усѣ* is spelled phonetically; a numeral such as *кольканайцять*³⁹ is spelled in wholly vernacular fashion (in one of the southwestern Ukrainian forms, cf. AUM 1988: map 229); and marked vernacular lexemes such as *гуртъ* are used even in a terminological sense.⁴⁰ Only the adjective *послѣдній* ‘the latter’ could be considered

38 URS 1953–1963 codifies the word without restrictions, but Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 do not mention it.

39 As expected, both Ukrainian dictionaries used record only the spelling *кільканайцять*, which Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 accept without stylistic restrictions, while URS 1953–1963 terms it “разг[оворное]” (coll[oquial]).

40 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 as well as Želexivs'kyj 1886 translate the substantive *гурт* as “Gesamtheit, Gesellschaft” (“entity, collective/society”), while URS 1953–1963 also gives the meaning “group.” Both dictionaries codify the word without restrictions, cf. also Polish *hurt*.

uncharacteristic of Ukrainian from a modern perspective, while the form *Слав'яне*⁴¹ with *a* in the root is not a Russianism but was already quite common in earlier forms of Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Church Slavonic, as in the *Synopsis* of 1672, where one reads, inter alia, *славеноРоскій* (*sic*, with a capital letter) (Moser 2007c: 271–272). Other noteworthy forms are the generic Ukrainian *анѣжъ*⁴² as well as the Galician *на вѣдворѣтъ*⁴³ and the comparative *скѣрше*.⁴⁴

The reading passage “Галичина” (Galicia) (Ї 4 1872: 151–155), in which the vernacular consistently predominates, presents geographic and economic data in an objective manner. The passage titled “Русь” (“Rus’”), however, is clearly set apart by its emotional tone: it seeks to arouse a patriotic attitude toward a “Rus’” that is described as a true idyll. “Rus’” is basically defined as the Ukrainian-settled area extending from the Wisloka to the Don and from the Prypiat and middle Dnipro beyond the Carpathian Mountains to the Black Sea (“*простигає ся она вѣдъ Вислоки рѣки – ажъ по рѣку Донъ, а вѣдъ Припяти и середнѣго Днѣпра – ажъ по-за Карпаты и по Чорне Море*”). The author implicitly emphasizes the common national identity of the Galician “Ruthenians” and the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire, who are here implicitly referred to as “Ruthenians” as well, “for we should know that the Ruthenians have long been divided between these two states, the Russian and the Austrian” (“*бо знати намъ трѣба, що Русини зъ-дѣвна уже роздѣлені помѣжъ двѣ державы тотій російську и австрійську*”).

“Our Rus’ is a land in which milk and honey flow” (“*Русь наша – се країна мѣдомъ та молокомъ пливуча*”)—such is the euphoric tenor of this first section, in response to which one might remind the reader of the title of Stanisław Szczepanowski’s book *Nędza galicyjska w cyfrach* (Galician Poverty in Figures), which appeared just a year after Ostap Levyc’kyj’s textbook.

What is even more interesting is the unequivocal extension of national space beyond the Zbruch. The “Dnipro-Slavutytsia” (“Днѣпро-Славутиця”) is referred to as “the center and cradle of the national and political life of the Ruthenians” (“*бсередокъ и колыбель народного и политичного житя Русинѣвъ*”) in a clearly all-Ukrainian sense, while the epithet “head and heart of Rus’, capital of the grand dukes” (“*головѣ и сѣрце Руси, столиця Великихъ князѣвъ*”) is applied to Kyiv. There are some remarks on the historical role of Volodymyr I and the glorious past of

41 Kuzelja–Rudnyč’kyj 1943/1987 note: “слав’ян → слов’ян”; URS 1953–1963 does not record the form with *a* in the root.

42 Both dictionaries codify the conjunction *анѣж* without restrictions.

43 Kuzelja–Rudnyč’kyj 1943/1987 codify *вѣдворѣтъ* in the meaning “Rückzug; Rückseite” (“retreat, reverse side”) and the adjective *вѣдворѣтний* in the meaning “umgekehrt, verkehrt; umgehend” (“reverse, backward; immediately”) without restrictions. This dictionary also records the adverbialized *навѣдворѣтъ*, which exactly matches the spelling in the reading passage except for the rendering of the reflex of *o* in the newly closed syllable, with the meaning “umgekehrt” (“contrariwise”), cf. Polish *odwrótny* ‘umgekehrt’ and the exact match *на одворѣтъ*, cf. in turn Modern Standard Ukrainian *навпаки*. URS 1953–1963, however, only mentions *вѣдворѣтний*, inter alia, in the nonstandard meaning ‘repulsive,’ classifying it as “редк[оупотребляемое]” (“rare”), cf. Russian *отвратительный*.

44 This form of the comparative is recommended in Smal-Stoc’kyj–Gartner 1913: 152. By contrast, Kuzelja–Rudnyč’kyj 1943/1987 note: *скѣрший* → *скѣртіший*. URS 1953–1963 classifies *скѣрше* as “обл[астное]” (“regional”) and also refers to *скѣртіше*.

ancient Halych, as well as on the Kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia. There is also an initial allusion to the Ukrainian Cossacks: the text says that Cossackdom developed in “Ukraine” (in the narrower sense), along the Dniro.

In outline form, this passage articulates the basic historical myths of the Ukrainian populists: their building blocks are Kyivan Rus', followed by Galicia-Volhynia and, finally, by Cossackdom, which also played an important role as a nation-building historical myth in Galicia. The most important element of those perhaps still missing here—the national poet Taras Ševčenko—was then supplied by gymnasium textbooks compiled approximately at the same time.

Textbook passages such as the following, which concludes with a mention of such “Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) memorial sites as graves and ruins, undoubtedly made a fundamental contribution to the awakening and strengthening of “Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) national consciousness:

Русь

Земля, на котóрой Богъ посадивъ вѣдь вѣковъ рускій народъ, се гарáздъ велика и простора краина; простиáе ся она вѣдь Вислоки рѣки – ажъ по рѣку Донъ, а вѣдь Припети и серѣднёго Днѣпра – ажъ по-за Карпáты и по Чорне Море. Въ наибѣльшой своѣй довжинѣ, вѣдь востока на западъ, мае она до 300 географическихъ миль, а наибѣльша ширина еѣ, съ пѣвночи на полудне, выно́ситъ до 140 миль географическихъ [...] бо знáти намъ трѣба, що Русины зъ-дávна ужѣ роздѣлені помѣжъ двѣ держáвы тотіу російску и австрійску. [...] Слѣвомъ однимъ: Русь на́ша – се краина мѣдомъ та молокомъ плаву́ча. – Рѣки та мѣста и горы: [...] Мѣста надъ Днѣстромъ: Гáличь – коли́сь-то столиця гáлицко-ру́ськихъ князѣвъ, сла́вна зъ багáцтвъ своі́хъ, хорѣшими церква́ми и оборо́ннымъ за́мкомъ, якъ и розлѣгою торго́влею и свободо́ю мѣщáньскои жи́зни. [...] Днѣпро-Славути́ця, ѳсерѣдокъ и колы́бель наро́дного и политичного житя́ Русинѣвъ. Серѣдне течѣне Днѣпра, зъ богáтыми своі́ми доплыва́ми, обды́мае краіну, котѣра по ны́нѣшній день Украіною зо́ве ся. Тутъ завязáла-сь и розвивáла ся коза́чина. [...] Мѣста надъ Днѣпромъ: Ки́ївъ, голова́ и се́рце Ру́си, столиця Вели́кихъ князѣвъ. – Коли́ Ки́ївъ залѣженный, обѣ́ томъ не звѣсно. Закла́дины ёго́ сягають, бу́ти мо́же, ажъ до тыхъ часѣвъ, коли́ Гре́ки надъ Чорнымъ морѣмъ торго́вали, та горѣ́ рѣ́ками въ глубинѣ́ Ски́товъ (себѣ́ то давнѣйшихъ Славя́нъ) [...] вернѣ́мъ бо ся 1000 ро́ковъ назáдъ, коли́ Ру́рикъ прибѣвъ на Русь, то ви́димо, що Ки́ївъ вже тоді́ бувъ мѣстомъ торго́вельнымъ, багáтымъ и вели́кимъ [...] Разѣ́мъ съ приня́темъ вѣры спровáдивъ Володи́миръ Вели́кій съ Царѣ́города тако́жъ будѣвни́чихъ, рѣ́збярѣ́въ, малярѣ́въ, золѣ́тниковъ и вся́кого ро́да ремѣ́сниковъ. [...] мѣ́сто, на горѣ́ надъ вели́чавымъ Днѣпромъ поста́влено, сия́ло зъ далѣ́ка, ненáчебы вто́рый Царѣ́городъ. [...]

Rus'

The land on which God settled the Ruthenian people from ages past is quite a large and expansive territory; it extends from the river Wisłoka all the way to the river Don, and from the Prypiat and middle Dniro beyond the Carpathian Mountains to the Black Sea. At its lengthiest, from east to west, it measures 300 geographic miles, and its greatest breadth from north to south constitutes up to 140 geographic miles...for after all, we should know that the Ruthenians have long been divided between these two states, the Russian and the

Austrian.... In a word, our Rus' is a land in which milk and honey flow. Rivers and towns and mountains:... Towns on the Dnister: Halych, once the capital of the Galician Ruthenian Princes, was well-known for its riches, for its fine churches and its defensive fortress, as well as for its extensive commerce and civic freedom.... The Dnipro-Slavutytsia is the center and cradle of the national and political life of the Ruthenians. The middle reaches of the Dnipro, with its rich tributaries, comprise a land that is still known as Ukraine to the present day. Here, Cossackdom emerged and developed.... Towns on the Dnipro: Kyiv, the head and heart of Rus', the capital of the grand princes. It is not known when Kyiv was founded. Its origins perhaps extend to the times when the Greeks were trading on the Black Sea and upstream to the heartlands of the Scythians (that is, the ancient Slavs)...let us go back a thousand years, when Rjuryk came to Rus', and we shall see that Kyiv was then already a rich and great trading center.... Together with the adoption of the [Christian] faith, Volodymyr the Great also brought architects, sculptors, painters, goldsmiths, and craftsmen of all kinds from Constantinople. ...the town erected above the mighty Dnipro shone from far away, as if it were a second Constantinople....

From a linguistic point of view, the language of this interesting and emotional reading passage is no less vernacular-based than the rest of the textbook.

The same applies to the reading passages in the section titled "Історія Рýси" (History of Rus') (Č 4 1872: 302–324), which basically presents a history of Ukraine while clearly distancing Rus' from Russia. Kyivan Rus' is here essentially depicted as a Ukrainian state, and it is also emphasized that the "federation" of Rus' featured democratic elements, most notably the *vičє* (*вѣче*) assemblies. Because of them, "Rus'" is said to have been diametrically opposed to the Russian Tsardom (*цáрство російське*), which, in complete conformity to widespread stereotypes, is characterized as despotic. The later Great Russian territories of the high Middle Ages are basically described as a Rus' colony "beyond the forests" (*Залѣсьє*). In that region, the Russian people allegedly emerged as a consequence of intermingling with the indigenous Finnish peoples ("*помѣжь чужими народами чухоньскими*"),⁴⁵ which led to the development of differences between the inhabitants of Northern and Southern Rus'. Allegedly, Jurij Dolgorukij (*Юрій Довгорукій*) was the founder of Northern Rus', which then developed into the Russian or Muscovite Tsardom ("*котóra нынѣ цáрствомъ Російскимъ (Московскимъ) зовѣся*"), quite independently of Southwestern Rus'.⁴⁶ The whole account depicts "Southern Rus'" as the center and Northern or Muscovite Rus' as the periphery. In contrast to the view of history predominant in Russia, it is emphasized that, to express it anachronistically, Russia parted with Ukraine, and not the other way around. The text then goes on to speak of the "Galician Ruthenian state" ("*Галицко-ру́ска держа́ва*") (not "Grand Principality" or "Kingdom"), although it mentions that this state developed approximately at

45 On the substantive, see Vasmer 1986–1987: s.v. *чухна́*. The word appears in the old North Russian chronicles and is regarded as a derisive nickname for the Finnish peoples. Augmented by the expressive suffix, it was derived from the old Russian term for the Finnish *чудь*.

46 Cf. very similar explanations in Nakonečnyj 2001: 71–81, with an indication of historical sources in which this toponym was used.

the same time as the Grand Principality of Suzdal or (later) Moscow (“князѣство Суздальске (Московске)”). The times of Jaroslav Osmomysl are depicted as the most prosperous for “our Galician Rus” (“часы, найщасливѣйшій для нашої Галицкої Русі”), showing yet again that it is incorrect to assume that Kyivan Rus’ was not part of the integral historical myth of the Galician populists.⁴⁷

The text on the history of “Rus” is rather abruptly interrupted by the demise of the Galician-Volhynian state and then continues with some sections about the Cossacks. Nothing more is said about the period of foreign rule by Poland. The last sentence of the reading passage contains only the laconic mention that afterwards, “our Galician Rus’, in which we are living” (“Галицка наша Русь, де мы живемо”), came under Polish and then Austrian rule. In the original, this key text continues as follows:

Русинѹ упѣршѹ не тої булі вѣры, що нинѣ, се-бѣ-то християнської, але булі поганцями [...] Великій Володимѣрь [...] охрестивъ такожъ и цѣлѹ Русь. [...] Молодѹ князѣ, а іменно синѹ помѣршого Великого князѣ не радо терпѣли, що по вѣтцѹ наступивъ на великокняжій престолѣ якийсь тамъ далѣкій кровнѣякъ. [...] До сыхъ же борѣбъ приходили ещѣ и инші [...] А трѣба намъ ещѣ знати, що Русь стародавна не була такъ упрѣвляна, якъ нинѣшнє царѣство російске, де всѣ области пѣдвѣаднѹ суть однимъ установамъ, одному панови, котѣрый держить надъ всѣми землями и пѣдданѣными одну найвысшу нѣчимъ не обмежену власть. [...] Вѣ мѣстахъ сходили ся бояре та горожанѣ (мѣщанѣ) на раду (вѣчѣ) [...] Вѣ кождѣмъ такѣмъ мѣстѣ бувъ звѣнъ вѣчевѣй [...] На вѣчахъ представляла ся воля народа. [...] Звали ся тогѣ поселѣня залѣскими, бо роздѣляли ихъ водѣ Руси старѣи лѣсы превеликіѹ. Вѣ часѣ тому, якъ Русь полуднѣва дѣлила ся и колотила ся (аж до XII. столѣтя), заселила ся новѣ Русь на пѣвночи помѣжъ чужими народами чухѣнскими, а далѣше и завели помѣжъ ними порядки свої. Заложителемъ пѣвночної Руси, котѣра нинѣ царѣствомъ Російскимъ (Московскимъ) зовѣ ся, бувъ Юрѣй Довгѣрукѣй (вѣ половинѣ XII. столѣтя). Але приберѣючи до себѣ народѣ зѣвсѣмъ чужѣ, мѣсли и рускіѹ лѣде де-що и водѣ нихъ приняти, и стали чѣрезъ примѣшку тѹю иншими, якъ Русинѣ на Руси полуднѣвой... На залѣской Руси постѣли мѣста, якъ Суздаль, Москва и инші; вѣ нихъ вѣтворило ся инше житѣ, а жителѣ тої Руси и не оглядали ся болѣше на Русь полуднѣву... Сѣ того часу стала окрѣме жити и поводити ся Русь пѣвночна або московска; а своїмъ давнымъ ладѣмъ ишла заодно и поводи́ла ся Русь полуднѣва. [...] Майже пѣдъ той самѣ часѣ, коли князѣство Суздальске (Московске) засновало ся, на полуднѣвой Руси вѣробила ся такожъ новѣ, окремѣшна – Галицко-руска держѣва; а здѣяло ся се слѣдѹющимъ знову пѣбытомъ. [...] Ярославъ, названий за-дѣла мѣдрѣсти своѣи Осмомыслѣ [...] Суть то часы, найщасливѣйшій для нашої Галицкої Русі [...] [last sentence:] Галицка наша Русь, де мы живемо, прийшла упѣршѹ пѣдъ панѣванѣ Польщи, а по пѣдѣлѣ еѣ (р. 1772) пѣдъ владѣнѣ Австрѣи – саме тодѣ, коли у нѣї панували Мѣрія Терѣса и Іосифъ II., о котѣромъ то послѣднѣмъ поговѣримо тепѣрь болѣше (С 4 1872: 302–324).

47 Cf., for instance, Wendland 2001: 131–133.

Originally the Ruthenians were not of the same faith as today, that is, of the Christian faith, but were pagans.... Volodymyr the Great also baptized Rus' as a whole.... The young princes, namely the sons of the grand prince, were not about to tolerate the ascension of some distant relative to the throne of the grand prince after their father.... Even more conflicts followed these.... We should also be aware that ancient Rus' was not governed like the Russian Tsardom of today, where all regions are subject to the same institutions and the same overlord, who holds undivided, supreme, and completely unlimited power over all lands and subjects.... In the towns, the boyars and burghers ("miščane") convened for councils ("vič").... In every such town, there was a council bell.... At the councils, the will of the people was represented.... These settlements were called "zalis'ki" because huge forests separated them from old Rus'. In that period, when southern Rus' disintegrated and was in turmoil (until the twelfth century), the new Rus' settled in the north among alien Finnish peoples and subsequently introduced their way of life among them. The founder of northern Rus', which is now known as the Russian (Muscovite) Tsardom, was Jurij Dolgorukij (in the mid-twelfth century). But as the Ruthenian people attracted completely alien peoples to themselves, they too had to adopt something from them and, owing to this admixture, they became different from the Ruthenians in southern Rus'.... In the "Rus' beyond the forests," towns such as Suzdal, Moscow, and others arose; a different way of life emerged there, and the people of that Rus' no longer paid any heed to southern Rus'.... From that time on, northern or Muscovite Rus' began to live and act differently, while southern Rus' held to its old order.... Almost at the same time as the Suzdal (Moscow) Principality was founded, in southern Rus' a new, separate Galician Ruthenian state emerged in southern Rus', and this happened in the following way.... Owing to his wisdom, Jaroslav was called "Osmomysl" ["the one of eight minds"].... These were the most fortunate times for our Galician Rus'.... [last sentence:] Our Galician Rus', where we live, first came under the rule of Poland, and after its partition (1772), under that of Austria, at the very time when Maria Theresa and Joseph II were ruling there; of the latter, we shall now say more.

While these passages, too, are written in decidedly vernacular-based Ukrainian, they also contain some isolated archaisms, Russianisms, and Church Slavonicisms: *послѣднѣмъ* (locative singular masculine), the Church Slavonic loan *престѡль* (which also entered the Ukrainian Standard language), and *іменно*,⁴⁸ which occurs in the passage along with *саме*, and *вѣројатно* (Č 4 1872: 352).⁴⁹ One notes Church Slavonic and Russian *области* (nominative plural), which was also integrated into Modern Standard Ukrainian, *власть*,⁵⁰ and *владѣне*.⁵¹ As for the

48 However, this word was also still used by Ivan Franko and is to be found in the works of Pantelejmon Kuliš and others.

49 As expected, this word is not to be found in either of the dictionaries used, but Želexivs'kyj 1886 does indeed have an entry for *віројатний* with the meaning "glaublich" ("credible").

50 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 note s.v. *власть*: "→ *влада*" and gives the meaning "Befugnis" ("authority/competence"). URS 1953–1963 classifies the term *власть* as "редк[оупотребляемое]" ("rare").

51 Neither of the dictionaries used codifies *владіння*, nor is a corresponding form to be found in Želexivs'kyj 1886.

adjectivized present participle *слѣдуючимъ* (instrumental singular masculine),⁵² the phonetic Ruthenianization of the suffix and the non-Russian stress are noteworthy.

The aforementioned section about Joseph II is followed by two quite comprehensive reading passages about the Cossacks and Petro Konaševyč-Sahajdačnyj. The Cossacks are emphatically characterized as “one community, one large brotherhood” (“завязовали-сь у одну громаду, въ брѣцтво одно велике”) of “the bravest people” (“люде вѣдвѣжнѣиши”), and the textbook employs the native Galician Konaševyč-Sahajdačnyj as a bridge between the Cossacks and the Galician Ruthenians. In the final reading passages, pupils learn about “Ancient Lviv” (“Стародавний Львів”) (Č 4 1872: 348–358), “Demolished Lviv Churches” (“Знесѣнъ львівскѣ церкви”) (Č 4 1872: 358–360), and “Ruthenian Churches Existing in Lviv to Date” (“Рускѣ церкви існуючі нинѣ у Львовѣ”) (Č 4 1872: 361–364). The author makes insistent use of these monuments to emphasize the originally Ukrainian character of the city of Lviv.

Ostap Levyc'kyj's textbook demonstrates that the schools played at least as great a role as the press in Ruthenian nation-building, not only in the struggle over the language of instruction but also in content.⁵³

To sum up, the language of Levyc'kyj's textbook is very close to Modern Standard Ukrainian, although it still contains some isolated Russian and Church Slavonic elements from which Ukrainian language planners would later distance themselves.⁵⁴ What is especially striking is the endeavor to avoid some generic Galician forms on the grammatical level. Levyc'kyj uses no personal endings in the first and second persons of the preterite and conditional. The reflexive particle is not movable in his work but always occurs after the verb. Enclitic forms of personal pronouns of the type *зо, му* and others are not to be found in his work. As was already the case in the textbooks of 1871 and 1872 for the second and third grades of primary school, the third person in verb conjugations ends exclusively in soft *-ть* in the corresponding forms. Epenthetic *l* is now also to be encountered in forms of the *становлять* type. The textbook consistently uses *все*, never the form *всѣ* that is widespread in Galician dialects. In Levyc'kyj's textbook, soft-stemmed neuters regularly end in *-[i]* in the locative singular, not in *-[u]*, as in many Galician textbooks, cf. *въ сѣрци*. Furthermore, Levyc'kyj predominantly uses the genuine dative ending *-ому* in the locative masculine and neuter singular, which is practically nonexistent in earlier Galician Ukrainian texts. Especially in his reading passages, he frequently uses several generic vernacular words that are rarely to be seen in Galician Ukrainian written texts before the period of the Prosvita Society, such as the function words *ба, саме, мійже, чейже, неначе, такий* (with this stress) or *сѣбто* (in various spellings). A certain weakness of the fourth-grade textbook is the inconsistency of some forms, especially with regard to spelling.

52 S.v. *слѣдуючий*, which thus shows the root stress that coincides with Russian, Kuzelja–Rudnyč'kyj 1943/1987 note: “veralt[et]” (archaic). URS 1952–1963, which also shows the root stress, classifies the word as “паз[оворное]” (“coll[oquial]”).

53 On the role of the press, see Sereda 2001.

54 For further information on this, see Moser 2007: 206–207.

3. The significance of primary school textbooks

Our comparison of the textbooks of 1871 and 1872 with their predecessors (some of which had gone to press only two years earlier) shows how decidedly their language had come to approximate the vernacular in the early 1870s.⁵⁵ The commission appointed in 1869 by the Galician *Landesschulrat* had indeed managed to “break ground for the free development of the living Ruthenian language on a vernacular basis” (cited in Burger 1995: 61). If the textbooks of 1871 and 1872 still featured certain conservative elements, this was often due to remnants of the earlier model texts. Not surprisingly, then, one of the linguistically most successful reading passages in the third-grade textbook turns out to be “Таличина,” which did not appear in Bohdan Didyc'kyj's edition, and Ostap Levyc'kyj's original work may be considered the best of the four textbooks of 1871–72.

A number of Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms that did not enter Modern Standard Ukrainian are to be encountered in the works of central and eastern Ukrainian authors whose works are cited in these Galician textbooks. This applies particularly to the writings of Pantelejmon Kuliš, who turned out to be an extraordinarily important contact for the Galician populists (Ševel'ov 1991: 39: cf. also pp. 305–336 in this volume) in just this period of the late 1860s and early 1870s.

Some of the Church Slavonicisms encountered in the Galician textbooks, particularly in the one compiled by Ostap Levyc'kyj, are regarded even now as integral elements of the vocabulary of Modern Standard Ukrainian, for example, *сѣвѣсти* (locative singular), *союзъ*, *престѣль*, *поблагословѣвъ* (preterite singular masculine) or *области* (nominative plural), while others, such as *власть* or *завидовали* (standardized as *завидували*), are commonly encountered in everyday use. Other striking elements in Levyc'kyj's textbook are the partly Ruthenianized *могѹщество*, derived from East Slavic-Church Slavonic *могѹщество*, *вѣдѣ востѣка на западѣ* alongside *съ пѣвночи на полѹдне*, and *независѣмыми* (instrumental plural).

It is interesting to note that the higher the school grade, the more the textbooks discussed here gravitate toward the Ukrainian vernacular. Those who moved on from the textbooks and wished to perfect their Ukrainian could do so with the aid of anthologies for gymnasium students compiled by the leading populists Omeljan Partyc'kyj and Oleksander Barvins'kyj. These were printed in 1871–72, that is, concurrently with the textbooks analyzed here. Since a two-volume edition of Taras Ševčenko's poems had appeared (Romaniv 1997: 92) in 1867–69 at the initiative of Oleksander Barvins'kyj, the trend toward a vernacular-based written language was clearly spreading beyond the sphere of textbooks; moreover, it was becoming apparent that Galicians would increasingly orient themselves on the literary practice of Russian-ruled Ukraine, above all on the language of Taras Ševčenko and Pantelejmon Kuliš. That tendency is also manifest in the textbooks for the four primary school grades, becoming more pronounced in materials for the higher grades.

55 On this section, see the more detailed chapter “Synchronische Zusammenschau” in Moser 2007: 217–242.

Incidentally, it was of no practical importance for language development whether the reading passages were printed in ornate Cyrillic or in civil script. To this day, the civil script as a retarding factor is often greatly overemphasized in Ukrainian studies, partly because leading nineteenth-century Galician populists themselves regarded the “phonetic” orthography as a particularly important symbol of their dedication to the establishment of a vernacular-based written language. This should come as no surprise: as late as the nineteenth century, a typeface as archaic as that of *Fraktur* could serve perfectly well to render the German language, and, *mutatis mutandis*, the same applies to ornate Cyrillic. Our study also shows yet again that the choice of the “Maksymovyčivka,” the etymological orthography, need not imply the abandonment of the vernacular, as is so frequently suggested in Ukrainian studies. Although it is true that the phonetic orthography, either the “Kulišivka” or the “Želexivka” (which was only established in the 1880s), signals that a text printed in that orthography is deliberately Ukrainian in character, the reverse does not apply. The most important advantage of the so-called phonetic orthography appears to have been that it made alphabetization easier. Its greatest disadvantage was its break with tradition, as conservatives justly observed back in the nineteenth century. But the etymological orthography was by no means a serious obstacle to the establishment of a written language on a vernacular basis: if a non-phonetic orthography were indeed such an impediment to writing a language, then how could vernacular-based English possibly be conveyed in that orthography? By the same token, wholly vernacular-based Ukrainian can certainly be written in etymological orthography.

Although generic Galician elements on the level of grammar were increasingly avoided in the textbooks under discussion—this applies most particularly to Ostap Levyč'kyj's fourth-grade textbook—it remains true that they all essentially still adhered to Galician traditions, especially on the lexical level. This is all the less surprising as the editors of the textbooks knew a number of Taras Ševčenko's poems, some works of Pantelejmon Kuliš, and perhaps Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida*. They may have been inspired and linguistically influenced by these works, but in general, partly because of the Valuev Circular of 1863, Ukrainian written culture in Russian-ruled Ukraine provided almost no models for texts dealing with the more advanced subjects to be covered in the textbooks. Consequently, Galician Ukrainians of the early 1870s could hardly infer from Ukrainian literary works appearing in the Russian Empire what forms of language were best suited to the composition of a geographic or economic sketch of a given region or a discussion of historical relations. The primers of Pantelejmon Kuliš and Taras Ševčenko came nowhere close to the level of the textbooks discussed here.⁵⁶ Aside from that, the abstract vocabulary employed by Ukrainians in the Russian Empire was replete with Russianisms, from which the Galician populists in particular wanted to distance themselves as clearly as possible, beginning in the 1860s, because of the competing Russophile movement.

56 See, for instance, excerpts from both primers in Istorija 2004: 68–72; 73–81.

Perhaps the most important achievement of these primary school textbooks—and here again, it is Ostap Levyc'kyj's textbook that stands out—is that they conveyed very vividly and convincingly to pupils who perhaps would never go on to read the works of Ivan Verxrats'kyj or the magnificent *Annals of the Ševčenko Scientific Society* (Записки Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка) that topics far removed from everyday discourse could be expressed and discussed in an extraordinarily attractive vernacular-based form of the Ukrainian language. Although the forms of language presented in the four textbooks were not entirely homogeneous, the variants that they conveyed nevertheless paved the way for the development of a better codified, increasingly polyfunctional, and stylistically differentiated Ukrainian written language in its Galician variant, whose potential for supra-regional coordination served increasingly to incorporate the extra-Galician Ukrainian-speaking regions.

THE LINGUISTIC LEGACY OF THE GALICIAN RUSSOPHILES (BASED ON THE WORKS OF IVAN NAUMOVYČ)

1. Beyond the canon

Like other philological disciplines, Ukrainian studies suffers from the circumstance that at one time a certain canon was established—and hastily to boot—beyond which few scholars venture, even though in some places the foundation of this canon is quite brittle. The consequences of this are felt, perhaps, even more in Ukrainian historical linguistics than in many other related disciplines. Jurij Ševel'ov (George Shevelov), to whom this article is dedicated, was the discoverer of new branches of knowledge in Slavic philology and in Ukrainian studies in particular. He himself has become the canon.

When one speaks of the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia, the first book that springs to mind is Ševel'ov's *Galicia's Contribution to the Formation of the Ukrainian Literary Language* (Ševel'ov 2003, 1966). In keeping with his intention, in this work the author devoted less attention to the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia per se than to Galician influences on the development of the Ukrainian literary language. This may explain why there are still significant lacunae in research on Galicia's linguistic history. Since the Ukrainian studies canon traditionally ignores "less important" figures, who are even stigmatized (for some reason), these lacunae unquestionably include the linguistic legacy of the Galician Russophiles.¹ Although it stands to reason that Ukrainian philologists at

1 In the original Ukrainian-language version of this article, I deliberately use the term "москвофілізм" ("Muscophilism"). I disagree with Paul Robert Magocsi, who has a very negative attitude to this term and even goes so far as to say that there is no place for it in scholarship (see Magocsi 2002: 103–4 and elsewhere). First of all, Magocsi's view notwithstanding, the term "Muscophilism" does not imply any disrespect; neither does its formative word, *Moskva* (Muscovy). Even the word *moskal'* (Muscovite), which today has acquired a pejorative meaning, was a completely neutral word until the early twentieth century. Second, the surrogate "rusofil'stvo" (Pol. *rusofilstwo*; Russ. *rusofil'stvo*), a word that exists in Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian, does not strike me as a very successful term, since the people who considered themselves "Rusyns" (Ruthenians) were all those who were concerned about their national self-identity, and for the most part those same Rusyns had a receptive attitude to the concept of *Rus'*, regardless of their stance toward Russia or the Russian language. Third, the Ukrainian word *moskvofil'stvo* (Muscophilism) does not necessarily imply (as Magocsi suggests) that the representatives of this movement supported the idea of political annexation to Russia; it simply denoted a friendly attitude to Russia and a certain orientation toward that country. Where the linguistic question is concerned, this issue is very straightforward: Muscophiles were those who championed the Russian language as the literary language of all Eastern Slavs. The "old Rusyns" (*starorusyny*), however, were not fighting for the introduction of the Russian language but for the preservation of Church Slavonic traditions. Fourth, "Muscophilism" in this interpretation did not emerge in the 1890s, as Magocsi claims, but shortly after the Revolution of 1848, when many of the old Rusyns (and not only they but considerable numbers of people who favored the development of a literary language on the basis of the language of the people) adopted "Muscophile" positions. The "Muscophiles" frequently resorted to so-called *jazyčije*—which at times was the "Ruthenian-Russian" language (*Russoruthenisch*)—simply because the Austrian censorship objected to their using the Russian language (see Moser 2011: 602–26, 641–66). Thus it is highly likely that "the enemies of the old Rusyns, whether Poles or populists/Ukrainophiles" (Magocsi 2002: 110) did not "accuse them of being Russophiles or Muscophiles" without good reason (*ibid.*). Fifth, the Muscophiles' official language use and official declarations should not always be accepted at face value: as their personal correspondence reveals,

the turn of the nineteenth century were not yet capable of researching the work of their Russophile opponents in an unbiased and comprehensive fashion, the time has now come to formulate a more lucid approach to the development of their so-called *jazyčije* and to the history of the Russian language in Galicia (Moser 2011: 602–26, 641–66). Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to carry out a fundamental rereading of the Ukrainian-language vernacular writings of the Russophiles, who had clearly grasped that it was crucial to address the Galicians in their native language, not in some foreign tongue.

2. The early years of a Galician Russophile

Beginning in the 1860s, Ivan Naumovyč (1826–1891) was arguably the most popular representative of the Galician Russophiles. Some parts of the most detailed extant biography of Naumovyč, written by his friend, the Russophile Osyp (Josyp) Mončalovs'kyj, are practically hagiographic in character (Mončalovs'kyj 1899).² The first chapters reveal that Naumovyč, like many other Galician “awakeners” during the nineteenth century, was first raised in a Polish-speaking milieu, although his family had preserved certain remnants of their “Rus” past.³

Иванъ Наумовичъ родился 14 (26) января 1826 г. въ селѣ Козловѣ, нынѣшнѣго повѣта Каменки Струмиловой, въ домѣ своего дѣда по матери, Николая Дроздовскаго, пароха въ Козловѣ и декана Бужскаго. Отецъ ... Григорій, былъ учителемъ въ Бужску ... Первоначальное образование получилъ И. Наумовичъ въ школѣ, подъ руководствомъ своего отца. ... Тогда каждый, кто перемѣнилъ сердакъ или селянскую опанчу на мѣщанскій кафтанъ, или на сурдуть, уже стыдался русскаго слова и русскаго рода. Такъ было и въ домѣ учителя Григорія Наумовича, который даже читати не умѣлъ по русски. По той причинѣ въ дитинныхъ лѣтахъ Иванъ Наумовичъ не зналъ ни слова по русски. ... Маючи пять лѣтъ, онъ служилъ въ латинскѣмъ костелѣ до “мши,” хотя не зналъ и слова латинскаго. Помимо того изъ дома родичей И. Наумовича все таки не совсѣмъ исчезъ русскій духъ, ибо его поддерживала принадлежность домовникѣвъ до русской церкви. Именно родичи И. Наумовича съ дѣтьми ходили въ русскіи праздники въ церковь, а въ каждый праздникъ Господскій, Богородиченъ и св. Николая, мати И. Наумовича, Марія, ставила передъ отповѣднымъ образомъ свѣчку или лампадку, а отецъ читалъ русскій акафистъ изъ книжечки, писанной польскими буквами (ibid., 5–6).

their inclination toward the Russian language was much stronger than printed sources indicate (Moser 2011: 602–26; see also the letters of Ivan Naumovyč cited in this article). In this English translation, I will use the widely accepted terms “Russophiles,” “Russophilism,” etc.

- 2 This biography is written in the bizarre language of a passionate Muscophile of the late nineteenth century who was, in fact, Naumovyč's successor. Nina Pašaeва's Internet publication (Pašaeва, I. G. *Naumovič kak obščestvennyj, političeskij i religioznyj dejatel' Galičiny vtoroj poloviny XIX veka* (<http://www.ukrstor.com/ukrstor/paszaewanaumovicz.html>) is actually an abbreviated version of Mončalovs'kyj's book, the only difference being Pašaeва's addition of some (nonessential) archival materials.
- 3 In addition to Anna Veronika Wendland's monograph *Die Russophilen in Galizien: ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Russland, 1848–1915* (Wendland 2001), the life and views of Ivan Naumovyč are discussed sporadically in Ostap Sereda's unpublished dissertation (Sereda 2003).

Ivan Naumovič (Naumovyč) was born on 14 (26) January 1826 in the village of Kozliv in today's county of Kamianka-Strumylivska, in the home of his maternal grandfather Nikolaj Drozdovskij [Mykola Drozdovs'kyj], the parish priest in Kozliv and dean of Buzke. His father...Grigorij [Hryhorij] was a teacher in Buzke.... I. Naumovyč received his primary education in school, under the tutorship of his father.... At the time, anyone who exchanged his *serdak* [peasant wool coat] or *opancha* [peasant wool overcoat] for a burgher's caftan or coat would be ashamed of the Russian word and Russian background. That was also the case in the home of the teacher Grigori Naumovyč, who could not even read Russian. For that reason, in childhood Ivan Naumovyč did not know a word of Russian.... When he was five years old, he served Mass [as an altar boy] in a Latin [Roman Catholic] church, even though he did not know a word of Latin. Despite that, the Russian spirit had not disappeared completely from I. Naumovyč's parental home because it was sustained by the connection of the inhabitants of the house to the Russian church. It was in fact the parents of I. Naumovyč who went to church with their children on Russian feast days, and on every feast day of the Lord, the Mother of God, and St. Nicholas, I. Naumovyč's mother, Maria, placed a candle or an icon-lamp in front of the appropriate image, and his father read a Russian acathist from a little book written in Polish letters.

After obtaining financial assistance from a Polish countess, the young man was eventually able to study at a gymnasium in Lviv. When he was forced to repeat a year, he did not dare to ask for more funds. To make ends meet, he tutored the son of a wealthy Lviv Jew and did physical labor at a mill owned by a German Lutheran. For some time he considered remaining in this job, but his father turned him away from that "sin." Thus, Galicia's multiethnic character was omnipresent in Naumovyč's personal life, as was multilingualism. Mončalovs'kyj records that Naumovyč knew German (although not fluently), and, in the words of his biographer (which are marked by certain anti-Semitic notes), he could imitate a Galician Jew so well that Jews thought he was one of them (*ibid.*, 18).

As mentioned earlier, Polish was the true mother tongue of the future leader of the Russophiles, but his fluency in "Ruthenian" must have been considerable—despite what Mončalovs'kyj writes in his book—because, once Naumovyč discovered his "Ruthenianness," he expressed himself quite well in the written language. Naumovyč also spoke French, which impressed the Polish countess who offered him a stipend during his first years at the gymnasium. It is very likely that Naumovyč did not yet know Russian, and he made his first closer acquaintance with Church Slavonic in 1844, when he enrolled for "philosophical" studies (i.e., the last two years of gymnasium) at the Lviv Theological Seminary. The Polish language reigned throughout this educational institution, where the Polish revolutionary movement was actively promoted. According to Mončalovs'kyj (*ibid.*, 6–10), the seminary students were greatly influenced by Kasper Cięglewicz, the most popular Polish agitator among the "Ruthenians."⁴

4 For information on Cięglewicz, see Moser 2003 and Moser 2011: 562–601.

Naumovyč was captivated by the ideas of the Polish revolutionaries. Initially, he remained staunchly on their side even after witnessing the clash of Polish and "Ruthenian" ideas concerning the political reorganization of Galicia during the Revolution of 1848. But after he was forced to return to his parents' home when the theological seminary was temporarily closed, a key incident took place in his life in the town of Zalizhchyky, which, according to various accounts, transformed him from "Saul into Paul." One fine day Naumovyč headed for the bridge on the Dnister River, where he launched into his latest speech about "Ruthenian-Polish brotherhood." It soon became clear, however, that the "Ruthenian" inhabitants of his native land were not at all receptive to this propaganda, and in one fell swoop he rid himself of his *konfederatka*, the cap traditionally worn by the Polish military, and his Polish convictions as symbolized by this type of headgear:

Мужики стали еще бѣльше насмѣхатись надъ Иваномъ Наумовичемъ, пытали его, зъ-ѣтки ѣнъ возьме войско, бо мужики не пойдутъ за Польщу битись, а съ одними "гвардистами" та ихъ офицерами "Москалеви" не вѣдѣють ничего, а наконецъ одинъ мужикъ сказалъ: "Чи вы, паничу, не русская дитина? Вашъ тато ходить на службу Богу до церкви, щѣ вы за такій Полякъ?" Иванъ Наумовичъ ѣтповѣдалъ мужикамъ, якъ мѣгъ, но одинъ мужикъ приступилъ до него, знялъ зъ его головы польскую рогатывку и сказалъ: "А вы, паничу, возьмѣть ту шапочку и такъ кинѣть ю о землю – и такъ ю здопчѣть, здопчѣть, а ѣттакъ плюнѣть и кинѣть въ Днѣстеръ (все то мужикъ и здѣлалъ); – о такъ, такъ, нехай пропадае Польща!" Мужики зареготались, а синяя конфедератка поплаыла собѣ Днѣстромъ. Иванъ Наумовичъ не зналъ, що робити; но коли одинъ паробокъ, якъ то на селѣ умѣють, заточился на него для зачепки, ѣнъ, боячись, щѣбъ мужики еще и не поколотили, поѣшолъ безъ шапки домѣвъ. Сей случай вызвалъ рѣшительный переворотъ въ мысляхъ Ивана Наумовича (ibid., 12–13).

The peasants began to laugh at Ivan Naumovyč even more; they asked him where he would get an army, for the peasants would not go to fight for Poland, and with 'guardsmen' and their officers alone they could not do anything to the 'Muscovite'; and finally one peasant said: 'Mister, are you not a Russian child? Your dad goes to [a non-Catholic] church for divine liturgy: what kind of Pole are you?' Ivan Naumovyč answered the peasants as best he could, but one peasant approached him, removed the Polish *rogatywka* [peaked cap worn by the Polish military, a distant relative of the *konfederatka*] from his head, and said: 'Young gentleman, take that little cap and throw it on the ground, and then trample it, trample it, and then spit and throw it into the Dnister (the peasant did all that); so, so may Poland perish!' The peasants burst out laughing, and the blue *konfederatka* floated down the Dnister. Ivan Naumovyč did not know what to do, but when a young fellow accosted him in order to provoke him, as villagers know how to do, he, fearing that the peasants might even give him a thrashing, went home without the cap. This incident produced a decisive change in Ivan Naumovyč's thinking.

Soon afterwards, the last remaining vestiges of the Naumovyč family's "Ruthenianness" helped save him from arrest when he managed to recite the entire

Apostles' Creed in Church Slavonic in an attempt to prove his non-involvement in the Polish uprising in Lviv (ibid., 17). After his father's death from cholera during the revolution, Naumovyč finally realized the need to reorient his life.

Soon Naumovyč published his first "Ruthenian-language" works, in particular, *A Verse in Honor of His Excellency the Most Reverend Bishop Mixail Levickij, Metropolitan of Galicia...on Behalf of the Alumni of the General Greek Catholic Seminary of Lviv, Composed in the Year 1848* (Стихъ в честь Его превосходительству Преосвященному куръ Михаилу Левицкому, Метрополитѣ Галицкому ... именемъ питомцѣвъ Семинаріи ген. гр. каѳ. Львовской уложенный 1848 г.) (signed with the initials I. N.; Levyc'kyj 1888: 36) and the play *Hryc' Maznycja*, which immediately entered the Galician Ukrainian theatrical repertoire (Pylypovyč 2004: 119–71) and was even staged in Kyiv in 1850. It is clear that Naumovyč had already become imbued with the spirit of the times that had emerged in Galicia shortly before the revolution, in keeping with a resolution passed by the Congress of Ruthenian Scholars that was held in Lviv in October 1848.

In his "low-style" works Naumovyč used the common spoken language, but he composed his "high-style" works "in the written language, which traces the origins of its development to the distant past and which is mistakenly called pure Russian—in all ways avoiding all those expressions and forms that are exclusively Muscovite in origin" (Studyns'kyj 1905: xv).⁵ In time, Naumovyč drew increasingly closer to the Russian language.

Naumovyč readily collaborated with various Galician periodicals. Among his early works are the *Speech Delivered in the Seminary Church at the Divine Liturgy for the Soul of Rev. O. Gerovs'kyj* (Слово изреченное в церквѣ семинарской при божественномъ богослуженію за дѣшѣ бл. о. М. О. Геровского), published in 1850 in *Zorja Halyc'ka* (Levyc'kyj 1888: 55), and the *Spring Psalm* (Псаломъ веснянный), which also appeared in that periodical in 1851 (Naumovyč 1851). The language of these works is occasionally even more archaic and closer to the Russian literary language (particularly of the eighteenth century) than similar works by other authors:⁶

Ты й мнѣ далъ жизнь – я есмь, чувствую –
Я вижу Тя въ дѣлахъ Твоихъ;
Въ тварехъ Твоихъ ся люблю,
Не понимая ся зъ утѣхъ.
И всегда о безлѣтно Сый!
Мой смыслъ и сердце къ Тебѣ чаеъ,
Я тебе чту; но я слѣпый –
Мой умъ Тебе не понимаеъ (Naumovyč 1851: 207).

5 "[...] въ языкѣ письменномъ, который мае начало своего развитія въ далекой минувшости, а который ошибочно чисто-російскимъ называютъ—всѣяко остерѣгаючи ся всѣхъ оныхъ выраженій и формъ, которыи суть исклѣно московскаго происхожденія [...]."

6 The distance from panegyric works based on the common vernacular language was particularly substantial (see Moser 2006a; Moser 2011: 462–73).

You gave me life—I am, I feel—
 I see You in Your deeds;
 I delight in Your works,
 Not comprehending myself for joy.
 And you, always beyond years!
 My sense and heart aspire to You,
 I worship you, but I am blind—
 My mind does not comprehend You.

At first, this linguistic stance of Naumovyč's was mostly connected with the religious sphere. Later, the "lofty style"—and this would be a language that drew increasingly closer to Russian, with an admixture of either deliberately or unconsciously introduced Galician-Ukrainian interferemes or outright errors—would expand to other domains of intellectual discourse.

With the help of the Old Ruthenian Jakiv Gerovs'kyj, Naumovyč gained the opportunity to complete his studies at the theological seminary despite his former links with Polish revolutionaries. Later, he followed in the footsteps of many other Galician Russophiles. As happened in the life of the Transcarpathian Oleksander Duxnovyč and a number of other figures, Naumovyč's initiation was the "chance to see the tsarist Russian army, which, on the orders of Tsar Nicholas I, was passing through Galicia into Hungary to assist the Austrian army against the Hungarians" (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 17).⁷ After graduating from the seminary in 1851, Naumovyč married and then became a priest. At this time he continued studying Russian, although he never mastered the language. As early as 1856 he sent a letter to Jakiv Holovac'kyj, which was written thus:

Милостивый Государь
 Я записаль изъ Вѣны 340 штукъ книжокъ школьныхъ съ тѣмъ, чтобы
 оныи прислати на Ваши руки; понеже до Львова они имѣють своихъ
 отставчиковъ, а до Перемышлянъ тяжкобы было прямо получить. Извольте
 выручить мя, и сколько нужно будетъ заплатить, я буду съ братомъ моимъ
 не за долго въ Львовѣ, и съ благодареніемъ Вамъ отдамъ. [...] Узнавъ отъ
 Богдана Бѣлоуса, что Ваша родина помножилася одной головой, мило мнѣ
 при сей способности пожелать Вамъ, чтобы Всемогушій Отецъ излилъ на
 ню богатую струю благословенія, изволилъ Вамъ еще вѣнчати чада чадъ.
 Съ тѣмъ остаюсь всегда неизмѣнный.

И. Наумович

Скажите по милости Шеховичу, что я памятствую о моей должности, но
 теперь мои финансы, какъ вѣрнаго подданаго Австрійскаго, стоятъ не
 очень потѣшительно. (Cited in Studyns'kyj 1905: 313–14)

Gracious Sir!

I have ordered 340 schoolbooks to be sent to you from Vienna, as they have
 their own suppliers for Lviv, but it would be difficult to receive [them] directly

7 "[...] случайность увидѣти царско-русское войско, которое, по приказу царя Николая I, переходило черезъ Галичину въ Угорщину на помощь австрійскимъ войскамъ противъ Мадыаръ."

in Peremyshliany. Be so kind as to help me out and pay whatever is required; I will soon be in Lviv with my brother and will reimburse you with gratitude.... Having learned from Bohdan Bilous that your family has been expanded by one person, it is my pleasure on this occasion to extend my wishes to you that Almighty God will pour a rich stream of blessings on it and deign to grant you the chance to marry off the descendants of your descendants. I remain as always,
 I. Naumovyč [sic]
 [P.S.] Kindly tell Šexovyč that I remember my debt, but at this point my finances, as those of a loyal Austrian subject, are not very encouraging.

Much in this letter attests that it was not the Church Slavonic language but Russian that served as the ground of our Russophile's "literary language" (e.g., the infinitive ending *-ть*, the reflexive postfix *-сь*, the adverb *очень*, the connective *какъ*, etc.). Did Naumovyč, in writing this letter, understand that the expression *не за долго*, in the sense of "soon," is most decidedly not Russian but a calque of the Polish *niezadługo*? Was he aware of the bizarre impression that his use of the word *способность* made? That is unlikely, although, on the other hand, the use of the pronominal forms *мя*, (*на*) *ню* might very well have been the result of deliberate choice.

From 1851 to 1853 Naumovyč was the parish priest in Horodok, a town near Lviv. Later, he was assigned to Liashky Korolivski (the present-day village of Zastavne) near Hlyniany (until 1856) and Peremyshliany, where, unfortunately, "there was no priest's residence," for which reason "he settled in the sister church in the village of Korosne" (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 19–20),⁸ where he served Mass only once every three to five weeks. Mončalovs'kyj hints that it was these unfortunate circumstances in the Peremyshliany parish that led Naumovyč to the idea of "cleansing the Rus' [*russkoi*] Church throughout Galicia of all Latin innovations that have become mixed up in it as a result of the clergy's fecklessness and pressure on the part of Roman Catholicism" (ibid., 20).⁹ In any case, it was during this period that Naumovyč founded the so-called "rite movement" (*obriadovshchyna*), to which the Galician Russophiles gravitated in the early 1860s.¹⁰ However, the many articles that Naumovyč published in those days, mostly in the newspaper *Slovo* (Word), are devoted not only to questions of rite but also to the completely secular demands of the national movement of the Galician Ruthenians. In particular, they discussed linguistic rights in the fields of education, the court system, and the state sphere, such as the Galician Diet and the postal service.

8 "[...] не было обиталища для священника [...] поселился при дочерней церкви, въ селѣ Коростнѣ."

9 "[...] очистити въ цѣлой Галичинѣ обрядъ русской церкви ѿтъ всѣхъ латинскихъ новизнъ, якіи въ него примѣшались вслѣдствіе нерадѣнья духовенства и давленья ѿтъ стороны латинства."

10 On *obriadovshchyna* and Naumovyč's role in this movement, see Wendland 2001: 121–31, esp. 121–24.

There is no doubt that during this period Naumovyč provoked a number of processes. The rite movement elicited a reaction from the Vatican: on 8 April 1862 the pope issued his encyclical *Amantissimus humani generis* (On the Care of the Churches), in which he announced that the issue of the rite movement would soon be examined by the supreme bodies of the Roman Catholic Church (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 21, 50). On 8 December 1864 the head of the Catholic Church issued his *Concordia*, which launched a substantial review of the principles of coexistence between the Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic churches in Galicia. Naturally, the members of the rite movement were not pleased by the theses expressed in the *Concordia* (justifiably so, because the Greek Catholic Church's attainment of equal rights was still far in the future). As early as 1883, Naumovyč felt compelled to publish in Russia (although he still lived in Austria) a Russian-language brochure titled *An Appeal to Pope Leo XIII* (Апелляція къ папѣ Льву XIII), in which he discussed the unceasing harm that was being done to the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia.

Thanks expressly to the rite movement, Naumovyč became a real star of the "Ruthenian" populist movement; at the same time, the ranks of his enemies also increased. In 1861 the rural communities of Zolochiv county elected him as their deputy to the first Galician Diet, where he staunchly championed "Ruthenian" national interests. He further demonstrated his skills in practical matters when a fire destroyed the village of Korosne, where his parish was located. Thanks to his efforts, assistance in rebuilding the village arrived rather quickly from both the owner of the village, Count Andrzej Potocki, and Metropolitan Hryhorij Jaxymovyč. In addition, Naumovyč organized a fund-raising campaign in aid of the burned-out villagers at the editorial offices of the leading Galician periodical of the time, the Lviv-based newspaper *Slovo* (ibid., 25). By this time Naumovyč already had a better grasp of the importance of the idea of social solidarity for the popular "Ruthenian" movement than did most of his contemporaries, and his demands concerning public education clearly went beyond the framework of religion. Besides specifying several urgent requirements, namely, "1) Religious-moral novels" and "2) Lives of the Saints," he called for the publication of general educational works of a practical, recreational, and national educational character, particularly in such fields as: "3) Astronomy, geography, history, physics, et al.; 4) Agriculture, market gardening, cattle raising, and beekeeping; 5) Fables, short stories, and songs for children; 6) Belles lettres, novels, poetry, and popular humor; 7) Popular philosophy: parables and proverbs; 8) Biographies of famous Ruthenian men."¹¹

In keeping with this program, Naumovyč himself wrote farming and beekeeping manuals as well as novels and poems intended for children and the "ordinary people" of Galicia. Even according to non-Russophile opinion, he thereby

11 "1. Религійно-моральныи повѣсти [...] 2. Жизнеописанія Святыхъ [...] 3) Астрономія, географія, исторія, физика и пр.; 4) Земледѣліе, огородництво, ското- и пчеловодство; 5) Байки, повѣстки и пѣсни для дѣтей; 6) Белетристика, повѣсти, поэзіи и гумористика народа; 7) Народная философія: притчи и приповѣстки; 8) Біографіи славныхъ русскихъ мужей." Cited in Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 47 (from *Slovo*, 1864, no. 67).

became “one of the most distinguished Galician popular writers” (EU 5 1966: 1716–17; see Hrycak 2006: 397). Naumovyč published a considerable number of these works in the form of individual brochures, but most appeared in various Galician periodicals, particularly in the one he himself founded, *Nauka* (Learning), which appeared from 1871 to 1876 in Kolomyia and in Lviv until 1886 (its publication was revived in the twentieth century).¹²

3. The Russophile credo

In the first decades after the revolution, the “Ruthenian” (руська) consciousness of many Galicians increasingly morphed into “Russian” (русская) consciousness. Without a doubt, political circumstances had a hand in this transformation. Naumovyč was quite concerned by the earliest rumors about the introduction of autonomy in Galicia, as he realized that autonomy would further strengthen the Poles’ dominant position. In the 59th issue of *Slovo* for 1866, this truly popular author formulated the well-known credo of the Galician Russophiles, which was titled “From Lvov. A Look into the Future” (Отъ Львова. Поглядъ въ будущность). The original version of this text is rarely cited, and later publishers even changed the language in some places. It is therefore worthwhile to cite the most important passages of the original text and compare it with Mončalovs'kyj's version (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 59–63, identified as “M” in the passages cited below) (here I omit all discussion of punctuation and spacing, which differ significantly in the two versions). The changes correspond to the general linguistic orientation of the Russophiles.

In his article “A Look into the Future,” Naumovyč claims that since time immemorial the so-called “Rus” (руссѣи) in Galicia were in fact “Russians” (русскими), not “Ruthenians” (русинами). If they called themselves by that (latter) name, then it was for one reason only: it was impossible to speak the truth to the Austrian government:

[...] Въ 1848 роцѣ вопрошали насъ, що мы [М: кто вы]? Мы сказали, що мы всемирнѣйшій Ruthenen. (Господи! если бы праотцы наши узнали, що мы сами прозвали себе тымъ [М.: тѣмъ] именемъ, якимъ окрестили нас во время гоненія наши наילותѣйшій вороги, они въ гробахъ зашевелилибъ ся. [М: зашевелились бы]) [...] – А може вы русскіи? допрошалъ насъ Стадіонъ. Мы кляли душу-тѣло, що мы не русскіи, не Russen, но що мы таки собѣ Ruthenen, що границя наша на Збручѣ, що мы отвращаемся [М: отвертаемся] отъ [М: отъ] такъ званныхъ [М: званныхъ] Russen, яко отъ [М: отъ] окаянныхъ шизматикѣвъ, съ которыми ничего вполѣного имѣти [М: мати] не хочемъ. Якое ваше письмо? допрашали насъ далѣй [М: далѣ]. Мы сказали, що письмо наше тое [М: то], що въ церковныхъ

12 The entry in EU 5 (1966), p. 1710 states briefly that *Nauka* “was published in the common language and helped spark interest in political and economic affairs in rural areas; starting in the 1880s, it switched to ‘jazyčie.’” In his study of the distinguished western Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko, Jaroslav Hrycak notes that the newspaper's circulation (between 1,000 and 1,500 copies) was more or less equal to that of *Vistnyk* (Herald) and *Slovo*, as well as the first publications of the Kachkovs'kyj and Prosvita societies (Hrycak 2006: 397).

книгахъ, и знову [М: *знова*] кляли душу-тѣло отъ [М: *ѡтъ*] гражданки, що то serbisch-russische [М: *serbisch-russische* [sic]] Zivilschrift [М adds the following comment in parentheses: *сербско-россійское гражданское письмо*], которой [М: *которого*] мы отрицаемся, яко чужой [М: *чужого*]. Такъ вовсе удивляти не можеть [М: *не може удивляти*] никого, если намъ Рутенамъ не позволено въ певномъ времени [М: *не позволили въ извѣстное время*] употреблять ни выражений русскихъ ни гражданки русской, ни русской скорописи, но допущено [М: *допустили*] лишь то, щобы намъ яко Рутенамъ свободно было подання до урядовъ и судовъ [М: *-ѡвъ* twice] писати-друковати церковною кирилицею, а языкомъ такимъ, якимъ бесѣдується [М: *бесѣдується*] по окрестныхъ того уряда [М: *last three words omitted*] торгахъ и корчмахъ. И для чоґожь [М: *last two words omitted*] мы не сказали въ 1848 роцѣ, що мы рускїи [М: *Русскїи*], що границею нашею [М: *нашею*] народною ни Збручъ, но дальше Днѣпра? [М: *!*] Бо тоґды настрашили бы ся нась были [М: *настрашились бы нась*], щобы мы, связанны [М: *связанныи*] исторїею тысячелѣтною [М: *тысячелѣтнѣю исторїею*], обрядомъ церковнымъ [sic, М: *церковнымъ*], языкомъ и литературою съ великимъ русскимъ [М: *русскимъ* omitted] народомъ, незабагликоли отъ [М: *ѡтъ*] Австрїи оторватися [М: *оторватися*], и не были бы нась допустили до свободъ конституційныхъ, были бы нась слабенькихъ тоґды придушили, щобысьмо и не дыхнули дыханьемъ русскимъ [...] (Naumovyč 1866: 2).

...In the year 1848 we were asked, who are we? We said that we are the most humble Ruthenians [*Ruthenen*]. (Lord! If our forefathers knew that *we ourselves* used the very name with which our fiercest enemies had christened us during the period of persecution, they would turn over in their graves.)... Perhaps you are Rus' people, Stadion asked us. We swore up and down that we are not Rus' people, not Russians [*Russen*], but that we are Ruthenians, that our border is the Zbruch River, that we turn away from so-called *Russen* as from accursed schismatics with whom we want to have nothing in common. What is your writing like? They asked us then. We said that our writing is the one that is in church books, and again we swore off the *grazhdanka*, declaring that it is the Serbo-Russian *Zivilschrift* [civil script] that we reject as something alien. Thus no one should be surprised that for a certain period we *Ruthenians* were not allowed to use either Russian expressions or the Russian *grazhdanka* or the Russian cursive, but that we, as Ruthenians, were free only to write/print petitions to the government and the courts in Church Slavonic, and in the language that is spoken in the markets and taverns on the outskirts of that administration. And why did we not say in 1848 that we are Russians, that our national border is not the Zbruch River but past the Dnipro River? Because then they would have become frightened of us that we, associated by a thousand-year-old history, church rite, language, and literature with the great Russian people, might someday want to separate from Austria, and they would not have allowed us constitutional freedoms, then they would have crushed us weak ones so that we would not even breathe in Russian....

Afterwards, according to Naumovyč, it was precisely the linguistic factor that demonstrated the completely natural character of the "Russian" approach to "Rus'" issues. In particular, the "Ruthenians" readily used Johann Adam Schmidt's German-Russian dictionary:

Но мало-по-малу [М: мало-помало] рѣчи розъяснились. Ледви [М: *ледва*] одинъ, другій рѣкъ проминулъ, и Русь стала отживати [М: *отживати*], показалось, що ей [М: *ей*] литература безъ словаря Шмидового [М: *Шмида*] не успѣтъ [М: *успѣе*] ни на крокъ, що словарь той русскій [М: *той русскій словарь*] такъ добре русскій для Петербурга якъ и для Львова, що въ немъ есть сокровище языка истинно литературного, письменного, русского. Показалось вскорѣ, що Русскій галицкій [М: *галицкій Русскій*], оглянувшійся [М: *оглянувшись*] въ исторіи, прійшли до того пересвѣдченія [М: *пересвѣдченья*], що имъ не тільки языкъ испортила Польша, но и обрядъ упалъ подъ гнетомъ латинства (ibid.)

But little by little, things became clear. Barely a year or two passed, and Rus' began to revive; it turned out that without Schmidt's dictionary her literature would not progress a single step; that that Russian dictionary is as good a Russian dictionary for St. Petersburg as for Lviv; that it contains the treasury of the truly literary written *Russian* language. Soon it became clear that the Galician Russians, looking back in history, had come to the realization that not only had their language been spoiled by Poland, but the rite, too, had fallen under Latin oppression.

According to Naumovyč, the result was that “we do not have a single fine writer who would believe in the brilliant future of an exclusively Galician-Russian literature.”¹³ He arrives at the following conclusion:

[...] Русь Галицка, Угорска, Кіевска, Московска, Тобольска [in М, -ая appears five times] и пр. подъ [М: *подъ*] взглядомъ етнографическимъ [М: *э-*], историческимъ, лексикальнымъ, литературнымъ, обрядовымъ есть одна и таяже [М: *та-же*] самая Русь, мимо того, що въ Галичинѣ она вѣрно предана своему возлюбленному Монарху и Его свѣтлой династіи, а тамъ за границею она тоже предана своему [М: *своему*] Монарху и своей династіи. [...] Но доки мы Рутенами, ограниченными [М: *ограниченными*] съ языкомъ и литературою нашою на сельскій хаты дванадцати [М: *дванадцати*] окрутовъ [М: *округовъ*] галицкихъ, а не признаючимися до цѣлости русского міра: горе намъ отъ канцлерства польского! (ibid.).

...Galician, Hungarian, Kyivan, Muscovite, Tobolsk Rus' et al., from the ethnographic, historical, lexical, literary, and ritual standpoint, is one and the same Rus', despite the fact that in Galicia it is steadfastly devoted to its beloved Monarch and his illustrious dynasty, and there, across the border, it is also devoted to its Monarch and its dynasty.... But as long as we are Ruthenians, restricted by our language and literature to the village homes of twelve Galician districts, not acknowledged as belonging to the whole the Russian world, woe to us from the Polish chancellorship!

Thus, urges Naumovyč, the time has come “to cross our Rubicon”:

13 “[...] не ма у насъ ни одного изъ лучшихъ литераторѣвъ, который вѣрилъ бы въ блистательную будущность исключной галицко-русской литературы.”

Для того есть мнѣніемъ нашимъ, що время уже переступити нашъ Рубиконъ и сказати откровенно въ слухъ всѣмъ: Не можемъ отдѣлится [М: *отдѣлится*] хиньскимъ [М: *китайскимъ*] муромъ отъ [М: *отъ*] братьей [М: *братѣвъ*] нашихъ и отстояти [М: *отстати*] отъ [М: *отъ*] языковой, литературной, церковной [М: *церковной omitted*] и народной связи со всѣмъ русскимъ міромъ! Мы не Рутены зъ 1848 року, мы настоящіи Русскіи! но якъ всегда были, такъ есьмо и останемъ [М: *останемся*] въ будуще непоколебимо [М: *непоколебимо*] вѣрны нашему августѣйшому [М: *Августѣйшому*] австрійскому Монарху и свѣтлѣйшой династїи [М: *Династїи*] Габсбургѣвъ! Зложивши такое вѣроисповѣданіе, не будемъ потребовати бояться польского канцлерства, не будетъ намъ тое могло закинути [М: *не буде намъ мѣгъ никто закинути*], що языкъ нашъ неспособенъ до высшихъ училищъ, необразованный [М: *необразованный*] до урядованья и пр. [М: *проч.*], бо языкъ нашъ и литература наша русска [М: *-ая*] давно и далеко перестигла польску [М: *-ую*], чого намъ и самы [М: *сами*] Поляки въ соймъ и всюда заперечити не здужають.

Одинъ именемъ многихъ (ibid.).

Therefore it is our view that the time has come to cross the Rubicon and state openly for all to hear: We cannot separate ourselves from our brothers by a Great Wall of China and lag behind the linguistic, literary, ecclesiastical, and national connection with the entire Russian world! We are not the Ruthenians of 1848; we are true Russians! But as we always have been, so we are and shall remain in the future unshakably loyal to our most august Austrian Monarch and his most illustrious Habsburg dynasty! Having made this confession of faith, we will not have to fear the Polish chancellorship; it will not be possible to reproach us that our language is unsuited to higher educational institutions, unfit for administration, etc., for *our* language and *our Russian* literature long ago far outstripped the Polish, which the Poles themselves in the Diet and everywhere will be incapable of denying.

One in the name of many.

In the 83rd issue of *Slovo* (1866), Naumovyč confirmed his Russophile credo by devoting even more attention to the linguistic factor:

А хоть [М 65–66: *хотя*] я Малорусинъ, а тамъ живутъ Великоруссы [М: *Великоруссы*]; хоть [М: *хотя*] у мене выговоръ малорусскій, у нихъ великорусскій: то такой [М: *таки*] и я русскій, и они русскіи, такъ само якъ Мазуры и Великополяне и такъ зовимыи Васерполяки имѣють свои собстенности [М: *особенности*], свой [М: *свѣй*] выговоръ, свою простонародную литературу, но всѣ сходятся въ томъ [М: *тѣмъ*], що всѣ суть Поляками, и всѣ имѣють общую книжную литературу, общій книжный литературный языкъ. [...] (Naumovyč 1866a: 2).

But although I am a Little Ruthenian, and the Great Russians live over there; although my accent is Little Russian, while theirs is Great Russian, I am just as Russian as they are, just as the Masurians and Great Poles and the so-called *Wasserpölen* ["Water Poles": Poles who lost their Polish identity over time] have their own characteristics, their own accents, and their own folk literature but

all agree that all of them are Poles and all have a common bookish literature, a common bookish literary language.

In another, lesser known section, Naumovych introduces a new—albeit not original—argument: he writes that even though under different circumstances it might have been possible to create a “Little Russian bookish language,” it was the Poles who did not allow the Ruthenians such an opportunity. To be sure, Naumovych hints that the phrase “Little Russian bookish language” should nevertheless be understood rather as a Russophile variety of the “Great Russian” language:

Що до образованья нашего малорусского нарѣчія яко языка книжного, заперечи не дасться [М: *заперечитись не дасть*], що народъ, числящій 15 миліонівъ [М: *миліонівъ*] душъ, т. е. вдвое тільки [М: *стільки*], кільки [М: *скільки*] всѣхъ Поляковъ [М: *Поляківъ*] єсть [М: *немає єсть*] на свѣтѣ, могъ бы былъ [М: *бувъ бы мігъ*] виобразовати собѣ при благопріятныхъ обстоятельствахъ питомую, отъ [М: *отъ*] великорусской независимую литературу, котора [М: *которая*], чи колись не сляла бы ся [М: *злилася бы*] конечно съ существующимъ уже книжнымъ русскимъ языкомъ, было бы вопросомъ будущности. Но же [М: *що*] то не сталося, кто тому виненъ, якъ [М: *если*] не самыи Поляки, подѣ [М: *підъ*] которыхъ владѣнемъ [М: *владѣннямъ*] жилъ малорусскій народъ стільки вѣковъ [М: *вѣківъ*], подѣ [М: *підъ*] которыхъ властью (большинства соймового) [М: *(соймового бѣльшинства)*] живе тутъ и нынѣ (ibid.).

As for the formation of our Little Russian dialect as a bookish language, it cannot be denied that a people numbering fifteen million, that is, twice as many as all the Poles in the world, could have formed for themselves, under favorable circumstances, a particular literature independent of the Great Russian literature, which, whether it might ultimately merge with the already existing bookish Russian language, would be a question of the future. But that that did not happen, who is to blame if not the Poles themselves, under whose rule the Little Russian people lived for so many centuries, under whose power (the Diet majority) they are still living here today.

This is followed by typical “Russophile” argumentation: since the “Russian bookish language” was created on a common Rus’ foundation, then either way the “Little Russian bookish language” would ultimately have to merge with it. But, owing to the obstruction of “Little Russian education” on the part of the selfsame Poles, there was seemingly no other solution than the adoption of the “Russian language”:

Великорусы [М: *Великоруссы*] лучше умѣли пользоваться [М: *пользоватись*] обстоятельствами. Они, имѣючи свое питомое, великорусское нарѣчье [М: *нарѣчїє*], взяли до него класическую [М: *класическую*] церковнославянщину [М: *церковно славянщину*] и живущее [М: *живое*] малорусское нарѣчье [М: *нарѣчїє*], и зъ того всего за помощью [М: *помощью*] ученыхъ Велико- Мало- и Бѣло-русовъ [М: *-руссовъ*] образовали общій русскій книжный языкъ, который всѣмъ русскимъ

племенамъ рѣвно [М: *ровно*] приступный, и рѣвно отдаленный [М: *отдаленный*] отъ [М: *отъ*] простонародного нарѣчья [М: *нарѣчя*] велико-якъ и мало- и бѣлорусского [М: *велико-мало-и бѣлорусского*]. Для образованья же малорусчины [М: *малорусчины*] остало [М: *осталось*] было еще одно поле, т. е. Галичина, где по истинѣ благопріятствовало ей не дуже росширенное знаніе книжного русскаго языка, въ Россіи высокообразованного, и выговора великорусскаго. Я самъ былъ изъ числа подвижниковъ [М: *подвижниковъ*] на томъ [М: *тѣмъ*] поли, и думалъ ажъ до уконченія [М: *окончанія*] послѣдней [М: *послѣдней*] сесіи [М: *сессіи*] Галичскаго [М: *галичскаго*] Сойма, що Поляки, братья Словяне [М: *Славяне*], имѣющіи въ соймѣ важный привилей бѣльшости [М: *бѣльшинства*], приложить всякихъ усилій [М: *всякихъ усилія*], щобы поданіемъ [М: *подачею*] нашимъ народнымъ школамъ и другимъ институціямъ братной [М: *братней*] помощи [М: *помочи*], поставили [М: *поставити*] насъ въ возможности [М: *возможность*] образованья нашего малорусскаго нарѣчья [М: *нарѣчя*] независимо отъ [М: *отъ*] великорусчины [М: *великорусчины*]. Голосъ мой при внесеніи посла Лавровскаго касательно марныхъ 3.000 зрс. [М: *зр.*] для нашего ультра малорусскаго театра былъ голосомъ лебединымъ [М: *лебединымъ*], съ которымъ упала послѣдняя надежда на братерство сосѣдовъ Поляковъ [М: *сосѣдей-Поляковъ*], и [there is no in Mončalovs'kyj] вѣдай и для малорусчины [М: *малорусчины*], которой самыя первѣйшии поборники за кордономъ перейшли, утративши въ галичскомъ соймѣ послѣднюю крѣпость, прямо въ таборъ великорусскій,¹⁴ ибо стало доказано якъ не можъ [М: *можно*] лучше, що Малорусь [М: *Малорусь*], если не имѣе остати [М: *стати*] настоящимъ Полякомъ, имѣе единое прибѣжище въ приобщеніи [М: *приобщеніи*] выобразованной [М: *высокообразованной*], готовой, книжной богатой русской литературѣ [М: *литературы*] (ibid.).

The Great Russians were better able to take advantage of circumstances. Having their own particular Great Russian dialect, they added to it the classical Church Slavonic language and the living Little Russian dialect, and from all that, with the aid of Great, Little, and White Russian scholars, they created a *general Russian bookish language* that is equally accessible to all Russian tribes and equally distant from the simple common dialect, whether Great or Little and White Russian. For the creation of the Little Russian dialect, there still remained *one field*, that is, Galicia, where, in fact, it was favored by a not very extensive knowledge of the bookish Russian language, which is highly cultured in Russia, and of Great Russian pronunciation. I myself was one of the advocates in that field, and until the end of the last session of the Galician Diet I thought that the Poles, as brother Slavs possessing the important privilege of a majority in the Diet, would bend every effort so that, by granting fraternal assistance to our public schools and other institutions, they would afford us the possibility of creating our Little Russian dialect independently of the Great Russian. With regard to Deputy Ławrowski's motion concerning a miserable 3,000 gold coins (*złote ryńskie*) for our ultra-Little Russian theater, my voice was a swan song that marked the collapse of the last hope for brotherhood from our neighbors, the

14 This entire subordinate clause, beginning with the word *котрою* and ending with *великорусскій*, is omitted in Mončalovs'kyj's text!

Poles, and, know you, even for the Little Russian dialect, the very first advocates of which, having forfeited their last bastion in the Galician Diet, crossed over directly to the Great Russian camp, for it had been proved as compellingly as possible that the Little Russian, if he is not to become a true Pole, has the sole refuge of joining the highly cultured, ready, bookish, rich *Russian* literature."

Besides the addition of several superficial "Ruthenian" features (mostly *o* → *ô*; the occasional elimination of *-mъ* in the first, anonymously published, article in which the author took the daring step of writing such forms as *учнѣмъ*),¹⁵ Mončalovs'kyj's intrusions into the language of these excerpts boil down to bringing Naumovyč's language closer to Russian, which efforts indicate the yawning chasm between the actual linguistic usage of the Galician Russophile and the cherished ideal of the "Russian language." The assumption that Naumovyč was consciously introducing into his language all the non-Russian traits that appear in it is faulty. Very likely, he simply had a poorer command of the Russian language than Mončalovs'kyj, a representative of the younger generation. As usual, desire and reality in Russophile linguistic usage did not go hand in hand.

4. The latter years

After the publication of the above-mentioned articles, Naumovyč lost the patronage of Count Potocki, and he was never reelected to the Sejm (possibly owing to intrigues, as claimed by his Russophile biographers). Assistance in finding a new parish in 1867 in Striltsi, near Kolomyia, was provided once again by a Pole (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 68). There, in 1868, Naumovyč founded the first Galician society of apiarists (EU 5 1966: 1717), and in Kolomyia he began publishing the above-mentioned monthly *Nauka* and the biweekly *Russkaja Rada* (Ruthenian Council, in collaboration with Myxajlo Bilous, the owner of a printing house in Kolomyia). In 1872 Naumovyč moved to a parish in the town of Skalat, in the Ternopil region, and in the following year he was elected to the State Council, where he continued the struggle for the "Russian" cause. Some scholars claim that it was in Vienna, thanks to his Slovak contacts, that Naumovyč formulated the idea of creating a new popular-education organization, which was realized in 1874 with the founding of the Myxajlo Kačkovs'kyj Society (see Magocsi 2002: 119–58). It is quite likely that this initiative was no less influenced by the founding of the populist Prosvita Society in November 1868.

Meanwhile, Naumovyč's fame continued to grow. The peasants not only loved him because he treated them with homeopathy and magnetism free of charge but practically adored him, claiming that he cured the sick with water, by the laying on of hands, or merely by looking at them.¹⁶

But the political situation in Austria changed to the detriment of Russophilism. In 1882, the Austrian government struck a decisive blow at this movement after

15 For a discussion of these rather typical features, see Moser 2011: 602–26.

16 For information on Naumovyč's popularity among the peasants (a topic to which the Ukrainian populist Myxajlo Pavlyk also devoted attention), see Wendland 2001: 376–80.

the residents of the village of Hnylychka, ostensibly under Naumovyč's influence, announced their desire to convert to Orthodoxy. At the same time, there was increasing suspicion that Russophile circles were engaging in espionage on behalf of the Russian Empire.¹⁷ Out of the blue, several leading Russophile figures were arrested, Naumovyč among them. The arrests led to the notorious trial of "Ol'ha Hrabar and friends," the stenographic record of which was made public that same year in Lviv. The contents of this report have been analyzed often. The most interesting part of the report is the beginning of the trial, which pertains to the language question:

Предс[ьдатель]: Książ proboszcz słyśzał tamtego tygodnia akt oskarżenia, bo był tu czytany, a zresztą ma ks. proboszcz także w ręku, i słyśzał ks., że jesteś oskarżony o zbrodnię stanu. Czy czuje się ks. proboszcz tego winnym?

Наум[ович]: Не только не чувствуюся виноватымъ, но не вижу ни одного факта, на которомъ можна бы оперти такую провину.

Предс.: Czy ks. proboszcz chce po rusku mówić? bo to jest wolno.

Наум.: Такъ есть по русски.

Предс.: Tylko w takim razie proszę używać takich wyrazów, któremi lud mówi, zresztą to zależy od woli ks. proboszcza.

Наум. Ja właśnie musiałbym użyć niektórych wyrazów wyższych, bo to wymaga sam przedmiot; miałbym zaś być niezrozumiałym panom przysiężnym, a o zrozumienie każdego słowa bardzo mi chodzi, dlatego stosując się do moich poprzedników będę również mówić po polsku (Stenografический отчет 1882: 169).¹⁸

Chair[man] [speaking in Polish]: The parish priest heard the act of indictment last week because it was read out here, but, after all, the parish priest also has it in his hands, and the priest heard that he is accused of a crime against the state. Does the parish priest feel guilty of that?

Naum[ovych] [speaking in "Russian"]: Not only do I not feel guilty, but I do not see a single fact on which such a transgression could be based.

Chair: Does the parish priest wish to speak in Ruthenian? For that is permitted.

Naum.: Yes, in Russian.

Chair: In that case, please use such expressions as are spoken by the people; after all, that depends on the will of the parish priest.

Naum. [speaking now in Polish]: In fact, I would have to use some high-style expressions because the subject itself demands it; I would then not be understood by the jurymen, but the comprehension of each word is important to me; for that reason, adapting to my predecessors, I shall also speak in Polish.

17 In autumn 1866 the Lviv regional government and police placed Naumovyč under surveillance and began the scrupulous recording of his activities. These were the "first government documents about the potential Russophile enemy of the state" (Wendland 2001: 155). On the 1882 trial, see *ibid.*, 201–21.

18 Wendland's book contains certain inaccuracies with regard to the question of the use of different languages during the trial (Wendland 2001: 206–7). For example, it is not true that the court did not allow Naumovyč to use his version of the Ruthenian language because it was not one of the recognized regional languages, etc.

We have before us the recorded entry of Naumovyč's mixed, not quite Russian, spoken language. There is considerable doubt whether he truly knew all those "high-style expressions" that differed from the way "the people speak." Even if he did use the word *виноватый*, nevertheless he did not say *вина* but *провина*, not *опереть* or *основать* but *оперти*. Given such linguistic usage (which was rather typical of Russophiles), the artificiality of the argument that Galicians were ostensibly compelled to switch to Russian in order to employ "high-style expressions" once again comes to the fore. Of course, all those difficulties could have been resolved by other, simpler and more active methods, which the Galician populists succeeded in doing in short order.

In any event, for "taking part in such associations as had set themselves the task of fomenting hatred or contempt against the homogeneous union of the Austrian Empire, against the form of government and against the state administration, whereby he committed the crime of disturbing the public peace,"¹⁹ Naumovyč was sentenced to "eight months of ordinary imprisonment, with a harsher one-time fast every two weeks" (*ibid.*, 396).²⁰ His appeal was rejected and, to make matters worse, on 3 November 1882 he was excommunicated from the Greek Catholic Church (Wendland 2001: 232). He was released from prison on 14 (26) August 1884, and in September of that year he made his first trip to the Russian Empire, visiting Kyiv, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Vilnius, Warsaw, and Kholm (Chełm). By 1885 he was already so well informed about local conditions that he was able to find the necessary funds in Russia to repair the financial catastrophe that had struck the Society of the Farmers' Credit Institution ("Общество рольничо-кредитное Заведение"), the Galician bank that was linked to the fate of several "Russian" institutions and many private individuals, including Galician peasants, who were among its shareholders (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 87).

In 1886 Naumovyč settled down permanently in the Russian Empire. He lived in Kyiv and environs and was temporarily assigned to a parish. He continued to submit articles not only to local but also to Galician Russophile periodicals, especially *Nauka*.²¹ However, since even the Russophile Mončalovs'kyj, Naumovyč's biographer, writes that "Iv. Naumovyč did not have any kind of definite occupation in Kyiv" (*Ив. Наумовичъ не имѣлъ въ Кіевѣ якогo-нибудь опредѣленнаго занятія*) (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 89), it may be assumed that Naumovyč shared the fate of many other Muscovite émigrés from Galicia who had experienced a certain process of sober reflection and sometimes outright disillusionment, losing all the great hopes that they had invested in tsarist Russia (Hrycak 2006: 396; Wendland 2001: 459). Even so, Naumovyč continued to work on behalf of Galicians. In 1889, when famine began to rage there anew, he set about organizing the emigration of Galician

19 "[...] brał udział w takich związkach, które sobie postawiły za zadanie wzniecenie nienawiści lub pogardy przeciw jednolitemu związkowi Cesarstwa austriackiego, przeciw formie rządu i przeciw administracyi państwowej, przez co dopuścił się zbrodni zaburzenia spokojności publicznej."

20 "[...] na 8 miesięcy zwykłego więzienia, zastrzonego jednorazowym postem co dwa tygodnie."

21 For a detailed discussion of the prominence of *Nauka* in Galician reading rooms, see Wendland 2001: 264.

peasants to the Caucasus. In a letter written in 1890, he comments: "Nevertheless, it is better to direct our people here than to America!" ("Все таки лучше направлять наших людей сюда, чѣмъ въ Америку!", as cited in Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 93). The villages of Naumovychi and Stara Chernyhivka near the city of Sukhum-Kale were thus founded by Galician émigrés.

On the way home from the Caucasus, Naumovyč fell ill and died on 4 (16) August 1891 (shortly after his death, rumors began to circulate that he had been poisoned). He is buried on Askold's Mound in Kyiv.

5. Examples of Naumovyč's vernacular legacy

The extracts cited below come from various works by Ivan Naumovyč. Despite all the differences in details, they are united by the fact that they are written in "genuine Ruthenian," firmly based on the commonly spoken Galician-Ukrainian language.

5.1. Plays

As mentioned earlier, in 1849 Naumovyč wrote a play titled *Нрыс' Мазнысја*, a comedy that enjoyed considerable popularity. It was published in the Lviv-based literary journal *Pčola* (Bee) and as a separate brochure. The extract below features a character named "Lord Holyškevyč" (Р. Н.) ("Панъ Голишкевичъ") and another named "Krutosvic'kyj" (Кр.) ("Крутосвъцкій"), who are described in the commonly spoken language as "a down-at-the-heels rural nobleman" ("пѣдупалый шляхтичъ сельскій") and "An'ela's lover" ("любасокъ Аньели"):

П. Г.: Ци Панъ мене знають?

Кр.: Нѣтъ Господине, не тямлю.

П. Г.: Я ся именую Баронъ Голишкевичъ.

Кр.: Дуже мя тѣшитъ ...

П. Г.: Имя мое дуже добре знане цѣлому свѣту – малъ емъ то щастье вславитися подѣ Гореховомъ за отчизну...

Кр.: Красно!

П. Г.: Мой отецъ Иванъ Голишкевичъ, малъ гоноръ бути подстольомъ Короля Єгомосцѣ.

Кр.: Гм! Гм! то не жартъ.

П. Г.: Я малъ емъ въ моимъ родѣ такого, що поспродувавши свои всѣ добра поѣхалъ за море на вояжъ.

Кр.: Всѣ вѣрю.

П. Г.: Донесене мнѣ що Господинъ любить и вганяє ся за одновъ молодичею, котра ... єсть моіовъ донькою, и за которою яко отецъ и за такимъ чоловѣкомъ, що має гоноръ бути моимъ зятюмъ въ цѣлой силѣ обстану (Naumovyč 1849: 43).

Р. Н.: Does your lordship know me?

Кр.: No, sir, I don't remember you.

Р. Н.: My name is Baron Holyškevyč.

Кр.: I'm very glad to know you....

P. H.: My name is very well known throughout the world—I had the fortune to gain fame for the fatherland at Horokhiv....

Kr.: Wonderful!

P. H.: My father, Ivan Holyškevyč, had the honor of being His Majesty the King's deputy master of the table.

Kr.: Hmm, hmm! That's no joke.

P. H.: There was a kinsman of mine who, after selling off all his possessions, went on a voyage beyond the sea.

Kr.: I believe it all.

P. H.: It has been reported to me that you, sir, love and are chasing a young woman who is...my daughter, and for whom I, as a father, and for such a man as has the honor of being my son-in-law, will stand up with all my strength.

The orthography in this text is conservative in places: to be more precise, there is the issue of the highly inconsistent marking of *o* ← *i* with *ô* (see *мої, подъ*, etc.) and the etymological rendering of the suffix in the past tense in the masculine singular (*малъ*). One may also include here the form *нѣтъ* (some scholars have considered that, in pronouncing it as [n'i], this word still had to be written, according to tradition, as *нѣтъ*; moreover, the form *нит* in fact exists in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects). In general, however, the language of this extract is undoubtedly the common spoken Galician. Special attention should be paid to such purely Galician elements as the particle *ци*; the movable reflexive particle *ся*; the abbreviated pronominal form *мя*; personal forms of the past tense, such as *малъ емъ; всѣ* (the similarity to the Russian form is accidental); the hard-stem ending of the instrumental singular of soft-stem masculine nouns, such as *подстольомъ, зятьомъ*; and the abbreviated adjectival (and, in some places, nominal) ending of the instrumental singular *одновъ, моіовъ* (along with *котою, молодицею, донькою*). The writing of *щастѣ* with an *-e* ending in the nominative/accusative singular is not necessarily evidence of conservatism, since the pronunciation of [-t'e] instead of [-t'a] [or -[t' t'a]] is predominant in Galician dialects, and it was long written in an enhanced manner as *щасте, жите*, etc. Other traits also correspond to the Ukrainian language rather than to Church Slavonic or Russian: *мати*, not *имѣти*; *бути*, not *быти* (however, the latter spelling appears in other Naumovyč texts; see below); *вганяє*, not *вгоняєтъ*, etc. It is worth pointing out the parallelism between the forms *котра* and (за) *котою*, which is also found in early Galician populist publications (see Moser 2007: 60, 68, 116, 149). The lexicon of this passage does not contain any traces of convergence with the Russian language. Even if they do occur here and there in the remainder of the text, they are mostly inconspicuous. In point of fact, many years later the Russophiles' opponents were still not writing in a "purer" common spoken language.

Another of Naumovyč's comedies, *Germanized Jurko* (Знѣмченый Юрко), was first published in 1872, when the writer was already middle-aged. The play was reprinted several times (the extracts below are from the second edition, dated 1884). One of the extremely interesting comic effects of this text is that Jurko (George) tries to impress his relatives by speaking a "Germanized" language apparently learned

in the Austrian army. In fact, this invented military *Surzhyk* combines elements not only of the German and "Ruthenian" (Ukrainian) languages but also of Czech.

Юрко: А вігейць, сервусь!

Доця: Юрку, Юрку, Юрцуню, Юрцуненьку, дитинонько голубчику!

Юрко: Ніксь голубчику, я семъ панъ капраль, я семъ тего не розумімъ, ніксь ферштанденъ русішь.²²

Стефанъ (обнимає его): Не бувъ бымъ ты и спѣзнавъ – за пять лѣтъ такъ ѳтмѣнився! Ну, сѣдай, сыну, розгостися. Ажъ теперъ знаю, що нема знахора на свѣтѣ, якъ Проць, дай вамъ Боже здоровье.

Елена: И я бы его не була спѣзнала.

Проць: ...Но Юрку, якъ ся тамъ воювало?

Юрко: Гальть рехтъ бравъ. Прайсѡвъ фермалядайтыхъ мы пошлюгали такъ на макъ, на макъ.

Доця: Юрцуню, скажи но менѣ, що тобѣ ѣсти дати?

Юрко: Ну, гальть флейшъ, по вояцки: флейшъ и цушпайсь.

Доця: Та я сего не розумѣю. Скажи намъ по русски.

Юрко: Ніксь русішь, ніксь русішь (Naumovyč 1884: 11).

Jurko: *A wie geht's, servus* [Ah, how are things, greetings]!

Docja: Jurko, Jurko, Jurchun'o, Jurchunen'ko, my dear little pigeon!

Jurko: *Nix* little pigeon, I am Mr. Corporal, I don't understand that, *nix ferstanden rusiŝ*.

Stefan (*embracing him*): I would never have recognized you; you've changed so much in five years! Well, sit down, son, make yourself at home. Now I know there is no better sorcerer than Proc', may the Lord grant him health.

Elena: I wouldn't have recognized him either.

Proc': ...So, Jurko, how was the fighting there?

Jurko: Well, quite okay. We pummeled the damned Prussians to smithereens.

Docja: Jurtsun'o, tell me, what do you want to eat?

Jurko: Well, meat, soldier-style: *fleisch* and *zuspeis* [meat and side dish].

Docja: But I don't understand that. Tell us in Ruthenian.

Jurko: *Nix rusisch, nix rusisch*.

As is appropriate in this case, the corrupt German language rendered in traditional Cyrillic script has several curious features. Among the Czech and pseudo-Czech elements, the following deserve attention: [j]*sem* (first person singular of *být* 'to be'), *teho* (mistakenly instead of *toho*), *rozumím* (mistakenly instead of the participle in *-l-*), *по вояцки* (in the Czech literary language, the adjective-forming stem corresponds to the form *vojenský*, which is contaminated here, as one may assume, by the Ukrainian *вояц(ь)кий*). Other characters in the play speak in the vernacular Galician-Ukrainian language (marked by typical Galician elements, such as *бувъ бымъ*; *тя*; the movable *ся*; *сего* instead of *цього*, etc.).

22 It is unlikely that this use of the word *русішь* (Ger. *russisch*) as the equivalent of the adjective *руський* (German *ruthenisch* or *russinisch*) was Naumovyč's invention. Most likely, it reflects actual word usage on the part of uneducated German-speaking circles of the time.

The German elements are: *візейць, сервусь!* (*Wie geht's? Servus!*), *ніксь* (German colloquial *nix*, for *nichts* 'nothing'), *ферштандень* (as in the present perfect tense *habe verstanden*, incorrectly used here without *haben*, from *verstehen* 'to understand'), *русінь* (*Russisch* 'Russian'), *гальть рехть бравь* (*halt recht brav* 'quite okay'), *Прайсôвъ* (from *die Preißen*, Austrian Bavarian for *die Preußen* 'the Prussians'), *фермалядайтыхъ* (from *vermaledeit* 'damned'), *гальть* (*halt*, a German particle), *флейшъ* (*Fleisch* 'meat'), *цушнайсь* (*Zuspise*, here without the *-e*, as is common in colloquial Austrian Bavarian German; the word as such is also typical of Austrian German). Sentences such as *я семь того не розумінь, ніксь ферштандень русінь*, or *ніксь русінь, ніксь русінь* could in fact be characterized as pidgin Czech or pidgin German.

It is striking that this same language of the people is also predominant at the end of the play, where, in contrast to the light humor in other parts of this comedic work, the motif of loyalty to one's nation, which is sacrosanct to the representatives of the "Ruthenian" revival, emerges:

Гласовичъ: А дивѣть, якъ уже чисто по русски говоритъ!

Доця: Юрцуню, то ты не нѣмецъ? ты русска моя дитина!

Юрко: Та где я Нѣмецъ, я лишь такъ жартовавъ. [...]

Гласовичъ: Ну, то скѣнчѣмъ уже тую комедію. Но закимъ тобѣ, Юрку драбину приставаю, говори за мною тії слова: (Юрко за нимъ повтаряє): Я [...] Юрій [...] Чорновусъ [...] Русинъ зъ роду [...] до смерти [...] буду все моимъ матернымъ языкомъ говорити [...] отчину мою, вѣру мою святую любити [...] и еще другихъ такъ учити [...].²³

Юрко: (Доця и Стефанъ цѣлуютъ его). Простѣть тату, простѣть мамо, то така дурна вояцка натура, то мене такъ другѣ намовили. Я якъ васъ все любивъ, такъ и люблю.

Гласовичъ: Такъ Юрку, се одна мати, що тебе породила, и грудьми своими плакала, се (показує широко руками) друга мати, щось ю любити повинень: наша Русь, наша святая Русь! Щобысь зôйшовъ весь свѣтъ, не найдешъ ей рôвнои, солодшой, милѣйшой, бо она насъ также зродила, хлѣбомъ своимъ кормила, водою своею поила, пѣснями своими веселила! Въ ней лежатъ кости отцôвъ нашихъ русскихъ, въ ней и мы колись ляжемъ. Цуръ тому, кто ей цураєся, кто чужимъ Богамъ служитъ! (Naumovych 1884: 29–30)

Hlasovych: See how he's speaking pure Ruthenian now!

Docja: Jurcun'o, so you're not a German? You are my Ruthenian child!

Jurko: No way am I a German, I was only joking....

Hlasovych: Well then, let's put an end to that comedy. But before I bring you a ladder, say these words after me (*Jurko repeats after him*): I...Jurij...Čornovus...a Ruthenian by birth...until death...will always speak my mother tongue...love my native land and holy faith...and also teach others thus....

Jurko (*Docja and Stefan kiss him*): Forgive me, Dad, forgive me, Mama, it's just the stupid nature of a soldier; I was egged on by others. I still love you as I have always loved you.

23 The ellipses in brackets are merely repetitions of passages already cited.

Hlasovyč: Yes, Jurko, this is one mother, who gave birth to you and nourished you with her breasts; this (*spreading his arms wide*) is the second mother, whom you should love: our Rus', our holy Rus'! Even if you traveled the whole world, you would not find her equal, a sweeter or dearer one, for she, too, gave birth to us, fed us with her grain, gave us her water to drink, made us merry with her songs! In her lie the bones of our Ruthenian fathers, in her we, too, shall lie one day. The devil take those who shun her, those who serve foreign Gods!

Although Hlasovyč most certainly did not obtain his “formal” Church Slavonic surname by accident, he, too, speaks the folk vernacular language with its specifically Galician features, such as the form of the interrogative *дивѣтъ* with a hard ending; the connective *закимъ* and the adverb *все* in the sense of “always”; the nontruncated endings of the pronoun *тую, тїи*; the hard stem of the adjective *матернымъ*; the finite ending of the connectives *що[-]сь [...] повинен, щобысь зѣйшовъ*; the hard sound in the verbs *служить, лежатъ*; the lack of *-т(ь)-* in the reverse form of the verb *цураєся*, etc.

The nontruncated ending of the word *святая* is probably not of dialectal origin but was adopted from traditional church language use. The spelling of the pronoun *кто* does not necessarily mean that it was supposed to be pronounced [к]то (although such a pronunciation is actually characteristic of several southwestern Ukrainian dialects, particularly the western ones); similarly, the *-ова-* in the verb *жартовавъ* generally corresponds to Naumovyč's conservative orthography, but here it does not necessarily indicate the sound *o* (cf. the writing of *воювало* in the first fragment). The lack of a *в-* in the pronoun *она* is also most likely an example of orthographic conservatism that did not require the pronunciation of [она] instead of [вона] or [wона] (or, rather, with the practice of *ukannia*, which was very widespread in Galicia: [вуна] or [wуна]). Instead, phonetic value may also be given to the forms *отцѣвъ* and *отчину* (versus *ѡтчина*, which is used in other Naumovyč texts): according to tradition, in the noun *отець*, used figuratively, the initial *o* was often not subject to alternation because this word was very well known from church use. In those days its derivative, the noun *отчина*, was written in a variety of ways (e.g., *ѡтчина* and *вѡтчина* appeared in readers for public schools in 1870 and 1872, respectively, but *отчину* in an 1871 reader (Moser 2007: 81–82, 125–26; see also pp. 361–362 in this collection). Naturally, after his “return to the sources” the protagonist, Jurko, begins speaking the same folk vernacular as all the other characters in this comedy.

5.2 Agricultural manuals

The common spoken language appears not only in dramatic texts intended to be performed by actors playing the roles of rural inhabitants. Certain traditions also governed its use in agricultural manuals, which, after all, is completely natural in view of the types of readers to whom they were addressed.²⁴

Of the various branches of agriculture, Naumovyč loved beekeeping most of all. In 1876 his *Catechism of Beekeeping* (Катехись пчоловодства) was published; it

24 Earlier works in this genre include the famous Počaiv publication of *Księga o gospodarstwie* (see *Dva počajivs'ki starodruky* 1985) and a book written by Naumovyč's father-in-law (!) (Havryškevych 1844).

was reprinted in 1907 with hardly any changes to the text. The first part of this work does indeed read like a catechism:

Вопросъ: Що есть пчола?

Отвѣтъ: Пчола есть насѣкомое (муха) лѣтающее, отъ которого люди мають вѣсъ и мѣдъ, и котре есть для насъ примѣромъ громадского ладу, соединенія силъ и трудолюбія.

В: Много есть родѣвъ²⁵ пчѣлъ?

О: Есть три роды пчѣлъ: 1) матка, 2) трутъ, 3) пчола робоча.

В: Що есть матка?

О: Матка есть пчола женьского рода (самиця); она служитъ до множенія пчѣлъ, трутѣвъ и другихъ матокъ (Naumovych 1876: 3).

Question: What is a bee?

Answer: A bee is a flying insect (fly), from which people get wax and honey, and which is an example to us of social order, the union of forces, and industry.

Q: Are there many types of bees?

A: There are three types of bees: 1) queen bee; 2) drone; 3) worker bee.

Q: What is the queen bee?

A: The queen bee is a bee of the feminine sex (female); she serves in the multiplication of bees, drones, and other queen bees.

In certain passages, the language of the manual deviates from the folk language, featuring such Church Slavonicisms as *соединенія* and *трудолюбію* or the participle *лѣтающее*. The Russian term *насекомое* is used to denote insects, although the folk equivalent, *муха*, is given in parentheses.²⁶ Serving as the predicate is the form *есть*, not *є* or the dialectal form *єст(ь)* with a hard pronunciation. In the form of the genitive case, *рода*, the *-а* ending is noteworthy (although earlier the *-у* ending is encountered in the form *ладу*). In place of the noun *примѣромъ* (instrumental case), which is of Church Slavonic origin (*приміром*, however, is also common in contemporary Ukrainian), the word *прикладомъ* (from the Polish and early Middle Ruthenian tradition) could have been used.

In general, the language of this work has a vernacular coloration that is also reflected on the orthographic level to some extent: after the sibilant, the grapheme *ô* is written quite consistently, and *o* appears after sibilants (see *пчола*, *пчѣлъ*, *лѣтающее*, etc.). Also noteworthy is the typically Galician softening of [н'] before the suffix *-ск-* in the adjective *женьского* and the softening [ц'] (in *самиця*); the text also contains the forms *що*, *мають*, *громадского*, etc.

The "catechetical" section is followed by a descriptive chapter. Its concluding sentences are as follows:

Якъ съ часомъ давнѣ низенькѣ хатки по нашихъ селахъ попеременяли въ лучшѣ свѣтлѣйшѣ хаты на помостахъ, якъ (N 1907: *такъ*) давнѣ некованѣ возы уже защецають (N 1907: *щесли*), а всюда кованѣ и на желѣзныхъ осахъ (N 1907: *осяхъ*) заводятся, якъ чоловікъ для себе и для худѣбки стараеся о

25 In the second edition, we find *родѣвъ* (!). See I. Naumovych 1907: 3.

26 Cf. the Pol. *owad*, which denotes an entire class (like the Ukr. literary word *комаха*).

большу выгоду, такъ прійде колись часъ, що всѣ тії прості уліи перемѣнятся въ такі, що съ рухомыми (N 1907: *рухомими* [!]) крыжками. Уже есть много господарѣвъ, що мають хороші пасѣки съ всякими новыми способами, и берутъ красный грѣшъ за мѣдъ; дай Боже, щобы наука дальше розходилася и коренилася, а для того списавъ я вамъ тую маленьку книжочку, щобысьте собѣ взяли до головы найважнѣйшї вѣдомости пасѣчництва, а дальше практикою вашою надолужили (Naumovych 1876: 79–80).

Over time, as the low, small houses of the past throughout our villages were replaced by better, brighter houses made of wood planks, as the old wagons with uncased wheels are already disappearing, and everywhere wagons with cased wheels on iron axles are being introduced, as a man expends efforts for greater advantage for himself and his livestock, so too there will come a time when all those simple hives will turn into ones with movable roofs. There are already many farmers who have fine apiaries with all kinds of new fittings and are getting good money for honey; God willing, science will continue to expand and establish itself, and that is why I have written this small book for you, so that you can absorb the most important information about beekeeping and compensate with your further practice.

The language of this concluding extract is typical of the entire book. Naturally, the orthography is still fairly conservative (and not free of errors: see, e.g., *крыжками* instead of *крышками*). The language itself, however, has a vernacular character. To those Galician traits that have already been encountered in other texts, one may add the construction with thematic *o* + the accusative case with the verb *старається*. The clear-cut vernacular elements include the relative pronoun *що* in the construction *много господарѣвъ, що мають хороші пасѣки*, and the verb *надолужили*. Also striking is the author's penchant for diminutive forms (already apparent in the rendering of spoken language in his plays), of which the most interesting one in the above-cited passage is, perhaps, (для) *худѣбки*.

Naumovych's work *Lessons on Farming* ("Поученія о земледѣльствѣ") of 1874 and 1875 (in the 1886 edition) is generally written in the same kind of language:

Уже мы выше представили, яка честь належится земледѣльчому господарству, и яке оно пожиточне для людей и для краю и для державы. Такъ якъ честне и пожиточне, такъ оно и миле, бо оно николи не наскучится; оно що-день дає нове занятіє, нову роботу, нову надѣю, нову утѣху.

Коли купецъ або ремѣсникъ въ мѣстѣ все въ своемъ склепѣ або при своемъ варстатѣ сидѣти мусить и не може ѳгъ него ѳтступити, все ему кожного дня одна и тая сама наскучна робота; то сельскій господаръ съ перемѣною поры року, съ перемѣною мѣсяця, ба не разъ що-день має иншу роботу, иншу надѣю, иншу утѣху.

Съ якимъ то нетерпѣніємъ виглядає сельскій господаръ теплого весняного сонѣчка! [...]

Часъ бы уже былъ, щобы мы Русины подумали также уже разъ о лучшѣмъ и штучнѣмъ гноєнью нашихъ нивъ, если оно не такъ дороге, щобы мы черезъ всякіи пробы не выставлялися на бѣльшіи страты. Суть

у насъ уже и паны въ сторонахъ, где земля неурожайна, которы завели у себе вже хемичное гноенье и похвалитися могутъ богатыми жнивами, совсѣмъ не такими, яки мали ихъ попередники, що спускалися на самый товарячий гнѣй, которого пустымъ а великимъ и далекимъ обшарамъ не такъ легко достарчити (Naumovyč 1886: 27, 48).

Above, we have already suggested what honor belongs to farming, and how beneficial it is for people and for the land and for the state. Just as it is honest and beneficial, it is also precious because it is never boring; every day it provides new activities, new work, new hope, new delight.

When a merchant or artisan in a city must always sit in his shop or at his workbench and cannot leave it, every day he has the same old boring work; but with the change of season, with the change of month, and often every day the farmer has different work, a different hope, a different delight.

With what impatience does the farmer await the warm spring sun!...

It is also high time that we Ruthenians finally bethought ourselves of better and artificial fertilization of our pastures, if it is not so expensive as to expose us to greater losses because of various trials. In our land, there are even lords in places where the land is infertile who have introduced chemical fertilization on their farms and can boast of rich harvests, not at all like those of their predecessors, who resorted to the most commercial manure, which is not so easy to obtain for empty but large and distant expanses.

In such texts, Naumovyč does not avoid such obvious Polonisms as (*въ*) *склепѣ*, (*при*) [...] *варстатѣ*, *обшарамъ* (dative plural) et al. Purely vernacular forms, like *що-день*, *иниу*, *ба*, *то* (particle), or elements of abstract vocabulary that differ from Church Slavonic and Russian ones, like *попередники*, occasionally crop up in the text. The following are manifestations of purely Galician use: the ending *-[и]* in the form *о* [...] *гноенью* and the rendering of the Greek root according to Latin traditions in the adjective *хемичное* (not *химичное*). On the other hand, we also encounter *былъ* instead of *бувъ*. The form *совсѣмъ* may be regarded as purely orthographic conservatism, although the spelling *вже* (instead of *уже*) contradicts the etymological principle.

Similar language is also to be found in *The Golden Book for Farmers* (Золотая Книжочка для сельскихъ господрей; Naumovyč 1906) and other comparable texts.

5.3. Short Stories

Naumovyč's short stories (mostly of a didactic nature) were also among the favorite reading material of Galician peasants. Cited below is the ending of the short story "Nastunja" (1876), which is concerned with the need to vote for "Ruthenian" candidates in elections:

Прійшли выборы, Яцентій бувъ выборцемъ и его напередъ перечитали. Всѣ паны усмѣхнулися, що ѓнѣ дасть голосъ такъ якъ они. Яцентій ставъ середъ салѣ, та сказавъ поважно и съ вагою имя и прозвиско русского кандидата. Зробився великій шумъ, они не довѣрювали своимъ слухамъ, засумовалися, а выборцѣ наши поійшли за нимъ всѣ, що були щирі та не перекуплені. Вечеръ утѣшилася наша Русь, що на ихъ стало.

По выборахъ мала бѣдна Настуня гѣрку годину. Другій день переплакала, а третого дня вернула до дому. Въ двѣ недѣли послѣ того выголосили заповѣди, и було славное весѣлье Николы съ Настунею.

Дай Боже имъ прожити, та и другихъ еще учти, якъ русску ѣтину, русску мову и вѣру любити, якъ стерегчися пѣдмовы и зрады, а якъ вѣрно служити своему народови! (Naumovyč 1876a: 24)

The elections came, Jacentij was a voter, and his name was called out first. All the lords smiled, thinking that he would cast his vote like them. Jacentij stood in the middle of the hall and pronounced the name of the Ruthenian candidate seriously and with emphasis. A great din arose; they could not believe their ears; they became sad, and our voters followed him, all who were sincere and had not been bribed. In the evening our Rus' was gladdened that their side had won.

After the elections, poor Nastunja experienced a bitter hour. She cried the whole second day, and on the third day she returned home. Two weeks after that the banns were proclaimed, and the splendid wedding of Nykola and Nastunja took place.

God grant them long life, and also to teach others how to love the Ruthenian fatherland, the Ruthenian language and faith, how to be wary of instigation and betrayal, and how to serve one's people loyally!

This extract focuses on issues that were of great importance to Naumovyč's contemporaries, who were quite removed from the traditional life of the peasantry. Nevertheless, they too are phrased in the folk language. Some of the purely Galician features include the forms *третого, вернула* (without the particle *ся*), *прозвисько, еще, стерегчися*, the ending of the dative case in the word *народови*, as well as (*середь*) *салъ* (cf. the "Western" *заля* and the "Eastern" *зала* or *зал*; Polish *sala* and Russian *зал*). Even political (in the wider sense) terminology, e.g., *выборцѣ, перекуплені, пѣдмовы, зрады* (genitive singular), is not borrowed from Russian. In contrast to the play that was cited earlier, we see *ѣтину* written here, which recreates the pronunciation [vĭtchinu]. As in all the above-cited extracts, *довѣрювали* is found in the vicinity of *засумовалися*, as though in soft stems one was supposed to pronounce [y], and in hard stems, [o].

The short story collection *Luc' Zalyvajko* (1872 and 1875) gave rise to the publication of a separate imprint, *Hrys' Špačok* (the 1904 edition is cited here), whose text is styled along the lines of a folktale.

Не знатоньки, люди добрѣ, чи тыми часами есть еще на свѣтѣ где такій наймать, якій бувъ Гриць Шпачокъ. Бо то и було кому робити, бо сила була нѣурку, и охота була до роботы, и въ роботѣ ѣнъ нѣколи не перебивавъ и що въ руки взявъ, то и зробивъ. Ётъ досвѣта до ночи Гриць собѣ все найшовъ роботу, и николи на него не треба було голюкати, нѣ наганяти его, нѣ стояти надъ нимъ. Где уже Гриць бувъ, тамъ робота ишла належито, бо не лишень що самъ не полѣновався, а еще и другихъ робѣтникѣвъ наказовавъ, и имъ приговорювавъ, щобы широко робили. [...]

Отъ бо люди добрѣ, мы собѣ такє говорили, колисьмо въ селѣ нашѣмъ, въ Стрѣльчи, зѣйшлися самѣ честнѣ газды на раду, щобы заложити въ селѣ читальню. А було насъ богато. Безъ читальнѣ, повѣдаю я, не може бути у насъ добра, бо не може бути науки. Гдє чоловікъ неписьменный має чого научитися? А мы всѣ гдє маємъ зѣйтися, щобы забавити ся та побалакати? А чоловіка кожного тягне до товариств, а гдє-жъ у насъ товариство? Въ корчмѣ, а то нема и дивницѣ, що людей нашихъ тягне до корчмы, а въ корчмѣ жидокъ грає а мы танцюємъ, и не одинъ перетанцювавъ уже худобу и грунтъ и хату и все. (Naumovyč 1904: 3, 11).

Good people, there is no way of knowing whether these days there is still a farmhand in the world like Hryc' Špačok. For he was a great worker because he had a lot of strength and desire for work, and he was never fussy about work, and no matter what he took up, he did it. From dawn to dusk Hryc' always found work for himself, and you never had to holler at him, drive him on, or stand over him. Wherever Hryc' was, there the work proceeded as it should, for not only was he himself not lazy, but he also gave orders to other workers and urged them to work with a will....

So, good people, that's what we told ourselves when the most honest farmers gathered for a council in our village, in Strilche, in order to establish a reading room in the village. And there were many of us. Without a reading room, I say, there cannot be any prosperity in our village because there cannot be any knowledge. Where can an illiterate person learn something? And where are all of us supposed to gather in order to entertain ourselves and have a chat? And everyone is attracted to societies, but where is there society in our village? In the tavern; and it's no wonder that our people are drawn to the tavern, where the Jew plays and we dance, and many a one has danced away his cattle and his land and his house and everything.

One of Naumovyč's most popular stories was “Добра Настя” (“Nastja the Good”; 1884), which begins with the following autobiographical reflections:

Давно, за молодыхъ еще лѣтъ, скорѣло мене разъ видѣти наши горы Карпаты. А у молодого чоловіка думка и дѣло то одно. Давно бывало якъ не было желѣзныхъ дорѣгъ, ѣздили богатши люди почтою, а бѣднѣйши жидѣвскими будками. Славнѣ же въ той часъ были жида будкарѣ Хаимъ и Хаскель изъ Станиславова, а тогды, коли у мене уже окѣнчился курсъ, якбы нарочно были они оба въ Львовѣ, глядаючи пасажирѣвъ, такъ при конкуренціи легко было менѣ за гульдена дѣстатися до Станиславова, а ѣдтамъ я уже пустился пѣшкомъ къ Надвѣрной.

Лѣто было чудное, горы зеленѣлися лѣсами и пестрилися цвѣтущими лугами, солодкаья воня которыхъ наполняла воздухъ. Я ишолъ такъ собѣ, безъ цѣли, не знаючи котру нѣчь гдє заночую. Въ карманѣ было три сорокѣвцѣ—на тогды величественная сумма—казалось менѣ, що надъ мене не ма богатшого. (Naumovyč 1884: 3)

Long ago, in the years of my youth, I had the urge one day to see our Carpathian Mountains. And for a young man, thought and action are one and the same. A long time ago, when there were no railroads, wealthier people traveled by mail coach, and poorer people by Jewish carts. The Jewish carters Chaim and

Haskel of Stanyslaviv were famous in those days, and when my course ended, as though on purpose, both of them were in Lviv looking for passengers, so owing to the competition it was easy for me to get to Stanyslaviv for a gulden, and from there I set out on foot for Nadvirna.

It was a beautiful summer; the mountains were turning green with forests and multicolored from the blooming meadows, the sweet aroma of which filled the air. I was walking with no fixed purpose, not knowing where I would spend the night. In my pocket were only three 20-cent coins—a huge amount at the time—it seemed to me there was no one wealthier than I.

Although the folk vernacular element is also predominant here, there are certain deviations. The text reveals not only greater conservatism in orthography, as demonstrated by such forms as *человѣка* (along with *богатишою*), *были*, *пустился*, *наполняла*, as well as a number of Russian borrowings, such as *(въ) карманѣ*, *пѣшкомъ*, *казалось* (in *железныхъ дорогахъ*, a calque from Russian, the adjectival form is authentically Galician as well). Also probably deriving from Russian is the shortened version of the particle in the verb *казалось* (although this particle is also characteristic of many Ukrainian dialects spoken in the lands east of Galicia). Another departure from the folk language is the suffixal form *величественная*, which more probably derives from Russian language than from Church Slavonic. But in general there are not many elements in this short story that differ radically from vernacular ones. Vernacular stylization clearly predominates: *она гей на тарелцѣ передомною* [sic]; *а иди до неї, два дни ба и бѣльше* (Naumovyč 1884: 4), etc.

5.4 Poems

Some of Naumovyč's poems have a linguistic basis in the folk vernacular. Below is an extract from his poem "Послѣдне Слово Мѣсяцослова" (The Last Word of the Church Calendar; 1881):

Бывало-то братья, мы ничѣ не читаемъ,
И мѣсяцослова дома мы не маемъ;
Та ничо не знаемъ, лишѣ поклоны бити
Передъ всякимъ дурнемъ, та ему служити.
Бывало то братья, мы й того не знали,
Отки ся на свѣтѣ русски люди взяли?
Чому они нынѣ бѣднѣ, пониженѣ,
Якбы на бѣду лишѣ были сотворенѣ?
Мы не знали, братья, бо мы не читали,
Що мы въ нашомъ краю колись пановали,
Поки еще наши рѣднѣ князѣ жили,
Стару русску вѣру, славу боронили.
А якъ ихъ не стало, якъ повымирали,
Отъ тогды Ляшеньки въ насъ запановали,
Отъ тогды неволя що-разѣ гѣрша была,
Поки та шляхотска Польща не минула,
Тогды козаченьки грѣбъ ей выкопали,
Три цари межѣ себе єю розѣбрали. [...]
О братья любезнѣ, возьмѣтсѣ за руки

До всякой доброй полезной науки!
 Того хоче Цѣсарь, панъ нашъ милостивый,
 Щобъ въ Австріи каждый народъ былъ счастливый! (Naumovyč 1881: 88).

It used to be, brothers, that we read nothing,
 And did not even have a church calendar at home;
 And we knew nothing, only how to bow to the ground
 Before every fool and serve him.
 It used to be, brothers, that we did not even know
 Whence the Ruthenian people had come into the world.
 Why are they poor today, brought down low,
 As though created only for woe?
 We did not know, brothers, because we did not read
 That long ago we ruled in our land,
 When our own princes still lived
 And defended the old Ruthenian faith and glory.
 And when they were no more, once they died off,
 From then on the Liakhs began to rule in our land,
 From then on bondage grew ever worse,
 Until that noble Poland passed,
 Then the Cossacks dug her grave,
 Three tsars divided it up between themselves....
 O my dear brothers, hold hands and
 Take up all manner of good and useful study!
 That is what the Emperor, our gracious lord, desires,
 So that every nation in Austria will be happy!

As elsewhere, Naumovyč writes *бывало, были*, etc., although there is also a rather telling rhyme, *была—минувла* (!). Also featured in this extract are the Church Slavonic and Russian *полезной* (genitive singular feminine), the non-folk origins of the form *любезній*, and a calque from Russian, *поклоны бити*. The orthographic conservatism is made clearer by the use of *счастливый* (versus *щаст-* in other texts). Here too, however, the language is unmistakably that of the common people, with a goodly dose of Galician coloration. Besides the features already noted (such as forms of the imperative *возьмѣтся*), *ничь* (along with *ничо*) and *що-разъ* are also noteworthy.

6. Conclusions

The preceding analysis of the language of Ivan Naumovyč's works shows that the Galician situation in the nineteenth century was not as clear-cut as it is sometimes portrayed. The simple division into populists on one side and Russophiles on the other is unfounded not only in sociopolitical terms but also in linguistic ones. Whenever a Galician Russophile addressed the "common people," he had to resort to a language different from the one that he regarded as the "Russian literary language." Naumovyč's contemporaries and followers in the Russophile camp frequently emphasized that he was fluent in the language of the people. In his biography, Mončalovs'kyj praises Naumovyč, who "knew how to speak doubly,

differently, that is, with other words and another structure for the peasants, and again, with other words and another structure for educated people" (Mončalovs'kyj 1899: 71).²⁷ Earlier, Bohdan Didyc'kyj made the following claim:

...якъ Тараса Шевченка уважати слѣдує великимъ, наскрѣзь популярнымъ малорусскимъ поетомъ, такъ зновъ Ивана Наумовича такимъ-же прозаикомъ, неподражаемымъ къ тому еще и для того, що каждое его рѣченіє наскрѣзь дыше свойственною лишь малорусскому мужику наивностію и юморомъ (ibid.).

...just as Taras Ševčenko should be considered a great, thoroughly popular Little Russian poet, so too Ivan Naumovyč is the same kind of prose writer, inimitable if only because every one of his sentences exudes throughout the naiveté and humor characteristic only of the Little Russian peasant.

It goes without saying that this is something of an exaggeration. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Naumovyč was instrumental in spreading, in a truly energetic and successful manner, a rather sophisticated variant of the Ukrainian language based on the speech of the common folk, and that he did so not only in writing but in oral form as well (thanks to his speeches and to the fact that his works were frequently read aloud in reading rooms throughout Galicia).

In view of the linguistic realization of Naumovyč's popular-education and sociopolitical activities, this determined Russophile emerges in the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia not only as an antihero but also as a figure of some distinction (regardless of his motives). Although he did not believe that the (all-)Ukrainian literary language had a future, he was favorably disposed toward the Galician folk language of his native land (even though he did not regard it as a "literary" language). Even the variant of the Galician-Ukrainian language that he used, for all its numerous dialecticisms, can hardly be called purely dialectal. Indeed, the written language of Galicia only rarely had a purely dialectal character, even if, routinely, a large number of dialectal features were inevitably reflected in it (see Moser 2007: 232–37).

Thus, thanks to their heightened Galician coloration, Naumovyč's folk language-based writings differ fundamentally from those produced by the Galician populists: whereas the latter sought to base themselves increasingly on the language of Greater (Russian-ruled) Ukraine and, in particular, on Taras Ševčenko, Naumovyč either remained a Galician or tried his utmost to be a "real Russian" ("настоящимъ русскимъ"). (This precept of his is particularly evident in a series of articles collectively titled "Back to the People!" ("Назадъ къ народу!"), which was published in *Slovo* in 1881.)

The populists' ultimate victory over the Russophiles, which occurred soon afterwards, is to be explained not only by the support that Austrian officials

27 "[...] умѣлъ говорити подвійно, – иначе, т. е. другими словами и другимъ складомъ для крестьянъ, а снова другими словами и другимъ складомъ для образованныхъ людей."

provided to the former (simultaneously creating difficulties for the latter). Even more important was the fact that the populists' linguistic position was more in accord with common sense and corresponded to the *Zeitgeist*. To their simple question concerning the feasibility of teaching two "native" languages to the local population, with its large numbers of illiterates, the populists never received a convincing reply. The absurdity of the linguistic ideology of Russophilism—paving the way "back to the people" by using one language for that same "people" while fostering another (let's not mince words here) foreign language for "educated" people—is obvious. It can be understood only against the background of certain additional factors, several of which are as follows:

- 1) The linguistic conservatism of church circles, whose members regarded the Russian language as the successor of Church Slavonic and ancient Rus' traditions while failing to realize the extent to which it was "adulterated" (if judged according to their own purist approach) by borrowings and calques from West European languages (including Polish);
- 2) The desire to distance themselves as much as possible from Polish, which, for historical reasons, was the "natural" first secular "high-style" language in Galicia but also the one with which the national movement of the "Ruthenians" had perforce to break. In view of the logic of the dialect continuum and the course of historical development, Russian differed from Polish much more significantly than variants of Ukrainian, even more so in Galicia;
- 3) The weakness of the Ukrainian movement in other lands where the Ukrainian language was spoken. Shortly before the Revolution of 1848–49, it became clear that the inhabitants of Transcarpathia had not matured to the extent of constructing a new literary language on a folk basis (see Moser 2009a and pp. 281–298 in this volume); even their main awakener was an unswerving Russophile (see Moser 2011: 637–40). The Bukovynians, for their part, took their cue from the Galicians. It should be borne in mind that even in the Russian Empire, the Ukrainian movement was far from a mass phenomenon. On the contrary, even leading Ukrainian intellectuals constantly let it be understood that their Ukrainian-language writings pertained to regional affairs, whereas they regarded Russian as a full-fledged literary language (see Moser 2011a, 79–84 and pp. 305–336 in this volume). In these circumstances, then, the Galicians had every right to assume that it would be difficult for them to withstand pressure from the Polish side all by themselves.

There were many other reasons why the Russophiles of Galicia failed to realize their linguistic program. To begin with, they themselves did not speak "pure" Russian, and the motley versions of their "Little Russian literary language" provoked astonishment, derision, or antagonism. Meanwhile, the populists were able to capitalize effectively on the opportunities presented by Austrian legislation. In deliberately looking beyond the linguistic borders of Galicia, they based themselves on the linguistic legacy of Taras Ševčenko and collaborated with Ukrainian figures based in the Russian Empire. Finally, they created a powerful antithesis to the Russophile program by developing a polyfunctional Ukrainian

literary language in its Galician (but not fundamentally Galician in origin) variant, which became widespread in Galicia and Bukovyna. Thus the prerequisites were in place for Galicia's considerable contribution to the formation and further development of the Ukrainian literary language (see Ševel'ov 1966/Ševel'ov 2003).

Part IV

Challenges to the Standard Language: Ukrainian in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

**THE “MIRROR FROM OVERSEAS”:
THE HISTORY OF MODERN STANDARD UKRAINIAN
AS REFLECTED IN THE NORTH AMERICAN
UKRAINIAN NEWSPAPER *SVOBODA*
(THE EARLY YEARS: FROM 1893 TO THE 1930S)**

1. *Svoboda*, the oldest Ukrainian newspaper

Svoboda (Liberty) is the oldest Ukrainian-language newspaper in the world.¹ It was founded as a weekly in Jersey City (New Jersey, USA) on 11 September 1893 by the Greek Catholic priest Hryhorij Hruška, who emigrated from Galicia to the United States in 1889. *Svoboda* became a biweekly newspaper on 1 March 1894, a triweekly on 8 August 1914, and a daily on 3 January 1921. In the early years, *Svoboda* also circulated outside the United States. For many years, it was also the only Ukrainian-language newspaper “of any note” for Ukrainians living in Canada and Brazil, who received regular information about “Canadian Rus” (Канадійська Русь) and Brazil (under the heading “Visti z Brazilii” [News from Brazil])² beginning in 1896 and 1897. In the home country, Ukrainians from Galicia and Bukovyna subscribed to the paper as well (Kravciv 1973/1998).

The Reverend Hruška, “an emigrant from Galicia who settled in Jersey City, N. J. in 1890,” and his newspaper soon “played the leading role in the growth of ethnic-group consciousness among the Ukrainian peasant immigrants” to America (Procko 1979: 53). The newspaper was closely associated with the Ruthenian National Association, since 1914 the Ukrainian National Association (Руський/Український Народний Союз), an aid organization established on 22 February 1894 in Shamokin, Pennsylvania, when several local brotherhood organizations separated from the Union of Greek Catholic Brotherhoods (Соединение греко-католических³ русских братствъ въ США) (Encyklopedija 1976/2000; Magocsi 2005), where Hungarophile and Russophile views predominated.

Both the newspaper and the Ruthenian/Ukrainian National Association played a crucial role in shaping the identities of those Ukrainians in North America who had mainly arrived from the regions of Galicia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia, where a Ukrainian national identity had not yet been disseminated across all strata of the population. As for Galicia and, to a somewhat lesser degree, Bukovyna, the modern Ukrainian national movement had already gained considerable ground by the 1890s, but it still competed with both Polonophile and Russophile views and identity models.⁴ In the Hungarian realm (Transcarpathia), the Ukrainian movement was still

1 I would like to thank Gene Shklar, who introduced me to *Svoboda*’s electronic archive at Stanford in February 2010.

2 On the huge impact of *Svoboda* even in Brazil, see Teodor Potoc’kyj’s report of 1897 from Rio Claro (Čajkovs’kyj 2011: 36–48, esp. 44).

3 Pronounced [kaftol-].

4 Those who adhered to “Russophile” or “all-Russian views” identified “Great Russians” (Russians), “Little Russians” (Ukrainians), and “Belorussians” (Belarusians) as three members of a single Russian nation. The founding of the Ukrainian national idea meant the rejection of this all-Russian

largely unknown at the time. Many Ruthenians from the Uzhhorod, Mukacheve, or Berehove districts were primarily “sympathetic to the Hungarians” (Procko 1979: 54) and therefore often stigmatized by the Galicians as “Magyarones”; many of them identified themselves as “Slovaks.” All-Russian views tended to be more widespread among the Transcarpathian than the Galician Ruthenians.

When the Ruthenians of Galicia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia moved to the Americas, they transferred their antagonistic identity models across the Atlantic. Consequently, in the United States “a few Ruthenians became ‘Hungarians’ in America,” “others became ‘Slovaks’ or ‘Poles,’” yet “most became ‘Ukrainians,’ ‘Carpatho-Ruthenians,’ or ‘Russians’” (Kuropas 1991: 73). Hryhorij Hruška and *Svoboda* undoubtedly contributed to the complexity of the situation in that Hruška referred to *Svoboda* in English as “the first Russian [!] political paper in the country” (Procko 1979: 56).⁵ Contrary to this poor translation, however, his and his newspaper’s understanding of “Ruthenianness” was clearly based on a Ukrainian, not an all-Russian identity model. The fact that the name “Ukrainian” was still avoided can easily be explained: in the home country—or, rather, only in the Austrian part of Austria-Hungary—the ethnonym and glottonym “Ukrainian” gained official recognition only between the turn of the twentieth century and the end of the First World War (see Moser 2011: 667–83), several decades after the “Ruthenian” or “Ruthenian or Little Russian” identity models had essentially merged with those that would later be designated “Ukrainian.”

This situation was perfectly reflected in North America, where the Ruthenian National Association was renamed the Ukrainian National Association only after more than twenty years of existence. At the same time, however, it must be noted that after the Ruthenian National Association was founded, on 22 February 1894, its expressly Ukrainian character was revealed when, at its first general convention in Shamokin, Pennsylvania, the delegates, wearing blue and gold emblems, sang the Ukrainian national anthem “Ukraine Has Not Yet Perished” (Ще не вмерла України [Procko 1979: 59, Kuropas 1991: 82]). According to its nameplates, *Svoboda* became the official organ of the Ruthenian National Association with issue no. 18 for 1894.⁶ Notably, it “was issued in blue colors one week and in gold the next,” that is, it used the national colors of Ukraine (Procko 1979: 59).

From the outset, the management of *Svoboda* was not an easy endeavor. In June 1895, Hruška sold the newspaper to Fathers Nestor Dmytriv and Ivan Konstankevych.⁷ Dmytriv had gone to the U.S. as a member of the so-called

perspective and the identification of so-called “Ruthenians,” or “Little Russians,” as a separate nation in its own right. This movement was older than the general dissemination of the name “Ukrainian.”

5 Procko states that Hruška was “the leading advocate of Ukrainian national consciousness in the United States at the time” (Procko 1979: 56).

6 Procko’s information that *Svoboda* was “unanimously chosen by the convention to become the association’s official organ” is thus confirmed by the nameplates. Bohdan Kravciv (1973/1998) claims that *Svoboda* became the official organ of the Ruthenian National Association only in 1908, which seems to be erroneous.

7 In December 1896, Hruška converted to Russian Orthodoxy (Procko 1979: 61) before returning to Galicia in 1910, where he reconverted to Greek Catholicism prior to his death in 1913.

"American circle," a group of seven "ethnonational enlightened Galician priests" who "vowed (1) to take up their pastoral duties in the United States; (2) remain celibate in order to be free of family obligations and to avoid friction with the Irish-American Roman Catholic hierarchy;⁸ and (3) organize the Ruthenian community in America along Ukrainian ethnonational lines" (Kuropas 1991: 76). Dmytriv became a co-owner of *Svoboda* within months of his arrival in Mount Carmel, Pennsylvania. Konstankevych had been in America since 1893 and had allied with Hruška against the Greek Catholic Union at that time. When he became the other co-owner of *Svoboda*, he had already joined the "American Circle" (ibid., 77).

Since its founding, *Svoboda* has played a significant role in shaping and maintaining Ukrainian identity in the Americas.⁹ When "Dmytriv left for missionary work among Ukrainians in Canada" (ibid., 62), Stefan Makar, another member of the American Circle, who "took Nestor Dmytriv's place in Mount Carmel while the latter visited Ukrainian communities in Canada" (Kuropas 1991: 77), assumed the editorship in the year of his arrival in the U.S. (April 1897). Three years later, in August 1900, Ivan Ardan, another member of the American Circle, followed him (ibid.; see also Kravčenjuk 1993 and Kuropas 1991: 77).¹⁰ Ardan, who had arrived in the U.S. in 1896 and settled in Jersey City, was originally a Greek Catholic priest as well. After leaving the priesthood in 1902, he became the first secular editor in chief of *Svoboda*. In 1904, he published the pioneering study *Ruthenians in America*, and in 1920 he became an adviser to the first Ukrainian Diplomatic Mission in Washington (Kravčenjuk 1993).

After Antin Curkovs'kyj became editor in chief in August 1907, the year of his arrival in the United States,¹¹ it was decided at the tenth convention of the Ruthenian National Association in Philadelphia (7–10 July 1908) that *Svoboda* should be edited not only in Cyrillic script but also in "Slovak" in order to attract Transcarpathians as well as Galicians who did not know the Cyrillic script. Osyp Stetkevych, a teacher by profession, who immigrated to the U.S. in 1904, followed Curkovs'kyj in October 1910 and stayed, with a break between December 1911 and September 1912, until August 1919.¹² He was succeeded by Volodymyr Lotoc'kyj, who had already worked as a journalist in Galicia before immigrating to the U.S.

8 In the Americas, the Roman Catholic Church constantly discriminated against Greek Catholic priests because of the fact that they—in full accordance with the statutes of their church—were not usually celibate.

9 These data seemingly contradict Myron Kuropas's observation that "for the first six years of its existence, *Svoboda* advertised itself as a 'Russian' newspaper," that it became "Little Russian" only in 1899, and was billed as "Ruthenian (Little Russian)" in 1894, "remaining so until 1906 when it began to identify itself simply as 'Ruthenian'" (Kuropas 1991: 74). See section 2 of this article.

10 Contrary to Kuropas, Procko and Kravčenjuk claim that Ardan arrived in the U.S. in 1895, not 1896. Kuropas, however, offers the most reliable information in his study.

11 Andrij Gela, who worked as a chaplain in Hungarian Ruthenian parishes of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, became editor of the "Slovak" version of *Svoboda* in July 1908. Unfortunately, I was unable to find any copy of a "Slovak" issue, and I tend to doubt that the word "Slovak" was actually used. It is more likely that this "Slovak" language was actually a western Transcarpathian dialect of Ukrainian (or Rusyn, from a different point of view).

12 Interestingly, Stetkevych offered Ukrainian language courses at New York's Columbia University between 1935 and 1937 (Kravčenjuk 1993).

in January 1914; he remained *Svoboda*'s editor in chief until 1926. At that point Omeljan (Emil) Revyuk, a trained lawyer who had arrived in America in 1912, took over. Revyuk had already published several influential pamphlets in both Ukrainian and English, including *Польща йде, та не одна, а дві* (Poland Is Coming, and Not One but Two, 1917), *Ukraine and Ukrainians* (1920), and *Trade with Ukraine: Ukraine's Natural Wealth, Needs and Commercial Opportunities* (1920). Revyuk's most notable study, a monograph titled *Polish Atrocities in Western Ukraine*, was published by Svoboda Press in 1931 (Revyuk 1931). From 1933 to 1955, that is, for more than twenty years, Luka (Luke) Myshuha was *Svoboda*'s editor in chief. Myshuha, a trained lawyer, had served as secretary to the prominent Galician Ukrainian lawyer and politician Kost' Levyck'kyj and moved to the U.S. as envoy of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic in 1921. In 1955 Antin Dragan, another trained lawyer, took over. After almost twenty-five years, Vasyl' Teršakovce' followed him in 1979 but was almost immediately succeeded by Zenon Snylyk in 1980. Snylyk, who had arrived in the United States as a child, was *Svoboda*'s first editor in chief to be educated entirely in the U.S. In 1998, Rajisa Haleško (Raisa Haleshko), who had immigrated to Canada in 1989, became the first female editor in chief of *Svoboda* and the first born and raised in Soviet Ukraine, notably outside Galicia. In 2000, Irena Yarosevych (Jarosevyč) followed her as the first editor in chief born in the U.S. Roma Hadzewych (Hadzevyč), who was also born in the U.S., has held this position since 2007.

As for *Svoboda*'s place of publication, it changed several times throughout its history but always remained within the confines of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the city of New York. After Hruška's beginnings in Jersey City, N.J. (15 September 1893–June 1895), *Svoboda* was published in Shamokin, Pa. (18 June 1895–25 June 1896), Mount Carmel, Pa. (2 July 1896–12 July 1900), Olyphant, Pa. (1 August 1900–9 July 1903), Scranton, Pa. (16 July 1903–29 November 1906), New York, N.Y. (20 December 1906–6 April 1911), Jersey City, N.J. (13 April 1911–6 November 1997), and finally Parsippany, N.J. (since 7 November 1997) (see Kravciv 1973/1998, Balan – Kravtsiv 1993, and Kravčenjuk 1993).

Svoboda's circulation "has remained steady in recent years at approx. 18,000, the largest among Ukrainian papers in the West" (Balan – Kravtsiv 1993).

2. Nameplates and mastheads

The nameplates and mastheads of *Svoboda* tell a great deal about the history of this newspaper and its language. In this section, I list all major changes pertaining to the language of the nameplates and English-language mastheads of *Svoboda* between 1893 and 1936 (no attention is paid to non-linguistic layout elements):

S 1893/1: Свобода. Часопись для руского народа въ Америцѣ.

Comment: During the first years, *Svoboda* used etymological orthography, as also officially used in Galicia until 1893–94. Regarding the form *часопись*, its final -ь was often used at that time in both Galicia and Greater Ukraine. In *для руского народа*, the spelling of the adjective with one *c* merely indicates the Ruthenian, not Russian character of the journal; the lack

of the soft sign (*рускозо*, not *руського*) underscores its Galician character. The genitive ending *-a* in *народа* was often used in the contemporary Ukrainian language of the homeland as well.

S 1893/1: Masthead: *Russian*. The English-language masthead of issue no. 1 reads as follows: "SWOBODA (LIBERTY). The only Russian [!] political paper in this Country and has a large circulation tro-ugh [*sic*, including the wrong hyphenation] the United States and is an invaluable advertising medium. ADWERTISING [*sic*] RATES: One inch per Six monts [*sic*] 6.00. All money or money orders should pe [*sic*] adressed [*sic*] to "Svoboda" Printing Office" (S 1893/1: 3).

Comment: This masthead is the first English text featured in *Svoboda*. Its numerous errors at all linguistic levels demonstrate how alien English still was to Hruška and his team of quite recent immigrants. The unfortunate translation of *руській* as "Russian" in the masthead was not changed for several years.

S 1894/18. Свобода. Часопись для руского народа въ Америцѣ и органъ "Руского Народного Союза."

Comment: As mentioned above, *Svoboda* became the organ of the Ruthenian National Association beginning with issue no. 18 for 1894. Contrary to Modern Standard Ukrainian, *Союза* has the genitive ending *-a*.

S 1896/3: Свобода – Liberty. Часопись для руского народа въ Америцѣ и органъ "Руского Народного Союза."

Comment: The otherwise identical title of the newspaper was now given in English translation as well.

S 1899/4: Masthead: *Russian* > *little Russian*: Only beginning with issue no. 4 for 1899 did the masthead change the term *Russian*, but the change was not carried out consistently. The masthead now read: "'SVOBODA' (LIBERTY.) Weekly Paper. The only little Russian political Newspaper published in all parts of the United States and Canada, wherever the Russian [*sic*] language is spoken and is the best advertising medium..." (S 1899/4: 2).

S 1900/26: Masthead: *little Russian* > *Little Russian*: The next change introduced a merely orthographic (though essential) improvement. Issue no. 26 for 1900 introduced capitalization to "Little Russian," but one could still encounter the phrase "wherever the Russian language is spoken" (S 1900/26: 2).

S 1904/1: Masthead: *Little Russian* > *Little Russian (Ruthenian)*. The first issue for 1904 introduced the following text: "'SVOBODA' (LIBERTY.) The Ruthenian (Little Russian) Weekly published every Thursday..." (S 1904/1: 6). The expression "Russian" was thus ultimately removed.

S 1904/44: Masthead: *Little Russian (Ruthenian)* > *Ruthenian*. The masthead now read as follows: "'SVOBODA' (LIBERTY). THE RUTHENIAN WEEKLY published every Thursday..." (S 1904/44: 4). This version of the masthead remained basically unchanged for ten years.

S 1906/28: 26-го Липня 1906. Свобода – Svoboda. Орган Руського Народного Союза в Америці і орган "Руского Народного Союза."

Comment: Major reforms are reflected in this new nameplate. First and foremost, the etymological orthography was now replaced by "phonetic"

orthography. Final *-v* was eliminated, and *ѣ* was replaced by *i*, in accordance with the Galician orthography established by Jevhen Želexivs'kyj (*Želexivka*). The Ukrainian title was now given in both Cyrillic and Latin script, whereas the English translation was removed. *Svoboda* was now called the organ of the "Ruthenian National Association in America" and the organ of the "Ruthenian National Association." The adjective meaning "Ruthenian" was now written with *v* in the former case but without it in the latter. In the latter case, quotation marks for the "Ruthenian National Association" may have been used for that very orthographic reason. Whereas in earlier issues the traditional Latin-based names of months had been used, expressly Ukrainian names were now introduced. The word *часопись* was no longer used in the nameplate.

S 1913/24: Свобода. Урядовий орган Р. Н. Союза в Америці. "Svoboda."

Official Organ of the L. R. Nat'l Union of America.

Comment: The nameplate was now bilingual, with the English version displayed in smaller letters. *Svoboda* was now called the "official" ("урядовий") organ of the "Ruthenian National Union" (later "Association"), and the earlier problem of the spelling of *руський* vs. *русский* was overcome by the abbreviation "L. R." in the English title, which apparently meant "Little Russian." "Руський Народний Союз" was thus translated as "Little Russian Union."

S 1914/60: Свобода. Урядовий орган Р. Н. Союза в Америці "Свобода."

Official Organ of the L. R. Nat'l Union of America.

Comment: Issue 60 for 1914 is curious, inasmuch as *Svoboda* was still called the official organ of the "Ruthenian National Union of America," but in the same issue there is an appeal to the same organization titled "Відозва головних урядників. До членів Українського Народного Союзу." The name "Ruthenian National Union" was thus paralleled by "Ukrainian National Union"!

S 1914/62: Свобода. Урядовий орган У. Н. Союза в Америці.

"Svoboda." Official Organ of the Ukr. Nat'l Assn. of America.

Comment: In issue 61 there was no change in the nameplate, but issue 62 for 1914 replaced the abbreviation "P." with "У." The English version made the major change even more visible, inasmuch as "Ukr." was now featured instead of "R." Furthermore, the word "Union" was now replaced by the quasi-synonymous "Ass[ociatio]n."¹³

S 1914/62: Masthead: Ruthenian > Ukrainian. Issue 62 for 1914 represented a true breakthrough in the masthead, which now read: "‘SVOBODA’ (LIBERTY). THE UKRAINIAN NEWSPAPER [...]" (S 1914/62:4).

13 Myron Kuropas notes that already by 1912 "ads announcing planned local events [in *Svoboda*] employed either 'Attention Ruthenians' or 'Attention Ukrainians' as headlines to catch the eye of the reader" (Kuropas 1991: 83).

S 1921/1:

Свобода. Український деньник. Урядовий орган запомогової організації Український Народний Союз в Злучених Державах Америки.	Svoboda. Ukrainian Daily. Official Organ of the Ukrainian National Association, Inc.
---	--

Comment: Not only was the nameplate now bilingual, but the Ukrainian and English-language parts were given in parallel script of equal size. *Svoboda* was additionally identified as a daily in both versions. Only the Ukrainian part of the nameplate, however, included the information that the “Ukrainian National Association” was an aid organization, and only the Ukrainian part now read “Злучені Держави Америки” (one of the Ukrainian translations of “United States of America”) instead of the previous straightforward “Америка.” As the term *aid organization* (“запомогова організація”) was introduced, the name of the organization now appeared in the nominative case. Only the English part of the nameplate included the abbreviation “Inc.” (indicating the incorporated status of *Svoboda*).

S 1936/76. Свобода. Український щоденник. Урядовий орган запомогової організації Український Народний Союз.

Svoboda. Ukrainian daily.

Comment: In 1936, the English part of the nameplate was again displayed in smaller letters following the Ukrainian part. In the Ukrainian title, the word *деньник*, which is also used in Russian, was now replaced by the expressly Ukrainian word *щоденник*. *Svoboda*’s sister newspaper, the English-language *Ukrainian Weekly*, has been published since 1933 (Kravciv 1973/1998).

As stated in the newspaper itself, a major problem during the early years of *Svoboda*’s existence was adult illiteracy among the Ukrainian community in North America. *Svoboda* reacted, inter alia, with the publication of a primer titled *Self-Teacher and Dictionary for American Ruthenians* and “a Ruthenian-English dictionary and a fact sheet in its pages” (Kuropas 1991: 78). In its early years, *Svoboda* “cared about the social problems of the Ruthenian immigrant and was equally, if not more, concerned with the development of a unique sense of ethnonational consciousness” (ibid., 80). On 20 April 1894, *Svoboda* published the passionate “Ten National Commandments”:

- I am *Svoboda* that wishes to lead Ruthenian Americans out of the darkness of ignorance and spiritual slavery.
1. You will not read any newspapers printed in Ruthenian but devoid of the Ruthenian spirit.
 2. Do not call yourself Ruthenian if you are indifferent to the Ruthenian cause in America.

3. Do not forget to become a member of the Ruthenian National Association¹⁴ and belong to a reading club and make sure that you subscribe to *Svoboda*.
4. Honor, respect, and support sincere Ruthenians and you will lead a long and happy life in America.
5. Do not kill your body and spirit by leading a life of drunkenness and debauchery.
6. Do not engage in friendly relations with the Hungarophile clique, [which is] hostile to the Ruthenian cause.
7. Do not seek to obtain *Svoboda* free of charge. First pay for it, then read it.
8. Do not testify falsely against the Ruthenian National Association or *Svoboda* but make sure you know where the truth lies.
9. Do not seek to become a traveling agent of *Viestnik* [the main organ of the Hungarophiles] or you will suffer for it [a threat or a warning?].
10. Do not seek the purse of the haughty Magyarophiles because it is empty; the people are wise and do not throw away "quarters" [25-cent coins]; neither seek their bigotry nor their fox-like shrewdness—they belong to them (cited in Kuropas 1991: 80).

Svoboda called for national solidarity and a virtuous life. At the same time, it identified a common foe (at that point, it was more the Hungarophiles than the Russophiles) and underlined its own role in the confrontation, as well as the importance of community support for it. Ever since the early years, the question of Ruthenian, or Ukrainian, national identity and its maintenance in America has been the constant focus of the newspaper.

The language of *Svoboda* has not yet been studied. Bohdan Ažnjuk used materials from *Svoboda* for his monograph on the Ukrainian language in North America, but he did not analyze its language (Ažnjuk 1999). Borys Balan and Bohdan Kravciv (Balan – Kravtsiv 1993) noted that *Svoboda* employed the etymological orthography until 1903 and then switched to the "phonetic" orthography (which is only partly true; see below). The question of the language of *Svoboda* is, however, of great interest for a number of reasons. The first decades of the newspaper coincided with a period when the Modern Standard Ukrainian language was making particularly great and rapid progress in the home country. This was particularly true in Galicia, where not only authoritative dictionaries and grammars were available, but also books and pamphlets on a variety of topics, as well as newspapers and journals. Even scholarly journals with highly elaborated terminologies and the laws of Austria-Hungary were published in Ruthenian/Ukrainian. At the same time, however, the Ruthenian/Ukrainian language was still characterized by a high level of variation even within the confines of Galicia, while an all-Ukrainian standard language linking Galicia and Greater Ukraine was not established until the Second World War. The question of how all these important facts related to the history of the Ukrainian language were reflected on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, particularly in the most important Ukrainian newspaper of the Americas by far, is still a *tabula rasa*.

14 Kuropas (1991: 80) has "Ruskyi narodnyi soiuz" in this text (see also "commandment" 8).

3. *Svoboda*: Issue No. 1, 1893 and its language

The following extracts are taken from the first issue of *Svoboda* for 1893. They give a good impression not only of the language of *Svoboda* but also of its major topics:

3.1. "Ruthenian Brethren!"

The first text ever published in *Svoboda* is an editorial calling upon Ruthenians to accept *Svoboda* as their own organ and defining the mission of the newspaper as a medium intended to "enlighten the Ruthenian people, defend its honor against hostile attacks, point out the path to progress, civilization, and wealth," and help maintain Ruthenian/Ukrainian identity, described below as a triune "treasury" of faith, rite, and language:

БРАТЯ РУСИНИ! Пускаючи сей першій нумеръ нашої часописи въ широкій свѣтъ, кличемо до Васъ щиро руськимъ братнимъ голосомъ: Приймѣтъ и повитаєте яко свою „Свободу"! [...] Народе Рускій! Ты показавъ еси яка въ тобѣ сильна вѣра, яка у тебе терпеливость, яка у тебе постоянность! Слава, слава да честь, Тобѣ о народе мѡй! Кто ту въ Америцѣ твой хлѣбъ ѣсть а о твоє добро, о твою просвѣту не дбає – да будетъ Богомъ, и людьми проклятъ! Ты во власныхъ силахъ ишовъ дорогою, котра веде до-правди а правда до свободи. Но теперъ оглядаешъ ся за провѣдникомъ, коръый [sic] б [sic] завѣвъ Тебе до храму свободи. Тимъ провѣдникомъ власне зсть [sic] часопись „Свобода". Нашою задачею зст [sic] просвѣщати рускій народъ, боронити его честь отъ вражихъ нападѡвъ, всказати дорогу до постпу [sic], до цивилизації, до добробыту. Дальше – свтимъ [sic] буде обовязкомъ сохрѣняти межи наrodomъ [sic] ей сокровища то єсть: вѣру, обрядъ и мову (S 1893/1: 1).

3.2. News from the "Old Country"

The second extract offers "news from the Old Country," specifically about a flood in the Lemko region and in Bukovyna:

ВѢСТИ ИЗЪ СТАРОГО КРАЮ. Сего року постигло страшне нещастье нашу лемковщину и зелену Буковину, де черезъ велики и части дощи та зливи, рѣка Сереть, Прутъ и друти, выступили зъ своихъ береговъ и зъ страшнымъ шумомъ та лоскотомъ розлили свои воды по хлѣбодайныхъ нывахъ [sic] такъ, що цѣла праця и надѣя рускихъ хлѣборобовъ зѡстала въ намулѣ надъ водою [...] (S 1893/1: 1).

3.3. News from the new home country

Beginning with its first issue, *Svoboda* reported on American issues, with a focus on topics of particular interest to Ruthenians/Ukrainians. The following extract focuses on the "black cloud of unemployment":

АМЕРИКАНСКИ НОВОСТИ. Отъ береговъ атлантика ажъ до береговъ тихого океана, Америка переживає тяжки часы. Чорна хмара безработія повисла надъ робѡтничою головою. [...] всѣ съ нетерпеливостію питають [sic] одинъ другого якъ вивяжешъ [sic] конгресъ съ [sic] той такъ прикрѡй [sic] ситуації. [...] (S 1893/1: 2).

3.4. News from around the world

From the beginning, *Svoboda* reported on international politics, again, of course, with an eye on the Ruthenian/Ukrainian perspective:

ПЕРЕГЛЯДЪ ПОЛИТИ<Ч>НЫЙ.¹⁵ Росія провадить зъ. Німе<ч>чиною цлову войну. – Австрія готовить ся д<о> великихъ осѣннѣхъ ма<не>-врѣвъ, на котри прибудуть царѣ, королѣ и множест<во> дробненькихъ князѣвъ. М<а>неври отбудуть ся на угорской сторонѣ (S 1893/1: 2)

3.5. News from “American Rus”

As for the American context, *Svoboda* naturally maintained a strong and constant focus on the Ukrainian community and its cultural endeavors. The following extract reports on a picnic organized by one of the Jersey City brotherhoods in a center of “American Rus” (“Американська Русь”), as the Ruthenian/Ukrainian community was often called during the early years.

АМЕРИКАНЬСКА РУСЬ. Джерзі Сіті. Дня 11. Юлі<я> отбувся дуже ве<е>личново другій рѣч<н>ѣй пікнікъ тутейшого братства С<в.> Апостолъ Петра и Павла [...] (S 1893/1: 2).

3.6. Entertainment and Culture

From the very outset, a variety of texts, including jokes, poems, and (most often serialized) short stories or novels, and, later, cartoons (“Tarzan” [Тарзан] etc., with original English texts, as a rule) appeared in *Svoboda*:

Весела хвиля. Въ школъ.– Скажи менѣ Ивасю, котри звѣрята найбѣльше суть привязаны [sic] до чоловѣка и его тримають ся? – Пявки, прошу пана професора (S 1893/1: 3).

ДО СВОБОДИ. Свободо премила, / Жизнь Бога самого // Чомъ намъ не окажешъ / Ты личенька Твоего? [...] (Федоровъ) (S 1/1893: 3).

КОВАЛЬ А ЧОРТЬ.[Съ италіянского] [оповідання] (S 1893/1: 3).

3.7. Political commentary

The following piece is a polemical response to an article on Ruthenians published in the Polish journal *Przyjaciół ludu*:

Кѣлька слѣвъ письмакови “о Rusinach” въ “Przyjaciół [sic] Ludu”: ... Письмакъ кричить що треба рускій народъ просвѣтити. Най онъ о тѣмъ нестара ся уже суть такіи, що о се дбають; най скорше самъ возьме книжку до рукъ та най иде до шкуби щобъ на будуще такихъ дурниць неписавъ ... (S 1893/1: 4).

15 The text within angle brackets is not readable in the scanned versions of *Svoboda* (and, in most cases, probably not readable in the original versions either).

3.8. Advertisements and promotion:

Understandably, *Svoboda* has always been a medium of self-promotion. Ads for various clients were introduced, starting with the second issue (see below):

ПРОШЕНИЕ. Просимъ нашихъ читател<> щобъ собѣ се взяли на увагу, що друге число нашої часописи вишло тілько тимъ, що зъ гори заплатять на цѣлый рѣкъ <а>бо на пѣвъ року по одержан<>о першого числа [...] Просимо дальше всѣхъ правдивихъ Русинѣвъ щобъ були такъ добри, доносити все де що нового <в>ъ ихъ мѣсцевости станеся, а мы радо помѣщати будемо. Сли до кого окалѣчить або де кто умре або робѣтникамъ зробилась яка кривда – все просимъ донести (S 1893/1: 4).

3.9. The Ruthenian/Ukrainian language of issue no. 1 of *Svoboda*

Issue no. 1 of *Svoboda* clearly demonstrates the technical problems that cropped up in the early issues. Numerous misprints, omitted letters, incorrect letters, or inverted types (particularly Latin *d* for Cyrillic *p*) are indicated in the citations. Obviously, the typesetters lacked Ukrainian typefaces and therefore printed *ε* for *є*, *й* for *ї*; see *зъ свойхъ береговъ* (p. 1) and many other instances,¹⁶ and *з* for *ѕ*; see *Конгресъ* (p. 2). Apparently, the publishers of *Svoboda* were initially reluctant to employ the so-called “phonetic” alphabet not only for ideological but also for merely technical reasons.

Other errors and inconsistencies do not seem to be based on technical obstacles:

- *нивахъд* (p. 1) for *нивахъ*, *Русини* (p. 1) for *Русины*, *М<а>неври* (p. 2) for *Маневры*, *до-правди* (p. 1; with a hyphen at the end of the line) for *до правды*, *до свободи* (p. 1, as in the title of the poem on p. 3) for *до свободы*, *до штуби* (p. 4) for *до штубы*, *зъ гори* (p. 4) for *съ горы*, *зливи* (p. 1) for *зливь*, *сѣтимъ* (p. 1) for *святимъ*, *правдивихъ* (p. 4) for *правдивихъ*, or *вивяжесь* (p. 2) for *вивяжеся*/*вивяжесь* and *вишломо* (p. 4) for *вышломо*;
- *Тимъ* (p. 1) for either *Тымъ* or *Тѣмъ* (instr. masc. sing.), *тимъ* (p. 1) for either *тымъ* or *тѣмъ* (dat. pl.);
- *зъ* [*sic*, with the full stop] *Нѣмеччиною* (p. 2) for *зъ* (or: *съ*) *Нѣмеччиною*, *осѣннѣхъ* (p. 2; gen. pl.) for *осѣннихъ*. The spellings *царѣ*, *королѣ* (both nom. pl.) and *князѣвъ* (gen. pl., with *ѣ < е*) (all p. 2) with the non-etymological *ѣ* [i] are well attested in older Ukrainian texts;
- *Братя* (p. 1) along with *нещастѣ* (p. 1) and *Прошеніе* (p. 4) *съ нетерпеливостію* (p. 2), *безработія* (p. 2);
- *онъ* (p. 4, for *днь* or *вѣднь*; see Galician *она* elsewhere (S 1893/1: 4)), *твой* (p. 1), *береговъ* (p. 1), *хлѣборобовъ* (p. 1), *отъ* (p. 1) along with correct *мѣй* (p. 1), *рѣкъ* (p. 4), *пѣвъ року* (p. 4), *береговъ* (p. 2), *ма<не>врѣвъ* (p. 2; with the hyphen probably at the end of the line), *робѣтничю* (p. 2), *вѣйну* (p. 2), *дрѣбненькихъ* (p. 2), *зѣстала* (p. 1), etc.¹⁷ Although some western dialects retain *o* in the suffix *-ost'* as well, the overwhelmingly prevailing usage prescribed the spellings *терпеливѣсть*, *постояннѣсть*, not *терпеливостъ* (p. 1) and *постоянностъ* (p. 1);

16 Ukrainian *i* was not problematic because it was still used in the prerevolutionary Russian orthography as well.

17 As for *возьме* (p. 4), the *o* is etymologically correct (*o < ѡ*).

- *сь той такъ прикрѡй* (for: *прикрой*) *ситуації* (p. 2) along with correct *нашої часописи* (gen. sing.) or, on the other hand, *на угорскої* (for *угорської*) *сторонѣ* (p. 2);
- *рѡч<н>ѣй* (for *рѡч<н>ый*) *пѣнікъ* (p. 2) (a mere misprint of an awkwardly rendered hypercorrect soft stem?);¹⁸
- *провѣдникомъ* (1) along with correct *провѣдникомъ* (p. 1);
- *зъ страшнымъ шумомъ* (p. 1), *зъ. Німе<ч>чиною* (p. 2) along with *сь нетерпеливостію* (p. 2); *сь той такъ прикрѡй ситуації* (p. 2) for *изъ той такъ прикрой ситуації*;
- *котри звѣрята найбільше суть привязаний* (for *привязани* according to the orthography employed in this issue) *до чоловѣка* (p. 3); *уже суть такіѣ* (for *такі*) (p. 4).

Finally, one might note the inconsistent *до добробыту* (p. 1) along with *отбувся* (p. 2) and *були* (p. 4). The variation of the verbal ending in *Кличемо* (p. 1), *вишлемо* (p. 4), *будемо* (p. 4), or *просимо* (p. 4) vs. *просимъ* (p. 4) is typical of the Ukrainian language of all realms well into the twentieth century. The inconsistent spelling of the negative particle, as in *неписавъ* (p. 4), *нестара ся* (p. 4) vs. *не дбає* (p. 1), *оглядаєшь ся* (p. 1), *не окажешъ* (p. 3) can be encountered in much Ukrainian-language writing of the time.

All these problematic matters notwithstanding, the language of *Svoboda's* first issue is beyond a doubt Ruthenian in the sense of Ukrainian; it should not be denoted either as "Jazyčije" or as "Russo-Ruthenian" (see Moser 2011: 602–66). In other words, authors did not strive to avoid Ukrainian linguistic elements, as exemplified by the following list:

- The orthography as in *окажешъ* (p. 3) instead of Russian and traditional *окажешь*, to name just one feature;
- A large number of word forms, such as *просвѣту* (p. 1; acc. sing.), *допост[у]ту* (p. 1), *обовязкомъ* (p. 1), *праця и надѣя* (p. 1), *дурницѣ* (p. 4; gen. pl.), *кривда* (p. 4), *робѣтничою* (p. 2), *прикрѡй* (p. 2), *в<е>личаво* (p. 2), *першій* (p. 1), *тутейшого* (p. 2), *де що* (p. 4), *яка* (p. 4; as an indef. pron.) *ишовъ* (p. 1), *дбає* (p. 1), *отбудуть ся* (p. 2; see Modern Ukrainian *відбудуться*), *зробилась* (p. 4), *теперь* (p. 1; with a hard ending, as in Modern Standard Ukrainian), *дуже* (p. 2), *та* (p. 1, as a conjunction), *або* (p. 4, several times), *якъ* (p. 2), *межи* (p. 1), *ажъ до* (p. 2), etc. Although the noun *языкъ* (or *язык* even in the modernized orthography) was still widely used in Ukrainian texts of the time, in issue no. 1 of *Svoboda* we encounter *мову* (p. 1; acc. sing.);
- The entire inflectional morphology, including the dative form *менѣ* (p. 3), the vocative form *Ивасю* (p. 3), the truncated form *Твого* (p. 3), the genitive singular ending in *до храму* (p. 1), the dative singular ending in *письмакови* (p. 4) (for some specifically Galician forms, see below);
- The derivational morphology, as in *личенька* (p. 3; gen. sing.);
- For syntax, see the use of the genitive in *Сего року* (p. 1; genitivus temporis), the use of *до*, etc. (for some Galician features, see below), or the use of

18 Most Galician dialects are devoid of soft-stem adjectives.

relative *що*, as in *такіи* [= *такі*], *що о се дбають* (p. 4), and *тимъ, що зъ гори заплащать* (p. 4), etc.

At first glance, the only features that seem to contradict this diagnosis are, apart from the etymological orthography (including *кто* [p. 1], but along with *що*, *щобъ* [both p. 4], not *что*, *чтобъ*, or *де* [p. 4], not *здѣ*), isolated, archaic, or seemingly archaic elements. In the cited extracts, the following elements spring to mind:

- The form of the copula in *показавъ еси* (p. 4) instead of *показавесь*;
- The spelling *во* in *во власныхъ силахъ* (p. 1), which was often used in nineteenth-century Galician Ukrainian to render the preposition with syllabic value, that is, *у* (from etymological *ѣ*), through the etymological orthography;
- Church Slavonic elements, such as *да будетъ Богомъ, и людьми проклятъ!* (p. 1) or *Слава, слава да честь* (p. 1), which are the result of code-switching to Church Slavonic; see also *братства С<в.> Апостолъ Петра и Павла* (p. 2) with the archaic zero-ending in the genitive plural (< -ѣ), whereby the archaic element belongs to the name of the brotherhood organization and not to the language of *Svoboda*;
- The verbal form *умре* in *де кто умре* (p. 4), which is a rather peculiar form, inasmuch as the highly archaic Church Slavonic aorist in the predicate is combined with an expressly Ukrainian form of the indefinite pronoun (cf. modern Ukrainian *дехто*) in the subject;
- Isolated Church Slavonic lexemes, such as *храмъ* (p. 1), *просвѣщати* (p. 1) *вражихъ* (p. 1), *сохраняти* (p. 1), *сокровища* (p. 1), *жизнь* (p. 3; from the poem), many of which were still broadly used in nineteenth-century Ukrainian, even by Taras Ševčenko (see Moser 2008a: 236–262); possibly *премила* (p. 3) with the prefix *пре-*, which is, however, not necessarily a Slavonicism; see Polish *przemiliły*;
- Seemingly archaic elements, such as *сей, сего* (p. 1), *се* (p. 4), and *но* (p. 1), which are well attested in Galician dialects; *тільки* (p. 4; not *тільки* [Modern Standard Ukrainian = *тільки*]), which is broadly used in both earlier writings and modern Ukrainian dialects; *зст[ъ]* (p. 1) and *суть* (p. 3), which are genuinely Ukrainian and were broadly used well into the twentieth century; *задачею* (p. 1), *Дня 11. Юлі<я>* (p. 2), *на будуще* (p. 4), all of which were still widely used in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ukrainian. As for the verb *старається* (see *нестарає ся* [p. 4]), Ukrainian purists often regard it as a Russianism in Ukrainian; the presence of the Polish *starać się* shows, however, that this is highly unlikely. Regarding *часотись*, see above (for all forms, see their usage by Taras Ševčenko in Moser 2008a: 172–329).

More specifically, this language is Galician Ukrainian, which does not mean, however, that we are dealing with a Galician dialect. The typical Galician Ukrainian features of this language are the following:

- Orthographic features, such as the frequently encountered separate writing of the reflexive particle, as in *отбудуть ся* (p. 2) along with *отбудуься* (p. 2);

- Phraseological items, such as the Galician *прошу пана професора* (p. 3), with *пань професорь* in the object used as an address, *взяли на увагу* (p. 4);
- Phonological features, such as the phonemic structures of the suffixes, as in *рускій* (p. 1), *Американьски* (p. 2), *Американьска* (p. 2), the soft *l'* in the loan *атлантика* (p. 2);
- Morphological features, such as the locative singular ending in *по одержан< >о* (p. 4), that is, *по одержаню*; see *о розвою* elsewhere (S 1893/1: 4); the suffix in *звѣрята* (p. 3), the lack of *-л'* in the third person singular present tense forms of reflexive forms, as in *станесе* (p. 4), and the prevailing hard endings of the third person singular and plural present tense forms of the type *провадить* (p. 2), *готовить ся* (p. 2), *прибудуть* (p. 2), *заплатять* (p. 4), *дбають* (p. 4). However, this ending is paralleled by soft endings, starting with the first issue of *Svoboda*:¹⁹ see: “Рускій народъ темный, непросвѣщенный, надъ рускимъ народом панує, царить египетска тьма’ то суть осячи слова глубокой клапоухой мудрости bel asino delle marche. На се отвѣтимъ коротко. Мы Русини знаємо азбуку Св. учителей славянъ Кирила и Методія–поляки ю забули и съ ней смѣють ся” (S 1893/1: 4); the hard ending in the second person plural imperative forms of the type *Пріймѣть* (p. 1); the exclusive use of *ego* (p. 1; this is hardly intended to render [joho]) instead of *його* and *ей* (p. 1) instead of *її* (gen. case); Galician *ю* instead of *її* appears in the accusative in other extracts; see “Мы Русини знаємо азбуку Св. учителей славянъ Кирила и Методія–поляки ю забули и съ ней смѣють ся” (S 1893/1: 4);
- Lexical features, such as *всказати* (p. 1) instead of *вказати*, *провадить* (p. 2) instead of *проводить*, *цѣла* (instead of *вся*) *праця и надѣя* (p. 1), *цлову войну* (p. 2; see Polish *clo*, German *Zoll*), *зъ гори* (p. 4), *одинъ другого* (p. 2) instead of *одинъ одного*; *най* (p. 4; several times); *сли* (p. 4), and many more (see *ничъ* in S 1893/2: 1, etc.);
- Syntactic features, such as the use of the genitive instead of the accusative case in *де що нового* (p. 4), the conjunction *a* in the copulative, not the adversative meaning, as in *Коваль а чортъ* (p. 3), the use of *o* + accusative case, as in *о твоє добро*, *о твою просвѣту не дбає* (p. 1; several times), along with the sporadic (basically non-Galician) use of *o* + locative case as in *о тѣмъ нестарає ся* (p. 4); the more frequent use of the *genitivus negationis*, as in *Чомъ намъ не окажешъ / Ты личенька Твого?* (p. 3) or *най иде до штуби щобъ на будуще такихъ дурниць неписаць* (p. 4).
- Many of these Galician features link Galician Ukrainian with Polish.

Other Galician features were clearly avoided. As opposed to dialects and older writing traditions, the reflexive particle is not usually used in positions other than immediately following the full verb, that is, no constructions of the type *ty sja myješ* are employed here (they do, however, occur sporadically elsewhere in the first years; see *якъ маємъ ся називати* [S 1893/2: 1]). The role of the language of Greater Ukraine as a model is particularly apparent, as the reflexive particle is often used in the non-Galician form *-сь*; see *зробилась* (4) and *вивяжесь* (2; obviously for *вивяжесь*). Instead of *narid*, which prevails in Galician dialects, the form *народъ*

19 The situation is not entirely clear, though, as the hard and soft signs are often employed erroneously.

(1) is used in the extracts cited above (see, however, *нарôдъ* in S 1893/2: 1 and elsewhere, but *народъ* again in S 1894/4: 2). The fact that *Svoboda* was oriented toward Greater Ukraine from the beginning is also reflected by the slogan displayed in the nameplate, where one reads Taras Ševčenko's verse: "Учите ся брати мои, думайте, читайте / И чужому научайтесь – Свого не цурайтесь, / Въ своей хатѣ своя правда и сила и воля" (S 1893/1: 1).

Ukrainian dialects, primarily Galician or Transcarpathian dialects, appear in *Svoboda*, but mainly in the form of quotations designed to poke fun at dialect speakers. The following extract from the first issue imitates a typical feature of most Transcarpathian dialects:

Піттсбургъ, Тамошни Русини мають вигоду, бо не платять колекти.
Сли прійде колектор съ уніятской стороны, то кажуть: мы не даме бо
належимо до православной церкви, сли прійде съ стороны православной,
то кажуть мы уніяты—*qen trovato* (S 1893/1: 3).

The jokes published in *Svoboda* are a rich source of dialectal materials. In the following short extract, the highlighted Galician features are those that were most probably regarded as dialectal as early as the turn of the twentieth century (*мѣ* may also have been regarded as "standard," although the spelling is unusual; see more clitic pronominal forms in ordinary articles in later issues):

– Прошу пана превелебного прити *мѣ* дитину покрестити. Но–але
най не забудуть, бо *южъ* єсть готове и *най* метрику зо *собомъ* возмуть
(S 1893/1: 3).

English loans are not absent even from the first issue of *Svoboda*. In the cited extracts we see not only the place-name *Джерзі Сімі* (p. 2) but also *конгрєсь* (p. 2) for the political institution (with *з* featured probably owing to the lack of types for *с*, as mentioned above), and, most interestingly, *пiкнікъ* (p. 2) as an American concept of community culture (for more early English loans, see Appendix).

4. On the way to the "phonetic" alphabet and Modern Standard Ukrainian

The orthography and language of *Svoboda* changed constantly during the first years of its existence, although the changes were not always radical and most often were not introduced consistently, at least at the beginning. Quite often, forms varied markedly not only within one issue of *Svoboda* but even within one article.

In the second issue one still finds the forms *она* and *они* as typical of many Galician sources even apart from the Russophile sphere, but now we come across *ôнъ* (1893/2: 2; instead of *онъ*, as encountered in the first issue). The conservative spelling form *отъ* (1893/2: 2, 3, etc.) is still used, yet *одъ* appears as well in *одъ довшого уже часу* (1893/2: 3), that is, preceding a voiced consonant. In the prefix, not only *от-* and *од-* but even *вôд-* appears; see *отбулося*, *одбулося*, *вôдповѣдъ* (all 1893/2: 3). The adverbialized adjective *остро* (1893/2: 4) is spelled without a prothetic consonant, yet obvious violations of etymological orthographic

principles are still encountered, as in *въ згодѣ* (1893/2: 4), etc. Some specifically Galician forms are [*при добрѣмъ*] *здоровлю* (S 1893/2: 3), the short pronominal form in [*добре*] *мы* [*на семь свѣтъ жити*] (ibid.), the form of the numeral *двайця<ть>* (ibid.), the comparative form *повисше* (4) without dissimilation, or the passive construction with *зѣстати* (with the meaning of action, not state; see the Polish construction with *zostać*, a loan translation from German), as in *Плянъ будови моста черезъ рѣку Гудсонъ риверъ зѣ Джерси Сити до Нью Йорки зѣставъ потверджений отъ министерства войны* (S 1893/2: 4), *чотири женицини зѣстали забити на смерть* (S 1893/4: 2). Over time, several forms were “corrected”: the above-mentioned title of the serialized story was changed from “Чортъ а Коваль” to “Чортъ и Коваль” (S 1893/2: 4) because coordinative *a* was obviously interpreted as a Polonism (and rightly so). Some isolated vestiges of an either extremely conservative or (rather) Russian-based orthography occur sporadically; see *продолженіе* (S 1893/2: 4), etc., yet considerably more forms expressly distance *Svoboda*’s language from Russian; see *судженими*, *потверджений* (1893/2: 4) or *всѣма министрами* (1893/2: 4), *Борба* (1893/2: 4), etc.

Issue no. 3 introduced an unwarranted correction of Taras Ševčenko’s famous verse in the nameplate. Someone apparently believed that *Учѣте ся брати мои* (S 1893/3: 1) was better than *Учите ся*, although Ševčenko consciously used an archaic form of the imperative (Moser 2008a: 150–151), while the correct modernized form could have been only *Учѣть* (or *Учѣтъ* in some Galician dialects). The form *народъ* was often “Galicianized” into *нарѣдъ* (S 1893/3: 1). The spellings *одъ* and *од-* were now employed more frequently, as in *одъ руского* (S 1893/3: 1), [*наберавъ*] *одваги* (S 1893/3: 2), *одповѣдъ*, *одбувъ ся* (S 1893/3: 3) alongside the traditional spelling, as in *открывъ* (S 1893/3: 3), and there was an idiosyncratic rendering of the adverb *съ вѣтки* [for *звѣдки*] (S 1893/3: 2).²⁰ The preposition and prefix are still spelled against the etymology in *що зѣ нами зробили* (S 1893/3: 3). The conservative spelling *питуаніе* concurred with forms of the type *питуане* and *значине* [*sic*, for *значене*, as the form would have been spelled in Galician sources at that time] (all S 1893/3: 3). The latter forms can hardly be interpreted as misprints, since the third issue consistently replaced *ѣ* with *е* (see the oblique form *переконаня* [ibid.]). Issue no. 3 still used *онъ* (S 1893/3: 2) and contained some texts that were obviously “translated” from the Russian in highly unconvincing fashion. At the same time, the editors did not shy away from expressly Galician forms and spellings, as in *скѣньчилися*, *честнота*, or *завсе* ‘always’ (cf. Polish *zawsze*) (S 1893/3: 2). The same issue deserves particular attention inasmuch as it features the first letter to the editor (under the heading “АМЕРИКАНЬСКА РУСЬ”), obviously written by an emigrant from Transcarpathia. It contained not only several Transcarpathian dialectal features (highlighted in boldface) but also more conservative or Russian forms than were

20 Here, the *m* might be regarded as a concession to phonetic circumstances only from a Galician viewpoint (as opposed to Modern Standard Ukrainian, most Galician dialects do assimilate consonants following voiceless consonants), whereas the spelling *съ* is clearly unfortunate, as is the separate spelling of the adverbial form.

usually encountered in *Svoboda* articles. Even the introduction by the editors contains the form *получила* and the not otherwise used ending *-oe* in *красное*:

На дняхъ получила наша Редакція дуже красное русское письмо
пересякнене письмо [*sic*], котре тутъ подаемо дословно:

Beacon Falls 22.9. 1893

Слава Ісусу Христу!

Получивши ,первый [*sic*, the comma is a misprint] нумеръ „Свободи“ котру
намъ Іосифъ Вархоликъ доручив, витаемо [*sic*] и принимаемо ю щиро, яко
давно очѣковану нашу просвѣтительку понеже познаваме зъ первихъ ей
основнихъ рядкѣвъ що она хоче нашъ рускій народъ съ твердого сну тутъ
въ Америцѣ пробудити и ко просвѣщенію и благоразумію привести. [...]
Съ почтєніємъ оставамъ щыримъ русиномъ

Стефанъ Гомиць

Сей листъ дуже насъ урадовавъ бо пѣзнали мы съ [*sic*] него що нашъ
чоловѣкъ тутъ въ Америцѣ самъ приходить до того переконання же му
треба русской и то правдивой русской газеты, котру онъ самъ оцѣнить и сли
отповѣдае его потребамъ и его задушевнымъ бажанямъ, онъ самъ о такую
просить.

Дай Боже щобъ такихъ Стефанѣвъ було бѣльше въ Америцѣ, а тогда
мыбъ инакше стояли и не такє значине мали помежи другихъ народностей
якъ нынѣ (S 1893/3: 3).

Regardless of whether this letter was authentic, it was apparently published for propagandistic reasons. It does not seem accidental that the letter accorded perfectly with the editorial in the same issue, which made a vigorous appeal for unity among Galician and Transcarpathian Ruthenians and offered an intriguing account of the tensions between the two groups:

Справа народна, економѣчна релѣгійна языкова ортографична, суть такъ
разомъ помѣшани, запутани, заколочени же нѣмудрѣйшіи [*sic*] чоловѣкъ
якъ бы все тое хотѣвъ розбѣрати стративъ бы розумъ. ... Русинъ съ тамтой
стороны зеленыхъ Карпатъ зве Русина галичанина полякомъ и его мову
польскою. Русинъ же съ галицкой стороны называе русина съ угорской
части: унгаромъ ... Слибъ якій ученый американецъ спытавъ ся одного
съ насъ: якѣй мы народности, а дѣставъ одповѣдъ що мы Greek Cath.
насмѣявбы ся и плонувъ бы въ очи, бо такой народности не ма на свѣтѣ.

Дальше мы не унгаре анѣ руснаки – Мы Русини. (S 1893/3: 1).

The fourth issue of 1893 still featured *отъ* (S 1893/4: 1) and *отженемъ* (S 1893/4: 1), *отциурались* (S 1893/4: 2), *отбудеться* (S 1894/4: 3), along with *оддала* (S 1893/4: 2), *поодбирали* (S 1893/4: 3) and *открыемо* (1). Soft present tense third person singular and plural endings of verbs were now frequent but were still paralleled by hard endings: *гинутъ*, *звуть*, *ростуть* (1893/4: 2), but *робить ся* (1893/4: 1); *Наша Русь спить, спить сномъ блаженныхъ коли она пробудить ся коли она встане Богъ святій знае* (1893/4: 2). The same issue still employed the spelling *онъ* (1893/4: 2, 4),

она (1893/4: 3), and the Church Slavonic spelling of *i* as a reflex of so-called tense *jers* was widely employed (see *за помочию* (1893/4: 1); *знищеніє; скоростию, въ самолюбію* (1893/4: 2), *продовженіє, въ труднѣмъ положенію* (1893/4: 4); (see, however, *Братя* [1893/4: 2]). Russian elements occasionally occurred, as in *Францъ Фердинандъ есть красивій [sic] високого росту мужчина съ синими очима якъ и всѣ габсбурчики* (1893/4: 2), yet expressly non-Russian and non-Church Slavonic forms prevailed; see the verbal form *щезъ* (1893/4: 2), the spelling *-ива-* in *запанувавъ* (and the verbal stem itself) (S 1893/4: 3; still co-occurring with *-ова-*, as in *скасовати* [1893/4: 2]), the ending in *передъ мислю* (S 1893/4: 3, with the etymologically wrong vowel in the nominal root), the imperative form *повѣрь* (cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *повір* as opposed to Modern Standard Russian *поверь*) (all 1893/4: 1), the widespread Ukrainian form of the noun in *кѣлька день пѣзнѣйше* (see also the stem of the numeral and the spelling of the adjectival stem), and the adverb *отже*. Clear Galicianisms were also to be found: see past tense forms of the type *далисьмо*, the negative pronoun *ничъ*, the verb stem in *жють*, spellings like *мыслямъ* (cf. Polish *myślat*), and the frequent use of clitic pronouns: *отженемъ ю отъ себе* (1893/4: 1), *прійшовъ просити щобъ му пизичили* (1893/4: 2), *Онъ есть сыномъ брата теперѣшного цѣсара [sic], котрый въ часъ, взявъ го за свого на мѣсце небѣдника Рудолфа, котрый такъ передъ часомъ пѣшовъ съ того свѣта* (1893/4: 2); the conjunction *же* 'that,' the spelling *небеспеченьствомъ*, and the use of the predicative instrumental case with the present tense copula in the subject clause in *Же велики маетки суть небеспеченьствомъ и страшнымъ ворогомъ соціального спокою и стоять на переходѣ благодатному розвою чловѣчества, о тѣмъ не треба богато говорити, бо кожій [sic] здоровомислячій чловѣкъ се ясно видить* (all S 1893/4: 4).²¹

Issue no. 5 featured several occurrences of *ѣнъ* (S 1893/5: 1) along with *онъ* (S 1893/5: 4), predominating non-etymological spellings of *отъ*, as in *ѣдъ газеты* (S 1893/5: 4), *до ѣѣзду* (S 1893/5: 4), or *ѣтсунути, ѣткинути* (both S 1893/5: 1).²² It also preferred the spelling *зъ* 'with' but still featured *стараніемъ* (S 1893/5: 2), *вѣроисповѣданій* (S 1893/5: 4) and had Russian-based words, such as *почтенными читателями* (S 1893/5: 1). At the same time, the language was still expressly Galician; see *рѣжныхъ* (S 1893/5: 4) or the hard adjectival stem in *мѣй порожный жолудокъ* (S 1893/5: 4).

While even the first issue for 1894 still had *онъ, отповѣтъ, выходитъ, при житію* (S 1894/1: 2), *просвѣщенія, отповѣдаемъ, отверженіемъ* (S 1894/1: 3), along with *ѣдъ анархистѣвъ* (ibid.), etc., issue no. 4 brought significant changes. Henceforth, the more expressly Ukrainian variants began to dominate with regard to almost all the elements discussed above. We now encounter *ѣдъ насъ, ѣдъ появляня ся [тои часописи], ѣдповѣдъ, ѣддозвались, ѣддважнымъ, ѣдкидати; для пѣддвиженя,*

21 *Чловѣчество* is an inappropriate Church Slavonic element here (see concurrent *люцкѣсть* [ibid.]). The *о* in *богато* was the usual spelling of the time, not only in Galicia, and participial forms of the *здоровомислячій* type were still quite common in the Ukrainian language of the time (see also Polish *zdravomysłący*), as was the use of *видѣти* rather than *бачити*. The form *кожій* was much more typical of Galician Ukrainian than *кожен*.

22 In both cases, the spelling of *т* before voiceless consonants is in fact "phonetic" from the Galician perspective; see also *отповѣтъ* (S 1893/5: 4). Truly etymological spelling is encountered only in exceptional cases; see *отбѣрають* (S 1893/5: 4; note *-бер-*, cf. Polish *odbierać*).

скрѣпленя, Братя; знову, зъ [правдивыми Русинами – патріотами]; зависить (S 1894/4: 1), [грядуще] поколѣня [sic, with я], [въ народнѣмъ рускѣмъ] житю [въ Галичинѣ]; Мѣркують; Приймѣть (imperative) (S 1894/4: 2), вѣд важный [sic, without a hyphen at the end of the line], до вѣдна, but ѳдвѣдчивъ (S 1894/4: 3). Forms with -ива- also occurred more often: дописуватель (S 1894/4: 2), рахувати, змалювани [sic; see Modern Standard Ukrainian змальовані] (all S 1894/4: 4), along with обраховати (S 1894/4: 2) and потребувала (S 1894/4: 3). Several forms revealed *в* for etymological *и*, as in вже, вмирала, [Бракне менѣ хлѣба, то можу собѣ пожичити] въ сусѣда (S 1894/4: 3), the spelling найменшого (S 1894/4: 3) occurred, etc. Within a few months, *Svoboda* had become increasingly more open to expressly Ukrainian forms; see але (S 1894/4: 3), мов [sic; without ѣ] середѣ на пятницю, крѣмъ, проти [сего трактату], жѣнка (all S 1894/4: 3), тожъ [хотѣя вже и такъ спѣзнали сѣмо ся] (S 1894/4: 1), [робѣять незгоду] мѣжъ [своимъ народомъ] along with межи [польскимъ а [!] рускимъ народомъ въ Америцѣ] (both S 1894/4: 3). Conservative spellings and forms still occurred, but they were moving increasingly into the background.²³ The language of *Svoboda* leaned increasingly toward the Galician koiné of the turn of the twentieth century. Typically Galician elements were past tense forms used with personal endings, as in спѣзнали сѣмо ся and моглисьте (both S 1894/4: 1), passive constructions with зѣстати (Торговельный договоръ межи Росією а Нѣмеччиною зѣставъ съ обохъ бокѣвъ потверджений [S 1894/4: 3]), or future tense with *bude* and the *l*-participle, as in Polish; see Нѣмеччина буде потребувала порады отъ старой політичной головы Бисмарка (S 1894/4: 3). The particle for the construction of the third person imperative was either най (S 1894/4: 3) or нѣй (S 1894/4: 3). Apart from Polonisms and Russianisms, several Austrian-German loan words were used; see [не було бы ... свѣжихъ] віришлѣвъ (S 1894/4: 3; in an article on Germany). Western loans were spelled in Galician fashion; see ортографію (S 1894/4: 3; genitive singular), etc.

The fact that something important had happened in *Svoboda* prior to the appearance of issue no. 4 for 1894 is also reflected in an article that for the first time explicitly called upon Canadian Ukrainians to organize themselves:

Нашимъ Братѣмъ въ Канадѣ

Мы о Васъ дороги бра- [/] братѣ [sic] не забудемъ, и “Свободу” будемъ Вамъ посылати точно, тѣлько держѣть ся купи, закладайте братства и давайте знати о собѣ разъ въ разъ, а все будемо помѣщати въ “Свободѣ” (S 1894/4: 3).

Later issues published in 1894 confirmed the need for the type *є*; see the continued use of the questionable spellings значене (S 1894/5: 2), [Цѣкаве] оповѣдане [Ивана Нечуя] (S 1894/5: 4). The letter was finally introduced in issue no. 13 for 1894:

23 See они, кто (both S 1894/4: 1), ктось (S 1894/4: 3), отъ/от- even before a voiced consonant in отбулось (S 1894/4: 2), spellings of the нещастѣ type (S 1894/4: 2), сѣяньє (S 1894/4: 3) and even застѣданіє (S 1894/4: 2), понятія (S 1894/4: 3) самолюбіємъ (S 1894/4: 1), статію (S 1894/4: 3), or съ нами (S 1894/4: 1). Hard verb endings were still employed, as in значить (S 1894/4: 1).

Кто належить до “Союза”, той сповняє завѣтъ Христовъ, бо дбає про братерство, котре намъ Христось заповѣдавъ, своєю вольною смертію скрѣпивъ и тридневнымъ Воскресеніємъ прославивъ (S 1894/13: 1).

Or:

Редакторъ “Свободы” заявляє всѣмъ неприхильнимъ до того дѣла, за котре боре ся “Свобода” власними силами, що его ни мало не страшать всяки особисти напады на него, бо онъ распочавъ виданє своєї газети ни для особистой користи, але маючи на оцѣ добро рѣдного народу. Тымъ бѣльше соромъ тимъ, котри противъ чистой ідеи выступають зъ [sic] болотомъ, не маючи мабутъ, красшого оружя для защиты свого дѣла. Ще бѣльше соромъ тимъ, котри хочуть сидѣти разомъ на двохъ стѣлцахъ [sic], хочуть служити и Богу и мамонѣ и нарѣкають на остри напады “Свободы[”] на ворогѣвъ народа. Наше дѣло праве и мы вѣруємо, що мы побѣдимо. Нехай же виходять вороги зъ болотомъ, они тѣлько сами забрудять ся нимъ, а насъ не покаляють, бо тутъ иде не о нашу особу але о добро бѣдного люду и мы не маємо ни права ни охоты вѣдступити нѣ на крокъ ѳтъ того що считаємо за честне и правдиве (S 1894/13: 2).

Also in issue no. 13 (1894), the appearance of a “Самоучитель англійской мовы” published by *Svoboda* was announced (“кѣттрый [sic] достъ [sic] можнѣтъ [sic] нашимъ робѣтникамъ пѣзнати англійску мову и тымъ зробити зъ нихъ [wrong form: should be зъ себе, or зробить instead of зробити] людей, котри зрозумѣють [sic] обставины житя того краю, въ котрѣмъ они жѣють, научить ихъ бути правдививими [sic] горожанами, а не попихачами въ рукахъ политикерѣвъ [interestingly, a loan from German]”) (S 1894/13: 2). (The undoubted importance of the message to many readers of *Svoboda* was matched only by the disastrousness of the spelling in which it was delivered.) The letter *ѣ* was not used with full consistency, though: Ivan Nečuj-Levyc'kyj's serialized story was still called *оповѣданє* (S 1894/13: 3).

Another letter that was missing from the early issues of *Svoboda* was *ʃ*, the letter for the phoneme /g/, which occurs only in a limited number of genuinely Ukrainian words but is to be encountered in a host of loan words and foreign names. As the orthography of *Svoboda* increasingly tended toward the adequate rendering of Ukrainian phonetics and the spelling of *хто* (for example, S 1899/26: 2; see already S 1898/45: 1: нѣхто) instead of the traditional *кто*, the need for *ʃ* became even more obvious. This step was taken in the second half of 1899. Issue no. 26 for that year still had *конгрѣсь* (S 1899/26: 1) and *интелѣгенція* (ibid., 3; and *англійски*: ibid., 4), issue no. 33 still had *вѣдъ Винніега* (S 1899/33: 2). Issue no. 34, however, featured *Роковины мадярского гѣнія* (S 1899/34: 2; on Sándor Petőfi) and *Гете* (ibid.; Johann Wolfgang von Goethe) along with *археологѣвъ* (S 1899/34: 2; i.e., *l'*, but not *ʃ*). Other issues that year featured *телеграмы* (S 1899/35: 2), *гвернерны*, *телеграфы* (1899/36: 1), *делѣгатѣвъ* (ibid., 2), *латунку* (1899/41: 3), *вагоны* (1899/46: 3); (see also *Винніега* [S 1900/1: 2]).

By now, many elements of the so-called *Želexivka* orthography had already been established even within the framework of the so-called etymological

orthography. The grand reform itself, namely, the introduction of the so-called “phonetic” orthography that had evoked such heated debates in the home country in the preceding decades, was adopted with extreme caution, step by step.

The first examples of the “phonetic” orthography to be revealed in *Svoboda* may be found in issue no. 9 for 1901, in which most of the texts are still rendered in the “etymological” orthography. Interestingly, the first text is a letter to the editor “From Ukraine,” that is, not a letter for which the editors themselves could be held responsible:

26. Січня, 1901 р.

З України

Через цілий сей рік по селах Катеринославщини і Харківщини сподіяно декілька душегубств. Вбивали по церквах сторожів і по “волостных правлениях” по декілька людей і грабували гроші чи то церковні чи то громадські. Остатний [sic] випадок, коли у Ново-Івановському “волостному правленні” вбито було аж 11 душ заразом (вся родина писаря, який там мешкав, його слуг, двох писарчуків і де-кілька так чоловіків, які там на той час ночували), підняв на ноги всю поліцію тих двох губерній. По довгим [sic] шуканю чомусь накинули ся на шатрових циган й [sic] 9 чоловіків і 1 жінку з них впіймали, а решта втекла, їх ще ловляють. Впійманих циган, хоч майже нічого нема виразного, щоб вони певно були розбійниками, звелено судити незвичайним судом а военним по законах военных часів. Суд той розпочав ся у Харкові за три дни до нового року, та й тяг ся аж до 9. січня ... (S 1901/9: 2).

The anonymous author quoted from the trial of the gypsies and protests against their conviction. Although the author was reporting on Greater Ukraine and signed his text as “Українець” (the signature is not legible after *Укра*<> but appears elsewhere in readable form), his language is clearly Galician in origin, not the language of Greater Ukraine (see hard-stem *остатний*, *майже*). The article was written uniformly according to the rules of the Galician “*Želexivka*,” albeit with some mistakes.

The same issue of *Svoboda* features a “Ruthenian-American folk song” also rendered in the “phonetic” orthography. It is titled “Руско-американска народна пѣсня,” and a barely legible remark underneath the title should probably be deciphered as “жалѡсна,” both still in accordance with the “etymological” orthography. The brief text itself, however, is different:

Як сом ішол з Америкі до дому, (2 разы)
Стрітіл я там Австріяша на коню, 2.
– Австріяше камаряте якь ше мац, 2.
Чи там жіє еше моя стара мац? 2.
– Ей, нї жіє твоя matka, нї жіє 2.
Сіцем рочків як ф чарной жемі гніє, 2.
– Ке-біл я знал, же моя мац не жіє 2.
Зостал біл я в америцкей країне. 2.
Записавъ Ст. Рябець въ Mahanoy Plane, Pa.
(село Чертевь. Угорщина) (S 1901/9: 3).

One could now argue that in this case, a “phonetic” spelling could have been used primarily because this dialectal language, which obviously went back to contemporary Eastern Slovakia, differed so markedly from the Galician-based koiné variety employed in *Svoboda*. Nonetheless, it must be noted that this way of rendering Transcarpathian Ukrainian was a novelty as well. In issue no. 8 for 1901, for example, another “Ruthenian-American folk song” was still presented in the etymological orthography:

А кой мы въ Гамбурку на шифу сѣдали,
 То намъ наши власы калапы двигали.
 А якъ мы зъ Гамбурку до Англіѣ пришли,
 Англицьки панове на чудо къ намъ пришли.
 А якъ мы въ Нью Йорку зо шифы сходжали,
 То насъ америцкы панове витали:
 „Витайте унгаре зо старого края,
 Чомсте не привели ту свого цисаря?”
 „Панове, панове такъ мы го не знаме,
 Бо мы одъ цисаря далеко бывае.”
 Записавъ Д. Ванько, Ansonia, Conn. (Svoboda 1901/8: 3).

Moreover, it turns out that it was the editors who had changed their strategy regarding the publication of the serialized “Ruthenian-American folk songs”: the same collector, a D. Van'ko from Ansonia, Connecticut, saw his next piece published in the “phonetic” orthography:

(Спѣває ся весело.)
 Моя жена в старім краю а я ту.
 Глядав я сой в Америці роботу,
 Нашов я ей при Маганой*) до майнох,
 Лем же би мї милий пан Бог допомог,
 Дванац кари на шихту ладувал,
 А до того сам на себе вачювал.**) [...] (Svoboda 1901/10: 3).

*) Мѣсточко въ Пенсилвеніи.

**) Уважавъ. [...]

Two ads written in the “phonetic” orthography were also published in issue no. 9 for 1901. In both cases, however, it was publications from Galicia that were advertised, not American products:

“Тромадський голос”, радикальна часопись для руського робучого народу виходить у Львові що тижня, з образками і коштує на рік \$1.50. Гроші треба посилати на руки агента: Mr. M. Kolodij, 327 Shamokin Str., Shamokin, Pa.; а дописи на адресу: Red. des “Hromadskyj Holos”, Lubliner – Union Gasse, 5. Lemberg. Austria. Galicia.

“Комар”, одинокий [!] гумористично-сатиричний орган на Руси. Виходить у Львові два рази на місяць під редакцією Івана Кунцевича. Передплата:

цілорічна \$2.00, піврічна \$1.00. Адрес: "Комар", Львів, улица Личаківська ч.
23. Замовляти можна через редакцію "Свободы." [sic] (both S 1901/9: 4).

Henceforth, folk songs tended to be rendered consistently in the "phonetic" orthography even if they were not labeled "Ruthenian-American"; see "Гарôлки ... Подавъ М. В. Мороловичъ" and its beginning, "Вилетіла ластівочка із корча ..." (S 1901/15–16).

From issue no. 19 (1901) onward, a serialized story ("Росповідок") titled "Поярмаркував" was also published in the "phonetic" orthography. The editors, however, still signaled that it should not be regarded as *Svoboda*'s own orthography, as the story was accompanied by the information that it had been written for *Svoboda* by a certain "Oleksander Katrenko" ("Написав для 'Свободи' Олександр Катренко" [S 1901/19: 3]), that is, not by a Galician.²⁴ Here is the beginning of the story:

А знаєте ви, панове, що воно за циганська коника є? Кажете, що не знаєте? Так підіть-же поспитайтеся вчителя нашої школи Ля Сїча! (Його справедливе ім'я, бач, Ілія Олексієвич, але він сам себе для швидкості, по звичаю своєму московському, зве Ля Сєїч, то через те його і люди так). Еге! Він добре довідав ся що то воно за річ та циганська коняка (S 1901/19: 3).

Then, in issue no. 26 for 1901, there was another letter to the editor, sent "from Ukraine" by "a Ukrainian" ("Українець") and published in the phonetic orthography ("Дописи. З України" [S 1901/26: 2]), not a text written either by an "American Ruthenian" or by a Galician).

Only issues 1–2 for 1902 were innovative in that they featured a report on Brazil that was not marked as a piece either from Greater Ukraine or from a Transcarpathian folkloristic context. On the contrary, the article was introduced by the comment that someone on the staff of *Svoboda* had translated it from a Polish text sent to the editors from Galicia:

Гостина Івана Волянського в Ріо-Кляро в Паранї, року 1896.
Коли горячка еміграційна до Бразилії, або як нарід наш зве "Брензолії, [sic, without closing quotation marks], таки на добре обхопила Галичину, а нарід за безцін позбувавсь рештки батьківської землі і сотками родин спішив за море за ліпшою долею, а проклонами на устах покидаючи батьківщину з єї ославленими порядками, то навіть галицкі ряди, хоть як они лихі, не могли сего не бачити і про око муіли щось почати (S 1902/1–2: 2).

Whereas at the end of this piece one could still read: "Продовжене на сторонѣ 7-ôй" (ibid.), an advertisement following it was again rendered in the "phonetic" orthography:

24 Names ending in -енко are not Galician.

Щоби виїлвити простуду
в однім дни,
бери Laxative Bromo Quinine Tablets ... (ibid.).

On the next page, the issue featured a letter to the editor not “from Ukraine” but “from the Old Country” (“Лист із старого краю”), and this Galician text appeared in the “phonetic” orthography as well. Subsequently, the sphere of “phonetic orthography” grew steadily,²⁵ and, beginning with issue no. 51 for 1904, it became predominant. Here are some extracts from just one page of that issue:

З сучасної сальонової політики (Михайло Беля). Перед неди́вним часом вернув я від праці в суботу, і як зви́чайно, за́чав пере́глядати деко́трі з наших газет, щоби́ ся до́відати, що́ нового ді́є ся в сві́ті. ...

Дописи. Зъ Beaver Creek, Alta Can. Мені́ лучило́ ся прочитати́ кілька́ чисел́ Нью Йорско́ї казети́ [sic] і́ подума́в я собі́: за́ що́ тут лю́де платя́ть, коли́ в ній́ нема́ ні́чого ин́шого, крім одних́ клевет. ...

Справозда́не з дія́тельности Руско́го робі́чиного [sic] тов. “Рі́вність” в Е́дмонтоні́, А́лта Кана́да: Тов. “Рі́вність” за́ час сво́го истно́вання за́ложило́ в Е́дмонтоні́ чита́льню ім. Т. Шевче́нка з слі́дуючим ви́ділом: ... Да́льше хотя́чи мати́ центрум де́ би́ ся мо́гли на́ші Русини́ сходити́, това́риство за́думує́ присту́пити до́ будови́ “На́родного́ До́му” (S 1904/51: 2).

Almost two years later, in issue no. 28 for 1906, only a handful of advertisements that had already been published in older issues still employed the etymological orthography. Interestingly, this included *Svoboda*’s self-advertisement: “Чита́йте! Списъ кни́жокъ, які́ прода́ємо...” (S 1906/28: 8). The first issue for 1907 no longer featured any text in the etymological orthography; *Svoboda*’s ad had been changed to “Чита́йте! Спис кни́жок, які́ прода́ємо” (S 1907/1: 8).

As the orthography of *Svoboda* was reformed, the language was modernized as well. Although it is merely traditional prejudice that the “etymological” orthography did not allow for writing good Ukrainian (one could in fact render any piece of Modern Standard Ukrainian in the “etymological” orthography without doing any harm to its language, see Moser 2007: 232), it is a fact that the “phonetic” orthography had a huge symbolic value in the Ukrainian context. As it was introduced, Ukrainian Church Slavonic and Russian elements became much rarer on all linguistic levels, and the quality of the Ukrainian language increased immensely.

5. The all-Ukrainian orthography and the split of 1933

Despite its great potential, the “Zelexivka” remained solely a Galician orthography, whereas all Ruthenian or Ukrainian identity models had always included Greater

25 Occasional issues of that period still featured the “etymological” orthography almost exclusively (S 1904/1, for example, the advertisement “Dr. F. J. Meek / (Миколайчик.) / Спе́ціялі́ст / сла́бостей / жі́ночих, / дитя́чих / і́ венери́чних. / Жени́ при́ поро́ді́ ді́знають особли́вшої́ о́піки” (S 1904/1: 12).

Ukraine as well.²⁶ Throughout 1914, Galician spellings of the type *американський* were replaced by new spellings of the type *американський* (S 1914/1: 3), while one could still encounter such spellings as [З *широкого*] *світа* and *святий* (ibid.). Beginning with issue no. 6 for 1920, the use of *i* according to the “*Želexivka*” was abandoned; see *по ріці Дністру і від Дністра по ріці Збручу* (S 1920/6: 2), and *св-* was avoided as well; see *посвятили* (S 1920/6: 1). In 1920, the spelling *-нне, -тте* for earlier *-не, -те* (*оголошене* [S 1909/1: 4]) was introduced as well. In Galicia, this spelling was standardized by the Ševčenko Society in Lviv only slightly later, in 1922, besides the spelling *-ння* (Istorija 2004: 315–40, esp. 321–22).²⁷ In issue no. 1 for 1920, the spellings *-не* and *-нне* occurred on the same page:

Закриття Української Академії Наук. На приказ Денікіна закрито в Києві українську Академію Наук, а в її місце основано московську. Вернувшись з Ростова президент Української Академії Наук В. Вернадський, який їздив туди для вияснення про дальше існування Академії, подає близші інформації в тій справі. [...] Був він прийнятий ген. Денікіном, якому подав доклад про становище Української Академії Наук. Сей доклад вніс згодом Денікін на розгляд „особово совещанія“. Ухвалено тимчасово заховати весь скарб Академії і продовжувати роботу до утворення в Києві російської Академії Наук [...] (S 1920/1: 1)

Справа Польщі. Саветська Росія робить Польщі мирове пропозицію. Заперечує вістку про пляноване наступу при помочи хінського війська (ibid.).

Unmistakably non-Galician features were more frequently used in various contributions; see *раде* (third person singular only in southeastern Ukrainian dialects), the compound spelling of the reflexive particle with the verb, and its shortened form in the headlines of an article from issue no. 1 for 1921:

Як Англія ставиться до України і Галичини? – Правительство Великої Британії раде підпирати Україну. – Галичину трактує окремо і хоче галицьким Українцям допомогти освободитись (S 1921/1: 2).

The development toward an all-Ukrainian standard that took place in interwar Europe was perfectly echoed by *Svoboda*. Spellings of the type *-ння* appeared in 1925:

Едмонт тверезіє...

Статистика едмонтонського магістратного суду, виказує, що в місті з кожним роком, що раз то менше арештовань із за п'яньства. [...] Від 10 мая с.р., себто від дня проголошеного закону в Альберті, 62 соби [sic] повандувало до Форт Саскачевану на отвезіння [...] Удержанне в'язнів в Форт Саскачевані коштувало провінцію до тепер 2.835 [...] (S 1925/1: 1).

26 Some other identity models still claimed Belarusians as “Ruthenians,” while others embraced “all-Russian” views (Moser 2011c).

27 Roman Smal'-Stoc'kyj and Theodor Gartner still codified *знанє*, etc. but stated that forms of the type *знання* were perfectly acceptable as well (Smal'-Stoc'kyj – Gartner 1913: 269).

As late as 1927, both *-ння* and *-нне* were used in the same issue:

Звільнення зі служби за невивчення української мови. Спеціальна підкомісія Всеукраїнської Центральної Комісії в справі українізації радянського апарату під головуванням Приходька ухвалила постанову про звільнення з посад деяких службовців різних установ та підприємств, що, не зважаючи на попередження, до цього часу не вивчили української мови, хоча їм було дано певні пільгові строки (S 1927/123: 1).

Англійський парламент за зірванням зносин з совітами. Лондон, 26. мая. – Внесення Партії Праці, щоби вибрати спеціальний комітет, який має перевірити заміти, звернені проти Радянського Союзу, перепало [...] (ibid.).

As of early June 1927, spellings in *-нне* still occurred sporadically, but features untypical of Galician traditions continued to be used on a broad scale (залізницю [S 1927/125: 1], найновіщий [ibid., with dissimilation even in this case, as often practiced in Greater Ukraine], etc.). By the time the people's commissar of education of Soviet Ukraine, Mykola Skrypnyk, convened the International Orthographic Conference in Kharkiv (26 May–6 June 1927), not only the Galician media but even the North American newspaper *Svoboda* had already basically adopted an all-Ukrainian language and orthography. This may have been the very reason why *Svoboda* journalists did not regard the conference as newsworthy. In late May and early June 1927, *Svoboda* did not report on the Kharkiv conference at all. The newspaper paid some attention to questions of language planning in Soviet Ukraine, yet issue no. 136 (14 June 1927) still did not mention the Kharkiv conference, although it featured a sarcastic critique of the language of Soviet Ukraine, focusing on the spread of Soviet abbreviations:

Нова українська мова. Як виглядає тепер українська мова на Україні в большевицьких видавництвах, можуть виробити собі цікаві погляд зі слідуючого уривку, який бережемо буквально зі статті з часопису "Народний Учитель", що виходить в самім Харкові: "Треба знати, що, не зважаючи на ті пільги, які НКО дав при прийомі без іспитів, всеж таки до педтехнікумів вступили ті, що не мали змоги по своїй підготовці вступити до спеціального ВУЗу, а через те педтехнікум є для них переходним до іншого ВУЗу. Є значний відсоток і таких, які профшколи не закінчили з різних причин і перейшли до педтехнікумів. А коли і є бажання у профшкольця бути вчителем, то він має рацію вступити до ІНО на факпрофос, тільки не на соцвих, де становить аналогічне що і в педтехнікумах".

Пересторога! – Читаючи се, вважаєте, щоби де близько не було собаки, бо може сказитися! (S 1927/136: 1).

Much worse things than the broad usage of Bolshevik abbreviations would befall Ukraine very soon. In January 1930, three years prior to the onset of the Stalinist terror against Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalism" and shortly after the first Stalinist show trial of the so-called "Spilka vyzvolennja Ukrainy," *Svoboda* published an article on the Bolsheviks' "War with Ukrainianness" that offered a highly realistic view of the essence of Soviet "Ukrainization":

Війна з українством. Московські большевики рішили, що вже кінець бавитися в “передишку”. Відпочили трохи кати й треба дати їм нову роботу, щоби не забули свого фаху. ... Годі вже бавитися в “самоопределение народов” аж до відділення, бо вже час настав твердійше загнуждати всі народности Росії, зцентралізувати управління всією Росією під твердою московською рукою. ... Для того, щоби приспати активність українського національного руху, направленого до створення своєї суверенної держави, большевики вдягнули всіх московських агентів на Україні в українські національні шати. Вони змусили навіть своїх партійців вивчитися “балакати” по українськи і старалися цими зовнішніми формами замилити очі українському народові.

Вся, так звана “українізація України” була нічим іншим, як провокацією української національної ідеї, національної справи. Убравши московських катів на Україні в національні українські шати, большевики гадали, що їх катівської роботи не буде відчувати так болюче український нарід, як відчувавби він, колиб ті кати були в справжньому своєму московському убранню. ...

Тепер їх [the Bolsheviks] охопила лють і вони починають шукати винувників своєї невдачі. І першим ділом караюча рука московського ката впала на голови українських комуністів, на яких Москва покладала надію як на свою гвардію, що зручно здурить свій нарід та приведе його до покори червоно [sic] Кремлю. Тоді впали жертвою гніву московських можновладців О. Шумський та його прихильники. А потім покотилися голови під сокирою московського ката тисячів українських селян та робітників. Але й цього мало. ... Довелося братися ще більше за рішучі методи.

Цими методами мав стати ідейний, а по можности й фактичний розгром осередка української національної культури, Всеукраїнської Академії Наук, яку створив український нарід в часи свого найкращого революційного пориву, в часи Центральної Ради. Для того арештовано піоніра й творця Академії Наук, С. Єфремова ... Щоби здеморалізувати Академію Наук і підорвати її потенціональне значіння в масах українського народу, московські чекісти змусили деяких учених та академіків висловити свій осуд діяльности С. Єфремова. Що варті ті заяви, які зроблені людьми, до потилиці кожного з яких приставчений револьвер чекіста? ... (S 1930/1: 2).

Both the Great Famine²⁸ and the slaughter of Ukrainian intellectuals in 1933 reinforced *Svoboda's* anti-Bolshevik views. On 13 May 1933, *Svoboda* reported on the deadly Stalinist assault on Ukrainian linguists and the Ukrainian language:

Знову суд над українськими культурними діячами.

Прага (Чехословаччина). Чехословацькі газети одержали повідомлення з Москви, що на Україні радянська влада готує новий судовий процес над українськими вченими та культурними діячами. Процес цей має нагадувати суд над українським академіком С. Єфремовом та над іншими вченими нібито за створення ними “Спілки Визволення України”.

28 *Svoboda* did report on the Great Famine in Ukraine: see “Большевицька п'ятилітка породила голод у Радянщині” (S 1933/1: 1) and many more articles.

Большевики твердять, що вони тепер викрили нову українську націоналістичну організацію, яка складалася зі службовців комісаріату народньої освіти, різних професорів вищих шкіл та вчителства. Між арештованими знаходяться визначніші українські мовознавці, Олена Курило та Трохименко, які були професорами харківського інституту мовознавства.

Чекісти обвинувачують їх у тому, що вони, складаючи словник української мови, "навмисно викидали" з нього всі слова російського походження, беручи їх з різних діалектів української мови. Московські чекісти кажуть, що цим вони старалися віддалити українську мову від "братньої московської мови", віддаляючи тим український нарід від московського, а крім того вони ще пропагували впровадження на Україні латинської азбуки, щоб мовляв, тим наблизити Україну до Європи.

Службовців комісаріату народньої освіти обвинувачують за те, що вони, складаючи список обов'язуючої літератури для середніх та вищих шкіл України, вписали в нього лише твори українських письменників усіх земель та європейських письменників, зігнорували зовсім московських письменників. Таксамо обвинувачено їх у "примусовій українізації" деяких шкіл у більших містах. Отже акт обвинувачення каже, що всі арештовані продовжували контрреволюційну та сепаратистичну політику, яку провадила Спілка Визволення України до 1928 р. (S 1933/110: 1).

After that, the language and orthography of Soviet Ukraine could not serve as models, since they were a product of Stalinist terror and Russification. When Galicia and the other regions of the Ukrainian west came under Soviet control, the temporary refusal to regard the official language of any region of the homeland as a shining example became permanent. The new emigrants after the Second World War, most of whom came from pre-Soviet Galicia and had experienced Soviet rule, added to this split. Henceforth, North Americans regarded it as their cultural mission to maintain the pre-Stalinist standards of the Ukrainian language.

6. Conclusion and outlook

As the early issues of *Svoboda* (see Appendix 1) reveal, the language of North American Ukrainians has been strongly affected by English from the very beginning. Despite constant assimilatory pressure, Ukrainian communities have continued to exist for almost five generations in Canada and the United States, and *Svoboda* has undoubtedly played a major role in that regard (see Appendix 2). As this study has shown, *Svoboda* contributed strongly to the dissemination of modern Ukrainian national identity across the Atlantic Ocean. Until the Second World War, its language always developed in accordance with models from the home country and was amended with an eye to an all-Ukrainian standard. This tradition was interrupted in 1933 and 1945, when Ukrainians in the diaspora refused to follow Soviet models of Russification.

During the Cold War, when official linguistic models from Soviet Ukraine remained unattractive, North American Ukrainians and *Svoboda* succeeded surprisingly well in preserving pre-Stalinist linguistic standards and further developing the Ukrainian language in their own manner. After 1991 they immediately

called for a thorough reform of the Ukrainian language and orthography in Ukraine. Owing to the realities of post-Soviet Ukraine, the first official results have remained meager to date. If, however, in recent years the Ukrainian language has been increasingly emancipated from the formerly disproportionate impact of Russian, and if today some of the most intellectually attractive Ukrainian publications employ unofficial orthographic variants similar to diaspora traditions (*Krytyka* and *K. I. S. publishers et al.*), that is largely to the credit of North American Ukrainians, who have never ceased to cherish the Ukrainian language in its pre-Stalinist form, as they have developed it since the early years of *Svoboda*.

APPENDIX 1.

Some Brief Notes on Early English Loans

From the very beginning, numerous English loanwords entered the language of *Svoboda*.¹ The early loans from English are numerous and cover various semantic spheres. Here are a few of them: *стейтъ* (S 1893/7: 2); *въ Монтанъ, на вестахъ* (S 1893/2: 3); *300.000 долярôвъ* (S 1893/2: 3); *за одного кводра* 'for one quarter' (S 1894/4: 3); *ченджъ* 'change' (S 1893/2: 3); *при баръ Баръкъперъ* (S 1893/2: 3); *грингорскою* (S 1893/2: 1; from *greenhorn*), *салюнь* (S 1900/26: 3); *въ майнахъ* (S 1893/4: 1), *майнерôвъ* (S 1893/2: 3); *перша руска гросерня* (S 1893/2: 4); *три фармери* (S 1893/4: 2); *3 центи за акеръ* (S 1893/4: 2); *На тихъ акрахъ* (ibid.); *съ плейзу на плейзъ* (S 1893/4: 1), *въ инши контри* (S 1893/4: 3); *першій мітингъ* (S 1893/4: 3); *ундертекера* (S 1893/4: 1); *пикнікъ* (S 1893/1: 2), *гаускиперъ* (S 1893/4: 4); *два тренъ* (S 1893/2: 3); *сѣвъ на горс-кару* (S 1893/7: 2); *стриткара* (1899/34: 1), *тикеть* (S 1893/5: 4); *рентъ* (S 1893/4: 4), *Въ ... бейзментъ* (S 1894/4: 3); *бетрамы* (S 1894/5: 3); *въ ледяной баксъ 'box'* (S 1893/4: 1), *"чю"* (in quotation marks) 'chewing gum' (S 1893/5: 4); *въ доброй капотъ 'capote'* (S 1893/4: 4), *"кікують"* (in quotation marks) 'kick' (S 1900/26: 1), *вачювалъ 'watch'* (S 1901/10: 3; from a miners' song, see above); *въ реджістрованôмъ листъ* (S 1904/1: 6); *money order* (*мони ордеръ*) (ibid.); *на експресовôмъ офисъ* (ibid.); *въ ихъ бѣзнесъ* (1893/2: 2), *съ набитыми револьверамъ* [sic] (S 1893/2: 3).

Quite often, English words were inserted into Ukrainian texts in their original orthography: "... просимо напередъ николи не посилати на чеки банку ... Най лучше посилати черезъ Money Order або въ листъ registered letters, а що найлѣпше черезъ Postall Note" (1894/1: 3), "All right я заплативъ тай хочу сѣдати на тренъ и дверникъ каже що я тимъ треномъ не можу ѣхати" (S 1893/5: 4), "... пôдъ сходами комнати напише "to let" а я буду просити о продовженіе и присягатись що на першого заплачу а онъ скаже "to late" [sic]" (S 1893/4: 4), "дôзнатись чи Tarif Bill Вилсона перейде чи нѣтъ" (S 1894/4: 2).

From the beginning, North American place-names were a challenge for speakers of Slavic languages. Many of the Ukrainized forms varied in the early years, e.g., *Нью-Йоркъ* (S 1894/1: 2), *въ Нью Йорку* (S 1894/4: 3); see the adjective [кілька чисел] *Нью Йорскої [казети]* [sic] (S 1904/51: 2), *Джерси Сити* (S 1893/2: 4) vs. *Джерсей Сити* (S 1893/2: 3), *Аркансасъ* vs. *Арканзасъ* (both S 1893/4: 2), *въ Питсбургъ* (S 1894/1: 2) vs. *въ Питсбургу* (S 1893/7: 4). In many cases, it was unpredictable whether place-names were to be declined or not; see loc. forms, such as *въ Лонгъ Аилянô* (S 1893/2: 3), *Въ Бенвудъ, О.* (S 1894/1: 2), *въ СкрантонъПа* [sic] (S 1894/4: 2; see below), *въ Олифантъ* (S 1894/4: 3) (all definitely in loc. case),

1 The language of *Svoboda* in the early years is even more interesting in that it perfectly reflects the fact that its writers (and speakers) not only acquired English loan words, but also brought with them a multitude of loan words from the home country. Along with a multitude of Polish loan words, these are surprisingly many loans from German. To give just two examples: "... наше братство розвинуло американську а потôмъ руску фану" (S 1893/2: 3), "Сли хочете буду здоровими, люфтуйте що дня ваши бетрамы и держѣть ихъ чисто" (S 1894/5: 3).

or до ... Пітерсборґ (S 1904/51: 7), съ Квинстонъ до New York-у (S 1893/4: 2), as opposed to declined forms, such as въ Газлестонѣ Па. (S 1894/4: 2), въ Вашингтонѣ (S 1894/4: 2), въ Нев Арку (S 1893/5: 4), до Нев Арку (ibid.), въ Пітсбургу (S 1894/1: 2), изъ Скрантону (S 1894/4: 3; see above), недалеко Кливелянду Огаю (S 1893/4: 2). In some cases, the indeclinability of names was more understandable from a contemporary point of view (and has partly even remained so in Modern Standard Ukrainian); see names in -о, like въ Санъ Францѣско (S 1893/7: 4; loc. case), до Чикаго (S 1893/5: 4), коло Буфало (S 1893/4: 3).

Quite often, American place-names were given in their original form. Although in many cases these might have been either morphologically complex names or names of lesser-known places, that was not necessarily so. Many readers who had never heard of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, probably found it useful to see the English spelling in the phrase дописъ съ Wilkesbarre (S 1893/5: 3). Cases such as Идуть депутаты до Маһаноу City (S 1894/4: 2) and Русини зъ Mt. Carmel Pa. (S 1894/4: 2) are different, as those mining towns were quite prominent at the time; here, the morphological complexity of the toponyms may have been decisive. The same may apply to the name of New York, which was sometimes rendered in the Latin alphabet even in the context of other American place-names presented in Cyrillic, as in съ Квинстонъ до New York-у (S 1893/4: 2), Плянь будови моста черезъ рѣку Гудсонъриверъ зъ Джерси Сити до New Yorku (S 1893/2: 4), or Нашъ чоловѣкъ Андрей Федакъ, вертаючи зъ Шенандоа Па, до старого краю, понавъ въ New York-у межи агентѣвъ жидкѣвъ (S 1894/4: 2). The once-famous mining center of Shenandoah was treated in a particularly interesting way. In вертаючи [sic] зъ Шенандоа Па it is indeclinable, as might have been expected. Elsewhere, however, the stem is expanded with -г, and the name is treated as a masculine noun ending in -О; see коло Шенандору (S 1894/4: 2). Names of town dwellers were then derived from that stem; see Слава Вамъ Шенандорцѣ (S 1894/4: 2) and Шенандорцѣвъ (S 1894/1: 2), along with бѣднымъ Шенандорчанамъ (ibid.). Adjectives such as пенсильванського (S 1893/5: 4) or скрантоньска (S 1894/4: 3) could be formed with no problem. The adjective for Чикаго is [съ всемірної выстави] чикаговської (S 1893/4: 2), i.e., чикагівськ- if rendered in Modern Standard Ukrainian orthography. The morphological treatment of many place-names of this kind still remains problematic in modern Slavic languages (Торонто etc.).

APPENDIX 2.

Early Efforts at Language Maintenance as Reflected in *Svoboda*

The following editorial from the second issue of *Svoboda* demonstrates that the key problem of the struggle against assimilation had evolved very quickly. The anonymous author—most likely Reverend Hruška himself—argued that language (here presented in the triune manner as *мова, бесѣда, языкъ*) is the major feature of a nation and called upon “American Ruthenians” not only to maintain their identity but also to exert (in this particular case, even brutal) group pressure on those who ceased to speak their heritage language:

“На широкѣмъ божѣмъ свѣтѣ жиє багато народѣвъ, котри рѣзнять ся межъ собою мовою, звичаями, обичаями, нижшимъ або висшимъ степенемъ просвѣти, цивилизації. Самою першою и найголовнѣйшою ознакою, по котрой розпѣзнаємъ одинъ народъ одъ другого, єсть мова, бесѣда, языкъ. ... Гей поволи! Забылъ еси дураку якъ и ты опинивъ ся въ Castle Garden ... съ вошима поза обшивкою а съ двома прускими фенігами въ кишени ...? Встидається своей власной мовы такъ значить якъ бы встидається своей рѣдной матери. ... Русини американьски! Сли съ осерпедины [*sic*] вась найдеть ся такій, що встидаєсь по руски говорити, виганяйте вѣдь себе якъ паршиву вѣвцю; въ хату непоскайте на улицѣ оминайте, виставте го на смѣхъ, на ганьбу передъ своимъ и чужимъ – напишѣть до старого краю: якій тутъ ставъ ся съ Ивана панъ” (S 1893/2: 1).

Like other minorities, American Ruthenians/Ukrainians could best maintain their old ethnic or national identity within their own communities. Many advertisements in *Svoboda*, beginning with the first ad in issue 2 for 1893, accentuated the national or language factor, pointing out that one would be served by “one’s own man” or that one’s language was spoken in a certain facility:

“W. Budzynski. 122 Cedar Str. New York.
Помежи Greenwich i Washington улицями.
АГЕНТУРА
КОРАБЕЛЬНА¹ И КОЛЮВА.
Спродаетъ шифкарты на найлѣпшій линіи морскій на Бременъ и Гамбургъ.
Посылає грошѣ до всѣхъ части свѣта.
Звертаємъ увагу, що яко свѣой чоловікъ обходить ся съ людьми сумлѣнно”
(S 1893/2: 4).

A particularly interesting text in this regard is Myxajlo Juhas’s versified advertisement for his “first Ruthenian butchery” in Scranton, Pennsylvania, in which Juhas pointed out that he “firmly stands for the Ruthenian people” and was fluent in various languages:

1 *b* is in fact inverted in the original publication.

ПЕРША РУСКА БУЧЕРНЯ ВЪ SCRANTON, PA.

Михайла М. Югаса

314 THIRD STREET.

Хочешь купить добре мясо,
Шинку чи смачныхъ ковбасъ,
Не трать брате грошей й часу,
Лишь пытайся, де бучерь Югасъ.
Вонъ всѣяке мясо мае,
Зъ людьми красно розмовляе
И поруски [sic], по словеньски,
По англицки и по польски.
Зъ него Русинъ, бучерь славный,
Къ доброй справѣ всегда справный,
За рускій нарѣдъ крѣпко стоитъ,
Вражды люцкой ся не боить.
Тожъ Русинамъ треба знати,
Що его тре пѣдирати;
Красно вважить, въ папѣрь запакуе,
Бучерня чиста, ажъ ся серце радуе.
Мы, Руснаки не жалуемо,
Вѣдъ Югаса все мясо купувати будемо,
Бо вонъ у Scranton найлѣпше мясо мае,
О томъ кожда дитина навѣтъ добре знае.
Тожъ милѣ братья, нѣкуда ся не волочѣтъ,
До найлѣпшой бучернѣ до Югаса ходѣтъ
Добре, тано, справедливо,
Чисто, смачно и уцтивно!" (S 1904/10: 7).

Notably, Juhas the butcher not only boasted of his command of Ruthenian, Polish, and Slovak² but also pointed out his knowledge of English.

As mentioned above, *Svoboda* itself offered its readers materials for the study of the majority language of North America. Moreover, it provided space for advertisements for English courses:

“ЕМІГРАНТ Є
ВЛАСТИТЕЛЕМ
СВОЄЇ СУДЬБИ

в тім краю лише тоді, коли він знає англійський язык. Не знаючи його, Ви не лише [sic: the second *ne* is missing] будете всілі найти роботу, але на все позістанете тут чужинцем і не будете покористуватись всіма привілеями і свободою, якими користаєсь американський народ. Коли научитесь по англійськи, то Вам легче будесь жити і скорше дібетесь становища. Ви ще не вибираєтесь до краю, але коли хочете їхати, учіться англійського языка. Той язык має велику будучність в краю. Вам трапляється народа вивчитись заочно сеї мови протягом 3 місяців при дуже легкій методи. Пробну лекцію і подробиці висилаємо за одержаннем

2 This is probably the correct interpretation of словенський. See the contemporary Slovak word *slovenský* ("Slovak").

10 цнт. грішми або марками, можна канадійськими. / Адресуйте: 39–41 FIRST AMERICAN PREPARATORY SCHOOL Dept. 46. 525 W. 47TH ST., NEW YORK CITY" (1920/80: 6).

If the major problem of the first generation was to find a place and acquire some knowledge of English, the situation changed dramatically for the second and third generations, whose representatives already had to make an effort to maintain the heritage language. In an issue that appeared in 1914, there is an interesting reflection on the question of the value of language maintenance as opposed to assimilation:

"Чи маємо ми вирікати ся рідної мови? ... Скаже хтонебудь: най би була одна мова на світі, бо правда – по що їх стільки? Воно може би то й було добре, а може й не зовсім. Скажім, коли було би одного лише рода дерево, або одного рода збіже чи інші рослини, то певно легко догадати ся, що на світі було би далеко не так добре, як є тепер. Але коли деревина чи інша рослина є лише зверхною прикрасою землі, то людська мова є як-би осередком сего життя, його душею, його внутрішньою прикрасою. ... Що подумала би, пережила би наша українська мати, коли-б її дитина прийшовши на світ, відізвала ся першим словом замість "мама", "тато" – "модер", "фадер"? Як би таксамо недорічи виглядало, колиб на весілю молодятам почали співати жінки чужу незрозумілу пісню?" (S 1914/60: 3).

This anonymous call for loyalty to the heritage language is noteworthy in that it does not merely make a traditional appeal "in the name of the nation" but also aptly brings in another argument, one that is as convincing as it is timely: translated into modern terminology, this article is first and foremost (especially in the first part of the quoted passage) an amazingly strong appeal for linguistic diversity.

IVAN PAN'KEYVYČ'S GRAMMAR OF THE RUTHENIAN LANGUAGE AND THE GALICIAN UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE IN SUBCARPATHIAN RUS'

1. Ivan Pan'keyvyč, the Galician language codifier in Subcarpathia

Ivan Pan'keyvyč,¹ the distinguished Ukrainian linguist and philologist, was born on 6 October 1887 in the village of Tseperiv in what is today the Kamianka-Buzka raion of Lviv oblast. After completing public school, he studied at the universities of Lviv and Vienna, obtaining his doctorate in the Austrian capital in 1912. Until 1919 the young Galician intellectual taught Russian at the Theresian Consular Academy in Vienna. After the closure of that institution in the fall of 1919, he moved to Prague to study at Charles University. However, a twist of fate resulted in his move from Prague to Subcarpathia:

Властитель квартири [в Празі], в якій я жив, сходився з братом референта шкільного реферату в Ужгороді Йосифа Пешка. Цей писав своєму братові, що потребував би мати при рефераті філолога, що є ознайомлений з мовою закарпатських українців. (Pan'keyvyč 2002: 98).

The owner of the apartment [in Prague] where I was living socialized with Josef Pešek, the brother of the head of the school board in Uzhhorod. He wrote to his brother that the school board needed a philologist who was acquainted with the language of the Transcarpathian Ukrainians.

Since Pan'keyvyč had already long been interested in the language of Subcarpathia, in December 1919 he was "hired as a contractual official of the school board who was supposed to take charge of the language department and regulate the language of instruction and the official language" (ibid.).² In addition, Pan'keyvyč became the editor of the children's magazine *Vinočok* (Little Garland) and the teachers' journal *Uchytel'* (Teacher). He also translated official circulars and school board directives into Ukrainian (ibid., 99). In 1920, Pan'keyvyč became a "provisional teacher" (ibid., 100) and, eventually, a professor of the Uzhhorod gymnasium.³ In Uzhhorod he was an extraordinarily active cultural figure. After the occupation of Subcarpathia by Hungary, which was then under the rule of Miklós Horthy, Pan'keyvyč returned to Prague, where he resumed teaching in various gymnasiums. In 1939 he became a docent of the Ukrainian Free University (UVU), which was then based in Prague,⁴ and in 1947 he was appointed professor of Ukrainian studies at Charles University. Ivan Pan'keyvyč died in Prague in 1958 (Mušinka 2002: 25).

1 This article is a considerably abbreviated version of a forthcoming book. In this essay, the terms "Subcarpathia" and "Transcarpathia" are used interchangeably.

2 "[...] ангажовано як договірному урядника шк. реферату, який мав вести мовний реферат, регулювати мову навчання та і урядову."

3 See Mušinka 2002; for a more detailed discussion, see Mušinka 2002a.

4 Today, the Ukrainian Free University is based in Munich.

Pan'keyvych was the author of numerous scholarly works, but the present article focuses only on his *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language for the Lower Grades of High School and Public Schools* (Граматика руського языка для молодших клас шкіл середних и горожанських), which was published in three editions: 1922, 1927, and 1936. The linguistic and political framework of this grammar is best described by Pan'keyvych in his autobiography:

[1919 p.] чеська адміністрація хотіла знати якою слов'янською мовою є мова закарпатських жителів, бо генеральний статут цієї автономної країни говорив про мову населення, як руську мову, в якій має вестися навчання в школах і адміністрація в краї. Анкета Чеської академії наук виразно заявила, що мова закарпатського населення є діалект української мови, а не радить заводити четверту східнослов'янську мову. Радила з огляду на консерватизм тамошньої інтелігенції придержуватися поки що старого українського правопису, уживаного до 1890-х років в українських школах Галичини. Я цим і руководився. (Pan'keyvych 2002a: 99).⁵

[In 1919] the Czech administration wanted to know which Slavic language was the language of the Transcarpathian inhabitants because the general statute of this autonomous land spoke of the language of the population as the Ruthenian language, in which instruction was to be carried out in schools and in the administration of the land. The questionnaire of the Czech Academy stated clearly that the language of the Transcarpathian population was a dialect of Ukrainian and did not advise introducing a fourth East Slavic language. In view of the conservatism of the local intelligentsia, it advised adhering in the meantime to the old Ukrainian orthography used in Ukrainian schools in Galicia until the 1890s. I governed myself accordingly.

In a letter to the Lviv philologist Ul'jana Jedlins'ka dated 12 January 1957, Ivan Pan'keyvych also writes about other factors that influenced the language of his grammar, specifically his discussions and arguments with the Ruthenian ethnographer and historian Hijador Stryps'kyj (ibid., 162–63).

Although the situation in the areas south of the Carpathian Mountains undoubtedly had a decisive impact on Pan'keyvych's linguistic conduct in Subcarpathia, one should bear in mind not only this factor (for detailed discussion of the issue, see also Pan'keyvych 1923) but also the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia during the preceding decades. Pan'keyvych's strategy was undoubtedly based on the fact that even before the interwar period, the Ukrainian populist current in Transcarpathia was extremely weak in comparison with Old Ruthenianism and Muscophilism, and the Rusyn movement in the present-day sense did not yet exist (Moser 2008c). But this strategy cannot be understood without reckoning with Pan'keyvych's linguistic background: in his early years he had witnessed the final

5 With regard to the status of the Subcarpathian dialects as dialects of the Ukrainian language, the Czech Academy of Sciences was merely reiterating a point on which, in fact, all nineteenth-century scholars concurred. Even the most zealous opponents of Ukrainian identity claimed that the Subcarpathian dialects, along with other dialects of the Ukrainian-speaking space, belonged to the "Little Russian branch" of the Ruthenian language.

stage of Ukrainian identity formation in Galicia, which was marked by the decision of the Galician "Ruthenians" to adopt (finally) the term "Ukrainian" with respect to themselves. Pan'kevych was studying at a village school in Galicia in 1894, when the Galician school system officially adopted the so-called "phonetic" orthography, and he was witness to the extent to which the Galician Ruthenian-Ukrainians sought to master and disseminate all-Ukrainian linguistic norms that they had adopted from the "Little Russians"-Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Even without the Czech Academy of Sciences, Pan'kevych probably realized that it was not enough simply to "Ukrainize" the inhabitants of Subcarpathia, but that it was necessary—and preferable—to duplicate the Galician experience of the second half of the nineteenth century in Subcarpathian Rus'; to pave the way for the contemporary Ukrainian literary language only after placing increasingly greater distance between the Slavic Ruthenian and Russophile linguistic traditions and regional ones.

Below, Pan'kevych describes the linguistic foundation of his grammar in the introductions to the first and second editions (the third edition does not have an introduction; changes in the introduction to the second edition are indicated in bold):

1922:

Я постановив опертися на живый народній язык и взяв під увагу тѣ говори, котри суть найчистѣйши од чужих впливѣв и котри служили за основу першим галицьким писателям Н. Устияновичови и Могильницкому, т. є. говори верховинські и марамороські. При тѣм брав я також и на згляд окрем творѣв литературы малоруської и литературни твори Підкарпатских Русинѣв, а то: А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Дем'яна – писани народною мовою, а також пѣснѣ и оповѣданя из збѣрникѣв [...]
Односно правописи переняв я систему етимологичну Д-ра О. Огоновского, якого „Граматика руського языка“ довго служила в галицких середних школах, а котру у великій части перебрав о. Августин Волошин до своєї Граматики на мадярськѣм языцѣ из р. 1907.
Для лекшої орієнтації до терминѣв граматичних малоруських додав я також термини великоруські, яки тут були уживани (Н 1: 3–4).

1927:

Я постановив опертися на живый народній язык и взяв під увагу тѣ говори, котрѣ суть найчистѣйшѣ од чужих впливѣв и котрѣ служили за основу першим галицьким писателям Н. Устияновичови и Могильницкому, т. є. говори верховинські и марамороські. При тѣм брав я також и на згляд окрѣм творѣв литературы малоруської и литературни твори Підкарпатских Русинѣв, а то: А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Дем'яна – писанѣ народньою мовою, а також пѣснѣ и оповѣданя из збѣрникѣв [...]
Односно правописи переняв я систему етимологичну Д-ра О. Огоновского, якого „Граматика руського языка“ довго служила в галицких середних школах, а котру у великій части перебрав о. Августин Волошин до своєї Граматики на мадярськѣм языцѣ из р. 1907.
Для легкой орієнтації до терминѣв граматичных малоруських додав я також термини великоруські, якѣ тут були уживанѣ (Н 2: 3–4).

I have decided to base myself on the living vernacular, taking into consideration those dialects that are purest with regard to foreign influences and that have served as a basis for the leading Galician writers Mykola Ustyianovych and Mohyl'nyc'kyi, i.e., the Verkhovyna and Maramureş dialects. In that regard I also considered, aside from the works of Little Russian literature, the works of Subcarpathian Ruthenians, namely, A. Duxnovych, Ju. Žatkovych, and Luka Demjan, which were written in the vernacular, as well as songs and stories from [various] collections.... Regarding orthography, I adopted the

etymological system of Dr. O. Ohonovs'kyj, whose *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language* was long used in Galician high schools, [that etymological system] which Father Avgustyn Vološyn adopted for the greater part in his Hungarian-language grammar of 1907. For easier orientation with regard to Little Russian grammatical terms, I have added Great Russian terms that have been used here [in Transcarpathia].

On the one hand, Pan'kevyč wrote openly that he was basing himself on Galician models (see also Pan'kevyč 1923: 150); on the other, readers of his grammar were supposed to accept that the language of the grammar was grounded, above all, in their very own Subcarpathian linguistic reality in the regional sense, for he had written that he was orienting himself on the "Verkhovyna and Maramureš dialects" ("говори верховинські і марамороські").

However, even though almost all contemporary scholars, both Ukrainian and Rusyn,⁶ reiterate Pan'kevyč's claim that the language of his grammar is based on the Verkhovyna and Maramureš dialects, this is not entirely accurate. In fact, as Jurij Ševel'ov notes,

[О]бставини того часу змусили Панькевича маскувати українську мову в своїй граматиці під верховинський і мармароський діалекти [sic], з яких він зберіг одначе лише кілька особливостей (те, що інколи вважають діалектними [sic] елементами в Панькевича ... є тільки етимологічним правописом), і вдатися до етимологічного правопису, що справді був радше псевдоетимологічним. (Ševel'ov 1998: 162).

The circumstances of that period compelled Pan'kevyč to mask the Ukrainian language in his grammar as Verkhovyna and Maramureš dialects, of which he retained, however, only a few features (that which is sometimes regarded as dialectal elements in Pan'kevyč...is only the etymological orthography), and to use the etymological orthography, which was in fact a pseudo-etymological orthography.

In fact, only two features of the above-mentioned dialects are germane to the language of Pan'kevyč's grammar:

- 1) the reflex *i* from *o* in a newly closed syllable, which in the areas south of the Carpathians is typical only of the Rakhiv and Veretski Nyzhni areas (Pan'kevyč 1938: map no. 1);
- 2) the ending *-mo* in the first person pl. of the present tense of verbs, which, in the areas south of the Carpathians, is typical only of the eastern Maramureš region (AUM 1988: map no. 241).

6 See, e.g., the remarks of the Prešov-based linguist of Ukrainian orientation Zuzana Hanudel' in her commentary on Pan'kevyč 2002a: "This was the first grammar written on the basis of Carpathian dialects, with certain similarities to the Transcarpathian literary language in keeping with the etymological orthography of Maksymovyč-Ohonovs'kyj" (Pan'kevyč 2002: 167). See also the comments of the Rusyn activist Ivan Pop: "the first two editions of his *Hramatyka Rus' koho iazyka* (1922, 1927) were not grammars of literary Ukrainian but rather of a language based closely on local Rusyn vernacular speech" (Pop 2005: 370–71).

Clearly, both these apparent elements of the “Verkhovyna and Maramureš” dialects are in fact simply those that coincide with features of the contemporary Ukrainian literary language. Obviously, Pan'kevyč also selected the other features for his language on the same basis:

– the ending *-mb* in the third person sing. and pl. of the present tense of verbs, which is also typical of the Uzhhorod and Mukachiv areas (AUM 1988: map no. 242), while the hard ending *-m* is more prevalent in eastern Transcarpathia and recently entered the contemporary “Subcarpathian standard” of the current Rusyn language (Kerča 2007: 141);⁷

– *дж < *dj* in forms, like *ходжы*, although in areas around Uzhhorod there exists the reflex *ж*, which is also predominant in areas east of Mukachiv (Pan'kevyč 1938, map no. 2; cf. AUM 1988: map no. 235) and has entered the Subcarpathian standard of the contemporary Rusyn language (ibid., 141; in contrast to the Prešov (Priashiv) standard, cf. Jabur and Pliškova 2007: 159);

– the ending *-e* in the nom./acc. sing. neuter, which is also not typical of the vicinities of Uzhhorod and Mukachiv, where, in contrast to the Prešov region and areas east of Rika (Pan'kevyč: map IV; AUM 1988: map no. 217), *-oe* clearly predominates and has entered the “Subcarpathian standard” of the contemporary Rusyn language (Kerča 2007: 135).⁸

These points notwithstanding, one cannot speak unreservedly of the “Ukrainian language” in Ivan Pan'kevyč's grammar: although he intended to pave the way for the contemporary Ukrainian literary language in Subcarpathia, he could not use it. In fact, not only did he take a deliberate step backward in the domain of orthography, but he also reverted to the earlier Galician linguistic traditions on all other linguistic levels. Thus it comes as no surprise that the language of Pan'kevyč's grammar in fact approximates that of Galician school textbooks of the 1860s, the period in which the populists were just beginning to bring their language closer to the “great Ukrainian” language.

Ivan Pan'kevyč knew why he had done this. His linguistic innovations were not supposed to appear too radical because the situation was such that “during the First Transcarpathian Teachers' Congress (16–17 April 1920) no one even raised the question of the Ukrainian literary language” (Ševel'ov 1998: 162). Against the background of this prevailing mood, the Subcarpathian teachers' congress of 1923 rejected the use of Pan'kevyč's grammar by a vote of 544 against and only 2 in favor (ibid.; Magocsi 1978: 140). In the final analysis, this vote did not benefit any variant of Rusyn common language but the local variant of Russian,⁹ whose distance from the commonly spoken language was very considerable.

7 By contrast, the ending *-mb* is typical of the Prešov region: see AUM 1988: map no. 242. In fact, it has entered the Slovak standard of the contemporary Rusyn language: see Jabur and Pliškova 2007: 176.

8 By contrast, the Prešov standard of the Rusyn language has codified the ending *-e* (Jabur and Pliškova 2007: 173).

9 One of the most ardent adherents of the adoption of Russian was the Russophile Heorhij Gerovs'kyj, another Galician émigré.

Pan'keyvych did indeed mask himself. In the introductions to the first and second editions of his grammar, he acknowledged that he "had also...considered the works of the Subcarpathian Rusyns in addition to the works of Little Russian literature" (H2: 3). But at this point he failed to name a single "Little Russian" writer. The grammar also contains few examples of works by Subcarpathian writers. Here and there one finds extracts from Oleksander Duxnovyč's play *Virtue Is More Important than Riches* (Добродѣтель превышаетъ богатство) and the works of Jurij Žatkovyč and other writers, but quotations from folklore predominate.¹⁰

Ivan Pan'keyvych's *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language* is certainly not a grammar of the Rusyn language in the present-day sense. Nevertheless, it is a grammar of the Ukrainian language featuring a large number of purely Galician characteristics that distinguish both the object language and the metalanguage of this grammar not only from the contemporary Ukrainian literary language but also from all variants of the Ukrainian literary language in use during the interwar period. Despite certain rather pervasive claims to the contrary,¹¹ this pertains to all three editions of Pan'keyvych's work.

2. Three editions of the *Grammar of the Ruthenian Language*

The preceding quotations already demonstrate that the first and second editions of Pan'keyvych's grammar differ not only as to content but also as to certain linguistic features. Additional changes were made in the third edition and are evident on the title pages:

1922

Граматика руського языка
для молодших клас шкôл
середних и горожанських.
Написав Д-р Иван
Панькевич. Одобрено
рѣшенем министерства
школьництва и народноѣ
освѣты з дня 26. іюлія 1922,
ч. 66.879. Цѣна 8 Кч. 1922.
Накладомъ державного
видавництва Прага –
Братислава. Мукачево 1922.
Типографія „Карпатія”,
Мукачево, Городская ул. н-р 5.

1927:

Граматика руського языка
для молодших клас шкôл
середних и горожанських.
Написав Д-р Иван Панькевич.
Друге перероблене
и доповнене виданє.
Накладом Державного Ви
давництва в Празѣ. Ч. м.
760. Цѣна Кч 10.– 1927¹²

1936:

Граматика руського языка
для шкôл середних и
горожанських. Написав
Д-р Иван Панькевич
Трете пе рероблене и
доповнене виданя. Одобрено
розпорядком министерства
шкôль ництва и народноѣ
освѣты з дня 22. октября 1935,
ч. 156.507/34-II/1 як помôчна
книга для середних шкôл
з учебны [sic] языком пôд
карпаторуським. Цѣна Кч11.
– Накладом Державного
видавництва в Празѣ. 1936.

10 Oleksander Duxnovyč probably never wanted to see any fragments of his play cited in any grammar of the 'Ruthenian (or: Russian) language' (Moser 2011: 627–640).

11 See Pop 2005: 371: "...by the 1930s, texts using Pan'keyvych's language had been 'cleaned up,' the 'local dialectisms' removed, and the transition to a Ukrainian literary language completed (compare the third edition of his grammar, 1936)."

12 On the title page of a copy of the second edition that is preserved at the Stefanyk Library in Lviv, Pan'keyvych wrote the following inscription: "Бібліотечі наукового товариства ім [sic, no period] Шевченка у Львові від автора" ("For the Library of the Ševčenko Scientific Society from the author").

The title pages reveal interesting changes in the orthography, such as *горожанських* > *горожанських*, *клас* > *клас*, and *выдане* > *выдання*; at the same time, all the old scripts—along with the corresponding pronunciations of these forms—are typical of most nineteenth-century Galician orthographic systems, and the spellings *класа* and *выдане* were retained as late as the interwar period. Meanwhile, all the new forms represented approximations to the norms of the contemporary Ukrainian literary language in its interwar state, although the form *выдання* was still not being written as *-нн-* (see below). The form *класа* was also considered standard even according to the Kharkiv (“Skrypnyk”) orthography of 1928, which was replaced by the Russian-like *клас* within five years during the period of Stalinist repression that targeted Ukrainians and their language.

The introduction to the grammar in the first edition is titled “Введенє” (H1: 3);¹³ in the second edition, the title is “Передмова до першого видання” (Introduction to the First Edition) (H2: 3).¹⁴ The following changes appear in this introduction (I remind readers that there was no introduction to the third edition):

The *o* > *ô* substitution: The reflex < *o* is traditionally indicated in newly closed syllables.

<p>поднести язык свого народа на степень языка образованого (3) стрѣнулись мы из недостатком всяких помочных средств для научованя нашего языка (3)</p>	<p>пѣднести язык свого народа на степень стрѣнулись мы из недостатком всяких языка образованого (3) помѣчных средств для научованя нашего языка (3)¹⁵</p>
---	--

The *e* > *ь* substitution: Although the letter *ѣ* is not used in Modern Standard Ukrainian, this substitution reflects the process of approximation to the standards of the Ukrainian literary language, inasmuch as *ѣ* renders [i] (see Modern Standard Ukrainian *окрім*). Csopcy 1883 has entries for *окремь* and *окрѣмь*.

<p>При тѣм брав я також и на згляд окрем творѣв литературы малоруськоѣ и литературни творы Пѣдкарпатских Русинѣв (4)</p>	<p>При тѣм брав я також и на згляд окрѣм твѣров литературы малоруськоѣ и лите ратурни творы Пѣдкарпатских Русинѣв (4)</p>
--	---

Soft and hard stems of adjectives: The forms *народний* and *народній* coexist in the Ukrainian literary language; soft stems, however, are not typical of Galician and Subcarpathian dialects.¹⁶ The second example is evidence rather of a corrected printer's error in the first edition, since the word *граматичний* does not have a soft stem:

<p>творы Пѣдкарпатских Русинѣв, а то: А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Демяна – писани народною мовою (4)</p>	<p>творы Пѣдкарпатских Русинѣв, а то: А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Демяна – писанѣ народньою мовою (4)</p>
---	--

13 There is also a “Table of Contents” (“Содержанє”) at the end of the first edition (H1: 109).

14 This is, in fact, an edited version of the introduction to the first edition.

15 There are occasional errors, e.g., *окрем творѣв* (4) > *окрѣм твѣров* (4).

16 Cf.: “Деякъ з прикетників мягких мають тверде и мягке окѣнченя: *верхній* и *верхный*, *горѣшній* и *горѣшный*” (78). (“Some of the soft adjectives have a hard and soft ending: *верхній* and *верхный*, *горѣшній* and *горѣшный*.”)

до терминѡв граматичних малоруських
додав я також термини великоруськи (4)

до терминѡв граматичных малоруських
додав я також термини великоруськѣ (4)¹⁷

Endings of adjectival and pronominal forms in nom. pl.: The writing of *ѣ* [i] indicates unambiguous approximation to the standards of the Ukrainian literary language; the *-i* ending also predominates in the eastern dialects of Subcarpathia (AUM 1988: map no. 221). Meanwhile, the writing of the ending with *-и* is subject to interpretation as [i] and [y^e]. However, Pan'kevych himself appends the following piece of advice to the form *наши*: "Read as *naši*" ("Читай як наші") (H1: 41).

Пѡдкарпатски Русины (3)
письменни люде радили собѣ в письмѣ
всѣляко (3)
тѣ говоры, котри суть найчистѣйши од
чужих впылѡв и котри служили за основу
першим галицьким писателям
Н. Устѣяновичови и Могильницкому,
т. є. говоры верховинськи и
мараморошськи (3–4).
Творы Пѡдкарпатских Русинѡв, а то:
А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Демяна –
писани народною мовою (4)
До терминѡв граматичних малоруських
додав я також термини великоруськи,
яки тут були уживани (4)

Пѡдкарпатскѣ Русины (3)
письменнѣ люде радили собѣ в письмѣ
всѣляко (3)
тѣ говоры, котрѣ суть найчистѣйшѣ од
чужих впылѡв и котрѣ служили за основу
першим галицьким писателям
Н. Устѣяновичови и Могильницкому,
т. є. говоры верховинськѣ и
мараморошськѣ (3–4).
творы Пѡдкарпатских Русинѡв, а то:
А. Духновича, Ю. Жатковича, Луки Демяна –
писанѣ народною мовою (4)
до терминѡв граматичных малоруських
додав я також термини великоруськѣ,
якѣ тут були уживанѣ (4)

Substitution in word forms: A less widely known form is replaced in the following case (cf. Polish *lekki*). Sosepy 1883 has the entries *легкий* (-ый) and *полегшати*; Dzendzelivs'kyj 1958 has the entry *легко*. Želexivs'kyj 1886 has *легчити*, *улегчити* along with *легшати* [sic]; Kuzelja–Rudnyč'kyj 1943/1987 have an entry *улекш-*, but it refers to "→ *улегш-* = *влегш-*":

Для лекшоѣ орієнтаціѣ (4), пор. *легко* (6)

Для легшоѣ орієнтаціѣ (4), пор. *легко* (5).

Lexical changes: In the following cases, lexemes from the Slavonic-Ruthenian and Russophile traditions are supplanted:

Введење (3)
... гористый край, потворив окреми
языкови островы в дечѡм **одлични** од себе (3)

Передмова до першого видання (3)
... гористый край, потворив окремѣ языковѣ
островы в дечѡм **одмѣннѣ** од себе (3).¹⁸

In contrast to the introduction, the main text of the grammar exists in three versions. The order and contents of the various parts of the grammar differ from one edition to the next. The table below shows only a selection of the linguistic changes that appeared in every succeeding edition of Pan'kevych's grammar:

17 At issue here, however, is the correction of errors that may be explained by the influence of the "phonetic" orthography.

18 The Prešov variant of the Rusyn language uses the word *одлишній*.

Orthographic changes:

The *o* > *ô* substitution: see above. The following words could also be used in the Polish or Slovak pronunciations with the original *o*.

ПОДОБНЫЙ (7)	ПОД ^О БНЫЙ (6)	ПОД ^О БНЫЙ (4)
ВОЛЬНЫЙ (8)	В ^О ЛЬНЫЙ (7)	В ^О ЛЬНЫЙ (6)

The *od* > *vôd* substitution: The writing of *vôd* with an indication of the prothetical *v*- most corresponds to the most widespread use of the form in the contemporary Ukrainian literary language, *vid*.

На одн ^О м и т ^О м сам ^О м склад ^Ъ , а именно на друг ^О м од к ^О нця (7).	на одн ^О м и т ^О м сам ^О м склад ^Ъ , а именно на друг ^О м од к ^О нця (7).	на одн ^О м и т ^О м сам ^О м склад ^Ъ , а именно на друг ^О м в ^О д к ^О нця (5).
---	---	---

The *ôn* > *vôn* substitution: The writing of *vôn* with an indication of the prothetical *v*- is the closest to the contemporary Ukrainian writing of *vin*. The forms *ун*, *она*, and *они* are codified in the Subcarpathian variant of the Rusyn language (Kerča 2007: 134), but as *vin*, *она*, and *они* in the Prešov variant (Jabur and Pliškova 2007: 173).

О ^Н (8)	В ^О Н (7)	В ^О Н (6)
--------------------	----------------------	----------------------

The *e*- > *ε*- substitution: At issue here is merely the correction of a printing error that may have occurred under the influence of Russian orthography. Appended to the end of the first edition is a list titled "Printing errors" ("Печатни ошибки"), with the notation: "Here and there *e* is written instead of *ε*. Readers are requested to correct those cases themselves." ("Де куды мѣсто *ε* написано *e*. Тѣ случаѣ проситѣя читачѣв справити самим") (Н1: по р.).

Если [...] (8)	Єсли [...] (7)	Єсли [...] (6)
----------------	----------------	----------------

The *ezo* > *ïozo* substitution: The orthography has undergone phonetization, which brings the language closer to the Ukrainian literary language, but it is also grounded in Subcarpathian conditions, cf. *ezo* in the Subcarpathian variant of the Rusyn language (Kerča 2007: 134).

Тото звукове явище дуже давнє в наш ^О м языкѣ. Порозумѣти εго мож добре, коли возьмемо п ^О д увагу цѣлый малоруській язык за Карпатами поза. П ^О дкарпатскою Русею (11)	Тото звукове явище дуже давнє в наш ^О м языкѣ. Порозумѣти εго мож добре, коли возьмемо п ^О д увагу цѣлый малоруській (украинський) язык за Карпатами поза П ^О дкарпатскою Русею (11).	Тото звукове явище дуже давнє в наш ^О м языкѣ. Порозумѣти його мож добре, коли возьмемо п ^О д увагу цѣлый руський (украинський) язык за Карпатами поза П ^О дкарпатскою Русею (19).
---	---	---

The *-(нѣ)ск-* > *-(н)ськ-* substitution: Softening in the suffix *-ськ-* (< *-bšk-*) is typical of the eastern Subcarpathian dialects (Van'ko 2007: 79) as well as of the contemporary Ukrainian language. It is not typical of the majority of Galician dialects and Galician variants of the nineteenth-century written language, where the writing of *-(нѣ)ск-* clearly predominated.

В западных частях п ^О дкарпато-руського языка, а то в жупах – земплин ^{ЬС} к ^О й (западна часть),	В западных частях п ^О дкарпато-руського языка, а то в жупах – земплин ^{ЬС} к ^О й (западна часть),	В западных частях п ^О дкарпато-руського языка, а то в жупах – земплин ^{ЬС} к ^О й (западна часть),
---	---	---

шаришскѡй и спишскѡй наголос єсть недвижымый (7)	шаришськѡй и спишськѡй наголос єсть недвижымый (7)	шаришськѡй и спишськѡй наголос є недвижымый (5)
---	---	--

The *c* > *z* substitution: Orthographic conservatism has been supplanted.

с их частями (8) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно с перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне <i>и</i> (13)	з их частями (7) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно з перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне тверде <i>и</i> (13)	з их частями (6) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно з перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне тверде <i>и</i> (22–23)
---	---	--

Morphological changes:

Endings in the gen. sing. of masc. nouns: Hesitation about using *-y/-a* occurs in all Slavic languages in which both endings are used. In this case, the later editions opted for the form that did not enter the Ukrainian literary language, but in both the second and the third editions the form *голосу* predominates (HЗ: 6) and appears on the same page as *голоса* (HЗ: 6). The ending *-y* also predominates in the Subcarpathian dialects.

Голосу (8)	голоса (7)	голоса (6)
------------	------------	------------

Soft and hard stems of adjectives: see above. In the contemporary Ukrainian literary language, in the next two cases only the soft stem is used: *попередній, нинішній*.

попереднім (7) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно с перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне <i>и</i> (13)	попередним (6) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно з перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне тверде <i>и</i> (13).	попередним (5) Тота перемѣна <i>ы</i> на <i>и</i> у нас дуже давна и она зачалася одночасно з перемѣною <i>и</i> (давне <i>i</i>) на нынѣшне тверде <i>и</i> (22–23).
---	--	---

Endings of adjectival and pronominal forms in nom. pl.: see above.

наши писателѣ первоѣ половины XIX в. (6)	нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ половины XIX в. (6)	нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ половины XIX вѣка (4)
---	---	---

Substitution of morphological forms of words: In all the following cases, approximation to all existing standards of the contemporary Ukrainian literary language takes place. SUM does not list the form *наголошати*, only *наголошувати*. Csopey 1883 has an entry for *наголошувати*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 also lists only *наголошувати*. Csopey 1883 has an entry for *первый* along with *першый*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 also lists *первий* along with *першый*. Želexivs'kyj 1886 notes *єсть* (*ε*) under the entry for *єсть*; Csopey 1883 lists an entry for *ε* and adds (*єсть*) only in parentheses. Csopey 1883 lists *cece* without any marks; Želexivs'kyj 1886 does not have this dialectal form, which is also common in areas north of the Carpathians. Finally, forms of the indefinite pronoun without the particle *-сь* are quite prevalent in the Ukrainian-speaking area: they also occur, e.g., in the language of Taras Ševčenko (Moser 2008a: 226), but forms with the added *-сь* are neutral.

наголошаємо (7) наши писателѣ первоѣ половины XIX в. (6) [...] наголос єсть недвижымый, т. зн. стоить все на	наголошуємо (6) нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ половины XIX в. (6) [...] наголос єсть недвижымый, т. є. стоить все на	наголошуємо (4) нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ половины XIX вѣка (4) [...] наголос є недвижымый, то є стоить все на
--	---	--

однѠм и тѠм самѠм
складѣ [...]. Ø (7)

однѠм и тѠм самѠм
складѣ [...].
Єсть то вплив суспѣдного
польського языка (7)

однѠм и тѠм самѠм
складѣ, [...].
Є то вплив суспѣдного
польського языка (5)

Но суть у нас околицѣ у
Марамороши, де **сесе** *ы*
зовсѣм однаково звучить
як *и*. (13)

Но суть у нас околицѣ, на
прим.: Гуцульщина и коло
Ужгорода, де **сесе** *ы* зовсѣм
однаково звучить як *и* (13)

Но суть у нас околицѣ, на
прим.: Гуцульщина и коло
Ужгорода, де **се** *ы* зовсѣм
однаково звучить як *и*
(22–23) [see Modern
Ukrainian *це* < *оце* < *от се*]

якій запор (8)

якийсь запѠр (7)

якийсь запѠр (6)

Lexical changes:

Substitution of “dialectal” words:

Єѣ хоснують¹⁹ такожъ
наши писателѣ першоѣ
половины XIX в. (6)
из ротовоѣ **рурки** [...]
в устнѠй **рурцѣ** (8)²⁰

Єѣ **уживають** такожъ
нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ
половины XIX в. (6)
из ротовоѣ **ямы** [...]
в устнѠй **ямѣ** (7)

Єѣ **уживають** такожъ
нашѣ писателѣ першоѣ
половины XIX вѣка (4)
через ротовую **яму** [...]
в устнѠй **ямѣ** (6)

Substitution of lexemes from the Slavonic-Ruthenian and Russophile traditions:

Наѣголос (**удареніе**) (7)
послѣ губных чуемо **всегда** *й* (9)
При выговорѣ склада чуемо
нисколько [зам. *нѣсколько*]
звукѠвъ (6).

Наѣголос Ø (6)
по губных чуемо **все** *й* (8)
При выговорѣ слова чуемо
бѠльше звукѠвъ (5)

Наголос Ø (4)²¹
по губных чуемо **все** *й* (7)
(В кождѠм словѣ чуемо ще
Ø окремѣ його части, меншѣ
вѠд складѠвъ, якѣ не даються
вже дальше подѣлити. Тѣ
найпростѣйшѣ *й* и *неподѣльнѣ*
части слова або складу
називаємо звуками (3).)

Other word substitutions: In the first example, the content changes. On the second and third examples, see below.

При выговорѣ **склада** чуемо
нисколько звукѠвъ (6).

При выговорѣ **слова** чуемо
бѠльше звукѠвъ (5)

(В кождѠм **словѣ** чуемо ще
окремѣ його части, меншѣ
вѠд складѠвъ, [...]) (3).)

19 This Magyarism is quite widespread in Galicia. See also the entries for *хиснувати*, *хосен*, *хосенний* in Želexivs'kyj 1886.

20 Csopej 1883 and Dzendzelivs'kyj 1958 do not list an entry for *рурка*, a word that appears, however, in Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987. In SUM the words *пура* and *рурка* are defined as “colloquial” forms.

21 *Sic*. The stress is indicated in H1 and H2, but not in H3. It is obvious that Pan'kevych initially thought that the term was not yet known in Subcarpathia.

Syntactic substitutions:

Prepositions:

Не всѣ склады выговоряемо
О однаковою силою (7).
из ротовоѣ рурки (8)
Для практичных цѣлей
 привертаемо ту букву
 опять (6)
Послѣ²³ самозвука (9)
послѣ губных чуемо всегда ѣ (9)

Не всѣ склады выговоряе
 мо з однаковою силою (6).
из ротовоѣ ямы (7)
Из практичных цѣлей
 привертаемо ту букву
 опять (6).
по самозвуцѣ (8)
по губных чуемо **все** ѣ (8)

Не всѣ склады выговоряемо
 з однаковою *силою* (4).²²
через ротовую яму (6)
Из практичных цѣлей
 привертаемо ту букву
 опять (4).
по самозвуцѣ (7)
по губных чуемо **все** ѣ (7)

Word order: I list only one example (of several):

Наголос може стояти в
 руськомъ языкѣ на першомъ,
 другомъ, третѣмъ, або и
 четвертомъ складѣ [...] (7)

В руськомъ языкѣ наголос
 може стояти на першомъ,
 другомъ, третѣмъ, або и
 четвертомъ складѣ [...] (6)

В руськомъ языкѣ наголос
 може стояти на першомъ,
 другомъ, третѣмъ, або и
 четвертомъ складѣ [...] (5)

Other syntactic substitutions: I list only one example (of several):

Пересунемо язык
 мало наперед [...] (8)

Коли пересунемо язык
 мало наперед [...] (7)

Коли пересунемо язык
 мало наперед до середнього
 побднѣбня, а губы мало
 звязаться, одержимо
 звук *ы* (7)

Corrections and additions: Both the new editions are revised. I list only two examples of corrections and additions:

В западных частях
 підкарпато-руського языка,
 а то в жупах – земплинськѣй
 (западна часть), шаринськѣй
 и спишськѣй наголос есть
 недвижимый, т. зн. стоитъ
 все на одномъ и томъ самомъ
 складѣ, а именно на другомъ
 од конця. На прим.: ко́лач,
 ви́но, тра́ва и т. д. мѣсто
 правильного ко́лач [*sic*],
 вино́, трава́ (7).

В западных частях
 підкарпато-руського языка,
 а то в жупах – земплинськѣй
 (западна часть), шаринськѣй
 и спишськѣй наголос есть
 недвижимый, т. є. стоитъ
 все на одномъ и томъ самомъ
 складѣ, а именно на другомъ
 од конця. На прим.: ко́лач,
 ви́но, тра́ва и т. д. мѣсто
 правильного ко́лач, вино́,
 трава́. **Єсть то вплив**
сусѣднього польського
языка. (7)

В западных частях
 підкарпато-руського языка,
 а то в жупах – земплинськѣй
 (западна часть), шаринськѣй
 и спишськѣй наголос є
 недвижимый, то є стоитъ
 все на одномъ и томъ самомъ
 складѣ, а именно на другомъ
 вѣд конця. На прим.: ко́лач,
 ви́но, тра́ва и т. д. мѣсто
 правильного ко́лач, вино́,
 трава́. **Є то вплив**
сусѣднього польського
языка. (5)

Звук *ы* на области
 Підкарпатськоѣ Руси
 по більшѣй части задержав
 своѣй давный выговѣр.

Звук *ы* на области
 Підкарпатськоѣ Руси
 по більшѣй части задержав
 своѣй давный выговѣр.

Звук *ы* на области
 Підкарпатськоѣ Руси
 по більшѣй части задержав
 своѣй давный задній выговѣр.

22 In the original, the word *силою* was printed in bold.

23 Csopey 1883 has an entry for *послѣ*.

Но суть у нас околицѣ у
Марамороши, де сесе *ы*
 зовсѣм однаково звучить
 як *и*. Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и*
 у нас дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно с перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє *и*.
 На всѣй прочой **малоруській**
 области поза Карпатами звук *ы*
 звучить так само як *и* (13)

Но суть у нас околицѣ, **на**
прим.: Гуцульщина и коло
Ужгорода, де сесе *ы* зовсѣм
 однаково звучить як *и*.
 Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и* у нас
 дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно з перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє
тверде и. На всѣй прочой
малоруській (українській)
 области **на долах** поза
 Карпатами звук *ы* звучить
 так само як *и* (13)

Но суть у нас околицѣ, **на**
прим.: Гуцульщина и коло
Ужгорода, де се *ы* зовсѣм
 однаково звучить як *и*.
 Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и* у нас
 дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно з перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє
тверде и. На всѣй прочой
руській (українській)
 области **на долах** поза
 Карпатами звук *ы* звучить
 так само як *и* (22–23)

A comparison of several selected passages reveals a considerable number of changes that were gradually drawing the language in the editions of Pan'kevyč's grammar closer to literary Ukrainian. Yet there were not all that many changes. One of the most interesting (I cite two examples) vividly confirms that, when all is said and done, Pan'kevyč intended gradually to spread Ukrainian linguistic awareness throughout Subcarpathia:

Тото звукове явище дуже
 давне в нашом языкѣ.
 Порозумѣти его мож добре,
 коли возьмемо пѣд увагу
 цѣлый **малоруській** язык за
 Карпатами поза
 Пѣдкарпатскою Русею (11).

Тото звукове явище дуже
 давне в нашом языкѣ.
 Порозумѣти его мож добре,
 коли возьмемо пѣд увагу
 цѣлый **малоруській**
(український) язык за
 Карпатами поза
 Пѣдкарпатскою Русею (11).

Тото звукове явище дуже
 давне в нашом языкѣ.
 Порозумѣти його мож добре,
 коли возьмемо пѣд увагу
 цѣлый **руський**
(український) язык за
 Карпатами поза
 Пѣдкарпатскою Русею (19).

Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и* у нас
 дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно с перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє *и*.
 На всѣй прочой **малоруській**
 области поза Карпатами
 звук *ы* звучить так само
 як *и* (13)

Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и* у нас
 дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно з перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє
тверде и. На всѣй прочой
малоруській (українській)
 области **на долах** поза
 Карпатами звук *ы* звучить
 так само як *и* (13)

Тота перемѣна *ы* на *и* у нас
 дуже давна и она зачалася
 одночасно з перемѣною *и*
 (давне *i*) на нинѣшнє
тверде и. На всѣй прочой
руській (українській)
 области **на долах** поза
 Карпатами звук *ы* звучить
 так само як *и* (22–23)

Thus, step by step, the term "Ukrainian" is identified with the concept of "Ruthenianness," in which there is no longer any place for the Russian language. Thus, the final chapter of the third edition of Pan'kevyč's grammar discusses the unity of the Carpathian dialects of the Ukrainian language, which "together with it belong to the East Slavic group of the great Slavic family" ("з нею разом належать до схѣднославянської групи великої славянської [sic] сім'ї"). Elsewhere, the author writes of the "entire Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language" to which "our Subcarpathian common language also belongs." The Russian language is no longer even mentioned separately:

З огляду на старинні звуки і форми наших говорів називаємо їх говорами старинними або з грецька архаїчними. Вони творять з карпатськими говорами по півночній стороні Карпат одну цілість старинних карпатських говорів української мови а з нею разом належать до східнослов'янської групи великої славянської [sic] сім'ї (197).

Наш письменний язык опертий з одної сторони на письменних традиціях, а з другої сторони на тих особливостях, якъ лучать цілий руський (український) язык в одну цілість. А наш підкарпатгорський народній язык єсть частею малоруського языка, його найдальшим полуднево-западним кінцем (176).

In view of the ancient sounds and forms of our dialects, we call them *ancient* dialects, or *archaic*, from the Greek. Together with the Carpathian dialects of the northern side of the Carpathians, they form a single whole of ancient Carpathian dialects of the Ukrainian language, and together with it they belong to the East Slavic group of the great Slavic family.

Our written language is based, on the one hand, on literary traditions and, on the other, on those features that bind the entire Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language into a single whole. And our Subcarpathian common language is a part of the Little Russian language, its southwesternmost end.

3. The language of Pan'kevych's grammar

3.1. Slavonic-Ruthenian and Russophile traditions

Although a considerable number of elements from the Slavonic-Ruthenian and Russophile traditions were replaced between the first and third editions, a few nonetheless remain. These vestiges occur in the grammatical terminology where, however, traditional Church Slavonic and Russian expressions are most frequently listed next to Ukrainian expressions only within parentheses: see *дѣслово* (слово) (97), *недоконаным* (несовершеным) [sic, one н] (98), *придатки* (опредѣленя) (143, cf. the contemporary Ukr. *означення*), *злучники* (союзы) (128, cf. the contemporary Ukr. *сполучники*),²⁴ etc. Other terms simply remain as traditional or are made only partially similar: see *надеж* (24), *несклоняемѣ* [часті] (91–92, along with *неодмѣннѣ*, 123), *рѣд мужеський* and *женскій* (61), *частицю* (acc. case, 92), etc.

Church Slavonic and Russian lexemes, or those that could be considered as such and were thus replaced by other words in the Ukrainian context, also occur outside the purely terminological sphere. See, e.g., *в зависимости* (35), *зависима* (50), *перед слѣдующими словами* (127), *чувства* (55, 146, etc.), *прочѣ* (часті мовы) (3), *(в декотрых)* *случаях* (23), *наоборот* (23), *много* (18; however, there are also occasional occurrences of *богато*, which is written exclusively with *о*: 35, 165), *но* (33, 22, etc., along with *але*: 110, 187). The form *запад* is used almost consistently, but occasionally one encounters the form *(посередництвом)* *заходу* (*Европы*) (184), *(посередництвом)* *західноѣ Европы* (184). The term *славянскій* appears only with

24 In fact, all Ukrainian terms that are no longer used in the contemporary Ukrainian literary language occurred in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Galician grammars. Cf. *злучка* (Bieder 2008: 128), *придаток* (130), and *злучник* (137).

a in the root (4, ...).²⁵ Alongside these forms, occasionally there are alternative ones that approximate contemporary Ukrainian literary forms, e.g., *жѣночѣ* (43), [означеня ...] *жѣночоѣ* [истоты] (40) versus *женськѣ*, *залежно* (181) versus *зависимѣсть*, *зависимо*, *наваки* (23) versus *наоборот*, etc.

Pan'kevyč often uses the construction *по* with the dative case, which is rightly considered a syntactic Russianism. See *по правилу* (132), *имена осіб по занятю* (44). The Russianisms *ошибки* (149) and *ошибочно* (85, 140) occur several times. The form *довжен* is listed among modal predicatives, such as *я довжен заплатити* (141), while the verb *являтися* functions several times as a copula.²⁶ See *Поясняючѣ реченя ... являються супроти речень головных підрядними, зависимыми або побѣчными* (152).

3.2. Errors and inconsistent forms

The grammar contains dozens of typographical errors, for which Pan'kevyč was probably not responsible. See, e.g., *дванядцать* (11, instead of *дванадцять*), *прикметнокѣв* (24, instead of *прикметноикѣв*), *логаритм* (183, instead of *логаритм*), *при писаня слѣв* (182, instead of *писаню*), etc. Besides these mistakes, there are errors or inconsistencies that, perhaps, cannot be explained simply as printing errors, e.g.: *ктось* (163) along with *хто* (163), *групах* along with many forms with *с*, such as *срупах* (27), *етимологіѣ* (dat. case, 181) along with *етимологіѣ* (176), *сложене* (186) instead of *зложене* (cf. *зложенѣ*, 186), *шарыськѣ* (196) along with *шаришьськѣй* (5), *списькѣ* (196) along with *спишьськѣй* (5), etc.

Not only is *наоборот* (23) written inconsistently alongside *на оборот* (199), but also *кѣѣты* (135) together with *цѣѣты* (143), *мяжчующи* (45) along with *мягчення* (15),²⁷ *в народних говорах* (65) along with *в народных говорах* (87).²⁸ The pronouns *даскѣлько* (29) and *декотрѣ* (43) are both listed.²⁹

25 Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists only the forms *славянин*, *славяньський*, *славянищик* ('Slavist'); there is no form with the root *слов*(')ян-. Csopey 1883 also lists only forms with the root *слав*-. Meanwhile, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 note "*слав'ян* → *слов'ян*," but SUM does not provide forms with *слав'ян*-. The form is not derived from the Russian language; it already appears in the Kyivan *Synopsys* of 1672 (Moser 2007c: 174).

26 Under the entry for *явити ся* and *являти ся*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 list only the meaning "sich zeigen, erscheinen, aufkommen"; Csopey 1883 does the same, listing the meaning "jelenni, jelentkezni" under the entry for *явити ся*.

27 Entries for both *мяжкий* and *мякий* appear in Želexivs'kyj 1886. There is an entry for *мяжчати*, under which are listed the synonyms *мякнути* and *мяжшати*; there is also an entry for *мяжчати*. Listed under the entry for *мякнути* is the synonym *мяжшати*. Under the entry for *м'який*, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 indicate: "м'який." Only forms such as *м'яжчати* ("м'яжшати"), *м'яжшати*, and *м'яжшати* occur. Csopey 1883 includes only such forms as *мяжше*, *мяжшати*.

28 Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Csopey 1883 list only the hard stem in the forms *народний* and *народный*. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 cite *народний* ("= *народний*") and *народний*. SUM also lists only the hard stem: *народний*.

29 Under the entries for *дакий*, *даколи*, and *дакто*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 singles out *деякий*; *деколи*, *десь-колись*; *декто*, *дехто*, but he lists the word *дакус* "ein Bischen" (sic, "a little") without any notations. Csopey 1883 cites the forms *дагде*, *даедный*, *дакотрый*, *датко*, *дашито* (sic; possibly instead of *дахто*), *дацо*, *даякий*, etc., alongside *деколи*, *декотрый*, and *дескѣлько*, etc. (forms with *да*- predominate). Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 and SUM do not list forms with *да*-. In the chapter on "Indefinite Pronouns," forms with *де*- and *да*- are cited as equal (91).

Occasionally, Pan'kevyč advises his readers to avoid constructions that occur quite frequently in his own text. This pertains above all to present participles, which “should not be used” (see 175), even though Pan'kevyč himself uses them frequently. See *для виходячого голоса* (6), *залежне слово годиться з словом керуючим* (137), etc.

3.3. Ivan Pan'kevyč's western Ukrainian language

3.3.1. Vocabulary

Quite a few forms indicate that the grammar is based on the Galician and, to a certain extent, Subcarpathian background. See, e.g., *най* (129),³⁰ *ци* (128, 181),³¹ *зейбы* (128), *нич* (6, 195),³² *доста* (165),³³ *докля* (54),³⁴ *прото* (10, 55)³⁵ (both conjunctions are cited in a list of conjunctions on p. 55), *кобы* (129),³⁶ [*намъровѣ*] *обы* (129),³⁷

30 Želexivs'kyj 1886 records *най* without notations. Under the entry for *най* Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 clarify “= *нехай*.” Csopey 1883 also has an entry for *най*. On the prevalence of the particle *най/няй*, see AUM 1988: map no. 254.

31 Under the entry for *ци*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists “= *чи*.” Csopey 1883 lists the forms *ци* and *чи*, but he offers examples only under the entry for *ци*. Under the entry for *ци*, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 point to “→ *чи*.” In SUM, both the particle and the conjunction *ци* are called “dial. comparative” (“*діал. порівняльнѣ*”) [conjunctions]: *чи*, *ци* (128). Under the entry for *ци*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 indicates “= *чи*.” Csopey 1883 lists the forms *ци* and *чи* but provides examples only under the entry for *ци*. Under the entry for *ци*, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 indicate “→ *чи*.” SUM calls both the particle and the conjunction *ци* a “dial[ecticism].”

32 See the entry for *нич* with a notation about *нічо* in Želexivs'kyj 1886, and *нич* “→ *ніщо*” in Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987. SUM cites the form *нич* as a “dial.,” but Csopey 1883 cites an entry for *ничѣ* without notations.

33 Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 have an entry for *доста*, beneath which they indicate “s. *досить*” or “→ *досить*.” In SUM, the form *доста* is called a “dial.”

34 Under the entry for *докля*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 indicates *доки*. Csopey 1883 lists an entry for *докля* with the meanings of “meddig?, mig” without notations. The form *докля* is not listed either in Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 or in SUM.

35 Želexivs'kyj 1886 records only *проче*, not *прото*. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987, under their entry for *проче* (neither do they list *прото*) note that in the causal meaning this is a western Ukrainian (“westukr.”) form. The form *длятого* is mentioned in Pan'kevyč's grammar in the chapter on conjunctions (55). Csopey 1883 lists the forms *проче* and *прото* in the causal sense. SUM lists only the adversative conjunction *проче*.

36 Under the entry for *коби*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 indicates *щоби*. Csopey 1883 cites the form *кобы* without notations. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 list an entry for *коби* without notations. Under the entry for *коби* SUM indicates *коб*, which it terms a “dial.”

37 Under the entry for *оби*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 indicates *щоби*, *коби*, *би*, and *оби*. Csopey 1883 cites the form *обы* without notations. There is no entry for *оби* either in Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 or Želexivs'kyj 1886.

"причиновѣ злучники" айбо (128)³⁸ and ачей (153),³⁹ долѡв (142),⁴⁰ домѡв (162),⁴¹ днесь (22),⁴² девятыдесять (94), двѣста alongside двѣстѣ (94), дотыкає (8, 10),⁴³ глядати (131),⁴⁴ замчиско (178),⁴⁵ and the Hungarian borrowing хосенне (165),⁴⁶ which is widespread not only in Subcarpathia but also in Galicia, etc.

3.3.2. Orthography and phonology

Although Ivan Pan'kevych's orthography is etymological, it unquestionably reflects specifically Galician traditions; cf., e.g., the forms спеціалізують (48), кляса (111), мотоцикль (56),⁴⁷ діяграма (183), and біологія (185).

-
- 38 Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists an entry for айбо, beneath which he indicates або; the causal meaning is not given. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 do not cite such a conjunction; only the exclamation ай! is listed. Csopey 1883 includes an entry for айбо in the sense of contradiction ("de, igen, hanem; bizony, ám"). SUM does not contain an entry for айбо, and the conjunction ай with the meaning "contradiction" is called a "dial."
- 39 Želexivs'kyj 1886 does not list this word. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 only have an entry for ачей in the sense of "vielleicht" ("possibly"). The same pertains to Csopey 1883, who offers the meaning "talán, tán." SUM contains an entry for ачей with the notations "coll." and "rarely" in the meanings "може, можливо, а що як" (maybe, possibly, and what if).
- 40 Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists an entry for долі and also cites the form долів. Csopey 1883 cites the forms долѡв [!], долѣ, долѣвъ, and долу as identical to one another. Under the entry for долів, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 note that this is a "western Ukrainian" form. SUM does not list the form долів.
- 41 Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists entries for дома, домаки, and домів (with the collateral form домій) without notations. Csopey 1883 records the forms дома, домій, and домѡв. Under the entry for дома, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 indicate "→ вдома," and under the entry for домів—"→ додому." In SUM the form дома is cited without notations, but with the comment "те саме, що вдома" ("the same as 'at home'"). The form домів is called a "dial."
- 42 Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Csopey 1883 list днесь without notations; Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 have an entry for днесь with the notation "veralt" ["obsolete"] and with a notation stating "→ сьогодні." This word is not listed in SUM.
- 43 Želexivs'kyj 1886 only cites дотикати without notations; Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 list both forms as дотикати[ся]. SUM lists the form дотикати with the notation "dial." and the comment that this is a transitive verb. By contrast, Csopey 1883 does not list this word.
- 44 Želexivs'kyj 1886 does not include the form глядати, while Csopey 1883 only lists the verbal form глядати. Under the entry for глядати, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 comment that this is a "western Ukrainian" form. In SUM, however, there is no entry at all for глядати.
- 45 Both Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 have an entry for замчиско (Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987: замчісько [!]) with the parallel form замчище, without notations. SUM includes an entry for замчісько [!] with the notation "coll." and the comment: "the same as замчище"; it lists the form замчіще without notations.
- 46 Želexivs'kyj 1886 offers the form хосен ("gen. хісна́, u. хісну́") as well as the adjective хосенний without notations. Under the entry for хосен (хісну́), хосенний, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 indicate the forms "→ користь" та "→ корисний." In SUM, the form хосенний is called a "dial." It is interesting to note that Csopey 1883 does not list any similar noun or adjectival forms.
- 47 This word is not listed in Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Csopey 1883. Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 cite only the form мотоцикль. In SUM, of course, only the spelling мотоцикл is given.

It is worth indicating the forms that feature the preserved *o* or *e*, e.g., *конець* (9),⁴⁸ *возьмемо* (137), and *корень* (24).⁴⁹ Several forms remain without a prothesis: without *z-*: *острий* (59), without *j-*: *Европа* (168). The grammar also lists forms with the original *e* after sibilants, such as *шестий* (93), *шесте* (33),⁵⁰ *вечер* (170), *звечера* (124),⁵¹ *вчєра* (55, 144), *вчєрашній* (75), and *позавчєра* (49).⁵² In the word *менєрь* (23) and in the suffix *-арь-ярь*—see *дзвонарь* (38)—there is no hardening.⁵³

3.3.3. Morphology

Forms of the genitive case singular of masculine nouns do not always coincide with what is codified in the contemporary Ukrainian literary language: cf. the contemporary literary form *предмета* (78, cf. the Pol. *przedmiot, przedmiotu*)⁵⁴ versus today's non-literary form *склада* (186, cf. the Pol. *skład, składu*).⁵⁵ The grammar cites forms of the instrumental singular of nouns with *i*-stems with *-єю*, e.g., *неважливістю* (43), *за вигідністю* (186),⁵⁶ and here and there one encounters forms such as *підрядністю* (137), with the *o > i* shift in the suffix. The prepositional case of soft-stem neuter nouns ends in *-[u]*, e.g.: *в кожѣм речєню* (3).

The form *єѣ* (132) occurs in the genitive case of the personal pronoun (*в*)она; in the genitive and dative cases of the pronoun *вѣн*, the forms *єѣо* and *єѣму* appear in parentheses, alongside *його*, *йому*; in the genitive and dative cases of the pronoun *сей*, the forms *сеѣо* and *сеѣму* appear.⁵⁷ All the enclitic forms of the pronouns *ми*, *мя*,

48 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 include an entry for “*конець* = *кінець*,” while Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Csopey 1883 cite only the form *конець*.

49 Under the entry for *корень*, Želexivs'kyj 1886 indicates *корінь*. Csopey 1883 lists entries for *корень* and *корѣнь*, as well as various derivative words from both forms as being equal. SUM and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 note only *корінь*.

50 Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 note “*шестий* → *шостий*”; SUM does not cite this form. Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists *шестий*, but under the entry for *шостий* it indicates *шестий* [!]. Csopey 1883 cites the form *шестий*, but not *шостий*.

51 Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists the form *вечер*, indicating beneath it the seemingly identical forms *вєчєр*, *-ор* [sic]; Želexivs'kyj 1886 does not list the forms *звєчєра* or *звєчєра*. Similarly, Csopey 1883 lists entries for *вечєрь* and *вєчєрь* [!], but no forms such as [и]звєчєра, [и]звєчєра, or свєчєра, свєчєра. Under the entry for *вечєр*, Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 indicate “→ *вєчєр*” and cite only the form *звєчєра*. SUM, naturally, cites only the forms *вєчєр*, *звєчєра* (more rarely *ізвєчєра*).

52 Neither Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 nor SUM lists entries for *вчєра*, but Želexivs'kyj 1886 cites the form *вчєра* without notations; there is no entry for *вчєра*. Csopey 1883 cites the forms *вчєра* and *вчєра*.

53 See: “Ъ як знак м'якості пишемо в серединѣ або на кѣнци слова, де спѣвзвук дѣйсно м'який: ... косаѣь” (180) (“We write *b* as a soft sign in the middle or at the end of a word where the consonant is truly soft: *косаѣь*”) (180).

54 Neither Želexivs'kyj 1886 nor Csopey 1883 lists forms of the genitive case; Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 and SUM list only the genitive case with *-a*.

55 Neither Želexivs'kyj 1886 nor Csopey 1883 lists genitive case endings, while Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 and SUM cite only the genitive case ending in *-y*.

56 On the endings *-єц*, *-єю*, see AUM 1988: map no. 171.

57 Here are some interesting differences among the various editions. In the first edition, e.g., paradigms include only the forms *сеѣо*, *сеѣму*, followed by the comment: “Folk dialects use the form *сьѣо*, *сьѣму* in the masculine singular” (“В народных говорах уживаєся форма в родѣ мужескѣм однини *сьѣо*, *сьѣму*”; H1: 40). Meanwhile, in the third edition, after *сеѣо*, *сеѣму*, the forms *сьѣо*, *сьѣму*,

ти, тя, му, го; ю are cited within the paradigms (87). Moreover, these forms occur not only in proverbs but also in other examples: see *очи му почервонѣли* (166). The pronoun (в)весь in the instrumental case has the ending -ими, not -іма; cf. *всѣми* in the paradigm and [*перед*] *всѣми* [оконченями] (110)⁵⁸ in the text of the grammar.

Forms of the comparative degree of adjectives, such as *високий* and *низький*, occur as a rule only in a non-dissimilated form, e.g., *ниже* (5) and *высший* (45).⁵⁹ Other forms of the comparative degree are formed on the basis of the suffix -ійший (-ійший), not -іший; see *найчастѣйше* (34).⁶⁰

Reflexive verbal forms in the third person sing. of the present tense occur consistently with -еся (instead of -еться in the Ukrainian literary language),⁶¹ as in *приближаеся* (7), *отвиреся* (10),⁶² *повтаряеся* (169),⁶³ and forms of the infinitive such as *печи*, *напечи* (98), *сѣчи* (102) (instead of (на)пекти, etc., in the Ukrainian literary language). The second person sing. of the verb *дати* is listed in the form *даш* (105), not *даси* (cf. SG: 376).

The pronoun *жаден/жадный* appears only in this form with the root а; see (3) *жадным* (*падежем*) (126).⁶⁴ The pronoun *кождий* is explicitly recommended instead of the form *каждий*; cf. *каждого дня* (165).⁶⁵ Reduplicated forms of pronouns, such as *тотъ* (3) and *тота* (157), often occur.

Quite a few adjectives have hard stems, whereas in the contemporary Ukrainian language they have only soft stems. See *зворотного* (166), *давне* (19), *безпосередно* (137), etc. The grammar frequently lists adjectives formed on the basis of the suffix -ов-: see [*деякѣ*] *двоскладовѣ* [*слова*] (70), [*именники*] *большескладовѣ* (75), *причиновѣ* [*злучники*] (128), etc.⁶⁶

сьому are added in parentheses, followed by the comment: "In literature, the masculine singular form *сьому*, *сьому* is also used" ("В литературѣ [!] уживаеся також форма в родѣ мужеськом однини *сього*, *сьому*"; НЗ: 89).

58 Smal'-Stoc'kyj – Gartner (1913: 302) list *всіма* and *всіми* as forms of equal status.

59 Želexivs'kyj 1886 includes an entry for *вищийий*, *вищий* (as well as *висисть!*); Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 and SUM cite only the dissimilated form *вищий*. Csopey 1883 writes *высший* in keeping with the etymology. Smal'-Stoc'kyj – Gartner (1913: 142) cite the form *висый*.

60 Smal'-Stoc'kyj – Gartner (1913: 142, 290) list forms ending in -ійший or -иций.

61 The first edition features individual examples of the use of -еться. See *Край за Тисою зветься Затисяницина. Край при Днѣпрѣ звеся Приднѣрянщина* (Н1: 83).

62 The word *отвиратися* does not exist in current dictionaries. However, it is codified in Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 (cf. Pol. *otwierać*), as well as in Csopey 1883.

63 Under the entry for *потоворювати*, SUM provides the alternative form *повторяти*, but not *повтаряти* (cf. Pol. *powtarzać*). Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 also do not have an entry for *повтаряти*, while Želexivs'kyj 1886 lists only *повторити*, *повтаряти*. Csopey 1883 cites only the perfective aspect of *повторити*.

64 The form *жаден* usually appears in nineteenth-century Galician texts. Csopey 1883 lists only the form *жаден*, not *жоден*. Želexivs'kyj 1886 cites the forms *жаден* (*жадный*) and *жоден*.

65 SUM calls the form *кождий* a "dial."; Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 do not cite it. The form *каждий* does not occur in any of these dictionaries, while Želexivs'kyj 1886, under the entry for *кажний*, *каждий*, indicates *кожний*, *кождий*. Csopey 1883 only has an entry for *каждый*.

66 Želexivs'kyj 1886 and Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987 list an entry for *причиновий* (Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987: *причиновий*; Želexivs'kyj 1886 without the stress mark). Csopey 1883 has an entry for *причинний*, while the word form *причиновий* does not appear in SUM, only *причинний*.

The typically western Ukrainian movable particle *ся* occurs in a few examples; see *Потаняючий и бритвы ся имає* (174) and *Жило бы ся добре!* (134). Here and there it also occurs in the main text of the grammar. Pan'kevych writes: "The word *каждый* should be written as *кождый* because the word *каждый* is a foreign, not Ruthenian, form" (*Слово "каждый" повинно ся писати "кождый", бо слово "каждый" єсть чужою не руською формою*; 179). Personal forms of the past tense, above all in the conditional mood, occur rarely. Pan'kevych writes: "But in the middle we are not accustomed to writing a soft sign after *р*" (*Но в серединѣ не звикалисьмо писати по р мягкого знака*) (181), *"Хочу, щобысь встав! Став бысь"*; 172). Personal forms of the conditional mood are even codified in the grammar. See *я бым, ты бысь [...]* *мы бысьмо, вы бысьте* (117), and the comment: "The forms *бых, бым*, used in folk dialects, are forms of the past tense, called the aorist" (*"Уживанѣ в народных говорах формы бых, бым то формы минулого часу, званого аорист"*; 117). However, Pan'kevych advises that personal forms of the past tense not be used (118).

Preference is given to the western paradigm of the verb *жити*, but the standard Ukrainian paradigm is also indicated: *жити, живу, и живеш*, but also *живу, живеш* (113).⁶⁷ Parallel forms of the third person pl. of the present tense *могутъ* (91) and *можуть* (104) occur, but the paradigm features only the first person sing. of the present tense *можу*, and forms such as *печуть* (108) are indicated. However, in the paradigms themselves the parallelism of the forms *хочуть* (and *хотять*) (110) is indicated. In fact, the sole particle for forming the imperative mood is the western Ukrainian form *най*: see *най читає, най читають* (103), etc.

3.3.4. Syntax

From the standpoint of syntax, it is worth pointing out the Galician prepositional construction with *о* governing the accusative case, as in *Родичѣ стараються о своих дѣтей* (141). Women's names appear in the form of the original accusative case plural. Pan'kevych writes: "With the suffix *-иха* we denote **women** by their husband's occupation or by their own names" (*"Наростком -иха означаємо жѣнки по занятю чоловікѣв або по их именах власных"*; 40). The same applies to the nouns *особа* and *истота* as well as to names of animals: "With the suffixes *-ук, -юк, -чук* we denote **young males**, with the suffix *-уля* we denote **female persons** for expressing coarseness or endearment" (*"Наростком -ук, -юк, -чук означаємо малѣ мужеськѣ истоты"*; 43; *"нароском -уля означаємо особы жѣночѣ для выражена згрубѣлости або нестливости"*; 43; *"жену волю"*; 66; *"заведи конѣ до стайнѣ"*; 153).

Pan'kevych writes: "If the copula is in the present tense, then it can often be omitted. E.g.: *Сестра пильна* instead of *Сестра є пильна*" (*"Як злучка стоить в часѣ теперѣшнѣм, то єѣ мож часто опустити. На прим.: Сестра пильна мѣсто Сестра є пильна"*; 132).

67 Železixiv'skyj 1886 lists an entry for *жити* [*жию* (*житу* [sic]), *живеш* (*живеш*)], and under their entry for *жити* Kuzelja–Rudnyč'kyj 1943/1987 note: *жити "живу, живеш* od. *жию, живеш."* Csopey 1883 does not indicate forms, and SUM only cites the paradigm *жити, живу, живеш* [...].

However, a linking verb in the present tense (*є, єсть, суть*) is nearly always expressed, as here: *Співзвуки суть твердѣ, коли стоять перед твердыми самозвуками* ("Consonants are hard when they stand in front of hard vowels"; 11); *Дѣйменники суть ту так тѣсно звязанѣ особовою формою дѣслова, що мы их уважаємо як одну цѣлѣсть, як один присудок* ("Verbal nouns here are so closely connected by the personal form of the verb that we use them as a single whole, as one predicate"; 133). The negation *не є* (with the form *нема* only in parentheses) may be considered a syntactical Ukrainian Carpathianism; see *Матери не є (нема) в загородѣ* (147).

3.4. Ivan Pan'kevyč's grammar on the dialects of Subcarpathia

The most important sections of the grammar are those in which Pan'kevyč writes about "dialectal" ("діалектні" or "говіркові") features in Subcarpathia. He frequently indicates that these are "incorrect forms" that must be avoided in the "written language." A brief selection of these sections follows:

В западних частях підкарпато-руського языка, а то в жупах – земплінськôй (западна часть), шарішськôй и спишськôй наголос є недвижимый, то є стоить все на однôм и тôм самôм складѣ, а именно на другôм вôд конця. На прим.: *кôлач, вîно, трôва* и т. д. мѣсто правильного *колáч, винô, травá*. Є то вплив сусѣднього польського (5).

Примѣтка: Слова „май“ из степенем першим: *май добрый* не треба уживати, бо то єсть волоський (румунський) вплив (80).

В 6. падежи в народних говорах у именникôв, окôнченых на мягкий спôвзвук *и* на *й*, а також у именникôв, окôнченых на шопячѣ, чуємо окôнчене -ом; *корольом, коньом, крайом, ножом, товаришом*. В письменнôм языкѣ тых форм не треба уживати, а писати всегда: *королем, конем, ножем*, и т. д. (65; пор. також 72).

В 7. падежи в підкарпатсько-руських говорах чуємо старе окôнчене -ох, їх: *в лѣсох, крайох, в сусѣдѣх, в постолѣх*. Их в литературнôм языкѣ не уживаєся (66, пор. також 73).

В підкарпатсько-руських говорах маємо також мѣсто -єю окôнчення -ьов: *кôстьов, сôльов*, но в письменнôм языкѣ их не уживаєся (70).

В 6. падежи уживаються в народних говорах форми: 6. пад. роду жен. одн.: *мнов, тобов, нев, собов*, но в письменнôм языкѣ их не треба уживати (88).

Примѣтка: В говорах прикарпатських, особливо в западних, в способѣ приказовôм окôнчення -и з причини пересунення наголосу в один склад в зад ослабляєся до -ь. Мѣсто *ходіи, ходѣм, ходѣть*, говориться: *хôдь, хôдьме, хôдьте*; мѣсто *купіи, купѣм, купѣть*, чуємо: *кûп, кûпме, кûпте*; мѣсто *лишіи, лишім, лишіть*, чуємо: *ліиш, ліишме, ліиште*. Є то вплив языка словацького (119).

Не можна писати: *кунь, пун, вул*, але *кôнь, вôл, вôн* [sic, the words do not correspond] и т. д. Також не можна його писати мѣсто приименника *вы*, як то у наших говорах часто чути, на пр.: *уйти, уійняти, убрати* мѣсто правильного: *вийти, виныти, vybrати* (179).

Ошибкою єсть писати *у* або *ву* мѣсто *ю* в окôнченнях дѣслôв, як то часто у наших говорах чути: *маву, мау, мавуть, мауть* (179).

In the western parts of the Subcarpathian-Rusyn language, as well as in Zemplín (the western part), the Šariš and Spiš stress is immobile, i.e., it always falls on one and the same syllable, namely, on the penultimate one; e.g.: *кóлач, вино, трáва*, etc., instead of the correct *ко́лач, ви́но, тра́ва*. This is the influence of the neighboring Polish language (5).

Note: The word “май” with the first degree *май добрый* should not be used because this is Wallachian (Romanian) influence (80).

In the 6th case in folk dialects, in nouns ending in a soft vowel and *й*, as well as in nouns ending in sibilants, we hear the ending -ом; *корольом, коньом, крайом, ножом, товаришом*. In the written language those forms should not be used; one must always write *королем, конем, ножем*, etc. (65; see also 72).

In the 7th case in the Subcarpathian-Rusyn dialects we hear the old ending -ох, *ѣх: в лѣсох, крайох, в сусѣдѣх, в постолѣх*. They are not used in the literary language (66; see also 73).

In the Subcarpathian-Rusyn dialects we also have, instead of -єю, the ending -ьов: *кóстьов, сóльов*, but they are not used in the written language (70).

In the 6th case these forms are used in folk dialects: the 6th case fem. sing.: *мнов, тобов, нев, собов*, but they should not be used in the written language (88).

Note: In the Subcarpathian dialects, particularly in the western ones, in the imperative mood the ending -и is weakened to -ь owing to the backward shift of the stress by one syllable. Instead of *ходи́и, ходѣ́и, ходѣ́ть*, one says: *хо́дь, хо́дьме, хо́дьте*; instead of *купи́и, купи́и, купи́ть*, we hear: *ку́п, ку́пме, ку́пте*; instead of *лиши́и, лиши́и, лиши́ть*, we hear: *ли́иш, ли́ишме, ли́иште*. This is the influence of the Slovak language (119).

One must not write *кунь, пун, вул*, but *кoнь, вoл, вoн*, etc. As well, one must not write, instead of the preposition *вы*, as may be heard frequently in our dialects, e.g.: *уйти, уйняти, убрати*, instead of the correct *выйти, выняти, vybrати* (179).

It is a mistake to write *у* or *ву* instead of *ю* in verb endings, as is frequently heard in our dialects: *маву, мау, мавуць, мауць* (179).

Occasionally, Pan'kevych notes that certain forms “to be avoided” are also prevalent in Galicia:

Увага! В по́дкарпатських говорах, а также и в галицьких уживається форма часу минулого, зложена з дѣприкметника часу мн. II. читал (= читав) и слова помóчного – єсьм [sic] у формѣ ем: читав-ем, читав-есь, читав; з того нынѣшня коротша форма: я читав, она читала; але сих форм в письменнóм языцѣ належить оминати (118).

Attention! In the Subcarpathian dialects as well as in the Galician, the form of the past tense constructed of the plural past participle II читал (= читав) and the auxiliary word *єсьм* [sic] is used in the form *ем: читав-ем, читав-есь, читав*; hence the current shorter form *я читав, она читала*; but these forms should be avoided in the written language (118).

To this day, the final section of the third edition of Pan'kevych's grammar, titled “Dialects of the Subcarpathian Rusyns,” could serve as a succinct introduction to the linguistic features of Transcarpathia:

В говорах русинів Підкарпатської Руси і Словаччини задержалося много старовини так у звуках, як і у формах, про які були згадки в відповідних частих граматики. Найважливіш з них були: 1. задержання гортанного воговору *ы*, 2. переходні звуки: *у*, *й*, *ы* на місці замкненого старого *о* (*стул*, *стйіл*, *стыл*), 3. задержання давного воговору *и* = *i* в говорах западних, 4. задержання м'якого воговору шиплячих: *ч*, *щ* (*хочю*, *щюка*, *богачь*, *чьорный*) в більшості говорів, 5. задержання м'якого *р*: *верьба*, *верьх*, *косарь*, 6. *кы*, *гы*, *хы* м'єсто *ки*, *ги*, *хи*, 7. в одмінній старій форми: *-ом* (*-ум*, *-йм*, *-ым*, *-ім*), в 3. мн. муж. р., 8. *-ы* в 6. мн. м. і с. роду, 9. *-ох*, *-ѣх* [*sic*, without a hyphen], в 7. п. мн. муж. і сер. р., 10. довге окінчення прикметників в 1. пад. одн. р. сер. *-оє*.

Наші говори мають і багато новостей а також запозичень з сусідніх говорів словацьких та польських.

З того то причини а також задля гірського положення нашого краю, котре не дозволяє скоро розширюватися новостям і вирівнюватися з другими говорами, у нас є много менших говорів.

Найважливіш однак є три: 1. *лемківський*, котрий обнімає говори шариськ, списк та часть земплінських, 2. *бойківський* в'єд Лаборця аж по Тересву, 3. *гуцульський* в'єд Тересви по горішню Тису. Межи ними нема р'єзкої границі, бо переход до них творять говори м'єшані.

Лемківскі говори мають много словацького і польського а найголовніше сталий наголос на другім складі в'єд кінця: [197:] *крыло*, *в'єда* та вимовляють м'єткє *с*, *з*, як *шь*, *жь*: *шьіно*, *жьіля* м'єсто: *сьіно*, *зьіля*. Твердо вимовляють кінцеві м'єткє зубні сп'євзвуки: *пят ден*. В 1. пад. множ. прикметники мають *-ы*: *добры*, в 6. пад. ж. Р. мають *-ом*; *добром рыбом*.

Говори гуцульскі не знають грубого *ы* а м'єсто нього мають *и*: *мילו*, м'єсто *о* в замкн'єм складі всюди *і* (*кінь*), м'єткє *а* – *я* перейшло на *є*: *чєс*, *нєньо* м'єсто *час*, *няньо*, *ж*, *ш* вимовляють м'єткє: *жеба*, *шепка*, в 3. множ. д'єсл'єв часу тепер. опускають: *т* в окінченю *ять* – *ходє* м'єсто *ходят*.

Говори бойківскі мають т'є прикметы, що суть характеристичными для наших говорів як старинних взагалі, а які мы вычислили горі під 1–10.

З огляду на старинні звуки і форми наших говорів называємо их говорами *старинными* або з грецька *архаичными*. Они творять з карпатськими говорами по повночній стороні Карпат одну ц'єл'єсть старинних карпатських говорів української мови а з нею разом належать до сх'єднославянської групи великої славянської [*sic*] с'єм (196–97).

The dialects of the Rusyns of Subcarpathian Rus' and Slovakia have retained much antiquity in both sounds and forms, concerning which there were mentions in the corresponding parts of the grammar. The most important of them were: 1. the retention of the glottal pronunciation of *ы*, 2. the transitional sounds *у*, *й*, *ы* in place of the closed earlier *о* (*стул*, *стйіл*, *стыл*), 3. the retention of the age-old pronunciation of *и* = *i* in the western dialects, 4. the retention of the soft pronunciation of the sibilants *ч*, *щ* (*хочю*, *щюка*, *богачь*, *чьорный*) in the majority of dialects, 5. the retention of the soft *r'*: *верьба*, *верьх*, *косарь*, 6. *кы*, *гы*, *хы* instead of *ки*, *ги*, *хи*, 7. in declensions, the old forms *-ом* (*-ум*, *-йм*, *-ым*, *-ім*), in the 3rd pers. masc. pl., 8. *-ы* in the 6th case of the masc. and neut. pl., 9. *-ох*, *-ѣх*, in the 7th case masc. and neut. pl. and in the 7th case masc. and neut. pl., 10. a long ending of adjectives in the 1st case neut. sing. *-оє*.

Our dialects have both many innovations and borrowings from the neighboring Slovak and Polish languages.

For that reason, and also because of the mountainous location of our land, which does not allow innovations to spread rapidly and level out with other dialects, we have many minor dialects.

However, the three most important ones are: 1. *Lemko*, which encompasses the Šariš, Spiš, and part of the Zemplín dialects, 2. *Boiko*, from the Laborets to the Teresva River, 3. *Hutsul*, from the Teresva to the upper reaches of the Tisa. There are no strict boundaries between them because the transition proceeds by means of mixed dialects.

The Lemko dialects have much of Slovak and Polish, and the main thing is the fixed stress on the penultimate syllable: *крьѣло, вода*, and they pronounce the soft *с, з* as *шь, жь*: *шьѣно, жьѣля* instead of *сѣно, зѣля*. They give a hard pronunciation to the endings of soft dental consonants: *пят денъ*. In the 1st case, plural adjectives have *-ы*: *добры*, in the 6th case, feminine adjectives have *-ом*: *добром рыбѣм*.

The Hutsul dialects do not admit the coarse *ы*, and instead of it they have *и*: *мило*, instead of *о* in a closed syllable, everywhere there is *і* (*кѣнь*), the soft *а – я* has turned into *є*: *чєс, нєньѣ* instead of *час, няньѣ*; they pronounce *ж, ш* softly: *жеба, шєнка*, in the 3rd pl. of the present tense they drop *т* in the ending: *ятъ – ходє* instead of *ходят*.

Boiko dialects have features that are characteristic of our generally ancient dialects, which we have enumerated above under 1–10.

In view of the ancient sounds and forms of our dialects, we call them *ancient*, or *archaic*, from the Greek. Together with the Carpathian dialects on the north face of the Carpathian Mountains, they comprise a single whole of ancient Carpathian dialects of the Ukrainian language, and together with it they belong to the East Slavic group of the great Slavic family (196–197).

4. Ideological features in examples from the grammar

School textbooks and even grammars most often contained, and still contain, elements that were supposed to influence the formation of various group identities and loyalties of pupils. The same applies to Ivan Pan'kevych's grammar, in which we may read, for example, about the president of interwar Czechoslovakia and about Prague (before 1919, about the Austrian emperor and Vienna, etc.):

Вѣстка, що Тому Масарика вибрали президентом нашоѣ републики, дуже нас урадовала (144).

Тому Масарика вибрали президентом (144).

Прага єсть тым для Славян, чим Рим для свѣта (154).

The news that Tomáš Masaryk was elected president of our republic has greatly delighted us (144).

Tomáš Masaryk was elected president (144).

Prague is to the Slavs what Rome is to the world (154).

The grammar also contains sentences about the history and geography of the Subcarpathian Rusyns:

Ужгород єсть столицею Пѣдкарпатськоѣ Руси (147).

Чернеча гора находится коло города Мукачева (143).

Найдовша рѣка, котра плыве через Подкарпатську Русь, єсть Тиса (136).
 Князь Ляборець крѣпко бився з Мадярами, та все таки погіб у битвѣ (159).
 Теодор Коріятович, князь подольський, переселився з великим числом народу за Карпати (144, also 148).
 Князь Теодор Коріятович заложив город Мукачево... (143).

Uzhhorod is the capital of Subcarpathian Rus' (147).
 Chernecha Hora is located near the city of Mukachiv (143).
 The longest river that flows through Subcarpathian Rus' is the Tisa (136).
 Prince Laborec' fought mightily with the Magyars but nonetheless was killed in battle (159).
 Teodor Korijatovyč, the Podilian prince, moved with a great number of people beyond the Carpathians (144, also 148).
 Prince Teodor Korijatovyč founded the city of Mukachiv... (143).

But in such sentences Ivan Pan'kevych did not restrict himself to the world of the Transcarpathian Rusyns alone. His grammar also contains information about Prince Svjatoslav, Volodymyr the Great, and Danylo of Halych that opened prospects of a broader Ukrainian identity:

Князь Святослав не хотѣв вертати до Киѣва, бо добре йому було жити в Преславѣ на Дунаю (157).
 Володимир Святый охрестив Русь (148).
 Володимир Великий охрестив Русь, прото його и святым назвали (153).
 Король Данило Галицкий хоробро боровся з Татарями (143).

Prince Svjatoslav did not want to return to Kyiv because he lived well in Preslav on the Danube (157).
 St. Volodymyr baptized Rus' (148).
 Volodymyr the Great baptized Rus', which is why he was named a saint (153).
 King Danylo of Galicia fought the Tatars bravely (143).

The chapter titled "What Can Be a Predicate" ("Що може бути присудком") mentions the name of Taras Ševčenko in this short sentence: "Шевченко був поет" ("Shevchenko was a poet"; 132); elsewhere is this interrogative sentence: "Хто написав книжку 'Кобзарь'?" ("Who wrote the book *Kobzar*?"; 186). However, there are no quotations from his works or the works of other writers from Russian-ruled (and later Soviet) Ukraine.

5. Conclusions

In his grammar, Ivan Pan'kevych's use of the locutions "our language" or "in our land" ("наш язык," "у нас") most often pertained to Subcarpathian Rus', not to other regions. Here and there, however, Pan'kevych unmistakably presents this language as part of another language—Ukrainian. He writes:

Наш письменный язык опертый з одною стороны на письменных традиціях, а з другою стороны на тых особливостях, якѣ лучать цѣлый

руський (український) язык в одну цѣлѣсть. А наш підкарпаторуський народній [!] язык єсть частею малоруського языка, його найдальшим полуднево-западным кѣнцем (176).

Our written language is based, on the one hand, on written traditions and, on the other, on those features that bind the entire Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language into a single whole. And our Subcarpathian-Rusyn folk language is part of the Little Russian language, its southwesternmost end. (176).

Ivan Pan'kevyč realized that he could achieve his main goal—the spread of Ukrainian linguistic and national awareness in the Transcarpathian region—only on the basis of an understanding of the regional features of these lands. Thus, he not only described the Transcarpathian dialectal landscape in his monumental scholarly works—and did so much better than any researcher before him—but also wrote about this area in his grammar for high school students and “public schools” in Subcarpathia in such a way that students were able to derive considerable knowledge of the linguistic features of their region from his book. Pan'kevyč did not simply introduce the new Ukrainian literary language in Transcarpathia. In keeping with legislation passed by the Czech government, he also sought to reproduce in Subcarpathia the experience that Galicia had accumulated during the second half of the nineteenth century. However, the ultimate goal of this journey was neither the creation of a Rusyn literary language nor the establishment of any kind of Galician norms but the proliferation of the all-Ukrainian literary language.

RUSYN: A NEW-OLD LANGUAGE BETWEEN NATIONS AND STATES

1. Constructing identities across historical borders

Modern Rusyn activists have mapped their territory in those areas where Rusyn and Ukrainian national and linguistic identities are still competing with each other. Some regard Rusyns as a distinct fourth East Slavic people and Rusyn as a separate language, while others maintain that Rusyns are a branch of the Ukrainian people, Rusyn idioms are local variants of Ukrainian, and Modern Standard Ukrainian is a perfectly appropriate standard language for all Rusyns/Ukrainians.¹

In fact, until the late twentieth century, almost no one maintained that the very groups nowadays claimed to be Rusyn constituted a separate people (that is, the Rusyns of Ukraine's Transcarpathia oblast, northeastern Slovakia, one village in northern Hungary, some villages in the Maramureş region of Romania, and some in the Bačka-Srijem region of Croatia and Serbia, all of them historically belonging to the Kingdom of Hungary; apart from these, also the "Lemkos" of southeastern Poland).

Historically, many more Slavs associated with the legacy of medieval (Kyivan) Rus' and its "Rus' faith" (Orthodoxy or, later, Greek Catholicism) were called "Rusyns" (usually rendered as "Ruthenians" in English; see Plokhly 2006). This applied not only to all Ruthenians/Rusyns of the Kingdom of Galicia and the Crownland of Bukovyna, at least up to the turn of the twentieth century, but also to all those who were renamed "Little Russians" (*malorossy*) only after being integrated into the Russian Empire, where it was found necessary to distinguish them from the Muscovites or "Great Russians" (*velikorossy*). As late as the nineteenth century, even Belarusians were also still regarded more often than not as part of the Rusyn/Ruthenian or Little Russian nation (Moser 2011c, see pp. 171–186 in this volume). Great Russians, by contrast, were considered distinct even by those Russophiles who believed in one all-Russian nation but distinguished its "Little Russian and Great Russian branches" at a lower, non-national level.

The initial shaping of a Rusyn national identity in the modern sense began only after most Ruthenians/Rusyns in Galicia and Bukovyna (and others south of the Carpathian Mountains) had joined the Ukrainian national movement.² The Rusyns, then, were those who were reluctant to do so.

The concept of a Modern Rusyn language is also quite a recent phenomenon, and (as is the case with all other nations and languages) it is certainly not based first and foremost on any "natural" or "objective" Rusyn linguistic unity. The Lemko

1 In this article, I do not deal with the roughly 13,000 people who identified themselves as Rusyns in the U.S. census of 1990 (Magocsi 2007c: 386), although their efforts have undoubtedly played a tremendous role in the organization of the Rusyn movement since 1989.

2 Historical terms such as "Hungarian Rus'," which seemingly reflect a separate quasi-Rusyn identity, emerged only in the nineteenth century. They had a territorial meaning, not an ethnic or national one, and the Polish Lemko Rusyns always stood apart (even Paul Robert Magocsi's map of "Subcarpathian Ethno-Geographical Features" of 1978 did not yet include the Polish Lemkos; Magocsi 1978: 11).

dialects of Poland do share some important features with the Lemko dialects of northeastern Slovakia, but they are no less close to the neighboring Ukrainian San/Sian, Boiko, and Hutsul dialects than to most Rusyn idioms. Ukrainian dialects north of the Carpathian Mountains and Rusyn/Ukrainian dialects south of them share many important features (Pan'kevyč 1938), whereas the variants of Modern Rusyn are quite diverse. Except for internal dialectal development at all linguistic levels, this diversity is a result of different historical language contacts. The Polish Lemko variant is remote from all other Rusyn varieties owing to the massive, centuries-old influence of Polish, to which only Galician Ukrainian dialects come close. The variants of the Berehove, Uzhhorod, and Mukacheve regions were under the strong impact of Hungarian, whereas in the Prešov region (East) Slovak has been the more important contact language. Finally, in the Bačka-Srijem region, Croatian and Serbian have exerted ever-growing influence on those Ruthenian/Rusyn dialects that, even without such influence, differ significantly from most other variants in that they are much closer to (East) Slovak than to other varieties of Rusyn or Ukrainian, if they are not Slovak altogether. In Romania, meanwhile, Romanian has been a more important contact language than anywhere else (see some of the Rusyn variants as reflected in Magocsi 2007).³

Earlier nation- and language-building processes also differed strongly across the regions. The Polish Lemkos belonged to the Greek Catholic diocese of Przemyśl, which, in the first half of the nineteenth century, became an important center of the first modern "Ruthenian or Little Russian," that is, Ukrainian national and linguistic movement in Galicia. Here, even prior to the Revolution of 1848–49, a vernacular-based language was introduced into a wide range of domains and codified in grammars. It was explicitly regarded as the language of the whole "Ruthenian or Little Russian," that is, Ukrainian nation (Moser 2011: 303–666). Individuals from the Lemko region were important actors in the nation- and language-building activities that encompassed all of Galicia before and after 1848–49: Ivan Birec'kyj attended the Slavic Congress in Prague in 1848, where he represented all Ruthenians/Rusyns of Galicia; the Ruthenians/Rusyns of Hungary, by contrast, had asked the Slovaks to speak for them (Moser 2007b: 421–24). Administrative borders within Austria/Austria-Hungary often had great significance for language policy: when the Austrian authorities suggested introducing the Latin script instead of Cyrillic as an antidote to the growing Russophile movement in Galicia in 1858–59 (during the so-called (Second) "Alphabet War") (Moser 2011: 474–78), this would have affected the Polish Lemko region but not the Hungarian realm. When in the mid-1890s the "phonetic" orthography was introduced into the schools of Galicia and Bukovyna (Moser 2007: 33, 232), this was of no significance for the Ruthenian/Rusyn regions of Hungary.

3 Even if one considers the role of German, its impact varied strongly across the Rusyn regions. From the sixteenth century at least, the German language of migrants into rural regions played a more significant role in the Hungarian realm than among Polish Lemkos.

In Hungary, hardly any Ruthenian/Rusyn national movement existed until the end of World War I. The first developments that are sometimes interpreted as a manifestation of Ruthenian/Rusyn national aspirations took place at the turn of the nineteenth century, when a primer and a catechism were printed in Church Slavonic and in the traditional Ruthenian/Rusyn language under Bishop Andrij Bačyns'kyj of Mukacheve (Udvari 2000). A few decades later, the first “awakener,” Aleksandr (Oleksander) Duxnovyč,⁴ behaved like many other Russophiles of his time in that he wrote some pieces in a locally based vernacular for “commoners” but regarded Russian alone as a legitimate high variety of language (Moser 2009a). Conceptualizations of a vernacular-based standard language, as developed in other Slavic national movements of the era, played no important role. Exceptions were rare and cannot be attributed to a “Rusyn” setting. The language of László Csopey’s textbooks for elementary schools of the 1880s and 1890s was based on a local vernacular variant, but Csopey explicitly referred it to a “Ruthenian and Little Russian” framework (which, in his case, also still included Belarusian) (Moser 2009a: 78–79). Hijador Stryps'kyj used a locally based vernacular in some of his works on the eve of World War I, but he, too, felt Ukrainian at that point and wrote about “that true Rusyn/Ruthenian language that is spoken by a people of 22 million divided among three states” (Udvari 2007: 145–46).

The Greek Catholic Church was a stronghold against Polonization in Galicia, whereas in Hungary it often took an active part in Magyarization efforts. When during World War I Hungarian politicians hesitated to abolish the Julian calendar and the Cyrillic alphabet among the Ruthenians/Rusyns, Bishop Stefan Novák of Prešov himself introduced these measures in his diocese, and others followed him (Magocsi 1978: 72; see excerpts from textbooks in a traditional Ruthenian/Rusyn language written in a Hungarian-based Latin orthography in Duličenko 2008: 286–89).

The Rusyns of the Bačka-Srijem region developed a national and linguistic movement only after they established contact with Galician Ukrainian intellectuals at the turn of the twentieth century. Their first “awakener,” the Greek Catholic priest Havrylo Kostel'nyk from Ruski Krstur, published a small volume of poems titled *Z mojoho valala* in the Galician town of Zhovkva in 1904, when he was already closely associated with the Ukrainian movement.⁵ This book, now celebrated as the work that initiated the modern Rusyn movement, was printed in only five hundred copies and did not sell well at all. Kostel'nyk had hardly any desire to create a new standard Slavic language, and it took him almost two decades to publish his grammar of the Bačka Rusyn/Ruthenian language (*Грамматика бачваньско-рускей бешеди*) in 1923 as a consequence of developments after World War I (see next section). Even in this grammar, Kostel'nyk expressed the wish “that we not distance ourselves from Ukrainian where we do not have to” (“же би зме ше, дзе не мушине, не

4 All names are given in transliteration from Ukrainian. Regarding names, too, Rusyn variants differ significantly from one another.

5 Kostel'nyk studied theology in Lviv, married the daughter of a Ukrainian activist, and became a member of the Archdiocese of Lviv. Throughout his lifetime, he maintained strong ties with Galicia, particularly with the Greek Catholic metropolitan Andrej Šeptyc'kyj (Belej 2008).

оддалявали од українського") (cited in Belej 2008). Kostel'nyk wrote many of his works in Ukrainian. As late as 1935, he published a text titled "Why Did I Become a Ukrainian?" ("Чом сом стал Українець?") (Belej 2004: 277; Belej 2008).

To sum up, Rusyns can probably best be described as those remnants of the Ruthenian/Rusyn population who have not been willing to join the modern Ukrainian national and linguistic movement, which has turned former "Ruthenians/Rusyns or Little Russians" into "Ukrainians" and promoted the Modern Standard Ukrainian language across the borders of the Russian and Austrian/Austro-Hungarian Empires since the second half of the nineteenth century. Initially, this reluctance was not usually based on any Rusyn identity in the modern sense but resulted from the Russophile view that Ruthenians/Rusyns/Little Russians belonged to one indivisible Russian people and that there was no place for a Ukrainian nation and a Ukrainian language. Similar views were also widespread among Galician and Bukovynian Russophiles, but they proved more persistent on the western periphery of Galicia and south of the Carpathian Mountains. The more successful the Ukrainian project was, however, the more obvious it became that the idea of an indivisible Russian people could not be maintained. As a result, the expressly non-Ukrainian Ruthenian/Rusyn identity had to be reshaped.

2. Linguistic battlefields

Even after World War I, no Rusyn identity in the modern meaning emerged.⁶ Explicitly non-Ukrainian and non-Russian identity models were occasionally addressed, but they were confined to only one of the regions, and the actual national framework usually remained questionable.

Only in the Bačka-Srijem region, where Rusyns found themselves in the newly established Kingdom of Yugoslavia, was a vernacular-based Rusyn language developed after a council decided to cultivate a separate language in 1919; as a result, Kostel'nyk's grammar was published in 1923 (Fejsa 2007: 377; see preceding section), yet this language was designed exclusively for the Rusyns of the Bačka-Srijem region.

In Poland, the administration fought the Ukrainian movement in typical divide-and-rule fashion by fostering a separate Lemko identity (as well as separate Hutsul and Boiko identities, and so on). In the 1930s, the Polish authorities dismissed Ukrainian teachers from the Lemko region and cooperated with the Russophile activist Meletij Troxanovs'kyj. In 1933, two textbooks that he had prepared in a Lemko vernacular were approved for use in elementary schools (Misiak 2006: 61). In Troxanovs'kyj's primer (printed in Lviv in 1935), the word *rusyn* does not appear (Troxanovs'kyj 1935). In 1935, Russophile teachers were replaced with Poles, and, from 1937, Lemko was no longer taught and was replaced with Polish (Misiak 2006: 105).

6 In order to argue for the existence of supraregional Rusyn identity models, some scholars highlight the fact that activists of one of the so-called Lemko republics of 1918–20 (which actually consisted only of Florynka and some neighboring villages) voiced the desire to join Czechoslovakia (Dubiel-Dmytryszyn 2010: 81). They forget to add that consideration was given at the same level to joining the Soviet Union (Misiak 2006: 59–60).

Most Ruthenians/Rusyns of the formerly Hungarian part of Austria-Hungary became citizens of Czechoslovakia. The majority of them lived in a new administrative unit called Subcarpathian Rus' (*Podkarpatská Rus*), which largely coincides with today's Ukrainian Transcarpathian oblast. It was supposed to become autonomous within Czechoslovakia but received that status only in 1938. The Ruthenians/Rusyns of the Prešov region were separated from those of Subcarpathian Rus' by a highly disputed internal border (Švorc 2003). The tiny groups that ended up in Hungary and Romania stood apart.

In the Prešov region, most Ruthenian/Rusyn intellectual leaders were Russophiles (Plishkova 2009: 55–56). Some scholars argue that those texts from the region that were written in the traditional Church Slavonic-Russian mixture with dialectal elements “indirectly conveyed the idea that Carpatho-Rusyns represented a distinct East Slavic people and were thus attempting to distance themselves from both Russians and Ukrainians” (ibid., 52), but this is highly questionable, since the same kind of language had been used for decades in accordance with varying ideological frameworks. If there was “often a problem in distinguishing” (ibid., 57) Russian and alleged “Rusyn” orientations in interwar Czechoslovakia, this resulted primarily from the fact that most Russophiles did not know Russian well themselves and knew that this language was not understood by their audience or readership. In any case, “no constructive attempts were made to create a distinct Rusyn literary language on the basis of any one of the Subcarpathian dialects” during that period (ibid., 61). The Ukrainian movement became visible in Slovakia only after a branch of the Prosvita Society was established in Prešov in 1930 and the local writer and cultural activist Iryna Nevyc'ka gathered some activists around the journal *Слово народа* (The People's Word) between 1931 and 1932 (Štec' 1996: 64–76).

In Transcarpathian Rus', the contest of identities was much more serious, for only there would Ruthenian/Rusyn function as an official language.⁷ As it was still unclear what kind of language Ruthenian/Rusyn really was, the local school administration asked a commission of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague for advice. According to traditional views in Slavic studies, the commission identified the Ruthenian/Rusyn language of Subcarpathian Rus' as “Little Russian,” adding that it was particularly close to its Galician variant (see the text in Tichý 1938: 112–13). Although the commission recommended hiring teachers and purchasing textbooks published in Galicia, support for the Ukrainians was far from unanimous: the scholars also advised the local authorities not to introduce the so-called “phonetic” orthography, although they must have been aware of its symbolic value for the Ukrainian movement. Moreover, they pointed out that “the inhabitants of Subcarpathian Rus' ” should not forget that they, “like the Ukrainians, also belong to the great Russian people [!]” (ibid.) and therefore recommended the compulsory teaching of Russian in secondary schools. Regarding the possible creation of a

7 In Béla Kun's Hungarian Soviet Republic, Rusyns were recognized as a distinct people in 1919. “A Department (*katedra*) of Rusyn studies was created at the University of Budapest; and a few issues of a Rusyn newspaper, *Rus'ka Pravda*, later *Rus'ko-Kraïns'ka pravda*, appeared” (Pop 2005: 425). The Soviet *Rus'ka Kraïna* lasted only forty days.

"separate standard language for Subcarpathian Rus'," however, the Czech scholars maintained that this was "certainly no more necessary than for certain branches of the Czechoslovak people, e.g., the Hanaks [a group living in northern Moravia]" (ibid.).

During the first years after 1919, the Russophile and Ukrainian camps struggled for hegemony in the schools and in the press. The Ukrainian side was primarily supported by immigrants from Galicia; the Russophiles were backed by immigrants from the Russian Empire and Russophile newcomers from Galicia and Bukovyna. Even the most important grammars of both camps were written by immigrants (Moser 2011b: 103–107).

Also in the first few years after 1919, the Ukrainians were supported by the Czechoslovak government, but that changed quickly after a Russophile, Antin Beskyd, became deputy governor of Subcarpathian Rus' in 1923. External political developments made active support for the Ukrainians seem even less advisable: in the Soviet Union, Stalin initiated the policy of so-called "nationalization" (later "indigenization") in 1923 and declared Soviet Ukraine the new "Piedmont" for all Ukrainians (see pp. 504–505, p. 524 in this volume). At the same time, the Soviets decided that all Eastern Slavs of the Carpathian region were to be regarded as Ukrainians (Padiak 2009: 82).

The etymologically oriented orthography of the official publications separated Subcarpathian Ukrainian from both Galicia and the Soviet Union, yet local intellectuals soon began using the so-called "phonetic" orthography (which was no Soviet "invention" after all), with an increasing orientation on Modern Standard Ukrainian (Moser 2011b). Subcarpathian Russophiles, by contrast, did not adopt the Russian orthographic reforms that the Bolsheviks had introduced in 1918. Their traditionalism was enhanced by their inclination to pronounce the letter *jat'* as [i] (not [e], as in Russian) (see interwar Russophile materials written in traditional orthography in Duličenko 2008).

Rusyn attitudes in the modern sense did not emerge in Subcarpathia either. Only in 1935 did former Russophile circles from Mukacheve begin actively promoting a language that they declared to be opposed to both Russian and Ukrainian. This was, however, primarily a reaction to Eduard Beneš's proclamation of "an end to support for Russian and Ukrainian émigrés in the province" and his call for the fostering of a local Rusyn identity one year earlier (Kapral – Pop 2005). Generally, the language that was actually used by the Mukačevo Russophiles still remained traditional (Plishkova 2009: 50).

Throughout the interwar period, it was primarily the Ukrainian and Russian sides that competed in Subcarpathian Rus'. In early October 1938, Subcarpathian Rus' received autonomous status, and its first leader, the Russophile Andrij Brodij, was arrested as a spy for Hungary a few days after his inauguration. Soon after the Ukrainophile Avgustyn Vološyn succeeded Brodij, Hungarian troops annexed the most important regions of Subcarpathian Rus', including the towns of Uzhhorod, Mukacheve, and Berehove. Vološyn introduced the new name "Carpathian Ukraine" for the remaining polity, where the Ukrainian language was promoted (Magocsi

1978: 176). When it became clear that interwar Czechoslovakia would ultimately collapse, Vološyn declared Carpathian Ukraine an independent state on 15 March 1939, but within a few hours Hungarian troops overran the “republic for a day.” As a result, Subcarpathian Rus’ became Hungarian “Kárpátalja” (“Subcarpathia”), the Ukrainian language was banned (while the use of Russian was tolerated), and a “Hungarian Russian (Ruthenian/Rusyn)” language (“Magyarorosz nyelv”) was promoted. This language, as represented in Ivan Harajda’s grammar of the Ruthenian/Rusyn language (*Граммати́ка руського́ языка*), is celebrated by some modern Rusyn activists as an outstanding achievement in the modern Rusyn sense. In fact, the language was not only designed exclusively for Hungary under the reign of Miklós Horthy but was also very traditional at all linguistic levels and much closer to nineteenth-century Ruthenian/Rusyn variants (including those of Galicia) than to any variant of Modern Rusyn (Moser 2011b: 109–11).

3. Behind the Iron Curtain

After the Red Army invaded East Central Europe, the former Subcarpathian Rus’/Subcarpathia became the Transcarpathian oblast of Soviet Ukraine. Contrary to widespread modern Rusyn myths, the fact that the Soviets had identified the Rusyns as Ukrainians did not entail a “forcible Ukrainization” of the territory in the real sense of the word: after all, it was the use of the Russian language that was promoted there first and foremost, as in all other territories of the Soviet Union. No variant of Ruthenian/Rusyn identity or of a Ruthenian/Rusyn language was allowed, and no publications in such variants appeared during the Soviet period (Magocsi 2007a: 102).

The Ruthenians/Rusyns of Czechoslovakia initially found themselves in an especially paradoxical situation. On the one hand, they were officially regarded as Ukrainians; on the other, the only language they actually used as their official high variant was Russian, which now, of course, had to be Modern Standard Russian with its modern orthography. Only after 1952 was Ukrainian introduced there (Štec’ 1996: 76–86, Gajdoš and Konečný 2006: 173), but because Ukrainian was a threatened and stigmatized language in Soviet Ukraine itself, its standing in Czechoslovakia and other countries of the Soviet bloc was far from ideal. In the mid-1960s Ivan Macyns’kyj, then head of the Department of Ukrainian Literature of the Slovak Pedagogical Publishing House in Prešov, realized the growing difficulties of the Ukrainian language in Slovakia; he demanded that “school textbooks, popular brochures, and the weekly *Нове життя* (New Life) should begin coming out in the language spoken by the Rusyns of northeastern Slovakia” (Plishkova 2009: 73). Beginning in 1967, a two-page insert in the local vernacular was included in this Ukrainian-language newspaper (*ibid.*, 74–75), and Macyns’kyj, who was in fact a supporter of the Ukrainian side, prepared a 28-page typescript with a description of some features of this idiom (Štec’ 1996: 95–100). In 1970, the dialect-based inserts were removed from *Нове життя*. More than a decade later, on the eve of the fall of the Iron Curtain, a group of Greek Catholic activists headed by František Krajňák prepared some biblical texts in a Medzilaborce-based variety of Rusyn (Magocsi 2007a: 106), but those texts have appeared in print only since the 1990s.

In Poland, the Lemkos were forcibly expelled from their historical homelands between 1945 and 1947. About two-thirds of them were deported to Soviet Ukraine; the rest (between 40,000 and 50,000), now officially regarded as Ukrainians, were forcibly resettled during Operation Vistula (*Akcja Wisła*) in other areas of postwar Poland, primarily in the newly annexed former German territories (*ibid.*, 102). After 1956, the publications of newly established Lemko organizations included some texts in Lemko dialects (*ibid.*, 103, 106), yet there is no evidence that these idioms were regarded as a separate language or were associated with any other Rusyn variants in the modern sense. The “*Lemkivs'ka Vatra*” (Lemko Bonfire) folklore and cultural festivals in the historical Lemko region organized after 1983 (Magocsi 2007b: 36) were also of no great significance for Rusyn identity in a broader sense.

Only the Bačka-Srijem variant of Rusyn was further elaborated and codified prior to the 1990s, particularly in Mykola Kočyš's works of the 1960s and 1970s. When Vojvodina's autonomous status within Yugoslavia was expanded in 1974, Rusyn was acknowledged as one of the province's four official languages (Magocsi 2007a: 104–105). As a result, the Bačka-Srijem variant was used in all communicative spheres, including radio and television. No Rusyn identity models in the modern sense were as yet addressed by the activists, whereas many referred to a Ukrainian framework.⁸

4. After 1989

After the fall of the Iron Curtain and the breakup of the Soviet bloc, virtually all territories that have been mapped as Rusyn were located within new state borders. Since 1991, the Transcarpathian oblast has been an administrative unit of independent Ukraine. The Rusyns of Slovakia witnessed the peaceful breakup of Czechoslovakia in 1993, whereas the Rusyns of Yugoslavia, who were strongly affected by the secession wars of the early 1990s, ended up divided between independent Croatia and the new Yugoslavia (later: Serbia).

Most countries that now acknowledge Rusyn minorities were involved in the processes of European integration. Poland, Slovakia, and Hungary joined the European Union in 2004 (Romania, together with Bulgaria, followed in 2007) and entered the Schengen Area in 2007. Borders between these states have virtually ceased to exist, whereas those with other countries have again become less porous.

In the 1990s, local activists established Rusyn organizations and Rusyn journals and newspapers in all countries with Rusyn minorities except Romania, and for the first time in history a Rusyn identity in the modern sense was promoted. In March 1991, the first World Congress of Rusyns was held in Slovakia (Magocsi 2007b: 36–37). In the following years, Rusyns were acknowledged as national minorities not only in Slovakia, Poland, Serbia, and Croatia, but also in Romania, where only two hundred people identified themselves as Rusyn; in Hungary, where only

8 As the “Union of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Croatia” (Союз Русинох и Українцех Републики Горватскей) (<http://www.sriu.hr/o%20sojuzu.htm>) or the regularly held “Festival of Culture of Rusyns and Ukrainians” (Фестивал култури Руснацех и Українцех) in Ruski Krstur (Serbia) demonstrate, this has not changed to date.

one Rusyn-speaking village remains; and in the Czech Republic, where the only Rusyns are recent migrants from Slovakia (Magocsi 2007b: 37, Magocsi 2011: 271). All these countries now distinguish two national minorities in one ethnic group: those with a Rusyn and those with a Ukrainian identity. This is one of the reasons why Rusyn claims that approximately one million Rusyns live in Europe at present (Magocsi 2007b: 16) are sharply at variance with official data. However, only about 10,000 out of an estimated 740,000 persons in the Transcarpathian oblast identified themselves as Rusyns in the Ukrainian census of 2001, and other polls yield even smaller figures (with the exception of some unofficial censuses conducted by Rusyn organizations themselves, but even they did not find more than 22,000–28,000 Rusyns in the region) (Kuzio 2011: 102).

The vast majority of Ruthenians/Rusyns in the Transcarpathian oblast obviously identify themselves as Ukrainian and consider the Rusyns a branch of the Ukrainian people. So do the central Ukrainian political authorities, although on 7 March 2007 the Transcarpathian Oblast Council acknowledged a separate Rusyn ethnicity at the regional level (Magocsi 2011: 272). In Slovakia, the latest census counted 55,000 Rusyns (that is, many more than in the Transcarpathian oblast!). The corresponding figures in other countries are: Serbia 16,000, Poland 5,900, Croatia 2,300, the Czech Republic 1,100, Hungary 1,100, and Romania 200 (Magocsi 2011: 271). Thus, roughly 91,000 people in Europe identify themselves as Rusyns.

Efforts to promote and codify the Rusyn language were addressed for the first time in history in the 1990s. In November 1992, a seminar on the Rusyn language was held in Bardejovské Kúpele, Slovakia. At that meeting, later referred to as the “First Congress of the Rusyn Language,” activists from Ukraine, Poland, Slovakia, Yugoslavia, and Hungary decided to accept the “Romansch model” for the codification of the Rusyn language, that is, to develop four different standards of Rusyn for Ukraine, Poland, Slovakia, and Yugoslavia first and create an all-Rusyn language later (Magocsi 1996: 37).

In January 1995, the Slovak variant of Rusyn was officially declared a new Slavic language in Bratislava (Magocsi 1996: 38) even though the level of codification was still extremely low at that time. Five years later, Henryk Fontański and Mirosława Chomiak published a *Grammar of the Lemko Language*, and a Polish standard of Rusyn was declared to be in force. In both Slovakia and Poland, Rusyn is now taught in schools and universities. The Institute for Rusyn Language and Culture at the University of Prešov is probably the most active European center of the modern Rusyn movement. Rusyn studies at the Pedagogical University in Cracow (ibid., 109–11) are apparently at a considerably lower level than Rusyn sources suggest; only a course on the “grammar of the Rusyn-Lemko language” is taught in the Russian department of that institution (Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny 2011). In Ukraine’s Transcarpathian oblast, various grammars have been published since the 1990s; none of them has, however, been accepted by any larger groups to date (ibid.).

Although some activists are continuing work on a common Rusyn standard language, the actual achievements indicate an opposite trend of ongoing "nationalization" of Rusyn in various states. At present, there are no longer only four standard variants of Rusyn in the making. New work on a North American standard of Rusyn has apparently begun (see Magocsi 2007a and 2007b), and a Hungarian standard of Rusyn is being developed (Benedek 2007), even though the vast majority of Hungarian Rusyns are migrants, and the only Rusyn-speaking village is located near the border with the Transcarpathian oblast. Will the two hundred Romanian citizens who claim a Rusyn identity really do without their own variant in the long run? And is it likely that the Croatian and Serbian Rusyns will maintain the notion of a common standard?

Paul Robert Magocsi recently addressed some current problems of Rusyn language planning in his inaugural speech at the third congress on the Rusyn language, held in Cracow in 2007. In his presentation, that Rusyn leader called for the further elaboration of national standards where they have not yet been established, particularly in the Transcarpathian oblast, where at least two more or less serious versions have been proposed by Ihor Kerča and Stepan Popovych (1999) and Dmytro Sydor (2005), and in Hungary, where extremely diverse versions have been in use since the early 1990s (see Magocsi 2008: 10–11). With an eye to a future Rusyn common standard, Magocsi encouraged activists to replace loanwords from their state languages with words likely to be understood by all Rusyns; he also recommended that the creation of a single linguistic and geographic terminology on a Latin basis be discussed and criticized the curious fact that in some variants, e.g., in the Bačka-Srijem region, the adjective *rus'kŷj* means "Rusyn," whereas in Slovakia it means "Russian."⁹

First and foremost, Magocsi emphasized the importance of a common Rusyn standard not only because "Rusyns in Romania or Ukraine would be able to completely understand Rusyns in Slovakia or Poland" but also because non-Rusyn organizations and individuals have become increasingly interested in publishing Rusyn dictionaries or Rusyn grammars. However, he also pointed out that nobody really knows "which Rusyn language, or which of its variants, we should use" (*ibid.*, 13).

It is precisely the issue of a common Rusyn standard that may soon gain even more significance. Without such a common language, it could become increasingly difficult to convince outsiders that Rusyn is in fact only one language. If that were really the case, one might ask why the still so modest Slovak standardization of 1995 was celebrated with the slogan "A New Slavic Language Is Born" even though the Bačka-Srijem variant had already been codified for several decades. Why, then, did other Rusyns not just adopt (or at least adapt) that variant? Can one believe in the notion of one Rusyn language while observing that different variants of Rusyn are barely intercomprehensible, constituting a greater language barrier than the separate variants of Rusyn and other Slavic languages (including Ukrainian)?

9 Magocsi also addressed alphabet problems, deplored the fact that some publications of the Greek Catholic Church in Slovakia still appear in Latin script, and pointed out that the transcription of Rusyn in the electronic media is "chaotic" (*ibid.*, 11–13).

Only time will tell whether a common Rusyn standard will ever be established or, even more problematic, disseminated in the speech communities. One of the main problems is quite obvious: if variants of Rusyn were to be disseminated in speech communities with some success as so much closer to the local dialects than allegedly alien Ukrainian, then a switch to any language with a broader reach might appear highly risky, because, after all, such a language would inevitably be much more remote from the local dialects (and probably not much less remote than Modern Standard Ukrainian).

The first serious attempt at creating a modern Rusyn common standard was promoted quite recently by the Uzhhorod-based journalist, publisher, and activist Valerij Padjak, who introduced this idiom in a translation of Paul Robert Magocsi's *A People from Nowhere*. For more or less obvious reasons, that variant is clearly based on the dialects of the Transcarpathian oblast: Padjak writes *мавут* or *майперва* (Magocsi 2007d: 11, 24) and uses local forms such as *айбо* (ibid., 12); he also introduces not only Russian loanwords such as *изслідователи* 'researchers' or *побідоносно* 'victoriously' (ibid., 24, 91) but also several Hungarian ones such as *вадь* (from *vagy* 'or') (ibid., 12), *иннен* (from *éppen* 'just') (ibid., 22), or *фалатавут ся* (from *falat* 'bit, bite') (ibid., 21). Although Padjak, curiously enough, reintroduces the letter *ô* to cover the varying Rusyn reflexes of *o* in newly closed syllables (in accordance with much farther-reaching Ruthenian/Rusyn/Ukrainian etymologically based orthographies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries [!]), his project is unlikely to be accepted outside the Transcarpathian oblast, if at all. Slovak Rusyns are likely to have serious problems in recognizing that language as their own, and the same will certainly apply even more to the Lemkos in Poland, not to mention the Rusyns in the Bačka-Srijem region.

In fact, current Rusyn problems are even more basic. During the past few years, even leading codifiers in various countries have not managed to maintain a united front: Rusyn activists in Slovakia have not only sharply criticized recent orthographic innovations but also complained that the Slovak standard of Rusyn pays virtually no attention to the westernmost dialects (Van'ko 2008). Rusyn interest groups in Prešov have split, and since 2003–4 two standard Slovak Rusyn models have been in use (Koporova 2010: 5–6). In Poland, Henryk Fontański has complained that even Mirosława Chomiak, his coauthor of the Lemko grammar of 2000 (2d ed. 2004), is not willing to introduce the norms of that grammar into her own textbooks (Fontański 2008: 51). In the Transcarpathian oblast, Rusyns are still searching for norms (Padjak 2008: 72), and they are not likely to agree soon. In Hungary, Rusyns are "still far" from "ideal standards" (Kapral' 2008: 77). Even in the Bačka-Srijem region, the extent of divergence between the Rusyn standard and the spoken language appears to be much greater than "normal" (Ramač 2008: 86–89).

5. Conclusion

Accepting the status of the still loosely standardized national variants of Rusyn as one language (with one history) basically means agreeing with an axiom put forward by Rusyn activists. Despite some indisputable achievements, it is still impossible to predict whether the Rusyn project will succeed in the long run.

"UKRAINIZATION" AND THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

1. On the eve of "Ukrainization," a tactical break in the revolutionary movement

After the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the Red Army failed to annex Ukraine twice before the Bolsheviks finally seized power. The Red Army initiated its first attack in late December 1917, but it was expelled as early as March 1918. The second Bolshevik occupation lasted from January to August 1919. Not until the winter of 1919 did the Bolsheviks finally succeed in Ukraine, and it was only the Treaty of Riga (18 March 1921) that ultimately consolidated their power (Borys 1980: 171–295). Following the Bolsheviks' first assault of December 1917,

the Bolsheviks themselves recognized that the masses were against them. The population's enmity can be ascribed, first, to the Soviet food policy, the removal of grain and other foods from Ukraine to Russia, and second, to the party's national policy, which ignored and even fought the Ukrainian national movement and which included frequent reprisals against Ukrainians as such, not only against counter-revolutionaries (*ibid.*, 195).

The Bolshevik Party had only "a weak connection with the masses of Ukrainian nationality," as the Bolshevik party historian Nikolaj Popov admitted later (cited *ibid.*, 184), and there were very few ethnic Ukrainians among the party members.¹ The Bolsheviks had virtually no experience in conducting their "work among the masses in the Ukrainian language," as Popov added, so that Bolshevik "influence... in Ukraine on the peasantry...before and after October" was in general "very small" (cited according to Solchanyk 1985: 64). Moreover, especially during their first occupation of Ukraine between late December 1917 and March 1918, the Bolshevik troops under General Mixail Murav'ev presented themselves as an avidly anti-Ukrainian force. During their occupation of Kyiv in February 1918, they identified thousands of "counterrevolutionaries" by their language and massacred thousands of them (as witnessed even by Ukrainian Bolsheviks themselves).² From the outset, Ukrainian peasants suffered grain requisitions, and mass shootings occurred often. Up to 1922, this policy led to several local famines and a major famine in Ukraine, with millions of people starved to death (Graziosi 2008: 34; Holod 1992).

Peasant uprisings would not end. As Bohdan Krawchenko contends, "for the Bolsheviks in Ukraine, control of the village seemed to be an insurmountable problem. Unable to win the village from within, they attempted to control it from

1 In 1918, as few 3.2 percent of the Bolsheviks were Ukrainians (Ševel'ov 1989: 90).

2 None other than the Bolshevik leader Volodymyr Zatons'kyj reported: "The dialectic of life is that in fact those very same Red Guards who despised Petliura and along with him everything Ukrainian, those who very nearly executed Skrypnyk and me in Murav'ev's Kyiv—it was they and not Hruševs'kyj who were building Soviet Ukraine. I was to be executed, too. I was saved by accident. In my pocket I found a mandate with Lenin's signature. This saved me. Somebody recognized Skrypnyk, and this saved him.... Objectively, it was those who were doing the executing for the Ukrainian word—they were the ones who in fact built Ukraine" (Zatons'kyj 1927: 79; cited in part according to Solchanyk 1985: 65).

above, destroying in the process more than they could create" (Krawchenko 1985: 65; see also Graziosi 2008: 36).

Initially, the Bolsheviks were unable "to come to terms with the fact that in 1917–1919, side by side with the all-Russian revolution, Ukraine had also experienced a national revolution" (Solchanyk 1985: 63, *Ukrajinizacija* 2003: 26).³ Originally, they supported "every force leading to the eradication of national distinctions" (Borys 1980: 31). Faced with significant problems in Ukraine, however, the Bolsheviks finally found it necessary to revise their attitude to the Ukrainian question (*Ukrajinizacija* 2003: 18, 34; Solchanyk 1985: 66).⁴

In November 1919, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) (RCP[B]) accepted Lenin's "Draft Resolution on Soviet Rule in Ukraine" (Lenin 1965: 163–166), which obliged all party members to

facilitate in every way the removal of all obstacles to the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture.... Members of the RCP in Ukraine must in practice adhere to the right of the toiling masses to learn their native language and use it in all Soviet institutions, opposing in every way attempts by artificial means to push the Ukrainian language into the background and, quite the opposite, striving to transform the Ukrainian language into a weapon of communist education of the toiling masses. Immediate steps should be taken so that all Soviet institutions have a sufficient number of employees conversant in the Ukrainian language and that in the future all employees are able to make themselves understood in the Ukrainian language (quoted according to Solchanyk 1985: 66).⁵

3 The Central Rada had contributed a great deal to the development of Ukrainian-language education on all levels, including the establishment of the first Ukrainian university in Kyiv; it had introduced the Ukrainian language at all levels of administration as well. During the less than eight months of the Hetmanate, there were many more achievements in the sphere of "Ukrainization" prior to Bolshevik rule. Inter alia, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was established (*Ukrajinizacija* 2003: 26–27).

4 As early as January 1919, Xrystyjan Rakov's'kyj's second Bolshevik government declared that "the language of instruction in the schools depends on the will of the local worker and peasant populations" (Solchanyk 1985: 67). On 9 March 1919, the Provisional Government issued a decree "On the Mandatory Study of the Local Language, History, and Geography of Ukraine in the Schools" (*Ukrajinizacija* 2003: 34). However, during the short-lived second Soviet occupation of Ukraine, these documents had virtually no impact.

5 In the same month, Lenin wrote some remarkable sentences concerning the Ukrainian question in a discussion of "the figures of the 1917 election results, which had shown that the Ukrainian parties (chiefly the S[ocial] R[evolutionarie]s) [had] obtained the majority of the votes in Ukraine" (Borys 1980: 254): "In such a state of affairs, to ignore the importance of the national question in Ukraine, of which the Great Russians are very frequently guilty (and probably the Jews are guilty of it only a little less frequently than the Great Russians), means committing a profound and dangerous error. The division between the Russian and Ukrainian SRs in Ukraine as early as 1917 cannot be a mere accident. Being internationalists, we must first struggle especially energetically against remnants (sometimes subconscious ones) of Great Russian imperialism and chauvinism among the "Russian" Communists; secondly, we must make concessions only on the national question, as it is one of relatively little importance..." (ibid., 254). Although Lenin did not discuss the language question in this context, the message did, of course, pertain to it as well.

With the exception of Jakov Ėpštejn (Jakovlev) and Volodymyr Zatons'kyj,⁶ the Bolsheviks of Ukraine were reportedly "critical of the resolution, viewing it as a concession to Ukrainian nationalism" (*ibid.*, 67).⁷ After all, the Bolsheviks viewed themselves as "internationalists" and regarded the very concept of the nation as a mere remnant of bourgeois ideology. None other than Stalin (Ioseb Besarionis dze Jugashvili) had written in 1918 that "the national flag is sewn on only to deceive the masses, as a popular flag, a convenience for covering up...the counter-revolutionary plans of the national bourgeoisie," and that "if bourgeois circles attempt to give a national tint to [our] conflicts, then only because it is convenient to hide their battle for power behind a national costume" (cited according to Martin 2001: 4). It is true that, as Terry Martin argues, "this interpretation of nationalism as a masking ideology helps explain why the Bolsheviks remained highly suspicious of national expression, even after they adopted a policy explicitly designed to encourage it" (*ibid.*). At the same time, these words can be interpreted differently: obviously, the Bolsheviks were perfectly aware of the general utility of the "national mask." It followed that they, too, used it to cover up their own "struggle for power." Obviously, the "national mask" was convincing only if it spoke the "national language" as well.

On 22 February 1920, in the midst of the third Bolshevik invasion of Ukraine, Lenin sent the following telegram to Stalin:

It is essential immediately to arrange for interpreters at all headquarters and army institutions, and make it the duty of all to accept applications and other papers written in Ukrainian. This is absolutely essential—as far as language is concerned there must be every concession and the maximum of equality (Lenin 1965: 370; see Ševel'ov 1989: 86).⁸

In the course of 1919 and 1920, a series of laws stipulated the toleration of the official use of the Ukrainian language alongside Russian (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 18, Ševel'ov 1989: 88, Solchanyk 1985: 67),⁹ and in early 1921, the Bolsheviks

6 Volodymyr Zatons'kyj was Ukraine's People's Commissar of Education five times. As the Soviets repeatedly entered Ukraine and retreated during the Civil War, he held that post three times, albeit only for a few weeks each time (from December 1917, from January 1919, and from December 1919). Afterwards, Zatons'kyj held the same post from 30 October 1922 to 14 March 1924 and from 22 February 1933 to 3 November 1937. As early as 1923, Zatons'kyj criticized the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences for its contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language, complaining that it had oriented the language on Galician dialects. On 3 November 1937, Zatons'kyj was arrested as a Polish spy. He was shot on 29 July 1938.

7 In November 1920, Mykola Skrypnyk referred to this resolution as a "lost charter" (Solchanyk 1985: 68).

8 As Jurij Ševel'ov contended, this telegram demonstrated at least three things: that the Soviet occupation forces were of a "prevailing Russian [or, rather, Russophone] character"; that "in the years to come," too, "concessions would be made regarding language, but not other matters"; and that "not the domination of the Ukrainian language but rather its admittance alongside Russian should be fostered (in other words, Russian was one of the two accepted languages of Ukraine)" (Ševel'ov 1989: 86).

9 In particular, on 21 February 1920 the Soviets issued a decree "On the Use of the Ukrainian Language on a Par with Russian in All Soviet Institutions." On 21 September 1920, the Council of People's Commissars of Ukraine adopted another decree providing for the introduction of the Ukrainian language, sometimes along with Russian, in the schools and official institutions of Ukraine

considered establishing the use of the Ukrainian language within the party “as a means to disseminate Communist ideas among the toiling masses of Ukraine” (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 26).¹⁰

Paragraph 25 of the “Law Code on Popular Education in the UkrSSR” (“Кодекс законів про народню освіту в УРСР”) stated:

The Ukrainian language as the language of the majority of the population of the Ukraine, especially in villages, and Russian, as the language of the majority in cities and as the All-Union language, have in the Ukrainian S.S.R. national (общегосударственное) significance and must be taught in all educational (учебно-воспитательных) institutions of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist [it was “Socialist Soviet” until 1937] Republic (cited according to Ševel'ov 1989: 89).

Moreover,

the Criminal Procedures Code of 13 September 1922 spoke, in paragraph 22, of legal proceedings “in one of the two state languages, Ukrainian or Russian” (ibid.).

On the theoretical level, Lenin repeatedly emphasized that Ukraine was to be granted the right to self-determination and secession (which would even be enshrined in the Constitution of the Soviet Union) (Borys 1980: 12–51). In practice, the Bolsheviks consistently centralized their realm and persecuted any Ukrainian who showed any sign of “separatist” thinking.¹¹ At their plenum of October 1922, the Bolsheviks identified “four nationalist citadels” of “the Ukrainian counterrevolution”: traditional schools, the Autocephalous Church, Prosvita popular educational organizations, and various cooperatives (ibid., 38). Not surprisingly, all these institutions encountered Bolshevik hostility,¹² as did the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the leading Ukrainian intellectual center, which from the beginning of the third Soviet occupation was “reduced to a starvation budget..., and its access to printing facilities was restricted” (Ševel'ov 1989: 88). Under these conditions, it comes as no surprise that the years of Bolshevik rule up to 1923 were a period of “‘stand-still’ in the implementation of nationalities policy” (Solchanyk 1985: 68), as the Bolshevik party historian Nikolaj Popov wrote later.

(Ukrajinizacija 2003: 35).

10 Vlas Čubar and Oleksandr Šums'kyj were commissioned to prepare a circular in that regard (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 36).

11 When Ukraine “entered a union with Soviet Russia” in late 1920, it immediately relinquished its sovereignty in the spheres of the military, finances, labor, communication, and the economy,” and “it was accepted that all decrees issued by the CPC of Soviet Russia were also valid in the Ukraine” (Ševel'ov 1989: 94). Two years later, on 30 December 1922, the creation of the Soviet Union continued the gradual undermining of Ukraine’s sovereignty and administrative centralization in Moscow (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 39–44).

12 The branches of Prosvita were quickly suppressed. In February 1922, there were 4,500 of them; by 1925, only 573 survived (ibid., 39). In 1928, there were as many as 41,734 cooperatives. In 1927, the Bolsheviks began their struggle against the cooperatives, which inevitably “meant further limitations on the use of the Ukrainian language in the economic realm” (Ševel'ov 1989: 123, 126).

The Bolsheviks' leading expert on nationality policy was Stalin. In his theses for the XII Party Congress of the RCP(B) on 24 March 1923, he explained the ideological framework of that policy, which would be decisive for the nationality policy of the Soviet Union as a whole in the following years—the policy of “nationalization” or, as it was called later, “indigenization.” Stalin explained in his speech that because of the tsarist legacy, the Soviet Union was witnessing manifestations of “nationalism among a whole range of peoples” who had “suffered under the heavy yoke of national oppression and not yet arrived at the point where they could free themselves of the feelings of traditional national offense” (Stalin 1936: 173). It followed from this, according to Stalin, that there was “a certain national alienation and a lack of full trust among the formerly oppressed people [“народов”] for [any] measures taken by the Russians” (ibid.). Stalin argued that “these remainders turn into local chauvinism directed against weak national groups in the individual republics”; consequently, “a direct fight against them” was “mandatory for party members” (ibid.). He therefore insisted that henceforth “the organs of the national republics and oblasts” should increasingly be staffed with “local people who knew the languages, customs, manners and habits” of the local nationalities [“народов”]” (ibid., 175).

In another key speech on 23 April 1923, Stalin argued that the Bolsheviks “had risked departing too far from those resources of the revolution that were given by the will of fate,” and for that reason alone they had introduced their new economic policy (NEP). As an external measure, NEP would “retard forward movement”; as an internal measure, however, it was useful: after the period of war, the party “had to catch its breath and heal the wounds—the wounds of the leading rank, the proletariat,” and “get in touch with the peasant hinterland” (ibid., 180). Stalin explained that NEP had led to the growth of “Russian nationalism” as well as of “local nationalisms, particularly in republics inhabited by more than one nationality”; he added that “Great Russian chauvinism” was “certainly” the greater danger, simply because of its “power” (ibid., 180), addressed the danger of a “breach [“разрыв”] between the proletariat of a former state nation and the peasants of a formerly oppressed people,” and urged a “link” [Russian “смычка,” Ukrainian “змичка”] between proletarians and peasants.” In many regions of the Soviet realm, relations between the urban proletariat and the peasants were not least a problem of language, as peasants often spoke indigenous languages other than Russian, while the towns were often predominantly Russophone. Stalin explained that henceforth, the languages of the indigenous (Russian “коренные”) peasant masses were to serve as a means of uniting the party, workers, and peasants in the individual Soviet republics, for it was only if the peasants heard their languages being used that they would lose their “distrust of everything Russian,” which had been “nourished” by tsarist policy “for decades.”¹³ He promised that the result would be “full mutual understanding and trust...a true link not only between the proletariat and the Russian peasantry, but also between the Russian proletariat and

13 Lenin had also spoken about distrust toward Russians among non-Russian nationalities in 1919 (Martin 2001: 3).

the peasantry of other nationalities" (ibid., 181). It was precisely through the use of the non-Russian languages that Soviet power was to be made "comprehensible" to the peasant masses, who in turn would come to regard it as their own in the long run. Thus, in time, Soviet rule would be accepted not as Russian but as truly international (ibid., 181–182).

In the years to come, the policy of "nationalization" had a considerable impact on the development of many national languages and cultures in the Soviet realm, including Ukrainian. It should be pointed out, however, that when Stalin defined the program of "nationalization," he associated it very closely with the New Economic Policy (NEP), a rather short-lived phenomenon that ended with Stalin's introduction of central planning in 1928. Moreover, Stalin explicitly described both NEP and "nationalization" as a mere halt in the progress of the revolution.¹⁴

In Ukraine, "nationalization," or, as it was to be called later, "indigenization" meant first and foremost "Ukrainization."¹⁵ Moreover, "Ukrainization" was to be implemented in other Soviet regions with significant Ukrainian minority populations (the North Caucasus, Central Asia, Siberia, the Far East, etc.).

The Politburo of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of Ukraine (CP[B]U) discussed the "Ukrainization" issue in May 1923, and the June plenary session of its Central Committee ratified the Politburo directives regarding practical measures in the sphere of nationality policy (inter alia, the Bolsheviks decided to permit Ukrainian intellectuals to work in Soviet institutions) (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 49). Subsequently, two decrees of 27 July and 1 August 1923 on the "Ukrainization" of the educational and cultural sphere, intended to guarantee "the Ukrainian language a position corresponding to the numerical superiority of the Ukrainian people in the Ukrainian SSR," ultimately introduced the era of "Ukrainization" (ibid., Solchanyk 1985: 69). In the following months, however, "the very number" of new decrees and resolutions of similar content showed "that the situation did not" in fact "undergo any essential changes," and that "the published laws and ordinances were not consistently enforced" (Ševel'ov 1989: 90).

It is generally agreed that "Ukrainization" made very modest progress until 1925,¹⁶ when so-called "mechanical Ukrainization" was followed by "functional Ukrainization" (Martin 2001: 75–124; Ukrajinizacija 2003: 49–50). Interestingly, the Bolsheviks themselves admitted during the April 1925 plenum of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U that any serious achievements regarding "Ukrainization" had been "made mainly from below, by way of the natural Ukrainization of the Soviet

14 Interestingly, Symon Petljura wrote as early as 3 November 1923: "In general, the affair of Ukrainization makes the impression of a certain tactical move on the part of Bolsheviks; if it does not yield the desired outcome, it will soon be abandoned" (cited after Ševel'ov 1989: 112).

15 Originally, the term "Ukrainization" was apparently introduced by Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, "who, in the pages of the volume *The Liberation of Russia and the Ukrainian Question* (1907), polemicized with those who believed that 'the Ukrainization of higher education in Ukraine would have a harmful effect on scholarly life'" (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 15).

16 A special committee found at the end of 1924 that "far from all institutions took Ukrainization seriously.... After a year's work, we have achieved barely half of what we expected. Although our successes indicate that some work is being done, it is nevertheless insignificant" (Solchanyk 1985: 69).

apparatus that ha[d] contact with the peasantry and by way of the Ukrainization of the lower schools" (Solchanyk 1985: 69).

2. "Mechanical Ukrainization"

2.1. Discourses

The leaders of the CP(B)U were highly distrustful of Ukrainian national aspirations from the outset. Georgij Pjatak, who had been elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U in July 1918, was in fact one of the most prominent opponents of Lenin's slogan of the right of national self-determination. At the VIII Congress of the Russian Communist Party in December 1919, he argued that "the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination has shown itself in practice, during the social revolution, as a slogan uniting all counterrevolutionary forces" (cited according to Martin 2001: 2).¹⁷

In early 1919, Pjatak's Bulgarian-born precursor Xrystyjan Rakovskij denounced any effort to introduce Ukrainian as the official language of Soviet Ukraine as "reactionary and totally unnecessary"; the only concession he considered possible was the provision of elementary education "in the native language" (Solchanyk 1985: 65–66). In 1922, Rakovskij wrote that "the supremacy of the Ukrainian language would have had to have meant the supremacy of the Ukrainian petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the Ukrainian kulaks" (cited *ibid.*, 66),¹⁸ thus supporting the traditional idea of Ukrainian as an essentially "reactionary" language. In 1923, however, Rakovskij found himself obliged to convey the essence of Stalin's new policy to the Bolsheviks of Ukraine.¹⁹ It cost him considerable rhetorical effort to appeal to himself and his comrades to grasp "with our intellect and with our emotions...the psychology of the Ukrainian people" and "the anger of the oppressed subject nations" (Rakovskij 1923: 105) and to convince himself and his fellow party members that only "Ukrainization" would "forestall any effort to set village against town, Ukrainians against Russians, 'Xoxly' against 'Kacapy,'" a confrontation that would only help the counterrevolutionaries (*ibid.*).²⁰ Rakovskij's statement that "to wave this away and say that it does not

17 Lenin reacted to Pjatak with the following intriguing words: "Scratch any Communist and you find a Great Russian chauvinist" (cited according to Martin 2001: 2).

18 Jurij Ševčuk concluded that "the principle underlying [Rakovskij's] language policy was the legal equality of the Ukrainian and Russian languages" (Ševčuk 1989: 92–93). The question of whether such "legal equality" was not just sloganeering deserves further study.

19 As early as the XII Party Congress of the RCP(B), when Stalin outlined the policy of "Ukrainization," Rakovskij sided with him and declared: "Sometimes I have heard comrades call the Ukrainian language an invention of Galicians. Has not, after all, the great-power attitude of a Russian man crept into this, [the attitude of a man] who has never experienced national oppression but, quite the reverse, has oppressed other nations throughout [several] centuries?" (cited after Ševčuk 1989: 93).

20 "Почасті з тою ж самою метою, попередження спроб протиставлення села–місту, українців–росіянам, „хохлов”–„кацапам”, протиставлення, що відіграло величезну роль в руках контр-революції і може кожен день знову стати перешкодою на дорозі нашої революції – ми повинні дати правильне розв'язання національного питання. [...] Як про російську інтелігенцію, навіть національного пригнічення, так і про російських робітників можна сказати: їм потрібно зробити над собою певні зусилля, аби зрозуміти психологію українського

exist; that those who speak about it are not internationalists, and so on and so forth, is incorrect and dangerous" (ibid.) is highly suggestive with regard to prevailing views among the Bolsheviks.

Another Bolshevik leader in Ukraine, the Latvian-born ethnic German Ėmmanuil Kviring, explained the goals of "Ukrainization" in an article in the journal *Červonyj Šljax* (Red Pathway) (Kviring 1923: 107). Kviring, too, found it important to refute the (obviously widespread) view of "Ukrainization" as an aberration from Bolshevik "internationalist" policy. He explained that it was essential to elevate the formerly oppressed Ukrainian culture to the level of the Russian, even if that could not be achieved quickly.²¹ At the same time, he intimated that the Bolsheviks did not want "Ukrainization" to become a truly comprehensive policy: if he began by praising the early achievements of "Ukrainization," he went on to place considerably more emphasis on those spheres in which it was to be introduced only with the utmost caution, if at all. Going into detail, Kviring boasted that elementary schools had been successfully "Ukrainized"—although he forgot to add that many achievements in that sphere had been anticipated prior to Soviet rule—and envisaged the possibility of "Ukrainizing" agricultural institutes. First and foremost, however, Kviring underscored that the "Ukrainization" of middle and higher level-schools would "inevitably" take a lot of time. Moreover, he mocked the idea of "Ukrainizing" medical institutes "with their cadres of old professors and urban bourgeois students" as "ridiculous," declaring that anyone who thought that after a few years all universities of Ukraine would be "Ukrainized" was an "ardent chauvinist" (ibid., 107–109, 112).²² At that point, Kviring switched focus and

народу. Росія панувала. Вона захоплювала [...], вона асимілювала, вона примушувала всіх так чи інакше проходити через російський казан. І Росія, як пануюча нація, не розуміла обурення пригнічених, підлеглих націй. А нам це треба зрозуміти своїм розумом і своїм чуттям. [...] Махнути рукою на це й сказати, що цього нема, що ті, які говорять про це – вони не інтернаціоналісти й т. ін. – неправильно й небезпечно."

- 21 "Багатьом товаришам здається, що в нашій національній політиці настав різкий поворот, що ми круто повернули в бік націоналізму, особливо в галузі національної культури. Це зовсім не так. Спілка Республік є тільки більш досконала форма використання права нації на самовизначення в умовах пролетарської диктатури. Спілка більш яскраво й повно здійснює це право в новозмінених господарчих умовах. Те ж саме й що до національної культури. Правда, ми робимо значний поворот, переводючи держапарат на українське діловодство, але цей різкий перехід став можливим лишень завдяки нашій попередній роботі. [...] Українську культуру кілька сот літ душив царат. Зрозуміло, що українська культура мусила відстати від культури російської. Як же зразу тепер змінити цю різницю сил? Піднести українську культуру за рік за два на височінь російської – очевидно неможливо. Потрібна була велика підготовча робота в шкільній галузі, і найперше в школі початковій, щоб широко розгорнути українську культуру. – Ми можемо сказати, що за роки Радянської влади в ділянці закріплення й розвитку української культури зроблено дуже багато. І якраз ця пророблена підготовча праця дозволяє нам зараз зробити найсильніший натиск у бік поширення й поглиблення української культурної роботи в усіх галузях."
- 22 "Але разом із тим мусимо знати, що українізація середньої та вищої школи є неодмінно довготривалий, поступовий процес, який вимагає великої підготовчої роботи що до утворення відповідних кадрів учителів та пролетарського складу студентства. Було б донкіхотством українізувати наші медінститути з кадрами старих професорів і міським міщанським студентством. Така українізація була б сміховищем. Інша справа, коли ми, дібравши вже тепер до сільсько-господарчих інститутів 49% студентів-селян, українців,

discussed the need to unite both Russian and Ukrainian culture and the masses of workers and peasants of both countries. He emphasized that Russian culture was important to the Ukrainians—a peasant people with only a small percentage of workers—and underscored that every educated Ukrainian was to be bilingual²³ (*ibid.*, 109).²⁴ Kviring's actual attitude toward the Ukrainian language became even more apparent when he remarked that everyone preferred to read Lenin, Trotsky, "and others" in the original Russian, whereas "we have not yet managed to make the Ukrainian language a weapon of communist propaganda" (*ibid.*, 112).²⁵ Present-day historians broadly agree that Kviring did not foster but in fact actually hampered the progress of "Ukrainization" (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 51).

Bolshevik propaganda notwithstanding, the policy of "Ukrainization" was thus introduced in an atmosphere unfavorable from the outset to the comprehensive development of the Ukrainian language. As early as November 1920, Grigorij Zinov'ev (Ovsej-Gershon Radomysl'skij-Apfel'baum) defined the "essence of the nationality policy in the Ukraine" as follows:

We must act so that no one can say that we want to be in the way of Ukrainian muzhiks who want to speak Ukrainian.... In some years [to come] that language will win that has more roots, that is more vital, more cultured (Ševel'ov 1989: 92; see also Solchanyk 1985: 67).²⁶

Accordingly, when Dmitrij Lebed', the "second-ranking Bolshevik in Ukraine," officially declared that a "Battle of Two Cultures" was going on in Ukraine, this was not just the expression of an isolated opinion of a random member of the Bolshevik Party. In his pamphlet, which was published in 1923, that is, in the same year that Stalin proclaimed the policy of "nationalization,"²⁷ Lebed'

почнемо викладати більшість дисциплін [*sic*] українською мовою. [...] Проте, чи визначає це, що через де-кілька років всі вищі школи на Україні будуть українізовані і що російська мова буде мати для української науки таке ж значіння, як, скажемо, в Німеччині або у Франції. Треба бути запеклим шовіністом, щоб ставити собі такий ідеал. [...]"

23 In accordance with stereotypical ideas about "bilingualism" in Ukraine, Kviring said nothing about the Russophones of Ukraine, who might have found it useful to learn Ukrainian.

24 "Ми вважаємо, що російська та українська культура злучені остільки же міцно, як і робітничеселянські маси обох Республік, і що це єднання, з розвитком української культури, не буде слабшати, а зміцнюватися, й обидві культури стануть взаємно цінними. Ми мусимо прагнути того, аби зберегти за українським юнацтвом можливість однаково засвоювати досвід обох культур. А це визначає, що кожний освічений українець мусить остільки ж добре володіти російською, як і українською мовою, і всі досягнення російської науки мусять стати досягненням української і навпаки."

25 "Тіше з книжками з боку соціального знання. В цій галузі на першому місці стоїть російська література, та й то, головним чином, тому, що Леніна й Троцького та інших всі читають в оригінали радше, аніж в перекладі. Однак, це свідчить про те, що ми й досі ще не встигли зробити українську мову зброєю комуністичної пропаганди. Цей свій гріх ми знаємо й прагнемо його виправити, але я маю дуже великий сумнів, що це буде до вподоби панам шовіністам."

26 As Ševel'ov adds, "a poignant fact is that no one attending the conference objected to the statement" (Ševel'ov 1989: 92).

27 One year earlier, in September 1922, Lebed' had warned in a circular to the gubernia executive

argued that Ukrainization was objectively “reactionary,” since nationalization—that is, the artificial introduction of the Ukrainian language into the Party and working class—given the current political, economic, and cultural relations between city and village—means to stand on the side of the lower culture of the village, instead of the higher culture of the city (Martin 2001: 78–79).

Lebed' thus “argued that Ukrainian should be used only for ‘cultural enlightenment’ in the village to prepare the peasantry for an eventual transition to the higher Russian culture,” but “under no circumstances should the Ukrainian language or culture be promoted in urban environments”; “no repressive measures would be needed; official state neutrality would ensure the triumph of the superior Russian culture” (ibid.). Although these views were immediately refuted on the official level, Lebed' simply moved to Moscow and repeated the essence of his theory in 1928, that is, at the peak of “functional Ukrainization,” in the highly authoritative organ of the Central Committee of the CPSU (Ševel'ov 1989: 127).

2.2. Achievements

From the outset, the implementation of Soviet “Ukrainization” was no easy task. The Bolsheviks became somewhat “more Ukrainian” only in March 1920, when members of other socialist revolutionary parties joined them. The most important of these were the so-called “Borot'bists,” some of whom would play key roles in the years of “Ukrainization,” such as Hryhorij Hryn'ko,²⁸ Oleksander Šums'kyj,²⁹ and Panas Ljubčenko.³⁰ But even as late as 1922, only 23 percent of Bolshevik Party members were Ukrainians, compared to 54 percent Russians and 21 percent others (predominantly Jews), and even fewer party members—only 11 percent—

committees against “right” elements that allegedly wished to “forcibly introduce Ukrainian culture to the Ukrainian people” (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 47).

- 28 Hryhorij Hryn'ko was Ukraine's People's Commissar of Education from 1920 to late 1922, when he was dismissed as a result of “Moscow policy” (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 48) for what some called “excessive haste in carrying out Ukrainization” (Solchanyk 1985: 68, referring to Popov's history of the CP(B)U). In the following years, Hryn'ko made a significant career on the all-Soviet level, becoming People's Commissar of Finance in 1930. In 1937, Hryn'ko was arrested as an alleged member of the so-called “Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites”; he was shot in 1938.
- 29 Oleksandr Šums'kyj was Ukraine's People's Commissar of Education for a few weeks after 21 November 1919 and once again from September 1924 to February 1927. In 1926, the Bolsheviks severely attacked Šums'kyj for “nationalist deviations” (see below) and transferred him to Moscow. In May 1933, Šums'kyj was arrested as an alleged member of the so-called “Ukrainian Military Organization” (UVO), one of the non-existent “Ukrainian nationalist organizations” invented by the Soviet secret police (see below). He spent several years in the GULAG and in internal exile. In 1946 he was murdered on the direct orders of Stalin and Lazar Kahanovyč (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 34).
- 30 Panas Ljubčenko served as a Bolshevik Party secretary in Kyiv from 1920 to 1927 and on the republican level from 1927 to 1934. He was first vice chairman and then chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR beginning in 1933 and 1934, respectively, before becoming a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U. Ljubčenko had a central role in the party campaign against “Šums'kism” after 1926 as well as during the show trial of the “Union for the Liberation of Ukraine” in early 1930. He was an important political actor during the Stalinist terror until 1937, when, accused of leading a counterrevolutionary Ukrainian nationalist organization, he shot his wife and himself.

had some command of Ukrainian (which did not necessarily imply active mastery) (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 62). By 1926, the proportion of Ukrainians had grown to 43.9 percent, compared to 37 percent Russians and 11.4 percent Jews (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 62–63); as for the Central Committee of the CP(B)U, Ukrainian representation increased from 16 percent in 1923 to 25 percent in 1925 (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 62–63).

Several decrees of 1923 provided for the predominant or exclusive use of Ukrainian in Soviet Ukrainian institutions; only persons with a command of “both most widely disseminated languages” of Ukraine, that is, Ukrainian and Russian,³¹ were to be hired, while those lacking such command could be accepted if they agreed to learn Ukrainian within six months. Previously hired employees were threatened with dismissal if they did not learn Ukrainian within a year (*ibid.*, 69);³² they were offered free language courses that were usually scheduled for two hours after the regular working day. All these initiatives notwithstanding, little progress was made, especially in the most Russified regions: in Odesa in March 1924, for example, only 11 percent of officials reportedly knew Ukrainian “well” (whatever this actually meant) (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 72). New deadlines by which employees were expected to learn Ukrainian were repeatedly established and then extended; also, various commissions were created (*ibid.*, 75–77), but to little avail. By April 1925, as many as 68 percent of 25,854 Soviet officials asked about their knowledge of Ukrainian reportedly had not acquired any command of the language whatever (*ibid.*, 77; cf. Solchanyk 1985: 69).³³

In the educational sphere, several decrees of 1923–25 stipulated that everyone in Ukraine had to learn both Ukrainian and Russian independently of the language of school instruction, whereby all national minorities with a compact territory of settlement enjoyed the right of native-language education (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 85). The use of Ukrainian as a language of instruction depended greatly on the region. In terms of mere figures, the situation in 1923 was as follows: throughout Ukraine (with an ethnic Ukrainian population of 72.5 percent), 61.3 percent of schools were Ukrainophone, and 11.4 percent were mixed. In the Poltava, Kyiv, Podilia, and Volhynia gubernias, the percentage of Ukrainian-language schools exceeded the percentage of ethnic Ukrainians; in all other regions, however, the opposite was true (*ibid.*; Pauly 2009: 254). In the Kharkiv gubernia, with ethnic Ukrainians constituting 79.2 percent of the population, 29.1 percent of schools were Ukrainophone and 49.2 percent mixed; in the Donetsk gubernia, with 47.9 percent ethnic Ukrainians, as few as 0.4 percent of schools were Ukrainophone (0.7 percent mixed); in the Odesa gubernia, with 53.6 percent ethnic Ukrainians, 34 percent

31 Some documents of 1923 spoke of two “state languages,” but the term “state language” was abandoned within the year.

32 As Jurij Ševel'ov noted, citizens of Soviet Ukraine “knew that, by law, those officials who did not have a command of Ukrainian were to be fired”; they also knew that “whereas a messenger, a typist, or a secretary was occasionally dismissed on these grounds, the high functionaries, or *specy*, were in practice excused from Ukrainization” (Ševel'ov 1989: 127).

33 According to Ševel'ov, citizens of Soviet Ukraine were perfectly aware that “whereas signboards were scheduled to be redone in Ukrainian” (by a resolution of 3 October 1926), “behind the façade the old Russian bureaucratic machine continued to exist” (Ševel'ov 1989: 127).

of schools were Ukrainophone (34 percent mixed) (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 86).³⁴ By 1925, the proportion of Ukrainian schools had officially reached 71 percent (7 percent were mixed) (Solchanyk 1985: 69), but, as critical contemporary voices suggest, and as Matthew Pauly's recent studies confirm, "the formal, linguistic Ukrainization of institutions" by no means indicated "a qualitative improvement in their use of Ukrainian" (Pauly 2009: 252). Quite often, such percentages merely give the impression of "Ukrainization on paper."

Moreover, most schools above the elementary level usually remained Russophone, and urban schools were in general "almost entirely" Russophone, meaning that the Ukrainian language "was not taught even as a subject in those schools," as Mykola Skrypnyk indicated in 1923 (cited according to Ševel'ov 1989: 101).³⁵ Another urgent problem was the lack of Ukrainophone teachers in the most Russified regions of Ukraine. The People's Commissariat of Education (Narkomos) "designated specific numbers of Ukrainian teachers that its provincial sections needed to train, focusing primarily on the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine: 500 for the Donbas, 300 for Katerynoslav (Dnipropetrovsk), 300 for Odesa, and 300 for Kharkiv" (Pauly 2009, 254);³⁶ moreover, many Ukrainophone teachers were transferred to the eastern or southern provinces (*ibid.*, 256).³⁷ Another huge obstacle was the notorious lack of Ukrainian-language schoolbooks: in 1923, out of 2,513 schoolbooks printed in Ukraine, only 459 were Ukrainophone (aside from the large number of schoolbooks imported from Soviet Russia). Consequently, in 1924 about half the Ukrainophone schools were not supplied with schoolbooks, as Bolshevik officials themselves admitted (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 88–89).

The lack of funds for "Ukrainization" was notorious (Pauly 2009: 255),³⁸ and the linguistic reality of Ukrainian classrooms was far from ideal. As archival

34 As for mixed schools, "in practice, teachers...taught largely in Russian" (Pauly 2009: 255).

35 Mykola Skrypnyk was one of the few Ukrainians who had been active in the Bolshevik Party prior to the Bolsheviks' fusion with the "Borot'bists." During the wars of 1917–21, Skrypnyk worked for the Cheka. In Ukraine, he was People's Commissar of Worker-Peasant Inspection (1920–21) and Internal Affairs (1921–22), then People's Commissar of Justice (1922–27). Skrypnyk contributed to the purge of Oleksander Šums'kyj, who had allegedly connived at the "forced Ukrainization" of Russian workers as Ukraine's People's Commissar of Education. Skrypnyk became Šums'kyj's successor from March 1927 to 22 February 1933 and took a leading role in "Ukrainization." Thereafter, Skrypnyk's role in the process of "Ukrainization" was eminent. From 26 May to 6 June 1927, Skrypnyk convened an orthographic conference in Kharkiv. In 1928, the Council of People's Commissars accepted rules of Ukrainian orthography as established on the basis of the results of that conference. In early 1933, the Bolsheviks accused Skrypnyk of "lack of vigilance" with regard to "national deviations." Skrypnyk shot himself on 7 July 1933 (see below).

36 In December 1924, a report by the Donetsk provincial inspector "pointed to a gap between the number of teachers needed for Ukrainization in the province (2,791 persons) and those who spoke Ukrainian (523)" (Pauly 2009: 256). Since local school administrations usually could not offer housing and other benefits, "only the most desperate or the most enterprising would have accepted the risk associated with such a move" (*ibid.*, 257).

37 Some of these teachers were Galicians (Pauly 2009: 256).

38 While "the greatest number of copies" that the People's Commissariat of Education "planned for any new textbook was 30,000," at the end of the academic year 1922–23 there were "some 779,500 children enrolled in Ukrainian-language schools alone," so that "these target numbers for textbooks fell well short of a full supply" (Pauly 2009: 257).

documents from Soviet Ukraine reveal, “Ukrainian teachers in the central regions taught according to their own dialectal inventory, and teachers in more Russified regions switched regularly between Russian and a Ukrainian heavily reliant on Russian borrowings” (ibid.).

In many “Ukrainized” schools, work was actually done in Russian (Pauly 2009: 258–259).³⁹ Regarding the print media produced in Ukraine, Russian-language newspapers clearly prevailed over Ukrainophone ones up to 1924:

Year	In U: number; circulation	In R: number; circulation
1918	60; not given	227, not given
1923	28; 80,000	86; 492,000
1924	36; 176,000	95; 752,000

(Source: Ševel'ov 1989: 96)

Furthermore, Russian newspapers were brought in from Soviet Russia in large quantities, so that “the low number of Ukrainian newspapers becomes even more striking” (Ševel'ov 1989: 97). As for journals produced in Ukraine in the early 1920s, their number and circulation were generally very low (ibid., 98–99).

Ukrainian-language book production grew from 36 percent in 1923 to 45.8 percent in 1925–26 (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 145; cf. slightly different data in Ševel'ov 1989: 100), but here, too, the actual percentages of books offered in the shops and libraries of Ukraine were quite different, given the large number of books imported from Russia. As for belles lettres, the founding of the literary association *Hart* is noteworthy, as it “resented the restriction of the Ukrainian literature and language to the countryside and wanted to see Ukrainian conquer the city and the class that was officially the most advanced, the bearer of the future, and the subject of dictatorship in the present—that is, the workers” (ibid., 106; for details see Shkandrij 1992).

Most other spheres remained predominantly Russophone.

The leading institution in charge of Ukrainian language standardization was the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, led by Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj. The academy not only published (in 1920) a slightly revised version of the orthographic rules prepared at the time of the Hetman State but also established an Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language in 1921, which prepared a number of

39 Although similar statements might occasionally have been made for purely Ukrainophobic reasons (as nowadays), the assessment was probably quite realistic: for decades, teachers had been trained to teach in Russian, while opportunities to disseminate the Ukrainian standard language had been meager at a time when Ukrainian was not authorized for use in schoolbooks or in classroom instruction. In the 1920s, the Ukrainian standard language was in fact still in the making, and it was clearly in urgent need of institutional support.

terminological dictionaries, and a commission on the compilation of a dictionary of the contemporary Ukrainian language, which worked on a four-volume Russian-Ukrainian dictionary (Ševel'ov 1989: 103). The scholars regarded the Ukrainian language as an autonomous system and did not aim to bring it close to Russian; moreover, they were by no means Bolsheviks, and so the Russian-Ukrainian dictionary offered barely any illustrations from Soviet sources, concentrating instead on literary, ethnographic, and biblical texts (*ibid.*).⁴⁰

But even sympathizers of the Soviet cause developed ideas for the standardization of Ukrainian that did not please the Bolsheviks. As early as 1923, that is, three years before the central party organs themselves addressed the latinization of alphabets in the Soviet Union (Martin 2001: 187), two prominent Ukrainian writers suggested introducing the Latin alphabet for the Ukrainian language in the name of “internationalization.” In issues 6–7 of the Bolshevik Ukrainian journal *Červonyj šljax*, Serhij Pylypenko published an “Open Letter” (*Odvertyj lyst*) in which he used the Latin alphabet, largely following the rules of contemporary scholarly transliteration. He mentioned earlier attempts to introduce the Latin alphabet “in both Dnipro and Dnister Ukraine,” arguing that this step was to be taken “precisely in our days of the creation of Ukrainian statehood on the basis of Soviet society...now or never,” since the worldwide “unification of alphabets” was as inevitable as “social reconstruction” (Pylypenko 1923: 267).⁴¹

Pylypenko argued that the use of the Latin alphabet would make it easier to learn other languages and eventually enhance the creation of “a single international language (which is rich only in territorial and professional dialects).” He declared that latinization was thus an important component of “communist construction” (*ibid.*),⁴² adding that the time to take this step was ideal precisely because of the current status of the Ukrainian language: “As long as we do not have solid, great scholarly works, as long as we generally limit ourselves, in the sphere of textbooks, to the elementary school and only think about the professional [secondary] level, as long as only the crop of new Soviet literature is sown, it is not so difficult to do this” (*ibid.*, 268).⁴³

40 For a criticism of the “somewhat eclectic” character of the first volume of the dictionary, with strong “vacillations between standard and dialectal, urban and rural (often, folkloric)” materials, see Ševel'ov 1989: 104–105.

41 “Skilka raziv uže pidnosylasja sprava pro te, ščo vart bulo b zavesty v ukrajins'komu pys'mi latyns'kyj al'favit. Buly i sproby praktyčno perevesty cju dumku v žyttja—tak na Ukrajinі Naddnistrjans'kij, jak i Naddnistrjans'kij. [...] Meni zdajet'sja, ščo sprava cja stojit' majže dylemoju: teper čy nikoly. „Majže tak“, bo tvrdo perekonanyj, ščo unifikacija al'favitiv je nemynuča sprava—i to ne tak dalekoho majbutn'oho. XX storiččja maje cju problemu rozvjazaty razom iz velykoju social'noju perebudovuju.”

42 “Ljudstvo maje odnakovo pysaty, aby men'se [*sic*] vytračaty času na oznajomlennja z ynšymy movamy. Ljudstvo maje ce zrobyty, aby sprjaty procesovi kopuljaciji mov i tvorenju jedynoji internacional'noji movy (lyše bahatoji na dijalekty terytorijal'ni j profesijni).”

43 “Poky my ne majemo solidnyx velykx naukovyx prac', poky v sferi pidručnykiv obmežujemojsja holovnym čynom počatkovoju školoju i til'ky dumajemo pro profesijnju, poky til'ky zasivajet'sja lan novoho radjans'koho pys'menstva — ce zrobyty ne tak važko.”

Pylypenko was perfectly aware that "Muscophiles" would regard the latinization of the Ukrainian alphabet as an act of "separation from Russian culture" and as "independentism," while "Ukrainophiles" would bemoan "separation from Galicia, which is even closer to us," and regard it as an act of "Polonization, to a certain degree" (ibid.).⁴⁴ Nonetheless, Pylypenko had no doubts about the need for the "latinization" of Ukrainian.

Myxajlo [Majk] Johansen basically agreed with Pylypenko, calling the Latin alphabet "once Latin, now international" (Johansen 1923: 167).⁴⁵ Johansen, however, suggested a different alphabetic system that he first briefly introduced and then immediately applied in the latter half of his text.⁴⁶ Both Pylypenko and Johansen reiterated their proposals during the orthographic conference of 1927 in Kharkiv, where fifteen participants opted for the Latin alphabet. Neither in 1923 nor in 1927 were such views welcomed by the Bolsheviks, but there were no political repercussions at that time. By 1933, all the above-mentioned ideas

44 "Dovodyt'sja, zvyčajna rič, obhovoryty i šče odyn bik spravy – vužčyj, a same: stosunky z Rosijeju (de, miž ynšym ce pytannja takož ne ščo davno znymalos') i Halyčynuju. „Moskvoily“ hovorytmut' pro vidryv od najbil'šoji v teperišnij čas i najblyžčoji do Ukrajiny v usix vidnošennjax Radjans'koji Respubliky. Poprykatymut', može, j „samostijnycstvom“ [sic], odhorožuvannjam od rosijs'koji kul'tury, toji kul'tury, žčo [sic] najperša maje kopuljuvaty z ukrajins'koju. „Ukrajinoily“ kryčatymut', navpaky, pro odhorožuvannja vid išče blyžčoji do nas Halyčyny i, do pevnoji myry „polonizaciji“, jak možut' zustryty taku dumku de-xto na Naddništrščyni. i t.y, i t.y."

45 "В 6–7 ч. „Черв. Шляху“ ще раз порушив С. Пилипенко важливе й цікаве питання переходу на латинське колись, тепер інтернаціональне письмо."

46 Johansen's main goal was to adapt the Latin alphabet for use in the Ukrainian language in a manner conducive to Ukrainian phonetics. First and foremost, he insisted that the letter *j* be used consistently to render iotation only, whereas the apostrophe was to render palatalization. As for *l* in foreign words, Johansen pointed out that its pronunciation was close to the "European middle *l*" and suggested that it be rendered by *l*, while only the genuinely soft [*l'*] was to be rendered as *l'* ("Адже ж наше українське „l“ як найближче підходить вимовою своєю до європейського середнього „l“ і викинувши ми мнякшення в „логіка, флота“, послідовно мусимо одмовитися од цієї чужої нам правописної прикмети і в інших словах, де її немає в вимові, (L'uol'u писатимемо, одначе, з мнякшенням, як і чуємо в вимові–також stav'at' i t. инш) [sic].") Moreover, Johansen suggested that the Ukrainian sound traditionally rendered by Cyrillic *u* be written as *e*, arguing that in many dialects, Ukrainian *u* (< *i*, *y*) and *e* had merged into one sound in unstressed positions (Johansen admitted that this did not apply to all Left-Bank dialects), so that Ukrainian pupils could spell *u* and *e* correctly only on the basis of their command of Russian (ibid., "Кожен знає, скільки труднощів має подолати учень, щоби написати без помилок слово хоч би „перенеси“, або „великий“, або „синенький“. Врешті всі зазначені курсивом знаки відзначають один звук, а пишеться його різно. Без знання російської мови не обійтися учневі, вивчаючи етимологічний бік українського правопису."); stressed etymological *y* (< *i*, *y*) was to be rendered as *ê* ("Тож факт, що одна je категорія, де „ê“ vemovl'ajets'a často na Livoberezz'u blêžče do „i“ n'iž do „e“ [everything sic] – prekmêtnеke jak ot červonej, bilej, čdorovej [sic] j ênši z naholosom ne na ostann'omnu skladovicej fakt vrvinovazujets'a tēm, ščo na Zachod'i navpakê majemo javešče protelêžne–там звук „ê“ pošêrevsja j na taki prekmêtnеki ja kot sênej, serednej (naše sên'ij, seredn'ij). Otže l'iteraturna [l] mova volens nolens doderžuje seredene, j pêše vse odno bilej, ale sên'ij"). Finally, Johansen insisted that dental consonants were not to be softened in front of *i* < *o*. In the position before *i* < *e*, *ê*, he suggested rendering the softness of dental consonants with the apostrophe (ibid., 169). In foreign words, *i* was to be written without a preceding apostrophe ("Označajuče mjakkist' apostrofom, musimo odznačate jiji takož pered „i“ (takêm jak u „t'in“). Navpakê pered „i“ takêm ja kot u „stil“ apostrofa ne stavemo. Rozumijets'a, ščo pomn'akšenn'a je racija vidznačate pered „i“ tilke po zvukax d, t, n, l. Takem čenom usuvajets'a holovni trudnošči pravopesu čužex sliv. Imenno–v čužex slovax pêšemo prosto j skriz' „i“ (ne ê) bez poperedn'oho apostrofa.").

regarding Ukrainian corpus planning would be labeled counterrevolutionary, with all the inevitable consequences.

3. "Functional Ukrainization"

3.1. Discourses

The Bolsheviks themselves openly admitted that "Ukrainization" was at first largely ineffective when Lazar Kahanovyč, who had replaced Kviring as general secretary of the CP(B)U in April 1925, declared the "first anniversary of Ukrainization" in June 1926 (Ševel'ov 1989: 109). Kahanovyč, an ethnic Jew from a Ukrainian village, stood apart from most Bolshevik leaders in that he had a certain command of the Ukrainian language and even "occasionally used it in public" (ibid., 110). Kahanovyč played a key role during the transition from "mechanical" to "functional" Ukrainization.

Not only were a number of decrees on "Ukrainization" issued under his rule, but "a whole book of decrees and directives," titled *The Ukrainization of Soviet Institutions* (Українізація радянських установ), was published in Kharkiv as early as 1926 (ibid., 113). More important, these documents did have some effect, and considerable progress was now made.

Nonetheless, "functional Ukrainization" took place in a context no less ambivalent than that of the earlier stage of the policy.

To begin with, at the very beginning of so-called "functional Ukrainization," in early 1925, Jurij Larin (Mixail Lur'e) complained at a session of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR that "Ukrainization" in Ukraine "had unleashed Ukrainian chauvinism directed at the Russian minority, which was being forcibly Ukrainized in 'Petljura-type fashion'" (Solchanyk 1985: 70). Like Lebed', Larin was officially criticized, but "the degree to which he could count on the support of influential party leaders could be seen from the fact that at the end of 1926 the central party organ in Moscow, *Bol'shevik*, provided Larin with the opportunity to argue his case on its pages" (ibid.).

The fear that "Ukrainization" would ultimately play into the hands of so-called "nationalists" notoriously accompanied any measures to implement it. In June 1925, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U created a commission "for the study of the issue of the Ukrainian intelligentsia" (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 31), with Lazar Kahanovyč, Oleksander Šums'kyj, Vlas Čubar, Hryhorij Hryn'ko, and Vsevolod Balyč'kyj (the chairman of the Ukrainian secret police) as its members. In a secret letter of 30 October 1925, the Central Committee stated: "In the very weakly Ukrainized Party, there have been and are currently insufficient forces to ensure that the swift and tempestuous development of Ukrainian culture...followed the Soviet communist line, and not the line of the petty bourgeois national counterrevolution" (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 58).

In February 1926, the Politburo convened for debates "On moods among the Ukrainian intelligentsia" and commissioned Vsevolod Balyč'kyj to study measures "to dissolve rightist groups in the milieu of the Ukrainian intelligentsia." In the following months, the GPU issued a number of secret documents, particularly

"On Ukrainian Society" of 30 March 1926 and "On Ukrainian Separatism" of 4 September 1926 (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 31; see the former document *ibid.*, 254–267). According to the GPU, Ukrainian nationalists, after their defeat in the wars of 1917–21, had transferred their anti-Bolshevik efforts to the cultural sphere (*ibid.*) and were now making use of "Ukrainization...to organize adherents of nationalist ideas in all vital parts of the state organism" (*ibid.*, 31–32). The GPU warned that the Academy of Sciences, the Autocephalous Church and, ultimately, the entire cultural sphere, particularly that of literature, were under the strong influence of Ukrainian nationalists. As a result, Stalin enjoined the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U in a letter of 26 April 1926 to fight any "national deviationists...without mercy" (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 34).⁴⁷

Ukrainian literature became one of the first targets. In 1926, the Politburo of the CP(B)U initiated the dismissal of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj and Myxajlo Jalovyj from *Červonyj šljax* and replaced Šums'kyj with Zatońs'kyj as the journal's editor in chief (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 142). In the same year, the Politburo began debating the relaunch of a second important Ukrainian-language journal, *Žyttja j revolucija* (Life and Revolution); by April 1927, a new editorial board was in place because the journal had allegedly been abused by "hostile forces" (*ibid.*, 143).

In June 1926, the Central Committee of the CP(B)U convened a plenary session to discuss the achievements and further goals of "Ukrainization." The session also served as a platform to discuss the situation that had evolved around the Soviet Ukrainian writer Mykola Xvyl'ovyj (Fityl'ev), who had caused particular trouble by arguing in his polemical writings for nothing less than the cultural sovereignty of Soviet Ukraine and for the de-Russification of the Ukrainian proletariat. Along with Xvyl'ovyj, who had even coined the slogan "Away from Moscow" ("Геть від Москви"), the party launched an attack against People's Commissar of Education Oleksander Šums'kyj.

Šums'kyj had complained to Stalin during a conversation in Moscow in 1925 that certain "functionaries who do not understand Ukrainian nationality issues"—that is, Lazar Kahanovyč—had been "sent to Ukraine from Moscow" (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 33). As Šums'kyj complained that "Ukrainization" was having little effect on the Ukrainian proletariat, Stalin reacted with the proclamation that the Bolsheviks would never allow the "forced Ukrainization" of the proletariat (Pauly 2009: 263).⁴⁸ Kahanovyč, who was now more than ever Stalin's man in Ukraine, went on to play a major role in the staging of the so-called "Šums'kyj affair."

The June 1926 meeting of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U confirmed the ambivalence of "functional Ukrainization" in that it was convened first and foremost to discuss the prospects of "Ukrainization" but at the same time turned out to be a particularly important step in the development of the "Šums'kyj affair" and the actual curbing of "Ukrainization."

47 It is therefore questionable whether the "main goal" of "functional Ukrainization" was actually "the de-Russification of the cities and industrial centers of the Ukraine" (as stated by Ševel'ov 1989: 119).

48 Šums'kyj himself had warned against hasty or forced "Ukrainization" in June 1923 (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 49).

Volodymyr Zatons'kyj's speech at the meeting was quite characteristic. He praised the rapid achievements of "Ukrainization" and explained that "Ukrainian culture had developed among the masses in their millions both in the villages and, partly, in the towns"; he emphasized the significance of the "Ukrainization of the Soviet apparatus," including the party apparatus, and "even of the Russified urban proletariat" (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13); and he discussed the positive development of the "Ukrainization" of schools and the press. Zatons'kyj's main message was linked, however, to Stalin's new slogan that the Russian-speaking proletariat should by no means be "forcibly Ukrainized" (*ibid.*, 13–14).⁴⁹ Zatons'kyj repeated the slogans about the need for "a close link with the village," which he deemed impossible if a "divergence of languages" were to continue, but he spoke of the Russophone status of the proletariat of Ukraine as something almost natural, and in his speech the "Ukrainization of the proletariat" came down to a mere invitation to learn the Ukrainian language (*ibid.*, 14).⁵⁰ Zatons'kyj did add that proletarians might be attracted to Ukrainian culture through Ukrainian libraries, books, the cinema, exhibitions, concerts, lectures, and the like, but he emphasized that this kind of "Ukrainization" would take a "rather long" time, since "the Ukrainian proletariat in its majority does not use the Ukrainian language and does not understand Ukrainian culture at this point; it does not immediately contribute to its construction, and therefore this culture develops mainly on the foundations of the peasantry and the urbanized intelligentsia" (*ibid.*, 14).⁵¹ At that point, Zatons'kyj

49 "Ми ні в якому разі не можемо затримувати, гальмувати працю над українізацією. Навпаки, оскільки українська культура розвивається в мільйонових масах і на селі, і почасти в місті, ми не можемо гальмувати процесу українізації і радянського апарату, і партійного і навіть пролетаріату міського, русифікованого, бо коли б ми загальмували, то це привело б до відриву робітничої класи й партії від селянських мас і тієї підростаючої молоді, що є зараз в українських містах, що пройшла вже українську школу. Безумовно, гальмувати ні в якому разі не можна, але безоглядно українізувати – про це, також треба подумати, – як кого? [...] Розуміється, школи будемо продовжувати українізувати, як і досі. Теж пресу і т. інш. На радянський апарат теж будемо натискувати, щоб далі українізувався, будемо натискувати на членів партії, починаючи з активу. Актив, прошу не ображатися, тиснути будемо ще більше, як досі. Апарат партії мусить бути українізовано. Це ж відноситься цілковито до КСМ, це має значіння і для профспілок. Потрібно більш українізації і більш енергії до українізації, ніж було раніш, в свій час, про що тут говорилось, треба продовжувати ту лінію, що маємо за останній, не такий довгий, по правді сказати, період."

50 "Але, товариші, коли вже ми підходимо до партійця рядового від станка, то навряд чи зможемо ми його так просто примусити, як активиста, навряд, може кінчиться тим, що буде зменшений зріст партії, бо до загального партійного навантаження накинути ще й українізацію – це не так просто. Рядових партійців від станка ми будемо українізувати повільніше, ніж активних товаришів. Тепер що до робітничої маси – до тієї робітничої маси, що або російська була по своєму походженню, або звика, набула російську культуру, російську мову і т. інш., як, наприклад, „Серп і Молот“ чи Канатний завод, де всі українці і майже всі російською мовою говорять і української мови не вживають. Тут треба сказати, що силоміць їх українізувати не можна, не будемо. [...] Ми повинні лаумачити це пролетаріату взагалі, як керівнику революції, і він повинен зрозуміти, що він не зможе мати щільної змички з селом, цілком щільної змички з селом, коли буде розходження по мові. Ми, звичайно, не будемо його дерусифікувати, дерусифікувати той пролетаріат, що звик до російської культури. Ми не скажемо – забудь російську мову, а скажемо – вчись української мови."

51 "Треба допомогти пролетаріату вчитися українській мові всілякими засобами, через бібліотеки, книжки, кіно, українські вистави, концерти, доповіді і т. інш. З початку, звичайно, звідсіль ми

ultimately switched to a discussion of Russian “chauvinism” and counterposed it to Ukrainian “chauvinism.” He briefly described Russian chauvinism as a problem associated with the Russian bourgeoisie (*ibid.*, 14–16) and then elaborated on the phenomenon of Ukrainian chauvinism in a whole chapter titled “Four Roots of Ukrainian Chauvinism” (Чотири корні українського шовінізму). According to his outline, those roots consisted of four social groups: the first root was the “kulak” (Ukrainian “куркуль”), who “already wanted to bring about his own Ukrainization, that is, not simply [for] Ukraine but [for] a Ukraine of ‘kulaks’”; the second root was the Ukrainian urban “bourgeois” intelligentsia; the third root was made up of certain careerists who were using “Ukrainization” to take over jobs held by their Russian competitors; and the fourth root was an even more inchoate group of people “who did not understand the pathos of the peaceful construction” [of communism] and consequently were in danger of “taking the path of nationalism”⁵² (this last group was obviously invented in order to find a label for Mykola Xvylyovyj and Oleksander Šums'kyj; *ibid.*, 16–19).

Vlas Čubar⁵³ pointed out at the same June 1926 convention that “circles hostile to the revolution, hostile to the proletarian issue” had become active in the framework of “Ukrainization”—circles that regarded the “interests of the nation as a whole” as more important than the “proletarian interests of the international revolution.” Čubar warned that such attitudes would generate “contradictions in the Soviet Union” as well as “among us at home.” In his view, they might lead to the “creation of an atmosphere of Austrian dispute” that would “seriously complicate

будемо підходити й потроху будемо пробувати і далі йти, щоб він міг потроху оволодіти мовою. Але наперед кажемо, що примушувати не будемо. [...] А, взагалі, українізацію пролетаріату ми вважаємо за процес досить довгий. Не можна так примітивно ставити справу – дайш [sic, Russian in Ukrainian letters] українізацію, дайш український пролетаріат – нічогоісінько з того не вийде [...] Тоді і лише тоді остаточно вже зникнуть ці труднощі, які ми маємо зараз, тому що пролетаріат український, в більшості, зараз не вживає української мови, не розуміє української культури, не прикладає безпосередньо руку до її будування; і через те ця культура складається на тлі переважно селянства і урбанізованої інтелігенції.”

52 “Перший корінь – це куркуль, який трохи підживився на селі й хоче вже провести свою українізацію, щоб-то не просто Україну, але Україну куркульську. [...] [Другий корінь] Це корінь міської буржуазної культури. Не такої вже молодой, він вже давно існує. Коли в Центральній Раді до кулацького коріння належала партія українських есерів, принаймні, її права течія, то до другого коріння – буржуазного – належали есдеки, з Винниченком на чолі. [...] Кажуть нам, – немає української буржуазії, яка там українська буржуазія? [...] Є ще третій корінь українського шовінізму. Власне це є класове прошарування, хоч би той самий спец, що хоче усунути свого російського конкурента, щоб самому сісти на його місце. [...] Четвертий можливий корінь є також в соціальних прошаруваннях. [...] Це ті розгублені люди, які заплуталися в нетрах Неп’у, ті, що подекуди брали навіть участь у революції, потім „були фронти, нема фронтів”. І вони не знають, що далі робити; ті, що не розуміють патосу мирного будівництва. Оскільки вони перебувають в тузі й розпуці, то цілком можливо, що вони можуть легко стати на шлях націоналізму.”

53 Vlas Čubar took a leading role in the organization of Ukraine’s industry and economy beginning in 1919. In July 1923, he became Chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR. Čubar is regarded as one of the persons with particular responsibility for the Great Famine of 1932–33. In 1932, he was appointed Vice Chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR; in 1937, People’s Commissar of Finances of the USSR. In 1938, Čubar was arrested and shot without trial.

our status, disperse proletarian forces, and weaken us in our struggle” (Čubar 1929: 35–36).⁵⁴ Čubar did not forget to mention that “Ukrainization” was to continue and decried the fact that “not all comrades in the party are convinced that they should learn the Ukrainian language, that they have to adapt to the requirements of Ukrainian reality so that they can take leading positions in all branches of activity” (ibid., 37).⁵⁵ But his main message concerned the unity of the “proletarian masses” of Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Russia (ibid., 36).⁵⁶

Mykola Skrypnyk explained at the same convention that the Bolsheviks would henceforth differentiate the pace of “Ukrainization” of various social groups. The party would continue to “Ukrainize” the “semi-Russified workers of Ukraine,” who allegedly spoke a “broken, semi-Ukrainian language” (that is, if translated into present-day terminology, “Surzhyk”). The party would not, however, allow for any “forced Ukrainization whatever of the Russian part of the working class and the Russian workers and peasants” (Skrypnyk 1929: 31).⁵⁷ Skrypnyk then defined “Ukrainization” as an instrument “of the party and of Soviet power” to create a unified state of workers and the formerly oppressed Ukrainian people through the development of culture and socialist construction (ibid., 31).⁵⁸ He also tried to explain the economic significance of “Ukrainization”: the ongoing urbanization of the Ukrainian peasant masses would inevitably lead to the “Ukrainization” of the cities, just as the cities of the former Habsburg Empire had lost their predominantly

54 “Кожен, хто цікавиться цією справою баче [sic], що справу українізації розв’язує, не тільки наша партія, але за неї беруться і кола, ворожі революції, ворожі пролетарській справі. [...] Я згадав, товариші, про склад партії, тому що є ще деякі комуністи, які підпадають під вплив тої ідеології, що дбає не про те, щоби на першому місці ставити пролетарські інтереси всесвітньої революції, [...] а в першу чергу ставить інтереси нації в цілому, вимагає якихсь інших форм розвитку трудящих УСРР, інших шляхів, ніж ті, що ними йде російський пролетаріят. Коли б партія піддалась цьому, то ми прийшли б зараз по-перше до суперечок у радянському [sic] Союзі, по-друге, до суперечок тут, у себе вдома, до утворення в УСРР атмосфери австрійської гризні, до утворення такої обстановки, що буде сильно ускладняти наш стан[,] розпорошувати пролетарські сили, знесилювати нас в боротьбі.”

55 “Ще не всі т.т. в партії переконані в тому, що треба вчити українську мову, що треба пристосовуватися до вимог української дійсності, щоби керувати всіма галузями роботи.”

56 “Нам не можна припускати того, щоб у нас в сучасних складних обставинах в партії було два табори – один табір український, другий – російський, або якийсь німецький, чи ще який. Нам, як партії, треба знищувати такі явища.”

57 “Ми зараз проводимо диференційований курс, диференцюємо завдання що до українізації. Це нове дають партії ці нові тези. Ми не можемо з однією тією ж міркою підходити до різних галузів суспільного життя, коли ми говоримо про українізацію і про темп її. [...] Партія ставить собі питання про українізацію, напіврусифікованих робітників, про поглиблення лінії українізації, про при звичаєння до української культури всіх українських кол робітників, що говорять ламаною, напівукраїнською мовою. Разом з тим ми повинні твердо сказати, що не буде провадитись ніякої примусової українізації що до російської частини робітничої класи і взагалі росіян-робітників і селян.”

58 “На одному з засідань Політбюро я визначав, що таке є українізація. „Українізація це є більш-менш діяльність партії та радянської влади, що нею керується, щоби до цього часу, до Жовтневої революції пригнічений і поневолений український народ, працюючі маси організувати в робітничо - селянську державність і цим самим виводити з минулого стану пригнічення і розвивати культуру, підносити її і рухатися далі шляхом соціалістичного будівництва.”

German-speaking character after World War I. Consequently, "the working class, including its Russian part," needed to understand the Ukrainian language, otherwise they would not be able "to lead this economically inevitable process" (ibid.).⁵⁹

Oleksander Šums'kyj pointed out that, owing to a mistaken interpretation of "Ukrainization," this policy had not yet been successful. In his view, it was insufficient to regard "Ukrainization" as "a method of uniting with the peasantry" and as "a necessary weapon in the struggle against Ukrainian nationalism," for this motivated neither party members nor non-party workers to "learn the Ukrainian language and integrate themselves into Ukrainian cultural life and construction" (Šums'kyj 1929: 28).⁶⁰ According to Šums'kyj, "Ukrainization" could succeed only if it were regarded as "a necessary method of socialist construction" and as "an instrument of socialist construction in the hands of the Ukrainian masses," for "no linguistic wall between the process of social and cultural construction and the Soviet and party leaders" was to exist in Ukraine (ibid., 28–29).⁶¹ Interestingly, Šums'kyj added that Soviet Russia could serve as a model in that regard because, thanks to its linguistic unity, "the leaders of the state and of the party" were "at the same time the leaders of Russian Soviet society and culture" (ibid.).⁶² Even more interestingly, a "voice from the audience" interrupted Šums'kyj at that point and insisted that Russian Soviet leaders were not only the leaders of Soviet Russia but also "of the entire Union" (ibid., 29). This prompted Šums'kyj to reply that Soviet Russian leaders could not be expected to take a leading role in "Soviet Ukrainian life and culture," as they did not have to be "Ukrainized" (ibid.).⁶³ In conclusion, Šums'kyj warned his

59 "Економіка диктує безумовну неминучість українізації. Економічний розвиток приводить до перетворення пролетаріату в нові маси пролетарізованого селянства. Міста, що були до цього часу російськими, об'єктивним процесом будуть приведені до того, що вони стануть українськими. [...] Робітнича класа України, в тому числі і російська її частина, аби керувати цим економічним неминучим процесом, повинна зрозуміти свої історичні завдання і оволодіти українською мовою."

60 "До цього часу ми трактували українізацію, пояснювали партії її необхідність, як засоба змирення з селянством, як необхідну зброю в боротьбі з українським націоналізмом. Таке умотивування необхідності українізуватись не могло, розуміється, запалити партію й передових позапартійних робітників вчити українську мову й увіходити в українське культурне життя й будівництво."

61 "Тези Політбюро трактують українізацію, як передумову, як необхідний засіб соціалістичного будівництва, як знаряддя соціалістичного будівництва в руках українських трудящих мас. Така трактовка українізації надає цій справі іншого характеру. Кожний комуніст, як палкий борець за соціалістичне будівництво, незалежно від того, якої він національності, не може поставитись байдуже до українізації в такому її розумінню. А надто це стосується старих більшовиків, партійних кадрів, які за цього часу тут йшли на українізацію."

62 "Шумський. Там [in Soviet Russia] нема цієї мовної стіни між суспільно-культурним процесом будівництва й радянським та партійним керівництвом, яка в нас ще є. Там керівники держави й партії є в той же час керівниками російської радянської суспільності й культури. – Голос з місця. Всього Союзу."

63 "Шумський. Ні, стій, товаришу, не звальюй, будь ласка, своїх обов'язків керувати радянським українським суспільним життям і культурою на плечі керівників Союзу. Ти хочеш, щоб і вони українізувались? Це керівництво є нашим обов'язком, обов'язком керівників України і його не перекладеш на плечі союзу [sic]. – Партія в цілому та її керівники мусять стати і керівниками українського суспільного культурного будівництва, тоб-то оволодіти українською мовою й

comrades that if they did not ensure comprehensive “Ukrainization,” that process would eventually be taken over by the “bourgeois” activists whom the Soviets had allowed to reimmigrate to Ukraine a few years earlier (*ibid.*, 29).⁶⁴

Lazar Kahanovyč’s words at the June 1926 convention had particular weight. Kahanovyč strongly underscored the role of “Ukrainization” in Soviet foreign policy. Just as Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Kazakhstan were to “serve as examples” for “the eastern peoples,” so Ukraine was to “serve as a role model and example” regarding the “national liberation of oppressed people” and the “state-building of national republics in the framework of the Soviet system” in the west (Kahanovyč 1929: 41).⁶⁵ With striking emphasis, Kahanovyč rejected the idea that “Ukrainization” had been initiated only under the pressure of forces hostile to Soviet power, which would in fact have meant that the Bolsheviks were “insincere,” and that their policy of “Ukrainization” was only a “maneuver” and a “pretense to fool someone” (Kahanovyč 1929: 41–42).⁶⁶ He then addressed the vexed question of whether local nationalisms or Great Russian chauvinism constituted the greater danger to the Soviet Union. One of the notorious “voices from the audience” interrupted him, stating that “our party in Ukraine is better prepared to fight Ukrainian chauvinism” (*ibid.*, 53). This prompted Kahanovyč to agree immediately and add that the country was in fact tending toward Ukrainian chauvinism (*ibid.*). He concluded this debate with a masterpiece of Bolshevik dialectics: “Okay, let’s put it like this: in our country we are faced with a

культурою. Бо цей суспільно-культурний процес не може бути без керівництва, без вождів.”

64 “Ви подивіться, як всі ці Грушевські, Дорошкевичі, Гермайзе, Єфремови, Ніковські, Зерови й інші їм подібні, що в 1919–20 роках обірвали були свої суспільні звязки з Україною, чи вірніші, ми розрубали ці звязки й викинули їх за кордон, що збанкрутували були, – як вони тепер знову відновляють ці зірвані звязки й намагаються керувати новим радянським суспільно-культурним життям. [...] Треба це керівництво взяти до рук партії, а для цього треба, щоб партія стала українською по мові й культурі.”

65 “Якщо для східних народів у нас може й мусить бути прикладом республіки Узбекистанська, Туркменістанська, Казакстанська [*sic*] і т. ін., то для західних народів Україна мусить служити зразком і прикладом розв’язання пролетаріатом проблеми національного визволення пригнічених мас, проблеми державного будівництва національних республік, в рамках [*sic*] радянської системи. Ми мусимо показати як можна поєднати добровільну спілку радянських республік з наданням бувшим пригніченим массам [*sic*] максимальних можливостей прояви самодіяльності в будівництві своєї державности, в розвиткові свого господарства, в піднесенні культури країни – в справі втягнення мільйонних мас до культурного соціалістичного будівництва.”

66 “Ось чому абсолютно неправильні всякі тлумачення, всякі натяки на те, що українізація провадиться нами в силу якоїсь-то важкої необхідности, під натиском якихось-то стихійних ворожих нам сил. Така постановка питання іноді збігається з ворожою нам постановкою питання, що більшовики [*sic*] нещирі, що більшовики брешуть; коли вони говорять за українізацію, що в більшовиків це лише маневр, що в більшовиків це лише привод [*sic*] для того, щоби одурити когось-то; що провадять більшовики українізацію, не бажаючи її, не вірючи в неї, не люблячи її то-що. Така постановка питання мусить бути нами рішуче одкинута – та наша політика українізації є дійсна політика інтернаціоналізму, вона не потурає якомусь національному шовінізму, а йде на користь не лише внутрішнього зміцнення диктатури пролетаріату, але й на користь світової революції, й вже само по собі будівництво української державности, сам по собі розвиток робітничо-селянської культури у нас в країні служить взірцем та зразком для пригнічених мас, для пригнічених національностей та штовхає їх на шлях боротьби з імперіалізмом, на шлях боротьби з буржуазією.”

huge danger, Ukrainian chauvinism, and that is why we in the party must push hard to fight Great Russian chauvinism."⁶⁷

A few months later, on 20 November 1926, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U convened again to reproach Šums'kyj with promoting the "forced Ukrainization of the Russian proletariat" (Kahanovyč 1929a: 113). According to Kahanovyč, Šums'kyj had failed to clarify his attitude toward "Moscow" and found no clear words to characterize Xvylyovyj and the so-called neoclassicists (a group of Ukrainian writers who did not please the Bolsheviks). Moreover, Šums'kyj had not made it clear that "the old Bolshevik cadres, the Russian proletarian cadres had to be preserved" in Ukraine (ibid.).⁶⁸

After Józef Piłsudski seized power in Poland in May 1926, the Bolshevik leaders tended increasingly to associate their internal enemies with external ones.

In November 1927, at the Tenth Party Congress of the CP(B)U, Lazar Kahanovyč spoke about the "growing interest in Ukraine on the part of the European bourgeoisie" (Kahanovyč 1929c: 145) and explained that "the imperialists of the world were embarking on a new crime against humankind by preparing to make war on the Soviet Union." Kahanovyč reported that the social-democratic press in "Germany, France, Czechoslovakia and, particularly, Poland" had recently shown special interest in "the Ukrainian problem" and in "prospects of 'independence' for Ukraine" (ibid.).⁶⁹ He declared that the Ukrainian language was in fact flourishing in Ukraine, as opposed to Poland, where Ukrainians were severely oppressed. Kahanovyč boasted of the following achievements of "Ukrainization":

- a) The elementary school serves the Ukrainian population (2 million Ukrainian children are being instructed in Ukrainian).
- b) The universities are gradually and firmly being Ukrainized.

67 "Каганович: [...] нам, безперечно, небезпечний великоруський шовінізм, як шовінізм, що має історичні корні та історичну давність. Голос з місця: Наша партія на Україні більше пристосована до боротьби з українським шовінізмом. Каганович: Це правда, наша партія на Україні більш пристосована до боротьби з українським шовінізмом. Країна наша більше схильна до українського шовінізму [...] Ось давайте так і скажемо: в країні в нас величезна небезпека – це український шовінізм, а тому ми мусимо в партії натискати рішуче на те, щоби боротися з великоруським шовінізмом."

68 "Каганович. На жаль, і в питанні за Москву ми не чули від тов. Шумського ясного і чіткого відмежування від Хвильового, але ми говоримо не лише за Москву, ми говоримо також за неокласиків. [...] Старі більшовицькі кадри, руські пролетарські кадри мусять бути збережені поруч з висуванням нових кадрів українців, що їх ми висуваємо і мусимо висувати широко. Шумський. Я це обстоюю. Каганович. Ось цього то й не видно. – Треба, щоби була повна ясність в цим [sic] питанні. Тепер відносно темпу, відносно того, що ви за примусову українізацію руського пролетаріату. Тут ви мусите прямо сказати, що та лінія, яку ми ведемо, є єдина лінія та якщо це так, то партія й країна мусять знати, що у вас немає тих попередніх помилок, що ви їх робили."

69 "І от нині, в момент, коли світові імперіялісти готують новий злочин проти людства, підготовляючи війну проти Радянського Союзу, вони знову починають використовувати цей прапор наче б то для оборони пригноблених націй, пристосовуючи це, насамперед, до України, що її ніби то потрібно визволити від гніту руських. [...] Ціла низка органів буржуазної та соціал-демократичної преси Німеччини, Франції, Чехословаччини та особливо Польщі багато трактують на всі лади українську проблему та перспективи „незалежності” України."

c) Ukrainian book printing and the press have grown in quantity and quality as never before in the history of Ukraine.

d) Literary life guarantees the correct development of Ukrainian literature.... Our Ukrainian Academy of Sciences is gaining tremendous importance under the conditions of our state-building and the growth of the country's productive forces (Kahanovych 1929c: 151).⁷⁰

Returning to the topic of the "Ukrainization of the party and the battle against deviations" (Kahanovych 1929c: 153), Kahanovych followed the notorious scenario. He began by briefly touching on the issue of Russian chauvinism, then elaborated extensively on Ukrainian "chauvinism."⁷¹ In conclusion, Kahanovych reproached Šums'kyj with "not having been willing to see the very serious achievements that we have made with regard to Ukrainization in recent years" (ibid., 156).^{72 73}

The Šums'kyj affair resulted in self-criticism (and an attack on "Šums'kism") on the part of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj (Xvyl'ovyj 1929a)⁷⁴ and in the removal of Šums'kyj from his post. After Šums'kyj's dismissal was finalized, Lazar Kahanovych explained that Skrypnyk, as "an older Bolshevik," would henceforth conduct "Ukrainization... in a truly Bolshevik way, without deviations, without falling under the influence of these or other groups" (Kahanovych 1929a: 123).⁷⁵ He added—again, with suspect emphasis—that any rumors of an end to "Ukrainization," let alone an upcoming "anti-Ukrainian deviation" by the party, were unfounded (ibid., 123)⁷⁶ but emphasized that anyone who gave a Russian worker Ukrainian-language documents in which

70 "а) Початкова школа обслуговує українське населення (2 мільйони українських дітей навчаються українською мовою). – б) Вища школа ступнево та надійно українізується. – в) Українська книга та преса виросли кількісно і якісно, як ніколи в історії України. – г) Літературне життя забезпечує правильний розвиток української літератури [...] Наша Українська Академія Наук набуває величезного значіння в умовах нашого державного будівництва та зростання продукційних сил країни [...]"

71 Scholars now broadly agree that "no exponent of anti-Ukrainian, pro-Russian views was legally persecuted. In the worst scenario, they were publicly criticized and dismissed, whereupon they left for Russia and obtained good positions there" (Ševel'ov 1989: 126–127).

72 "Тов. Шумський не хотів бачити тих найсерйозніших досягнень, яких ми досягли за останні роки в справі українізації."

73 Apart from the question of who ruled in Poland, another factor of great significance for the image of Soviet Ukraine as a "Piedmont" of Ukrainian culture was the fate of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (prior to 1923: Communist Party of Eastern Galicia). In the earlier years, the Bolsheviks had generously supported this party, but during the "Šums'kyj affair," Karol Maksymovych (Savryč), the leader of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine, defended both Xvyl'ovyj and Šums'kyj (Maksymovych 1929). The Bolsheviks, in turn, destroyed the party. As early as 1928, Kahanovych and Skrypnyk commented on "The break-up in the Communist Party of Western Ukraine and the national policy of the CP(b)U" and "On the reasons and sources of the break-up in the Communist Party of Western Ukraine" (Kahanovych 1929d, Skrypnyk 1929a). On the Communist Party of Western Ukraine, see Radziejowski 1987.

74 "Цю статтю я розглядаю, як статтю першу з циклу статтів 'проти шумськізму'. М. Х."

75 "Я гадаю, що Наркомосвіта під керівництвом тов. Скрипника, старшого більшовика, що вміє провадити українізацію – дійсно по-більшовицькому, без ухилів, без підпадання під вплив тих чи інших груп, ширше та глибше розгорне свою роботу."

76 "Деякі товариші, разом з тов. Шумським намагаються зараз пустити до обігу такі балачки: „Починається, мовляв, в ЦК антиукраїнський ухил, похід іде проти українізації, ЦК почне викидати і тих і других і третіх, почнеться пригнічення, взагалі українців та бувших боротьбістів зокрема" і т. ін. і т. ін."

he “could not understand anything” was to be held responsible for a “breach between the party and the working class and for a violation of the statute of the dictatorship of the proletariat” (ibid., 124).⁷⁷

Thus, as soon as “Ukrainization” actually went into effect, alleged “Ukrainian nationalism” immediately became the target of massive Bolshevik attacks. As early as 1926, Šums'kyj reported that Komsomol members had repeatedly exposed him to reproaches for Ukrainian nationalism (“Petljurivščyna”) (Šums'kyj 1929a: 106).⁷⁸ Shortly afterwards, he complained of being forced to work “under constant suspicion of nationalism, in an atmosphere of distrust and constant attacks,” which, as he argued, actually “paralyzed him in his fight against [genuine] Ukrainian nationalism” (Šums'kyj 1929b: 135).⁷⁹ In his speech, Šums'kyj attempted to personalize the problem and declared that none other than his party fellow Andrij Xvylja (Olintar)⁸⁰ was responsible for “this morbid phenomenon” (Šums'kyj 1929a: 105; Šums'kyj 1929b: 135).⁸¹ But Šums'kyj was wrong: the actual mastermind of the game was none other than Stalin.

77 “Але той, хто гадає провадити українізацію, даючи руському робітникові колективний договір та розрахункову книжку українською мовою, що в ній він нічого не розуміє, той веде до розриву партії з робочою класою [sic], до порушення статуту диктатури пролетаріату, йой [sic] веде неправильно політику.”

78 “Кожний раз, коли виступають на фронті боротьби з ворожою ідеологією, зараз же удар з-заду й ти оказуєшся в цій кампанії. Не можна так боротися, коли тобі на кожному кроці дають удар. Ось, наприклад, коли приходять до НКОсвіти комсомолец і починає горлопанити, що тут петлюрівщина і т. ін. і т. ін.” Later, Šums'kyj argued: “[...] я говорю те, що говорив у всіх наших резолюціях – що партія повинна вести активну пропаганду серед робітничої класи серед російських робітників теж, щоб вони органічно входили в процес громадського життя й культурного будівництва України, щоб керувати українським селянством і всім будівництвом соціалізму на Україні, але про примусову українізацію я не казав, бо я так гадаю, що хто пропонує примусову українізацію, той був би ідіотом, а себе я за такого не вважаю” (Šums'kyj 1929a: 107). “Я доводив, що перебування українця-партійця під постійним підозрінням націоналізму, в атмосфері недовір'я і постійних нагінок, позбавляє його всякого авторитету перед безпартійними, паралізує його боездатність в боротьбі з українським націоналізмом, робить його пасивним і приводить його до того, що він забувається в кут і мовчить. Або породжує друге хворобливе явище, утворює тип комуніста, аля тов. Хвиля (підчас Лебедівщини в 1921–22 році цей тип персоніфікувався в особі тов. Мусульбаса, що кажуть зривав навіть портрети Шевченка в клубах, як прояв націоналізму), що в погоні завоювати довір'я в русотяпськи настроєної частини партії доходить до головоутиятства і садизму в боротьбі з українським націоналізмом (що лише збільшує націоналізм, ізолюється від суспільно-культурного українського процесу і не тільки губить можливість комуністичного впливу на цей процес, і таким чином, перестає бути корисним для партії, а навіть просто стає шкідливим” (Šums'kyj 1929b: 135).

79 Šums'kyj's claims are confirmed by the documents prepared for the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U of April 1925, which reported that particularly those party workers who had come to Ukraine from Russia “quite often...regarded Ukrainization as Petljurism and counterrevolution, and...regarded those party people who spoke and used the Ukrainian language as ‘ardent Petljurites,’ ‘independentists,’ etc.” (Ukrainization 2003: 65).

80 At the convention of the Politburo of the CP(B)U on 20 November 1926, Xvylja reported “On the journal *Červonij Šljax*” and its reorganization in light of the Xvyľovyj affair (Xvylja 1929)]. In 1933, Xvylja would play a leading role in the Bolshevik struggle “on the linguistic front” (see below).

81 “Особисто я вважаю, що це питання загострив Хвиля, як і питання що до Хвильового, як і питання до помилок відносно неокласиків.”

In the years to come, the party continued discussing the “Ukrainization” of the proletariat. At a plenary session of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U in March 1927, Mykola Skrypnyk reiterated his theory that the party opposed both the Russification and the “de-Russification of the proletariat,” with the exception of “Russified workers,” and Kahanovych confirmed Skrypnyk’s words.⁸² Nobody asked at that point how “Russified” or, as it was expressed elsewhere, “semi-Russified” workers could ultimately be recognized. Did anybody expect them all—and them alone—to speak the above-mentioned “broken, semi-Ukrainian language” that Skrypnyk had introduced into the debates of the mid-1920s?

At the same session of March 1927, Andriy Xvylja told a story about “certain comrades” with whom he had discussed “recent events in Ukraine,” that is, the Šums'kyj affair (Xvylja 1929: 129). Xvylja reported that according to those party comrades, “the circumstances were obviously such that a national whipping-boy” was “needed to be beaten,” and that “Šums'kyj was that whipping-boy.” Xvylja explained that this was nonsense, for “no matter how often you beat a whipping-boy, he will always remain a whipping-boy,” which reportedly evoked laughter among the audience (*ibid.*).⁸³

Panas Ljubčenko emphasized at the same assembly that “in fact, we are now witnessing the growth of nationalist tendencies” (Ljubčenko 1929: 130–131). He attacked Serhij Jefremov and Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj of the Academy of Sciences, pointing out that “one and a half or two years ago, the same Kryms'kyj and the same Jefremov would not have dared to talk to us that way” (*ibid.*, 131). Then he referred to Vlas Čubar’s suggestion that “those who behave so impudently” should be expelled from the country because “their forms of behavior exceeded all tolerable limits” and complained that “for formal reasons,” these people “could not even be deprived of their vote” (*ibid.*, 130–131).⁸⁴

82 “Каганович: Ми проти русифікації, та проти дерусифікації. Скрипник. Крім русифікованих робітників. Каганович. Безперечно правильно. Ми за українізацію. [...]” (Kahanovych 1929b: 140).

83 “Мені довелося говорити з деякими товаришами в справі останніх подій на Україні. Вони кажуть: „Шумського зняли, але справа культурної роботи страшенно багато програє. На Україні, кажуть вони, такі обставини, що потрібен „націонал-хлопчик“ для биття. Шумський таким був. Він приходив в ЦК і перед самим носом махав кулаками, його били, але де в чому з ним і погоджувались”. Я гадаю, що „хлопчика“ скільки не бий, він завжди буде „хлопчиком“ (сміх). Нам потрібні не „хлопчики“, а серйозні політичні діячі в цій справі [...] Вони скажуть, що основні рішення ЦК фактично б'ють по українізації. Ні, товариші, це не удар по українізації, а це є дійсний правильний підход [*sic*] в справі українізації.”

84 “Дійсно, ми маємо зараз зріст націоналістичних настроїв [*sic*, no period] Візьмемо, приміром, хоч би останні виступи академіка [*sic*] Ефремова [*sic*] [...] Я гадаю, що Ефремов два роки тому назад не посмів би такою мовою з нами розмовляти, як він пише. [...] Півтора-два роки тому назад той же Кримський, той же Ефремов він би не посмів так розмовляти з нами. [...] Безумовно, ми тут стоїмо перед питанням, як і т. Чубар мені з Президії підказав, вислати тих, хто нахабно поводить, за межі радянської території, тому, що форми поводження вийшли за межі припустимого. А ми навіть не змогли за формальних причин позбавити його права голосу, хоч, я думаю, нехай він буде 70 раз українським інтелігентським академиком [*sic*], а його треба позбавити голосу.”

Signals from Moscow constantly supported the struggle against "Ukrainian nationalism." In June 1927, Grigorij Zinov'ev declared at the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU in Moscow that "in Ukraine, they are conducting 'Ukrainization' in a manner that contradicts our nationality policy...and helps the Petljurites, while genuine chauvinism is not being opposed" (Ukrainizacija 2003: 57). In the same year, Jurij Larin published another sharp criticism of "Ukrainization" at the behest of Stalin (ibid.), while Lazar Kahanovyč sent a declaration to the Comintern pointing out that Ukraine was suffering from the growth of Ukrainian chauvinism, kulak ("глитайня") influence on the village intelligentsia, and the formation of an ideology of bourgeois restoration led by the Ukrainian urban bourgeoisie (ibid., 195).

In the latter half of 1927, the Bolsheviks began reorganizing the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences according to their needs. Mykola Skrypnyk began by dismissing two academicians. A year later, Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj was removed from his post as secretary of the academy, and seven party members "were imposed on the assembly of the academy" (Ševel'ov 1989: 124). This was only an indication of what was to follow.

All achievements of "Ukrainization" were unfailingly accompanied by concerted attacks on "Ukrainian nationalism." In 1927, the year of the Kharkiv conference, Vagaršak Vaganjan published his book *On National Culture*, in which he polemicized against the Galician impact on the Ukrainian language in Soviet Ukraine as follows:⁸⁵

Russian Ukraine has created its language, which differs considerably from Galician Ukrainian, under the much stronger impact of the Russian language. Probably, this [Galician] dialect is richer than Russian Ukrainian ("російсько-український"), but what follows from that? Can one conclude from this that the language of the Galician-Ukrainian intelligentsia can be imposed on "Russian"-Ukrainian ("російсько-українським") workers and peasants?" (cited according to Skrypnyk 1931: 6).

Vaganjan protested the "preference for the alien Galician dialect" and argued for the "rapprochement of the two neighboring eastern peoples, which will be an absolutely inevitable concomitant of the economic development of the [Soviet] Union" (ibid., 8). Vaganjan's publication was one more instance of the writing on the wall. Ukraine and the Ukrainian language would soon be brought closer to Soviet Russia. At the same time, they were to be ultimately distanced from the West.

In 1928, the Bolsheviks launched a major campaign against Mixail Volobuev, an ethnic Russian who had published an article "On the Problem of the Liquidation of Colonialism and Nationalism" (До проблеми ліквідації колоніальності та націоналізму) in *Bil'shovyk Ukrainy* (Bolshevik of Ukraine).

85 About fifty to sixty thousand Galician immigrants who came to Soviet Ukraine before the 1930s took leading roles in many walks of Soviet political, scholarly, and cultural life. Mykola Skrypnyk's personal secretary, Mykola Erstenjuk, had Galician roots.

Volobuev had analyzed the colonial exploitation of the Ukrainian economy in the tsarist empire and concluded that many problems had in fact remained unchanged. His article was published together with a critical reply by Andrii Ričyc'kyj (Anatolij Pisoc'kyj) (Ričyc'kyj 1929). Soon afterwards, Mykola Skrypnyk condemned Volobuev in his speech "On the Economic Platform of Nationalism" (Skrypnyk 1929b). In the wake of "Šums'kism," another Ukrainian nationalist deviation appeared—"Volobujevščyna."⁸⁶

A year later, a Galician-born historian at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Matvij Javors'kyj, was accused of "nationalist deviations," and a witch hunt against "Javorščyna" set in.

In the same year of 1928, Lazar Kahanovyč returned to Moscow as a secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (he held the post until 1939). Stanislav Kosior, an ethnic Pole, succeeded him as general secretary of the CP(B)U. Kosior's most important task was to oversee the collectivization of agriculture in Ukraine, which soon led to the Great Famine of 1932–33. NEP was over, and Bolshevik propagandists declared that a period of acceleration had begun. The break in the forward movement was over. The Bolshevik terror against the "kulaks" was unleashed with such fervor that Stalin ultimately called for a slackening in his article "Dizziness with Success (Concerning Questions of the Collective Farm Movement)" (published in *Pravda* on 2 March 1930).

Throughout the years of "functional Ukrainization," the use of the Ukrainian language was in fact not unanimously encouraged. "All manifestations of 'spontaneous' Ukrainization met with severe reprisals," as Jurij Ševel'ov later recalled,⁸⁷ and "speaking Ukrainian publicly, though officially encouraged, was in general considered to be risky, unless an occasion was explicitly designed to be conducted in Ukrainian" (Ševel'ov 1989: 126). The situation was actually grotesque: "Those who wanted to succeed were expected to pass examinations in Ukrainian but not to use it any more than required," and "the stigma attached to the use of Ukrainian in the large cities did not dissipate" (ibid.); "when it came to important events, Russian was used consistently" (ibid., 128).

Contemporaries became increasingly aware of what was actually going on. In 1928, Mykola Kuliš wrote his outstanding play *Myna Mazajlo*, in which one of the characters prophetically declares, "Their Ukrainization is a method of revealing all us Ukrainians in order to destroy us all together so that not even a trace of our spirit will be left.... I warn you!" (Kuliš 1955: 169).⁸⁸ In early 1929, Serhij Jefremov noted in his diary that a "new course" had begun (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 196).

Jefremov was perfectly right. The GPU had invented a "counterrevolutionary Ukrainian nationalist organization," the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine" (Спілка Визволення України, SVU). On 22 November 1929, Soviet newspapers

86 Volobuev was exiled to Kazakhstan in 1934 (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 34).

87 Ševel'ov spent those years in Kharkiv.

88 "Їхня українізація - це спосіб виявити всіх нас, українців, а тоді знищити разом, щоб і духу не було... Попереджаю!"

declared that a band of counterrevolutionaries had been uncovered in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 199). Seven high-ranking Bolsheviks, including Mykola Skrypnyk, Volodymyr Zatońskij, and Oleksander Šlihter, were now “elected” to the Academy (Ševel'ov 1989: 124; Ukrajinizacija 2003: 197–198), while “all voluntary scientific societies affiliated with the academy were disbanded... [and] scores of the academy's associates were arrested,” including the chairman of its Ruling Board and its actual *spiritus movens*, S[erhij] Jefremov” (ibid.).

The SVU show trial was prepared during a personal meeting with Stalin on 5 February 1930 and held from 19 March to 9 April 1930 (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 40; Pauly 2009: 264). Among the defendants were precisely those who had in fact borne the main burden of genuine “Ukrainization”: professors, teachers, and church activists. Several defendants represented the major intellectual center of “Ukrainization,” the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, which came under vigorous attack; some of them were leading linguists.⁸⁹ Immediately after the trial, about seven hundred other persons were arrested, many of them teachers. Moreover, according to some estimates, as many as thirty thousand people were arrested, exiled, or murdered in the context of the so-called SVU affair (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 41).⁹⁰

Less than five years after the beginning of “functional Ukrainization,” the SVU affair marked the beginning of its end. In the documents of the trial, “in fact anything Ukrainian” became “‘Petljurite,’ ‘nationalist,’ ‘wrecking,’ etc.,” while the Bolshevik phrase of the need for “correct Ukrainization” became increasingly devoid of content (ibid., 43).

In the years to come, the GPU invented many more anti-Bolshevik Ukrainian nationalist organizations, such as the “Kuban' Union in Ukraine,” which had designs on the Ukrainians in Kuban' (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 202), or the “Ukrainian National Center,” which involved the academics Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj and Matvij Javors'kyj and “initiated a veritable hunt for emigrants from Galicia” (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 45, Ukrajinizacija 2003: 204).

Mykola Skrypnyk wrote a lengthy article on the SVU trial in 1930 that was published in Russian in the all-Union paper *Kommunist* and in two Ukrainian translations (see section 6). In his text, Skrypnyk denied all claims of the “bourgeois and social-fascist press of Poland, France, Germany, and other countries,” which had labeled the trial of the SVU a “Bolshevik intrigue,” a “provocation of the Cheka,” and a “trial of the flower of the Ukrainian intelligentsia” (Skrypnyk 1930: 3).⁹¹ According to Skrypnyk, Serhij Jefremov of the Ukrainian Academy of

89 Vsevolod Hancov, an editor of the academy's Russian-Ukrainian dictionary; Hryhorij Holoskevych, the author of an orthographic dictionary that disseminated the rules of the Kharkiv orthography; and Hryhorij Xolodnyj, the head of the Institute for Scientific Language.

90 Other sources mention “more than five thousand people” arrested as a consequence of the SVU affair (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 201).

91 “Намагаючись отруїти свідомість широких працюючих мас, вороги СРСР за останній час використали і процес „Спілки Визволення України”, що відбувався в столиці Радянської

Sciences was the leader of a group of treacherous “members of various Ukrainian bourgeois and socialist parties: social democrats, social federalists, national democrats, fascists, etc.” (ibid.).⁹² Allegedly, “the old leaders, proven over decades, of the Ukrainian bourgeois national movement and the young representatives of Ukrainian fascism, master academics and professors as well as ordinary teachers, writers, and philologists, cooperators, and medical doctors,⁹³ one after another,” had denounced their treasonous past in the course of the trial and called upon others to renounce any “wrecking and damaging counterrevolutionary” activity and contribute to the defense of “the Soviet Republic...against a capitalist intervention, particularly by fascist Poland, for whose sake and with whose support and on whose instructions the SVU had been working” (ibid., 4–5).⁹⁴ Skrypnyk explained that the success of the Bolshevik revolution had forced the “national bourgeois intelligentsia” to collaborate with the Soviets, but the period of “reconstruction,” that is, Stalinist “collectivization in the framework of the first Soviet five-year plan,” had encountered “cruel resistance” on part of “the kulak” to the “liquidation of the kulak as a class” (ibid., 7).⁹⁵ Skrypnyk explained that the members of the SVU included “a considerable number of professors and instructors of various universities in Kyiv and other cities” who had brought up counterrevolutionary cadres among the students of bourgeois and kulak origin, particularly among village teachers (the latter were united in a separate suborganization, the “Union

України, в Харкові. „Більшовицькі застінки”, „чекістська провокація) [sic], „розправа над цвітом української інтелігенції [sic]” і т. п. штаповані,просякнені [sic; no space after comma] ядовитою злобою, епітети зустрічались в цій справі на сторінках буржуазної і соціал-фашистської преси Польщі, Франції, Німеччини і друг. країн, супроводжуючись протестами проти „таємних розправ”, вимогами „відвертості” і т. п. Але ледве розпочався процес [sic] в справі СБУ, як зі сторінок наче б мітлою вимело всі відомості з процесу.”

92 “Коварні” більшовики широко надали свободи слова всім, що сиділи на лаві підсудних, членам різних українських буржуазних і соціалістичних партій: соціал-демократам, соціал-федералістам, націонал-демократам, фашистам і т. п., розсилаючи по радіо їхні промови у всі кінці світу.”

93 Interestingly, Stalin himself had instructed Kosior and Čubar to add “medical focuses” to the SVU affair (ČK – НПУ – НКВД 1997: 42; Ukrajinizacija 2003: 200).

94 “Старі, провірені десятиріччями [sic] проворирі українського буржуазного національного руху і молоді представники українського фашизму, маститі академіки та професори і рядові вчителі, письменники і філологи, кооператори і лікарі, один за другим, в своїх виступах на суді п’янують свою минулу діяльність і через радіохвилі закликають всіх, хто ще хитається, або хто раніш йшов за ними, відмовитись від шкідливих і згубних контрреволюційних шляхів, закликаючи працювати для Радянської Республіки і сприяти охороні її проти капіталістичної інтервенції, перш за все з боку фашистської Польщі, що в її користь, що при її допомозі [sic, no dot above i] і що по її вказівкам працювала СБУ.”

95 “В останні роки відбудовчого періоду і особливо з переходом до реконструктивного періоду на селі загострилась клясова боротьба. Широкий розвиток промисловости, індустріалізації країни, і, нарешті, перехід до технічної і економічної реконструкції сільського господарства зустріли жорстокий опір куруля, який побачив, що пролетарська партія щільно підходить до завдання ліквідації куруля, як кляси. Непримиримі націоналістичні елементи української дрібнобуржуазної інтелігенції виступили в цій боротьбі зачинниками і організаторами. Вже в 1926 р., напередоні [sic] переходу нашої країни до реконструктивного періоду і плянової перебудови господарства в Кіїві організується СБУ (Спілка Визволення України).”

of Ukrainian Youth") (ibid., 9–10).⁹⁶ Their "entire plan for the liberation of Ukraine was based on Polish and German military intervention" (ibid., 11),⁹⁷ and "the class force from which the Ukrainian counterrevolution consciously wanted to draw support was the large wealthy peasantry—the kulaks."⁹⁸ The SVU had planned to make Ukraine a "peasant country" under kulak leadership, while industry was to be owned by foreign capitalists (ibid., 11–13). Ukraine was to become a colony of Polish and German fascists and capitalists, and "all Western Ukrainian, bourgeois, and socialist parties and organizations" had "already become a direct and immediate instrument in the hands of the fascists of Poland, a compliant tool for the military intervention that had been prepared" (ibid., 16).⁹⁹ Skrypnyk added that these counterrevolutionary forces targeted not only Soviet Ukraine but even Moscow as well. Both their "program and tactics" had allegedly been coordinated by Marshal Piłsudski and the German general Groener (ibid., 17).

According to Skrypnyk, some isolated cells "contaminated by kulak Petljurite nationalist elements" were still "doing their harmful work, although they had lost their leading role in the cooperatives and therefore could not contribute much to the counterrevolutionary organization" (ibid., 21). Moreover, "an organization of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church especially created for that purpose" had organized the "kulak forces" (ibid., 21–22).¹⁰⁰ Skrypnyk declared that the SVU had propagated anti-Semitism, nationalism, and fascism in the Ukrainian pedagogical sphere. He explained that Ukrainian nationalism had already had

96 "СВУ мала в своїх лавах досить значну кількість професорів, викладачів різних ВИШ-ів в Києві і інших міст, ведучи вперту, хоча й скриту, роботу по вихованню контрреволюційних кадрів з числа студентів буржуазно-куркульського походження. [...] Молоді контрреволюційні сили були об'єднані в доповнюючі організації СУМ (Спілка Української Молоді), члени якої повинні були бути масовими [sic] агітаторами СВУ серед студентства і куркульського селянства."

97 "Нарешті, зізнання головніших керівників СВУ вияснили, що весь "плян" звільнення України був оснований на воєнній інтервенції з боку Польщі і Німеччини, при чому цю інтервенцію повинно було бути куплено поділом України на дві сфери впливу: Правобережна Україна мала ввійти в склад Польської Річі Посполитої, а Лівобережна – мала попасти в залежність і підлеглість німецькому капіталові."

98 "Класовою силою, на яку свідомо хотіла спертись українська контрреволюція, було велике заможне селянство – куркулі. їх [sic] класові інтереси цілковито і повністю [sic] відбивались в програмі СВУ."

99 "Всі західно-українські, буржуазні і соціалістичні партії і організації насправді стали вже прямим безпосереднім знаряддям в руках фашистської Польщі, службовим засобом для воєнної інтервенції, що готується."

100 "Формування куркульських сил для готування повстання Спілка Визволення України провадила старими петлюрівськими кадрами кооперативних організацій. Українська кооперація довгі роки була в руках українського куркуля і служила одною з важливіших баз петлюрівського націоналістичного руху. [...] Але з розгорненням ленінського „кооперативного пляну“ з переходом в реконструктивний період, з широким розвитком колективізації сільського господарства націоналістичні куркульські елементи було вибито з кооперації. Ще є зараз окремі осередки кооперативної організації засмічені куркульсько-петлюрівськими націоналістичними елементами; вони ще провадять [sic] шкідливу роботу, але вони загубили в кооперації керівну роль і тому мало могли дати для контрреволюційної організації. Основною організованою силою і, так би мовити, „управлінням для формування“ куркульських сил була спеціально створена, керована націоналістами організація української автокефальної православної церкви."

strong roots among village teachers during the years 1917–20 but added that under Bolshevik rule, “the character of the Ukrainian teachers had changed completely,” so that the SVU had managed to recruit only “an insignificant part of its adherents” among the teachers (*ibid.*, 24).¹⁰¹ Regardless of Skrypnyk’s declaration, tens of thousands of teachers were purged.

Another leading Ukrainian Bolshevik who commented on the SVU trial in *Bil'shovyk Ukrainy* was Panas Ljubchenko. In his article “Ukrainian Nationalists in Their Struggle for the Restoration of Capitalism (On the SVU Trial)” (Ljubchenko 1930), Ljubchenko argued that the trial was of interest “not only to the workers and peasants, the toilers of Ukraine, but also to the [Soviet] Union as a whole” (*ibid.*, 59).¹⁰² He declared that the trial had issued a summary verdict on the “many years of struggle of the nationalist counterrevolution,” which consisted of various “so-called socialist parties” (*ibid.*).¹⁰³ According to Ljubchenko, the desire for Ukrainian independence had emerged only after the October Revolution, and Ukrainian nationalists had thus “proclaimed independence primarily in order to distance themselves from proletarian Russia and obtain the right to immediate negotiations with the Central Powers—Germany and Austria—[that is] the right to trade Ukraine away to German imperialism, to strangle the workers’ and peasants’

101 “Націоналістичні педагоги, що об’єдналися в Науково-Педагогічне Товариство при Всеукраїнській Академії Наук, на чолі якого стояв член президії Спілки Визволення України – Дурдуківський, розгортали широку, ідеологічну, шкідницьку роботу. Поволі, з дня на день, в легальних формах, тонким, хитрим ядом наповняли вони свою роботу [sic], педагоги-шкідники впливали на дитячий розум, виховували з них антисемітів, вщипували національну ворожнечу і людську ненависть. Завданням їх було зробити з школи засіб націоналістичного, фашистського виховання, підготовлювати в ній нові молоді кадри ворогів радянської влади, які б з усією енергією пішли на повстання і терор, вбивства і погроми. Але ця розкладаюча робота шкідників-педагогів зустріла опір в самій школі, і з боку вчителів і з боку самих учнів. Ще 10 років тому, в 1917–1920 рр., український сільський вчитель в переважній своїй частині знаходився під впливом українського націоналізму. На українського вчителя і на кооператора перш за все і більш за все спиралась петлюрівщина в своїх ідеологічних впливах на село. Минуле десятиріччя і широко розгорнута за минулий час культурно-освітня робота і будівництво нової радянської культури зовсім змінили характер українського вчителства. Спілка Визволення України могла набрати собі серед вчителів лише незначну групу прибічників; величезна маса вчителства цілковито відвернулася від контрреволюціонерів. Більше того: в загостреній класовій боротьбі на селі сільський вчитель є передовим борцем і організатором в боротьбі за переведення широких господарчих і освітніх засобів радянської влади, за переведення колективізації села і т. п. Не дарма ж куркульський терор на селі спрямований зараз не лише проти комуністів і активістів з селянської бідноти, але й проти вчителя школи, ліквідатора неписьменности, робітника освіти. Українська контрреволюція могла розрахувати лише на окремі десятки вчителів і на школи, де керівниками були члени СВУ – в Києві [sic] Дурдуківський, в Чернігові – Холодний і др.”

102 “Процес „Спілки Визволення України” – СВУ, що недавно закінчився в Харкові, являє інтерес не тільки для робітників і селян, для трудящих України, але і для цілого Союзу.”

103 Цей процес підсумував багаторічну боротьбу української націоналістичної контрреволюції, на чолі якої стояли, так звані, соціалістичні партії проти влади робітників і селян, проти пролетарської революції. Саме колишні члени двох основних партій української контрреволюції – соціально-демократів і соціально-федералістів, партій, які були за організаторів і керівників, так званої, Української Народньої Республіки – УНР, складали ядро і керівні кадри СВУ.”

uprising with the support of German bayonets, and to preserve the power of the bourgeoisie" (ibid., 61).¹⁰⁴ The defendants in the SVU trial had sold out Ukraine piece by piece, while allegedly struggling for the unification of all Ukrainian lands (ibid., 67).¹⁰⁵ Those "arch-traitors" had collaborated with "the Polish gentry and Mr. Piłsudski," who had wished to realize their "Great Polish program, the creation of a Rzeczpospolita from sea to sea" in 1920 (ibid., 69),¹⁰⁶ while the "toilers of Western Ukraine" knew precisely "how the Ukrainian nationalists had betrayed Western Ukraine" (ibid., 72).¹⁰⁷ As Ljubchenko concluded:

The peoples of the USSR who, under the guidance of the proletariat and its Leninist party, are building a new socialist society will mercilessly and decisively reject any jiggery-pokery and attempts of the capitalist overlords and their nationalist lackeys to organize new "liberation" campaigns (ibid., 75).¹⁰⁸

Stalinist paranoid, gigantomaniac and extremely redundant hate rhetoric was about to reach its peak.

One of the best examples was Stanisław Kosior's speech "On Mass Collectivization, the Liquidation of the Kulak as a Class, and the Ongoing Tasks of the Party" (Kosior 1930), which was published in *Bil'shovyk Ukraïny* in February 1930. In this article, Kosior declared that thanks to collectivization, a higher level of socialist construction had been reached—the time for "the liquidation of the kulaks ("куркулі") as a class" had thus arrived (ibid., 13). According to Kosior, the "great success" of Bolshevik policy made possible "an unheard-of large growth of our socialist industry," the "enormous intensification of its [the industry's] impact on agriculture," as well as

104 "Тасло незалежності й відокремлення від Росії було вписано до програми націоналістичних партій тільки після перемоги Жовтневої революції. Ні українські еседеки, ні українські есери, ні партія української буржуазії – соціалісти-федералісти – підчас панування Тимчасового Уряду, не стояли на позиції самостійності. Їхні вимоги щодо руської буржуазії обмежувались вимогами для України найкращої культурно-національної автономії. [...] Українським націоналістам треба було проголосити незалежність, насамперед, для того, щоб одмежуватись від пролетарської Росії, щоб дістати право на безпосередні переговори з центральними державами – Німеччиною, Австрією, право на запродажництво України німецькому імперіялізмові, щоб за допомогою німецьких багнетів придушити повстання робітників і селян, зберегти владу буржуазії."

105 "Поруч генеральних запродажництв закордонньому капіталові, за лицемірно галасливої заяви про боротьбу за собірність, цебто за об'єднання всіх українських земель: України Наддніпрянської, Галичини, Буковини, Закарпатської України, Україну розпродавалось частинами."

106 "На весні 1920 року польській шляхті й панові Пілсудському вдалось, що приспів найсприятливіший час реалізувати великопольську програму, утворити Річ Посполиту від моря до моря. [...] Ролю димової завіси мусіли бути відіграти українські націоналісти. Зрадники із зрадників, патентовані крамарі інтересами українських трудящих, викинуті за межі радянської України, українські націоналісти дістали ще одну можливість поставити свої підписи й печатку проституйованої УНР під новою окупацією."

107 "Трудящі Західньої України знають, як українські націоналісти зрадили Західню Україну."

108 "Народи СРСР, які успішно будують, під керівництвом пролетаріату та його ленінської партії, нове соціалістичне суспільство, дадуть нещадну, рішучу відсіч усяким підступам та спробам капіталістичних хазяїв і їхніх націоналістичних льокаїв організувати нові походи за „визволення“."

"the intensification of the leading role of the proletariat for the peasant masses" (ibid.).¹⁰⁹ Kosior declared that NEP had led to a "unification [of the proletariat] with the basic peasant masses" (ibid., 14)¹¹⁰ thanks to the colossal growth of "our industry" and the industrialization of agriculture, which "Il'ich" (Lenin) had only dreamed of (ibid., 15).¹¹¹ Henceforth, in the course of the "socialist reconstruction of agriculture," "middle" peasants ("середняки") were to be increasingly isolated from the kulaks, who were preventing them from collaborating with the proletariat (ibid., 15–16).¹¹² If the Bolsheviks had formerly depended on the "kulaks," the situation had now changed thanks to collectivization.¹¹³ Therefore, "we have launched a truly successful and decisive attack against the kulak along the entire front; we have moved from the

109 "Основні причини, які дозволяють нам нині зробити в нашій політиці поворот, перехід від обмеження визискувальних тенденцій куркульства до політики його ліквідації, як кляси, саме в тім, що ми стали на вищий щабель соціалістичного будівництва. Лише досягши впертою роботою й боротьбою певних великих успіхів, ми можемо тепер взяти цей курс. Ці успіхи насамперед виявляються у нечуваному своїми розмірами зростанні нашої соціалістичної індустрії, у величезному посиленні її впливу на сільське господарство, в посиленні провідної ролі пролетаріату на основі маси селянства. В наслідок за останні два роки сталися виключні своїм значенням ґрунтовні, глибинні зрушення в основній середняцькій масі села."

110 "На основі НЕПу ми зміцнили єднання з основними масами селянства, міне [sic] лише остаточно привернули на свій бік середняка, але й як ніколи зміцнили це єднання сталими економічними зв'язками через товарообіг, кооперацію, кредит, через ту постійну допомогу, що її держава давала біднякові й середнякові в тяжкі моменти недроду й т. д."

111 "Лише завдяки колосальному зростанню нашої промисловости, успішному здійсненню лінії на індустріалізацію ми змогли за останні два роки утворити багато дійсних зразків соціалістичного, громадського господарювання на селі тобто те, чого у нас ще не було за Ільїча і про віщо Ільїч лише мріяв. Ми останнім роком ці зразки утворили у вигляді колгоспів, машиновотракторних станцій, радгоспів, під які ми підвели вже міцну технічну базу. Завдяки цьому ми наш уплив на основну масу села незрівняно посилили, авторитет і довір'я до партії та пролетарської диктатури підвищили."

112 "Завдяки швидким темпам розвитку соціалістичного господарства, особливо промисловости, ми два роки тому впрост практично підійшли до соціалістичної реконструкції сільського господарства. [...] У цих вирішальних для соціалістичного будівництва зрушеннях наша політика до куркуля також відіграла величезну роль. Ви знаєте, що своєю природою середняк вагається, у нього дві душі: одна – дрібно-власницька, як продавець хліба, яка тягне його до заможного, до куркуля, а друга душа, душа трудівника, що зазнав визиску поміщика, єднає його з робітничою клясою, наймитом, біднотою. Вся справа в тім, щоб за цю основну другу рису середняка нам якомога міцніше зацепитися, сполучити його з собою, уплив куркуля на середняка звести на нівець, щоб куркуля ізолювати, щоб середняка повернути проти куркуля. І все це нам вдалося здійснити. Протягом минулого й цього року партія виконала на селі велетенську роботу, щоб залучити середняка в основному питанні про хліб на свій бік. Саме в цей період перед основною масою селянства стало рубя на селі питання про вибір шляху: або з куркулем проти пролетарської держави, або разом з партією, з пролетарською державою будувати нове господарство проти куркуля."

113 "Те, що ми спромоглися подолати опір куркуля, відіграло не абияку роль для середняка, для якого куркуль мав деякий господарський авторитет. Ми завдали куркулеві убіючого вдару. Ми, поперше, на ділі, показали, що держава будь-яких вагань у питанні про хліб не дозволяє і з клясовим ворогом – куркулем розправиться нещадно. Далі ми довели основній масі селянства, при чому знову таки довели на ділі, що наше громадське господарство багато краще й вище від куркульського [sic] господарства. Зростання колгоспів і радгоспів дозволило нам із суто економічного погляду замінити куркульські господарства. Ще рік, півтора тому ми залежали від куркуля. В якому розумінні? В тому, що хліба, с.-г. сировини у нас було без лишку. Бідняцько-середняцькі господарства через малу свою товаровість давали явно недостатню кількість хліба, а куркульські господарства мали 30–40% товарового хліба – цифра досить солідна. Нині становище дуже змінилося."

former policy of restriction to a policy of the liquidation of the kulak as a class" (ibid., 17).¹¹⁴ However, this "deadly and irreconcilable enemy" was "still making a stand" and exerting his "kulak terror."¹¹⁵ Therefore, "having well beaten the kulak, it would be a great mistake to say, 'Don't beat a man when he's down (although he is by no means down yet),' as this would give him "the opportunity to recover and further maneuver and continue his destructive work." The party would thus welcome any demands "from below" to complete the liquidation of the kulak. The masses were to be "mobilized and organized for the decisive suppression of any kulak resistance" (ibid., 17),¹¹⁶ for in the era of collectivization, the kulak was as unnecessary and harmful as the "nepman" (ibid.).¹¹⁷ Kosior insisted that it was important not to extend the "dekulakization" to "middle peasants" (ibid., 19).¹¹⁸ He argued that middle and poor peasants had already understood that the kulak was a "predator" ("хижак") and that the party was interested in "raising the elementary peasant masses to a higher material level" (ibid., 20).¹¹⁹ The "liquidation of the kulak" had admittedly caused "serious" production shortages (ibid., 22),¹²⁰ but the grain-requisition rates had to be maintained, and more attention to stock farming would help overcome the

114 "За останній рік ми розгорнули успішний, рішучий справжній наступ на куркуля по всьому фронту, ми перейшли від колишньої політики обмеження до політики ліквідації куркуля, як кляси."

115 "Куркуля ми переробити не можемо, це ілюзія, і опортунізм, надії на вrostання куркуля в соціалізм розвіялися начебто і у самого тов. Бухаріна. Наш соціалістичний наступ, успішно розвиваючись, привів до того, що ворог ізольований, оточений бідняцько-середняцькою колгоспною масою, але він і досі ще шалено чинить опір. Він є смертельний, непримиренний наш ворог, ворог колективного господарства. У куркуля ще досить сил, щоб, коли не в одвертому бої, то боротися нишком із-за паркану, через підкуп, з середини зривати колгоспи. Нам доводиться провадити з ним шалену, часто криваву боротьбу, щодня доводиться бачити вияви куркульського терору. Тим то дати нині куркулеві перепочинок, лишаючись на колишній позиції його обмеження, це означає дати йому можливість маневрувати, перешикуватись й продовжувати боротьбу."

116 "Було б великою помилкою за наших обставин, побивши гарненько куркуля, сказати – лежачого не б'ють (хоч він ще далеко не в лежачому стані), дати йому змову пересидіти й далі маневрувати, дати йому змогу вести підривну роботу. Ми були б справжні дурні, коли б на такий погляд пристали. Ось чому партія йде назустріч вимогам знизу про ліквідацію куркуля. Та мало цього. Партія сама повинна організувати широкий рух колгоспних бідняцько-середняцьких мас, щоб організовано провести розкуркулювання і ліквідувати куркульські господарства. Треба мобілізувати і організувати маси на рішуче придушення усякого опору куркуля, щоб його відродження стало неможливим ані завтра, ані позавтра, ані через рік."

117 "[...] ми тепер безпосередньо встановлюємо єднання між соціалістичною промисловістю і соціалістичним сектором (колгоспами) села та індивідуальним селянським господарством через контрактацію. Для цього нам більше не потрібен куркуль і непман, не лише не потрібен, але вони шкодять налагодженню безпосередніх взаємин, безпосереднього товарообігу на основі обопального тривалого договору між робітничою державою і основною масою села."

118 "Найважливіший наш обов'язок за проведення розкуркулення – це, безперечно, запобігти будь якому поширенню цього заходу на якусь частину середняцьких господарств."

119 "[...] піднести на вищий матеріальний рівень основні маси селянства [...]."

120 "Поперше ми ліквідуємо куркуля. А що це означає? Це означає, що коли минулого року в наслідок політики посиленого наступу на куркуля, що її провадила партія, ми мали помітний недосів у куркульському господарстві, то цього року ми матимемо цілковите випадання куркульського господарства в районах суцільної колективізації й чимале випадання в інших районах, бо куркуль, незалежно від розкуркулювання, почав закидати своє господарство, ліквідувати свою худобу тощо."

problems (ibid., 22–23). After all, Kosior envisaged “tremendous prospects unheard of in grandiosity,” “colossal progress” among the working class and poor and middle peasants, and “grandiose tasks” for the future (ibid., 23–24).¹²¹

What the Bolsheviks called “dekulakization” was in fact a ruthless “war against the peasantry” (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 39), which, after all, constituted the vast majority of speakers of Ukrainian. Merciless dekulakizing brigades deprived so-called “kulaks” of their (often very modest) possessions and deported them from their homelands, although no one could say what a “kulak” really was (Graziosi 2008: 40). By 1 June 1930, 90,000 homesteads had been dekulakized; during the entire period of collectivization, the number rose to more than 200,000 (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 38). As a reaction to this, in the course of 1929 alone “about 1,300 peasant disturbances” (Graziosi 2008: 40) occurred in the Soviet Union as a whole. “In 1930 there were 13,754 peasant disturbances...with 2.5 million participants in the 10,000 disturbances for which data were gathered; ...the most affected ‘region’ was Ukraine, with 4,098 demonstrations” (ibid., 44–45).

The Bolsheviks continually proclaimed their alleged adherence to “Ukrainization” (see, e.g., Xvylja 1930), but, given their attacks on Ukrainian intellectuals and the peasantry, these proclamations became increasingly hollow. The Bolsheviks not only intended to change the status of the Ukrainian language but also, simultaneously and increasingly, interfered in corpus planning. In 1931, for example, People’s Commissar of Education Mykola Skrypnyk joined a certain Comrade Poznans’kyj in attacking alleged attempts in the language commission of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences to “arrest the development of our language” (Skrypnyk 1931), particularly in the *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary of Legal Terminology* (Російсько-український словник правничої мови), which Ahatanhel Kryms’kyj had edited in Kyiv in 1926. According to Skrypnyk, “one could hardly conceive a more inappropriate adaption of the old terminology to contemporary phenomena,”¹²² for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century terminology corresponded only to “the economy of the pre-capitalist period and commercial capital,” while the

121 “Ми ввійшли до такого періоду, коли перед нами справді відкриваються величезні, нечувані своєю грандіозністю перспективи. [...] Колосальні зрушення відбуваються й серед робітничої класи, і серед бідняцько-середняцької маси селянства. Тут ми маємо свого роду взаємочинність ентузіазму робітничої [sic] класи, її згуртованість, організованість навколо нашої партії. [...] Грандіозні завдання, що стоять перед нами, потребують виняткового напруження сил, величезних кадрів, а ці кадри нам треба знайти, підняти. Їх може дати тільки робітнича класа, що веде за собою величезні маси колгоспників, які підводяться до нового життя.”

122 In the preface to this dictionary, Ahatanhel Kryms’kyj had openly written: “We have deliberately introduced into the dictionary many words from the old Ukrainian legal language in order to disclose the tie of the contemporary language with the old one, to buttress the present-day legal language with a historical foundation, and to show how many words the contemporary language of the Ukraine retains from the old legal language and how gravely err those who accuse the present-day Ukrainian language of being forged, Galicianized. It proves that the Ukrainian language some two or three hundred years ago used those same words that at times, it seems, so grate on our Russianized ear” (cited according to Ševel’ov 1989: 137). The criticism of the dictionary was even less justified, as the dictionary contained “only ca. 2,000 archaic words (the total number of words was over 67,000), which were singled out by the editorial comment *star.* (ancient) and had no prescriptive intent” (ibid.).!

transfer of terminology “from one economic formation to another” meant “littering the language or hampering the development of new economic phenomena and social interrelations” (ibid., 41–42).¹²³ Skrypnyk conceded that “for the enrichment of our language...many words” could be taken from “our treasury, both the old and the new Ukrainian literature” (ibid.); he even explicitly criticized some individuals in the editorial commission of the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* who opted for a new strategy of “internationalizing the Ukrainian language,” generally opposed “old terms,” and argued that “if there were good Russian ones, why look for others” (ibid., 42). Skrypnyk declared that such views were “already from the gospel of the apostle Vaganjan” (see above) (ibid., 42–43)¹²⁴ and concluded that both “arresting development” and “internationalization (by Russification)” of the Ukrainian language were “deviations [“збочення”] in the linguistic sphere.”

Notably, Skrypnyk’s criticism of the legal dictionary was not an isolated instance; it was part of a broader campaign “on the linguistic front” that had been initiated a year earlier. As early as 7 March 1930, amid the hysteria that had developed around the SVU trial, the Bolsheviks liquidated the Institute of Ukrainian Scientific Terminology and a number of scholarly commissions of the Academy of Sciences that were working on a dictionary of the living Ukrainian language, a historical dictionary of the Ukrainian language, an etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language, a normative grammar of the Ukrainian language, the study of the history of the Ukrainian language, and the study of Ukrainian dialectology. Instead, an “Institute of Scholarly Research in Linguistics (‘Науково-дослідний інститут мовознавства’) was created, where only about half the earlier staff continued to work under the new director, Borys Tkačenko (Kubajčuk 2004: 81–82). The first publication of the new institute, which appeared in 1931, was a large volume titled *On the Linguistic Front* (На мовному фронті); it was filled with accusations of

123 “Тут тов. Познанський зауважив, що, мовляв, у мовній комісії ВУАН були спроби законсервувати нашу мову. Це може стати одним із виявів певної політики на мовному терені. Я візьму російсько-український словник, юридично-термінологічний, що вийшов років 5 тому. І мушу сказати, що невдалішого пристосування старої термінології до сучасних явищ навряд чи можна вигадати, бо термінологія XVI і XVII сторіччя відповідала певній економіці, та й то економіці докапіталістичної доби, торговельного капіталу. [...] І коли безпосередньо без всякої глибокої праці переносити терміни з одної економічної формації до другої, то це значить засмічувати мову, або гальмувати розвиток нових соціальних явищ і соціальних співвідносин тому, що й термінологія може бути знаряддям розвитку, або гальмом.”

124 “З другого боку, нещодавно у редакційній комісії української радянської енциклопедії відбулася нарада, де говорили про мовне оформлення УРС [sic]. Там були такі, що говорили, що треба, мовляв, вести лінію на „інтернаціоналізацію“ української мови, не брати старих термінів, а коли є хороші російські, навіть інших шукати. Це вже з євангелії апостола Ваганяна і, на мою думку, так і треба їх оцінювати. [...] Треба сказати, що в нас зараз іноді кують багато нових слів, тоді як є багато хороших слів, уживаних уже в нашій літературі, але ще мало прищеплених до життя. Візьмімо наприклад, слово „предслово“ [sic], що його Шевченко викував, та ще одне нове слово „передмова“. Слово „передмова“ прищепилось до життя, а слово „предслово“ до життя не прищепилось. Я гадаю, що в нашій скарбниці, і старої і нової української літератури, є багато слів, які ще можна взяти для того, щоб збагачувати нашу мову. Такі твердження, що не можна брати старої української термінології, невірні й хибні, і коли вони супроводяться заявами про те, що, мовляв, коли є хороші російські слова, то треба їх брати і ними інтернаціоналізувати українську мову, то це вже з євангелії Ваганяна. Отже на мовній діяльності є різні збочення й коли говорити про одне, то треба розбирати й інші.”

"wrecking" language planning at the Academy of Sciences and self-incriminations of those who remained on staff pending their imminent purges.

Borys Tkačenko soon disappeared, and Naum Kahanovyč took his place (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 202). Kahanovyč had been among the first to set the new tone for Ukrainian "linguistics." In 1930, in an article titled "Against 'Populism' in Linguistics," he had polemicized against the "essentially conservative and wrecking" tendency to "go back to the popular language" ("назад до народної мови"). In another article titled "A Few Words on Dictionaries," he wrote about the "scholarly sabotage" ("наукове шкідництво") resulting from the "Ukrainian bourgeois-nationalist homestead mentality" ("українське буржуазно-націоналістичне хуторянство") (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 201–202; Ševel'ov 1989: 154–155). Kahanovyč soon became editor in chief of the newly established journal *Linguistics* (Мовознавство), which was from its beginnings little more than an organ of the Bolshevik campaign "on the linguistic front" (Ševel'ov 1989: 157).

3.2. Achievements

The Bolsheviks initiated "functional Ukrainization" at a time when, thanks to the gradual reconstruction of industry and other factors of modernization, a new Ukrainian urban intelligentsia had come into being, "not yet very numerous but large enough to be taken into account" (ibid.). Although "a marked, though still very limited, Ukrainian element" had developed within the CP(B)U, no more than 14 out of 45 members of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U knew Ukrainian in late 1926 (Ševel'ov 1989: 63–64). In the years to come, it never became mandatory for leading Ukrainian Bolsheviks to have a command of the Ukrainian language.

As in the earliest years of "Ukrainization," employees were still offered language courses free of charge, but beginning in 1927, "those lagging behind in Ukrainization had to pay for their instruction" (Ševel'ov 1989: 116). Nonetheless, little progress was made, and the "last serious legal act regarding the Ukrainization of the apparatus" was the decree "On Guaranteeing the Equal Rights of Languages and on Fostering the Development of Ukrainian Culture," issued by the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars on 6 July 1927 (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 83). While this decree stipulated that all legal documents of state organs were to be published in Ukrainian and Russian, that the internal correspondence of Ukrainian institutions was to be written in Ukrainian, and that those officials who declined to learn Ukrainian were to be dismissed (ibid., 83–84), none of these regulations was ever put into practice consistently, if at all (ibid., 84).

Most scholars agree that "Ukrainization" was particularly successful in the educational sphere (ibid., 85): after all, Bolshevik statistics reveal that by 1927, 82 percent of schools attended by 76 percent of the pupils of Ukraine were "Ukrainized."¹²⁵ From a different perspective, however, the achievements were much less impressive. First, in the towns, the percentages were only 49 percent

125 Actually, this was identified as "full Ukrainization" because the ethnic share of Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine was 80.0%.

and 42 percent, respectively (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 90; Pauly 2009: 268); second, Ukrainophone teaching was apparently much less widespread than the statistical data suggest (Pauly 2009: 259), since the putative continual growth of "Ukrainized" schools even after the SVU trial often meant "little more" than the fact that certain "schools had been designated as such on paper" (*ibid.*, 270). For that very reason, announcements of language evaluations frequently "caused near-instant anxiety among teachers" (*ibid.*, 261), and inspectors in fact regularly complained that "rural school workers are extraordinarily distorting the language," while "in 1927 the graduates of pedagogical higher educational institutes still do not know the language well and those that graduated from 1920–24 absolutely do not know the language" (*ibid.*, 262). There can be little doubt that many of those teachers in fact taught in Russian even in 100 percent "Ukrainized" schools.¹²⁶

Aside from that, even during "functional Ukrainization," it remained a matter of fact that the higher the school level, the lower the degree of "Ukrainization." In 1929, for example, only 66 percent of professional schools were officially "Ukrainized," and 16 percent were mixed (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 91).

At the university level, one of the major problems was the low percentage of ethnic Ukrainian teachers, who were well represented only among professors in agricultural or pedagogical institutions; another problem was the unwillingness of a number of academics to take on the challenge of Ukrainian-language teaching. In that situation, the Ukrainization Commission of the CP(B)U decided in a session of 6 August 1925 to invite Ukrainian professors from abroad (mainly from Galicia or from countries to which Galicians had migrated, particularly the Czech Republic). Henceforth, individuals such as Stepan Rudnyc'kyj, Myxajlo Lozyns'kyj, and Ivan Sijak played a leading role in Soviet academic life up to 1933, when they all ended up in the GULAG (*ibid.*, 96–101).¹²⁷ In the academic year 1929/30, Mykola Skrypnyk declared that 40 percent of all university teaching had been "Ukrainized," but in fact, local data show Ukrainian-language teaching to have been least represented in Odesa and Kharkiv and, according to academic disciplines, in medicine, the arts, and industry (only 20.7 percent of the teaching of industrial disciplines was regarded as "Ukrainized") (*ibid.*, 102–103). Even at the Academy of Sciences, which "appeared as an entirely Ukrainian institution" at first sight, in fact only the historical and philological branches functioned largely in the Ukrainian language; in economic and social sciences and, even more so, in mathematics and natural history, Russian prevailed ("and the absolute majority of collaborators were purest Russians") (Ševel'ov 1989: 105).

Regarding the production of newspapers in Ukraine, a turnaround occurred shortly before the beginning of "functional Ukrainization." While on 1 April

126 Incidentally, observers frequently noted that the inspectors themselves had a poor command of Ukrainian (Pauly 2009: 262–263). Another problem was that "there were few qualified communist Ukrainizers in the school or elsewhere," while "the party leadership was fundamentally uncomfortable with its dependence on non-party intelligentsia" (*ibid.*, 264).

127 In 1933, Mykola Skrypnyk was accused of having asked the Politburo for permission to invite as many as 1,500 teachers from Western Ukraine (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 96–101).

1924 Russophone newspapers had a print run of 445,000 compared to 90,000 Ukrainophone ones, by 1 November 1924 Ukrainophone newspapers had reached a print run of 439,000 compared to 360,000 Russophone ones (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 138). By 1 March 1926, 50 Ukrainian-language newspapers were being published in Ukraine with a print run of 612,000, which constituted 61 percent of production. As for the percentage of Russian-language newspapers, it was supplemented by 150,000 copies of *Pravda* and 200,000–250,000 copies of other all-Union newspapers, all of which were Russophone (ibid., 139). Nonetheless, the temporary “Ukrainization” of the press was a serious endeavor, as confirmed by the events of 16 June 1926, when the central organ of the CP(B)U, the newspaper *Komunist*, switched to Ukrainian (ibid.).¹²⁸ In 1930, Mykola Skrypnyk summarized that the proportion of newspapers published in Ukrainian had reached 68.8 percent. By 1932, the percentage had risen to its maximum, 87.5 percent (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 140; see also Ševel'ov 1989: 117). A particularly important point was that Ukrainian-language newspapers did indeed find their readers (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 140). Also, the number of Ukrainophone journals “grew quickly, and so did their differentiation by types” (Ševel'ov 1989: 118). By 1929, the print run of Ukrainian-language journals had attained 84 percent (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 143).

Ukrainian-language book production grew from 45.8 percent in 1925–26 to 76.9 percent in 1931 (ibid., 145; Ševel'ov 1989: 118),¹²⁹ but even at that point, owing to the influx of Russian-language books from other Soviet republics, no more than about 25 percent of the books available in Soviet Ukraine were written in Ukrainian. As for scholarly books, up to 50 percent were published in Ukrainian in 1931; among textbooks for higher education, up to 79.4 percent were in Ukrainian (ibid., 118). Many textbooks of the Ukrainian language that appeared in those years were written or compiled “by outstanding linguists, such as O[lena] Kurylo, O[leksa] Synjavs'kyj, and M[yxajlo] Sulyma” (ibid., 129).

In 1924–25, Soviet Ukrainian radio became partly Ukrainian-speaking, although Russian radio broadcasting prevailed because it was under the jurisdiction of the All-Union People's Commissariat for Post and Telegraph (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 144). Ukrainian cinema was silent until 1932, when *Ivan*, the first Ukrainian sound film, was produced in Ukrainian (ibid.).

As for theaters, as of November 1927, out of 60 theaters 38 were Russophone, 16 Ukrainophone, and 8 Yiddish-speaking. By 1931, the ratio had changed to 9:66:12 (ibid., 148).¹³⁰

In the Red Army, “Ukrainization” played a very limited role. As late as 1926, only 6.7 percent of 2,004 Red Army commanders and political workers knew Ukrainian well enough to use the language professionally (ibid., 155). Despite some projects

128 The Ukrainian newspaper for industrial workers *Proletar* was founded in the same year (Ševel'ov 1989: 117).

129 Mykola Skrypnyk indicated that in 1931, “Ukrainian titles comprised 65.3 percent of publications, while in circulation they were 77 percent” (Ševel'ov 1989: 118).

130 Jurij Ševel'ov refers to the same data. His statement that “Russian theater, including opera, was practically expelled from the Ukraine” (Ševel'ov 1989: 118) is slightly exaggerated.

with Ukrainophone units in the earlier years and the creation of a "Ukrainized" Cavalry Corps of Red Cossacks in Haisyn, Podilia (ibid.; Ševel'ov 1989: 116), the Red Army remained largely Russophone.

Regarding the codification of the Ukrainian language, it is noteworthy that two new Ukrainian-Russian and four Russian-Ukrainian dictionaries were published during the years of "functional Ukrainization" (ibid., 129). One of the major achievements was "the new edition of B[orys] Hrinčenko's *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*, which was edited and supplemented by Serhij Jefremov and Andrij Nikovs'kyj. Only three volumes of this dictionary appeared, however, before both authors fell victim to the SVU affair (ibid.). The *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary* whose first volume had appeared in 1924 added five more volumes, but this project, too, stopped at the letter *P* owing to the Stalinist onslaught of 1933 (ibid., 130). Notably, "virtually all dictionaries were Russian-Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Russian," with the exception of Ivan Šarovol's'kyj's German-Ukrainian dictionary of 1929. Also, the Academy of Sciences published up to about four dozen terminological dictionaries (ibid.), all of which were "as a rule prescriptive, even though in most cases they were subtitled 'Project'" (ibid., 131).

A particularly important achievement regarding standardization was the regulation of the new Ukrainian orthography. The reform was prepared in July 1925 by the creation of a working group of thirty-seven individuals, "including ten Academy affiliates and ten prominent Communist Party members" (ibid., 131). The formal head of the commission was the Narkomos, that is, originally Oleksandr Šums'kyj and only subsequently Mykola Skrypnyk; the actual work was done by leading linguists, particularly Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj, Vsevolod Hancov, Hryhorij Holoskevych, and, particularly, Oleksa Synjav's'kyj (ibid.). The latter prepared a draft that was presented for public discussion in August 1926. After sixty letters proposing changes had reached the working group, a conference was held in Kharkiv from 25 May to 6 June 1927. The participants were "four high functionaries of the Narkomos, five members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, twenty-eight university professors of linguistics and philology, eight teachers, seven journalists, and eight writers" (ibid.), as well as three leading linguists of Western Ukraine (Kyrylo Studyns'kyj, Ilarion Svjencic'kyj, and Vasyl' Simovyč) (ibid., 131–132). The major intention of the conference was to establish an all-Ukrainian orthography that would eventually unite the traditions of western and central Ukraine; the result was the most detailed description of Ukrainian orthographic rules that had ever appeared up to that point. On 6 September 1928, Mykola Skrypnyk and a party convention ratified the "Kharkiv" orthography, which was alternatively called "Skrypnykivka." The rules were published in 1929 and became "compulsory in all schools and publications of the Ukrainian SSR" (ibid.). Although they were abandoned in Soviet Ukraine only four and a half years later, those rules have largely remained in force among most Ukrainians living outside Soviet Ukraine to date.

The most characteristic trait of the Kharkiv orthography was its great attention to those western traditions of the Ukrainian language that have often been regarded

as Galician¹³¹ but have in fact been common to all Ukrainophone territories since early modern times. In particular, the Kharkiv rules provided for the use of soft *l'* (not *l*) (клуб, not клуб) and *g* (not *h*) (пропаганда, not пропаганда), the use of *e* for Greek *η* (хемія, not хімія) and *t* (not *f*) for Greek *θ* in more recent loans from Western languages. Although Jurij Švel'ov contended that "the orthographic rules of 1928/29 were utopian and doomed to failure" (ibid., 133), one need not necessarily agree with this opinion. While it was in fact problematic that the spelling reform was introduced "in the conditions of a bilingual intelligentsia and of a low level of education among other social groups just beginning to accept Ukrainization" (ibid.), there can be little doubt that this compromise might have worked under different conditions, if only the adherents of the Kharkiv orthography had had sufficient time to disseminate its rules.

4. 1933

4.1. Discourses of terror

The man-made Great Famine of 1932–33 cost many millions of lives; the deadly blow to the peasants of Ukraine was at the same time a blow to the vitality of the Ukrainian language.¹³² Moreover, Bolshevik propaganda established a link between the Great Famine and "Ukrainian nationalists." In the midst of the Great Famine, on 14 December 1932, a decree of the All-Union Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party and of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR declared that the recent poor harvest had been caused by "bourgeois nationalist elements, Petljurites, etc.," who had managed to carry out their wrecking because "Ukrainization" had been introduced "mechanically, without taking into account the concrete specifics of each *rajon* and without cautiously selecting Bolshevik Ukrainian cadres" (Ukrajinizacija 2003: 209). "Ukrainization" was therefore to be terminated immediately in the Russian Federation (particularly in Kuban), and all Ukrainophone schools and media in the Russian Federation were to switch to Russian, as stipulated in a telegram signed by Stalin and Vjačeslav Molotov (ibid., 209–210).

Shortly afterwards, the wave reached Ukraine. In late February and early March 1933, Pavel Postyšev arrived in Ukraine as the new second secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U. With him came Vsevolod Balyc'kyj, the new head of Ukraine's GPU, and about three thousand party members whose "common assignment was to exterminate any and all Ukrainian resistance" (Švel'ov 1989:

131 Generally, it did not come as a surprise that Galician Ukrainians exerted great influence on Soviet Ukrainian for at least two reasons. First, owing to the restrictive language policy of the Russian Empire, the Ukrainian language had been in comparatively broad polyfunctional use primarily in Galicia until the end of the First World War, so that non-Galician Ukrainians had had every reason to take account of Galician traditions while striving to modernize the Ukrainian language. Second, the Soviet Piedmont policy made the attempt to take Galician traditions into consideration look even more logical.

132 Although there were famines in other Soviet republics as well, the Great Famine in Ukraine had its specific elements (Graziosi 2008). In Soviet Russia, many of the affected regions were those with large Ukrainian minorities, such as Kuban.

141). The former slogan of “union with the peasantry” had already been replaced by the reality of the war against the peasantry during the years of collectivization; during the Great Famine, it became utterly meaningless. The “Piedmont” principle also no longer played any role: no longer was Soviet Ukraine to serve as a model for Ukrainians abroad; instead, it was to develop into an “unshakable fortress” (Popov 1933). Although it is true that officially Bolshevik “Ukrainization” was never abolished, and although it is no less true that Soviet statistics even create the impression of a continual flourishing of the Ukrainian language even after 1933,¹³³ the reality of Stalinist mass terror rendered “Ukrainization” completely obsolete.

According to the Stalinists’ narratives of those days, “Ukrainian nationalists” who were spying for “fascist” Poland and preparing an intervention had exerted their deleterious influence and caused the recent famine. Henceforth, anyone who played a role in Ukrainian cultural life risked sharing the fate of thousands of others who were “unmasked” as Ukrainian nationalists and ended up in the GULAG.

Thousands were arrested on false accusations; under unbearable conditions and torture, they “confessed” to belong to underground subversive “organizations” which never existed and never figured in any open trial, but which were mentioned in the public speeches of Postyšev, Kosior, and others.... Not a single group of the intelligentsia in the Ukraine escaped the arrests and executions, from clergy to engineers, from workers in cooperatives to actors, from writers to agronomists (Ševel’ov 1989: 143–144).

The result was “the nearly total destruction of Ukrainian intellectuals” (Ševel’ov 1989: 143).

The catastrophe was comprehensive. A number of periodicals ceased publication; theaters were closed (most notably, Berežil, the world-famous theater led by the Galician Les Kurbas, was shut down, and the leading Ukrainian film director Oleksandr Dovženko was sent to Moscow; Ševel’ov 1989: 144). The leading Soviet Ukrainian writer Mykola Xvyl’ovyj anticipated the Bolsheviks’ actions against him and committed suicide on 13 May 1933;¹³⁴ other writers fell victim to the GULAG. Mykola Skrypnyk was dismissed as people’s commissar of education on 28 February 1933, that is, immediately after Postyšev’s arrival (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 50; Ukrajinizacija 2003: 213). Postyšev soon accused Skrypnyk of having arranged matters so that “Ukrainization often was put into the hands of Petljurite bastards [сволочи], and these enemies with Party cards in their pockets hid behind your [Skrypnyk’s] broad back as a member of the Ukrainian Politburo, and you often defended them” (Martin 2001: 347–348). Skrypnyk shot himself during a session of the Politburo on 7 July 1933. His Galician-born personal secretary, Mykola Erstenjuk, had been arrested as early as 19 February 1933 for

133 It should also be recalled that the Ševčenko monuments in Kharkiv and Kyiv were erected in 1933–35 and 1935–39, respectively, that is, during the most brutal terror campaigns against “Ukrainian nationalists” (Ševel’ov 1989: 143).

134 The Bolsheviks published a full-page obituary and a woodcut showing Xvyl’ovyj in his coffin in *Červonyj Šljax*, no. 6 (Editors 1933: n. p.).

alleged membership in one of the fabricated Ukrainian nationalist organizations (the so-called Ukrainian Military Organization, UVO). He testified that Skrypnyk, “with his nationalist activities, encouraged me and other members of UVO in our counter-revolutionary activities” (Martin 2001: 147). Henceforth, “virtually all Galicians who lived in the Ukrainian SSR” (and who often played an important role in “Ukrainization”) were associated with the UVO, “arrested and liquidated” (Ševel’ov 1989: 162).¹³⁵

The history of the monthly journal *Červonyj Šljax* gives a good idea of the events of 1933. Issue 4 for 1933 took as long as four and a half months to receive its imprimatur¹³⁶ and ultimately turned out to be one of the slimmest issues of the journal ever. Volodymyr Kuz’mič (alternatively referred to as *Кузьмич* in issue 3) followed Myxajlo Jalovyj (pseudonym: Julian Špol’) as the journal’s editor in chief after the latter had been arrested (and shot in 1934). By issue 7 of 1933, not one member of the editorial board of issue 3 was left:¹³⁷

Журнал виходить за редакцією: М. Ялового (відповідальний редактор), В. Кузьмича (заст. відп редактора) і членів редколегії Дм. Гордієнка, О. Копиленка, М. Майського, В. Меллера та О. Слісаренка (<i>Červonyj Šljax</i> 1933/3).	Журнал виходить за редакцією: В. Кузьмича (т. в. о. гол. редактора) і членів редколегії Дм. Гордієнка, О. Копиленка, М. Майського, В. Меллера та О. Слісаренка (<i>Červonyj Šljax</i> 1933/4).	Журнал виходить за редакцією: Остапа Вишні, Др. Галушки, Гр. Епіка, І. Кириленка (відп. редакт.), Мілева, П. Панча, – П. Тичини, М. Ткача, Н. Чередник (<i>Červonyj Šljax</i> 1933/7).
--	---	---

In the course of 1933, no fewer than 200 “nationalist, hostile elements” in the Narkomos and between 90 and 100 percent of the staff members of its local branches were dismissed and purged; so were about 4,000 “class enemy elements” among teachers in Ukrainian schools and others (ČK – HPU – NKVD 1997: 51; Ukrajinizacija 2003: 222). Within the CP(B)U, 23 percent of its members—27,500 people—were purged (Kostiuk 1960: 61).

The Ukrainian language as such soon became a target of assault as well. On 4 April 1933, Andrij Xvyľja, the leading Ukrainian Bolshevik language

135 “In May 1933, the GPU forwarded a list of thirty-one arrested party members to the Ukrainian Politburo to be approved for inclusion in a show trial of Ukrainian nationalists. They were all ‘Galicians’” (Martin 2001: 352).

136 “Здано до складання 25-V-33 р. Підписано до друку 5-X-33 р.”

137 Issue 7 of *Červonyj Šljax* for 1933 was sent to print on 16 August 1933 and received an imprimatur only on 22 November 1933. After the purge, the page count of the journal was doubled, and it frequently featured full-page portraits of leading Bolsheviks (the first was a photograph of Nikolaj Popov, secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U). Another striking feature of these new issues was that the authors’ names now usually appeared with (abbreviated) patronymics (in accordance with Russian, not Ukrainian traditions).

planner of those days, published an article titled "For Bolshevik Vigilance at the Front of the Creation of Ukrainian Soviet Culture"¹³⁸ in the newspaper *Komunist* (Ševel'ov 1989: 157). On 6 April 1933, the new people's commissar of education, Volodymyr Zatons'kyj, established a special commission "for supervision of work on the language front" that was headed by Andrij Xvylja (Olintier) (Vakulenko 2009/2012). On 25 April 1933, the Bolsheviks established a commission for the revision of Ukrainian terminologies at the Narkomos. On 3 May 1933, the People's Commissariat issued a decree based on the commission's decisions that provided for minimizing the use of *l'* (i.e., the spellings *план, планувати, плакат, блок, блуза*, etc.), but the retention of *l'* in words where it had, according to the commission, already been established "in recent times (and especially years)," as in "*лямна, заля, новеля*, etc." (ibid.). Regarding *ʹ*, the decree initially still provided for its broad use, except in "those cases where this or that word" had, according to the commission, "ultimately been established during recent times" with *z*, as in "*граматика, грецький, губернія, газета*, etc." (Vakulenko 2009/2012).

In late June 1933, then, the Central Committee of the CP(B)U issued the decree "On Changes in Ukrainian Scholarly Terminology, Grammar, and Orthography," which was based on the conclusions of a Politburo commission that included Nikolaj Popov, Stanislav Kosior, Pavel Postyšev, Volodymyr Zatons'kyj, Panas Ljubčenko, and Andrij Xvylja, but not a single linguist (ibid.).¹³⁹ This document was "semi-secret"; it was not published and survived only in the archives (Jefimenko 2002). Thus it was not until 5 September 1933 that Volodymyr Zatons'kyj ratified the new "Ukrainian orthography" created by "Comrade Xvylja's orthographic commission" and sent to the publishers on 4 August 1933.

Not until 28 October was the new orthography finally authorized for publication. Its most important regulations provided for the use of *l'* in foreign words in full accordance with Russian (including all inconsistencies, e.g., Ukrainian *Ісландія* like Russian *Исландия*, *Фінляндія* like Russian *Финляндия*) and the complete elimination of the letter *ʹ*; the introduction of forms of the type *хімія, кафедра*, and of many other minor changes that primarily served only one purpose: to bring Ukrainian orthography considerably closer to Russian (Vakulenko 2009/2012; Ševel'ov 1989: 163).¹⁴⁰

Work on Ukrainian terminologies was reduced to a minimum and strove for maximal closeness to Russian. The meager product of subsequent years was a number of slim terminological bulletins whose introductory remarks about the wrecking activity of bourgeois nationalists notoriously comprised up to one-

138 "За більшовицьку пильність на фронті творення української радянської культури."

139 In fact, few Ukrainian linguists were left.

140 "All in all, no more than perhaps half a dozen foreign words preserved their traditional Ukrainian form, e.g., *adresa, pošta, Evropa* vs. Russian *adres, pošta, Jevropa*" (Ševel'ov 1989: 163). As for *Есрона*, it was replaced by *Еспона* during the next assault on the Ukrainian language in 1937 (Ševel'ov 1989: 166). Another step taken in 1937 was insistence on writing compound words in the form *двох-, трьох-* instead of *дво-, три-* (i.e., *двох-* and *трьохповерховий* instead of *дво-* and *триповерховий*) (ibid.).

fifth of the content (Ševel'ov 1989: 163), while a *Dictionary of Medical Terminology* (Словник медичної термінології, 1936) was "the only terminological dictionary on a somewhat higher level" (ibid.). English-, French-, and German-Ukrainian dictionaries were repeatedly announced but never appeared in print. Other minor accomplishments were some brief dictionaries for schools and a Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of 1937, which was of poor quality although it had been prepared by the Institute of Linguistics at the Academy of Sciences (ibid., 163–164).

The public sphere was marked by excessively aggressive and monotonous propaganda against Ukrainian "fascism" in every sphere or "front" of activity, and the Ukrainian language was one of the most important fronts.

Nikolaj Popov, the secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U, wrote "On Nationalist Deviations in the Ranks of the Ukrainian Party Organization and the Task of Fighting Them" (Popov 1933). Popov's article¹⁴¹ was based on a speech he had delivered at the Kharkiv *partaktyv* convention on 9 July 1933,¹⁴² two days after Mykola Skrypnyk's suicide. In this text, Popov argued that "nationalist deviations in our party" required not an "abstract" approach but a discussion of "concrete tasks." He referred to the decrees of the Central Committee of the All-Union CP(B) of 14 December 1932 and 24 January 1933 that had underscored the need to "liquidate the backwardness of our agriculture" and urged party workers to "ensure the further progress of the industrialization of socialist construction in Ukraine and in the Soviet Union as a whole" (ibid., 109).¹⁴³ Popov emphasized "the huge importance of Ukraine, with its powerful metallurgy, coal, and machine engineering, which are most closely associated with our agriculture," for "our Soviet economy and the foreign policy of the Soviet regime, particularly under the current circumstances: the most acute crisis of all economic and political contradictions of the capitalist world" (ibid., 109).¹⁴⁴ According to Popov, the Ukrainian party organization had weakened its vigilance with regard to the restructuring of agriculture. The recent poor harvests had been the result of "significant right-wing opportunistic errors and a broad application of 'leftist' distortions" (ibid.). The Ukrainian Bolsheviks had failed "to uncover the new maneuver of the class enemy, the kulaks who were

141 The article was preceded by his above-mentioned full-page portrait.

142 A footnote says, "Доповідь на зборах Харківського партактиву 9-го липня [sic] 1933 року" (Popov 1933: 109).

143 "Товариші! До оцінки націоналістични ухилів у лавах нашої партії, до оцінки помилок у національному питанні, які були допущені на Україні, треба підходити не абстрактно, а з погляду тих конкретних завдань, що стоять тепер перед української партійною організацією. Ці завдання ясно й чітко сформульовані в постанові ЦК ВКП(б) від 14 грудня 1932 року і в історичній постанові ЦК ВКП(б) від 24 січня 1933 року. Вони полягають у тім, щоб ліквідувати відставання нашого сільського господарства добитися швидкого його піднесення й цим забезпечити далі успіхи індустріалізації соціалістичного будівництва на Україні і в усьому Радянському Союзі."

144 "Про величезна [sic] значення України з її потужною металургією [sic], вугіллям, машинобудуванням, якнайшліпніше зв'язаним з нашим сільським господарством, про величезне значення України в нашій радянській економіці й у зовнішній політиці радянської влади, особливо в теперішніх умовах, крайнього загострення усіх економічних і політичних суперечностей капіталістичного світу – говорити не доводиться."

being liquidated," namely their "desire to penetrate into our collective and state farms, various Soviet organs, and even party organizations to wreck and corrupt our work from within" (ibid., 109–110).¹⁴⁵ "A distortion of the party's nationality policy" and "the weakening of Bolshevik watchfulness and vigilance on that front" had allowed those kulak saboteurs, proceeding "under a false national banner," to take action. The wreckers were "Petljurite elements and bourgeois-nationalist emigrants from Western Ukraine" who had "occupied those posts in the Soviet apparatus, on the collective farms and even in some party organizations, that gave them the opportunity" to corrupt the Soviet system and attempt to replace "Leninist with bourgeois-nationalist national policy" (ibid., 110).¹⁴⁶ Thus the agricultural crisis could not be overcome unless the "errors committed with regard to the nationality question" were corrected, the party and various Soviet organs "purged of bourgeois nationalists," and "the whole mass of the party mobilized for the struggle against nationalism" and the intensification of "work for the international education of the masses" (ibid.).¹⁴⁷

Popov announced that, as every party member had to realize, 1933 was the "year of the break" ("переламний рік") or, in Stalin's coinage, the "Great Break" ("Великий перелом").¹⁴⁸ He discussed "the maneuvers of the Ukrainian bourgeois-nationalist counterrevolution" (ibid., 111–114) and argued that the wreckers had infiltrated Soviet structures "to utilize Soviet power for their bourgeois, kulak, and nationalist aims," while the Soviets had liberated the Ukrainian masses and given them "the opportunity to build socialism and, moreover, to develop a

145 "Українська парторганізація, як ви всі знаєте, послабила за останні роки уваги до соціалістичної перебудови сільського господарства. Наслідком цього послаблення був провал двох хлібозаготівельних кампаній – 1931 і 1932 років, при значних правоопортуністичних помилках і при широкому застосуванні „лівих“ перегинів. У цьому провалі величезну роль відіграло невміння наших організацій викрити новий маневр класового ворога, ліквідовуваного куркульства, прагнення його проникнути до наших колгоспів, радгоспів, різних радянських органів і навіть партійних організацій, для того, щоб шкодити, розкладати нашу роботу зсередини."

146 "Це проникання, що часто-густо провадилося під фальшивим національним прапором, полегшувалося перекручуванням національної політики партії, послабленням більшовицької пильності (!) та уваги на цьому фронті. І коли ми тепер говоримо про ліквідації відставання України в галузі сільського господарства, про розгром решток класового ворога, що проліз до наших організацій, – то це завдання не можна розв'язати без рішучого виправлення помилок, допущених у національному питанні. Ці бо помилки допомагали нашим ворогам петлюрівським елементам, буржуазно-націоналістичним вихідцям з Західної України зайняти ті позиції в нашому радянському апараті, в колгоспах і навіть у деяких партійних організаціях, що давали їм можливість зривати нашу роботу, розкладати зсередини наші радгоспи, колгоспи, земельні органи, підмінювати ленінську національну політику буржуазно-націоналістичної."

147 "Завдання піднести наше сільське господарство не можна розв'язати, не виправивши помилок, допущених в національному питанні, не очистивши нашу партію, наші радянські, культурні, земельні, колгоспні та інші органи від буржуазних націоналістів, не мобілізавши всю партійну масу на боротьбу з націоналізмом, не посиливши роботи над інтернаціональним вихованням мас."

148 "Кожний член нашої партії повинен це усвідомити, щоб нинішній рік став справді переламним роком для України, щоб ті незначні ще успіхи, яких ми досягли при величезній допомозі ЦК ВКП(б) твердо закріпити й щоб вони були початком рішучого переламу."

Ukrainian culture that was national in form and Soviet in content" (ibid., 111).¹⁴⁹ "Masked as Soviet people, even communists," these wreckers had carried on their "counterrevolutionary and often espionage activity," aiming at "a bourgeois-nationalist perversion of Soviet Ukraine" (ibid., 112).¹⁵⁰ Many of those who had joined the Bolsheviks from other socialist parties (the Borot'bists, particularly Šums'kyj), as well as the originally non-Bolshevik Ukrainian intellectuals ("zminovixivci"), had joined the ranks of the Bolsheviks only "as a maneuver to corrupt the Bolshevik party from within" (ibid., 113).¹⁵¹

According to Popov's outline, the tremendous success of Soviet collectivization and industrialization had convinced the nationalist counterrevolutionaries that they had no chance of success. While supporting Xvyl'ovyj's slogan "Away from Moscow," Šums'kyj, following "Piłsudski's fascist revolution," had intended to tear Ukraine away from the Soviet Union and orient it on bourgeois Europe (ibid., 114). Moreover, he had opted for the "forced Ukrainization of Russian workers, that is, the replacement of Bolshevik with bourgeois-nationalist Ukrainization" (ibid., 114–115).¹⁵² Thanks to Lazar Kahanovyč's vigilance "in the merciless struggle against Great Russian and Ukrainian chauvinism," the party had successfully destroyed Šums'kism and revealed that it was "an agency of the class enemy" (ibid., 115).¹⁵³ Moreover, thanks to the GPU, the Bolsheviks had successfully fought the counterrevolutionary Communist Party of Western Ukraine, "an instrument of Polish fascism" (ibid.), the historian Javors'kyj as "one of the most outstanding agents of fascism," the SVU, and other

149 "Але вже в цей період громадянської війни, коли більшовики перемали й перемогли, коли українські маси, звільнившись від ярма поміщиків і капіталістів, дістали можливість будувати соціалізм, а також будувати національну форму, радянську змістом, українську культуру, – з розбитого ворожого табору до радянської влади і більшовицької партії приходили не тільки люди щирі, що справді переходили на нашу сторону, ставали чесно до наших лав і працювали, як уміли.

Для декого і тоді перехід на сторону радянської влади був маневром, тимчасовою орієнтацією, яка змінювалася завтра на іншу орієнтацію, спробою використати радянську владу для своїх буржуазних, куркульських, націоналістичних цілей."

150 "[...] вони там під машкарою радянських людей, і навіть комуністів, провадили роботу в напрямку буржуазно-націоналістичного переродження Радянської України і взагалі провадили контрреволюційну, в тому числі шпигунську, роботу."

151 "Багато з представників українських дрібнобуржуазних партій, боротьбистів, укапів тощо, вступаючи до нашої партії, робили це, як маневр, щоб розкласти більшовицьку партію зсередини."

152 "Саме тоді Шумський виступає з підтримкою гасла Хвильового – „Геть від Москви”, гасла орієнтації української культури на буржуазну Європу. Це була фактична орієнтація на відрив України від Радянського Союзу. – Основна лінія політики українських буржуазних націоналістів і їх агентів у лавах нашої партії. Саме тоді Шумський вимагає ламання старих партійних кадрів КП(б)У, вимагає примусової українізації російських робітників, тобто відміни більшовицької українізації буржуазно-націоналістичною. Саме тоді Шумський робить разом із своїми однодумцями спробу захопити до своїх рук українську парторганізацію."

153 "Комуністична партія (більшовиків) України під керівництвом свого тодішнього генерального секретаря Лазаря Мойсеевича Кагановича в нещадній боротьбі проти великоруського і українського шовінізму доценту розгромила і викрила шумськізм, як агентуру класового ворога. Вона викинула за межі України не тільки Шумського, а й його найближчих соратників Максимовича і Солодуба."

counterrevolutionary organizations (ibid., 115).¹⁵⁴ As the party had declared in its resolution of 14 December 1932, owing to a “mechanical approach to Ukrainization” Bolshevik Ukrainization had “gotten into the hands of elements hostile to us... Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists”; more recently, they had been additionally motivated by Hitler’s coming to power (ibid., 115–116).¹⁵⁵ All this had come about solely because of weakened Bolshevik vigilance.

In particular, Mykola Skrypnyk had made “huge errors with regard to the nationality question” (ibid., 116). Skrypnyk had surrounded himself with “our most ferocious enemies, who had utilized their very close ties with him even for their espionage activities”; he had thus become “an instrument” of the enemies of the Soviet Union and thereby even fostered Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism (ibid.).¹⁵⁶ In a separate chapter “On Comrade Skrypnyk’s Errors” (ibid., 117–120), Popov declared that these errors were of a “Trotskyist,” “right-opportunist, and, above all, nationalist character” (ibid., 117).¹⁵⁷ Skrypnyk had committed his first errors as early as 1924–25, when he had reproached the party for not effectively combating “great-power” chauvinism and even dared to disagree with Stalin (ibid., 117).¹⁵⁸ Although Skrypnyk had taken an active part “in the fight against Šums’kism” (ibid., 118),¹⁵⁹ he had otherwise “excessively exaggerated the significance of the nationality question”

154 “Я маю на увазі викриття яворщани, що сталося 1929 року, вигнання з партії Яворського – одного із найвидатніших агентів фашизму. Я маю на увазі розкриття органами ДПУ під керівництвом тов. Балицького контрреволюційної організації СВУ і слідом за нею інших контрреволюційних організацій, в яких значну участь брали українські есери, що повернулися з-за кордону.”

155 “Але, товариші, за останні два-два з половиною року більшовицька боротьба української парторганізації проти буржуазного націоналізму і націоналістичних ухилів послабла. Це зокрема виявилось в констатованому резолюцією ЦК ВКП(б) від 14 грудня 1932 р. механічному підході до українізації, без зважування особливостей окремих районів. Справа більшовицької українізації, про величезні досягнення якої я не говоритиму, бо вони нам усім відомі, – справа більшовицької українізації в цей період значною мірою випала з партійних рук і потрапила до рук ворожих нам елементів. [...] дії контрреволюційних елементів, окрилені (я маю на увазі останній час) приходом до влади гітлерівського фашизму, на який тепер все більше й більше орієнтуються основні сили української контрреволюції [...]”

156 “[...] в роботі тов. Скрипника за останні роки найяскравіше виявилось послаблення більшовицької пильності і навіть цілковита втрата її. В наслідок цілковитої втрати цієї пильності тов. Скрипник опинився буквально оточений тісним кільцем найлітійших наших ворогів, які використали свій найтісніший зв’язок з ним навіть у шпигунських акціях. [...] Грунт для цього був підготований рядом його величезних помилок у національному питанні і в інших основних питаннях нашої революції, рядом помилок, з яких поступово виросла певна система поглядів, певний ухил від лінії нашої партії в національному питанні, потурання українському буржуазному націоналізмові. І це дало змогу нашим ворогам – українським буржуазним націоналістам – зробити з тов. Скрипника деякою мірою своє знаряддя і навіть деякою мірою свій прапор.”

157 “Якщо тепер зібрати букет з помилок тов. Скрипника, помилок троцькіського, правоопортуністичного, але насамперед націоналістичного характеру, то що ми ту знайдемо [...]”

158 “Тут тов. Скрипник одверто заявляє, що ми фактично не провадимо боротьби з великодержавним шовінізмом, слова у нас розходяться з ділом, і на ділі ми національної політики не провадимо. [...] І далі він одкрито виступає проти тов. Сталіна.”

159 “Він брав не останню участь у боротьбі проти шумскізму [sic].”

and ended up in a “nationalist deviation from our party line” (ibid.).¹⁶⁰ After 1926, Skrypnyk had repeatedly voiced disagreement with Popov as well as with Postyšev (ibid., 118–119).¹⁶¹ One of his major errors had been his attempt to introduce Latin letters into the Ukrainian alphabet; fortunately, Lazar Kahanovych had corrected him (ibid., 118).¹⁶² Personnel at the “Institute of Marxism” (which had been headed by Skrypnyk) had even attempted “to revise Lenin’s and Stalin’s teachings regarding the nationality question” (ibid., 119), which had laid the groundwork for the “forced Ukrainization” of those children who, according to Skrypnyk, spoke in “a mixed dialect” (ibid., 119).¹⁶³ Therefore Skrypnyk, whose suicide was “a criminal act,” had had to be removed from the director’s post (ibid., 120).¹⁶⁴

Popov declared that the party would “refute” any tendencies similar to those that had evolved under Skrypnyk’s influence (ibid., 120).¹⁶⁵ To that end, the Bolsheviks had to “decisively intensify their struggle against nationalism and nationalist deviation in every sector of our ideological front,” as Stalin had clearly demonstrated at the XVI party convention that “the local nationalist deviation plays directly into the hands of the interventionists” (ibid., 123).¹⁶⁶ The individual sectors of that “ideological front”

160 “Надзвичайно характеристична для тов. Скрипника постава національного питання 1923 року відбилася на цілому ряді його важливіших політичних виступів надалі й, кінцево кінцем, перетворилася не тільки в примиренство до націоналістичних ухилів у бік місцевого шовінізму, але і в прямий націоналістичний ухил од лінії нашої партії. [...] Тов. Скрипник і тоді слабував на надмірне перебільшення значення національного питання.”

161 “На червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 року, коли провадилася найгостріша боротьба з шумськізмом [sic], тов. Скрипник накинувся на мене за одну фразу про те, що для нас національна політика не є самоціль. Я змушений був свій виступ проти Шумського на цьому пленумі починати з полеміки проти тов. Скрипника і, посилаючись на Леніна й Сталіна, підкреслити підпорядковане значення національного питання перед соціальним. Про те тов. Сталін говорив на тому ж самому XII партз’їзді, коли тов. Скрипник не знайшов жодного слова проти грузинських ухилістів. Але до крайніх меж дійшли помилки тов. Скрипника уже останніх років, коли він підштовхуваний ворогами партії, обороняючи цих ворогів, зокрема Бадака, пішов у похід проти харківської організації, на чолі якої тоді стояв тов. Постишев і яка вказувала на найгрубіші помилки т. Скрипника.”

162 “[...] але і в цей період тов. Скрипник робив помилки. Центральному Комітетові і зокрема тов. Кагановичу доводилося його виправляти в питаннях правопису, коли він пробував вводити латинські літери в українську абетку. Дуже міцно доводилося поправляти т. Скрипника тому ж тов. Кагановичу і в питаннях КПЗУ і Комінтерну [sic].”

163 In fact, even in 1930 only two out of 92 elementary schools in the district of Stalino (Donetsk) were Ukrainian (Sevel’ov 1998: 103).

164 “[...] злочинний навіть для рядового члена партії [...].”

165 “Тоді ж навколо тов. Скрипника в інституті марксизму на кафедрі національного питання утворилася ціла школа, яка намагалася кананізувати [sic] тов. Скрипника й його найгрубіші помилки в національному питанні, зробити з них „нову фазу” ленінізму, ревізувати вчення Леніна і Сталіна в національному питанні. Саме тоді т. Скрипник докотився до тверджень, що нації в цілому йдуть до комунізму, що Комінтерн є організація вселюдства, докотився до прямих закликів розвивати національну свідомість. І тоді таки в Наркомосі, спираючись на розвинену тов. Скрипником „теорію” про те, що дітей, які розмовляють так званою „мішаною говіркою”, треба обов’язково українізувати,—почали проводити ту саму примусову українізацію, за яку партія свого часу зняла Шумського.”

166 “На всіх ділянках нашого ідеологічного фронту треба рішуче посилити боротьбу проти націоналізму і націоналістичних ухилів. XVI партз’їзд на доповідь тов. Сталіна ясно сказав у своїй постанові, що місцевий націоналістичний ухил безпосередньо грає на руку інтервенції.”

were “the historical front” (ibid., 120–121), “the philosophical front” (ibid., 122), “the agrarian front” (ibid., 122), and “the literary front” (ibid.).¹⁶⁷

The “linguistic front” was the focus of Popov’s concluding chapter, titled “Bolshevik Nationality Policy: A Powerful Means of Strengthening Soviet Ukraine as an Inseparable Part of the USSR” (ibid., 123–126).¹⁶⁸ According to Popov, “the question of language and orthography had assumed particularly great significance in the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and the Ukrainian nationalist deviation” (ibid., 123).¹⁶⁹

The bourgeois nationalists, primarily from among Western Ukrainian emigrants, have engaged in extensive activities that have led to the corruption of the Ukrainian language and terminology in order to alienate Ukrainian from Russian culture as much as possible. Regarding this very important issue, as our press has already noted, Comrade Skrypnyk was on the leash of those elements and became an instrument of their policy of separating Ukrainian culture from the center of the international proletarian revolution—Moscow.¹⁷⁰

In accordance with Bolshevik traditions, Popov briefly mentioned “great-power” chauvinism (ibid., 124),¹⁷¹ while his actual focus was on the need for a “purge” that would help “us...get rid of [Ukrainian] nationalist elements” (ibid., 124–125).¹⁷² Popov also announced that “Bolshevik Ukrainization” was to be

167 “Особливо багато помилок, антиленінських перекручень, над виправленням яких ми повинні тепер найтитульніше попрацювати – допущено на історичному фронті. [...] [122:] Візьмімо наш філософський фронт. І сюди проникла фашистсько-націоналістична контрабанда. [...] [122:] Я вже не кажу докладно про аграрний фронт. [...] Треба, товариші, посилити пильність на літературному фронті. Це в нас важливіша дільниця. Хіба демонстративне самогубство Хвилювального не є новий доказ того, як буржуазно-націоналістичні впливи діяли на наших письменників. А те, що Яловий, кол. редактор „Червоного шляху” [sic, lowercase], колишній голова Вапліте, яка в свій час була створена з ініціативи Шумського опинився в лавах зрадників і дворушників,—хіба це не серйозне застереження для наших письменників, які ряд років працювали з ним і не зуміли викрити його дворушництва.”

168 “Більшовицька національна політика – могутній засіб зміцнення Радянської України, як невід’ємної частини СРСР.”

169 “Особливо великого значення в боротьбі з буржуазним націоналізмом і українським націоналістичним ухилом набуває питання про мову й правопис. Цьому питанню ЦК КП(б)У надає виняткового значення.”

170 “Буржуазні націоналісти переважно з числа західно-українських емігрантів, особливо широку роботу розгорнули над засміченням української мови й термінології, щоб максимально відірвати українську культуру від російської і в цьому важливішому питанні, як уже відзначала наша преса,—тов. Скрипник пішов на повіді у цих елементів, став знаряддям проведення їх політики відриву української культури від центра міжнародної пролетарської революції—Москви.”

171 “Одночасно треба дати найрішучішу відсіч великодержавному шовінізму, який по своєму сприймає боротьбу з українським буржуазним націоналізмом, який тлумачить цю боротьбу, як перегляд нашої політики, як ліквідацію українзації. Про це цілком своєчасно нагадав тов. Постишев на останньому пленумі харківського обкому.”

172 “Чистка партії, яка тепер розгортається в ряді найважливіших областей України, повинна допомогти нам позбутися націоналістичних елементів.”

continued in any event (ibid., 125),¹⁷³ albeit with new “cadres” (ibid., 125) and in the framework of a state that was now to become “an unshakable fortress prepared to resist any attacks by enemies from both West and East” (ibid., 126).¹⁷⁴

In a written version of his speech titled “A Summary of Nationality Policy in Ukraine and Its Impending Tasks” (Kosior 1933),¹⁷⁵ Stanisław Kosior emphasized that “we must expose and unmask before the toilers of Ukraine those vile and loathsome traitors of the Ukrainian people—Ukrainian nationalists of every stripe” (ibid., 228).¹⁷⁶ While “counterrevolutionaries with party cards in their pockets” had recently carried out their wrecking activity (ibid., 229),¹⁷⁷ Kosior called for the “international education of the masses” and the “comprehensive strengthening of the militant revolutionary unity of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the shield of the proletarian world revolution” (ibid., 238).¹⁷⁸ He emphasized that the nationalists had “not been entirely exposed and unmasked” and attacked the “kulak agents in the party” (ibid., 239).¹⁷⁹ With reference to recent party resolutions, he confirmed the new postulate that “in some republics of the Soviet Union, particularly in Ukraine...local nationalism” was, “at the given moment,” regarded as the “major threat” because it was associated with the intentions of imperialist interventionists (ibid., 239).¹⁸⁰ In conclusion, Kosior declared that “the fundamental culture in Ukraine—that is, Ukrainian culture—is now national in form and socialist in content” (ibid., 240).¹⁸¹

Pavel Postyšev elaborated on the programmatic topic “Soviet Ukraine: the Unshakable Outpost of the Great USSR” (Postyšev 1933). Despite its title, his article on “Particularities of the Contemporary Stage and the Tasks of the Struggle for Bolshevik Collection, Threshing, and Delivery of Grain” in issue 7–8

173 “Треба рішуче провадити й далі ленінську національну політику, політику більшовицької українізації, даючи найрішучішу і найнещаднішу відсіч перекрученням у національній політиці, а також ліквідаторським „наплювательським” настроям до цього питання, по цих настроях рішуче ударив на XVI з’їзді ВКП(б) вождь і вчитель нашої партії тов. Сталін.”

174 “Гостріше ніж будь-коли перед нами стоїть завдання зробити Радянський Союз неприступною фортецею, готовою відбити всякі напади ворогів і на Заході і на Сході.”

175 Kosior’s and Postyšev’s texts (see below) were published in issue 8–9 of *Červonij šljax*, which featured full-page portraits of Stanisław Kosior and Pavel Postyšev.

176 “Ми повинні виявити, викрити перед трудящими України цих мерзотних і підлих зрадників українського народу, українських націоналістів різних мастей.”

177 “Минулих років ми викрили ряд контрреволюційних організацій [...] Характеристична особливість контрреволюційної роботи, що її останнім часом провадили націоналісти, є насамперед те, що головну роль відігравали контрреволюціонери з партквитком у кишені.”

178 “Перше й основне завдання,—це інтернаціональне виховання мас, всебічне зміцнення бойової революційної єдності народів СРСР, основи світової пролетарської революції.”

179 “Націоналісти ще цілком не виявлені і не викриті. [...] Агентура куркульні в партії.”

180 “У проєкті резолюції з цього проводу [sic] ми говоримо так: „Великодержавний російський шовінізм є, як і раніш, головна небезпека в масштабі всього Радянського Союзу і всієї ВКП(б). Але це ніякою мірою не суперечить тому, що в деяких республіках СРСР, особливо на Україні в даний момент головну небезпеку являє собою місцевий український націоналізм, що змикається з імперіалістичними інтервентами”. Як бачите, товариші, це формулювання нове.”

181 “Тепер основна культура на Україні – це культура українська – національна формою, соціалістична змістом.”

of *Bil'shovyk Ukrainy* (Postyšev 1933a) is of even greater interest, for in this text Postyšev developed the notion that the major cause of agricultural problems was Ukrainian nationalism, as reflected, inter alia, in the Ukrainian language. Following a discussion of the tasks of collectivization, the need to increase productivity in the collective farms, and "class struggle...in various branches of socialist construction in Ukraine" (ibid., 5–6), Postyšev suddenly asked:

Is this whole business limited to the facts mentioned by Comrade Skrypnyk in the sphere of Ukrainian grammar and orthography? Does the main wrecking activity of the bourgeois-nationalist Petljurite elements, who established themselves and often took the lead in the Narkomos only come down to their incorrect placement of the letters "r" and "r"? Of course, letters are significant too. But these are mere details as compared to the wrecking activity carried out in the system of the Narkomos organs, which was directed toward the seduction of our youth with an ideology hostile to the proletariat. Namely, before they placed the letters "r" and "r," these wreckers in the People's Commissariat placed their people all over the system of educational agencies.¹⁸²

Postyšev declared that Skrypnyk's Galician-born secretary Erstenjuk was a spy, as was the historian Javors'kyj, who also came from Galicia. Then he attacked a certain Polons'kyj, who had dared to complain about the "break with Galician culture after Skrypnyk" (ibid., 9),¹⁸³ and concluded:

The party has always struggled and will continue its utterly implacable struggle against any Russian great-power elements. But at the same time, the party has destroyed and will further destroy any chauvinist Petljurite elements, whatever masks they may wear (ibid., 10).¹⁸⁴

Postyšev thus posited a direct link between the disaster in agriculture and linguistic problems. Ukrainian nationalists, particularly immigrants from Galicia, had infiltrated the country as foreign spies and exploited Soviet organs and functionaries for their own purposes. Their activities in the field of language

182 "Невже вся справа в тих фактах, які тов. Скрипник наводив з галузі української граматики, правопису? Хіба головне шкідництво буржуазно-націоналістичних петлюрівських елементів, які засіли і нерідко заправляли в Наркомосвіті, тільки на те й сходило, що вони неправильно розставили літери „r" і „r"? І літери, звісно, мають значення. Але це ж дрібниці, рівняючи до тієї шкідницької роботи, яку проваджено в системі органів наросвіти і яка була спрямована на обплутання нашої молоді ворожою пролетаріятові ідеологією. Адже перше, ніж розставити літери „r" і „r", ці шкідники в Наркомосі розставили своїх людей по всій системі органів освіти."

183 "Ось у промакадемії виступив якийсь Полонський, безпартійний викладач української мови і навіть голова циклової комісії з української мови. Він виступив з приводу статті, вміщеної в газеті „Комуніст", про стан на мовознавчому фронті. Цей ворожий агент так знахабнів, що з радянської трибуни він виступив з такою заявою: „Після Скрипника почався розрив з галицькою культурою. Треба боротися проти російського шовінізму, бо навіть УНДО за кордоном пише, що після Скрипника відбувається русифікація на Україні."

184 "Партія завжди боролася і далі провадитиме найнепримиреннішу боротьбу проти всяких великодержавницьких російських елементів. Але партія разом з тим громила й громитиме всякі шовіністичні, петлюрівські елементи, хоч би в які маски вони не одягалися."

planning had served only one purpose: to tear Ukraine away from Soviet Russia and make it a satellite of fascist Poland or Germany, or both.

In the same issue of *Bil'sovnyk Ukrainy*, Andriy Xvylja wrote on "Uprooting and Destroying Nationalist Roots on the Linguistic Front" (Xvylja 1933; see also *Ukrains'ka mova* 2005: 113–132).¹⁸⁵ In this text, Xvylja argued that with regard to "the Ukrainian language and its development, there ha[d] been a lack of truly Bolshevik leadership on part of the Narkomos" (ibid., 42),¹⁸⁶ for Lenin and Stalin had allegedly "taught our party that the development of Ukrainian culture should go hand in hand with the development of the culture of our fraternal Russian people" (ibid.). Xvylja referred to Stalin's letter of 26 April 1926, where Stalin had warned against Ukraine's "alienation" from the general Soviet course in the context of the Šums'kyj-Xvyl'ovyj affair. It was only because these warnings had been ignored that Ukrainian counterrevolutionaries had managed to "conceal themselves under a national form" and conduct their "significant wrecking activity" (ibid.).¹⁸⁷ Under their influence, the Ukrainian language had been directed onto "nationalist paths" with regard to terminology and syntax alike (ibid.).¹⁸⁸ It was they who had artificially created dozens of Ukrainian "equivalents" to Russian words (Xvylja placed the word "equivalents" in quotation marks), such as *письмівка vis-à-vis курсив*, *витунок vis-à-vis сектор*, *дотик vis-à-vis контакт*, *автомобілярня vis-à-vis автозавод*, *відпружник vis-à-vis буфер*, *неділка vis-à-vis атом*, etc. (ibid., 42–43). It was they, too—more precisely, the Institute for Scientific Language in 1930—who had "liquidated...a word such as *завод* [originally Russian]," which was "known to the broad masses of many millions," and "replaced" it with "the word *виробня*" only because the former was a "Russianism," while nobody cared that the latter was derived "from the Polish and Czech languages" (ibid., 43).¹⁸⁹ Xvylja added that even Skrypnyk himself had opposed "international terms" ("інтернаціональних термінів") and declared:

The process of the creation of Ukrainian scientific terminology and the orientation of the development of the Ukrainian scientific language was directed toward artificial separation from the common language of the Russian people, which is a fraternal language of Ukrainian. On the linguistic front, the

185 The Bolsheviks considered this text so important that they reprinted it in 60,000 copies as a separate pamphlet in November 1933 (*Ukrains'ka mova* 2005: 132). An earlier version was published on 29 April 1933 in the newspaper *The Communist* ("Комуніст") (*Ukrainizacija* 2003: 214).

186 "В питаннях української мови, її творення, останніми роками від НКО не було дійсно більшовицького керівництва."

187 "На мовному фронті українська контрреволюція, прикриваючись національною формою, проводила по суті велику шкідницьку роботу."

188 "Вона виявилася в тому, що останніми роками в питаннях творення української термінології, в питаннях української синтакси, — українську мову спрямовували на націоналістичні шляхи."

189 "Таке слово, як завод, відоме широким багатомільйонним масам, було ліквідовано і замінено словом "виробня". З приводу ліквідації цього слова відбулася спеціальна ухвала українського інституту наукової мови в 1930 р. [...] слово "завод" ліквідовано через те, що воно походить з російської мови. І хоч це слово замінено словом "виробня", що не є українське слово, а походить з чеської та польської мови, проте, як видно з протоколів арбітражної комісії, його ліквідовано, через те, що це слово є "русизм"."

nationalist elements are doing all they can to erect a barrier between Ukrainian Soviet culture and Russian Soviet culture and to re-direct the development of the Ukrainian language onto bourgeois nationalist paths. This has been done with the intention of educating the masses, through the use of the Ukrainian language, in a kulak and Petljurite spirit; to educate them in a spirit of hatred toward the socialist fatherland but love for Cossack romanticism, the Hetmanate, etc. In carrying out this activity, the bourgeois nationalist elements cut off the Ukrainian language from the achievements of world culture and from international technical terminology, which is, of course, an achievement of all humankind" (ibid., 43–44).¹⁹⁰

Xvylyja protested "the corruption of Ukrainian scientific terminology in physics, chemistry [*xemii!*], mathematics, natural sciences, etc." and complained that these terminologies had been transferred from the dictionaries of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences "into the textbooks of the Narkomos and into the schools," where they "crippled millions of children" and "isolated them from the generally known scientific terminology" that had been "accepted by the very life of the socialist country" (ibid., 44).¹⁹¹ According to Xvylyja, Serhij Jefremov and the SVU had initially played a central role in this process when they sought to create terminologies on an exclusively popular Ukrainian basis and thereby set back Ukrainian terminologies to the feudal Cossack period (ibid., 44–45). Moreover, as Xvylyja argued, Ukrainian dictionaries had been "stuffed with bourgeois nationalist, religious, and Black Hundred [Russian (!) nationalist and anti-Semitic] materials" in their illustrative parts (ibid., 45),¹⁹² as exemplified by the following quotations:

Muscovite protection was very costly to Ukraine.... The complete destruction of the economy.... They confuse the public and provide nothing.... God is the supreme being, the creator of the world and everything in it.... And who does not want to believe it (the Gospel)? Only the heathen and the Jew (ibid., 46).¹⁹³

190 "Процес творення української наукової термінології, скеровування розвитку української наукової мови, — було направлено по лінії штучного відриву від спільної, братньої українській мові, мови російського народу. На мовному фронті націоналістичні елементи роблять усе, щоб між українською радянською культурою та російською радянською культурою поставити бар'єр і повернути розвиток української мови на шляхи буржуазно-націоналістичні. Це робилося для того, щоб, користаючись українською мовою, виховувати маси в куркульсько-петлюрівському дусі, виховувати їх в дусі ненависті до соціалістичної батьківщини, а любови до козацької романтики, гетьманщини тощо. Ведучи таку роботу, буржуазно-націоналістичні елементи відгороджували українську мову від досягнень світової культури, від інтернаціональної технічної термінології, що є, зрозуміла річ, досягненням усього людства."

191 "Так, наприклад, ми маємо виключне засмічення української наукової термінології у фізиці, хемії (!), математиці, природознавстві тощо. А звідси, з цих словників ця термінологія йшла в підручники наркомосівські, в школи. Таким чином, мільйони дітей калічили, відривали від загальновідомої наукової термінології, прийнятої самим життям соціалістичної країни — збивали на шляхи штучного відгороджування від російської мови."

192 "Треба зазначити, що словники ці буржуазно-націоналістичні елементи оформляли буржуазно-націоналістичним, релігійним, чорносотенним літературним матеріалом."

193 "Московська протекція дорого коштувала Україні. [...] Повна руйнація господарства. [...] Плувають публіку, не даючи нічого сенько. [...] Бог це найвища істота, створитель світу і всього, що в нім. [...] А хто-ж їй (євангелії) вірити не хоче? Сам тільки поганин та жид."

Xvylja declared that in recent years, the Ukrainian language had been developed according to the ideological principles of “the former Petljurite minister, leader of the Autocephalous Church, and now Petljurite emigrant” Ivan Ohijenko or of “Ukrainian fascists” such as Dmytro Doncov (ibid., 46).¹⁹⁴ He quoted from the textbook *The Ukrainian Language in the Highest Teacher Groups* (Українська мова в найвищих групах учителів), where a certain Mykola Osypov had deplored the fact that “Russified” members of the intelligentsia were “corrupting” the language with Russian elements such as *завідуючий, слідуючий* (ibid., 47). Xvylja then referred to the monograph *Sketches of Ukrainian Syntax* in which, on the basis of a study of Ukrainian historical syntax,¹⁹⁵ Serhij Smerečyn's'kyj had criticized the use of certain syntactic constructions, such as the use of the forms of *бути* with the participle in *-но, -то* (as in *було, буде видруковано*), the excessive use of the passive voice and the expression of agency in the passive voice with the instrumental case instead of *від* + genitive case (ibid., 47–48).¹⁹⁶

Returning to the problems of Ukrainian terminology, Xvylja claimed that new terms had to be taken “from life, since millions of toiling masses create them, and every worker on the linguistic front must understand that.” Moreover, he insisted that “in all dictionaries, generally used terms must be renewed in the Ukrainian language” (ibid.),¹⁹⁷ whereby it was clear that these allegedly “generally used terms” were to be as close to Russian as possible.

In the last section of his article, Xvylja discussed the question “What Have They Done to Ukrainian Orthography?” (ibid., 49–56).¹⁹⁸ Referring to the Kharkiv Orthographic Conference of 1927, he emphasized particularly that some participants

194 “[...] проф. Іван Огієнко, бувш. петлюрівський міністр, керівник автокефальної церкви, теперішній петлюрівський емігрант [...]. Всі ці теорії — є теоріями української буржуазії, українського фашизму. Українські фашисти — Донцов та інші завжди розвивали теорії про те, що українська мова, українська культура — європейські, а тому можуть і повинні орієнтуватися в своєму розвитку на буржуазну Європу.”

195 Xvylja particularly criticized Smerečyn's'kyj for using examples not only from the Cossack chronicles but even from the *Ihor Tale* or the medieval chronicles (Xvylja 1933: 48).

196 As for the latter issue, Xvylja himself invented an intriguing, indeed comic example. He argued that according to Smerečyn's'kyj, one could not write “Звільнена Червоною армією територія,” but only “Звільнена від Червоної Армії територія”—which, however, “entirely distorts the content” (ibid., 48). (The latter means not “liberated by” but “liberated from” the Red Army.) See also the replacement of the passive voice and, in the remaining passive constructions, the replacement of the agent in the instrumental case with *від/од* and the genitive case in chapter 6.

197 “Зрозуміла річ, що мова кожного народу в СРСР живе, зростає, розвивається. Цей процес іде в країні будованого соціалізму УСРР. Це знайшло свій відбиток і в українській мові. Ростуть нові поняття, терміни. Мова українська збагачується, її, як і кожну мову, не можна взяти в берети раз встановленої термінології тих чи інших галузевих словників. Але нові слова, терміни ми повинні брати з життя, бо їх творять мільйони трудящих мас і це треба зрозуміти кожному робітникові на мовному фронті. Як висновок з цього, треба відновити в усіх словниках загальноживані терміни в українській мові. Треба відкинути увесь штучний, мертвий термінологічний матеріал, що його збудовано на основі буржуазно-націоналістичного підходу до складання української, наукової термінології. Треба витравити буржуазно-націоналістичне оформлення українських словників, треба усталити технічну термінологію, уніфікувавши її з термінологією, що існує у всьому Радянському союзі. Треба ввести радянську лексику, яка б відбивала могутній процес розвитку соціалістичного будівництва, в усі нові словники.”

198 “Що зробили з українським правописом?”

had voted for the adoption of the Latin alphabet, which, as Xvylja argued, would have “erected a barrier between the Russian and Ukrainian languages” in the interest of “Ukrainian nationalists” (ibid., 49). Xvylja then reported that Skrypnyk himself had suggested the introduction of the Latin letters *s* and *z* to render *дз* and *дж*, respectively, and declared that the Central Committee of the CP(B)U alone had blocked that measure in 1928 (ibid., 49). According to Xvylja, who forgot to mention the union-wide “Latinization campaign” of 1926 (Martin 2001: 187), the rules of the Kharkiv orthography for rendering foreign words had “alienated and isolated Ukrainian from the Russian language,” “complicated the adoption of Ukrainian orthography for millions of toilers” and thus “complicated the development of the Ukrainian language” (Xvylja 1933: 49).¹⁹⁹ Xvylja summarized the rules for the use of hard and soft *l/l'* according to the Kharkiv orthography and argued:

And, really, who needs this “ljakannja”? After all, everybody knows that the Ukrainian worker and peasant does not say “аероплян” but “аероплан”; that the Ukrainian worker and peasant does not say “плян” but “план,” not “платформа” but “платформа”; that the Ukrainian worker and peasant does not say “фльота” but “флот”; and that the Ukrainian worker and peasant does not say “льозунг” but “лозунг.”²⁰⁰

Again, Xvylja declared that all these forms that allegedly were not used had been introduced merely to alienate the Ukrainian language from the Russian (ibid.). Regarding *з* and *г*, Xvylja made the absurd statement that “of course, in the Ukrainian language the sound [instead of letter] ‘r’ is pronounced in two ways.” He added the second absurd statement that [g] was pronounced in *ланок* not because of the history of this word, but only “because the word is used among the Ukrainian masses of many millions. And that’s it” (ibid., 52).²⁰¹ On the basis of such strange assumptions, Xvylja ultimately argued that *з* alone should be used for rendering both [h] and [g] (ibid.).

Xvylja further pointed out that Skrypnyk himself, in his preface to a 1926 Ukrainian translation of Lenin’s “Two Tactics,” had warned against “deviations in two directions that occur in the making of Ukrainian orthography: the striving to use orthography to separate the Ukrainian language from the Polish or from the Russian, depending on this or that orientation of these or those representatives of

199 “Але конференція прийняла розділ про правопис чужих слів, який одриває, відштовхує українську мову од російської мови, утруднює для трудящих засвоєння українського правопису, створює великі труднощі для засвоєння його робітниками і таким чином утруднює розвиток української мови.”

200 “І, дійсно, кому потрібно оце “лякання”? Адже відомо всім, що український робітник та селянин говорить не “аероплян”, а “аероплан”. Відомо, що український робітник та селянин говорить не “плян”, а “план”, не “платформа”, а “платформа”. Відомо, що український робітник та селянин говорить не “фльота”, а “флот”. Відомо, що український робітник та селянин говорить не “льозунг”, а “лозунг”.”

201 “Зрозуміла річ, в українській мові звук “г” вимовляється двояко. Наприклад, не можна сказати “ганок”, а треба казати тільки “ганок” з твердим г. Але це не тому, що це слово заходило в тому чи іншому сторіччі до української мови, з тої чи іншої мови, а тому, що слово це так вживається в багатомільйонних українських масах. І все.”

our scholarly and social thought." Skrypnyk had thus very consciously opted for the separation of the Ukrainian language from the Russian (ibid., 53).²⁰² Following a discussion of Skrypnyk's alleged "errors" of the prerevolutionary period, Xvylja made the interesting statement that the orthographic principles adopted at a session of the editorial board of the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* in 1931 reminded him of prerevolutionary tables offering advice as to when to write *jat'* in Russian (ibid., 54);²⁰³ he thus placed all contemporary problems of Ukrainian orthography in an expressly non-Bolshevik context.

Finally, Xvylja summed up his diagnosis and outlined the necessary measures:

1. On the linguistic front, we are faced with the wrecking activity of nationalist Ukrainian elements.
2. This activity has aimed at the separation of the Ukrainian language from the Russian, at the separation of the Ukrainian language from international scholarly terminology, at the direction of the Ukrainian language and its terminology onto bourgeois nationalist paths.
3. In Ukrainian orthography, especially in its third section [on the orthography of foreign words], this separation of the Ukrainian language and its terminology from the Russian language has already been continued in orthographic form and in the adoption of foreign words.
4. The Narkomos of Ukraine has not waged any struggle against this activity but has, on the contrary, fostered it.
5. It is therefore necessary:
 - a) immediately to halt the printing of all dictionaries, b) to revise the dictionaries and the entire terminology, c) to establish the unification of technical terminology with the terminology used in the Soviet Union and in Ukraine itself, d) to inspect the cadres on the linguistic front and drive the bourgeois nationalist elements away from that front, e) to revise Ukrainian orthography, f) to change the principle governing linguistic usage in the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia*, and g) to issue a special document comprehensively addressing all these issues and fostering the total further development of Ukrainian Soviet culture on the linguistic front along truly Bolshevik paths, as Lenin has taught us, and as Comrade Stalin is teaching us (ibid., 55).²⁰⁴

202 "Таким чином, як бачимо, вже в 1926 р. перед М.Скрипником стало питання, що за допомогою українського правопису можна "відрізнати українську мову від польської або від російської мови. Залежно від тої чи іншої орієнтації, яка є у тих або інших представників нашої науково-суспільної думки". Очевидно, т. М. Скрипник стояв і на тій „орієнтації“, щоб відрізнати українську мову за допомогою українського правопису від російської мови."

203 "Таким чином, коли б ми йшли по лінії виконання настанов українського правопису в цьому пакті, нам потрібно видати реєстр, де і як писати „г“ і „а“. Це було б щось подібне до тої старої таблиці в старому російському правописі дожовтневому, було зазначено, де писати і де не писати „ять“."

204 "1. На мовному фронті ми маємо проведену націоналістичними українськими елементами шкідницьку роботу. 2. Ця робота йшла по лінії відгороджування української мови від російської мови, відгороджування української мови від інтернаціональної наукової термінології, спрямовування української мови та термінології на буржуазно-націоналістичні шляхи. 3. В українському правописі, особливо 3-й розділ, це відгороджування української мови, термінології від російської мови продовжено вже в правописній формі та при запозиченні

Xvylyja reported that the Narkomos of Ukraine had already begun the purge of all "harmful nationalist materials" ("шкідливий націоналістичний матеріял") from the terminologies and grammars, as well as from Ukrainian orthography (ibid.), and added:

In grammar, all artificial, nationalist forms that have retarded the development of the Ukrainian language for whole centuries have been removed. In so doing, the nationalist elements wanted to hold back the Ukrainian language from the tasks of socialist construction.

In Ukrainian orthography, in section III on "the orthography of foreign words," the rule on the use of softened *l* has been liquidated if it does not emerge from the nature of the language itself.

For rendering the two "r" sounds of the Ukrainian language, it has been deemed necessary to leave only the one letter "r."

Archaic forms and provincialisms have been eliminated.

Parallel forms have been eliminated. As for the "Ukrainian Orthography," corrections have been made to eliminate all artificial rules intended to direct the development of the Ukrainian language toward Polish bourgeois culture.

Moreover, the great majority of literary illustrations must be completely changed because the orthography approved by Comrade Skrypnyk includes a series of literary illustrations of a nationalist-kulak sort (ibid., 55–56).²⁰⁵

Xvylyja declared that "Comrade P. P. Postyšev" had, with all "Bolshevik forthrightness," placed the current tasks of work "on the cultural front...on a level of high principle" (ibid., 56)²⁰⁶ and added, in full accordance with the slogans of those days:

чужоземних слів. 4. Проти цієї роботи Наркомос України не вів будь-якої боротьби, а, навпаки, сприяв цьому. 5. Отже потрібно: а) припинити негайно видання всіх словників, б) переглянути словники і всю термінологію, в) провести уніфікацію технічної термінології з тою термінологією, що є в Радянському союзі і вживана й на Україні, г) переглянути кадри на мовному фронті і вигнати з цього фронту буржуазно-націоналістичні елементи, д) переглянути український правопис, є) змінити настанову щодо мовного оформлення УРЕ, ж) видати спеціального документа, який би всі ці питання всебічно охопив і забезпечив цілковитий дальший розвиток української радянської культури на мовному фронті дійсно більшовицькими шляхами, так, як вчив нас Ленін, як цьому вчить нас тов. Сталін."

205 "В граматиці ліквідовано всі штучні, націоналістичні форми, які відтягали творення української мови назад на цілі століття. Роблячи це, націоналістичні елементи хотіли відтягти розвиток української мови від завдань соціалістичного будівництва. В українському правописі в III розділі „правопису чужих слів” ліквідовано правило про вживання пом’якшеного „л”, коли це не виникає з природи самої мови. Для визначення двох звуків „л”, що має українська мова, – визнано за потрібне залишити одну літеру „л”. Ліквідовано архаїчні форми та провінціалізми. Ліквідовано паралельні форми. В „Українсьий правопис” внесено виправлення, зміни по лінії усунення всіх штучних правил, які було спрямовано на те, щоб повернути розвиток української мови в бік польської буржуазної культури. Крім того, потрібно цілковито змінити переважну більшість літературних ілюстрацій, бо в тому правописі, що його схвалив т. Скрипник, є низка літературних ілюстрацій націоналістично-куркульського гатунку."

206 "Ці завдання роботи на культурному фронті — з усією більшовицькою чіткістю, цілком правдиво поставив, підняв на велику принципову височінь тов. П.П. Постишев."

Those aberrations of nationality policy that have recently taken place in Ukraine are the consequence of lack of class vigilance, lack of merciless struggle.

This activity must be developed in every sphere, mercilessly assailing and uncovering bourgeois nationalist elements of every kind that carry on their hostile activity, sometimes concealing it with their party cards.

This activity must be carried out mercilessly while fighting against Russian and Ukrainian nationalism.

Ukrainian nationalist elements try to interpret our work on the linguistic front as “the destruction of Ukrainian culture.” We are not destroying Ukrainian culture but Ukrainian bourgeois culture. We are doing so in order to develop the construction of Ukrainian proletarian culture with even greater speed (*ibid.*).²⁰⁷

In conclusion, Xvylja offered yet another of the notorious eulogies for the “tremendous victories” of “socialist construction...under Comrade Stalin’s brilliant leadership” and promised a bright Ukrainian proletarian future following victory over the Ukrainian nationalists (*ibid.*).²⁰⁸

In the July-August issue of *Bil'shovyk Ukraïny*, Oleksandr Šlixter basically reiterated Xvylja’s statements. Most interestingly, he complained that Ukrainian chauvinists had been pleased by Skrypnyk’s alleged project of a “self-sufficient Ukrainian language.”²⁰⁹ Henceforth, Ukrainian would not be self-sufficient but would have to depend on Russian.

4.2. Achievements

According to Soviet statistics, “Ukrainian remained the predominant language” in Ukraine even after the terror of 1933/34 and the “Great Terror” of 1937/38 (on the implications of the “Great Terror” for the history of the Ukrainian language, see Ševel'ov 1989: 164–171).²¹⁰ In cities and larger towns, however, its use continually

207 “Ті викривлення національної політики, що останніми часами мали місце на Україні, – є наслідок відсутності класової пильності, відсутності нещадної боротьби. Цю роботу треба розгорнути на всіх ділянках, нещадно б'ючи, викриваючи всілякі буржуазно-націоналістичні елементи, які подекуди ведуть свою ворожу роботу, прикриваючись партійними квитками. Цю роботу потрібно вести нещадно, борючись проти російського та українського націоналізму. Нашу роботу на мовному фронті українські націоналістичні елементи намагаються витлумачити як „нищення української культури”. Ми нищимо не українську культуру, а українську буржуазну культуру. Ми робимо це для того, щоб ще швидшими темпами розгортати будівництво української пролетарської культури.”

208 “Під геніальним керівництвом тов. Сталіна ми в усіх ділянках соціалістичного будівництва досягли велетенських перемог. Під керівництвом тов. Сталіна, ми на фронті будівництва української пролетарської культури в нещадній боротьбі проти українських націоналістів — дійдемо всесвітніх історичних досягнень. Для цього потрібна дійсно більшовицька пильність, дійсно більшовицька робота.”

209 “Інтернаціональні терміни набули права громадянства в усіх мовах, в тому числі і в українській. [...] Можна уявити собі, як за такі настанови в українському мовному питанні вдячні т. Скрипникові українські шовіністи з лінгвістичного фронту що брали курс „на самодостатню українську мову”, без домішки „чужих слів”, особливо російських, що орієнтували розвиток української мови на відрив від завдань соціалістичного будівництва та диктатури пролетаріату й трудящих мас.”

210 Ševel'ov reports that this was the time when “lists of prohibited words” were first sent to all periodicals (at that time, by the style editors of *Komunist*) (Ševel'ov 1989: 167). Norms for the Ukrainian language

"went underground, except for officially sanctioned ceremonial occasions" (Ševel'ov 1989: 146).²¹¹ Under Postyšev and Stalin, more and more Ukrainophone schools became bilingual or Russophone (*ibid.*, 151). As for mere figures, the immediate changes did not appear to be very significant at first glance: according to Volodymyr Zatons'kyj, 8.7 percent of pupils studied in Russian-language schools in 1933–34, as compared to 6.9 percent in 1932–33. In major cities, however, the effect was considerably more apparent. "The number of children in Russian-language schools in grade 1 increased from 20 percent to 39 percent in Kharkiv, from 21 percent to 38 percent in Odesa, and from zero to 32 percent in Kherson" (Martin 2001: 355). On 20 April 1938, then, a decree of the CPC stipulated "the compulsory teaching of the Russian language in all Ukrainian ('non-Russian') schools beginning in the second grade, for four to five hours weekly" (Ševel'ov 1989: 149–150).²¹²

While 6,394 books were published in Ukrainian in 1930, the figures for 1933 and 1938 were 3,472 and 1,895, respectively; the percentage of Russian newspapers produced in Ukraine grew from 10.1 percent in 1933 to 22.2 percent in 1940, aside from the large number of newspapers imported from Soviet Russia (*ibid.*, 152; cf. different figures in Martin 2001: 369) and aside from the fact that quite a few "Ukrainian-language newspapers" were largely Russophone, merely bearing a Ukrainian title (Martin 2001: 369) and containing a few Ukrainian-language inserts (as is often practiced nowadays).

More important than these percentages was the fact that even those Ukrainian intellectuals who survived the terror were unable to contribute to the development of the Ukrainian language in any direction diverging from the established Russocentric ideological guidelines. As a result of the terror, "the traditional deficient structure of Ukrainian speakers was being reinstated; again, those who spoke the language were primarily peasants and the humanist intelligentsia" (*ibid.*, 153), or, rather, the survivors of both groups.

As noted by Nikolaj Popov in 1933, factory newspapers were increasingly switched from Ukrainian to Russian, although they sometimes preserved their Ukrainian titles. A director of the Odesa fine arts technical college noted that instructors increasingly "switched to Russian, fearing that otherwise they would be labeled a Ukrainian nationalist" (Martin 2001: 363), and the Italian embassy in Ukraine reported that "Russian was being increasingly used by the bureaucracy" (*ibid.*).

after the purge of Naum Kahanovyč, Andrij Xvylja, and Volodymyr Zatons'kyj remained unclear. "Teachers were confused and frightened, and students were bewildered. Not to follow the new trend was criminal, but to follow it was impossible, because of the lack of information. Instability seemed to be an inherent feature of the Ukrainian language, in contrast to Russian, which suffered no upheaval of any kind. The already damaged prestige of Ukrainian sank further" (*ibid.*).

211 Terry Martin summarizes that "1933 did not mark a strong move toward russification in Ukraine. Rather, the modest reforms in education, the theater, and the press aimed at bringing those fields in line with the consensus that had emerged elsewhere by 1932: a bilingual public sphere with a strong Russian-language presence in Ukraine's major cities" (Martin 2001: 355). Under the circumstances described by Ševel'ov, one can hardly speak of a genuinely "bilingual public sphere."

212 Previously, the teaching of Russian had begun "in the third grade, for two to four hours per week" (Ševel'ov 1989: 150).

It was now mandatory to contextualize Ukrainian affairs within the ideological framework of the “fraternity of Soviet nations,” particularly the Russian nation.²¹³ Aside from these developments, the Ukrainian language itself gradually took on a new shape. The changes extended far beyond the sphere of orthography, increasingly turning official Ukrainian into a copy of Russian.

Until 1937, the topic of Ukrainization “disappeared from public discourse” (ibid., 364). Although individual Bolshevik directives continued to address the need for a command of Ukrainian in Bolshevik institutions (ibid., 365–367), inspections of Ukrainization in Odesa, Dnipropetrovsk, and Donetsk in 1935 revealed that now “all oral work was being conducted exclusively in Russian, while written work had largely been shifted to Russian in Odesa, Donetsk, and the city of Dnipropetrovsk, though the oblast authorities in Dnipropetrovsk were still using mostly Ukrainian” (ibid., 367). Henceforth, linguistic Ukrainization was largely abandoned, while a number of decrees, issued mainly in 1935 and 1936, called for the promotion of ethnic Ukrainians to leadership positions (ibid., 365–367).

In 1937 and 1938, the “Great Terror” affected Ukraine no less severely than other parts of the Soviet Union. Ironically, when Postyšev fell victim to the purge in early 1937, he was blamed, *inter alia*, for insufficient attention to “nationality policy in Ukraine.” In the following weeks, Stanislav Kosior and Postyšev’s successor, Sergej Kudrjavcev, temporarily even returned to the slogans of linguistic Ukrainization until the inevitable mass arrests of “bourgeois nationalists” began in September 1937 (ibid., 370–371).

The centralization of the Soviet state, enshrined in the Constitution of the Soviet Union of 1937, gradually continued (ibid., 145–146).²¹⁴ In December 1937, a decree of the Organizational Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union criticized the “liquidation of Russian newspapers in republican and oblast centers of Ukraine” as “incorrect and politically erroneous” and declared that it had “eased the criminal work of bourgeois nationalism” (ibid., 372). Consequently, the decree “ordered the formation of a republican Russian-language daily with as large a circulation as *Komunist* [*Sovetskaja Ukraina* began circulation in January 1938], as well as Russian dailies in Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Odesa, and Mykolaiv” (ibid.). All of a sudden, “the Russian-language press jumped rapidly from 12.5 percent of total Ukrainian circulation in 1936 to 29.4 percent in 1938” (ibid.), again, leaving aside the masses of newspapers imported from Soviet Russia.

In June 1938, as the mandatory study of Russian was introduced in all non-Russian schools in the USSR, Nikita Xruščev declared:

Enemies of the people and bourgeois nationalists recognized the power and influence of the Russian language and culture. They knew that this was the

213 In 1935, this slogan was replaced by that of the “Friendship of Peoples,” which would thereafter serve as the ubiquitous metaphor of the new Soviet constitution (Martin 2001: 353).

214 Incidentally, the Constitution of 1937 “said nothing about language” in Ukraine, “except for the statement that ‘citizens of the Ukrainian SSR have the right to an education. This right is secured... by school education in the native language’” (Ševel’ov 1989: 148).

influence of Bolshevism, the influence of the teachings of Lenin-Stalin on the minds of the Ukrainian people, on Ukrainian workers and peasants. That is why they were rooting out the Russian language from schools. In many Ukrainian schools German, French, Polish, and other languages were studied, but not Russian.... Comrades! As of today all of the peoples will be studying the Russian language! (cited in Solchanyk 1985: 72).

5. Official Soviet Ukrainian in the course of "Ukrainization"

Owing to the lack of Ukrainian-language schooling in the Russian Empire and the brief period of Ukrainian independence after World War I, there can be little doubt that the Ukrainian language of numerous pamphlets and books, let alone private letters, diaries, etc., or unofficial oral speeches was characterized by considerable variety, especially during the early years of "Ukrainization." The intention of the following lines is to give an idea of those varieties of Ukrainian that represented the potentially best-standardized varieties but were not limited to the scholarly sphere (as, particularly, in the field of linguistics). The varieties that will now be analyzed might tentatively be designated "official Soviet Ukrainian" as encountered in journals (which potentially reflected a higher degree of elaboration than everyday newspapers, as the latter allowed less time for editing), pamphlets, and books that addressed readers, in one way or another, in the name of the Bolshevik Party itself.

The fact that the elaboration of the Ukrainian language was one of the tasks of Soviet journals is reflected in the editorial of the first issue of the "civil and political, literary and scholarly monthly" journal *Červonyj Šljax*, which particularly addressed the problem of Soviet Ukrainian language development in April 1923:

The Ukrainian language itself is a major factor in the process of the creation of a [literally: our] new life, and it requires continual perfection and broadening [or: dissemination] to meet the requirements posed by the cultural rise of the toiling masses. *"Červonyj Šljax" must carefully approach this task and mobilize [its] literary and scholarly forces for the work of molding the Ukrainian language into a powerful tool for the cultural development of the toiling masses* (Editorial 1923: 6; italics in the original; otherwise, the translation is cited from Ševel'ov 1989: 99).²¹⁵

Červonyj Šljax, *Bil'šovyk Ukrajiny*, and other journals frequently featured articles that were written in the name of Bolshevik leaders, on which the following analysis will focus. As many of these party figures did not have an active command

215 "Нарешті, сама українська мова являється величезним чинником в процесі творчості нового життя і вимагає невинного удосконалення і поширення, щоб задовольнити ті потреби, які ставить перед нею культурний підйом працюючих мас. „Червоний Шлях” повинен уважно підійти до цієї справи і мобілізувати літературні і наукові сили для праці над вивченням української мови, як могутнього знаряддя культурного розвитку працюючих мас." I do not concur with Jurij Ševel'ov's interpretation expressed in the following lines: „In such declarations, a guilt for writing in Ukrainian seems to combine whimsically with a peculiar stubbornness and pride in the undertaking" (Ševel'ov 1989: 99). On the contrary, it seems to me that the editors formulated one of the tasks of their journal quite realistically.

of Ukrainian, their contributions discussed above were obviously written almost exclusively in Russian and then translated and edited for Ukrainophone journals by others.²¹⁶ Even with regard to party leaders who had an active command of Ukrainian, it is not always clear whether their contributions were originally submitted in Ukrainian, especially if the texts were originally conceptualized as speeches for party events, which were usually held in Russian as well (because many Bolsheviks of Ukraine did not fully understand Ukrainian, let alone speak it). Moreover, it should be noted that even the language of articles originally submitted in Ukrainian was in all likelihood edited by party workers and/or by collaborators of the various newspapers or journals. There is thus no doubt that, apart from the editors of various pamphlets or book publications (here, *Budivnytstvo Ukraïny* 1929), the collaborators of Soviet periodicals contributed significantly to shaping the norms of “official Soviet Ukrainian,” which will now be discussed.

5.1. Orthography and phonology

One aspect that deserves particular emphasis is that many of the orthographic norms generally characterized today as typical of the “Kharkiv orthography” were either widespread or at least not unknown prior to 1928.

The “Kharkiv” spelling *ia*, not *ia*, was applied almost exclusively, beginning in the texts of 1923: *імперіялізму* (Editorial 1923: III), *соціялістичного* (ibid.), *соціальних* (ibid.), *соціалізму* (ibid.), *пролетаріят* (ibid., IV), *пролетаріят* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 89), *експропріаторів* (ibid.), *диференціацію* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *імперіялістичної* (ibid., 78), *ініціативи* (ibid., 82), *комісаріятів* (ibid., 87), *соціального* (Kviring 1923: 109), *матеріального* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84), *матеріальна* (ibid.), *пролетаріят* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85). After the adoption of the Kharkiv rules and prior to 1933, this spelling was of course largely preserved: *соціялістичної* (Kosior 1930: 13), *індустріалізацію* (Kosior 1930: 15), *ініціатива* (ibid., 19), *матеріальний* (Kosior 1930: 20), *соціалізм* (Skrypnyk 1931: 37), *діалектично* (ibid., 36). Serhij Pylypenko, who wrote his article in the Latin alphabet in 1923, rendered the intervocal glide as well: *dijalekty terytorijal'ni* (Pylypenko 1923: 267).

Contrary to the results of the Kharkiv conference, for the most part the consonant *l* was initially not treated as soft even in more recent Ukrainian loans from Western languages: *васалом* (Editorial 1923: III), *класових* (ibid.), *класовою* (ibid., V), *капітал* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *капіталу* (Editorial 1923: IV), *класові* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 94), *класа* (ibid., 105), *класи* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *лоїального* (ibid., 74), *планове* (ibid., 79), *Лозана* (ibid., 80), *в Філадельфії* (ibid., 84),²¹⁷ *планову* (Kviring 1923: 108), *класові* (Skrypnyk 1923: 107), *класової* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *палатальних* (Johansen 1923: 167). However, there were also some occurrences of soft *l'*: *плянү*

216 Unfortunately, Soviet publications of that period usually do not specify whether a certain text was originally written in Ukrainian or identify who translated it from Russian. In 1923, Hryhorij Hryn'ko described the situation as follows: “The state machinery from top to bottom works in the Russian language, with quite small exceptions in the staff of the People’s Commissariat of Education in the provinces and some others” (cited in Ševel'ov 1989: 96).

217 The second *l* is rendered as soft in accordance with Russian.

(Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77), *плян* (ibid., 80), *пляни* (ibid., 87), *al'favit*, *al'favitiv* (both Pylypenko 1923: 267).²¹⁸ As a result of the Kharkiv conference, forms with soft *l'* were of course used much more often: *клясові* (Ljubčenko 1930: 60), *клясову* (ibid., 61), *соціяль-демократів і соціяль-федералістів* (ibid., 59), *соціяль-угодівці* (ibid., 62), *парлямент* (ibid., 65), *за плянами* (Ljubčenko 1930: 65), *бльокувалися* (ibid.), *цьому бльоку* (ibid., 55), *деклярували* (ibid., 70), *льокаї* (ibid.), *льокайського* (ibid., 71), *соціяль-демократи* (ibid., 72), *пляни* (ibid., 72), *клясовим* (Kosior 1930: 16), *серед* [...] *кляси* (ibid., 24), *плянуння* (Skrypnyk 1931: 13); but even in otherwise carefully edited publications of the period after the Kharkiv conference, forms with *l* instead of the expected *l'* appear: *класи* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), *класи* (Šums'kyj 1929a: 107), *в клубах* (Šums'kyj 1929b: 135), *з робочою класою* (Kahanovyč 1929a: 124). The latter even applied to texts published under the name of Mykola Skrypnyk: *класи* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *платформи* (Skrypnyk 1929b: 188).

The letter *ʃ* was not used in many early texts, which may have been a result of technical problems as well: *інтелігенцію* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *делегатів* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *революційно-прогресивну ролю* (ibid., 72), *гарантій* (ibid., 74), *білогвардійських* (ibid., 76), *з Копенгагена* (ibid., 77), *Генуя* (ibid., 80), *Гаага* (ibid.), *Енгельса* (ibid., 81, 85), *прерогативи* (ibid., 83), *грунт* (ibid., 83), *агенти* (ibid., 84), *найгрунтовніші* (ibid., 86), *колегії* (ibid., 88), *в оригіналі* (Kviring 1923: 112), *пропаганди* (ibid.), *прогресивним* (sic, Skrypnyk 1923: 92), *на ґрунті* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91, 100), *губерніальних* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *делегация* (ibid.), *агрикультурні* (ibid., 84), *еміграції* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84), *в групах, групи* (Johansen 1923: 167). Serhij Pylypenko's article, however, attests that the pronunciation [g] was obviously not at all unknown: *ідеолоґічні підоснову* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *реорганізації* (ibid., 268), *пропаґаґіґу* (ibid.). After the Kharkiv Conference, *ʃ* was largely used according to its rules: *баґнетів* (Ljubčenko 1930: 61), *ґарантію* (ibid., 65), *делегация* (ibid., 69), *в еміґрації* (ibid., 71), *нелеґальну* (ibid.), *обґрунтовувати* (ibid.), *аґітаторами* (ibid.), *пропаґандистами* (ibid.), *маґнати* (ibid., 71–72), *аґенти* (ibid., 72), *ґрунтувались* (ibid.), *аґентурою* (ibid., 74), *ґрунтовні* (Kosior 1930: 13), *ґав* (genitive plural, ibid., 23), *енерґійних* (ibid., 23; from a Greek stem), *якнайенерґійніше* (ibid., 23), *ґрандіозністю* (ibid., 24), *ґрандіозні* (ibid.), *аванґарду* (ibid.), *неґативно* (Hvylyja 1930: 38), *еміґрації* (ibid., 55), *інтелігенцію* (Skrypnyk 1931: 10). Deviations are, however, not infrequent even after 1928: *інтелігенції* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *ґрунтом* (ibid., 37), *ґрунт* (Kahanovyč 1929: 45) along with *грунтом* (ibid., 42), *пропаґанду* (Šums'kyj 1929a: 107), *груп* (Kahanovyč 1929a: 123), *Білогвардійсько-українська еміґрація* (Kahanovyč 1929c: 147), *ґрандіозности* (ibid., 149), *німецькі генерали*

218 In his article devoted to the introduction of the Latin alphabet for the Ukrainian language, Mykhajlo Johansen suggested writing only *l* because Ukrainian *l* was, as he argued, close to "European middle" *l*. Moreover, Johansen argued that soft *l'* was not really pronounced in recent Western loanwords: "Адже ж наше українське „л” як найближче підходить вимовою своєю до європейського середнього „л” і викинувши ми м'якшення в „логіка, флота”, послідовно мусимо одмовитися од цієї чужої нам правописної прикмети і в інших словах, де її немає в вимові [...]" (Johansen 1923: 168). Johansen did not even mention the fact that the soft pronunciation was quite common in Western Ukraine and was apparently well known in the central and eastern Ukrainian lands in earlier times.

(Ljubčenko 1930: 62–63), *генеральних* (Ljubčenko 1930: 67). Again, deviations could even occur in texts that appeared under the name of Mykola Skrypnyk: *легальних* (Skrypnyk 1930: 22 and Skrypnyk 1930a: 20), *групи* (Skrypnyk 1930: 7; unchanged in Skrypnyk 1930a: 13), *генералам* (Skrypnyk 1930: 11; unchanged in Skrypnyk 1930a: 15), *германізацію* (Skrypnyk 1931: 47), *агроном* (*ibid.*, 10; from a Greek stem), *у [...] газети* (*ibid.*, 20).

Russian names were rendered quite inconsistently as regards the treatment of *l* and *g*. Alongside *Плеханова* (*ibid.*, 84), one finds *В. І. Ленін* (*ibid.*, 85 and elsewhere) and *Леніна* (Kviring 1923: 112). Kosior 1930 has the form *Сталінградський* (Kosior 1930: 20); Skrypnyk 1931 has *Денікінові* (Skrypnyk 1931: 6), *з Валяняном* (*ibid.*), *ленінізму* (*ibid.*, 9).²¹⁹

The use of *u* and *i* in foreign words was not well-ordered, especially in some of the earlier texts, even though there was a clear tendency toward the so-called “rule of the nine” (i.e., the rendering of foreign *i* as *и*, not *і*, after dentals, but as *і* elsewhere); see “unmarked” *політичну* (Editorial 1923: IV), *політики* (*ibid.*, V), *практичній* (*ibid.*, IV), *економіки* (*ibid.*, V), *мобілізувати* (*ibid.*, VI), *публіцистики* (*ibid.*, V), *публіцистів* (*ibid.*, VI), *популяризаторів* (*ibid.*, VI), *популяризації* (*ibid.*, V), *трибуною* (*ibid.*, V), *кардинальних* [*sic*, for *кардинальних*] (*ibid.*, 4), *соціалістичними* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *соціалістичне* (*ibid.*, 72), *політичних* (*ibid.*, 74), *демократичному*, *республіканському* (*ibid.*, 75), *марксистами* (*ibid.*, 75), *Міністра Директорії* (*ibid.*, 77), *на принципі* (*ibid.*), *Соціалістичними Республіками* (*ibid.*, 78), *капіталістичного* (*ibid.*), *приватного* (*ibid.*), *раціонально* (*ibid.*), *Республік* (*ibid.*, 80), *політика* (*ibid.*, 81), *фетишем* (*ibid.*), *асимілювала* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *шовіністом* (Kviring 1923: 109), *ветеринарії* (*ibid.*, 112), *деспотизм* (Šums'kyj 1923: 93), *латинське*, *латиницею* (Johansen 1923: 167), *транскрипція* (*ibid.*) and *пропозиція* (Johansen 1923: 167), *італійські капіталісти* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *кваліфікований* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *диявольський* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84), etc., alongside *економічного* (Editorial 1923: IV), *економічні* (*ibid.*), *капіталістичних* (*ibid.*, V), *республіками* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *економічних* (*ibid.*, 74), *принципових* (*ibid.*), *принцип* (*ibid.*, 76), *соціалістів* (*ibid.*, 75), *економічної* (*ibid.*, 77), *економічного* (*ibid.*), *привілейованих* (*ibid.*), *буржуазно-цівільне* (*ibid.*), *принципом* (*ibid.*), *стратегічним* (*ibid.*, 81), *стратегічний* (*ibid.*), *цітатами* (*ibid.*, 85), *цитованого* (*ibid.*), *принципи* (*ibid.*, 88), *дисциплін* (genitive plural; Kviring 1923: 109), *медицини* (*ibid.*, 112), *медицину* (*ibid.*), *цівілізований* (Šums'kyj 1923: 93), *принцип* (Želexivs'kyj 1923), *економічної* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *етимологічний* (*ibid.*, 168). Pylypenko's article has *політичних* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *latyns'kyj* (*ibid.*), *do dylemy* (*ibid.*, 268), *transkrypcijeju* (*ibid.*), with all forms in accordance with the rule of the nine. After the Kharkiv conference, the rule of the nine applied almost exclusively as in Modern Standard Ukrainian (including its exceptions): *активних* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *депусифікувати* (*ibid.*, 14), *до російської культури* (*ibid.*), *примітивно* (*ibid.*), *Економіка* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *Економічний* (*ibid.*), *об'єктивним* (*ibid.*), *садизму* (Šums'kyj 1929b: 135), *проституйованої* (Ljubčenko 1930: 69). Sometimes,

219 Ljubčenko has the surprising form *Ефремова* (Ljubčenko 1929: 130).

however, divergent forms occurred: *академика Ефремова* (Ljubčenko 1929: 130), *академиком* (Ljubčenko 1929: 131), *привилейованого* (Ljubčenko 1930: 73).

The form *євро-* was common in earlier publications: *європейського* (Editorial 1923: IV), *європейської* (ibid., V), *Європи* (ibid.), *європейських* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73). After the Kharkiv conference, the form *євро-* occurred: *європейської* (Kahanovyč 1929c: 145).

Several individual Western loans appeared in their “western” shape prior to the Kharkiv conference. In one of the first articles in *Červonuj Šljax*, the word *хемія*, not *хімія*, was used in the title of the article “Сучасні завдання хемії” (Тумофijiv 1923). After the Kharkiv conference, the relevant forms were usually used in accordance with its rules: *на катедрі* [not: *кафедрі*] *національного питання УИМА* (Skrypnyk 1931: 43), *теза Кавтського* [not: *Каутського*] (Skrypnyk 1931: 47), *ор циркові клоуни* [not: *клоуни*] (Ljubčenko 1930: 70).

The apostrophe was used quite inconsistently in several texts (especially within roots): *п'ять* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 88), *п'ятьох* (ibid.), *суб'єктом* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *п'яте* (ibid., 80), *обов'язком* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *обов'язки* (ibid.), *розв'язував* (Editorial 1923: III), *розв'язання* [sic] (ibid., IV), *розв'язанням* (IV), but *зв'язки* (ibid.); *розв'язання* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *розв'язання* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72, 75), *розв'язаним* (ibid.), *розв'язання* (ibid., 87), *розв'язується* (ibid.), *в зв'язку* (ibid., 76), *зв'язку* (ibid., 87), *alongside з'язку* [sic] (ibid.). Even texts of the years after the Kharkiv conference featured some inconsistencies: *обов'язків* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29) alongside *зв'язки* (ibid.), *розв'язання* (Kahanovyč 1929: 41), Pylypenko used no apostrophe (or equivalent sign) in his transliteration: *rozv'jazannja* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *rozv'jazaty* (ibid.), *rozv'jazana* (ibid., 268).

In the documents of the early Ukrainization period, only forms of the type *инший* (with *и-*) occurred: *инакше* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *инша* (ibid.), *й т. ин.* (ibid.), *инколи* (ibid.), *в иншому напрямі* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *в инших* (ibid., 71), *инколи* (ibid., 73), *инакше кажучи* (ibid., 81), *инших* (Kviring 1923: 108), *инша* (ibid., 109), *инше* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *і таке инше* (Johansen 1923: 168), etc. Serhij Pylypenko and Mychajlo Johansen, who wrote Ukrainian in Latin transliteration, confirmed the phonetic substance behind this spelling: *z ynšyту* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *miž ynšyт* (ibid., 268), *tak або ynak* (ibid.), *ēnši* (Johansen 1923: 168). After the Kharkiv conference, forms of the type *інший* were used: *і т. инш.* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13, 14), *Зерови й інші* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *та інші* (Petrovs'kyj 1929: 55), *іноді* (Kahanovyč 1929: 41), *інакше* (Ljubčenko 1930: 69), *інших* (ibid., 70), *по-іншому* (Kosior 1930: 16), *інших* (Skrypnyk 1931: 43).

Other noteworthy orthographic features were the following:

Instead of *експлуат-* (see Modern Standard Russian *эксплуат-*), the prevalent form is *експлоат-* (see Polish *eksploat-*); see *експлоатуючи* (Editorial 1923: IV), *експлоатації* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *експлоатує* (ibid.), *експлоатуючих* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77), *експлоататора* (ibid., 78), *експлоатацію* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85).

Occasionally, the spelling *ц* occurred where Modern Standard Ukrainian has etymologizing *тс*: *розвиток багачтв країни* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71) alongside *багатства* (ibid., 74), *багатств* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *шляхецькі* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a:

83) alongside *шляхетсько-буржуазна Польща* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85). In his article of 1923, Serhij Pylypenko used *bahactva* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), *bahactvamy* (ibid.). This spelling is quite frequently encountered in earlier Ukrainian texts, cf. Polish *bogactwo*, *szlachecki*. Rakovs'kyj 1923a has *замісць* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 78, 83), which is recorded in this spelling in Borys Hrinčenko's dictionary. Consonant clusters *-нтст-*, *-ндц-*, etc. were quite often rendered in a simplified way: *ірланиців* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *голанські* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 85), *студентства* (Kviring 1923: 109), *студентством* (ibid.). Several texts of the Ukrainization period use the spelling form *маштаб*: *маштабі* (Kahanovych 1929c: 151).

The form *керовник* instead of *керівник* prevailed in the earlier years: *керовники* (ibid., IV), *керовництвом* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *керовництва* (ibid., 80). Alongside, one finds *духівництвом* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 83). Even after the Kharkiv conference, the forms with *o* and *i* co-occurred (often even within the same texts or even within the same sentence): *Це керовництво є нашим обов'язком, обов'язком керівників України і його не перекладеш на плечі союзу* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *партійним керівництвом* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *без керовництва* (ibid.), *керівники* (ibid.), *керівників* (Ljubčenko 1930: 59), *керівні кадри СБУ* (ibid.). Other forms occasionally lacked the *i < o* change as well: *торговля* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *вироб* (Šums'kyj 1923: 101), *всіх українських кол робітників* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *привод* (Kahanovych 1929: 42), *правильний підход в справі українізації* (Hvylja 1929: 129), *національні островки* (Skrypnyk 1931: 45). On the other hand, *i < o* occurred as opposed to Modern Standard Ukrainian in *собірність* (Ljubčenko 1930: 67) or *перелім* (Skrypnyk 1931: 19) for *перелом* or *перелам*.

The forms *від-* and *від* with the prothetic consonant and *i < o* prevailed beginning in the early years; see *відріжняється від усіх до свого часу бутих революцій* (Editorial 1923: III), etc., but *од-* and, less often, *од*, also occurred quite often: *період одвертої озброєної боротьби* (Editorial 1923: III), *одсіч* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 81), *одвічним ворогом* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *odvertij lyst* (Pylypenko 1923: 267, 268), *одногоживання* (ibid., 268), *одмовитись* (Johansen 1923: 167), *одбити* (Johansen 1923: 168), *одкинута* (Kahanovych 1929: 42), *оддавав* (Ljubčenko 1930: 70), *відкрито-реставраторську програму* (ibid., 73), *одразу* (Kosior 1930: 16), *давати рішучу одсіч* (ibid., 20); *pidryv od najbil'shoj v teperišnij čas i najblyžchoj do Ukrajinu v usix відношеннях Radjans'koj Respubliki* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), *німецькі генерали прогнали їх од влади* (Ljubčenko 1930: 62–63), *на три дні пізніш од договору* (ibid., 69), *Ленінова настанова цілковито відрізнялась од інших настанов* (Skrypnyk 1931: 15).

The first issues of *Červonij Šljah* used *i* instead of *u* in *кріпавий* (Editorial 1923: III), *В [...] кривавій [...] боротьбі* (Šums'kyj 1923: 110); *збирають* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 88), *вибираються* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *вибирається* (ibid.), *спірається* (ibid., 77), *збираємось* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *піднімає* (Editorial 1923: III), as well as in *узімку* (ibid.). Pylypenko, however, has *zynmalos'* (Pylypenko 1923: 268).

The spellings *мільйонів* (Editorial 1923: VI) or *мільйонів* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 86) of earlier texts were consistently replaced by *мільйонових* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), *мільйонних* (Kahanovych 1929: 41), *мільйони* (Kahanovych 1929c: 151), *мільйонних* (Kosior 1930: 24) after the Kharkiv conference.

Sporadically, prefixes were spelled according to the Russian model: *роспочали* (Kviring 1923: 108), *росташовано* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84), although the rules of Modern Standard Ukrainian require the preservation of voice even in front of voiceless consonants.

The epenthetic vowel occasionally appeared not as *i* as in Modern Standard Ukrainian, but as *y* in *розигрували* (Ljubčenko 1930: 70), or *o*, as in *відограло* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *відограв* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72 and elsewhere), *відограти* (Ljubčenko 1930: 69). In later publications, *i* predominated: *відіграла* (Kosior 1930: 16).

The editors of various texts often paid great attention to the rendering of Ukrainian euphony rules: see *відрізняється від усіх до цього часу бувших революцій* (Editorial 1923: III), *збільшила й піднесла* (ibid., IV), *Махнути рукою на це й сказати, що цього нема, що ті, які говорять про це – вони не інтернаціоналісти й т. ин. – неправильно й небезпечно* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *але й приєднав їх до політичного та духовного життя країни, й, викликаючи в них в [here instead of expected y] середині відповідну класову диференціацію між багатими та бідними, запалив в [here instead of expected y] самому селі класову боротьбу* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *все це йшло паралельно з розвитком капіталізму* (ibid.), *кожний свідомий робітник розумів її й вітав* (ibid., 73), *тепер, у другий період революції* (Editorial 1923: IV), *виходить у світ „Червоний Шлях“* (ibid., V), *поруч з усіма иншими назвами* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *Стара й нова Україна* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *робітники й селяне України* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *не можуть спокійно дивитись на грубе порушення його з боку польської шляхти й не можуть бути безучасними свідками галицької трагедії* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *dijalekty terytorijal'ni j profesijni* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *stvoryto rižnorodnu naukovu literaturu j zabezpečuto profesijnu školu* (ibid., 268), *А надто це стосується старих більшовиків, партійних кадрів, які за цього часу туго йшли на українізацію* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29). In a number of cases, however, most Ukrainophones would have preferred different forms: *робітничі клуби i* [instead of *й*] *селянські будинки* (ibid., V), *в* [instead of *y*] *сфері економіки, політики i* [instead of *й*] *культури* (ibid.), *відношення в середині союзу можуть змінитись в* [instead of *y*] *той бік* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71), *Але славнозвісним в* [instead of *y*] *цьому відношенні в історії людства лишається 19-ий вік* (ibid., 72); as for the period after the Kharkiv conference, see *знесилювати нас в* [instead of *y*] *боротьбі* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 36), [...] *щоб у нас в* [instead of *y*] *сучасних складних обставинах в* [instead of *y*] *партії було два табори* (ibid.), *Ви подивіться, як всі* [instead of *усі*] *ці Грушевські, Дорошкевичі, Гермайзе, Єфремови, Ніковські, Зерови й інші їм подібні [...]* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *в нас в* [instead of *y*] *величезному масштабі* (Kahanovych 1929c: 151). In the earlier texts, the name *Ukraine* was still subject to euphonic rules as well: *на Вкраїні* [sic] (Skrypnyk 1923: 92), *з точки погляду вкраїнської фонетики* (Johansen 1923: 167), *сучасного вкраїнського пропису* [sic] (ibid.), *в літературній (південно-українській) вимові* (Johansen 1923: 168), *для учня вкраїнця* (ibid.).

Many earlier texts pay little or no attention to the euphony rules that apply in sibilant clusters: see *рахуватись з* [instead of *із*] *національністю як з фактом* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *рахуючись з* [instead of *із*] *професорськими силами* (Kviring

1923: 108), etc. Others do: *разом зі зникненням самих класів* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 81), *робоче-селянська Галичина зі своїм одвічним ворогом* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83). Occasionally, euphony rules for sibilant clusters were disregarded in later texts as well: *користуючись з* [instead of *із*] *Варшави і Львова* (Ljubčenko 1930: 74).

In the earlier texts, certain forms that were widely regarded as dialectal could appear: see the forms with epenthetic *n* in Мухайло Johansen's article of 1923: *помнякшення* (Johansen 1923: 167), *помнякшеність* (ibid.), „*мнякшених*” (ibid.)²²⁰; see also *з національністю* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105) with preserved *o*.

In concluding, it should be noted that some earlier texts suffered from significant technical shortcomings, as was the case in the 1923 editorial of *Červonyj Šljax*. In several cases, full stops were missing, commas were printed not at the bottom but in the middle of the line, or italicized *i* was used instead of italicized *ï* (Editorial 1923), etc. Some articles featured strange remnants of the Russian language, such as Russian (rather than northern Ukrainian dialectal) *akan'e* in *разв'язання* (Editorial 1923: IV), *развиваются* (ibid., V), *в щоденній практичній роботі* (ibid., IV); the spelling *ненавистью* (ibid., V),²²¹ which is inapt in light of the Ukrainian pronunciation; the use of geminate consonants in *прогрессивним* (Skrypnyk 1923: 92) or *массам* (Kahanovyč 1929: 41); the morphologically oriented spelling *приказики* (ibid., 70); or the Church Slavonic spelling of the preposition in *во огні громадянської війни* (Ljubčenko 1930: 59), alongside *в огні повстань* (ibid., 61, cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *у вогні*). Some later texts occasionally feature quite interesting typographical errors as well: see *перед прелюдним* [sic] *радянським судом* (Ljubčenko 1930: 68) alongside *перед прилюдним пролетарським судом* (ibid., 73; italics in the original), as a result of the Ukrainian similarity or identity of unstressed *y* and *e*; see also *Чекаленка* (Ljubčenko 1930) for *Чикаленка* in the same text. Finally, regarding Russian (rather than northern Ukrainian dialectal) *akan'e*, the following hypercorrect forms in the earlier texts of *Červonyj Šljax* are of interest: *кординальних* [sic] *питань* (Editorials 1923: IV), *[міжнародній] капіталізм* (ibid., 80), *кардонами* (ibid., 83), *анохронізм* (Šums'kyj 1923: 92), *анохронізми* (ibid.).²²²

5.2. Morphology

The noun *Політбюро* was sometimes inflected, as in *на Політбюрі* (Kahanovyč 1929: 44), *тези Політбюра* (Šums'kyj 1929: 28), as opposed to *Промова на Політбюро ЦК КП(б)У* (Kahanovyč 1929e: 109).

In one text, the noun *майстер* was treated as a soft stem in the plural in *майстрі* (Ljubčenko 1930: 73), if this was not a mere typographical error. The form *люди* (Xvylija 1930: 55) was probably just misspelled; it co-occurred with *люди* in the same text (both forms are nominative plural; ibid., 44).

220 It is unclear why Johansen used forms both with and without *n*, at least when he wrote in the Latin alphabet (i.e., precisely in that part of his article where interference on the part of the editors was unlikely): *mjakist'* (ibid., 169), alongside *pomn'akšenn'a* (ibid.).

221 The interpretation as an archaic spelling form seems implausible.

222 The form *деспотизм* in “Східньо-мусульманський деспотизм” (Šums'kyj 1923: 93) may be a mere typographical error: see *цивілізований деспотизм* (ibid.) on the same page.

Soft-stem feminine nouns ending in zero, particularly those with the suffix *-ість* or with other stems ending with *t'* and a preceding consonant (henceforth: genitive forms of the type *-ости*), were used exclusively with the genitive ending *-и*, not *-і*, in all texts prior to 1933: *до свідомої громадської творчості* (Editorial 1923: III), *вихід активності* (ibid.), *досвід громадської активності* (ibid.), *підйом культурної творчості* (ibid., IV), *з основними питаннями сучасності* (ibid., V), *підняття державної промисловості* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71), *більше [...] самостійності* (ibid.), *в розвитку буржуазної державності* (ibid., 78), *найвищої єдності* (ibid., 81), *немає і тіни* (ibid., 85), *кількості* (Kviring 1923: 108), *від робітничо-селянської більшості* (ibid., 110), *до найвищого ступіня жорстокості* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *соціальної нерівності* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *масової малоземельності* (ibid., 84), *принцип відносності* (Žellexivs'kyj 1923), *якої він національності* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), etc. Serhij Pylypenko's article of 1923, which was written in the Latin script, had *-osty* as well: *ukrajins'koji deržavnosty* (Pylypenko 1923: 267). As for other soft feminine stems with the nominative ending Ø, *-і* prevailed compared to *-и*: *до речі* (Johansen 1923: 168); *з доповіді на Харківському загальноміському партактиві* (Kosior 1930: 13), along with *вироб заліза й стали* (Šums'kyj 1923: 101). In the nominative/accusative plural of soft stems, the situation was similar: [...] *вважали національності взагалі „зістарілими передсудами“* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 75), *про національності* (ibid.), *ті національні особливості* (ibid., 76); *реальні річі* (Šums'kyj 1923: 92), *доповіді* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *на свої плечі* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *на плечі* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), alongside *плечи керівників Союзу* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29). In the locative (or dative) case, *-і* was used alongside *-и* even in *-ості*: *в дійсності* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *дивлючись по кількості працюючого населення окремих республік* (ibid., 70), *більшості з них невідомі переговори* (Ljubčenko 1930: 66).

In the locative singular ending of soft neuter nouns, the ending *-[u]*, which was typical of Galician dialects, occurred comparatively often: *в відношенні до основних природніх багатств* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *в такому її розумінні* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *на цьому програмовому домаганні* (Skrypnyk 1930: 13). Generally, however, *-і* predominated: *В якому розумінні?* (Kosior 1930: 16), etc.

The dative singular ending *-ові* for masculine nouns, which is often regarded as typically Galician, occurred very frequently with both animate and inanimate nouns: *одному комісаріатові* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 86), *цьому листові* (Editors 1923, n.p.), *спружату процесові копuljacji тов* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *нашої запропонованої читачеві транскрипції* (Johansen 1923: 168), *руському робітникові* (Kahanovuč 1929a: 124), *через ту постійну допомогу, що її держава давала біднякові й середнякові* (Kosior 1930: 14), *українському націоналістичному таборові* (Хвylja 1930: 55), *німецькому імперіялізмові* (Ljubčenko 1930: 61), *закордонньому капіталові* (ibid., 67), *українському націоналізмові* (ibid., 75), *чужоземному капіталові* (ibid., 73). Alongside *-[u]* appeared: *Ми повинні тлумачити це пролетаріату взагалі, як керівнику революції* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), etc.

The ending *-ові* was also used in the locative singular: *в розвитку політичних та господарських форм життя* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *в розвитку буржуазної*

державности (ibid., 78), в національному партикуляризмові (ibid.), в одному пункті: успіхові даного обхідного руху (ibid., 81), на союзному урядові (ibid.), на останн'оту складові (Johansen 1923: 168), в розвиткові свого господарства (Kahanovych 1929: 41).

The nominative plural of nouns with the suffix *-ан-ин* often had the ending *-е*: see *селяне* (Editorial 1923: IV), *євреї й росіяне* (Kviring 1923: 109), along with *лужичани* (Skrypnyk 1931: 47).

The genitive plural of feminine and neutral nouns ended in *-ів* more often than in Modern Standard Ukrainian (this was widely regarded as an expressly vernacular-based feature): *визволення національностей* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *означення „віку національностей“* (ibid., 73), *окремих національностей* (ibid.), *порушення прав національних меншостей* (ibid., 75), *запалення національних пристрастей* (ibid., 84), *права національностей* (ibid., 85), *до різних галузів суспільного життя* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), alongside *точних відомостей* (Kviring 1923: 107), *націоналістів усіх мастей* (Ljubchenko 1930: 75), *національних меншостей* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *максимальних можливостей* (Kahanovych 1929: 41), etc.; з *циклу статтів* (Xvylyovyj n.y.), з *ваших тезів* (Kahanovych 1929b: 140);²²³ *відповідних знаннів* (Xvylyja 1930: 38). Another expressly vernacular based-feature is the sporadic use of the genitive plural form *день* as in *кожні 10 день* (Kosior 1930: 22).

The forms *кожний* and *кожен* co-occurred, with *кожний* apparently prevailing: *кожний журнал* (Editorial 1923: VI), *кожний з нас* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *кожний свідомий робітник* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *кожний глибокий обхідний рух* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 81), *кожний освічений українець* (Kviring 1923: 109), *кожний комуніст* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *кожний раз* (Šums'kyj 1929a: 106), alongside *кожен день* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *кожен повуй рік* (Pylypenko 1923: 268).

The long form *повинний* was occasionally used in predicative function: *пролетаріят, коли захопить владу, повинний змінити будову державного апарату* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 82), *Але цей союз повинний бути добровільним* (ibid., 85).

The third person plural possessive pronoun appeared almost exclusively in its adjectival form as *їхній*, not as *їх* (cf. Modern Standard Russian *их* as opposed to non-standard *ихний*): *знищення влади класових ворогів, їхніх організацій і передумов їхнього панування* (Editorial 1923: III), *стимулювати їхній розвиток* (ibid., V), *їхня політична рівноправність* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 85).

The locative of the reflexive possessive pronoun, which in Modern Standard Ukrainian is *своєму*, appeared in the shortened form, as in *на своєму прапорі* (Skrypnyk 1930: 13); or with *о* in the ending as in *Ця весняна революцій наповідь винесла в своєму водовороті на поверх політичного життя всі партії й групи, що зародились під льодом старого ладу* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91).

The pronoun *сам* often ended in *-и*, not *-і*, in the nominative plural: *Ці цифри, як бачите, сами за себе промовляють* (Kosior 1930: 20).

The verbal suffix was occasionally rendered as *-ова-*, not *-ива-*: *завойовань* (Ljubchenko 1930: 74), *завойовання* (ibid., 75), *згуртовання* (Kosior 1930: 18).

223 The latter form may be the result of blending with Russian *тезис, тезисов*.

The suffix of gerunds was often *-и́у* where one could have expected *-а́у*: *Не дивлючись на те, що [...] (Kviring 1923: 108), [...] мова, що можна тільки припускати сидючи не на радянській Україні, а за кордоном (Ljubčenko 1929: 131), [...] провадять більшовики українізацію, не бажаючи її, не вірючи в неї, не люблячи її то-що (Kahanovyč 1929: 41).*

The first person plural present or future ending of verbs was occasionally rendered as *-м*: *ми не плачем (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), балакатимем (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71).* The imperative of the first person plural occasionally had indicative *-е* instead of *-и* in the ending: *візьмемо, приміром, хоч би останні виступи академіка Ефремова (Ljubčenko 1929: 130), таке ж значіння, як, скажемо, в Німеччині або у Франції (Kviring 1923: 109).*

Adverbial comparative forms often appeared in the short form *-иш*, where the long form *-ише* seems preferable from a modern perspective: *з того, що раніш мав (Šums'kyj 1924: 84), потрібно більш українізації і більш енергії до українізації, ніж було раніш (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), [...] вірніш, ми розрубали ці звязки й викинули їх за кордон (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), на три дні пізніш од договору (Ljubčenko 1930: 69), хіба можна сказати щось чіткіш і ясніше? (Ljubčenko 1930: 71).*

Occasionally, verbal forms that were widely regarded as dialectal occurred: *Кожен, хто цікавиться цією справою баче, що справу українізації розв'язує, не тільки наша партія (Zatons'kyj 1929: 35); see also хотять (ibid., 37), which was however very frequent in earlier Ukrainian texts.*

Forms of the pluperfect (usually meaning 'would almost have done' or 'temporarily did,' not pluperfect in the original sense) were no rarity: *Був мент, коли працюючі маси зацікавились були цією всеукраїнською просвітою (Šums'kyj 1923: 109), Ви подивіться, як всі ці Грушевські, Дорошкевичі, Гермайзе, Ефремови, Ніковські, Зерови й інші їм подібні, що в 1919–20 роках обірвали були свої суспільні звязки з Україною, чи вірніш, ми розрубали ці звязки й викинули їх за кордон, що збанкрутували були, – як вони тепер знову відновляють ці зірвані звязки й намагаються керувати новим радянським суспільно-культурним життям (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), Універсал, що в ньому проголошено незалежність України, був виданий 22/І 1918 року, коли ціла Україна палала в огні повстань, коли Київ, наполовину були захопили робітники-арсенальці (Ljubčenko 1930: 61), Так мала була видлядати, за плянами Петлюри й українських націоналістів, „самостійна“, „незалежна“ Україна (ibid., 65), Підсудні члени СБУ [...] мусіли були плямувати Деникіна, Вранґеля (ibid., 67).*

Imperfective future tense generally tended to be more often used according to the model *робитиму* than according to the model *буду робити* (only the latter model is paralleled in Modern Standard Russian): *Ми не балакатимем тут докладно про устрій двоохпалатної системи (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71), Ми, марксисты, безперестанно підкреслюватимемо величезну революційно-прогресивну ролю, що відіграв капітал в розвиткові політичних та господарських форм життя (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), після [...] дуже довгого процесу, що тягтиметься, може, не десяток, а сотню років (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 76), Škodуватимемо за вутраченою прасежі. Bojatytemosja skladnoji reorganizaciji (Pylypenko 1923: 268), українські націоналісти*

так ретельно боронитимуть засаду [...] (Ljubčenko 1930: 71–72), ми стикаємося й ще подибуватимемо труднощі (Kosior 1930: 16), Тим то боротьба з куркулем триватиме й далі, але боротьба ця матиме інший характер (ibid., 18), etc.

In the earlier texts, present active participles occurred more frequently than in Modern Standard Ukrainian: *працюючих мас* (Editorial 1923: III), *широких працюючих мас* (ibid.), *по кількості працюючого населення* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *новий громадський лад з участю найширших мас працюючих* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *працюючі маси* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31),²²⁴ *пануюча нація* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *сприяючі умови для розвитку пролетарського руху* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *визнання повної рівноправності та впливаючого звідси права на самоозначення* (ibid., 76–77), *радянська форма держави, що виключає владу привилейованих експлуатуючих класів та спирається на диктатуру пролетаріату й працюючого селянства* (ibid., 77), *відношення між існуючими Радянськими Соціалістичними Республіками* (ibid., 78), *вони є такими ж конкуруючими організаціями* (ibid.), *в соціалістичній державі нормуючим принципом є не інтерес приватного експлоататора, а інтерес усієї робітничої класи* (ibid.), *в біжучий час* (ibid., 80), *домінуюче положення* (Kviring 1923: 110), *в жорстокій, кривавій, руйнуючій боротьбі* (Šums'kyj 1923: 110), *до відриву робітничої класи й партії від селянських мас і тієї підростаючої молоді, що є зараз в українських містах* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), etc.

Adjectivized present passive participles were occasionally used as in Russian (and in Modern Standard Ukrainian): *Невиконання його Польщею не може бути далі терпимим* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *рямці припустимого* (Ljubčenko 1929: 131).

Forms with the shortened reflexive postfix occurred relatively often, even after -в- or in front of consonants: *в ній зформувалась Радянська Україна* (Editorial 1923: III), *збираюсь* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 88), *ставитись* (ibid., 105), *рахуватись* (ibid.), деякі з них можуть зробитись хазяями всього союзного життя (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *відношення в середині союзу можуть змінитись в той бік* (ibid., 71), *всі партії й групи, що зародились під льодом старого ладу* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *Розсипавсь* (Šums'kyj 1923: 94), *се питання також не ščo dawno znymalos'* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), *Таке умотивування необхідності українізуватись* (Šums'kyj 1929: 28), *тов. Шумський розійшовсь з партією, з партійною лінією* (Kahanovyč 1929b: 140). The shortened infinitive ending occurred as well, albeit somewhat less often: *„Червоний Шлях“ мусить стать трибуною* (Editorial 1923: V), *Ця весняна революцій наповідь [...] дала їм простір схрестити свої шпаги за новий громадський лад з участю найширших мас працюючих* (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), *Таке умотивування необхідності українізуватись не могло, розуміється, запалити партію* (Šums'kyj 1929: 28), *Треба це керівництво взяти до рук партії* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29).

224 The frequently used adjectivized and substantivized *трудо́чий* only appeared with the Church Slavonic form of the (genuinely grammatical) suffix: see *в інтересах трудо́чих мас України, трудо́чих мас Союзу Радянських Республік і трудо́чих мас всього світу* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *трудо́чих УСРР* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 36), *трудо́чих мас* (Šums'kyj 1929: 28–29), *Трудо́чі Західної України* (Ljubčenko 1930: 72). Alongside it, the form with the adjectival suffix *трудо́вий* occasionally appeared, as in *українських трудо́вих мас* (ibid., IV).

The third person masculine singular personal pronoun occasionally appeared without a prothesis in oblique cases: з завоюванням їми політичної та економічної свободи (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77).

The adjectival stem *народн-* was most often treated as soft: міжнароднього (Editorial 1923: III), міжнародніх (ibid.), міжнароднього (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), народнього з'язку [sic] (ibid., 87), народнього зродовля (ibid.), etc. The stem *національн-* occasionally appears as soft in національній мент (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 84), but this may have been a typographical error. The same occasionally applies to other stems: закордонньому капіталові (Ljubčenko 1930: 67) and околних сіл (Kosior 1930: 18).

In earlier publications, the form *значіння* prevailed: величезне значіння (Editorial 1923: III), велике значіння (ibid., IV), значіння народнього Робочо-Селянського органу (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), таке ж значіння (Kviring 1923: 109), значіння революційного явища (Skrypnyk 1923: 92), значіння (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), значіння (Kahanovyc 1929c: 151), etc. In the early 1930s, *значення* began to prevail, as in виключні своїм значенням ґрунтовні, глибинні зрушення (Kosior 1930: 13).

The Galician form of the demonstrative pronoun *цей* was occasionally used in the earlier texts, as in до цього часу (Editorial 1923: III) or in *Xiba može xtos' zaperečuvaty, ščo, nakoly dlja tak zvanyx „vyščyx“ verstv suspil'stva navčatysja inonacional'nym transkrypcijam bulo zajvoju vytratoju času, tak dlja mas trudovyx se bulo b nadmirnoju roskiššu* [sic] (Pylypenko 1923: 267). Generally, however, *цей* prevailed: ці характеристичні моменти, цей загальний підйом (both ibid., IV), не відчувати цього (Editorial 1923: V), перед цю масату (Pylypenko 1923: 267), etc.

Occasionally, the use of synthetic comparative forms in superlative meaning occurred (this feature is widely regarded as a Russianism): „Червоний Шлях“ мусить стать трибуною для кращих творів мистецтва, публіцистики і серьозної популяризації науки на українській мові (ibid., V). Sporadically, even analytical superlative forms with *самий* were used: організацій, що склались з самих висококваліфікованих старих спеціалістів (Skrypnyk 1930: 27),²²⁵ although synthetic superlatives were usually used correctly: найвідповідальніші керівники (ibid., IV),²²⁶ куркуль – це найзловмисніший, найжорстокіший і непримиренний ворог бідноти, середняків (Kosior 1930: 19), від справжніх найприхованіших плянів (Ljubčenko 1930: 74).

In several cases, analytic comparative forms were used as in Russian, although synthetic forms would have been preferable from a Ukrainian perspective: при більш уважному вивченні намічених загальних союзних органів (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), підбити під себе інші, більш слабкі національності (ibid., 73), це ще більш

225 In this particular case, even the otherwise attentive editors of Skrypnyk 1930 overlooked the Russian-based superlative form: організацій, які склались із самих глибоко кваліфікованих старих фахівців (Skrypnyk 1930a: 22). Elsewhere, the editors noticed the mistake and corrected it: об'єднуючи собою людей самих різних поглядів і переконань (Skrypnyk 1930: 28) vs. об'єднуючи в собі людей найрізноманітніших поглядів та переконань (Skrypnyk 1930a: 22), під соусом самих різнородних і навіть самих протилежних „ідеологій“ (Skrypnyk 1930: 23) vs. під приправою найрізноманітніших, ба навіть найпротилежніших „ідеологій“ (Skrypnyk 1930a: 29) (see section 6.).

226 Cf. also the intriguing incorrect superlative form Ми нині проводимо лише один з основних, щоправда, найвищішальних [sic] заходів (Kosior 1930: 18).

правильне в добу появи соціалістичної держави (ibid., 85), Спілка більш яскраво й повно здійснює це право в новозмінених господарчих умовах (Kviring 1923: 107).²²⁷

5.3. Vocabulary

Most authors used forms expressly distant from Russian without any hesitation: *невпинно* (Editorial 1923: IV; Šums'kyj 1924: 85), *без упину* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *безперестанно* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *негайно* (ibid., 73), *Позаяк [було скинено владу поміщиків та капіталістів, цим самим національне питання вже здавалось остаточно розв'язаним]* (ibid., 75, see also 78),²²⁸ *служували [німецькому імперіялізмові]* (Ljubčenko 1930: 62), *[далі діло піде,] мов [по маслу]* (Kosior 1930: 16), *[Саме в цей період перед основною масою селянства стало] рубя [на селі питання про вибір шляху]* (Kosior 1930: 16), *[давати рішучу одсіч правим, що] силкуються [not: стараються]* за різними приключками зводити на нівець ліквідацію куркульських господарств (ibid., 20), *повсякчас* (ibid., 22), *[наш вплив на сільське господарство тепер без міри] дужчий, [ніж раніш]* (ibid.), *[з очищенням насіння останньої] десятиденки* (Kosior 1930: 23),²²⁹ *[тих] митців [українського слова]* (Editorial 1923: VI), *умовини* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71, 75),²³⁰ *на [...] гризні* (ibid., 75),²³¹ *одначе* (ibid., 73, 75),²³² *безробітчиною* (ibid., 78),²³³ *єдиність [політичного та господарського фронту]* (ibid., 81),²³⁴ *задля [того, щоб]* (ibid.),²³⁵ *завдовольняє* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 87),²³⁶ *тільки-йно* (Kviring 1923: 108),²³⁷ *Адже [ж наше українське „І“ як найближче підходить вимовою своєю до європейського середнього „І“]* (Johansen 1923: 168), *двохзначним [шляхом]* (Skrypnyk 1923: 94), *Ропрыкатытут'* (ibid.),²³⁸ *труднацію* (Johansen 1923: 168),²³⁹ *силоміць [... українізувати]* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14),²⁴⁰ *горлопанити* (Šums'kyj 1929a: 106),²⁴¹ *[Але й перед цією німецькою креатурою українські соціаль-угодовіці плазували]* *навколюшках* (Ljubčenko 1930: 62),²⁴² *сумліватись* (Ljubčenko 1930: 72),²⁴³ *[і про] віщо [Ільїч лише мріяв]* (Kosior 1930: 15),²⁴⁴ *нехтує [справу проведення українізації]*

227 See also *застають Радянський Союз попередженням і ще більш підготовленим* (Skrypnyk 1930: 29) vs. *застають Радянський Союз попередженням і підготовленишим* (Skrypnyk 1930a: 23) (see section 6.).

228 SUM “застар.” “жарт.”

229 SUM “розм.”

230 SUM “застар.”

231 SUM “розмовн.”

232 SUM “розмовн.”

233 No entry in SUM.

234 SUM “рідко.”

235 SUM classifies *задля* as “розмовн.”

236 No entry in SUM.

237 SUM has *іно/іно* “діал.”

238 SUM has no entry for either *поприкати* or *прикати*.

239 SUM qualifies this form as “розм.”

240 SUM qualifies this form as “розм.”

241 SUM qualifies this form as “розм.”

242 SUM (s.v. *навколюшках*) qualifies this parallel form as “розм.”

243 SUM has no entry for this form.

244 SUM records *віщо* without any stylistic remarks, but other dictionaries classify it as “розм.”

(Хвylja 1930: 38), в Япанії (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73),²⁴⁵ Япанія (Ljubčenko 1930: 75), alongside *в [...] Японії* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), [ми підносимося на] чимраз [більшу височінь] (Kosior 1930: 24). The word *перезнаки* seems to be typical of Mykola Skrypnyk.²⁴⁶ Early texts of the Ukrainization period frequently featured the form *мент: в даний мент* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71), *основний мент розвитку капіталістичного громадянства* (ibid., 78), *національний [sic] мент* (ibid., 84, 88), *Був мент, коли працюючі маси зацікавились були цією всеукраїнською просвітою* (Šums'kyj 1923: 109); in other texts, *момент* prevailed: *національний момент* (Editorial 1923: IV), *момент* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *моменти* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 81). The loan *почт-* did not yet appear as *пошт-: поштово-телеграфні* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74, see also 78), *почт* (genitive plural; ibid., 86).²⁴⁷

Many of the forms had more or less close parallels in Polish; some of them were in fact loans from Polish, and many were probably, albeit not in all cases correctly, regarded as Galician elements, e.g.: [в культурних] *стосунках* (Editorial 1923: IV),²⁴⁸ *завше* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106),²⁴⁹ *nazavše* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), *Тим то [боротьба з куркулем] триватиме [й далі, але боротьба ця матиме інший характер]* (Kosior 1930: 18),²⁵⁰ *повстанча [боротьба]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 73),²⁵¹ *поміж [містом і селом]* (Editorial 1923: IV), *поміж ними* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 69),²⁵² [... що я вважав би, як старий російський і український революціонер, за потрібне,] *аби [кожний з нас в своїй пам'ятній книжці зазначив для своєї щоденної роботи ...]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106),²⁵³ *ухвалені [на першому союзному з'їзді підвалини радянського союзного будівництва, ще підпадуть низці змін для того,] аби [вони краще відповідали вимогам робітничо-селянської держави]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71), *розгорнути [українську культуру]* (Kviring 1923: 107), *розгорне [свою роботу]* (Kahanovych 1929a: 123),²⁵⁴ [Знов] *vertajučy [do dylemy...]* (Pylypenko 1923: 268),²⁵⁵ *квадратових [not: квадратних] верстов* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 86),²⁵⁶ *позавтра [not: післязавтра]* (Kosior 1930: 17),²⁵⁷ [Робітничка класа України, в тому числі і російська її частина,] *аби [керувати цим економічним неминучим процесом, повинна зрозуміти свої історичні*

245 No entry in SUM.

246 SUM has no entry for the word. Skrypnyk published a work titled "Перезнаки творчого терену" (Kharkiv, 1930).

247 The word *цікавність* with *-n-* as in *Не без цікавности буде зазначити [...]* (Skrypnyk 1930: 14) may be a typographical error—it is not recorded in the best-known dictionaries of Ukrainian (or, as *ciekawność*, in Polish).

248 See Polish *stosunki*.

249 The form is a Polonism marked by the reflex of the third palatalization of velars, as opposed to genuinely Ukrainian *завсе*. Cf. *завжди* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73) and elsewhere.

250 Cf. Modern Standard Ukrainian *тим-то*.

251 No entry in SUM. See Polish *powstańczy*.

252 See Polish *pomiędzy*.

253 See Polish *aby*.

254 See Polish *rozgarnąć*.

255 No reflexive postfix or reflexive particle is used, as in Polish *wracać*.

256 See Polish *kwadratowy*.

257 See Polish *po-jutrze*.

завдання і оволодіти українською мовою] (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), адміністративної (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 82), адміністративними (Kosior 1930: 19), провадить (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), провадять (Kahanovych 1929: 42),²⁵⁸ „варштан” праці (Šums'kyj 1924: 84),²⁵⁹ [Галичина ... стала] тереном [для переселення без-і-малоземельного селянства з Польщі] (Šums'kyj 1924: 84),²⁶⁰ [школи будемо продовжувати українізовувати, як і досі.] Теж [пресу і т. інші.] (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13),²⁶¹ [серед російських робітників] теж (Šums'kyj 1929a: 107), чинність (Ljubčenko 1930: 72),²⁶² братерським [ствіробітництвом] (Ljubčenko 1930: 75),²⁶³ смертельний, [непримиренний наш ворог] (ibid., 17),²⁶⁴ [ЦК партії ухвалив] постанову (ibid., 18),²⁶⁵ [А] тимчасом [у нас вже були окремі факти] (Kosior 1930: 19),²⁶⁶ поліпшення (Šums'kyj 1924: 84),²⁶⁷ [навіть чи є] рація [дебатувати з цим ухильником в інших питаннях] (Skrypnyk 1931: 6),²⁶⁸ [переговори і] коншахти (Skrypnyk 1930: 17),²⁶⁹ що [далі] то [ширший стає розмах її зрадиництва, підлішою стає її робота] (Ljubčenko 1930: 68).²⁷⁰

Some other forms that were later regarded as typical Galician dialectal elements also occurred: український нарід (Skrypnyk 1930: 11, Ljubčenko 1930: 73), єврейський нарід (Skrypnyk 1931: 43), здоровля (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 87), улекиують (ibid., 82),²⁷¹ полексиуємо (Johansen 1923: 168), потрібував (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74).²⁷² Other local forms were used as well: вузькі рямці національно-буржуазної революції (Šums'kyj 1923: 91), рямці припустимого (Ljubčenko 1929: 131),²⁷³ alongside в рямках радянської системи (Kahanovych 1929: 41).²⁷⁴

In the early publications, the Galician form of the root *ріжн*-²⁷⁵ prevailed over *різн*-. see *відріжняється* (Editorial 1923: III), *станові ріжниці* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *ріжноманітніші* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *ріжні міжнародні торговельні договори*

258 See Polish *prowadzić/prorowadzać*.

259 The form is in fact a Polonism, marked primarily by -ar- < -er-, most likely also by *š* from original German *s* (which is now also *s* in this position). Modern Ukrainian has *верстан* without a genuinely Polish reflex.

260 See Polish *teren*. Skrypnyk was known for using *терен* particularly often.

261 See Polish *też*.

262 See Polish *czynność*.

263 See Polish *braterski*.

264 Russian also has *смертельный*, but it is a Polish loan. Polish *śmiertelny*, in turn, is in fact phonologically marked as a loan from Czech (in genuine Polish, it should be *śmiercielny*).

265 See Polish *postanowienie*, with a different suffix, and Russian *постановление*, which is likely to be a loan from Polish.

266 See Polish *tymczasem*.

267 See Polish *polepszenie*.

268 See Polish *racja*.

269 The word, which is common in Polish (*konszachty*, a loan from German), is not recorded in SUM.

270 See Polish *co [...], to [...]*, as opposed to Russian *чим [...], тим [...]*.

271 SUM has no entry for *лекш*- or *улекиштити*.

272 SUM “*діал.*”

273 SUM “*заст.*”

274 SUM “*діал.*”

275 See Polish *różny*.

(*ibid.*), *ріжного роду* (*ibid.*), *ріжних елементів* (*ibid.*, 86), *ріжні статуту* (*ibid.*, 88), *ріжниці* (Kviring 1923: 107), *ріжних народів* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *ріжнорідну наукову літературу* (*ibid.*, 268), *ріжниці* (Johansen 1923: 167), *з тією тільки ріжницію* (Ljubčenko 1930: 59), *збереження національних ріжниць* (Skrypnyk 1931: 39). At the turn of the 1930s, *різн-* became more frequent: *до різних галузів суспільного життя* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *різні збочення* (Skrypnyk 1931: 43), etc.

The noun *роля* appeared exclusively in this form (not as *роль*):²⁷⁶ *відіграло величезну ролю* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *грати ролю* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *підкреслюватимемо величезну революційно-прогресивну ролю* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 72), *ролю* (Ljubčenko 1930: 66), *не абияку ролю* (Kosior 1930: 16). The noun *класа*/²⁷⁷ *класа* was usually used in the feminine form: *робітничка класа* (*ibid.*, 105), *проти своєї власної робітничої класи* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *інтерес усієї робітничої класи* (*ibid.*, 78), *робітничої класи* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), *робітничої класи* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *серед робітничої класи* (Šums'kyj 1929a: 107). However, the masculine form *клас* coexisted with the feminine one even within one and the same text: *Лише радянська форма держави, що виключає владу привілейованих експлуатуючих класів* (*ibid.*, 77), *разом зі зникненням самих класів* (*ibid.*, 81). The noun *програма* often occurred in the masculine form: *в своєму програмі* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *в партійному програмі* (*ibid.*), *В першому програмі* (*ibid.*), *13-й п. партійного програму* (*ibid.*, 74–75), *комуністичний програм* (*ibid.*, 81).²⁷⁸

Forms of the type *теза* and *тезис* coexisted,²⁷⁹ but *теза/криза* prevailed: *в наших тезисах 1919 року* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77), *промисловими кризами* (*ibid.*, 78),²⁸⁰ *нові тези* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *цілі тези* (Ljubčenko 1930: 71), *теза Кавтського* (Skrypnyk 1931: 47). The nouns *аналіза* (nominative singular; *ibid.*, 33) and *[наша] прогноза* (*ibid.*, 39) were used as feminine nouns, as was *зая* (Skrypnyk 1930: 3; Skrypnyk 1930a: 13).²⁸¹

The noun *фактор* was used along with *чинник*: *фактор сучасного міжнародного життя* (Editorial 1923: III), *Нарешті, сама українська мова являється величезним чинником в процесі творчості нового життя* (Editorial 1923: VI);²⁸² *індустрія* was used along with (prevailing) *промисловість*: *оживає індустрія* (Editorial 1923: III), *нашої соціалістичної індустрії* (Kosior 1930: 13); *розвивалась промисловість та торговля* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *промисловість* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85), see also the adjective in *промисловими кризами* (*ibid.*, 78).

Relatively often, the texts feature forms with suffixes that added a colloquial note: *[Він.] очевидячки, [мав на увазі чехів та німців і обов'язкову германізацію чехів]* (Skrypnyk 1931: 47), *[Та й] слабенька [ж, нарешті, русифікація. Адже не дуже багато*

276 See Polish *rola*.

277 See Polish *klasa* as opposed to Russian *клас*.

278 See Polish *program* as opposed to Russian *программа*.

279 See Polish *teza, kryza* as opposed to Russian *тезис, кризис*.

280 Cf. *безробіття* (Šums'kyj 1924: 85) and elsewhere.

281 See Polish *analiza, prognoza, sala*, as opposed to Russian *анализ, прогноз, зал*.

282 See Polish *czynnik*, Russian *фактор*.

людей займається медициною] (Kviring 1923: 112; see also Ljubčenko 1930: 74, etc.),²⁸³ [Особисті стосунки авторів в українських радянських літературних колах] нікогисько [аж ніяк не обходять] (Editors 1923: n.p.), нічогісінько [з того не вийде] (ibid.), [рух] широченних [мас] (Ljubčenko 1930: 63), [перед судом та] широчезними [масами] (ibid., 73–74).²⁸⁴

Like Soviet Russian, Soviet Ukrainian was characterized by a plethora of abbreviations. In most cases, the Ukrainian forms were loan translations from Russian (Ševel'ov 1989: 107): *робфаки*, *комнезами*, *комсомол*, *компартію*, *профспілках* (all ibid., V), *зубвиконкомам* (dative plural, Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 87), *Наркомпочтелем* (instrumental singular, ibid.), *Зовнішторг* (ibid., 87), *Наркомат* [Чужоземних справ] (ibid., 87), *перед ЦВК'ами та Раднаркомлами* (ibid.), [національний склад шкiл] *Соцвиху* (Kviring 1923: 107), [склад шкiл] *профосвіти* (ibid., 109), на [...] *партактиві* (Kosior 1930: 13), *колоснів* (ibid., 15), *радгоснів* (ibid.), *непман* (ibid., 17), *ЦК* (ibid., 18), [збільшити] *засівплощу* (ibid., 22; alongside non-abbreviated *засівну площу*, ibid.), *споживкооперація* (ibid., 22), *ВУАН* (Skrypnyk 1931: 41), *мовне оформлення УРЕ* (ibid., 42), *УИМ* (Skrypnyk 1931: 43), etc.

The morphological treatment of some abbreviations varied in various sources or even within the same texts. A good example is *Нен/Нена* (< Нова економічна політика < Russian *Нэн 'Новая экономическая политика'*): [в *нетрах*] *Нен'у* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 19), [Згадайте, що] *НЕП* [ми запроваджували не для *непмана* та *куркуля*] (Kosior 1930: 17), [ми ніби *касуємо*] *НЕПу* (Kosior 1930: 13), [як *відповідає* це політиці] *НЕПи* (ibid.), [що *таке*] *НЕПа* (ibid., 14). New compound nouns formed according to the model of Russian were, e.g., *радіостанція*, *радіозавісу*, *радіослухачам* (Skrypnyk 1930: 4; Skrypnyk 1930a: 11).

Lexical Russianisms occurred quite frequently: *підйом* (Editorial 1923: IV, VI), [дати їм *відповідну*] *орієнтовку* (ibid., VI),²⁸⁵ *трактівка* (Šums'kyj 1929: 28–29), [Передусім, Україна, як і Росія,] *доказали*, [що історично *пролетаріят* *визрів*] (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 89), *безперервна* [повстанча *боротьба*] (ibid., 73), [ріжного] *роду* [міжнародні *конвенції*] (ibid., 74), в постановці [справи *транспорту* та справи *народного з'язку* [sic]] (ibid., 87), [така] *постановка* [питання] (Kahanovyc 1929: 41), [пройшли *націоналістичну*] *виучку* (Skrypnyk 1930: 25, as in Skrypnyk 1930a: 21), [такого] *роду* [розв'язання *питань*] (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 87), [Тут ми *маємо* *свого*] *роду* [взаємочинність] (Kosior 1930: 24), *погромищика* [отамана *Струка*] (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 77), [в *добу*] *появлення* [соціалістичної *держави*] (ibid., 85), *добавляти* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *суголосних* (Johansen 1923: 167, a loan translation of Russian *согласный*, which is itself a loan from late Church Slavonic, alongside *приголосною*, ibid.),²⁸⁶ [до] *кулацького* [коріння] (Zatons'kyj 1929: 17, alongside [Перший *корінь* – це] *куркуль*,

283 SUM records *адже* without any stylistic comments. It is very often used in many texts of the Ukrainization period.

284 SUM qualifies this form and its parallel form *широчезний* as “розм.”

285 SUM records the even “more Russian” *орієнтировка*, although the suffix *-ур-* is commonly regarded as one of the most striking Russifying elements.

286 Sic. Johansen uses *голосна* and *приголосна* in the feminine, not masculine, form.

[який трохи підживився на селі й хоче вже провести свою українізацію, щоб-то не просто Україну, але Україну] куркульську (ibid., 16), [махав] кулаками (Хвуйла 1929: 129; i.e., even with кулак 'fist' in the literal meaning), [дійсна причина] ухода [тов. Шумського з України] (Kahanovych 1929b: 140), [власний] уход [із Директорії] (Ljubchenko 1930: 64),²⁸⁷ [Кожні 10 день ми дістаємо з місць] зводки, [як готуються до весняної кампанії] (Kosior 1930: 22), [Ми тут] ловили [instead of піймали] [недозволено гав] (ibid., 23), заводчиків (Ljubchenko 1930: 69), [в цілому] ряді [околичніх сіл] (Kosior 1930: 18),²⁸⁸ [два роки] тому назад (Ljubchenko 1929: 131), [українізація провадиться нами] в силу [якоїсь-то важкої необхідности] (Kahanovych 1929: 41), [інакше за рік будем в] куди [гіршому стані] (Kosior 1930: 23, see Russian куда in this function), [документ цей] являє інтерес (Ljubchenko 1930: 63), одним словом (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74; Ljubchenko 1929: 131), відповідно цьому (Editorial 1923: V, from Russian соответственно with dative), along with відповідно з чим (Ljubchenko 1930: 59–60), згідно з основними підвалинами пролетарської держави (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 69).

The noun *хазяїн* was often used (and always spelled with *a* in the root): деякі з них можуть зробитись хазяями всього союзного життя (ibid., 70), він робився хазяїном (ibid., 74), хазяїв (Ljubchenko 1930: 59). Adjectivized *бувший* frequently occurred in the earlier texts: [відрізняється від усіх до сього часу] бувших [революцій] (Editorial 1923: III), бувшого [Військового Міністра Директорії] (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77), [з наданням] бувшим [пригніченим массам [sic] максимальних можливостей] (Kahanovych 1929: 41). Only in the later documents did *колишній* begin to predominate: колишні [члени] (Ljubchenko 1930: 59), [території] колишньої [Росії] (Ljubchenko 1930: 63).

The compound adjective *робочо-селянський/робоче-селянський*, as in *Робочо-Селянського [органу]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *робоче-селянська [Галичина]* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83) is a loan translation from Russian *рабоче-крестьянский*, which is quite inapt regarding its first constituent. The form co-occurred with the better-formed *робітничо-селянською [державою]* (Editorial 1923: V), [вони краще відповідали вимогам] *робітничо-селянської [держави]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 71).²⁸⁹

The Ukrainian loan from English *farm* appears as *фарма* as in [колгоспних, радгоспних] *фарм* (Kosior 1930: 23), see Russian *ферма*. Skrypnyk 1930, which is full of errors and Russian elements, has [державне забезпечення великої,] *фермерського [типу]* (Skrypnyk 1930: 13); the revised version has *фермерського* instead (Skrypnyk 1930a: 18).²⁹⁰

Occasionally, some rather puzzling Russianisms occurred, particularly in the earlier texts: [В цих умовах виходить у світ „Червоний Шлях“, ними] *опреділюється [його напрямок і його завдання, як витвору цього нового радянського суспільства]* (Editorial 1923: V).

287 Cf. *похід* with *i < o* in the same text (Ljubchenko 1930: 70).

288 Elsewhere, *низка* is used very frequently.

289 As is well known, the Church Slavonic form *нужда*—as used in *матеріальна нужда* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84)—was and is widespread in Ukrainian dialects; it is not a Russianism.

290 SUM records only *ферма* and its derivatives.

5.4. Syntax

The present copula *є* was used considerably more often than the zero copula, as in *Спілка Республік є тільки більш досконала форма використання права нації на самовизначення в умовах пролетарської диктатури* (Kviring 1923: 107), *українізація середньої та вищої школи є неодмінно довготривалий, поступовий процес* (ibid., 109), *та наша політика українізації є дійсна політика інтернаціоналізму* (Kahanovych 1929: 42), *Він є смертельний, непримиренний наш ворог* (Kosior 1930: 17), *злиття націй є перспектива не соціалістичного, а комуністичного суспільства* (Skrypnyk 1931: 24). Very often, the predicative noun phrase appeared in the instrumental case:²⁹¹ *цілий світ є свідком того, з якою величезною увагою працюють над практичним розв'язанням цієї справи* (Editorial 1923: IV), *за наших часів ми є свідками боротьби ірланців за повне відділення від Англії* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *Вони є такими ж конкуруючими організаціями* (ibid., 78), *Ризький договір є обопільним обов'язком* (Šums'kyj 1924: 83), *I хіба, zreštoju, ne latyns'kyj al' favit–z pevnymu vidminamy na razı toho ču unšoho prystosuvannja–je najkraščym sposobom unifikuvaty jak najskorše i jak najzručniše rys'to rižnyx narodiv?* (Pylypenko 1923: 267), *Там керівники держави й партії є в той же час керівниками російської радянської суспільності й культури* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *Це керівництво є нашим обов'язком, обов'язком керівників України і його не перекладеши на плечі союзу* (ibid.), etc.

In sentences with the zero copula, the demonstrative pronoun *це* was frequently inserted before the predicative noun phrase:²⁹² *Перший корінь – це куркуль, який трохи підживився на селі й хоче вже провести свою українізацію, цеб-то не просто Україну, але Україну куркульську* (ibid., 16), *куркуль – це найзловмисніший, найжорстокіший і непримиренний ворог бідноти, середняків* (Kosior 1930: 19), *куркуль це не просто зразковий господар на селі – це хижак, що ніякого відношення до основної маси села не має* (Kosior 1930: 20). If *це* was inserted, *є* was used more rarely: *це є протилежне нашій політиці розвитку національної формою, пролетарської змістом культури всіх народів* (Skrypnyk 1931: 45), *Українізація це є більш-менш діяльність партії та радянської влади, що нею керується, щоби до цього часу, до Жовтневої революції пригнічений і поневолений український народ, працюючі маси організувати в робітничо-селянську державність і цим самим виводити з минулого стану пригнічення і розвивати культуру, підносити її і рухатися далі шляхом соціалістичного будівництва* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31).

Otherwise, the zero copula with the nominative predicate—which is the basic syntactic model in Russian and contemporary Ukrainian—was used surprisingly rarely, as in *Вища школа іще, головним чином, школа російська* (Kviring 1923: 108). The following sentence has two parallel clauses that once use the zero copula and the nominative predicate, then the present copula *є* and the instrumental predicate: *За переписом 1926 року на Україні було 1.300.000 людей, що визначали себе громадянами України, що їх національність українська [,] але визнавали, що їх рідною мовою є мова російська* (Skrypnyk 1931: 44).

291 This syntactic model corresponds to the basic Polish model.

292 This syntactic model has equivalents in both Polish and Russian.

Elsewhere, the verb *являтися* occasionally adopted the function of a copula, as in Russian: *Нарешті, сама українська мова являється величезним чинником в процесі творчості нового життя* (Editorial 1923: VI), *Із 42 інститутів – тільки 8 являються українськими [...]* (Kviring 1923: 108).

Possessive adjectives, which had already become uncommon in Modern Standard Russian, were used without hesitation: *договір Петлюрин* (Ljubčenko 1930: 67).

In the following example, the first predicative comparative form of the adjective (*більше*) is incorrect from the Ukrainian perspective, as it is not congruent with the subject in accordance with the syntactic rules of Russian: *Чим держава більше, чим численніше її населення, чим різноманітніші її багатства, тим швидче розвивалась промисловість та торгівля, зростали продукційні сили, збільшувался прибуток капіталу* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74).

Prepositional phrases with *по* and the dative case occurred quite often (the construction is regarded as a Russianism). In some cases, the locative was used instead of the dative case,²⁹³ which did not, however, alter the fact that the use of *по* followed the Russian model: *скерували розвиток українського народу по революційному шляху* (Editorial 1923: III), *підйом по всьому господарчому і культурному фронту* (ibid., IV), *Україна із глухої провінції царської Росії стала робітничо-селянською державою, другою по розмірах і впливу*²⁹⁴ *складовою частиною сучасного радянського Союзу і значним фактором міжнародного життя* (ibid., V), *дивлячись по кількості працюючого населення окремих республік* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 70), *по населенню вона має стільки ж, скільки всі інші германські держави* (ibid., 71), *Влітку 1913 р. [...] було прийнято [sic] резолюцію по національному питанню* (ibid., 74), *[...] розвивається по загальному державному плану* (ibid., 78), *які по праву будуть членами колегій* (ibid., 88), *роботу по українзації* (Kviring 1923: 109), *по соціальному складу* (ibid., 110). The construction was sometimes avoided in the earlier publications, as in *лекції з медицини й ветеринарії* (Kviring 1923: 112), and it was increasingly avoided in later publications: *Ми зараз проводимо диференційований курс, диференціюємо завдання що до українзації* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *Так мала була видлядати, за плянами Петлюри й українських націоналістів, „самостійна“, „незалежна“ Україна* (Ljubčenko 1930: 65). Even so, quite a few examples still occurred even during the period of “functional Ukrainization”: *Тепер що до робітничої маси – до тієї робітничої маси, що або російська була по своєму походженню [...]* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *розходження по мові* (ibid.), *Треба це керівництво взяти до рук партії, а для цього треба, щоб партія стала українською по мові й культурі* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *єднання по лінії виробництва* (Kosior 1930: 15), *наступ на куркуля по всьому фронту* (Kosior 1930: 17).

Constructions with the participle in *-но, -то* governing the accusative case were frequent: *Влітку 1913 р. [...] було прийнято [sic] резолюцію по національному питанню* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *Позаяк було скинено владу поміщиків та капіталістів, цим самим національне питання вже здавалось остаточно розв'язаним*

293 In other cases, the dative and the locative cannot be distinguished owing to case syncretism.

294 *Sic.* The first noun is locative case, the second dative case.

(*ibid.*, 75), *Апарат партії мусить бути українізовано* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), *Нас інформовано відповідними органами, що її написано 1926 року* (Ljubčenko 1929: 131), *в районах суцільної колективізації, тобто в таких, де колективізовано не менше, як половину селянських господарств* (Kosior 1930: 18), *у книжки відомого Ваганяна, книжки, що визнано її тепер за явно націоналістичну, великодержавницьку, хоч її й написано комуністичною мовою* (*ibid.*, 20), etc. In some publications, (inherently neutral) forms with -ся governed the accusative case as well: *викладалося переговори українського уряду з козаками* (Ljubčenko 1930: 61), *Україну розпродувалося частинами* (*ibid.*, 67), *Але й цим не обмежується боротьбу української контрреволюції за „незалежність” України* (*ibid.*, 68), *Коли доповідь друкувалося, одержано відомості про стан колективізації на 1 лютого* (Kosior 1930: 20), *Цікаво поглянути, як українізується службовців Артемівської округи* (Хвylja 1930: 39).²⁹⁵

Predicative *за* with the accusative case was used frequently: [...] *що я вважав би, як старий російський і український революціонер, за потрібне* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *Транскрипція Пилипенкова на своє місце ставить знака „х” і для ш, ч, ж бере чеські знаки š, č, ž як і годиться, за знак помнякшення уживає апострофа* (Johansen 1923: 167), *хто пропонує примусову українізацію, той був би ідіотом, а себе я за такого не вважаю* (Šums'kyj 1929a), *А, взагалі, українізацію пролетаріату ми вважаємо за процес досить довгий* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *соціал-демократів і соціал-федералістів, партій, які були за організаторів і керівників* (Ljubčenko 1930: 59), *таку роботу не можна було визнати за невірну, хибну й шкідливу* (Skrypnyk 1931: 44), *А 200.000 громадян російської національності за свою рідну мову визнали українську* (*ibid.*, 44), *у книжки відомого Ваганяна, книжки, що визнано її тепер за явно націоналістичну, великодержавницьку, хоч її й написано комуністичною мовою* (*ibid.*, 20).²⁹⁶

Thematic *за* appeared in *коли вони говорять за українізацію* (Kahanovyc' 1929: 41–42), *ми говоримо не лише за Москву, ми говоримо також за неокласиків* (*ibid.*, 53).²⁹⁷

Also, temporal *за* with the accusative or genitive was broadly used: *за наших часів ми є свідками боротьби ірланців за повне відділення від Англії* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 73), *Ми можемо сказати, що за роки Радянської влади в ділянці закріплення й розвитку української культури зроблено дуже багато* (Kviring 1923: 107), *А надто це стосується старих більшовиків, партійних кадрів, які за цього часу туго йшли на українізацію* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *Тов. Шумський не хотів бачити тих найсерйозніших досягнень, яких ми досягли за останні роки в справі українізації* (Kahanovyc' 1929c: 156), see also *Яка ж може бути, за таких завдань, – а тільки такі завдання і стоять перед українськими націоналістами, – інша програма?* (Ljubčenko 1930: 75), *те, чого ще не було у нас за Львча* (Kosior 1930: 15), *за наших обставин* (Kosior 1930: 17), *тільки за умови явних шансів* (Ljubčenko 1930: 70) (cf. Russian *под условием*), *Саме лише у поєднанні з найширшою організацією бідноти та наймитства, за згуртовання бідняцько-середняцьких мас на основі колективізації,*

295 Both constructions are also typical of Polish; the latter (with -ся) is not usually accepted in Modern Standard Ukrainian.

296 Predicative *за* is widely used in Polish as well; it is much less common in Russian (where it is most likely a loan from Polish, Ukrainian, and Belarusian; see Moser 1998).

297 The construction is not common in Modern Standard Polish or Modern Standard Russian.

потрібні адміністративні заходи можуть дати успішне розв'язання поставлених від партії завдань про соціалістичну перебудову села та ліквідації куркульства (ibid., 18), Зближення й злиття націй за доби соціалізму (Skrypnyk 1931: n.p. [book title]). The compound prepositions *за часу/за часів* and *за час/за часи* co-occurred: *за часу Першого Інтернаціоналу* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 75), *за часу 8-го Партійного З'їзду* (ibid., 76), *за час буяння австро-пруської війни* (ibid., 75), *за час та після імперіалістичної війни* (ibid., 78), *за часів найбільшого лементу* (Ljubčenko 1930: 63).²⁹⁸

Temporal adverbials were also often expressed in the instrumental or genitive case where Russian uses other constructions: *Ми останнім роком ці зразки утворили у вигляді колгоспів, машиновотракторних станцій, радгоспів, під які ми підвели вже міцну технічну базу* (Kosior 1930: 15), *останнього часу ми, безперечно, маємо, [commas sic] серйозне зрушення* (ibid., 20).

Comparative forms of the adjective were often used in connection with *за*, see also *більше за це* (Ljubčenko 1930: 69), *їй легше за все розуміли* (ibid., 71); with *від*, *наше громадське господарство багато краще й вище від куркульського [sic] господарства* (Kosior 1930: 16),²⁹⁹ or with *як*: *На цей час вже було колективізовано понад 2 200.000 селянських господарств, що охоплюють більш як 14.500.000 га землі* (Kosior 1930: 20). None of these forms was typical of Modern Standard Russian.

Most texts had a strong tendency to use predominantly relative clauses with *що*. This type of relative clause is regarded as the one that is most widespread in the vernacular; it is not typical of either Modern Standard Polish or Modern Standard Russian (though parallel constructions are widespread in dialects). See the following examples: *Револуція [...] створила численні кола тих, що прагнуть широкого онайомлення з основними питаннями сучасності* (Editorial 1923: VI), *Кінець 1922 року відзначився в історії Радянських Республік переглядом відносин, що існували до того часу поміж ними* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 69), *Ми, марксистки, безперестанно підкреслюватимемо величезну революційно-прогресивну роль, що відіграв капітал в розвиткові політичних та господарських форм життя* (ibid., 72), *до відриву робітничої класи й партії від селянських мас і тієї підростаючої молоді, що є зараз в українських містах* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 13), *дерусифікувати той пролетаріят, що звик до російської культури* (ibid., 14), *Ви подивіться, як всі ці Грушевські, Дорошкевичі, Гермайзе, Єфремови, Ніковські, Зерови й інші їм подібні, що в 1919–20 роках обірвали були свої суспільні звязки з Україною, чи вірніш, ми розрубали ці звязки й викинули їх за кордон, що збанкрутували були, – як вони тепер знову відновляють ці зірвані звязки й намагаються керувати новим радянським суспільно-культурним життям* (Šums'kyj 1929: 29), *у вас немає тих попередніх помилок, що ви їх робили* (Kahanovyc 1929: 53), *Цю єдність фронту, що її були продиктували клясові інтереси руської і української контрреволюції* (Ljubčenko 1930: 60), *Універсал, що в ньому проголошено незалежність України* (Ljubčenko 1930: 61), *через ту постійну допомогу, що її держава давала біднякові й середнякові* (Kosior 1930: 14).

298 All temporal constructions with *за* are paralleled by Polish.

299 This construction is typical of Modern Standard Polish.

In both earlier and later texts, relative clauses with *який* and *котрий* are encountered as well, but the former is used much less frequently than in the contemporary language: *відчит про ту роботу, якою я керував з доручення партії протягом мало не п'ятьох років* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 88), *Ми останнім роком ці зразки утворили у вигляді колгоспів, машиновотракторних станцій, радгоспів, під які ми підвели вже міцну технічну базу* (Kosior 1930: 15), *До будування „Червоного Шляху“ закликає редакція тих митців українського слова, публіцистів, громадських діячів і популяризаторів науки, тих читачів, котрі хочуть і здатні йти по червоному шляху радянського культурного будівництва* (Editorial 1923: VI), *Галичина таким чином стала тереном для переселення без-і-малоземельного селянства з Польщі, котре своєю масою було грізне для поміщицького стану посідання в центральній Польщі* (Šums'kyj 1924: 84).

Some authors used the conjunction *яко*, which is now regarded as archaic,³⁰⁰ e.g.: *Револуція не скасувала ані мови, ані побутові, господарські та інші риси, ані націю, яко продукт певного історичного розвитку* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 76), *він бо до краю викриває українських есдеків, есерів і есефів, яко спільників білих генералів, оборонців того буржуазного ладу, що гинув* (Ljubčenko 1930: 61). In other cases, *як* and *яко* are not distinguished even in those texts that occasionally do so (cf. here the examples from Ljubčenko 1930): *зформувалась Радянська Україна, як самостійна складова частина Радянського Союзу, і як фактор сучасного міжнародного життя* (Editorial 1923: III), *я вважав би, як старий російський і український революціонер, за потрібне, аби кожний з нас в своїй пам'ятній книжці зазначив для своєї щоденної роботи [...]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 106), *[...] виключити із складу Директорії Винниченка, як непримиреного* (Ljubčenko 1930: 65). At the turn of the 1930s, the use of *яко* increasingly faded away: *Нам, як партії, треба знищувати такі явища* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 36), *Про масову колективізацію, ліквідацію куркуля як кляси і чергові завдання партії* (Kosior 1930).

The genitive case of negation tends to be used considerably more frequently than in contemporary Modern Standard Ukrainian, e.g.: *І лише засліпений класовою ненавистю [sic] ворог може не бачити и [sic] не відчувати цього* (Editorial 1923: V), *Російський робітник не відчував національного гніту* (Rakovs'kyj 1923: 105), *рахуватись з національністю як з фактом, який підлягає аналізу, але якого, як факт, не можна відкидати* (ibid.), *Українські націоналісти ніколи не ховали свого пляну* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 77), *Ці союзи не можуть знищити існуючого антагонізму* (ibid., 78), *Щоб не згромаджувати нашої статті цитатами [...]* (ibid., 85), *ми не повинні забувати тієї науки, що дають нам наші вчителі* (ibid., 86), *Року ту не тајето solidnyx velukyx naukovykh prac' [...]* (Pylypenko 1923: 268), *він не зможе мати щільної змички з селом, цілком щільної змички з селом* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *пролетаріят український, в більшості, зараз не вживає української мови, не розуміє української культури, не прикладає безпосередньо руку до її будування* (Zatons'kyj 1929: 14), *не буде провадитись ніякої примусової українізації що до російської частини робітничої класи* (Skrypnyk 1929: 31), *Буржуазія не може не бачити всієї грандіозності будівництва української державности* (Kahanovych 1929c: 149), *Тов. Шумський*

300 SUM classifies *яко* as “заст.” Polish also distinguishes *jak* and *jako*, while Russian uses only *как*.

не хотів бачити тих найсерйозніших досягнень, яких ми досягли за останні роки в справі українізації (Kahanovych 1929c: 156), Інакше не можна тлумачити § 3-го Варшавського договору [...] (Ljubchenko 1930: 69), не треба утворювати собі ілюзій (Kosior 1930: 16).

In some publications, the agent in passive constructions was expressed with *od/vid* and the genitive case, following the advice of some linguists of that time: *Документ, підписаний 30-го листопада 1917 року від голови генерального секретаріату, В. Винниченка, де викладалося переговори українського уряду з козаками* (Ljubchenko 1930: 61), *засуджені од усієї радянської суспільности та підтримувані тільки лементуванням* (ibid., 74).

The passive voice was used comparatively often despite the advice of most Ukrainian linguists of the time, who tended to regard it as too bookish for Ukrainian: *В першому програмі, що склала собі РСДРП і який затвержений другим партійним з'їздом в серпні 1903 року, передбачалось [...]* (Rakovs'kyj 1923a: 74), *українізація провадиться нами в силу якоїсь-то важкої необхідности* (Kahanovych 1929: 41), etc.

In general, the syntactic arrangement of the analyzed texts was quite complex, as is evident from the quoted examples. In the leading publications of the "Ukrainization" period, the Ukrainian language, which had been denounced as a mere "peasant language," quickly turned out to be a well-elaborated medium for political propaganda in the highest spheres.

6. Creating good standard official Ukrainian in 1930

The remarkable quality of official Ukrainian was of course the result of considerable work. While extensive searches in Ukrainian archives might reveal a plethora of intriguing materials reflecting the process of editing the Ukrainian language during the period of "Ukrainization," quite interesting findings can be made even without such archival sources. In particular, two extraordinary publications of 1930 give an excellent impression of editorial measures that are quite revealing even beyond this individual instance. Both publications were translations of Mykola Skrypnyk's article on the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine" (SVU), which originally appeared in Russian on 20 April 1930 in Moscow, in *Kommunističeskij Internacional* (Skrypnyk 1930b). Shortly after the publication of the original—it is not clear when precisely—a first translation into Ukrainian was published as a separate pamphlet (no place of publication was indicated). The pamphlet was identified as a "reprint," but it was in fact a translation of the Russian article and hardly a reprint of any previous edition. This text abounded with errors. Many of them were quite banal technical or typing errors; others were of much greater interest, particularly regarding the closeness of the translation to the Kharkiv orthography reform of 1928 and its relation to the Russian language of the original text. As early as 30 April 1930, a second Ukrainian translation of Skrypnyk's text was published in *Bil'shovyk Ukrainy*. It is clearly apparent that the translator(s) of this version used the earlier translation and edited its language quite carefully (Skrypnyk 1930a). The following table briefly sums up the most significant changes, many of which interestingly demonstrate which linguistic elements the editors regarded as characteristic of proper Ukrainian and which they

did not;³⁰¹ some isolated changes would perhaps have been unnecessary from a contemporary point of view:

Orthography and phonology

Dashes: контрреволюційних [12: контр-революційних] шляхів (4).

Obvious spelling mistakes: ледви [11: ледве] (3), нашою відповіддю [відповіддю] (31).

Phonetically oriented spellings: багатцтвами [!] [15: багатствами] (12), у великому масштабі [24: великим масштабом] (30), серед студинства [14: студентства] (9), в масі студинства [21: студентів] (25).

Mistakes abetted by Russian interference: процес [11: процес] в справі СВУ (3), з боку Польщі і [14: Польщі й] Німеччини (11), на откупіві [sic] [12: на відкупі] (7), Ефремов [13: Єфремов] (7), ілюзії [15: ілюзії] (11), показником [18: показчиком] (17), роботу [20: роботу] (22), работа [23: роботу]³⁰² (30).

[o] or [e] after sibilants or [j]: в своєму [13: своєму] складі (8), в боєву [21: бойову] [...] організацію (25), боєвих [22: бойових] націоналізмів (28), ворожо [17: вороже] діяли (17).

Different reflexes of old liquid groups: Стержем [15: Стрижем] (12), проблесків [14: проблисків] (10).

Conservative spelling variants: десятиріччями [11: десятиріччями] (4), нігде [12: ніде] (5), нігде [22: ніде] (27), etc.

ія, ію vs. іа, іу: пролетаріату [15: пролетаріату] (11), віадукт [18: віадук [sic]] (18), „Опіум [20: опіум] народів“ (22).

I-I' in foreign words: планові [17: плянові] (17), плани [18: пляни] (18), парламенту [16: парляменту] (13), блок [15: бльоку], колонію [15: колонію] (11), колоніального [15: колоніальної] (11), соціал-фашистської [11: соціал-фашистської] (3), бухгалтерія [17: бухгалтерія] (17). From English: Макдональда [20: Макдоналда] (22).

Use of r:³⁰³ інтелегенції [sic] [11: інтелігенції] (3), ґрунт [13: ґрунт] (8), безґрунтовою [12: безґрунтовою] (6), аграрна [15: аграрну] (13), агрономів [22: агрономів] (27), емігрувала [13: емігрувала] (7), еміграції [13: еміграції] (8), білогвардійщини [14: білогвардійщини] (10), пропаганду [15: пропаганду] (11), агітаційної [20: агітаційної] (22), агентів [17: агентів] (17), пропагандистів-агітаторів [21: пропагандистів-агітаторів] (25), на [...] конгресах [16: конгресам] (14), енергією [20: енергією] (22), до Ліги [19: Ліги] Націй (20), металургії [22: металургії] (27).

Euphony: хто раніш йшов [12: ішов] за ними (4), господарства і [11: й] культури (4), письменники і [11: й] філологи, кооператори і [11: й] лікарі

301 The quotations are from Skrypnyk 1930. The amendments are given in brackets.

302 Here and in similar instances, the varying case forms result from a modified syntactic or, elsewhere, lexical context.

303 The letter *r* is not used at all in Skrypnyk 1930!

(4), через радіохвилі закликають всіх [12: усіх] (4), як заявляють всі [14: усі] члени СБУ (10), вимело всі [11: усі] відомості (3), індивідуальних вбивств [22: індивідуальних убивств] (27), і з того часу працював в [13: у] Всеукраїнській Академії [sic] [13: Академії] Наук (8), Рекрутувалась вона переважно з [20: із] студентів вищих учбових закладів [20: вищих навчальних закладів] (22), що [22: які] складались з [22: із] самих висококваліфікованих [22: глибоко кваліфікованих] старих спеціалістів [22: фахівців] (27), зі [11: із] сторінок (3).

o > i: керівництвом [12: керівництвом] (6), в керівництві [14: у керівництві] (10)³⁰⁴. Skrypnyk 1930 occasionally has forms of the type *міці* with generalized *i*. These forms are amended in accordance with the rules of Modern Standard Ukrainian in Skrypnyk 1930a: обезсилення міці і сили [23: знесилення моці й сили] (29), зміцнення сили і міці [sic] [11: могутности й сили] (4).

-іння/-ення: значіння [12: значення] (5), значіння [значення] (11).

од(-) and *від(-)*: (на откупі [sic] [12: на відкупі] (7), see above), від відвертих фашистів [од фашистів] (28).

Apostrophe: зв'язують [13: зв'язують] (9), зв'язали [18: зв'язали] (18), обов'язок [18: обов'язок] (19), запам'ятати [18: запам'ятати] (19), в об'єкт [15: на об'єкт] (11), п'ятирічному плянові [16: п'ятирічному плянові] (15), завдяки п'ятирічному пляну [24: п'ятирічним пляном] (30), п'ятирічкою [24: п'ятирічка] (30), etc.

ин-/ін-: в Кіїві і інших [14: інших] міст (9), СУМ по директивам Ефремова [14: за вказівками Ефремова] і інших [14: та інших] (10), іноді [22: іноді] (28).

Adaption of foreign *i*: дискредитація [19: дискредитація] (21), індивідуальний [21: індивідуального] (25), індивідуальних вбивств [22: індивідуальних убивств] (27), механіку [23: механіку] (29).

Adaption of foreign diphthongs *ai, eu*: нейтралітет [18: неутралітет] (17).

Adaptation of other foreign vowels: державне забезпечення великої, фермерського [18: фермерського] типу (13), проводити експлоатацію [sic] [16: експлуатувати] (15), експлоатацію [17: експлуатацію] (17).

Church Slavonic *vo*: во імя [16: в ім'я] інтересів „національного” виробництва (15).

Morphology

Genitive singular of soft stem feminine nouns (with nom. sg. in -Ø): куркульської і буржуазної молоді [20: молоді] СУМ (Спілка Української Молоді) [!] (22). All nouns with the suffix *-ість* retain the ending *-и* in both Skrypnyk 1930 and Skrypnyk 1930a.³⁰⁵

304 The forms coexist in both texts, but Skrypnyk 1930a has more spellings of the type *керівник*.

305 The seemingly hard ending in *в різних галузях* [22: в різних галузях] (27) is probably only a typographical error.

Locative singular of the same noun class: в вугільній промисловості [22: у вугільній промисловості] (27).

Locative singular ending of soft stem neutral nouns: в житттю [17: в житті] (16), в [...] питанню [18: питанні] (17).

Locative singular ending -ovi of masculine nouns: на откупові [sic] [12: на відкупі] польської, чеської, німецької і др. поліції (7).

Nominative plural -any vs. -ane: селяне [18: селяни] (19).

Inflection of Ukrainian surnames with the suffix -enko: і яскравого представника гетманської [sic] групи Дорошенко [13: Дорошенка] (8–9).

Inflection of foreign words ending in -o: розсилаючи по радіо [11: радіом] їхні промови у всі кінці світу (3), по радіо неслись [11: радіом лунали] (4).³⁰⁶

Declinable буржуї vs. indeclinable буржуа: озвіріла ненависть оскажених дрібних буржуїв з Спілки Визволення України [22: озлужена зненависть дрібних буржуа із «Спілки Визволення України»] (26).

Adjectival hard and soft stems: приватної [15: приватну] (12), приватної [15: приватну] (13), міжнародному [міжнародньому] (12), міжнароднього [as 15] (12–13), заможного [16: заможного] (13), західно-[15: західньо-] українським (11), західно-українських [17: західньоукраїнських] (16), в „східно-[18: східньо-]європейському” питанню [18: питанні] (17).

Comparative suffixes: одною з важливіших [19: важливіших] баз петлюрівського націоналістичного руху (21).

Analytic and synthetic comparative or superlative forms: ще більш енергійно і рішуче [12: ще енергійніш і рішучіше] (5), ще більш підготовленим [23: підготовленішим] (29); людей самих різних поглядів і переконань [22: людей найрізноманітніших поглядів та переконань] (28), під соусом самих різнородних і навіть самих протилежних „ідеологій” [23: під приправою найрізноманітніших, ба навіть найпротилежніших „ідеологій”] (29), аж до самих поміркованих [13: найпоміркованіших], ліберальних поміщиків (7).

Russian elative forms: Ефремов [sic] [13: Єфремов] був одним з видніших [13: найвидатніших] керівників [13: керівників] Київської Української Громади (7), зізнання головніших [свідчення найголовніших] керівників СВУ (11).

Possessive pronoun їх, їхній: їх [11: їхні] запізнілі заяви про їх [11: їхню] цілковите каяття [цілковиту розкаяність] (4), брехливості і фалшу їх стремління [11: їхніх прагнень] (4), їх [15: їхні] класові інтереси (13).

Ukrainian весь, увесь/весь: Україна весь [15: увесь] час маячить (12).

Indefinite pronouns: підкорити Україну кому будь [15: кому завгодно], на будь яких [15: на яких завгодно] умовах (11), повстання скільки небудь [18: скільки-будь] широкої маси працюючого селянства (18).

306 In 1937, during the next major assault on the norms of the Ukrainian language after 1933, the compilers of the Russian-Ukrainian academic dictionary of the same year were severely attacked because they admitted the declension of *біоро*, *дено*, and, in the instrumental singular, *радіо* (Ševel'ov 1989: 165). The propaganda denounced this as the “grossest vulgarization” (ibid.).

Nominative plural *сами*: Самі [21: Сами] члени СБУ (26).

Hard numeral stems (?): чотирох [*sic*]³⁰⁷-пяти [*sic*] [14: чотирьох [with no equivalent of *яму*]] років (10).

Shortened and non-shortened infinitive endings: піднять [19: підняти] (20).

Secondary imperfective forms with *-uva* or *-a*: відділює [!] [18: відділяє].

Gerund suffix: *-uçu/-açu*: вхідючи [23: входячи] (28).

Participles of *-nu-* verbs: *-n-en-* vs. *-nu-t-*: просякнені [11: просякнуті] (3), були притягнені [14: було притягнуто] до судової [*sic*] відповідальності (10).

Pluperfect forms: Правобережна Україна мала [14: мала була] ввійти в склад Польської Річи [!] [14: Речі] Посполитої, а Лівобережна – мала попасти [14: мала була потрапити у] в залежність і підлеглість німецькому капіталові [14: німецького капіталу] (11).

Present active participles: керуюче [20: керівне] ядро (22), свідомість широких працюючих [11: трудящих] мас (3), працюючих [17: трудящих] мас (16), see also "Syntax."

Present passive participles: Непримиримі [13: Непримиренні] націоналістичні елементи [...] стали несприймаючими [21: несприятливими] для ідей і почуття, що ворожі пролетаріатові (25).

Vocabulary

Nouns: самостійного господарчо-могутнього кулака [17: куркуля] (17), „більшовицькі застінки [11: катівні]" (3), єдиного контрреволюційного національного фронту всіх видів [12: гатунків] (6), тонко розрахованими міроприємствами [22: заходами] (28), зрив добичі [22: видобутку] вугілля (28), стремління [12: прагнення] (6), стремінь [11: прагнень] (4), зачинщиками [13: проводирями] (7), створити приклячку [19: привід] для збройної інтервенції (20), приклячку [23: привід] (29), автора цих стрічок [21: рядків] (25), програмним і тактичним постановкам [21: програми й тактичним настановленням] (26), націоналістичних кличів [15: гасел] (11), За директивами [19: вказівками] польського воєнного штабу (20), центральною фігурою [13: постаттю] (8), під знаменами різного кольору [22: під різнокольоровими прапорами] (27), спеціалістів [22: фахівців] (27), німецька воєнна кліка [18: згря] (18), вимогами „відвертості" [11: гласности] (3), різних ВИШ-ів [14: різних вузів] (9), ядовитою злобою [11: отруйною лютю] (3), озлоблення [18: лють] (18), каяття [11: розкаяність] (4), в ділянці [11: в царині] політики (4), проводирі [11: вожді] (4), проводирів [16: вождів] (14), господарів [22: хазяїв] (28), сприяти охороні її [12: її обороні] проти капіталістичної інтервенції (4–5), зміцнення сили і міці [11: могутности й сили] Радянської Республіки (4), крах і омертвіння [22: змертвіння] (28), в сучасний мент [12: тепер] (6), в рамках [13: в рямках] (7), ненависть [22: зненависть] (26), плян зриву [24: підриву] нашого господарства (31), до такої низкості [22: підлоти] (27),

307 Possibly, this may also be a mere typographical error.

виказування [19: вияви] „всенародньої волі“ (20), зізнання [14: свідчення] (11), колоніального визиску [15: колоніальної експлуатації] (11), Версальської умови [18: Версальського договору] (18), по умові [18: за договором] з українською контрреволюційною Центральною Радою (18), колоніального надприбутку [16: колоніальний понадприбуток] (16), для обдурювання [17: ошуканства] (16), Гданського [18: Данцигського!] коритару [18: коридору] (18). **Кляса/клас (по клас):** завдання ліквідації куркуля, як кляси [13: клясу] (7), привілеєм заможних клясів [21: клас] (24) [*sic*, promiscue in both versions]. **Програм/програма:** Програм [14: програма] СВУ (10), програм [21: програма] комуністичної партії (25), Стержем [15: Стрижем] програму [15: програми] (12), Аграрна програма [*sic*, feminine in this case] [15: Аграрну програму] (13), За планами [*sic*] і програмом [18: За плянами і програмою] (19). **Ряд:** терористичні напади на ряд [14: низку] комуністичних робітників (10).

Suffixation of deverbal nouns: Механіка підготовки [*sic*] [17: підготовлення] інтервенції (16), для його підготовки [17: підготовлення] (17), всі сподівання [17: сподіванки] української контрреволюції (16), займатись підготовкою [22: працювати над підготовленням] повстань (27), поєднала соціалізм з релігією, релігійне благовіщення зі служінням [20: службою] контрреволюції (22).

Adjectives and deadjectival adverbs: ядовитою злобою [11: отруйною люттю] (3), злобну [21: люту] ненависть (26), ганебною і мерзенною [22: ганебною, гідкою] „етики“ (27), якою безличною брехнею [24: яким безсоромним фалшем] (31), „Коварні“ [11: Лукаві] більшовики (3), зорке [23: пильне] око (29), гігантське [11: велетенське] зміцнення (4), могутній [16: велетенський] процес (14), могутній [17: потужний] рух (16), повне [цілковите] визнання (4), мастисті [11: поважні] академіки та професори (4), найважливішою [12: важливішою] (6), різnorodні [13: найрізноманітніші] українські групи (7), видні [16: найвидатніші] контрреволюціонери (13), з видними керовниками [17: найвидатнішими керівниками] (17), всіх материх [13: запеклих] представників української еміграції [13: еміграції] (8), рештки давнішнього [13: колишнього] петлюрівського центру (8), служебна [18: службова] роля української контрреволюції (17) приєднання до Польщі Горішнього Шлезьку [as 18] і Гданського [18: Данцигського [*sic*]] коритару [18: коридору] (18), через Гданський [18: Данцигський [*sic*]] міст (18), кінцевим [23: конечним] терміном (28), одна з численних [22: багаточисленних] контрреволюційних організацій (27), пляни [...] мають за собою одинокую [19: єдину] клясову силу – українського куркуля (20), різке протиріччя [23: гостру суперечність] (30), людей самих різних поглядів і переконань [22: людей найрізноманітніших поглядів та переконань] (28), з [22: із] самих високо-кваліфікованих [22: глибоко кваліфікованих] старих спеціалістів [22: фахівців] (27), вищих учбоних [*sic*] [21: навчальних] закладів (25),³⁰⁸ цей грандіозний [24: величезний] плян (31), природніми [*sic*] [15: натуральними] багатствами [15: багатствами] (12), інтервентських [19: інтервенціоністських] намірів (21), характерні

308 Elsewhere, Skrypnyk 1930a has *вуз*, which of course does not correspond properly to *вищих навчальних закладів*: *СВУ мала в своїх лавах досить значну кількість професорів, викладачів різних ВИШ-ів* [14: різних вузів] *в Києві і інших* [14: інших] міст (9).

[18: характеристичні] (19), по звірськи [21: по-звірячому] (26), прекрасно [15: чудово] розуміли (12), прекрасно [21: чудово] вияснив (25), прекрасно [24: чудово] zorganizовану [...] підготовку (30), мав на увазі орієнтаційно [19: орієнтовно] 1930 або 1931 рік (21). **Бувийший**: представників бувших [14: колишніх] соціал-федералістів і соціал-демократів (9), бувший [14: кол.] професор Чехівський, бувший [14: кол.] голова петлюрівського уряду (9), etc. **Ріжний > різний**: різних [11: різних] українських буржуазних і соціалістичних партій (3), в різних столицях Європи [13: у різних столицях Європи] (9), ріжнородних [12: різних] (5), в різних галузях [22: в різних галузях] (27), etc. **Adjectives with the suffix -ov-/-iv-**: мільйонові маси [17: мільйони] (16), їх програмові домагання [21: їхні програмні вимоги] (26), соціал-фашистівської [11: соціал-фашистської] преси (3).

The verb *пишати* aptly replaces the construction with the copula and the adjective *гордий* in *Другий Інтернаціонал може бути гордим* [20: пишати, що [...] (22). In *переговори представників офіційної* [as 18] (18) *Німеччини*, the form *офіційної* notably remains unchanged.

Adverbs: не єдиним прикладом чисто-куркульської [16: суто куркульської] антипролетарської партії (14), [...] завсім [sic] [20: цілком] змінили характер українського вчительства (24).

Pronouns: Польщі, Франції, Німеччини і друг. [11: та інших] країн (3); на чолі з Лотоцьким, Чикаленком і другими [13: та іншими] (8), до цього-ж часу [22: на цей самий час] (28), про цей же [23: цей самий] термін (28), соціал-демократія немає [sic] [19: не має] ніякого ґрунту [19: жодного ґрунту] (19); ця [19: та] сила, яку українські контрреволюціонери розраховували підняти [19: підняти] на „всенародне“ збройне повстання проти диктатури пролетаріату (20).

Verbs: заняті [22: зайняті] (27), спотикнулась [!] [16: спіткнулась] (13), українська соціал-демократія являлась [16: є] не єдиним прикладом чисто-куркульської [16: суто куркульської] антипролетарської партії (14), переговори [...] являються [18: є] реальним показником [18: показником] переорієнтації німецької буржуазії (17), не успіли нікого вбити [21: нікого не встигли вбити] (26), опирались [12: спирались] на сільську бідноту (6), озлоблені [21: озлочені] куркулі (26), озвіріла ненависть [22: озлочена зненависть] (26), і т. п. [11: та інші] епітети зустрічались [11: подибувано] в цій справі (3), Широкий розвиток промисловости, індустріалізації країни, і, нарешті, перехід до технічної і економічної реконструкції сільського господарства зустріли [13: натрапляє на] жорстокий опір куркуля (7), ця розкладова робота шкідників-педагогів зустріла [20: натрапила на] опір (23), націоналістична робота в школі зустріла опір [21: натрапила на відсіч] з боку організації молоді (25), [...] спирається вся робота [sic] [23: згрунтовано всю роботу] (30), мала потрапити в [14: мала була потрапити у] залежність і підлеглість німецькому капіталові [14: німецького капіталу] (11), добитись основного завдання [15: аби досягти основне завдання] (11), [...] приймали [14: брав] участь в керовництві [14: у керівництві] контрреволюційною [-ї] організацією [-ї] (10), [...] не приймали [брали] участі [не брали участі] в її закордонному центрі (14), „плян“ [...] був оснований [14: згрунтований] на воєнній інтервенції (11), Українська соціал-демократія [...] виставляла [16: висувала] це домагання (13), [...] Українська соціал-демократія [...] виставляла [16: висувала] домагання

(13), старі, провірені [11: випробувані] десятиріччями [11: десятиріччями] проводирі [11: вожді] (4), [...] п'янують [11: таврують] свою минулу діяльність (4), хто ще хитається [12: вагається] (4), до призначеного нею терміну [23: на час, що вона його намічала] (29), відмовитись від [12: зреклись Ø] шкідливих і згубних контрреволюційних [12: контрреволюційних] шляхів (4), [...] відмовляювались від них [15: зрікались своїх гасел] (11), насправді вели [15: провадили] революційну пропаганду [15: пропаганду] (11), українська дрібнобуржуазна інтелігенція [...] що [...] знаходиться [12: перебуває] на службі і на откупові [sic] [12: на відкупі] польської, чеської, німецької і др. поліції (7), На Західній Україні маються [17: є] окремі [sic] групи (16). Контрреволюціонери не обманювали [18: обдурювали] себе (18), соромитись по відношенню до хворих пролетарів і комуністів [22: панькатися з хворими пролетарями й комуністами] (26), підтверджували [18: потверджували] (18–19), Молодь радянської країни тісно спаялась [21: щільно з'єдналась] з радянською владою (25).

The phraseological unit *здавати собі справу*, cf. Polish *zdawać sobie sprawę*, was replaced by the verb *усвідомлювати* in *Спілка Визволення України ясно здавала собі справу з того* [19: *усвідомлювала*], що [...] (20).

Predicative expressions: необхідно убити і [22: треба вбити й] вирізати два мільйони [22: мільйонів зо два] комуністів (26).

Prepositions: відомості з [11: щодо цього] процесу (3), внутрі СРСР [23: в самому СРСР] (29), вже в кінці 90 [13: наприкінці] років (7), СВУ розгорнула свою діяльність протягом [14: упродовж] чотирох [sic]-пяти [sic] [14: чотирьох] років (10).

Conjunctions: [...] наче б мітлою [11: ніби метлою] (3), все це приймали і на все погоджувались керівники СВУ, лише б добитись основного завдання [15: аби досягти основного завдання] (11), які заявляли, буцім то в них [17: ніби у них] орієнтація на власні сили (16), Одначе [19: Однак] (21), одначе [20: проте] (22).

Idiomatic expressions: і т. п. [11: та інші] (3), і т. п. [і т. ін.] (3), і т. д. [14: тощо] (9), і т. д. [22: тощо] (27), перш за все [12: передовсім] (5), а в першу чергу і перш за все [17: і, насамперед, і раніш за все] (16), колонію міжнародного [17: міжнародного] і перш за все [17: , насамперед,] польського капіталізму (16), перш за все і більш за все [20: передовсім, і більше за все] (24), з дня на день [20: день-у-день] (22), і з того часу працював в [13: у] Всеукраїнській Академії [sic] [13: -і] Наук в характері її члена, а потім віце-президента [13: , як її член, а далі – як віце-президент] (8).

Syntax:³⁰⁹

Predicative case: СУМ (Спілка Української Молоді), члени якої [14: що члени її] повинні були бути масовиви [sic] агітаторами [14: за масових агітаторів] СВУ серед студентства [14: студентства] і куркульського селянства (9–10).

Case government: в керівництві внутрішнім контрреволюційним рухом на Вкраїні [у керівництві внутрішнього контр-революційного руху на

309 Here I pay no attention to word order, which was sometimes changed.

Україні] (8), Закордонний центр об'єднував собою [13: в собі] всіх материх [!] [13: запекалих] представників української еміграції [13: еміграції] (8).

Change of prepositions: розправа над [11: з] цвітом української інтелігенції [11: інтелігенції] (3), один за другим [11: один по одному] (4), в її користь [на користь її] (5), при її допомозі [sic] і що по її вказівкам [12: за допомогою та вказівками якої] працювала СБУ (5), Шляхетна фашистська Польща повинна була, за відомом [19: з відому] і згодою світових держав, виступити в характері шляхетного [19: як шляхетний оборонець] (20), партія [...] входить в склад [17: до складу] Другого Інтернаціоналу (16).

Russian *po* and dative case: розсилаючи по радіо [11: радіом] їхні промови у всі кінці світу (3), по радіо неслись [11: радіом лунали] [...] (4), при її допомозі [sic] і що по її вказівкам [12: за допомогою та вказівками якої] працювала СБУ (5), роботу по вихованню [14: роботу виховання] (9), по директивам Ефремова [14: за вказівками Єфремова] (10), [...] низку документів 1919 – 1929 років, по яким [14: що за ними] український націоналістичний „уряд“ складав і пропонував політичні і воєнні умови зі всіма і всілякими капіталістичними урядами (10), по умові [18: за договором] з українською контрреволюційною Центральною Радою (18), заплатити [...] по мінімальній розцінці [18: за мінімальною розцінкою] понад 7 мільярдів карбованців (19), по розрахункам [18: за розрахунками] [...] (19), підготувати зрив добичі і вугілля і кризи палива по всій промисловості [22: підготувати зрив видобутку вугілля й паливу кризу у всій промисловості] [sic] (28), по замовленню з-за кордону [23: на замовлення із-за кордону] (29), самовіддана робота по організації [24: на організації] пролетарських мас (31).

The calque from Russian *по відношенню до* (< *по отношению к*) was consistently replaced: службена [18: службова] роля української контрреволюції по відношенню до [18: щодо] світової капіталістичної буржуазії (17), по відношенню до цього явища [16: у відповідь на це явище] (14). The verb was changed as well in the following example: соромитись по відношенню до хворих пролетарів і комуністів [22: панькатися з хворими пролетарями й комуністами] (26). A whole sentence was reformulated (denominalized) to avoid the construction in the following example: 5: існував сильніший гніт по відношенню до української культури, переслідування української культури, української літератури і навіть української мови [12: якнайдужче пригнічувалося українську культуру, українську літературу, ба навіть української мови] [sic] (5).

Temporal and modal adverbials: вороги СРСР за останній час [11: останнім часом] використали і процес „Спілки Визволення України“ (3), в останні роки [13: останніми роками] (7), в перші роки [21: за перших років] революції (24), в попередній період [23: за попереднього періоду] (30), у великому масштабі [24: великим масштабом] (30), завдяки пятирічному пляну [24: п'ятиріним пляном] (30).

Present active participles and their replacement: ворогуючі між собою [13: ворожі, одна одній,] групи (8), Молоді контрреволюційні сили були об'єднані в доповнюючій організації [14: у додатковій організації] СУМ (Спілка Української Молоді) (9–10), [...] іноді навіть ворогуючих поміж собою, бойових націоналізмів [22: бойових націоналізмів, що іноді навіть

ворогують один з одним] (28), нові зміни підростаючого покоління [21: покоління, які підрастають] (25).

Active and passive voice: Брехня цих заяв була викрита їх же співбратами [16: Фалш цих заяв були викрили їхні ж таки брати на процесі] (14), Програма [sic] і тактика української контрреволюції була погоджена і керувалась одночасно маршалом Пілсудським і керовником німецьких збройних сил генералом Гренером [17: і нею одночасно керував маршал Пілсудський і керівник німецьких озброєних сил, генерал Гренер] (17), вони були пятирічкою поставлені на всебічну перевірку [24: їх п'ятирічка поставила на всебічну перевірку] (30), до призначеного нею терміну [23: на час, що вона його намічала] (29).

Constructions with -no/-to: [...] і т. п. [11: та інші] епітети зустрічались [11: подибувано] в цій справі [з приводу цієї справи] на сторінках буржуазної і соціал-фашистської [11: соціал-фашистської] преси Польщі, Франції, Німеччини і друг. [та інших] країн, супроводжуючись [11: і супроводжувано] протестами проти „таємних розправ“, вимогами „відвертості“ [11: гласності] і т. п. [і т. ін.] (3), Але ледви [11: ледве] розпочався [було розпочато] процес [sic] [11: процес] в справі СВУ (3), з яких 4 з пол. десятки [...] були притягнені [14: було притягнуто] до судової [sic] відповідальності (10), Як повністю виявилось [14: Як цілком виявлено] на суді з заяв всіх членів СВУ [...] (10), Плян [17: Пляна] світової буржуазії давне [sic] вже розрахований [17: розраховано] на те, щоб [...] (17), [...] спирається вся робота [sic]; [23: згрунтовано всю роботу] (30).

The expression of the agent in passive constructions: і повне [та цілковите] визнання ними [11: від них] брехливості і фалшу їх стремлінь [11: їхніх прагнень] (4), повне і безоглядне визнання ними [11: від них] досягнень Радянської Республіки (4), проваджений радянською владою [16: од радянської влади] могутній [16: велетенський] процес (14), нею неухильно проваджений плян [24: від неї неухильно переводжуваний плян] (31).

Relative clauses: Молоді контрреволюційні сили були об'єднані в доповнюючій організації [14: у додатковій організації] СУМ (Спілка Української Молоді), члени якої [14: що члени її] повинні були бути масовими [sic] агітаторами [14: за масових агітаторів] СВУ серед студентства [14: студентства] і куркульського селянства (9–10), [...] коли зачитано низку документів 1919 – 1929 років, по яким [14: що за ними] український націоналістичний „уряд“ складав і пропонував політичні і воєнні умови зі всіма і всілякими капіталістичними урядами (10), [...] аж до документу, який [14: що] показує повну готовність і охоту українських націоналістів вступити в союз і пряме підкорення до російської білогвардійщини [14: білогвардійщини] (10), ця Україна повинна стати селянською країною, влада в якій [16: де влада] належить великим куркулям (16).

The amendments to Skrypnyk 1930 were significant and applied to all linguistic levels. In many cases, they corrected forms or constructions that were widely regarded as incorrect or as Russianisms. In many other cases, they introduced forms or constructions that simply helped further distance the language of this text from that of its original, which Skrypnyk 1930 had often followed slavishly.

7. Introducing the new norms of 1933

In his meticulous study, Serhij Vakulenko demonstrated precisely how the orthographic reforms of 1933 discussed above were introduced step by step, at first rather inconsistently, in the leading organ of the CP(B)U, the newspaper *Komunist* (Vakulenko 2009/2012). Vakulenko showed that the first major changes in this newspaper can be traced back to issue 138 of 1 June 1933, where readers suddenly found the new spellings *аероклуб*, *блок*, *план*, *клас*, etc., alongside Kharkiv orthography-based *кляса*, *плян*, *платформа*, *металюргія*, *соціаль-[фашисти]*, etc. By 5 June, the *l'* forms had largely disappeared. Also on 1 June 1933, the spellings *агент*, *агентура*, *грунт*, etc. suddenly appeared alongside *бригада*, *латунок*, *інтелігент*, etc., that is, even before the decree "On the Change in Ukrainian Scholarly Terminology, Grammar, and Orthography" of late June stipulated the elimination of *ʃ*. As of mid-August 1933, three more innovations followed: 1. spellings of the type *ія*, *ію* were replaced with *иа*, *іу*, 2. reflexes of Greek *η* were now largely treated as in Russian, and 3. genitive forms of the *-ости* type were replaced with *-ости*; henceforth, the genitive, dative, and locative singular as well as the nominative and accusative plural would thus be homonymous, as in Russian. While the issue of *Komunist* for 16 August 1933 still featured *аритметика*, the next issue had *арифметика*, *орфографічний*, *орфографічно* (ibid.). Both issues featured parallel genitive singular forms of the type *вартости/собівартості*, *пильности/пильності*. After 5 September 1933, finally, Greek *η* was increasingly rendered with *i* instead of *e* (for example, *хімія* was now used instead of *хемія*), which was even more intriguing, as this feature was not even mentioned in the Xvylja orthography. Beginning with the issue for 12 September, *Komunist* introduced spellings of the form *проектний* (instead of *проектний*). As for the rendering of foreign diphthongs, new Russian-based forms of the type *Ейнштейн*, *аудиторія*, etc. co-occurred with older forms of the type *Айнштайн*, *авдиторія* throughout 1933; however, the new forms began to predominate in October of that year (all ibid.). Finally, as for place names with the suffixes *-s'k-*, *-c'k-*, new forms of the type *Дніпропетровськ* and *Сталіно* appeared instead of the old *Дніпропетровське* and *Сталіне* beginning on 11 October (all ibid.).

An examination of the periodicals *Červonyj Šljax* and *Bil'sovuyk Ukrajinu* largely confirms this picture of the gradual introduction of the Xvylja orthography in 1933. Issues 1 and 2—the latter issue was submitted for publication on 8 April 1933—still adhered to the Kharkiv orthography: (from issue 1): *класово-політично акцентовані*, *певної актуальности* (Stepnjak 1933: 147), *європейську* (ibid., 148), *матеріалу* (ibid., 149), *„неокласиків“* (ibid.), *в єзуїтській колегії* (ibid., 155); (from issue 2): *інтелігента*, *художньої творчості та ідеологічної озброєності*, *соціальних і класових пружин*; *оригінального, свіжого й обґрунтованого трактування епізодів і спогадів з часів громадянської класової боротьби* (all Vynnyčenko 1933: 176). Issue 3 was sent to the publishers on 23 March and submitted for publication on 11 May, that is, shortly after the People's Commissariat's decree of 3 May that had stipulated the reduced use of *l'*. Owing to the short time span, it might come as no surprise that the use of *l'* remained unchanged (see *класичний твір*, Zajec' 1933: 138). What one notices instead are a few substitutions of *ʒ* for *ʃ* that violate the rules of the

Kharkiv orthography: *без генеральної репетиції* (ibid., 140), *генеральна репетиція Жовтня* (ibid., 141), *Фата Моргана* (ibid., 141), and *оригінальний індивідуальний стиль* (ibid., 142) alongside *Толстой оригінальний* (ibid., 149; a quotation from Lenin's works). Also, the table of contents of issue 3 refers to the German author Georg Heym as "Георг Гайм," as opposed to the correct form "Георг Гайм" in issue 2. However, the mastheads of issue 3 still featured the form *редколегії*.

The latter form was changed beginning with issue 4 for 1933, which was sent to the publishers on 25 May 1933 and submitted for printing as late as 5 October 1933. This issue introduced a number of new spellings. It consistently replaced *ʹ* with *z*: *група* (Hončarenko 1933: 6), *перезгрупування* (ibid., 5), *авангардний* (ibid.), *інтелігенція* (ibid., 7), *інтелігенцію* (ibid., 5), *на ґрунті* (ibid., 6), *підґрунтя* (ibid., 17), *у своїй програмі* (ibid., 6), *пропагує* (ibid., 15), *проти релігії* (ibid.: 16), *з плагіатом* (ibid., 18), *оригінальний* (ibid.), *чогось оригінального* (ibid., 20), *агенти* (ibid., 21), and it consistently replaced *l'* with *l*: *клас* (ibid., 6, 8), *класу* (ibid., 8), *класових сил* (ibid., 5), *класову природу* (ibid., 7), *декласованої інтелігенції* (ibid., 8), *у цьому плані* (ibid., 10), *з плагіатом* (ibid., 8). Moreover, it introduced the spelling *ia* for *ia*, although a few *ia*-forms still co-occurred: *пролетаріат* (ibid., 5), *до пролетаріату* (ibid.), *соціалізм* (ibid., 15), *соціалістичного* (ibid., 21), *до цієї соціальної категорії* (ibid., 7), *Фальшива-„соціальна“ поезія* (ibid., 17), *з плагіатом* (ibid., 18), *імперіалізму* (ibid., 21), alongside *диференціяція* (ibid., 16) and *віршованого матеріалу* (ibid., 19).

Genitive forms of the *-ости* type still predominated: *щастя індивідуальности* (ibid., 6), *для творчости „молодомузців“* (ibid., 6), *на хисткому ґрунті безідейности і безперспективности* (ibid., 8), etc. However, new forms were used in quite a curious way: 1. In the immediate vicinity of old forms, as in *усвідомлення нікчемности, історичної приреченості на загибель* (ibid., 9), and 2. even as spelling variants of identical word forms: see *буржуазність його всієї творчости* (Hončarenko 1933: 12) alongside *в основних лініях своєї творчості* (ibid., 13), *мотиви творчості* (ibid., 19), and *націоналісти різної масті* (ibid., 21) alongside *націоналісти шумськістьсько-хвильовітьської масті* (ibid.). Hončarenko's text still had the forms *ролю* (ibid., 5, 13) and *формалістичної методи Степнякової* (ibid., 7; even with the possessive adjective), *Европу* (ibid., 5), but it did introduce *девіз* instead of *девіза* (ibid., 6).

Issue 6 for 1933 was sent to the publishers on 10 June and signed for publication on 19 July 1933. The table of contents still featured *ʹ* in *Володимира Гжицького*, but in the body text, the name appeared as *Гжицького* (Levkovyč 1933: 83). Also, forms of the type *класову* were used (ibid.), but neither *ia* spellings nor genitive forms of the *-ости* type were changed.

Issue 7, which was sent to the publishers on 16 August 1933 and submitted for publication as late as 22 November, largely conformed to the standard of issue 4. The letter *ʹ* was eliminated, and only forms of the type *клас* were used: *ґрунт* (Popov 1933: 116), *агентуру класового ворога* (ibid., 115), *ембарго* (ibid., 126), *класового ворога* (ibid., 109), *маталургією* [sic] (ibid.), *кolorитним* (ibid., 113), *блок* (ibid., 121), *проти бухгалтерії* (ibid., 117), *націонал-більшовизму* (ibid., 121). Spellings of the *ia* type clearly predominated (*гасло індустріалізації, соціалізм в нашій країні*; ibid., 114), but *ia* occurred (obviously erroneously) in *грузинським філіялом троцькізму* (ibid., 118). Genitive forms of the type *-ости* and *-ості* co-occurred: *послабленням*

більшовицької пильности (ibid., 110) vs. послаблення більшовицької пильності (ibid., 114), but *-osti* forms prevailed. Also, the form *кафедра* was introduced: *в інституті марксизму на кафедрі національного питання* (ibid., 119), *від кафедри національного питання* (ibid.). The name of *Europe* was still used without a prothesis, as in *на буржуазну Європу* (ibid., 114).

Many forms that were either close to Russian or Russian loans were now used without hesitation: *обман* (ibid., 122), *у цьому найскладнішому міжнародньому перепльоті*³¹⁰ (ibid., 126).³¹¹ Elative forms, as in Russian, were now increasingly regarded as unproblematic: *послаблення більшовицької пильності за останні роки – серйозніша помилка української партійної організації* (ibid., 115 [a chapter title]); *на цілому ряді його важливіших політичних виступів* (ibid., 118). As in the last example, *ряд* was now used frequently, as opposed to former texts, which had used *низка*; see also *Україна була протягом ряду років ареною найзапеклішої громадянської війни* (ibid., 110), etc. Present passive participles, which are alien to Ukrainian, were used as well (although their occurrence in the following example might be interpreted as a half-translated quasi-quotation from Russian): *шовіністи вже не сподіваються, що радянська влада відновить їм єдину і неділимую Росію* (ibid., 124).

Whereas the construction *в період* had been consistently changed into *за період* in Skrypnyk 1930a vs. Skrypnyk 1930, it was now used without hesitation, as in *в цей період громадянської війни* (ibid., 111). Passive constructions also came into common use: *до оцінки помилок у національному питанні, які були допущені на Україні, треба підходити не абстрактно [...]* (ibid., 109), *Грунт для цього був підготований рядом його величезних помилок у національному питанні [...]* (ibid., 116). The preposition *по* with the dative was increasingly used in accordance with the rules of Russian: *ряд найважливіших принципіальних документів української парторганізації по національному питанню [sic]* (ibid., 115),³¹² *те провідне [sic] місце, яке їй по праву належить* (ibid., 126). Relative clauses with *що* still occurred, but *який* was henceforth used much more frequently according to similar rules as *который* in Russian: *Особливо багато помилок, антиленінських перекручень, над виправленням яких ми повинні тепер найгрунтовніше попрацювати – допущено на історичному фронті* (ibid., 120–121), *хіба це не серйозне застереження для наших письменників, які ряд років працювали з ним і не зуміли викрити його дворушництва* (ibid., 122), *Меморандум Гугенберга є нове яскраве потвердження інтервенціоністських планів німецького фашизму, на який переорієнтуються тепер основні сили української контрреволюції* (ibid., 126).

Issue 8–9 of *Četvonyj Šljah*, which appeared in late 1933, introduced not only the form *експлоататорів* (Kosior 1933: 224) but also *прогноз* (Kosior 1933: 210), *метод* (ibid., 225), *роль* (ibid., 229), *в масштабі* (ibid.), *у проекті* (ibid., 239).

310 This word is not recorded in SUM.

311 See also the introduction of *в Японії* (ibid., 126) instead of the previous *в Японії* (Polish also has *Japonia*).

312 This typographic error might be revealing: it may be a remnant of (better Ukrainian) *з національного питання*.

As regards *Bil'shovyk Ukraïny*, the development was, briefly, as follows. Issues 1–2 to 5–6 for March and April largely adhered to the rules of the Kharkiv orthography. Issue 7–8 for May and June introduced two major changes: 1. the removal of the letter *ı*, which was only “quoted” in Postyšev’s above-cited considerations regarding this letter (Postyšev 1933: 8),³¹³ and 2. the introduction of hard *l* in *класова* (ibid., 5), *класовий* (ibid.), *класових* (ibid., 2), *планувати* (ibid.), *плану* (ibid., 3). By contrast, the *іа* spelling was still preserved: *соціалістичного* (ibid., 1), *територіальним* (ibid., 2), *ініціативи* (ibid., 5), *пролетаріату* (ibid., 7), as were genitive forms in *-ости*: *збільшення продуктивності* (ibid., 1), *посилення більшовицької пильності* (ibid., 6), etc. *Роля* was still used (*відіграла вирішальну ролю*; ibid., 3), but masculine *метод* replaced older *метода* (*при такому [...] зовсім непридатному методі*; ibid., 5). Obviously Russian elements such as *недаром* (ibid., 9) were used increasingly often.

Issue 9–10 for July and August finally added genitive forms of the *-ости* type (*посилення більшовицької пильності*; “*Bojovi zavdannja*” 1933: 3) as well as *іа* forms (*відрив від завдань соціалістичного будівництва та диктатури пролетаріату й трудящих мас*; Šlixter 1933: 66). Present active participles were now regarded as unproblematic: *тиснення куркуля проти зростаючого впливу МТС*; “*Bojovi zavdannja*” 1933: 6). Issue 11 for September 1933 still featured *проект*, as in *проектна потужність* (“*Peredova*” 1933: 2), *проектної потужності* (ibid., 5). New forms of the type *кризисний* as in *Капіталістичний світ вступив у н'яту кризисну зиму* (ibid., 1) added to the general picture: in the course of 1933, the Stalinists effectively brought the norms of Ukrainian considerably closer to those of Russian. Of course, this “reform” was not merely a matter of orthography or of puristic vs. “international” (in fact, Russian) terminology. Moreover, it was not yet the end of the development.

7. Conclusions

Contrary to the Ukrainophobic narratives mentioned elsewhere (see pp. 3–36 in this volume), the idea that Ukrainian was established as a standard language in the former Russian Empire thanks only to Bolshevik “Ukrainization” is by no means convincing. Originally, the Bolsheviks came to Ukraine as an obviously anti-Ukrainian force. When they introduced the policy of “Ukrainization,” they made it clear from the outset that they were reacting to the rise of Ukrainian national consciousness, which had occurred independently of them, and that they regarded “Ukrainization” as a mere tactical delay in the revolutionary movement. In the course of “Ukrainization,” leading Bolsheviks repeatedly perpetuated the popular belief that Ukrainian was above all a peasant language, while Russian, the language of Lenin and Stalin, was the language of progress. As soon as the

313 “Хіба головне шкідництво буржуазно-націоналістичних петлюрівських елементів, які засіли і нерідко заправляли в Наркомосвіті, тільки на те й сходило, що вони неправильно розставили літери „г” і „і”? Літери, звісно, мають значення. Але це ж дрібниці, рівняючи до тієї шкідницької роботи, яку проваджено в системі органів наросвіти і яка була спрямована на облутання нашої молоді ворожою пролетаріатові ідеологією. Адже перше, ніж розставити літери „г” і „і”, ці шкідники в Наркомосі розставили своїх людей по всій системі органів освіти.”

Bolsheviks introduced "Ukrainization" in earnest, they immediately began the first purges against deviationists in their own ranks, as well as against Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists." While they consistently insisted on "Bolshevik" as opposed to "nationalist" "Ukrainization," it was never made clear what "Bolshevik 'Ukrainization'" might actually mean if the proletariat—the leading class in the Soviet state—was exempted from so-called "forced 'Ukrainization'" and if the vast majority of leading Ukrainian Bolsheviks did not use or even know the Ukrainian language. In that situation, it was only logical that a great many of the genuine accomplishments of "Ukrainization" were made by individuals who were not particularly close to inner party circles.

"Ukrainization" did have a certain temporary impact, for example, on the development of Ukrainophone print media, but one might ask, given the general European experience of the interwar period, if something similar would not have occurred without Bolshevik "Ukrainization," for example, in a truly independent Ukraine. Other achievements proved even more marginal. Thus, when the Bolsheviks "Ukrainized" the schools of Ukraine, they failed to supply them with textbooks or teachers. The higher the school level, the lower the percentage of "Ukrainized" schools, and, even on paper, the "Ukrainization" of schools in the towns never came close to the level of that in the villages. Those intellectual forces that truly contributed to the development the Ukrainian language—members of the Academy of Sciences, teachers, and writers—were among the first victims of the Stalinist purges. The SVU trial of 1930 and its aftermath ultimately suffocated the spirit of "Ukrainization" a mere five years after the policy was seriously introduced. As for the bulk of Ukrainian speakers, it is obvious that the Bolshevik war against the peasantry during the period of collectivization in Ukraine—including the Great Famine as its peak—was, consciously or unconsciously, at the same time a war against the vitality of the Ukrainian language. By 1933, the Bolsheviks had succeeded in erecting another "ceiling" for the Ukrainian standard language that Ukrainians were henceforth never allowed to disregard—the Russian language, to which anything expressed in Ukrainian would now have to be adapted.

The question remains what deeper impact might have been made on the history of the Ukrainian language by a policy that was only seriously conducted for less than half a decade. Jurij Ševel'ov contended that during the years of "Ukrainization," "passive mastery of Ukrainian, though still not universal...encompassed much broader circles" and added that "the number of people interested in Ukrainian culture grew substantially" (Ševel'ov 1989: 129).³¹⁴ The question to what extent these two tendencies were an immediate result of Bolshevik "Ukrainization" can never be answered, but the fact that the language of the majority population gained

314 Ševel'ov added that "probably some intellectuals who under different circumstances would have worked within Russian culture opted, instead, for the Ukrainian one" (ibid.). He referred to the example of "Ivan Kaljannikov, who became the Ukrainian poet Kaljannyk (and was later liquidated as a 'Ukrainian nationalist') (ibid.). He could have added the example of himself, a non-Ukrainian who, after his emigration from the Soviet Union, was to become the leading specialist in Ukrainian linguistics after the Second World War.

considerable momentum at the expense of a formerly dominant language was certainly not unique to Soviet Ukraine in those years. Who knows how the Ukrainian language might have developed if an independent Ukraine had continued to exist after the First World War?

On a broader scale, Ševel'ov added two further results of "Ukrainization." First, even though "much of the language legislation [of the "Ukrainization" period] would be rendered null and void," he found that "much remained throughout the traumatic events of the 1930s, when virtually all the linguists of the period of Ukrainization were silenced or destroyed" (*ibid.*, 174). Although this seems plausible, the question of what actual impact the remnants of that legislation may have had on the destiny of the Ukrainian language remains to be studied in greater detail.

Finally, Ševel'ov emphasized in particular that "the policy of Ukrainization left an indelible imprint on the normalization of the standard Ukrainian language" and that "the normalization was conducted, basically, on a scholarly basis" (Ševel'ov 1989: 140).³¹⁵ These undoubted achievements of "Ukrainization" require further comment. It is obvious that over the years, the broader use of Ukrainian in the official sphere brought about some degree of "normalization" thanks to the work of careful editors and others. It should be emphasized, however, that almost none of the most important contributions to the standardization of the Ukrainian language can be regarded as direct outcomes of the "Ukrainization" policy. Almost all of them were the result of the work of non-Bolsheviks, mostly from the Academy of Sciences, who, furthermore, enjoyed no broad support from the Bolsheviks but were, on the contrary, punished for their "wrecking activity" almost immediately after they had managed to publish their most important works. Larger dictionary projects of the Academy of Sciences were backed by the Bolsheviks only halfheartedly, if at all; owing to the onslaught against the intelligentsia that set in with the SVU affair, some of the most important endeavors were never brought to fruition. A number of serious contributions to the study of the Ukrainian language notwithstanding, the standardization achieved during the period of "Ukrainization" period was by no means complete. First and foremost, not a single comprehensive normative grammar of the Ukrainian standard language appeared during the years of "Ukrainization."

The most important accomplishment that can be attributed more or less directly to "the policy of 'Ukrainization'" (and that did not have to push against the limits of Bolshevik "Ukrainization") is the Kharkiv orthography. The elaboration of a new Ukrainian orthography had been placed on the agenda of the Ukrainian Narkomos in July 1925, and party members, particularly those in the Narkomos, did

315 See also the following remarks: "The essential character of the Ukrainian language underwent no major changes, as can be confirmed by comparing literary or journalistic texts of, say, 1925 with those of 1935 or 1940. The major attainments of the short years of the Ukraine's independence or semi-independence were retained. A much greater change was evident in a comparison of newspapers published in 1905–1907, on the one hand, and those of 1925, on the other. (These conclusions are impressionistic and should be verified quantitatively.) Nor can one observe any drastic reduction of Galician in the general (not technical) language of 1933–1941" (Ševel'ov 1989: 174–175).

play an active role in the endeavor. However, aside from the fact that the Kharkiv orthography was mainly the accomplishment of the leading Ukrainian linguists of those years, it should not be forgotten that it was not implemented until 1930 and remained in effect only until mid-1933. That orthography was subsequently employed only outside the Soviet realm, and only after 1991 was it revived to some extent in Ukraine itself.³¹⁶

Notwithstanding the fact that virtually all the achievements of "Ukrainization" must be relativized, more than just the memory of those years has remained. Literary and cultural contributions of that period, partly rediscovered during the Thaw of the 1950s, contributed significantly to the Ukrainian Sixties movement. To an even greater degree, this rediscovery occurred on the eve of Ukraine's independence and is still taking place in independent Ukraine. Some crucial linguistic studies of the "Ukrainization" period have been reissued in Ukraine and abroad, while several dictionaries have left the secret chambers of Soviet Ukrainian libraries for good, are now accessible on the Internet, and are contributing their share to the further shaping of Ukrainian linguistic consciousness and the further elaboration of the Ukrainian language.

316 Ševel'ov (1989: 132) wrote: "Never was the spelling and the morphology of the Ukrainian language codified in such detail and precision." Doubts might be in order if one takes into account the entire Ukrainian-speaking territory and not just the former Russian Empire. Stephan Smal'-Stoc'kyj's and Theodor Gartner's *Grammatik der ruthenischen (ukrainischen) Sprache* of 1913 (Smal'-Stoc'kyj–Gartner 1913) paid less attention to questions of orthography but was a remarkable description of the morphological system of the Ukrainian language.

**COLONIAL LINGUISTIC REFLEXES IN A POST-SOVIET SETTING:
THE GALICIAN VARIANT OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE AND
ANTI-UKRAINIAN DISCOURSE IN CONTEMPORARY INTERNET SOURCES**

The area known as Galicia (Halychyna) has always functioned as a bridge between Central-Eastern and Eastern Europe. From the perspective of the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union, it has been constantly regarded as the “most European” genuinely East Slavic region, primarily for two reasons: first, it was part of the Austrian Empire between 1772 and 1918 (Austro-Hungarian since 1867), and second, it was not incorporated into the Soviet Union until World War II. Moreover, Galicia is known as the traditional stronghold of a separate Ukrainian national consciousness and of widespread use of the Ukrainian language. Hence, Galicia and the Galicians, as well as the Galician variety of Ukrainian, have always served as favorite targets for anti-Ukrainian and anti-European attacks. The present study demonstrates that this remains unchanged today, despite the fact that virtually all anti-Galician stereotypical attitudes, especially those concerning language, are based on false or at least questionable assumptions. Some of those stereotypes are widespread and occur even beyond the types of sources presented below. First, despite certain local peculiarities, the Galician variety of the Ukrainian language, as it comes into play in the linguistic discussions of today, is not “a Galician dialect” by origin. In reality, its most important source is the literary language that developed in the Ukrainian-speaking territories of the Russian Empire and that was adopted in Galicia under the influence of the most notable Ukrainian writers of the nineteenth century, Taras Ševčenko and Pantelejmon Kuliš, beginning in the 1860s. Second, it is true that Galician Ukrainian is characterized by various loan elements, but it is a fact that not only Modern Standard Ukrainian but also other languages, including Russian, feature a sizable number of various foreign elements at all linguistic levels as well. Third, some authors try to characterize recent efforts to introduce some changes into the orthography of Modern Standard Ukrainian as Galician by provenance. Yet even truly “Galician” orthographies, such as the “Želexivka” (the orthography designed by Jevhen Želexivs'kyj for his Ukrainian-German dictionary of 1886), included non-Galician models to a considerable extent. And the so-called Kharkiv orthography of 1928 and 1929 (cf. Vakulenko 2007), which many diaspora Ukrainians still adhere to and which indeed serves as an important point of reference within the recent discourse on the reform of Ukrainian orthography, was only the result of a quite reasonable Galician–non-Galician compromise, abandoned in 1933 at the peak of Stalinist terror in Ukraine. As a matter of fact, many peculiarities of the Galician variety of Ukrainian were best preserved in the Ukrainian diaspora, especially in North America, after Galicia was annexed by the Soviet Union. In Soviet Ukraine, Galician Ukrainian was persecuted and supplanted by a more Russianized Soviet variety of Ukrainian. Still, the Ukrainian language as such has remained more vital in Galicia than in any other area of Ukraine. Most likely, this is the reason why some contemporaries, especially those who still question the right of the Modern Standard Ukrainian language to exist, have developed a particularly negative attitude toward Galicia and Galician Ukrainian.

1. Anti-Galician sources on the Internet

Philologists studying the history of Slavic languages are perfectly aware of the fact that their field has always been an object of politically motivated debate and manipulation. By its very nature, the history of a language is part of a broader historical narrative. Scholarly and nonscholarly interpretations concerning the emergence and development of the Ukrainian language have been extremely varied over the years.

For instance, when N. M. Pašaeva published a book in 2001 on the history of the “Russian movement in Galicia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries” with the publishers of the renowned State Public Historical Library (Государственная Публичная Историческая Библиотека) in Moscow, most readers would certainly have expected a history of Galician Russophiles. Surprisingly, however, the book is devoted to the history of the Galician “Ruthenian” (“Ukrainian”) awakening, which is presented as “a complex phenomenon of the fatherland’s history” (“сложный феномен отечественной истории”) (Pašaeva 2001: 3) from a clearly Russian perspective.¹

Although Pašaeva’s work contains few innovative elements and suffers from numerous substantial shortcomings, it is still part of the scholarly discourse. A Google search for the author’s name (“Н. М. Пашаева”) quickly demonstrates that, regardless of Pašaeva’s own intentions, her work has still another meaning outside the academic world: the site <http://ukrstor.com/paszaewa.html>, one of the first results, contains links to the book and to two more of Pašaeva’s articles, on the Galician Russophile Ivan Naumovyč and the Russophile organization Halyc’ko-Rus’ka Matycja. In addition, the following emblem is located right above these links:



Source: <http://ukrstor.com/paszaewa.html>

The message is obvious: according to certain Russian chauvinist traditions, Galicia is viewed as one of the ancient Russian lands (“Русская Галиция”), whereas “Ukrainian nationalist” Galicia is stigmatized as the quite recent result of Austro-German—or Polish—or Jewish—at any rate, foreign-born, anti-Russian intrigue

1 As a reminder: geographically, “Rus” in its more general meaning initially referred to all territories of Kyivan Rus’ (in a narrower sense it meant just the Kyiv-Pereiaslav region). Russian *русский* ‘Russian’ is derived from “Rus’,” and some people argue that it has two meanings: 1) “belonging to Russia,” 2) “belonging to ‘Rus’.” Russian chauvinists, as well as representatives of the “Russophile” (or “Muscophile”) movement, which found many adherents in Galicia in the second half of the nineteenth century, denied any substantial difference between the two meanings and believed that everything pertaining to “Rus” is just “Russian” in the sense of “all-Russian” (comprising all Eastern Slavs). But apart from the many other shortcomings of that interpretation, it is obvious that the non-Russophile “Rusyny” (“Rusyns” or “Ruthenians”) of Galicia explicitly distanced themselves from the “Great Russians” (or “Muscovites”) yet identified themselves with the “Malorossiiane” (“Little Russians”) of the Russian Empire when they continued to refer to their own matters as *руский/руський* (“Ruthenian”), and so on. Hence, whereas their term can be adopted into modern Ukrainian as *руський*, it is certainly a mistake to translate it into Russian as *русский*. In order to be clearly identified, Galician “Rusyny” and the “Malorossiiane” of the Russian Empire adopted the name “Ukrainians” during the last decades of the nineteenth century and first decades of the twentieth century.

("Ukraine über alles"). Languages are not only the medium of such absurd propaganda but also their objects, in many cases. In regard to the debates on the role of Ukrainian and Russian in Ukraine, this obviously holds true for both languages. It is remarkable that the particular role of the Galician variant of the Ukrainian language has been strongly (re)emphasized since 1991 within the discussions on Ukrainian.

This article will demonstrate that the Galician variant of the Ukrainian language is still one of the favorite targets not only of an anti-Galician but also of a more general anti-Ukrainian, and eventually anti-European, discourse. Being interested in current attitudes toward the Galician variety of Ukrainian, I recently conducted extensive Google searches for the expressions "галицкий язык" (in Russian) and "галицька мова" (in Ukrainian), both meaning "Galician language" (on 20 March, 2 July, and 4 July 2007, with some proofreadings between 11 and 20 July 2007). Of course, these electronic searches can only be regarded as an initial stage of this subproject. Yet they provide a good impression of the prevailing attitudes toward Galician Ukrainian in today's most important general information source, the Internet. Moreover, they provide access not only to the different views of various "experts" but also to the current opinions of numerous "nonexperts" who appear as participants in various Internet forums and blogs and adopt the "experts'" attitudes to some extent in their own way. Some of these sources are very likely to disappear from the Internet within the next months or years. Yet, as a mirror for certain linguistic ideologies, which prove to be still alive at the turn of the twenty-first century, they deserve to be studied, regardless of their intellectual level, which quite often appears to be very low.

Although the present article is part of my project "One thousand years of Ukrainian language history in Galicia,"² the more unconventional approaches to the history of Galician Ukrainian encountered in the sources used here will be largely excluded from the present analysis. Still, it should be mentioned that, apart from the quite banal discourse on the alleged linguistic unity in Kyivan Rus' and the long-lasting linguistic unity of "Little Russian," "Ruthenian," and Russian afterwards, at least some of the tendentious scholarly sources do contain interesting information on the history of the Ukrainian language in the nineteenth century (see pp. 20–24 in this volume). Yet most interpretations of these materials in extremely Ukrainophobic works (such as Karevin 2006 or Ul'janov 1966/1996/2003) are merely absurd, so that only a careful examination can make these publications useful as additional sources for the historical study of the Ukrainian language's history. Then they can help overcome certain shortcomings of modern Ukrainianist philology, which usually pays too little attention to phenomena such as the Galician Russophile movement, or the contradictory attitude toward Ukrainian observed in some central figures of the nineteenth-century Ukrainian movement, such as Pantelejmon Kuliš and many others (see pp. 20–34 in this volume; cf. also Moser 2011a).

2 The project "One thousand years of Ukrainian language history in Galicia" was awarded the START prize by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in 2005. The project focuses on the interrelations between internal and external language histories in an area that has always played a significant role in the history of the Ukrainian language in general.

For my analysis, I viewed the first 150–200 entries under both the Russian and the Ukrainian expressions. Altogether the more relevant sources in this sampling comprise about 1,000 printed pages. The documents vary widely in length (from one printed page to about fifty) and in intellectual level. Among them, we find various text types: chapters from scholarly and nonscholarly books, as well as articles from scholarly and nonscholarly journals, newspaper articles, Internet articles, various Weblogs, and Internet forums. Most documents originate from Ukrainian sources, and others from Russian ones. Very few authors from other countries appear in these forums. In the results of these Google searches, anti-Ukrainian and anti-Galician views clearly prevail, especially in the search results for Russian “галицкий язык.” Not surprisingly, texts written in Russian tend to be of an anti-Galician orientation much more often than those written in Ukrainian, although this is indeed only a tendency. Quite frequently, anti-Galician texts are located on sites that are explicitly devoted to certain political interests, such as “Я–Anti-Orange” (“I am anti-Orange”), “Единое отечество” (“United fatherland”), or “Единая Русь” (“United Rus’”). The Russian language clearly dominates blogs of this kind, whereas contributions in Ukrainian are usually introduced by bloggers who oppose anti-Galician statements. As a matter of fact, unanimously positive assessments of the Galician variant of Ukrainian and its historical role appear very rarely, for instance, on the few Ukrainian sites that are explicitly devoted to peculiarities of Galician Ukrainian (e.g., “Fish” 2003 or “L'vivs'ka gvara” 2007). They occur in some apologetic sources from which I will quote at the end of this study, and in some scholarly articles (including my own).

Some anti-Galician sources are characterized by a particularly hateful attitude toward speakers of Galician Ukrainian, that is, the Galician Ukrainians and the North American diaspora, whereby the latter is usually viewed as an important stronghold of “Galician Ukrainianness.” There is virtually no anti-Galician or anti-Ukrainian stereotype that would not appear in these sources, and many of them clearly violate all rules of good taste. In particular, this holds for some of the forums where people hiding behind their nicknames strongly confirm all the widely debated disadvantages of the anonymity of cyberspace. Most of the steadily repeated traditional stigmatizations of Galician Ukrainians as “banderovcy” (or “banderovcy”) (“people who are followers of Stepan Bandera,” a leading ideologist of Ukrainian nationalism and organizer of the Ukrainian resistance against the Nazi, as well as the Soviet, regimes) and “zapadency” (or “zapadency”) (“Westernizers (viewed in a negative light)”) have been well-known at least since Stalin’s times. In the worst sources, the Galicians of Galicia and of the diaspora are accused of being traditional sympathizers of the Nazi ideology (cf. Geraščenko 2007);³ most often, this occurs in texts whose authors clearly adhere to a totalitarian, anti-democratic, anti-Western (and often anti-Semitic) ideology themselves. Other authors, trying to appeal to the Germanophobic emotions that are still widespread in anti-Western circles in post-Soviet countries, remind readers of Camp Thalerhof near Graz, where

3 Cf. “‘Язык высшего порядка’, надо полагать, предназначен для людей высшего сорта, белокурых галицких арийцев” and some more straightforward attacks.

Galician Russophiles (and not only Russophiles) were imprisoned during the last years of the Austrian monarchy (Anisimova 2000). Another rhetorical device that is well-known from Stalinist discourse and appears in the blogs is the comparison of targeted groups to various animals. Clearly, most of the labels used in anti-Galician discourse are, above all, expressions of certain intellectual deficiencies. The only interesting label, “Ukrainian Croats” (“украинские хорваты”), seems to be quite uncommon, appearing in only a single source (Baulin 2007).

2. Negative labels for Galician Ukrainian

When an assessment is based on insufficient knowledge, various superficial labels are often used as substitutes for sound argument. This holds true for assessments of languages or varieties of languages.

2.1. Not Ukrainian: In many anti-Galician sources, Galician Ukrainian is placed in opposition to “real” Ukrainian and depicted as virtually non-Ukrainian. “Maskal” 2007, for example, writes about the “Galician...not the Ukrainian” language and adds that it differs from “real Ukrainian...in pronunciation (intonation of words and sentences) and in the use of Polish words” (“Maskal” 2007). According to this widespread anti-Galician and anti-Ukrainian myth, it is not “real Ukrainian” but “the Galician language” that has been imposed on all Ukrainians since at least 1991.⁴

2.2. Dialect and mixed language: Most authors merely identify the Galician variant of Ukrainian as an entity that they call “the Galician dialect” (“галицкий диалект” (Poliščuk 2003) or “на галицком наречии” (Enals-Pilugina 2007)) or “the so-called Galician dialect” (“так называемое галицкое наречие” (Macuka 2004)). Skvorcov 2007 writes more concretely about “the Galician urbanistic [why not *urban/городской*?] dialect, generously ‘enriched’ by Polonisms and diaspora Americanisms” (“галицкий урбанистический диалект, милостиво «обогащенный» полонизмами и диаспорными американизмами”).⁵ Others call Galician Ukrainian a “Westernizing Polish dialect” (“западенско[!]-польское наречие”) (“Dreamer” 2007), and still others refer to it as “the Polish-Galician language” (“Польско-Галицкий язык”) (Ivanov 2007). Related labels such as “Galician Surzhyk” (“галицийский СУРЖИК [*sic*, in capitals]”) (Kornilov 2000)], “Ukrainian-Polish ‘Surzhyk’” (“на украинско-польском суржике”) (Macuka 2004) or, more aggressively, “dirty Surzhyk” (Anonymous 2007a),⁶ “Polish-Galician jargon” (“польско-галицийский жаргон”) (Vadrža 2007a or Kolesnikov 2002), “Polish-Hutsulian mixture...with absurd dialectisms” (“Польско-гуцульский микс [...] нелепые диалектизмы”) (Jurčenko 2007), and “hybrid language—neither

4 Even pro-Ukrainian participants of certain forums, who explicitly distance themselves from that absurd assertion, may argue that Galicians cannot be forced to speak “normal Ukrainian,” whereas inhabitants of Poltava cannot be forced to speak “with a Galician accent” (“Dybil” 2006).

5 “Anticommunist” 2007 is certain that “Ukrainian” is a Polonized Old Russian language, yet not Polish” (“Украинский’ это ополяченный старорусский язык, но не польский”).

6 “Вы же, твари, не знаете ни языка, ни дерьмовы! Трендите на грязном суржике. Бидляуки холомовні!”

Polish...nor Ukrainian" ("Šturman" 2005),⁷ also put the emphasis on the "mixed" or "dialectal" character of Galician Ukrainian. So did a nicknamed contributor to a blog on Viktor Janukovyč's personal information server—whose absurd text was, however, deleted from the server between 2 and 11 July 2007: he called Galician Ukrainian "a Polonized Roman-Galician dialect" ("Vladimir" 2007),⁸ whereas another blogger speaks about "the Galician Romanian-Polish language" ("на галицкой румыно-польской мове") ("Харков" 2007), and still another is certain that "the 'Ukrainian' language" is also "Lithuanized" ("Anticommunist" 2007a).⁹ Probably the most absurd label of this sort, which reflects the general xenophobic attitude of the anti-Galician discourse, is offered by "Margo" 2007, who introduces the term "this Polish-German-Yiddish Galician dialect" ("эта польско-немецко-идишская галицка говирка"), while referring not to Galician Ukrainian in particular, but to the contemporary Ukrainian standard language in general. Others decide to describe the Galician dialect as something ridiculous, while confessing that they have never come upon authentic examples of it.¹⁰

2.3. The alien language of the diaspora: In some sources, Galician Ukrainian is primarily characterized as the language of the alien, North American Ukrainian diaspora. One blogger calls Galician Ukrainian a "Western dialect," which is nothing but the "dialect of the American and Canadian diaspora...who thinks that all of Ukraine should talk like that" ("Al." 2006). Poliščuk 2003 even tries to show that the "Galician dialect" of the North American diaspora is characterized by more Russian elements than the Ukrainian language in Ukraine. In a particularly hateful article, he accuses the North American diaspora of traditionally preferring this "dialect" to "literary Ukrainian."

2.4. The artificial language: If it is not the "Polish," "Roman," "Romanian," "German," "Yiddish," "American," "Canadian," or "dialectal" character of Galician Ukrainian that is attacked, then its allegedly "artificial" character is stressed. Some participants of various forums do not hesitate to call it "newspeak" ("новояз") ("Myslyvec" 2007), or more expressively, "artificial Galician newspeak" ("искусственный галицкий новояз") ("Enals-Pilugina" 2007), in complete ignorance of the original meaning of the term.¹¹ Referring to historical myths created by certain anti-Ukrainian ideologists (cf. Karevin 2006), one blogger

7 "Вот и получается язык-гибрид - и не польский (так как надо напрягаться и учить язык), и не украинский (который многие галичане, похоже, не знают)."

8 "[...] базикают Романо-галицким опоященным диалектом."

9 "Наверное 'украинский' язык еще и олитовченный, кто его знает, вы филолог вам виднее."

10 "Как-то где-то я наткнулась на образцы галицкого наречия: абсолютно ничего не поняла. Посмеялась, а сохранить не додумалась. Но иногда для дебатов было бы неплохо знать настоящие, а не придуманные некими панамы слова 'народного языка.' Может, кто-то сталкивался в жизни с нелитературной [sic] мовой? (Я, честно говоря, много лет живя на Украине, нет!) Тогда, пожалуйста, приведите примеры! (Какие-нибудь характерные словечки, фразы)" ("ІЕЇ" 2005). The anti-Galician character of this contribution is only clear from the fact that it is located on the site "Я-Anti-Orange." In general, one may laugh about (not at) a dialect and sincerely value it.

11 Adopted from George Orwell's novel 1984, the term "newspeak" was applied to the language of communist propaganda in the Eastern bloc.

argues that it is “the tragedy of Ukraine” that “two Ukrainian languages” compete with one another, first “the Polonized Galician invention hastily made by Hruševs'kyj and his fellows,” and second, “the vernacular of Central and Eastern Ukraine propagated by Hruševs'kyj's teacher Nečuj-Levyč'kyj” (“nickpro” 2006).¹² Geraščenko 2007, a particularly aggressive author, speaks about “the new Galician literary language that was hastily created on the basis of the Polonized Galician dialect by the activists of the Ukrainian movement in full accordance with the Austrian politics of separatism” and rhetorically uses the genuinely Polish form of the adjective “літерацька” (‘literary’) in order to underline the allegedly alien character of this language.¹³

2.5. The non-existent “language”: One of the most paradoxical attitudes toward Galician Ukrainian, which is a well-known component of the general anti-Ukrainian discourse used since the nineteenth century, is expressed in a forum by a particularly aggressive person hiding behind the nickname “Ivanov.” He describes Ukrainian in general and Galician Ukrainian in particular as “a non-existent language in a non-existent state” (“Ivanov” 2006),¹⁴ which comes quite close to the wording of the Valuev Circular of 1863 with its paradoxical limitation of the use of a language “that never existed, does not exist, and cannot exist.” The same view is offered by another contributor who tries to present himself as a polyglot but suffers a painful defeat while trying to write a few words in Polish: “Ja wiem Rossijski i rozumie Polski. Ja movie - cholopy, chodźcie iz Krymu do dupy! Ja nie wiem języka Ukraińskiego. Jego nie ma. To nie est jakij sie język” (“I know Russian and understand Polish—I say, peasants, go from the Crimea to my ass! I do not know the Ukrainian language. It does not exist. It is not a language at all”) (“Micha” 2007). Yet another device that was often used in the past is the use of quotation marks for Galician Ukrainian in particular and Ukrainian in general. Certain authors, such as Smolin 2007, speak of “the invention of a separate ‘Ukrainian’ language” (“ізобретение особого ‘українського’ языка”) and subsequently refer to it only as “the language” (“язык”), again in quotation marks. Ljapunov 2006 writes about the “‘Ukrainian’ scholarly language” (“‘український’ научний язык”). Still others refer to Ukrainian as “the so-called state language” or “the state language named Ukrainian” (“так называемой ‘державной мовы’”, “‘державным’ языком под названием украинского”) (Baulin 2007), or simply “the state language” (“державная мова” or abbreviated “держмова”) (Baulin 2007). Some authors write about the “Little Russian language” (“малороссийский язык”) that was named “Ukrainian” at the beginning of the twentieth century (Baulin 2004), about

12 “Трагедия Украины: борьба между двумя украинскими языками — полонизированным галицким наколеночным изобретением Грушевского сотоварищи [sic] и народным языком Центральной и Восточной Украины, пропагандировавшимся учителем Грушевского, Нечуй-Левицким.”

13 “В полном соответствии с австрийской политикой разделения деятели украинского движения спешно сочиняли ‘нову галицьку літерацьку мову’ на основе полонизированного галицкого говора.”

14 “[...] давайте еще полиберальничаем и сами начнем говорить на несуществующем языке в несуществующем государстве. Традиционный вопрос, вам это надо?”

the "Little Russian dialect" ("На малорусском наречии") (Vpixatynec 2004), or even about the "West Russian literary language" ("западорусский письменный язык") ("Anticomunist" 2007a) that was abandoned for the sake of an "absolutely artificial" ("абсолютно искусственный") "Ukrainian-Ruthenian" language ["українсько-руського" *[sic, in Ukrainian and in quotation marks]* ЯЗЫКА *[sic, in Russian, in capital letters]*) (Vpixatynec 2004). Yet many refer to it in Ukrainian as "the mother tongue" ("рідна мова") ("Astakhov" 2007) or just as "the language" ("мова") (Baulin 2007, Gerašenko 2007) within a Russian text.¹⁵

2.6. The language and its speakers: As usual, some of the most tasteless derogatory "glottonyms" aim at characterizing a language by hateful stereotypes that the authors associate with its speakers. "Ivanov" 2006 calls Galician Ukrainian "the language of Galician cattle" ("мовою галичанського бидла") ("Ivanov" 2006a), or merely the "cattle nonsense" ("на быдлячей тарабарщині") ("Ivanov" 2006b).¹⁶ A "congenial" participant of another forum asserts that "the Ukrainian language is not a language but the sounds of animals...of the Jewish-Polish [!] cattle from Galicia" ("Voin" 2007).¹⁷ The pejorative derivational variant "галичанский," which is formed from *галичанин* ("inhabitant of Galicia"), is widely used in the anti-Galician sources. Baulin 2007 writes about the widespread "Westernizing pronunciation" ("западєнское [!] произношение") and complains that Ukrainian pupils have already begun "to pronounce *g* in the Galician manner" ("по-галичански [!] 'г'-кати" *[sic; the author clearly means [g]]*), whereas even speakers of Russian in Ukraine pronounce it "softly" [!]. Of course, Baulin expresses his sympathy for the people from the Donbas region and the Crimea who do not want to learn "the Galician mother tongue of the Ukrainian diaspora" ("они не хотят учить 'рідну галичанську мову' української діаспори"). Like so many others, he is convinced that in the schools of Ukraine it is the "Galicians' language" ("язык галичан") that is being taught at the moment, and that "the language of 10 percent of the population" is being imposed on the rest. This particularly annoys him because, according to him, it is Galician that is "the least developed and most archaic" ("на самом неразвитом, архаичном языке!") among the five East Slavic languages [!] that he finds in Ukraine (the others are Russian, "Little Russian," "Poltavian," and "Rusyn"). Moreover, referring to the fact that Galicia is an economically weak region of Ukraine, Baulin does not hesitate to write about Galician Ukrainian as "a beggars' language" ("язык нищеты"). In another particularly tasteless contribution that aims in the same direction, the Galician variant of Ukrainian is not only called a "Western Ukrainian dialect from Ternopil and Lviv" ("западноукраїнський діалект (Тернопільсько-Львівський)") but also "partly the language of the day laborers of

15 "Некоторые национально-озабоченные деятели попытаются приписать нам оскорбление мовы."

16 "[...] цвет титульной нации-галичане говорят на быдлячей тарабарщине, которая не имеет никакого отношения к украинской мове это ж факт, не требующий доказательств" ("Ivanov" 2006b).

17 "Українська мова - это не язык, это крики животных (мычанье, гавканье, хрюканье, карканье) - жидопольского быдла [!] из Галичины..."

the last century” and “partly the language of the war criminals (the Bandera people) who have settled in Canada and America” (“Tanja” 2006).¹⁸

2.7. “Glottonyms” derived from swearwords: The last category among the derogatory glottonyms applied to Galician Ukrainian and to Ukrainian in general is based on mere swearwords. One of them is “дерьмова” or “галичанська дерьмова,” which is derived from Russian *дерьмо* ‘dirt, mud, smut’ and can be interpreted as a tasteless parody of “держмова”¹⁹ (Anonymous 2007a).²⁰ Another one is “дупомова,” which is derived from *дуна* ‘ass’ (Anonymous 2007b).²¹

A blogger with the strange nickname “Ukrainian patriot” (“Украинский патриот”) manages to combine all of the most tasteless derogatory labels within one entry:

...the “language” [Ukrainian “mova” in the Russian text] does not exist beyond the sphere of radio and TV; some idiot decided to declare a dead language the state language [“гумударственным” could be either a typographical error or an allusion to “homo-” :)]...as long as I have been alive and traveling through all of Ukraine (Luhansk, Donetsk, Kyiv, the Crimea, Kharkiv, Odesa, Kherson), I have not heard alive “the language” [Ukrainian “mova” in the Russian text] but only our beloved mother tongue, the Russian language, was around...maybe in Bandera’s land in the wild forgotten bunkers [the word is taken from Polish *schron* ‘bunker’] far in the woods and mountains “the language” even exists, but in what way are these wild places related to Ukraine? ...so that the people’s language, Russian, should be the state language, and not the “der’mova,” the language of peasants and bulls.²²

18 “Навязывается именно западноукраинский диалект (Тернопольско-Львовский) и отчасти диалект прошло столетних заробитчан и военных преступников (бандэровцев), что осели в частности в Канаде и Америке.”

19 “Вы же, твари [!], не знаете ни языка [obviously, Russian is meant here], ни дерьмовы! [...] А що стосується м’якої Г, то це - чисто ‘галичанський’ діалект тієї же дерьмови! Ви - безродні жидята [!!!], які нічого не вміють, крім обливання лайном сусіда, який розумніший за вас. У западенському діалекті м’яка Г часто замінює нашу Д, наприклад – г’івка-дівка. І ви ще хочете сказати, що це гавкотіння і є укромова? БРЕШЕТЕ, СУКИ!!! [!]. Це є галичанська дерьмова, суміш мови з пшецьким діалектом. Коротше, ніколи не буде по вашому! НИКОЛИ!”

20 Interestingly, it is the very same author who appeals to the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages for the protection of Russian in Ukraine.

21 “ДУПОМОВА В СВИНАРНИКЕ [...] Ведь мова является жлобства основой, Её насаждает мутантный урод. От той дупомовы нас сильно тошнило [...] Терпеть эту мерзость уже нету силы, От мовы желудок и ногу свело. [...] Всё больше свилярник смердит дупомовой, Что делать, не знает несчастный народ, Руина, разруха – всё это не ново... Всё это устроил нам галицкий сброд.”

22 “[...] мова не существует за пределами радио и тв, какоц [!, a typing error] идиот надумал мертвую мову гумударственным [cf. above] языком объявит [sic :)] [...] сколько живу и бываю по всей Украине (Луганск, Донецк, Киев, Крым, Харьков, Одесса, Херсон), не слышал живую мову, крутом наш родной и любимый русский язык [...] может там на бандеровщине и есть мова в диких забытых схронах далеко в лесах и горах, но какое отношение имеют те дикие места к Украине? [...] так что государственным должно [sic] быть язык народа - русский язык, а не селяковская дерьмова бычачья” (“Ukrainskii patriot” 2005).

3. Modern Standard Ukrainian—a Galician project?

Interestingly, virtually all anti-Galican authors claim that, since 1991, Galician Ukrainian has been imposed on the rest of Ukraine. According to them, Ukrainian nationalists (the “conscious Ukrainians,” cf. also the formation “свідомити,” from Ukrainian *свідомий*, as used by “anb” 2006 and “Tanja” 2006) regard it as the best (“exclusively conscious”) variety of Ukrainian.²³ Hence they spread the myth that, after 1991, it was only the Galician Ukrainians and the North American emigrants who began reorganizing the functionality, orthography, and the very structure of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine. In particular, the suggestions that were made for orthographic reforms are characterized as “the appearance of a stubbornness that is traditional in Galicia” (“проявление традиционного для Галичины упрямства”) (Kornilov 2000), because the Galicians are allegedly unable to realize that Galicia is only one of Ukraine’s regions. Based on that attitude, other writers do not hesitate to write about the emergence of a “Galician” or, in another version, “Great Galician imperialism” (!) (“галицкий империализм” or “великогалицкий империализм”) (Jurčenko 2007).

To be sure, within this strange narrative it is the Galicians who are allegedly spoiling Ševčenko’s language (Jurčenko 2007), which is described as “real Ukrainian” or, as others put it in closer conformity with their view of the world, real “Little Russian.” In the forums, some participants would even explicitly assert what some anti-Ukrainian authors state only implicitly: for them, eventually nothing but Russian can be the “real Ukrainian” language [!] (“Anticommunist” 2007b).

One component of the anti-Galician myth asserts that, since 1991, the Galicians have been taking revenge for what the Bolsheviks did to them in 1933, preventing the Galicians from imposing their language on the rest of Ukraine for the first time. A lot of anti-Galician authors would agree with Macuka 2004 or Skvorcov 2007 that, since 1991, the “Ukrainian Westernizers” (“українці-западники”) have done their best to pass off “the so-called Galician dialect” as “the Ukrainian language” and to force the rest of Ukraine to accept it. According to this view, Ukrainians from the North American diaspora joined this effort, which was nothing but revenge (Kornilov 2000).²⁴ Now, the Galicians even want to punish those who do not speak like them, especially speakers of Ukrainian-Russian “Surzhyk,” although according to the anti-Galician faction, the Galician language is the real “Surzhyk,” and the Ukrainian-Russian mixture that is commonly referred to as “Surzhyk” is the genuine “Little Russian dialect” (“малорусское наречие”), spoken by far more people than “the Galician language” (Kornilov 2000).²⁵ Continuing in this vein, Andrei Vadžra, one of the authors who try to present themselves as serious scholars, claims that

23 “Вот этот диалект и навязывается всей Украине, как вынятково-свідомый” (“Tania” 2006).

24 “Діаспора все більше використовувала саме галицькі варіанти орфографії. Реванш галичане мечтали взяти завжди. Те, що пропонував Жулинський, - і єсть в більшій мірі цей самий реванш.”

25 “За ‘умишенне искаженіє’ українського мови націоналісти намірені всіх підля штрафувати, під гарячу руку повинні потрапити перш за все ті, хто говорить на руско-української суміші, суржикі” [...].

Ukraine is characterized not by bilingualism but by trilingualism, with Russian, the “Little Russian dialect” (“Surzhyk”), and the literary Ukrainian language functioning as the three main languages of the country. The Ukrainian literary language, according to him, is nothing but a variety of Galician Ukrainian and is only spoken by “a handful of trained ‘conscious Ukrainians.’” Subsequently, this variety of Ukrainian is linked to the ideology of the Orange Revolution; therefore, Vadžra 2007 calls it “orangeoid.”²⁶

Within the framework of this puzzling discourse, the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language itself ultimately appears to be “not real Ukrainian” but a variant of Galician Ukrainian (Geraščenko 2007).²⁷ Many anti-Galician authors would agree with Sokolov 2007, who asserts that “the real Ukrainian (Little Russian language),” as represented in Kvitka’s and Ševčenko’s works, significantly differs from “the Ukrainian literary language, as it was formed in Galicia.” The latter is an “artificial creation, it appeared under a strong German and Polish influence” and became the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language.²⁸ The creators of this language allegedly took as their basis “the Galician dialect, which was most heavily soiled [!] by Polish and German words” (“галицкое наречие, наиболее засоренное польскими и немецкими словами”) (Kolesnikov 2002), whereas elements of the genuine Ukrainian dialects were accepted only with utmost caution. Skvorcov 2007 even feels motivated to warn that “the Ukrainian language itself will soon not be Slavic anymore” if the influence of the Galicians from Galicia and from the diaspora continues. As the final outcome, he expects “an entirely West European macaronic mixture” (“вполне западноевропейскую макароническую помесь”).

As a consequence, some ardent anti-Ukrainians even assert that, despite their alleged command of true Ukrainian, they do not know and do not want to know the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language because they are sure that it is nothing but Galician by origin. Some are convinced that only Galicians can understand this language (Anonymous 2007),²⁹ while others “do not use this language as a matter of principle” and regard it as “a hostile language” (Ivanov 2006a).³⁰ “Margo”

26 “У нас не двуязычие, как принято считать, а триязычие. Думаю где-то 95% населения современной Украины говорит и думает или на русском языке, или на малорусском наречии (суржике). И лишь ничтожная горстка дрессированных ‘свидомых украинцев’ принципиально изъясняются на литературном украинском языке. [...] Получается странный, наспех сделанный полуфабрикат, который я называю ‘оранжойдом.’”

27 “[...] Ибо и создатели его, и его противники называли язык галицким, а не украинским. Галицким по своей сути и структуре он остался и поныне.”

28 “[...] литературный украинский язык в том виде, в каком он был образован в Галиции, весьма существенно отличался от собственно украинского (малорусского) языка, от языка Квитки и Шевченко, и представлял собой искусственное создание, возникшее под сильным немецким и польским влиянием.”

29 “Разве Галицкий язык понятен полтавчанину или харьковчанину, или Галицкие пляски близки сердцу сумчанина, или одесские шутки понятны галичанину!?”

30 “[...] що українську (sic, the author uses “I” for i and i) мову, підкреслюю УКРАЇНСЬКУ, а не ГАЛИЧАНСЬКУ розумію мабуть краще за тебе, але не використовую її принципово. При цьому залишую право використовувати її тим для кого вона є рідна. Для мене, завдяки таким як ти ‘укропатріотам,’ після вашого помаранчового цирку українська мова є мовою ворожою, знати її потрібно лише для того, щоб повноцінно й найбільш [sic] ефективно боротися з ворогом на його території [...]” [all orthographic peculiarities originate from the source].

2007 claims that she does not reply to any messages she gets in Ukrainian, and—probably guided by wishful thinking—asserts that she has even forced firms from Lviv to switch to “the human language” (“человеческий язык,” an often-used label for Russian as opposed to Ukrainian).³¹

“Enals-Pilugina” 2007 asserts that “the Kobzar’s descendants” do not want to speak Ukrainian because the modern Ukrainian language is “a mixture of the Galician-Polish dialect and the newspeak that was invented in the nineteenth century.”³² Of course, based on the interpretation of “Ukrainian” and “Galician” as two separate languages, the unity of the Ukrainian state is openly questioned in some forums, too.³³

Most of the sources we have been dealing with up to now confirm the opinion of “Viter” that Galician matters, including the Galician variety of Ukrainian, have unfortunately become the object of a true “information war” (“Viter” 2006).³⁴

Yet it is not only openly anti-Ukrainian authors who warn against the allegedly growing influence of the Galician variety of Ukrainian and the North American diaspora’s impact in Ukraine. One of the most prominent intellectuals who joined this anti-Galician discourse to a certain degree was Petro Toločko, a renowned archaeologist from the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences. In his leaflet *Who or What Endangers the Ukrainian Language?* (published in 1998), Toločko referred to the anti-Galician discourse of Ukrainian authors such as Ivan Nečuj-Levyc’kyj and others and reasserted, without any tempering, that the Ukrainian language has been “soiled” by “the Galician dialect” (later he refers to the same idiom as “the Galician language”),³⁵ that “the Galician dialect” is “entirely Polonized,” and that up to the end of the twentieth century, “two literary languages,” the “Dnipro” literary language and the “Galician” literary language, have coexisted (Toločko 1998). According to Toločko’s absurd claim, the “Galician...orthography” was created in the nineteenth century on the basis of “Latin or Polish” models, and the Galicians did not want to adopt “the phonetic language” [*sic*]. Toločko continues to write that, whereas the “Dnipro” literary language has proceeded far ahead in its development during the twentieth century, the “Galician” literary language (“in its diaspora variant”) has remained stuck in its position since the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. In this same leaflet, Toločko rejects the alleged attempt of the North American diaspora to influence the development of Ukrainian in post-Soviet Ukraine. Toločko’s linguistic arguments extend to some lexical

31 “А я начала борьбу с суржей Грушевского... С любой фирмой приславшей письмо, факс и т.д. на т. н. сов.укр.языке прерываются любые отношения. Любые!!! Вы знаете-помогает! Даже львовские фирмы перешли на человеческий язык [...]” (“Margo” 2007).

32 “Почему же потомки Кобзаря до сих пор не желают говорить на украинском? Да потому, что он в своем современном виде – смесь галицко-польского наречия и новояза, придуманного в 19 веке.”

33 “Зачем искусственно создавать видимость единой страны с единой мовой?” (“Èlla” 2006).

34 “Де інформаційна війна, а цей сайт - одне з місць, де точаться бої [...]” (“Viter” 2006).

35 “В ній письменник [Ivan Nečuj-Levyc’kyj] обурюється тим, що українська літературна мова, сформована на базі придніпровських діалектів, засмічується галицькою говіркою” (Toločko 1998).

items but focus mainly on some elements that are usually regarded as matters for “orthographic” discussion in the Ukrainian context, although in reality they mean much more, namely, various approaches to the crucial question of what exactly Standard Ukrainian should look like (Vakulenko 2007).³⁶

4. What is the Galician language?

It is Toločko’s (1998) leaflet that ultimately confirms what we have hitherto observed in virtually all of the sources that we have analyzed up to now: apparently, anti-Galician polemicists usually fail to understand the historical and current roles of Galician Ukrainian and demonstrate a very poor understanding of its structure and its very essence. No anti-Galician author from our sources asks the innocent, crucial questions that are posed in a forum by “Avangard” 2006 (in Ukrainian, from Moscow [!]):

What is the Galician language? Some say that it is a dialect of Ukrainian, others call it a real language of its own?... What elements make it different from the Ukrainian literary language? I have in mind above all grammatical, orthoepic, and orthographic ones. Is there any linguistic sketch on this question? I will be grateful for any information on this topic (“Avangard” 2006).

Even in the non-Ukrainophobic forum that “Avangard” turned to, no sound answer has been offered so far. All one can learn is that “the Galician language contains a lot of Polish words,” and that it would be “more correct to write about ‘the Galician dialect of the Ukrainian language’” (“Igor” 2006) or about “the Galician dialect of Ukrainian + Galician Surzhyk” (“Senk” 2006).

From a linguistic point of view, it is clear that the “Galician Ukrainian dialect,” as so many authors call it without hesitation, has never existed as such. Instead, linguists account for certain southwestern Ukrainian dialects that are spoken in Galicia and share some crucial linguistic qualities. Yet what the anti-Galician authors really discuss in their texts actually does not belong to the sphere of dialects at all. Their attack is directed against the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language in its Galician variant. As anticipated in the introduction, however, this variety is based neither on the “Galician dialect” nor on the southwestern Ukrainian dialects from Galicia but on the literary form of Ukrainian, as adopted primarily from writers such as Taras Ševčenko and Pantelejmon Kuliš between the 1860s and 1870s (cf. Moser 2007: 221; 232–237). Of course, the Galician variant of the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language incorporates certain dialectal elements from the Galician area, too. Yet it is not a dialect as such.

Thus it is nothing but absurd for Jurčenko 2007 to quote the sentence “Та вліли мі вуйко, би-м патрував го. Та власнов руков дав му фажку...” and try to assure

36 Toločko’s work is full of serious shortcomings; a sound response, which is also available on the Internet, was published by Andrij Hornjatkevyč in 2000.

his readers, based on a particularly ill-minded sort of rhetoric,³⁷ that "this is the colloquial language that exists in reality and is still common in the Ivano-Frankivsk region," and that, moreover, this is the language that is now being imposed by the Galicians on the rest of Ukraine. One of the correct responses to such assertions is offered by a non-anti-Galician participant of a forum on "Galician imperialism," who encourages those who constantly attack the alleged Galician linguistic expansionism to "give examples, where absurd Galician dialectal elements are really imposed as the norm of the actively used Ukrainian language" ("Dybil" 2006);³⁸ as might be expected, no convincing response has been posted so far. Obviously, "Angilov" 2005, who offers a parody of the general anti-Galician and anti-Ukrainian discourse and its steadily repeated stereotypes, is perfectly right when he comes to the conclusion that they ultimately originate "in the Soviet arsenal." Apart from the wide use of the traditional images of internal and external enemies, this also holds for the view of the Ukrainian language as the "'Westernizing' Galician language" ("навязывание украинского, в действительности же – 'западенского' Галицкого языка"). Attacks on Galician Ukrainian are, in fact, most often just a part of a general anti-Ukrainian³⁹ and eventually an anti-European program that aims at the destruction of a separate, non-Russian Ukrainian identity and is pursued in the name of pan-Russian concepts such as "the united people," "the common roots," "the common history," "the common language" ("Angilov" 2005).⁴⁰ Another author, Ihor Losiv 1998 (cf. also Hrabovs'kyj 2005), correctly writes about various anti-Galician intellectual "phantoms" that are widespread among anti-Ukrainian authors.⁴¹ He correctly points out that, in this discourse, Galicians are usually assigned the role of the Western, Catholic, or simply alien tempters of the Ukrainian people, of an alien, "non-Ukrainian" force that tore the Ukrainians away from the pan-Russian unity.⁴² Yet, as Losiv states, the creators of this myth are unable to explain how the

37 "Нет, нет уважаемый читатель, это не язык племени ням-ням, не вымышленный диалект из произведений какого-нибудь фантаста и даже не марсианская речёвка. Это реально существующий, разговорный язык, который и поныне бытует в Прикарпатье" (Jurčenko 2007).

38 "Приведите примеры, где 'Навязываются (в том числе и телевидением) галицкие нелепые диалектизмы, в качестве нормы живого украинского языка.'"

39 Yet these anti-Ukrainian authors are not necessarily Russian, as stated by "Angilov."

40 "И конечно же - о туповатых, упрямых с предательским характером, до смешного влюбленных в сало, с языком, которого вроде вовсе и нет – пародией на русский, мало на что самостоятельно способных - украинцах... [...] Так российскими журналистами-политологами был придуман, а точнее и не придуман вовсе, а всего лишь взят из советского арсенала, образ врага, виноватого во всех невзгодах и бедах и российского и украинского народа - Запад во главе с США, и их украинско-фашистские прихвостни – воики УПА-оуновци-бандеровцы, украинские, в советское время буржуазные, а сейчас (то же самое) просто – националисты и другие движения, которые уж если не за Россию – значит за США. А также навязывание украинского, в действительности же - 'западенского' Галицкого языка. [...] Маскируя притягательными лозунгами, вроде – 'единый народ,' 'общие корни,' 'общая история,' 'общий язык,' 'исконно (навек) вместе,' 'нельзя разорвать единый народ' и т.п. апологеты российского империализма пытаются отнять у украинцев право на государственность, язык, территорию, и даже веру – собственную церковь" ("Angilov" 2005).

41 Yet these anti-Ukrainian authors are not necessarily Russian, as stated by Losiv.

42 "Складовою (а де-не-де центральною) частиною цього міфа є галицький міф, який тісно

"Galician seed" could ultimately spread throughout Ukraine, and they stubbornly ignore the fact that Ukrainians from outside Galicia have been struggling for the maintenance of a separate Ukrainian identity, too.⁴³ In essence, it actually turns out that in the typical anti-Galician discourse, virtually everything that is depicted as Galician is just Ukrainian.⁴⁴

As regards the Ukrainian language in particular, anti-Galician attitudes often result from the observation that the Galicians were the first to realize that the sphere of the Ukrainian literary language should not be limited to belles lettres in the long run, but that a full-fledged standard language should be developed (Moser 2011: 303–331). The Galicians not only had the opportunity to make a serious contribution to the development of such a truly polyfunctional standard language in the Austrian Empire, they also made good use of it and started their efficient work on Ukrainian terminology and functional style. On the other hand, it is true that the Ukrainians under the Russian Empire suffered under the Valuev Circular of 1863 and the Ukase of Bad Ems of 1876, which limited the use of Ukrainian in the Russian Empire. But it is also true that, beginning with Pantelejmon Kuliš (Moser 2011a, see pp. 305–336 in this volume), many leading Ukrainian intellectuals from the Russian Empire, and later from the Soviet Union, failed to recognize the significance of the Galician efforts, while their reservations, which were often based on a certain arrogance, were usually not convincing.

Despite all the anti-Galician attitudes, the Galician impact on the Ukrainian language has in fact been quite powerful, at least since the turn of the twentieth century (Ševel'ov 1966). Beginning at least with Stalin's rule, however, Soviet stigmatization of the Galicians as "bourgeois nationalists" or "banderovcy," along with the extremely restrictive and Russian-oriented Soviet language policy, as symbolized by the strictly imposed "orthographic" reforms of 1933 and 1946 (cf. Vakulenko 2007), helped weaken this process for decades. Yet it has never been

пов'язаний з ідеєю 'всемирного заговора' проти Росії, коли весь безлад в російській політиці і житті пояснюється діяльністю зарубіжних ворожих сил. Галичани в межах цієї психополітичної конструкції розглядаються як західні, католицькі, чужі решті України 'искусители' українського народу, 'изобретатели' українського націоналізму і навіть зовсім не українці, які на думку багатьох росіян, мали бути налаштовані проросійськи за визначенням" (Losiv 1998).

43 "Творцям міфу про 'галицьку заразу' важко признатися самим собі, що ніколи не проросло б галицьке зернятко по всій країні, якби не було для цього благодатного ґрунту, психологічного, мовного, політичного, культурного, якби Велика Україна не визнавала Галичину своєю органічною частиною, не визнавала б такою на якомусь глибинному підсвідомому рівні, незважаючи на нав'ювані (досить цілеспрямовано!) побутові штампи - 'бандерівці' і 'западенці.' [...] Між тим, і до теперішнього часу в російській періодиці панує думка: якби не галичани, то не було б проблем з Малоросією, чи з УССР, чи з південно-західним краєм, чи 'прекрасным югом России.' І чомусь не згадують (якщо знають), що навіть тоді, коли Галичина перебувала за межами Великої України, проблеми з українцями все одно були. [...] А якщо б вдумливий дослідник звернув увагу на український дисидентський рух 60-х, 70-х років, то помітив би серед репресованих українських громадських діячів, письменників, вчених, студентів дуже велику кількість тих, хто народився і виховувався на сході України. Та значно простіше і приємніше 'списувати' все на Галичину" (Losiv 1998).

44 "Все, що російська свідомість схильна кваліфікувати як галицьке, по суті є просто українським. [...] Галичину неможливо відділити від України, як і Україну від Галичини" (Losiv 1998).

the “Galician dialect” that has contributed to the development of Modern Standard Ukrainian; it has always been the Galician *variant* of the Modern Ukrainian Standard Language. In the post-Soviet era, it is again not the “Galician dialect” that has come into play but the *Galician variant of Modern Standard Ukrainian*, as it has been partly preserved and developed in Galicia and within the Galician diaspora, particularly in North America. In the end, there is nothing amazing about the fact that the Galician variant of Ukrainian is now in fact playing a certain role in the general development of Ukrainian again. Given the broad functionality of Ukrainian in Galicia, as opposed to most other regions of Ukraine, it is not very likely that any anti-Galician, anti-Ukrainian, and ultimately anti-European attitudes, as encountered in the sources we have been dealing with, will stop that process in the near future.

LANGUAGE POLICY IN CONTEMPORARY UKRAINE (25 FEBRUARY 2010–25 FEBRUARY 2011)

The language situation

Ukrainian is a “large language” inasmuch as it is the official language of the second-largest European country, with a population of roughly 48,457,100 inhabitants.¹ At the same time, it is a “small language” as compared to Russian, which is the official language of the Russian Federation, one of the two official languages of the Republic of Belarus, and widespread in Ukraine. The coexistence of Ukrainian, Russian, and other languages on the territory of Ukraine has been an object of language policy for centuries. This has not changed under the presidency of Viktor Janukovyč, whose inauguration took place on 25 February 2010.

According to the most recent Ukrainian population census of 2001, “ethnic Ukrainians make up 77.8 percent of the population. Other significant ethnic groups are Russians (17.3 percent), Belarusians (0.6 percent), Moldovans (0.5 percent), Crimean Tatars (0.5 percent), Bulgarians (0.4 percent), Hungarians (0.3 percent), Romanians (0.3 percent), Poles (0.3 percent), Jews (0.2 percent), Armenians (0.2 percent), Greeks (0.2 percent), and Tatars (0.2 percent)” (“Opinion”: 4).

Commentators frequently emphasize that “Ukraine is a multiethnic state” (“Opinion”: 4). This multiethnicity is, however, of a very specific character, inasmuch as Russians make up 17.3 percent (or, in absolute numbers, roughly 8.3 mln) of the population, whereas the share of all other, officially more than 130 minority groups is lower than 5 percent, with as few as 0.6 percent Belarusians constituting the largest of them. As for the alleged number of 130 minorities, the Kyiv sociolinguist Volodymyr Skljár has rightly pointed out that it is due to the use of Soviet census lists in compiling the results of the Ukrainian population census of 2001. Many of the so-called nationalities of Ukraine consist only of some individual Soviet migrants, while only nineteen ethnoses fulfill the conventional criteria for the definition of a nationality (see “Masenko: Koly”). Ukraine is thus generally and not unreasonably regarded as a country divided first and foremost along the parameters of Ukrainians vs. Russians and of the Ukrainian vs. the Russian language.

According to the 2001 census, 67.5 percent of the citizens of Ukraine declared Ukrainian as their “*ridna mova*” (roughly, “native language”), while 29.6 percent regarded Russian as their “*ridna mova*.” It is thus obvious that although Ukrainian is the sole official language of Ukraine, a “considerable number of ethnic Ukrainians and persons belonging to non-Russian minorities have a command of the Russian language and even consider it to be their ‘native language’” (“Opinion”: 4). Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism is widespread in the country.

Since the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, the languages of Ukraine have been much more an object of political propaganda than of concrete political

1 My sincere thanks to Dr. habil. Ľubor Matejko for inviting me to prepare a lecture on contemporary Ukrainian language politics. The result of my studies was a monograph (Moser 2013); this article is a preliminary survey.

measures. A poll conducted in 2008 revealed that under the previous presidency of Viktor Juščenko (who fostered the spread of Ukrainian in the country), the number of those who regarded Ukrainian as their sole native language decreased by almost 8 percent in the brief period between May 2006 and October 2008. At the same time, however, the number of those who regarded Russian alone as their native language also decreased by more than 4 percent. The category that increased by more than 13 percent was made up of Ukrainians who declared both Ukrainian and Russian to be their native languages.

Survey (“Opytuvannja”)

	May 2006	June 2007	October 2008
Ukrainian	51.4	52.0	43.7
Russian	30.7	25.7	26.0
Both Ukrainian and Russian	15.6	21.5	28.7
Other language	1.1	0.9	0.9
Hard to say	0.6	0.5	0.7

As is widely known, the vitality of the Ukrainian language depends strongly on the regional factor. As the following poll on “ridna mova” reveals, the prevalently Ukrainian-speaking west remained quite stable even during the above-mentioned, otherwise highly dynamic period. Significant shifts occurred in all other regions.

Which language (“Jaka mova”)

April 2006: West: 90.3 U, 3.8 R, 3.3 R/U Center: 72.0 U, 13.0 R, 14.3 R/U South: 27.7 U, 52.0 R, 17.0 R/U East: 21.3 U, 54.0 R, 23.5 R/U	June 2007: West: 91.3 U, 3.2 R, 3.2R/U Center: 69.0 U, 10.7 R, 19.5 R/U South: 28.9 U, 43.7 R, 25.5 R/U East: 21.2 U, 45.2 R, 32.2 R/U	October 2008: West: 89.9 U, 3.5 R, 4.9 R/U Center: 59.6 U, 0.1 R, 29.1 R/U South: 13.9 U, 48.0 R, 35.4 R/U East: 15.2 U, 44.4 R, 39.0 R/U
---	--	--

Observers have frequently pointed out that the concept of “ridna mova” is “rather ambiguous” inasmuch as, “according to non-governmental sources, it has been understood by the persons filling out the census to mean either the language in which I think and can speak fluently (34 percent), the language of the nationality to which I belong (32 percent), the language my parents speak (24 percent), or the language I use most often (8 percent)” (“Opinion”: 4). Although the category does not really reflect actual language use, it should not be prematurely dismissed: those who declare a language to be their “ridna mova” do to a certain extent express

their loyalty to that language. Even if some individuals who declare Ukrainian to be their “native language” prevalently use Russian, they often tend to favor a policy in support of the Ukrainian language (“Kulyk”: 85). European institutions such as the Venice Commission, however, recommend the dismissal of the category “*ridna mova*” because they maintain that “in line with applicable international standards... the principle of individual free choice should prevail” (“Opinion”: 4). Supporters of the Russian language often share this view because they are convinced that Russian is more widely spoken in the country than Ukrainian.

Actual language usage, however, is not a category easily to be dealt with either. Recent surveys have demonstrated that in everyday communication 40.3 percent of the citizens of Ukraine speak only Russian or prevalently Russian, as compared to 35.3 percent who speak only Ukrainian or prevalently Ukrainian. No fewer than 20.4 percent, however, claim that they use Ukrainian on par with Russian, and 3.1 percent say that they speak so-called “*Surzhyk*” (a mixed Ukrainian-Russian language). Only 0.9 percent use languages other than Ukrainian or Russian (“*Masenko*”).

If Ukraine is a bilingual country, then this bilingualism is clearly asymmetric. An experiment at the turn of the twenty-first century revealed that 90.6 percent of Ukrainophones living in Kyiv switched to Russian when addressed in that language. At the same time, when Russophones were addressed in Ukrainian, 95.3 of them would answer in Russian (“*Masenko mova*”). Moreover, as soon as a Russophone joined two people speaking Ukrainian, in 74.8 percent of cases the latter would switch to Russian, as compared to only 0.7 percent who were ready to do so when a Ukrainophone joined a Russophone group (*ibid.*). The results of these experiments might look different today, but they are nevertheless indicative.

A recent poll by the Research & Branding Group (August 2011) revealed, on the basis of personal interviews, that at home 47 percent of Ukraine’s inhabitants prevalently use Ukrainian (95 percent in the west), 37 percent use Russian (66 percent in the south and east), and 15 percent use Ukrainian and Russian equally. At the workplace, 45 percent prevalently use Ukrainian, 35 percent Russian, and 18 percent both languages equally.

A poll conducted by the Razumkov Center in the same period asked respondents to pick only one language of preference for several domains. For everyday communication, 53.3 percent named Ukrainian, 44.5 percent named Russian, and only 1.4 percent another language. In public places, 49.2 percent use Ukrainian and 48.2 percent Russian (*ibid.*). Obviously, Ukrainians still avoid speaking Ukrainian in the public sphere as a result of language policies applied in the past, when speaking Ukrainian as such was stigmatized as “separatism,” “(bourgeois) nationalism,” etc. in the Russian Empire as well as in the Soviet Union. Among inhabitants of Ukraine, 56.6 percent believe that every citizen should know the Ukrainian language, while 38.2 percent do not share this view (“*Stanovyšče*”).

The Ukrainian language did witness a certain revival in independent Ukraine and, as a result, political activists who favor Russian have bemoaned the “forcible Ukrainization” of the country. Ordinary citizens usually think differently: in 2010,

only 7 percent of the citizens of Ukraine believed that the language issue ranged among their 25 most important problems, and more than half the population claimed that the language question, in particular the status of the Russian language, is of no current interest to them at all; 41.2 percent were satisfied with the current language situation ("7% ukrajinciv").

Among inhabitants of Ukraine, 88 percent in the western oblasts and 65 percent in the central oblasts believe that Ukrainian should remain the only official language of the country. By contrast, roughly 76 percent in the south and east hold that there should be two official languages. Interestingly, however, the number of those who supported the idea of two official languages decreased dramatically from 59 percent to 49 percent between 2009 and 2011 ("Stanovyšče"). Media controlled by leading spokesmen of the Party of Regions disseminate the absurd assertion that "U.S. experts confirm that Russian is the native language of 83 percent of Ukrainians" ("Vadžra").

The Russian language maintains an extremely strong position in the linguistic landscape of Ukraine. Contrary to the myth that no Russian schools and only few Russophone cultural institutions were left in Ukraine under Viktor Juščenko's presidency, in all of Ukraine in the school year 2008/9, 1,199 state schools had Russian as their language of instruction, and 1,628 were bilingual. A total of 779,423 pupils were taught in Russian, 1,292,518 more learned Russian as a subject, and 165,433 more learned it on a facultative basis. Specialists in Russian language and literature were trained in 31 schools. Ninety theaters of Ukraine had a Russian-language repertoire, and 25 more were bilingual. Russians in Ukraine had close to 100 social organizations that received funding from Ukrainian institutions ("Mazuka – Tyščenko"). In 2010/11, 82.3 percent of all pupils and 81.2 of all first-graders were taught in Ukrainian ("Stanovyšče"), but the regional divide was strong. In Odesa oblast, 73.5 percent of all pupils and 69.7 percent of all first-graders were taught in Ukrainian; in Luhansk oblast the figures were 48.5 percent and 43.8 percent. In the Crimea, there were only seven schools with Ukrainian as the language of instruction; in the city of Sevastopol there is only one. As a result, many citizens of Ukraine do not really know the official language (*ibid.*).

Even under Viktor Juščenko's presidency, "in Ukraine, in all spheres of public life, except for the spheres of education, advertising, cinemas, and theaters, Russian is dominant.... Almost 30 percent of film copies were shown in Russian." The most popular programs on prime-time television are predominantly in Russian. The share of Russian-language vs. Ukrainian-language books is 9:1. Only in the educational sphere does Ukrainian still dominate, except for the larger cities in the east and the south of the country. In 2010, 63 percent of all newspapers and magazines were edited in Russian only; in 2011 the share reached 66 percent (Ukrainian: 32 percent and 30 percent, respectively). The remaining media were "bilingual," but "bilingual" newspapers tend to be almost exclusively Russophone. Altogether, only about 13 percent of all print media copies sold in Ukraine were written in Ukrainian (*ibid.*; see also "Doslidžennja").

Ukrainian television does offer Ukrainophone advertisements, news, discussions, and some documentaries (the latter three are also offered in Russian). Ukrainophone films or entertainment on Ukrainian television channels are, however, rarities (see also “Stanovyšče”).²

The status of Ukrainian as the sole official language of Ukraine is secured by the Ukrainian Constitution, so the establishment of Russian as a second official language is not a politically viable option at the moment. The advocates of the Russian language have therefore developed different strategies and tried to make use of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages. Another important factor that should not be forgotten is neighboring Russia, which officially regards as “compatriots” (“sootečestvenniki”) not only Russians but all speakers of Russian and, moreover, all those born in the Soviet Union. Russia has repeatedly referred to the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages in order to call for an elevation of the status of Russian in Ukraine. Russia itself, however, has never ratified that document, and at the same time has recently exerted enormous pressure on the Ukrainian minority (the second-largest minority) in the Russian Federation.

The president and his team assess the language situation

Even prior to the breakup of the Soviet Union, the “Law of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on Languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic” (1989) established Ukrainian as the official language, while simultaneously attributing to Russian the role of the language of “interethnic communication.” Although this latter notion made sense only in the Soviet context, the law of 1989 is still in force (as of early 2012). Moreover, Ukraine’s Constitution of 1996 designates Ukrainian as the sole official language (“Opinion”). Although Ukrainian law stipulates that every state official must know the official language, an astounding number of leading Ukrainian politicians are either unable or unwilling to use it in public (beginning with Prime Minister Mykola Azarov).

President Janukovyč’s attitude to the Soviet past is highlighted by the fact that in 2011 he signed a law stipulating the public use of red banners as a symbol of the victory over fascism (“Janukovič podnjal”). Regarding the president’s attitude toward the Ukrainian language, a ninety-word official autobiographical note of 2004 with as many as twelve spelling errors has become legendary, particularly the spelling of Janukovyč’s own official academic title as “професор” (“Viktorovyč”).³ Janukovyč does, however, deserve credit for having acquired a certain command of the official language. In television interviews, he characteristically uses both Ukrainian and Russian.

During his election campaign of 2009, Janukovyč first promised to make Russian the second official language of Ukraine and declared that 226 votes were needed to

2 On the Internet, Russian plays an important role among users in Ukraine. Regarding growth of popularity, Ukrainophone Wikipedia ranked among the first three in the world in August 2011 (ibid.) and even second (after Chinese) by December 2011 (“Perohanyč”).

3 The name of the author of this article is “Jana Viktorovyč” (obviously a pseudonym derived from “Viktor Janukovyč”).

adopt a bill providing for the introduction of Russian as a second official language ("Janukovyč zrobyt"). This was wrong: in order to make Russian the second official language, the Constitution of Ukraine would have to be changed; not 226 but 300 votes in parliament would be needed, and a referendum would have to be held. Later on, during the same campaign, Janukovyč suggested only a "series of bills" in favor of Russian. Even so, some of his fellow party members have continued to reiterate the promise that Russian would be made the second official language.

Soon after his inauguration, at a meeting with Taras Shevchenko National Prize winners in Kyiv on 9 March 2010, Janukovyč declared that "in Ukraine the Ukrainian language will develop as the sole official language." At the same time, he indicated the role of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages ("Janukovyč i našym"). On the "Day of Ukrainian Literature and Language" in 2010, Janukovyč declared that "the Ukrainian language is the soul of the nation, the greatest spiritual treasure, as passed on to us by our ancestors." He promised that "the Ukrainian language, as an immense treasure of our people, will be a consolidating force of our society and will reliably be defended for the sake of our state" ("Ukrainskij jazyk").

In March 2011, Janukovyč's adviser Hanna Herman asserted that the oligarchs are primarily Russian-speaking and that "mentally Ukrainian people" have no financial or political impact in Ukraine ("German: oligarxi"). At the Thirteenth Assembly of the World Association of the Russian-Language Press in Kyiv in June 2011, she stated, in a similar vein, that the assembly was so generously funded because three hundred journalists would "write and speak about Ukraine to a 200-million audience" and that this would mean "free advertising," whereas "in the media world, those who write and read in Ukrainian are very weak" ("Janukovič profinansiroval").

The messages of the president and his team vary considerably, depending on their audience. Herman often plays the role of the Ukrainian patriot. But what is behind it? Under President Viktor Juščenko, there was a state program for the development and functioning of the Ukrainian language for the years 2004–10. It was not renewed under Janukovyč's presidency ("VRU"). Instead, Ukraine's Cabinet of Ministers appropriated 1.6 million UHN for measures to enact the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages in the country ("Ukrajina vytratyt").

Russia

In recent years, official Russia has repeatedly commented on and interfered in Ukrainian politics. It is generally known that the president, then prime minister and again president of Russia, Vladimir Putin, described the breakup of the Soviet Union as the "greatest geopolitical disaster of the last century" in 2005 and referred to Ukraine "as an 'artificial' entity with lands given to it by Russia and the USSR" in 2008. At a conference on "The Russian Language on the Boundary of Millennia," Putin's wife, Ljudmila, maintained that "the confirmation of the borders of the Russian world is also the assertion and strengthening of Russia's national interests. The Russian language unifies the people of the Russian world—the aggregate of those who speak and think in that language. The borders of the Russian world

extend along the borders of Russian-language usage" ("Gorham": 28). In June 2007, Vladimir Putin created the "Russian World Foundation" ("Fond Russkij mir") by presidential decree (ibid., 30). "Russkij mir" has organized or co-organized several conferences in Ukraine. In November 2010, "Russkij mir" held a conference at the Drahomanov Pedagogical University in Kyiv under the more programmatic title "Ukrainian-Russian Cultural and Linguistic Space: From Opposition to Unity" ("Vslid"). In March 2011, Viktor Sorokin, director of Russia's Institute of CIS Countries, declared that the Russian Federation had spent more than 1.2 million USD for the support of "compatriots" in Ukraine ("MZS RF."). The Russian Orthodox Church is a strong ally of "Russkij mir." At Janukovyč's inauguration ceremony, Kirill, patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church and a major agent of "Russkij mir," was present in order to bless the new presidency "in an unusual demonstration of the new Ukrainian leader's close ties with Russia" ("Russian Patriarch blesses"). Kirill's strongest ally in Ukraine is the Odesa-based Metropolitan Ahafanhel of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, who purportedly said in June 2011 that "Lviv [a largely Ukrainian-speaking city with comparatively few remnants of the Soviet past] is our Chechnia" and that "our common homeland is the USSR." Ahafanhel has been a member of the Party of Regions since 2006 ("Odesskij mitropolit"; "Mitropolit").

Dmytro Tabačnyk and the educational sphere

The fact that Janukovyč appointed Dmytro Tabačnyk minister of education was a clear signal in terms of language policy. Tabačnyk's "name is associated with everything anti-Ukrainian" ("Gorčinskaja"). Tabačnyk has written, inter alia, that western Ukrainians are "lackeys who have hardly learned to wash their hands," that in Ukraine a "struggle between the Roman-Orthodox-Galician and the Russian-Orthodox ethnos" is taking place ("Prezydent"), and that Ukrainian nationalists of the World War II period were "murderers, traitors and accomplices of Hitler's executioners" ("Kuzio"). By contrast, Stalin was, in Tabačnyk's view, "a victor" ("U novomu"). At the same time, Tabačnyk maintained that "democratic revolutions were CIA conspiracies and the 2005–2010 Yushchenko administration received its orders from the US embassy" ("Kuzio"). When a politician from the Tymošenko Bloc confronted him with his former statements about the lack of any foundations for the existence of a Ukrainian state, Tabačnyk replied that he considered any "hunting for political views of three or four years ago" counterproductive ("Tabačnik otvetil").

Tabačnyk's appointment aroused mass protests that have not ceased to date, and rumors of his dismissal have repeatedly been encouraged even by the Ukrainian president and prime minister themselves ("Prezydent rozkrytykuvav," "Tabačnik – na vyxod" etc.). In April 2011, Tabačnyk declared that student protests against him were financed from abroad ("Students'ki akciji"). In May 2011, he claimed on the Russian radio station "Èxo Moskvu" that Ambassador Jon Tefft of the United States had attempted to convince him of the importance of independent testing (of university entrance exams) because he wished to reduce Ukraine "to the moronic level of equatorial countries" ("SŠA").

By March 2010, Tabačnyk had repeatedly presented himself as “a strong advocate of Russian as Ukraine’s second official language.” Therefore, “fears [were] running high that Tabachnyk [would] attempt to rewrite history à la Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s refashioning—many say whitewashing—of that nation’s history. People [were] also worr[ied] that Tabachnyk [would] push for greater use of the Russian language” (“Gorčinskaja”). All those fears were justified.

Tabačnyk tried to initiate a draft law on higher education that has not been realized to date (28 February 2012). He did, however, introduce new rules for admission to university studies (which again supported corruption, a phenomenon widespread in the Ukrainian academic sphere), eliminate compulsory tests of Ukrainian language knowledge for students at all levels, and instead decree that internal testing be organized in six languages (“Misija”). Tabačnyk clearly introduced this latter reform in order to promote Russian, but he suffered a defeat. Only in Crimea, the city of Sevastopol, Donetsk, and Luhansk oblast did the majority of pupils choose Russian for independent testing. Nation-wide, 81.3 percent chose Ukrainian for testing in mathematics, with a percentage of 96 percent for Kyiv and no less than 81.3 percent for Dnipropetrovsk (Luhansk oblast: 32.2, Donetsk oblast: 27.8 percent, the Crimea: 5.8 percent, the city of Sevastopol: 3.2 percent) (“Stanovyšče”).⁴

Tabačnyk argued that history textbooks should contain only “indisputable facts,” for instance, that the “Great Patriotic War” was distinct from World War II and that Stalin was “a victor” (“U novomu”). On 19 May 2010, he announced that a common Ukrainian-Russian guide for teachers of history was to be prepared and would be published in October or November 2010. On 26 August of that year, a new fifth-grade textbook, *An Introduction to the History of Ukraine*, which conformed to the minister’s expectations, was published.

In Ukrainian schools, more attention was to be paid to Russian literature and less time devoted to the study of the Ukrainian language (“Tabačnyk vykyne” etc.).

Tabačnyk (who speaks Ukrainian well) has occasionally tried to convince the public of his concern about the quality of the Ukrainian language. According to him, “experts of the Ministry of Education” had found that “the language heard on some programs is full of elements of Surzhyk, contaminated by incorrect stresses or changes of endings that make the Ukrainian language unattractive and create a stereotype of its instability among citizens” (“Tabačnyk ne zadovolenyj”). First and foremost, however, Tabačnyk is promoting Russian under the slogan of a “free choice of languages” (“Tabačnyk xytro”).

In March 2011, Tabačnyk emphasized that Ukrainian legislation allows parents to participate in choosing their children’s language of instruction and added that “families need to be more energetic” in establishing Russophone schools and

4 Vadym Kolesničenko’s organization “Russian-speaking Ukraine” reacted with a “civic campaign” titled “Did you choose the Russian language test?” (“Štohrin”). The promoters encouraged their addressees to post on their websites and distribute via the Internet the “banner” of the campaign, which reproduced a well-known Soviet poster featuring a Red Army soldier reporting for duty in World War II. Choosing the Russian-language test for external independent testing was thus equated to fulfilling one’s “Soviet” duty and going to war.

preschool institutions. At the same time, Tabačnyk and his crew founded new Russian-language schools in Kyiv ("U Kyjevi," "Tabačnyk radyt").

Tabačnyk called it his "personal victory" that after seventeen years, "all-Ukrainian so-called 'Olympic' contests of Russian language and literature" were reintroduced ("SŠA"). In early May 2011 it turned out that for the first time, the 11th "Petro Jacyk International Ukrainian Language Competition" was organized without any involvement of the Ministry of Education ("Jaščenko"). The ministry declared that it was concentrating on a new "International Taras Ševčenko Language and Literature Competition" for pupils and students created by a presidential decree on 30 September 2010. The winners would not be awarded solely for their excellent command of Ukrainian, but the contest was to foster "the elevation of the knowledge of the Ukrainian language and literature, of the native languages and literatures, the fostering of love for the languages of the Ukrainian people among the younger generation, and the guarantee of their comprehensive development" ("Tabačnyk zamynyt"). This is another good example of Tabačnyk's policy of "multilingualism" and free choice of languages ("Tabačnik xočet"), whose actual purpose is the mass re-Russification of the schools of Ukraine.

In August 2010, Tabačnyk quietly eliminated a government agency for the fostering of education in the native language ("Za nakazom"). At the same time, he provided funding for thirty Ukrainian students who were to participate in the Russian summer camp "Seliger," as organized by the expressly pro-Kremlin and in fact Russian nationalist organization "Naši" ("Svoboda"). In mid-September 2011, he headed a delegation of four hundred Ukrainians driving to Moscow for the "Days of Ukrainian Education and Scholarship in the Russian Federation," the first such event ever to take place. During the meeting, about twenty bilateral Ukrainian-Russian agreements in the educational sphere were to be signed ("400 ukrajins'kyx osvityjan").

In December 2010, Tabačnyk's ministry issued a Concept of Language Education. Typically, its major slogan was that "free choice of language of instruction is an important characteristic of a democratic society and of the concept of language education in Ukraine" ("Ta"). To date, the law has not been adopted.

The minister's activities in the field of the so-called "optimization" of Ukrainian schools have led to the closure of schools, particularly of Ukrainophone schools in prevalently Russian-speaking areas. Massive protests followed ("Na Luhanščyni," "Dovženko," "Kommodova," "Fedorčuk," "Doneckie školy," "Ukrajinci Sevastopolja"). In the Ukrainian parliament, Tabačnyk argued that these measures were inevitable owing to the demographic situation ("Tabačnyk: školy"). According to him, only Russian-language schools were closed in Donetsk ("Tabačnyk kaže"). In early July 2011, he himself declared that 114 schools had been closed throughout Ukraine ("Tabačnyk zavavv"). In the fall of 2011, he reported that 115 schools had been closed in 2010 and 200 in 2011; 26 of them were located in Donetsk oblast ("U Donec'ku"). Regarding school № 111 in Donetsk, it turned out in late January 2012 the Voroshylov raion court overruled the Donetsk city council, finding that the closure of that Ukrainophone school was illegal (*ibid.*). The Donetsk city council appealed the decision on 30 January 2012 ("Vlada"), and the outcome is still unclear.

Tabačnyk next targeted preschool institutions. His fellow party member Vadym Kolesničenko (see below) was his most efficient ally. On 8 September 2011, Kolesničenko presented the intermediate results of his project "Legal aspects of the organization of Russophone instruction in the preschools and schools of the country," which explained how parents could make preschool institutions Russophone. By that time, Kolesničenko had already distributed fifty thousand copies of a leaflet offering advice in this regard ("Prezentovano"). On 10 November 2011, Prime Minister Mykola Azarov submitted a draft law "On Preschool Education" prepared by the Cabinet of Ministers, in particular by Tabačnyk's Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport, which aimed at the introduction of parental "free choice" of language of instruction in preschools ("Verxrada"). The draft did not pass the Verkhovna Rada. However, in accordance with a very typical pattern of language policy under Viktor Janukovyč's presidency, Maksym Luc'kyj, who had earlier worked on Tabačnyk's law "On Higher Education," and Vadym Kolesničenko submitted their draft law № 9714 "On the Making of Amendments to the Law of Ukraine on Preschool Education" (16 January 2012), which almost literally reiterated the earlier draft ("Rehionalny"), differing from it only inasmuch as the focus was now on "the guarantee of access to preschool education in regional and minority languages" ("Ekspert vbačaje").

With Tabačnyk as minister of education, it turned out in early 2011 that not enough Ukrainian-language textbooks were available in many areas of Ukraine. In Chernivtsi oblast, for instance, elementary schools with Ukrainian as the language of instruction received only 82 percent of the requisite primers, 74 percent of mathematics textbooks, and 66 percent of Ukrainian language textbooks. By contrast, schools with Russian as the language of instruction were supplied with 100 percent of the textbooks needed ("Na Bukovyni"). The General Procuracy of Ukraine later confirmed that there had been serious shortcomings in the ministry's work: 171,000 more textbooks should have been printed. Interestingly enough, 86,400 more copies than needed were printed of the fifth-grade history textbook that had been rewritten according to Tabačnyk's views. Moreover, 65,000 more Russian-language primers than needed were published ("Tabačnyk zapevnjaje"; "Tabačnyk nadrukuvav"). At the beginning of the academic year 2011/12, Ukrainian pupils were again provided with only 50 to 90 percent of the textbooks they required, depending on the region ("Nardep").

On 30 August 2011 in Dnipropetrovsk, Tabačnyk referred to a study published at the International Economic Forum in Davos and compared the rankings of Ukraine and Russia, stating that "Ukraine ranks 56th, and we 57th" ("Tabačnik ogovorilsja"). Given Tabačnyk's policies, this reference to Russia as "we"⁵ may have been more than just a gaffe.

5 In fact, Ukraine ranked 18 places higher than Russia (ibid.).

The electronic media

Under Viktor Juščenko's presidency, the dubbing or subtitling of foreign films was made mandatory. A few weeks after his inauguration, Tabachnyk stated that fewer people were going to the movies because of dubbing ("Tabachnik vystupaet"). Soon afterwards, not only stakeholders but even Ukraine's minister of culture confirmed that the opposite was true ("Iz-za ukrainskogo," "Minkul'tury"). In August 2010, Olena Bondarenko of the Party of Regions, first deputy chair of the parliamentary Committee on Freedom of Speech and Information and head of the parliamentary Subcommittee on Television and Radio Broadcasting of the Committee on Freedom of Speech and Information, submitted a draft law intended to eliminate the 50-percent quota for Ukrainian music on television and radio programs ("Rada maje namir"). The draft law received preliminary adoption by the Verkhovna Rada on 21 February 2011 ("Rada skasovuje") and final adoption on 3 November 2011 ("Stanovyšče"). Henceforth there were to be no quotas for music from Ukraine, and quotas for Ukrainian audiovisual products were to be lowered from 50 to 25 percent (ibid.; see also "Rada znyzyla"). Volodymyr Lytvyn, the speaker of the Verkhovna Rada, hesitated to sign the law and submitted it to the Committee on Freedom of Speech and Information, not to the president ("Lytvyn"). Meanwhile, the head of the committee, who strongly opposed the law, was dismissed, and a successor was not appointed until February 2012. The law has not yet passed the Verkhovna Rada.

Vadym Kolesničenko, the leading specialist on the language question in the Party of Regions

Vadym Kolesničenko has been the most active politician in the field of Ukrainian language policy to favor Russian ("and other regional languages", as some would add). After Mr. Švec', a policeman from Odesa, was filmed forbidding a Ukrainian-speaking person to use "calf language" (in Russian, "teljačij jazyk"), it was Kolesničenko who argued in January 2011 that the policeman should not have been fired because he had not attacked Ukrainian as such but only demanded that the individual not use "Surzhyk." Kolesničenko even added, "I would do the the same" ("Kolesničenko stav," "Serdjuk"). In November 2010, Kolesničenko had proclaimed that owing to "the nationalists...the Ukrainian language has turned into a garbage dump of Surzhyk surreptitiously occupied by anything and everything; hence we now have no literary language" ("Kolesničenko: Literaturnogo"). Back in February 2008, he had stated that no dissertations could be written in Russian, which prompted his interviewer to ask, "If you are unable to learn a related Slavic language, what kind of scholar are you?" Kolesničenko replied, "Why should I, having Russian as a native language, learn anything else?" ("Myxel'son"). This attitude perfectly reflects a widespread view among the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine.

According to Kolesničenko, "the language question in Ukraine has been raised for the past five years for one simple reason: the extinction of the Russian language and culture, the creation of a hostile image of Russia, the elimination of the history of the Great Patriotic War—all this was done solely to distance oneself from Russia to the utmost and to turn Ukraine into a buffer between Russia and Europe." In

his view, "our so-called political elite was not concerned about the future of the Ukrainian people and Ukraine. They filled the order that they had been paid for, and they simply did their work for their money. Language was only one of the instruments in the struggle against Russia" ("Kolesničenko Press Conference"). What Kolesničenko constantly seeks in the Ukrainian context are "nationalists" and "fascists." According to him—and here one sees very clearly that Kolesničenko is not a historian, although he has tried to present himself as such more than once—an "ethnocratic kind of state organization was typical of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—language, nationality, the slant of the eyes, the curvature of the eyebrows. We went through all this in the 1930s" (*ibid.*). In a more recent press conference, Kolesničenko reiterated this sheer nonsense ("Kolesničenko Press Conference 2").

Kolesničenko has argued repeatedly that more than eighty laws or, at least since January 2012, even "about a hundred laws forbid using any language other than Ukrainian in Ukraine" ("Kolesničenko Press Conference 2"). What he usually adds in this context is that "we do not protect languages; we protect human rights" (*ibid.*). The international document to which Kolesničenko refers most often, the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, is however expressly concerned with the protection of languages, not human rights.

On the occasion of Ukraine's Independence Day in August 2011, Kolesničenko remarked that "independence did not yield anything; for twenty years we have just consumed whatever was received from the Soviet Union" ("Kolesničenko ob otmene"). Elsewhere, he characterized the period of independence as "twenty years of pauperism, poverty, internal conflicts, stagnation, and no forward movement at all" ("Kolesničenko Press Conference").

Kolesničenko is head of the "All-Ukrainian Coordinating Council of the Organization of Russian Compatriots," head of the "NGO 'Human Rights Public Movement 'Russian-Speaking Ukraine'" [*sic*: the name itself is a slogan],⁶ and has recently become co-chair of a newly established so-called "International Anti-Fascist Front" ("Kolesničenko Today Ukraine"). Back in December 2008, the then Russian president, Dmitrij Medvedev, honored Kolesničenko with the Order of Friendship for his "great contribution to cultural ties with the Russian Federation and the preservation of the Russian culture and language" ("Medvedev nagradil"). In the summer of 2009, when Ukrainian-Russian relations were in a particularly critical state, Kolesničenko was named Russian "Compatriot of the Year" ("Kolesničenko Compatriot"). In June 2011, Kolesničenko declared that deputies who did not support recent language draft laws should be "checked by psychiatrists before they get their parliamentary mandates" and that they were people "whom the state should get rid of" ("Kolesničenko predlagaet"). He has referred to "the Orange Plague" ("Kolesničenko Press Conference") that should be brought to the scaffold ("Kolesničenko – Prezident"). In April 2011, he added that "any country outside the

6 The slogan displayed on the site reads like a masterpiece of early twenty-first-century newspeak: "We stand for civil peace and interethnic accord" (see "Kolesničenko etc.").

borders of Ukrainian territory is interested in an unstable Ukraine" because "the territory of our country is quite large; there are various natural resources and good industrial potential" ("Kolesničenko priznalsja"). In mid-April 2011 he declared that some "citizens not particularly burdened by morals," social organizations, and parties in Ukraine that receive grants and income from abroad form "fifth columns...prepared to betray their homeland" and "put the country on the auction block" ("Kolesničenko V Ukrainu"). After anti-government demonstrations in November 2011, he let the protesters know that those who destabilize official activity would face "serious punishment"; that the "cannon fodder that leads the way will suffer, and those who dispatch them will hide abroad: in Sicily, on Corsica, in offshore zones. From there they will watch the idiots being sent to jail pallets." Kolesničenko also warned the demonstrators that they were being "shoved under the butcher's axe, under the axe of the law like cannon fodder" (in Russian, cannon fodder is, literally, *пуšечное м'ясо* 'cannon meat') ("Ukraina Kolesničenko"; see also "Kolesničenko osvistali"). In 2011, Kolesničenko and his team began checking up on Western NGOs and cultural organizations in Ukraine ("Kosjukova"). The author concluded that most often, this "foreign, alien influence seeks to promote ideas of xenophobia, nationalism, and Russophobia. We call upon all responsible citizens of Ukraine to maintain a sober attitude toward this "invasion of aliens" ["нашествя чужинців"] and protect themselves from its antidemocratic manipulations" (ibid.).

Since 28 December 2011, the homepage of "Russian-Speaking Ukraine" has been displaying the headline "A simple recipe for the destruction of Ukraine. Made in USA." The article was allegedly written by a certain "Mixail Kornienko" (most probably a pseudonym: Mixail Kornienko is a popular Soviet cosmonaut). It suggests in all seriousness that the United States is responsible for alcoholism in Ukraine ("Kornienko").

When dealing personally with Western institutions, Kolesničenko presents himself as a human-rights activist fighting for oppressed "Russian-speaking Ukraine." Time and again, he uses quotations from documents issued by the OSCE, the UN, and the Council of Europe that he interprets in his own manner.

Kolesničenko misses no opportunity to search for "fascists" in Ukraine. In late January 2011, he argued once again that "attempts to cultivate one language, one religion, and one culture in our country mark the way to fascism" ("Kolesničenko: Ukraine"). As for Stalin, Kolesničenko says first and foremost that he was a "smarter and more colorful figure" than Stepan Bandera, the leader of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army who had been declared a "Hero of Ukraine" under Viktor Juščenko (ibid.). When citizens of Ukraine applied to change the names of villages and towns named after Soviet leaders such as Lenin or even Feliks Dzeržinskij, it was Kolesničenko who officially declared that he did not quite understand why this was necessary ("Ukrainians fight").

In April 2010 Kolesničenko, in his own words, "fulfilled his duty to the country" by not only wearing the so-called St. George Ribbon (actually, part of an order for extraordinary merit in wartime) on his chest but also by distributing "more than three hundred" ribbons among parliamentary deputies and journalists.

Kolesničenko asked the recipients to place them “in visible locations: on one’s chest, in offices, cars, and houses in order to express the protest that has been silenced for five years” (“Kolesničenko Georgievskaja”) and commented:

This is my contribution to the promotion “I remember, I am proud,” which symbolizes the great victory of the Soviet people [!] in World War II.... Actions such as those permitted by our former government have annihilated our historical memory. This can be equated to betrayal of the fatherland and the people. It is therefore our patriotic duty today to honor the memory of those who defended our lives in bloodshed and fighting. And the main task of our campaign “I remember, I am proud” with the Ribbon of St. George is to unite all citizens around the idea of pride and respect for our ancestors. The aim is to raise the level of patriotism and heroism among the people. In particular, only nationally conscious citizens who honor the memory not of pseudoheroes and fascist collaborators but of the heroes who fought for our future will be able to develop the country, and it is on these principles that our official policy is based (ibid.).

In a video uploaded on 25 May 2011, Kolesničenko appears in an office with a St. George Ribbon very prominently displayed. In the video, he claims that “We are at war, and I do not want my comrade [“товариш”] to stab me in the back with a knife” (“Kolesničenko my”). World War II has not ended for Vadym Kolesničenko. This “human-rights activist” has had a particularly strong impact on Ukraine’s language policy during the last few years.

Language legislation

Like other advocates of Russian, Kolesničenko puts particular emphasis on the “European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages,” as if Russian, spoken as a second or even first language throughout the country and strongly dominant in many spheres of activity, could seriously be treated as a regional or minority language. Ukraine’s path toward ratification of the charter was complicated and chaotic (“Humenčyk”). Curiously enough, the Ukrainian version of the charter was not translated from either the authentic English or French text but from the Russian translation. After some failed attempts, the charter was ratified on 15 May 2003 but submitted to the Council of Europe only on 19 September 2005 under President Viktor Juščenko (ibid., 82). It came into force on 1 January 2006. According to the charter, the following languages were to be protected: Belarusian, Bulgarian, Gagauzian, Greek, Jewish [there is no such language, and it is not clear whether this should be Hebrew or Yiddish], Crimean Tatar, Moldovan, German, Polish, Russian, Romanian, Slovak, and Hungarian (ibid.). The situation was problematic from the outset, as Ukrainian national language legislation does not use the terms “regional language,” “language group,” and “minority language,” as employed in the charter, but the terms “state language” and “languages of the national minorities” (ibid.). Advocates of European language legislation have often argued that Ukraine must adopt the terminology of the charter. At the same time, it is obvious that the charter is not above question. Many countries in Europe have never signed or ratified it, including traditional Western democracies such as France.

Language legislation was a very important sphere of political action under Viktor Juščenko's presidency. Between 23 November 2007 and 25 January 2008 alone, six different draft laws were proposed, with the first four submitted in less than a week, and three of them on the same day ("Bowring": 92–93). As for Viktor Janukovyč's presidency, the most important draft law was submitted on 7 September 2010. According to the propaganda of the party in power, the draft law was a reaction to the Council of Europe's "Assessment of the Application of the Charter in Ukraine" of 7 July 2010, in which a committee stated that "the linguistic landscape of Ukraine is unique from the Charter's perspective, as a language (Russian) which is not the state language is used by a large part of the population, including persons belonging to other national minorities" ("Application"). Vadym Kolesničenko pointed out that in the document "whole passages were cited" from the report provided by himself and his assistant Ruslan Bortnyk ("Kolesničenko: V ljuboj"). He referred to those passages in his public statements time and again. He never mentioned, though, that the committee actually found that Ukraine's undertakings regarding the charter had in fact been almost perfectly "fulfilled," particularly as regards Russian ("Application").

On 7 September 2010, shortly before the Ukrainian local elections of 31 October, the draft law "On Languages in Ukraine" (officially authored by Oleksandr Jefremov of the Party of Regions, Serhij Hrynevec'kyj of the Lytvyn Bloc, and Petro Symonenko of the Communist Party of Ukraine) was submitted to the Verkhovna Rada. Speaker Volodymyr Lytvyn nevertheless forwarded it to the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and to European institutions.

The draft law consistently uses the term "Russian and other regional languages," whereby any language that reaches the threshold of 10 percent in a given territorial unit would be used on par with the official language. "Acts of the central state bodies" would have to "be adopted in the State language and published officially in the Ukrainian and Russian languages." All passports and personal data should be recorded "in the State language and the Russian language" (*ibid.*, 7–8). Throughout Ukraine, "the citizens of Ukraine shall have the right to obtain education in the State language and the Russian language" (*ibid.*, 9), and the "study of the State language and the Russian language shall be ensured in all establishments of general secondary education" (*ibid.*, 10). In the media (article 25) and in advertising (article 27), full freedom would be guaranteed according to the wishes of the owners (*ibid.*, 11–12). Moreover, "the State shall guarantee free access to radio and television programmes transmitted from the neighboring countries in the same or similar languages to the State language or regional languages of Ukraine, will not interfere with rebroadcasting of radio and television programmes in such languages, and shall ensure freedom of expression of opinions and free distribution of print media in such languages" (*ibid.*, 12). The only sphere where the official language alone would be used is that of the Armed Forces (article 30; *ibid.*, 13). The law itself was to "be published in two languages—Ukrainian and Russian" (*ibid.*, 14). This latter point was another telling indication of the actual intention of the draft law—to entrench bilingualism, not multilingualism. As for the enormous costs that this legislation would entail, the document says that "Taking into account that the State budget provides for the

funding for ensuring development and functioning of the Ukrainian language as the State language and for implementation of the Law of Ukraine 'On Ratification of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages,' enactment of this draft law will not require additional budget funds" (ibid., 24).

In the following months, not only the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine but also the High Commissioner of the OSCE and the Venice Commission offered a generally negative assessment of the draft law of 7 September 2010.

The National Academy of Sciences declared on 14 September 2010 that the true purpose of the draft law was to undermine the official language for the sake of so-called bilingualism. It also refuted the "clearly false and politically motivated" argument of the draft law that command of Russian granted "broad access to the achievements of the world's science and culture," since more than 98 percent of the world's scientific and technical information is now being disseminated in English, whereas the Russian share is below 0.1 percent ("Prinjatie novogo"). Mass protests against the draft law shook Ukraine (see "Klymončuk").

The "Assessment and Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities on the Draft Law 'On Languages in Ukraine' (No. 1015-3)" of 20 December 2010 pointed out many shortcomings and particularly stressed the following:

The State language can be an effective tool in ensuring cohesion. Consequently, promoting the use of the State language constitutes a legitimate State interest. Moreover, knowledge of the State language is also beneficial to persons belonging to national minorities. Having a command of the State language increases the opportunities for effective participation in society at all levels.... To put it differently, there is no right of persons belonging to national minorities never to be expected to use the State language (p. 13) (ibid., 4–5).

The Venice Commission published its detailed "Opinion on the Draft Law on Languages in Ukraine" on 30 March 2011 ("Opinion"). Here are some of its most important assessments:

In its recent opinion on the State Language of the Slovak Republic, the Venice Commission examined the provisions on the use of languages in the constitutions of member states of the Council of Europe and concluded: "...42. ...*The promotion of the State language guarantees the development of the identity of the State community, and further ensures mutual communication among and within the constituent parts of the populations. The possibility for citizens to use the official language throughout the country can be ensured also in order to avoid that they be discriminated against in the enjoyment of their fundamental rights, in areas where the persons belonging to national minorities have a majority position.*" 53. In the same document...*[i]n addition, knowledge of the official language is also important from the perspective of persons belonging to national minorities*" (ibid., 12; italics in the original).

...a preferential legislative treatment of the Russian language promotes a de facto obligatory use of that language, with potentially damaging effects on the results of the forthcoming census (ibid., 16).

In the Venice Commission's view, the Ukrainian authorities should identify more adequate legislative solutions to confirm the preeminence of the Ukrainian language as the only state language, take protective measures in those fields where further development of the Ukrainian language is needed, and thus establish a fair balance between the protection of the rights of minorities, on the one hand, and the preservation of the State language as a tool for integration within society, on the other hand. In the meantime, clear and sustainable legal guarantees should be provided for the protection of the persons belonging to national minorities and their regional or minority languages, in line with the Constitution and the relevant international standards (*ibid.*, 24).

On 28 March 2011, Kolesničenko reacted to the Venice Commission's assessment with an infuriated open letter titled "National communities in Ukraine called the Venice Commission to refrain from preconceived conclusions" signed by Kolesničenko, "Chairman of Council, NGO 'Human Rights Public Movement 'Russian-Speaking Ukraine'"; Aurika Božesku, "Executive Secretary of Interregional Union 'The Romanian Community of Ukraine'"; Ištvan Hajdoš, "President of the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Ukraine"; and Arkadij Monastyr'skyj, "President of the Jewish Forum of Ukraine" ("Kolesničenko etc.").⁷ The key passage of that document deals with "the main weakness of the draft opinion," namely "that it is built on a myth about 'forced Russification' of Ukraine and the displacement of the Ukrainian language" (*ibid.*). Kolesničenko & Co. offer a different narrative:

But we would like to recall and emphasize that both Russian and Ukrainian languages appeared in 10th century and developed simultaneously on the territory of Ukraine. Birthplace of the Russian language is Ukraine. Both languages are indigenous languages of Ukraine, and in no way the languages of migrants or invaders. Russian and Ukrainian language have been co-existing peacefully within the territory of Ukraine for at least 500 years, Ukrainian is unique in this situation.

Level of official use of the Ukrainian language in the 30-40s of the last century in the Ukrainian SSR reached 80 percent, the use in Newspapers – 90 percent. Without knowledge of the Ukrainian language it was impossible to occupy any job in the Ukraine (*ibid.*; original in English).

This is sheer nonsense. Kolesničenko & Co. explained the European institutions' negative assessment of the Draft Law on Languages of 7 September 2010 as follows:

The draft law runs into fierce opposition from Ukrainian nationalists and political parties, groups and institutions that support them. There was created a coalition of NGOs and political parties that work on black PR campaign, aimed at hampering the adoption of the Draft Law (*ibid.*).

7 In the document, many passages are emphasized.

According to Kolesničenko & Co., Ukrainian nationalists and foreigners joined forces to wreck the initiative.

Later on, Kolesničenko argued that the Venice Commission employed "double standards...because they dislike our snouts" ("мы рылом не вышли") ("Kolesničenko zvyuvatyv"; "U Venkomissii"). On 24 March 2011, he wrote of "the pseudo-experts from the Venice Commission who dare to tell us that we should issue laws for the protection of the Ukrainian state" ("Venkomissija").

In the following months, things developed in the typical manner mentioned above. On 19 May 2011, Serhij Kivalov of the Party of Regions declared at "a friendship meeting of the Parliaments of Ukraine and the Russian Federation" in Kyiv that with regard to language policy, what is needed is not "much ado about nothing" but "a true solution of the problem by means of a constitutional amendment. One should add that the official languages are Ukrainian and Russian, and we will forget that topic forever" ("Kivalov xočet").

On 26 August 2011, Vadym Kolesničenko and Serhij Kivalov submitted a new draft law "On the Principles of State Language Policy" (nr. 9073) ("Partija Rehioniv"). The draft law basically reiterated that of 7 September 2010: Russian was to become a "regional language" in Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Zaporizhia, Luhansk, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Sumy, Kharkiv, Kherson, and Chernihiv oblasts, as well as in the Autonomous Republic of the Crimea and in the cities of Kyiv and Sevastopol. Crimean Tatar was to become a regional language in the Autonomous Republic of the Crimea, Hungarian in Zakarpattia oblast, and Romanian in Chernivtsi oblast. Other minority languages were to be protected in smaller administrative units. Acts of the central authorities were to be published in Ukrainian and Russian, in regional languages, or languages of national minorities. Only in the Armed Forces of Ukraine was Ukrainian to be the only official language (ibid.).

On 19 December 2011, the Venice Commission published its "Opinion" on the draft law. The central passage of the "Opinion" read as follows:

66. ...the question remains whether, having regard to the specific situation in Ukraine, there are sufficient guarantees, in the current Draft Law, for the consolidation of the Ukrainian language as the sole State language, and of the role it has to play in the Ukrainian multilingual society. The Venice Commission can only reiterate its call, in its previous Opinion, for a fair balance between the protection of the rights of minorities, on the one hand, and the preservation of the State language as a tool for integration within society, on the other hand. It ultimately is for the Ukrainian legislator to decide on this important matter ("Opinion 2": 12).

The legal initiative thus again ended in defeat.

Nevertheless, the party in power has pushed through its language policies in many spheres. On 13 December 2011, Ukraine's Constitutional Court decided that "regional" languages may be used in Ukrainian courts along with the official language ("Konstytucijnj Sud"). In various institutions, leading politicians from the party in power have demonstrated what "bilingualism" or "multilingualism" in

Ukraine comes down to in their interpretation. In December 2010, the newly elected mayor of Odesa, Oleksij Kostusjev, demanded at the first session of the new city council that Russian alone be used at meetings and that all documents be given to him solely in Russian-language versions ("V Odesse"). On 8 April 2011, the Odesa city council approved a "Program for the Maintenance and Development of the Russian Language until 2015" ("V Odesi"), and in July 2011 it allowed 78 schools and 120 preschools to provide instruction in Russian as well as in Ukrainian ("Odesskie vlasti"). Kostusjev commented that the language of instruction could be chosen freely but immediately added that "one has to understand that Odesa is a Russian-speaking city, and our culture is Russian-speaking" ("Odessa nevozmožna"). He is just one of the Ukrainian politicians who demonstrate that in light of the current political situation in Ukraine, the struggle for the Russian language in Ukraine is not so much a question of human rights as a struggle against the Ukrainian language.

P.S.: On Monday, 8 August 2012, the president's press service stated that Viktor Janukovyč had signed the law "On the Principles of the State Language Policy."

Bibliography

- "Al." 2006. 11–20. Форум «Галицкий империализм».
<http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- "anb" 2006. 11–21. Форум «Галицкий империализм».
<http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- Anderson 2006. Benedict Anderson. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. New ed. London and New York 2006.
- "Angilov" 2005. 07–11. <http://www.patent.net.ua/intellectus/forum/1/193/ua.html>.
- Aničenka 1957. В. В. Анічєнка. "Траматика" Л. Зізання. В: Весці Академії наук БССР. Серія громадських наук, 1957/4, 93–105.
- Anisimova 2000. В. Анисимова. Материк – Информационно-аналитический портал постсоветского пространства. Газета «2000».
<http://2000.net.ua/print/svobodaslova/zaschititdulcineyu.html>. <http://www.materik.ru/index.php?section=analitics&bulid=108&bulsectionid=10387>.
- Anonymous 1998. Русин. In: Енциклопедія українознавства, т. 7, Перевидання в Україні, Львів 1998 [first published 1973]: 2644.
- Anonymous 2007. Обращение, <http://www.usa52.narod.ru/adres.htm>.
- Anonymous 2007a. 06–24. Европейская хартия региональных языков. vlasti.net. Сеть независимых журналистов. <http://www.vlasti.net/index.php?Screen=news&id=214765>.
- Anonymous 2007b. 06–24. Дупомова в свинарике. vlasti.net. Сеть независимых журналистов. <http://www.vlasti.net/index.php?Screen=news&id=214765>.
- "Anticommunist" 2007. 02–26. Форум „Історія та походження української мови.”
<http://www.novy.ua/forum/viewtopic.php?p=882098&sid=3575649feceb19d613d5476322fa18fb>.
- "Anticommunist" 2007a. 02–27. Форум „Історія та походження української мови.”
<http://www.novy.ua/forum/viewtopic.php?p=882098&sid=3575649feceb19d613d5476322fa18fb>.
- "Anticommunist" 2007b. 02–26.
<http://novy.tv/forum/viewtopic.php?p=880794&highlight=&sid=c569508ce3ff46b7b7500f2cb4bfc00b>.
- "Application." Application of the Charter in Ukraine. Initial monitoring Circle. Strasbourg. 07–07–2010. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/Report/EvaluationReports/UkraineECRML1_en.pdf.
- "Assessment and Recommendations." Assessment and Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities on the Draft Law "On Languages in Ukraine" (No. 1015–3). OSCE. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. High Commissioner on National Minorities. The Hague. 20–12–2010. Ukrainian translation and scan of the original: http://portal.rada.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article/news_left?art_id=235755&cat_id=37486.

- "Astaxov" 2007. 04–25. <http://provokator.com.ua/phorum/read.php?1,287501,page=2>.
- Auer 1999. P. Auer. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3: 309–332.
- AUM 1988. Атлас української мови. Том другий: Волинь, Наддністрянщина, Закарпаття і суміжні землі, гол. ред.: І. Г. Матвіяс. Київ 1988.
- "Avangard" 2006. 10–13. Український Форум/Українська мова. Галицька мова, http://www.ukrcenter.com/forum/message.asp?message_id=76184&forum_name=%D3%EA%F0%E0%BF%ED%F1%FC%EA%E0%20%CC%EE%E2%E0&page=1.
- Ažnjuk 1999. Богдан М. Ажнюк. Мовна єдність нації: діаспора й Україна. Київ 1999.
- Babyč 1993. Історія української мови. Практичний курс, затверджено Міністерством освіти як навчальний посібник для студентів вузів, що вивчають дисципліну „Історія мови“. Львів 1993.
- Баца 1961. Юрій Бача. Літературний рух на Закарпатті середини XIX століття. Пришів 2004.
- Balan – Kravtsiv 1993. Boris Balan and Bohdan Kravtsiv. Svoboda (US) (Liberty). In: *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Vol. 5. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: 128.
- Barvins'kyj 2004. Олександр Барвінський. Спомини з мого життя. Частина перша та друга. Нью-Йорк – Київ 2004.
- Baulin 2007. П. Б. Баулин. Языковая проблема Украины: политические мифы и реальность. http://www.niurr.gov.ua/ru/conference/kniga_conf/baulin.htm.
- Belej 2004. Любомир Белей, А. О. Костельник, Гавриїл Федорович. В: Українська мова: Енциклопедія. Київ: 256–257.
- Belej 2008. Любомир Белей. Українці та українська мова на Балканах (Сербія, Хорватія, Боснія та Герцеговіна). Дивослово, Київ, № 8, see also: <http://www.ethnos.lemky.com/history/292-ukrayinci-ta-ukrayinska-mova-na-balkanakh.html>.
- Benedek 2007. Андраш Бенедек. Мадярсько. In: Magocsi 2007: 263–275.
- Best – Stepień 2009: Paul Best and Stanisław [Stanisław] Stepień [Stepień]. Does a Fourth Rus' Exist? Concerning Cultural Identity in the Carpathian Region. *Przemyśl and Higanum: South-Eastern Research Institute in Przemyśl*.
- Bieder 2008: Hermann Bieder. Die syntaktische Terminologie in den galizisch-bukowinischen Grammatiken der ukrainischen Sprache (19. Jahrhundert)—Aspekte multilateraler Sprach- und Wissenschaftskontakte. In: *Die Ukraine (Ruthener, Russinen) in Österreich-Ungarn und ihr Sprach- und Kulturleben im Blickfeld von Wien und Budapest*. Ed. M. Moser and A. Zoltán. Vienna (Slavische Sprachgeschichte, vol. 4): 111–71.
- Bojčuk 1962. М. К. Бойчук. Періодизація історії української літературної мови. В: Питання історичного розвитку української мови. Праці Міжвузовської конференції, що відбулася в Харкові 15-20 грудня, присвячені V Міжнародному з'їздові славістів. Харків: 57–64.
- Bojovi zavdannja 1933. No author. Бойові господарчо-політичні завдання парторганізації. Більшовик України 1933, 9–10: 1–19.
- Borys 1980. Jurij Borys. The Sovietization of Ukraine 1917–1923: The Communist Doctrine

- and Practice of National Self-Determination. Edmonton 1980.
- Boryś 2005. Wiesław Boryś. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow 2005.
- Bourhis – Landry 2008. Richard Y. Bourhis and R. Landry. Group Vitality, Cultural Autonomy and the Wellness of Language Minorities. In: *The Vitality of the English-Speaking Communities of Quebec: From Community Decline to Revival*. Ed. Richard Y. Bourhis. Montreal, Quebec 2008: 185–211.
- “Bowring.” Bill Bowring. Language Policy in Ukraine – International Standards and Obligations, and Ukrainian Law and Legislation Language Policy and Language Situation in Ukraine. Analysis and Recommendations. INTAS Project “Language Policy in Ukraine: Anthropological, Linguistic and Further Perspectives.” Ed. Juliane Bester-Dilger. Frankfurt am Main 2009: 57–100.
- Brock 1996. Peter Brock. Іван Вагілевич (1811-1866) та українська національна ідентичність. В: *Шашкевичіана*. New Series, vols. 1–2. Lviv and Winnipeg 1996: 389–416.
- Brückner 1989. Aleksander Brückner. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow 1927 (repr. Warsaw, 1989).
- Budivnyctvo 1929. Будівництво Радянської України. Збірник. Випуск I. За лєнінську національну політику. Державне видавництво України. Харків 1929.
- Bunčić 2006. Daniel Bunčić. Die ruthenische Schriftsprache bei Ivan Uževyč unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Lexik seines Gesprächsbuchs Rozmova/Besëda. Mit Wörterverzeichnis und Indizes zu seinem ruthenischen und kirchenslavischen Gesamtwerk (Slavistische Beiträge, vol. 447). Munich.
- Burger 1995. Hannelore Burger. Sprachenrecht und Sprachengerechtigkeit im österreichischen Unterrichtswesen 1867–1918. Vienna 1995.
- Buzina (Buzyna) 2007. Олесь Бузина. Тайная история Украины-Руси. Второе издание. Киев. Internet: <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html?c=post&i=5095>.
- Cooper 1989. Robert L. Cooper. Language Planning and Social Change. New York 1989.
- Csopey 1883. Л. Чопей. Русько-мадярський словарь, У Будапештѣ.
- Čajkovs'kyj 2011. Маріано Чайковський. Початок імміграції до Бразилії та свідчення перших іммігрантів. In: *Українці Бразилії – Os Ucrânianos do Brasil – Ukrainians in Brasil*. Гол. ред.: Марина Гримич. Київ, 29–50.
- Čaplenko 1970. Василь Чапленко. Історія української літературної мови (XVII ст. – 1933). Нью-Йорк 1970.
- ČK – НПУ – НКВД 1997. ЧК – ГПУ – НКВД в Україні. Ред.: Ю. Шаповал, В. Пристайко, В. Золотарьов. Київ 1997.
- Čornovol 2006. Ігор Чорновол. Експерименти Богдана Дідицького. Львівська газета 25 (832). <http://www.gazeta.lviv.ua/articles/2006/02/10/2927>.
- Čubar 1929. 34–40: В. Чубар. Промова на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 р.
- Dal’ 1880–1882/1978. Владимирь Даль. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка, reprint of the second edition of 1880–1882. Москва 1978.
- DD 1993. Ділова документація Гетьманщини XVIII ст. Ред.: Л. А. Дубровина. Київ 1993.
- Dem’jan 1996. Г. Дем’ян. Державницькі погляди Івана Вагілевича. В: *Шашкевичіана*.

- New Series, vols. 1–2. Lviv and Winnipeg: 50–54.
- Didyc'kyj 1866. Anonymous [B. Didyc'kyj]. Въ одинъ часъ научиться Малорусину по великорусски. Второе изданіе. Львовъ 1866.
- Djačan 1865. П. Дячанъ. Методична граматика языка мало-русского. Львѡвъ 1865.
- D'jačenko 1900/1993. Г. Дьяченко, Полный церковнославянский словарь (со внесениемъ въ него важнѣйшихъ древне-русскихъ словъ и выражений). Москва 1900/1993.
- DM 1976. Ділова і народно-розмовна мова XVIII ст. Ред.: В. В. Німчук. Київ 1976.
- DM 2007. Доба гетьмана Івана Мазепи в документах. Ред.: С. Павленко. Київ 2007.
- Dobrylove Jevanhelije 1164/2012. Добрилове Євангеліє 1164 року. Відп. ред.: Василь В. Німчук, упор.: Юрій В. Осінчук. Львів 2012 (Серії: "Історія Мови", "Пам'ятки української мови").
- Dobržans'kyj 1999. Олександр Добржанський. Національний рух Українців Буковини другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. Чернівці 1999.
- "Do Janukovyča došlo." До Януковича дошло, что закрывают украиноязычные школы. 22–02–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/02/22/85557_Do_Yanukovicha_doshlo_cho_zakrivayu.html.
- "Doneckie školy." Донецкие школы таки закрыли. 15–04–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/04/15/92754_Donetskie_shkoli_taki_zakrili.html.
- "Doslidžennja." Дослідження: наклади україномовної преси в Україні в меншості. 28–11–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1369/5/>.
- "Dovženko." Елена Довженко. Зачем закрывают украинские школы в Донецке. 02–03–2011. http://society.lb.ua/education/2011/03/02/86605_Zachem_zakrivayut_ukrainskie_shkoli.html.
- DR 2002. Дух і ревність: Владика Снігурський та інші перемишляни. Ред.: Володимир Пилипович. Перемишль, Львів 2002.
- "Draft Law on Languages." Draft Law on Languages in Ukraine and an Explanatory Note and Comparative Table. European Commission for Democracy Through Law (Venice Commission). Opinion no. 605/2010. CDL-REF(2011)001Strasbourg. 07–01–2011. www.venice.coe.int.
- "Dreamer" 2007. 04–24. <http://provokator.com.ua/phorum/read.php?1,287501,page=2>.
- Dubiel-Dmytryszyn 2010. Sebastian Dubiel-Dmytryszyn. Związki etniczno-kulturowe Łemków/Rusinów po obu stronach Karpat (kilka uwag na temat badań etnologicznych wśród Rusinów na Słowacji). In: Koporova 2010: 69–102.
- Duličenko 2008. Александр Д. Дуличенко. Письменность и литературные языки Карпатской Руси (XV–XX вв.). Вступительная статья. Тексты. Комментарии. Ужгород 2008.
- Duxnovyč 1847. Книжица читалнаа для начинающихъ, А[лександръ] Д[ухновичъ], Въ Бѣдинѣ градѣ, писмены Крал: Всеѣчилища Пештанскаго (Facsimile, Prešov 2003).
- Duxnovyč 2003. Олександр Духнович і наша сучасність. Міжнародна наукова конференція, присвячена 200-літтю від дня народження О. Духновича. Тези доповідей, упор.: М. Мушинка. Пряшів (додаток до газети „Нове життя“).

- Dva počajiv'ski 1985. Два почаївські стародруки, «Книжиця для господарства» (1788) та «Політика свецкая» (1770/1790), ред. О. Горбач. Мюнхен 1985.
- "Dybil" 2006. 11–21. Форум «Галицький імперіалізм».
<http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- Dzendzelivs'kyj 1958. Йосип Дзенделівський. Практичний словник семантичних діалектизмів Закарпаття – на допомогу вчителям Закарпатської області. Ужгород 1958.
- Dzendzelivs'kyj 2000. Йосип Дзенделівський. І. Вагилевич – перший дослідник іншомовних запозичень в українській мові (Переїмання зі слов'янських мов). *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 36, 2000: 157–77.
- Dzjuba 2011. Іван Дзюба. Від чорносотенців початку ХХ століття до українофобів початку ХХІ. Київ 2011.
- Editorial 1923. [The Editors.] Червоний Шлях, 1, 1923: III–VI.
- Editors 1923. Editorial note. Червоний Шлях 1923, 4–5: n.p.
- Editors 1933. Редакція журналу „Червоний Шлях” висловлює свої громадські вболівання. Червоний Шлях 1933, 6: n.p.
- "Ekspert vbačaє." Експерт вбачає ознаки наступу на українську мову. 25–01–2012.
<http://www.slovoidilo.com/koordinacija-z-pytan-zachystu-ukrayinskoyi-movy/ekspert-vbachaye-oznaky-nastupu-na-ukrayinsku-movu.html>.
- Elspaß 2005. Stephan Elspaß. Sprachgeschichte von unten. Untersuchungen zum geschriebenen Alltagsdeutsch im 19. Jahrhundert. Tübingen 2005.
- "Enals-Pilugina" 2007. 06–19. Gala.net: Політика.
<http://forum.gala.net/?page=read&tt=336922&ff=1004>.
- Encyklopedija 1976/2000: Anon. Соєдиненіє. In: Енциклопедія українознавства. Перевидання в Україні (first ed.: гол. ред.: Володимир Кубійович, 1976.). Т. 8. Львів 2000: 2973.
- Encyklopedija 1993–2003. Енциклопедія українознавства, 10 + 1 (доповнення) тт., Львів (first published 1955–84).
- ES. З епістолярної спадщини гетьмана Івана Мазепи. Ред. В. Станіславський. Київ 1996.
- ES 1982ff. Етимологічний словник української мови: в семи томах. Редакційна колегія: О.С. Мельничук (гол. ред.) та ін. Київ.
- EU. See Encyklopedija 1993–2003.
- "Èlla" 2006. 11–20. Форум «Галицький імперіалізм».
<http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- Fałowski 2007. Adam Fałowski. Rusin Ivan Użewicz: językoznawca — polonista — europejczyk. In: Європейський вимір української полоністики. Київ 2007: 435–439.
- "Faryna." Oksana Faryna. Film Critic: Grit, glamour of Donetsk captured by filmmaker. 15–04–2011. <http://www.kyivpost.com/news/guide/general/detail/102428/>.
- "Fedorčuk." Станіслав Федорчук. Оптимізація чи русифікація? 18–02–2011. <http://slovoidilo.com/realiyi-okupatsiyi-optymizatsiya-chy-rusyfikatsiya.html>.
- Fejsa 2007. Михайло Фейса. Войводина. In: Русинський язык. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi.

- Opole 2004 (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich) [here: 2d ed. 2007]: 375–384.
- "Fish" (2003). 08–13. Місто Львів, Форум рідного міста. Розробка рідного діалекту.
<http://www.misto.ridne.net/thread-1425.html>.
- Flier 2000. Michael Flier. The Rules of Engagement. In: Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe: Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk. Ed. Z. Gitelman et al. Cambridge, Mass.: 114–136.
- Fontański 2008. Henryk Fontański. Aktualne problemy języka łemkowskiego (normalizacja pisowni). In: Pljiskova 2008: 50–56.
- Fontański and Chomiak 2000. Henryk Fontański and Mirosława Chomiak. Gramatyka języka łemkowskiego. Katowice 2000.
- Franko 1898. Іван Франко. Пісня І. П. Котляревського в Галичині. Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка XXVI, 1898: 1–14.
- Franko 1898a. Іван Франко. Із переписки П. Куліша з Галичанами 1870–1871 р. Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка XXVI, 1898: 6–16.
- Freidhof 1980. Gerd Freidhof. Hrammatika Slovenska: Wilna 1596/Lavrentij Zizanij. Hrsg. v. G. Freidhof, 2., um das Faksimile erweiterte Auflage (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae 26). Frankfurt am Main 1980.
- Gajdoš – Konečný 2006. Marián Gajdoš and Stanislav Konečný. Postavenie a vývoj Rusínov a Ukrajincov na Slovensku v dvadsiatom storočí. In: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Neighbors: Essays in Honor of Paul Robert Magocsi. Ed. Bogdan Horbal, Patricia Krafcik, and Elaine Rusinko. Fairfax: 163–182.
- Geraščenko 2007. Геращенко, Г. Избранное от Герасима Геращенко.
<http://www.ravnopravie.kharkov.ua/2007/2007-02-09.htm>
- "German obvinila." Герман обвинила Кириленко в "грубой провокации". 03–06–2010.
http://lb.ua/news/2010/06/03/48377_German_obvinila_Kirilenko_v_gru.html.
- "German: oligarxi." Герман: олигархи - ментально не украинские. 11–03–2011.
http://lb.ua/news/2011/03/11/87596_Oligarhi_mentalno_ne_ukrainsk.html.
- Getman 2007. Гетман Иван Мазепа: Документы из архивных собраний Санкт-Петербурга, 1687-1705. ч. 1, ред. Т. Таирова-Яковлева. Санкт-Петербург 2007: 129–58.
- Goehrke 1992. Carsten Goehrke. Frühzeit des Ostslaventums. Unter Mitw. von Ursel Kälin (Erträge der Forschung; Bd. 277). Darmstadt 1992.
- "Gorčinskaja." Katya Gorchinskaya. Tabachnyk's views are dangerous in classroom. 18–03–2010.
http://www.kyivpost.com/news/opinion/op_ed/detail/62058/.
- "Gorham." Michael Gorham. Virtual Rusophonia: Language Policy as 'Soft Power' in the New Media Age. Digital Icons. In: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media 5, 2011: 23–48.
- Grabowicz 1979–80. George Grabowicz. The Nexus of the Wake: Shevchenko's Trizna. Harvard Ukrainian Studies 1979-1980/3–4: 320-347.
- Grabowicz 1996/2003. Григорій Грабович. Теорія та історія: „Горизонт сподівань“

- і рання рецепція нової української літератури (Prolegomena). In: idem. До історії української літератури. Дослідження, есеї, полеміка. Київ 2003: 46–126.
- Graziosi 2008. Andrea Graziosi. Stalinism, Collectivization and the Great Famine. Cambridge, Mass. 2008.
- Hafner 1985. Sebastian Hafner. Geschichte der österreichischen Slawistik. In: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slawistik in nichtslawischen Ländern. Ed. J. Hamm and G. Wytzens. Vienna 1985: 11–88.
- Halyčo-rus'kyj Vistnyk 1849–1850: Галичо-Рускій Вѣстникъ, виходить тричі на тыждень, въ вторникъ, четверъ и Сѣботѣ. Въ Львовѣ.
- Havryškevyč 1844. Руководство ко оумноженію і годованію садовини по селах і містечках. Перемишль 1844.
- “Herman obicjala.” Герман пообіцяла, що російська мова отримає широку підтримку держави. 24–05–2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/847/18/>.
- Himka 1999. John-Paul Himka. The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions. In: Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation. Ed. Ronald G. Suny and Michael D. Kennedy. Ann Arbor 1999: 109–64.
- Holod 1992. Голод 1921–1923 і українська преса в Канаді. Матеріали упорядкував і зредагував Роман Сербин. Торонто – Київ 1992.
- Holovac'kyj 1846. Havrylo Rusyn (= Ja. Holovac'kyj), Zustände der Russinen in Galizien. Jahrbücher für slawische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft 1846: 361–379.
- Holovac'kyj 1849. Розправа о языцѣ южнорускѣмъ и его нарѣчіяхъ сочинена Яковомъ Головацкимъ, читана въ общемъ засѣданію на сѣзді ученыхъ рускихъ 23 жовтня 1848 г. н. ч. у Львовѣ. Lviv 1849.
- Holovac'kyj 1849a. Три вступительніи преподаванія о руской словесности. Сочиненіе Якова Головацкого, пуб. Профессора Русского языка и Словесности Руской при ц. к. Львовскѣмъ Университетѣ. Lviv 1849.
- Holovac'kyj 1849b. Грамматика Русского Азыка, составленна Яковомъ Головацкимъ, ц. к. Профессоромъ руского азыка и словесности руской при всечлиаици Львовскѣмъ. Lviv 1849.
- Holovac'kyj 1860. Iwan Holovackij. Russisches Lesebuch. Poetischer Theil. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Betonung und Aussprache. Ein Beitrag zur darstellenden Unterrichts-Methode. Vienna 1860.
- Holovac'kyj 1863: Яковъ Ѡ. Головацкій. [Commentary]. In: Галичанин 1863, кн. I, вип. II: 110–112.
- Hončarenko 1933. Ів. Гончаренко. Поезія формування українського фашизму. Стаття. Червоний Шлях 1933, 4: 5–21.
- Norbač 1988: Олекса Горбач. Мовостиль новітніх перекладів св. Письма на українську народну мову 19-20 вв. Український Вільний Університет, Наукові Записки 13, 1988: 29–98.
- Hornjatkevyč 2000: А. Горняткевич. Що або хто справді загрожує українській мові? Сучасність 2000/4, квітень: 146–153. <http://litopys.org.ua/rizne/gorniatk.htm>.
- Hrabovs'kyj 2005. С. Грабовський. Львівська газета, 12–07 (№ 54).

- <http://www.gazeta.lviv.ua/articles/2006/12/07/20206/>.
- Hruševs'kyj 1995. Михайло Грушевський. Історія української літератури. Том VI: Літературний і культурно-національний рух половини XVII ст. (сер.: Київська бібліотека давнього українського письменства. Студії: т. 1). Київ 1995.
- Hrycak 1996. Ярослав Грицак. Нарис історії України. Формування модерної української нації XIX–XX ст. Київ 1996.
- Hrycak 2006. Ярослав Грицак. Пророк у своїй вітчизні. Франко та його спільнота (1856–1886). Київ 2006.
- Hrycak 2010–11. Yaroslav Hrytsak. "Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions" Reconsidered. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 35–36 (2010–11): 81–89.
- Hrynčuk 2007. "Гринчук." П. Куліш і Я. Головацький: від приязни до ворожнечі, Бібліотека Гринчука. <http://222.grinchuk.lviv.ua/referat/1/209.html>.
- HU. Універсали українських гетьманів від Івана Виговського до Івана Самойловича (1657–1687). Ред.: І. Бутич, В. Ринсевич, І. Тесленко. Київ, Львів 2004.
- Humenčuk 2010. Ольга Гуменчик. Причини підписання Європейської хартії регіональних мов або мов меншин в Україні. In: Міжнародні зобов'язання України та Німеччини в контексті європейської мовної політики. Українсько-німецький студентський семінар із соціолінгвістики. Наук. ред.: Галина Мацюк. Львів 2010: 70–91.
- Нур: Ипатьевская летопись. Том II. 2-е изд. Москва 2001.
- H1. Граматика руського языка для молодших клас шкіл середних і горожанських. Написав Др. Іван Панькевич. Прага, Братислава, Мукачево 1922.
- H2. Граматика руського языка для молодших клас шкіл середних і горожанських. Написав Др. Іван Панькевич. 2-е справл. вид. Прага 1927.
- H3. Граматика руського языка для молодших клас шкіл середних і горожанських. Написав Др. Іван Панькевич. 3-е справл. вид. Прага 1936.
- "ІЕЕ" 2005. 09–30. Региональные галицкие аспекты. http://www.anti-orange-ua.com.ru/forum/viewtopic.php?printertopic=1&t=44&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=0&finish_rel=-10000.
- "Igor" 2006. 10–14. Український Форум/Українська мова. Галицька мова. http://www.ukrcenter.com/forum/message.asp?message_id=76184&forum_name=%D3%EA%F0%E0%BF%ED%F1%FC%EA%E0%20%CC%EE%E2%E0&page=1.
- Il'nyč'kyj 1873. B. Ilnicki (Il'nyč'kyj). Ruthenisches Schulwesen. In: Bericht über österreichisches Schulwesen. Aus Anlaß der Weltausstellung 1873. Hrsg. von der Commission für die Collectiv-Ausstellung des österreichischen Unterrichts-Ministeriums. 2. Theil. Vienna 1873: 531–538.
- Instruction 1609. Інструкція українського населення міста на сейм для захисту його прав і привилеїв. Оригінал, 2 січня 1609. 4 арк. ЦДІА у Львові. Ф. 129, оп. 1, спр. 421.
- Isačenko 1958. Александр Исаченко. Вопрос 5. Какова специфика литературного

- двуязычия в истории славянских народов? Вопросы языкознания 7/3 (1958): 42–45.
- Isajevyč 2006. Iaroslav Isaievych. Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine. Edmonton 2006.
- Istorija 2004. Історія українського правопису. Хрестоматія. Ред.: Василь Німчук, Ніна Пуряєва. Київ 2004.
- Ivanov 2007. УРА-Информ Донбасс. Независимое информационно-аналитическое издание. Галицкий язык. <http://ura.dn.ua/forum/add.php?f=1&t=1219&q=9031>.
- "Ivanov," I. I. 2006. ("Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov"), in: Forum on "Galickij imperialism." <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>. 20 November 2006, 15:39.
- "Ivanov," I. I. 2006a. In: Forum on "Galickij imperialism." <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>. 20 November 2006, 09:02.
- "Ivanov," I. I. 2006b. In: Forum on "Galickij imperialism." <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>. 20 November 2006, 16:22.
- "Iz-za ukrainskogo." Из-за украинского дубляжа не снижалась посещаемость кинотеатров, утверждают кинопрокатчики. 06/07–04–2010. <http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/06apr2010/film.html>.
- Ižakevyč 1976. Г. П. Ижакевич (отв. ред.): Культура русской речи на Украине. Киев 1976.
- Jabur – Plišková 2007. Vasil Jabur and Anna Plišková. Пряшівська Русь. В: Русинський язык. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi. Opole: 2004 (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich) [here: 2d ed. 2007]: 147–209.
- "Jaka mova." Яка мова є для Вас рідною? (регіональний розподіл, динаміка 2006–2008). No date. http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/article.php/poll.php?poll_id=436.
- "Janukovič – odessitam." Янукович-одесситам: учите украинский. 25–02–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/02/25/86009_Prezident_posovetoval_odessitam_.html.
- "Janukovič podnjat." Янукович поднял красный флаг, не подписав закон о нем. 05–05–2011. <http://ru.tsn.ua/ukrayina/yanukovich-podnyal-krasnyy-flag-ne-podpisav-zakon-o-nem.html>.
- "Janukovič profinsiroval." Янукович профинансировал конгресс русскоязычной прессы. 16–06–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/06/16/101610_Yanukovich_profinsiroval_kongres.html.
- "Janukovyč i našym." І нашим, і вашим. 09–03–2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/775/18/>.
- "Janukovyč zrobyt'." Янукович зробить все, щоб російська мова стала державною. 02–09–2009. <http://tsn.ua/ukrayina/yanukovich-zrobit-vse-shchob-rosiiska-mova-stala-derzhavnoyu.html>.

- "Jaščenko." Анна Ященко. Табачник знову не полюбив українську мову і схилив до цього президента? 08–05–2011. <http://www.unian.net/ukr/news/news-436379.html>.
- Jefimenko 2002. Геннадій Єфіменко. Ставлення владних структур до розвитку національних мов у Радянській Україні 1930-х років. В: Мовні конфлікти і гармонізація суспільства: Матеріали наукової конференції: 28–29 травня 2001 року. Київ 2002: 179–185.
- Jefremov 1924. Сергій Єфремов. Історія українського письменства. З одмінами і додатками, т. 1, Ветцлар. 4th ed.
- Jevsevijs Jevanhelijes 1283/2001. Євсевіє Євангеліє 1283 року. Пам'ятки української мови XIII ст: Серія канонічної літератури. Відп. ред.: В. В. Німчук. Київ 2001.
- Johansen 1923. Mehajlo Johansen. Пристосування латиниці до потреб української мови. Червоний Шлях 1923, 9: 167–169.
- Jurčenko 2007. 07–02. К. Юрченко. Галицький імперіалізм. Великогалицький імперіалізм [11 июля]. Единое отечество. <http://www.otchestvo.org.ua/main/200611/2019.htm>, <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- Kahanovyc 1929. Л. Каганович. Промова на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 р. Budivnyctvo: 40–54.
- Kahanovyc 1929a. Л. Каганович. Питання нацполітики на Україні (Уривок з доповіді т. Кагановича на березневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1927 р. Budivnyctvo 1929: 121–129.
- Kahanovyc 1929b. Л. Каганович. Промова березневому пленумі [sic, по на] ЦК КП(б)У 1927 року. Budivnyctvo 1929: 135–141.
- Kahanovyc 1929c. Л. Каганович. До характеристики національної політики КП(б)У. З доповіді т. Кагановича на Х з'їзді КП(б)У. Budivnyctvo 1929: 145–158.
- Kahanovyc 1929d. Л. Каганович. Розлам в КПЗУ і національна політика КП(б)У. (Промова на об'єднаному пленумі ЦК і ЦКК КП(б)У 12–16–III–28 р. Budivnyctvo 1929: 231–239.
- Kahanovyc 1929e. Л. Каганович. Промова на Політбюро ЦК КП(б)У 20-IX [sic] 1926 р. Budivnyctvo 1929: 109–113.
- Kamusella 2008. Tomasz Kamusella. The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe. Basingstoke 2008.
- Kapral' 2003. Мирон Капраль. Національні громади Львова XVI–XVIII ст. (Соціально-правові взаємини). Львів 2003.
- Kapral' 2008. Михайл Капраль. Днешня мовна ситуація в Мадящині. In: Pljiskova 2008: 73–79.
- Kapral – Pop 2005. Muxajlo Kapral and Ivan Pop. Nedilja. In: Magocsi – Pop 2005: 209.
- Karevin 2006. Александр Каревин. Русь нерусская. Как рождалась „ридна мова”. Москва 2006. See also: <http://www.russian.kiev.ua/books/karevin/rusnorus/rusnorus01.shtml>.
- Karpluk 1977. Maria Karpluk. O języku Macieja Strykowskiego, historyka i poety z drugiej połowy XVI wieku. Regionalizmy, cechy ruskie i poetyzmy w dziedzynie fonetyki. (Prace Komisji Językoznawstwa, Polska Akademia Nauk, Nr. 45). Wrocław et al.

- 1977.
- Keipert 1988. Helmut Keipert. Metaslavismmentypen in ostslavischen Texten des 17. Jh. In: Wokół języka. Rozprawy i studia poświęcone pamięci profesora Mieczysława Szymczaka. Wrocław et al. 1988: 197–210.
- Keipert 2001. Helmut Keipert. "Rozmova/Besěda": Das Gesprächsbuch Slav. № 7 der Bibliothèque nationale de France. Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie 60/1: 9–40.
- Keipert – Bunčić 2005. Helmut Keipert and Daniel Bunčić. "Einleitung" in RB: XI–LI.
- Kerča 2007. Ігор Керча. Пудкарпатська Русь. В: Русинський язык. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi. Opole: 2004 (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich) [here: 2d ed. 2007]: 115–46.
- КН 1905. Кореспонденція Якова Головатського в літах 1850–62. Ред.: Кирило Студинський. 5 (Збірник фільологічної секції Наукового товариства імені Шевченка VIII + IX). Львів 1905.
- КН 1909. Кореспонденція Якова Головатського в літах 1835–49. Ред.: Кирило Студинський (Збірник фільологічної секції Наукового товариства імені Шевченка XI + XII). Львів 1909.
- Kiparsky 1963–1975. Valentin Kiparsky. Russische historische Grammatik. Bd. 1–3. Heidelberg 1963–75.
- "Kivalov хо́чет." Кивалов хочет сделать русский государственным и забыть о нем. 19–05–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/05/19/97197_Kivalov_hochet_sdelat_russkiy_go.html.
- Ključevskij 1956. Василий О. Ключевский. Сочинения. Т. 1: Курс русской истории. Ч. 1. Москва 1956.
- Kloss 1967. Heinz Kloss. Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. Anthropological Linguistics 9: 29–41.
- "Klymončuk." Оксана Климончук, УНІАН, Мітинг проти двомовності: «друга державна мова вже діє – мова брехні». 20–10–2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/976/6/>.
- Kohut 1988/1996. Zenon E. Kohut. Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy. Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s. Cambridge, Mass. 1988. = Зенон Е. Когут. Російський централізм і українська автономія. Ліквідація Гетьманщини 1760–1830. Київ 1996.
- Kohut 2003. Zenon Kohut. The Question of Russo-Ukrainian Unity and Ukrainian Distinctiveness in Early Modern Ukrainian Thought and Culture. In: Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945). Ed. Andreas Kappeler, Zenon Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen. Edmonton 2003: 57–86.
- "Kolesničenko Compatriot." Vadym Kolesnichenko named The Compatriot of the Year 2009. 11–06–2010. <http://r-u.org.ua/en/announ/22-news.html>.
- "Kolesničenko – Council." Vadym Kolesničenko. The Council of Europe requires adopting the Law "On Languages in Ukraine." 13–10–2010. <http://r-u.org.ua/en/announ/73-news.html>.
- "Kolesničenko etc." Vadym Kolesnichenko [Kolesničenko], Aurika Bozhesku [Božesku], Ishtvan Haydosh [Ištvan Hajdoš, István Gajdos], and Arkadiy Monastirskiy [Arkadij Monastyr's'kyj]. National communities in Ukraine called the Venice Commission to refrain from preconceived conclusions. Human Rights Public

- Movement "Russian-Speaking Ukraine." 28-03-2011.
<http://r-u.org.ua/en/official/213-national-community-in-ukraine-called-the-venice-commission-to-refrain-from-preconceived-conclusions.html>.
- "Kolesničenko Georgievskaja." Вадим Колесниченко: «Георгиевская лента – символ единства страны». 28-04-2010. <http://r-u.org.ua/recomend/581-georg.html>.
- "Kolesničenko: Literaturnogo." Колесниченко. Литературного украинского языка в Украине нет. 09-11-2010.
http://www.utro.ua/ru/politika/kolesnichenko_literaturnogo_ukrainskogo_yazyka_v_ukraine_net1289310948.
- "Kolesničenko my." Регионал Колесниченко: Мы на войне и я не хочу, чтобы мой товарищ всадил мне нож в спину. ВИДЕО. 25-05-11.
http://censor.net.ua/video_news/169685/regional_kolesnichenko_my_na_voyine_i_ya_ne_hochu_chtoby_moyi_tovarisch_vsadil_mne_noj_v_spinu_video.
- "Kolesničenko ob otmene." Колесниченко об отмене парада: Не нужно натужно праздновать то, чего нет. FaceNews – Новости от первого лица, 26-07-2011.
<http://facenews.ua/11791/kolesnichenko-ob-otmene-parada-ne-nugno-natugno-prazdnovat-to-chego-net.html>.
- "Kolesničenko osvistali." Колесниченко освистали в прямом эфире. 28-11-2010.
<http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/1143158-kolesnichenko-osvistali-v-pryamom-efire>.
- "Kolesničenko predlaeta." Колесниченко предлагает "толерантно избавляться от дураков" из оппозиции. 08-06-2011. <http://nikvesti.com/news/politics/22082>. See in Ukrainian:
<http://gazeta.ua/articles/politics/385823>.
- "Kolesničenko Press Conference." Lenta.Ru. Izdanie Rambler Media Group. Published on 13-01-2011. <http://www.lenta.ru/conf/kolesnichenko/>.
- "Kolesničenko Press Conference 2." 12 января в 12.00 news.tochka.net состоялась пресс конференция заместителя главы фракции ПР Колесниченко. No date. <http://r-u.org.ua/akt/6531-news.html>.
- "Kolesničenko – Prezident." Президент не должен реагировать на каждый визг оппозиции. 06-05-2010. <http://r-u.org.ua/politika/660-news.html>.
- "Kolesničenko priznalsja." <http://www.bagnet.org/news/summaries/ukraine/2011-04-18/124319>. Колесниченко признался: Развиваться Украине мешает весь мир. 18-04-2011. Cf. in Ukr.:
<http://tsn.ua/ukrayina/u-pr-vvazhayut-scho-stabilna-ukrayina-ne-potribna-nikomu-u-sviti.html>.
- "Kolesničenko stav." Колесниченко став на захист звільненого за «телячу мову» працівника ДАІ. 28-01-2011. <http://zik.ua/ua/news/2011/01/28/269368>.
- "Kolesničenko Today Ukraine." Vadym Kolesnichenko: today Ukraine has become the center of anti-fascism. 12-09-2011. <http://r-u.org.ua/en/news/315-news.html>.
- "Kolesničenko: Ukraine." Vadym Kolesnichenko: Ukraine will adopt the Law guaranteeing ethnic minorities the right to study in their mother tongue. 27-01-2011.
http://www.partyofregions.org.ua/en/deputy_faction/activities/show/1229.

- "Kolesničenko: V ljuboj." Вадим Колесниченко: В любой точке нашей страны одновременно действуют 14 региональных языков! 24–09–2010. <http://www.versii.com/news/215241/>.
- "Kolesničenko V Ukrainu." Колесниченко: В Украину брошены «пятые колонны» для организации «революций». Багнет – Мы к штыку приравняли перо. 16–04–2011. <http://www.bagnet.org/news/ukraine/123947>.
- "Kolesničenko vvažaje." Колесниченко вважає рішення Європарламенту щодо Тимошенко нелегітимним. 10–06–2011. <http://ukranews.com/uk/news/ukraine/2011/06/10/45685>.
- "Kolesničenko zvynuvatyv." Колесниченко звинуватив Венеціанську комісію в подвійних стандартах. 14–04–2011. <http://www.unian.net/ukr/news/news-431083.html>.
- Kolesnikov 2002. 02–12. А. Колесников. Какой язык до Киева доведет. http://www.duel.ru/200208/?07_3_2 or <http://www.old.russiane.org/101.html>.
- Kolesnikov 2004. А. Колесников. Русофобия на Галичине. Галичанский синдром, в: Родина. Сайт русской Латвии (2004). <http://rodina.lv/html/galichina.html>.
- "Kommodova." Наталя Коммодова. Оборона шкіл. 19–09–2011. (Матеріал друкованого видання № 37 (202) від 08–09–2011). <http://ut.net.ua/Society/30317>.
- "Konstytucijnyj Sud." Конституційний Суд дозволив розмовляти російською. 15–12–2011. <http://slovoua.com/news/konstitutsiinii-sud-dozvoliv-sudam-rozmovliati-rosiis%27koiu>.
- Kopitar 1816. Kopitar, Jernej. Nauka Chrjstjianskaja—Za Blagoslovenjiem "Kyr" Michayla Levčkago—Sostavlenaja etc. (Christlicher Unterricht, nach der Ordnung des Normal-Katechismus zum Nutzen der Landkinder nach dem Segen Sr. Ueberheiligkeit des Herrn Michail Lewitzki, Bischofs von Pzemyśl, Sambor, (u.) Sanok verfasst. In Druck gelegt in der Stadt Budin (Ofen), mit Schriften der k. Pester Universität, im Jahre 1816). Wiener Allgemeine Literaturzeitung 89, no. 5 (November 1816): 1423.
- Koropova 2010. Русинська мовна норма на прикладах з періодичної преси і красної літератури. В: Русинський списовний мовний на Слівенську 1995–2010 і сучасна література. Збірник рефератів з наукового семінара з міжнародних учасців 2. грудня 2010. Пряшів 2010: 4–22.
- "Kornienko." Михайло Корниєнко. Простий рецепт знищення України. Made in USA. 28–12–2011. <http://r-u.org.ua/recommend/6468-news.html>.
- Kornilov 2000. Д. Корнілов. Носяться со своим галицийским „Суржи́ком“... А русский хотя́т изгна́ть из теле-пространства Украины. Крымская правда (dating from 2000: 1999 is referred to as "last year"). <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Parliament/9677/surgik.htm>, <http://www.edrus.org/content/view/1862/69/>.
- Kosior 1930. С. Косіор. Про масову колективізацію, ліквідацію куркуля як класу і чергові завдання партії. Більшовик України, Нр. 3, 15 лютого, 1930. Політико-економічний журнал ЦК КП(б)У: 13–24.
- Kosior 1933. С. В. Косіор. Підсумки і найближчі завдання національної політики на Україні. Доповідь на Листопадовому об'єднаному [sic] пленумі ЦК і ЦКК КП(б)У. Червоний Шлях 1933, 8–9: 205–244.

- "Kosjukova." Арина Косюкова. Український суверенітет, або як благодійні фонди та організації «поважають» нашу країну. 28–10–2011. <http://zapad.r-u.org.ua/news/281-news.html>.
- Kostiuk 1960. Hryhory Kostiuk. *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine: A Study of the Decade of Mass Terror, 1929–1939*. Munich 1960.
- Kotljarevs'kyj 1982. Іван Котляревський. Поетичні твори. Драматичні твори. Листи. Київ 1982.
- Kravciv 1973/1998. Богдан Кравців. Свобода. In: *Енциклопедія українознавства*. Перевидання в Україні (first edition: гол. ред.: Володимир Кубійович, 1973). Т. 7. Львів: Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка 1998: 227–228.
- Kravčenjuk 1993. Осип Кравченко. Головні редактори "Свободи" 1893–1993. With some more recent information added by [an] unknown author[s]. Available online: http://www.svoboda-news.com/pro_svobodu/kravchenuk.htm.
- Krawchenko 1985. Bohdan Krawchenko. *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. London, Edmonton, and Oxford 1985.
- Krylovskij 1904. Амфросій Крыловскій. Львовское ставропигіальное братство. Киевъ: Типография Императорскаго Университета Св. Владимира.
- Kubajčuk 2004. Віктор Кубайчук. Хронологія мовних подій в Україні (зовнішня історія української мови). Київ 2004.
- Kubijovyc 1966. Володимир Кубійович. *Енциклопедія українознавства*, т. 5. Париж, Нью-Йорк 1966: 1716–17.
- Kuliš 1874. П. А. Куліш. *Исторія возсоединенія Руси. Томъ второй: Отъ начала столѣтней козацко-шляхетской войны до возстановленія въ Киевѣ православной іерахії, въ 1620 году*. С.-Петербургъ 1874.
- Kuliš 1955. Микола Куліш. *Твори*. New York 1955.
- Kuliš 1984. Вибрані листи Пантелеймона Куліша, українською мовою писані. Ред.: Ю. Луцький. Нью Йорк – Торонто 1984.
- "Kulyk." Володымыр Кулык. Родной язык и язык общения: на что должна ориентироваться языковая политика? Вестник общественного мнения. Данные. Анализ. Дискуссии 3 (105). Июль-сентябрь 2010. Год издания 17-й. Аналитический Центр Юрия Левады (Левада-Центр): 75–87.
- Kuropas 1991. Myron B. Kuropas. *The Ukrainian Americans. Roots and Aspirations 1884–1954*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London 1991.
- Kurs 1958. Курс історії української літературної мови. Ред.: Іван К. Білодід. Київ 1958.
- Kuzelja–Rudnyc'kyj 1943/1987. Z. Kuzelja – J. B. Rudnyc'kyj. *Ukrainisch-deutsches Wörterbuch, unter Mitwirkung von S. Iwanyčkyj und K. H. Meyer*. 3. Aufl. Wiesbaden 1987 (first published 1943).
- "Kuzio." Kuzio, Taras. Ukrainian Education Minister Tabachnyk Confirms His Russian Nationalist Credentials. *Eurasia Daily Monitor* Volume 7, issue 177, October 1, 2010. [http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=36985&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=27&cHash=41ea0f42ea](http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=36985&tx_ttnews[backPid]=27&cHash=41ea0f42ea).
- Kuzio 2011. Taras Kuzio. A multi-vectored scholar for a multi-vectored era: Paul Robert Magocsi. *Nationalities Papers* 39, no. 1: 95–104.

- Kuz'minova 2000. Грамматики Лаврентия Зизания и Мелетия Смотрицкого. Ул.: Е. А. Кузьминова. Москва 2000.
- Kviring 1923: Е. Квіринг. Крутий поворот чи розгортання попередньої роботи. До національного питання. Червоний шлях 1923, 4–5: 107–112.
- Lenec' 2000. К. В. Ленець. Суржик. В: Українська мова. Енциклопедія. Київ: 616.
- Lenin 1965. Vladimir Lenin. Collected Works. Vol. 30. 4th English ed. Moscow 1965.
- Lesiv 1997. Михайло Лесів. Українські говірки у Польщі. Варшава 1997.
- Levkovyc' 1933. Л. Левкович. Ненависть, Нотатки про роман Володимира Гжицького – Захар „Вовгура“. Червоний Шлях 1933, 6: 83–104.
- Levyc'kyj 1834. Joseph Lewicki [Йосиф Левицький]. Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien – Грамматика языка русского въ Галиції – Gramatyka języka ruskiego w Galicyi. Przemyśl 1834.
- Levyc'kyj 1838. Стихъ во Честъ Его Превосходительствѣ Преосвященнѣйшомѣ Курѣ Михаилѣ Лѣвицкомѣ, Митрополитѣ Галицкомѣ, Архиепископови Львѣвскому, Бискупови Каменца Подѣльскаго, Его Императорскаго Величества дѣйствительномѣ тайномѣ Совѣтнику, Докторови С. Богословия и т. д., во день Сватога Архистратига Михаила дна 8. Ноемвриа 1838, яко во день его высокаго тезоименитства, Йосифомѣ Лѣвицкимѣ, Парохоми Школьскимѣ Диецезіи Перемыскои у подѣножия Его Престола съ наибѣльшимѣ ушанованомѣ сложенный. Въ Перемышли, Дрѣковано въ дрѣкарнѣ Русскаго Епископа 1838.
- Levyc'kyj 1838a. Левицький. Ералькеніг, Гетого переведенъ на мало Рускій языкъ і названъ Богинею Йосифомѣ Левіцкимѣ, зо Шкла. Перемышль 1838.
- Levyc'kyj 1888. Иван Е. Левицкий. Галицко-русская библиография XIX столѣтія съ увзглядненемъ изданій появившихся въ Угорщинѣ и Буковинѣ (1801–1886), т. I: Хронологическій списокъ публикацій (1801–1860). Львовъ 1888.
- Levyc'kyj 1926. Кость Левицький. Історія політичної думки галицьких українців 1848–1914, на підставі споминів, накладом власним, з друкарні оо. Василіянів у Жовкві. Львів 1926.
- Ljapunov 2006. Б. М. Ляпунов. Единство русского языка в его наречиях (originally published in Odesa in 1919). 20-03-2006. www.edrus.org/content/view/2764/63/.
- Ljubčenko 1926. П. Любченко. Старі теорії й нові помилки. Budivnyctvo 1929: 81–94.
- Ljubčenko 1929. П. Любченко. Промова на березневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У (1927 року). Budivnyctvo 1929: 130–134.
- Ljubčenko 1930. П. Любченко. Українські націоналісти у боротьбі за реставрацію капіталізму (До процесу СБУ). Більшовик України 1930, 9–10: 59–75.
- Losiv 1998. І. Лосів. Галицький міф російської свідомості. Дзвін Севастополя, № 3, грудень 1998 р. <http://ukrlife.org/main/tribuna/losiv.htm>.
- Lozyns'kyj 1846. Grammatyka języka ruskiego (mało-ruskiego) napisana przez Ks. Józefa Łozińskiego. Przemyśl 1846.
- LS. Лірвак з-над Сяну: перемиські друки середини XIX ст. Ул. Володимир Пилипович. Перемишль 2001.
- Luckyj 1983. G. Luckyj. Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times. New York

- 1983.
- Luckyj 2004. G. S. Luckyj. Kulish, Panteleimon (Kuliš, Pantelejmon). Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine. <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/pages/K/U/KulishPanteleimon.htm>.
- L'vivs'ka gvara 2007. Форум «Львівська гвара». Львів. Форум рідного міста. <http://misto.ridne.net/viewthread.php?tid=4554&page=4>.
- "Lytvyn." Литвин відклав підписання закону, що урізає квоти українських виконавців. 08–11–2011. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2011/11/8/6740263/>.
- Łesiów 2000. Michał Łesiów. The Polish and Ukrainian Languages: A Mutually Beneficial Relationship. In: *Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe: Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk*. Ed. Z. Gitelman, L. Hajda, J.-P. Himka, and R. Solchanyk. Cambridge, Mass.: 393–406.
- Machek 1997. Václav Machek. Etymologický slovník jazyka českého. Fotoreprint podle 3. vydání z roku 1971. Praha 1997.
- Macuka 2004. 11–25. А. Мацука. Два проекта Украины, в: Интернет-журнал Новая Политика. <http://www.novopol.ru/article969.html>.
- Magocsi 1978. Paul Robert Magocsi. *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948*. Cambridge, Mass., and London 1978.
- Magocsi 1995. Paul R. Magocsi. The Rusyn Language Question Revisited. In: *A New Slavic Language Is Born. The Rusyn Literary Language of Slovakia*. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi (Series: East European Monographs, vol. 8). New York: 19–47.
- Magocsi 2002. Paul R. Magocsi. *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont*. Toronto and Buffalo 2002.
- Magocsi 2005. Paul R. Magocsi. Greek Catholic Union of Brotherhoods in the USA. In: *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*. Revised and expanded edition. Ed. Paul R. Magocsi and Ivan Pop. Toronto, Buffalo, and London 2005: 152.
- Magocsi 2007 [2004]. Paul R. Magocsi [Павел Р. Марочій]. Русинський язык. Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich. Opole 2004 (2d ed. 2007).
- Magocsi 2007a. Paul R. Magocsi [Павел Р. Марочій]. Языковый вопрос. In: Magocsi 2007: 85–112.
- Magocsi 2007b. Paul R. Magocsi [Павел Р. Марочій]. Етно-географічний і історичний перегляд [*sic*]. In: Magocsi 2007: 15–38.
- Magocsi 2007c. Paul R. Magocsi [Павел Роберт Марочій]. Америка. In: Magocsi 2007: 385–392.
- Magocsi 2007d. Paul R. Magocsi [Павло [*sic*] Роберт Марочій]. Народ нивыдки: ілюстрована історія карпаторусинів. Сюжетні коментарі ид ілюстраціям Валерій Падяк. По русинськы текст повтомачив Валерій Падяк. Ужгород 2007.
- Magocsi 2008. Paul R. Magocsi [Павел Р. Марочій]. Задачі III. Меджінародного конгресу русинського языка. In: Pljiškova 2008: 8–14.
- Magocsi 2011. Paul R. Magocsi. Eine rusynische Nation? Die Ukraine. Prozesse der Nationsbildung. Ed. Andreas Kappeler. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: 269–278.
- Magocsi – Pop 2005. *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*. Revised and expanded

- edition. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi and Ivan Pop. Toronto, Buffalo, and London.
- "Makarov." Юрій Макаров. Дискредитанти. 19–09–2011. Матеріал друкованого видання № 37 (202) від 08–09–2011. <http://www.ut.net.ua/Columns/50/30367?PageIndex=2>.
- Maksymovych (1840/1863). Письмо о галицко-русской словесности Профессора Михаила Максимовича. Писаное въ 1840. году изъ Киева. Галичанин 1863, кн. I, вип. II, 1863: 107–110.
- Maksymovych 1929. К. Maksymovych. Заява на березневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1927 р. In: *Budivnytstvo* 1929, 209–210.
- Marčuk 1969. Н. І. Марчук, Форми 3-ї особи дієслів теперішнього часу в українських говорах, в: *Українська діалектна морфологія*. Ред. Ф. Т. Жилко. Київ 1969: 168–177.
- "Margo" 2007. 01–28. <http://forum.pravda.com.ua/read.php?4,1805997,1809236>.
- Martin 2001. Terry Martin. *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union 1923–1939*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Masenko 2004. Лариса Масенко. Мова і суспільство. Постколоніальний вимір. Київ (see also: Суржик як соціолінгвістичний феномен). В: *І* 35, 2004. <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n35texts/masenko-surzhyk.htm>.
- "Masenko." Лариса Масенко. Законопроект «Про мови в Україні»: погляд лінгвіста. *Дзеркало тижня*, № 34 (814). 18–24–09–2010. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2009/04/23/3899542/>.
- "Masenko: Koly." Лариса Масенко: Коли не ведеться мовна політика в країні – це теж політика. 23–11–2010. <http://slovoidilo.com/polityka/larysa-masenko-koly-ne-vedetsya-movna-polityka-v-krayini-tse-tezh-polityka.html>.
- "Masenko mova." Лариса Масенко. Мова й холоїзм. 08–09–2010. <http://slovoidilo.com/polityka/mova-j-choluyizm.html>.
- "Maskal" 2007. Viktor Yanukovich. Personal Information Server. <http://www.ya2006.com.ua/eng/forum/4682278f19404/> (deleted between 07–02–07 and 07–11–07).
- "Mazuka – Tyščenko." Людмила Мазука. Юлія Тищенко. Як живеться росіянам в Україні? 23–04–2009. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2009/04/23/3899542/>.
- Medvedev – Morhun – Nakonečnyj 1962: Ф.П. Медведев – П.А. Моргун – М.Ф. Наконечний. Про основні етапи історичного розвитку української літературної мови. В: *Праці Міжвузовської конференції, що відбулася в Харкові 15-20 грудня 1959 року, присвячені V Міжнародному з'їздові славістів*. Харків 1962: 12–56.
- "Medvedev nagradil." Медведев наградил Колесниченко за русский язык. 08–12–2008. <http://news.liga.net/news/N0867231.html>.
- "Micha" 2007. 06–20. Gala.net: Политика. <http://forum.gala.net/?page=read&tt=336922&ff=1004>.
- Miller 2000. Алексей И. Миллер. „Украинский вопрос“ в политике властей и русском общественном мнении (вторая половина XIX века). Санкт-Петербург 2000.
- "Minkul'tury." Мінкультури звинувачує Табачника у брехні. 14–04–2010. <http://nbb>.

- com.ua/news/806/18/.
- Misiak 2006. Małgorzata Misiak. Lemkowie. W kręgu badań nad mniejszościami etnolingwistycznymi w Europie. Wrocław 2006.
- "Misija." Мисія Табачника. 07–09–2010. <http://slovoidilo.com/polityka/misiya-tabachnyka.html>.
- "Mitropolit." Митрополит УПЦ МП заявив, що його місія: відстоювати інтереси росіян в Україні. 18–10–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1338/18/>.
- ML. Листи Івана Мазепи 1687–1691. Ред.: В. Станіславський. Київ 2002.
- Mohyl'nyč'kij 1910. Філологічні праці Івана Могильницького. Вид.: Михайло Возняк. Львів 1910.
- Mohyl'nyč'kij 1838. [Antin Mohyl'nyč'kij.] Пѣснь радостна. Съ пригоды поставленія въ Церквѣ Митрополічой Львовской С. Великомѹченика Георгіа, дна ѿ. Марта, аѿли [1838], Єгѡ високопочтеннагѡ господина Васіліа Поповича катедральной церкви Прашовской Крылошана, Доктора Любомѹдріа, Архідїакона Спижкагѡ и прч. и прч. на Єѵспа Мункачовской Єпархіи обр. гр. каф. въ Уграхъ произнесенна Алунами Семинаріи генеральной обр. гр. каф. Въ Львовѣ, типоѡмъ інститѹта ставропіітанскагѡ 1838.
- Mohyl'nyč'kij 2003. Іван Могильницький. Вѣдомѣсть о Рускомѣ языкѣ. Ред.: В. Грещук. Івано-Франківськ 2003.
- Mončalovs'kij 1899. О. А. Мончаловскій. Житіє і дѣятельность Ивана Наумовича. Львів 1899.
- Morfolohiia 1978. Історія української мови: Морфологія. Ред. В. Німчук. Київ 1978.
- Moser 1998. Michael Moser. Die polnische, ukrainische und weißrussische Interferenzschicht im russischen Satzbau des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts (Schriften über Sprachen und Texte, Bd. 3). Frankfurt am Main etc. 1998.
- Moser 1998a. Michael Moser. Ostukrainische Urkunden- und Geschäftssprache im 18. Jahrhundert. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 57, 1998/2: 379–407.
- Moser 2001. Michael Moser. Zwei „ruthenische“ (ukrainische) Erstlesefibeln aus dem österreichischen Galizien und ihre sprachliche Konzeption. Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 47, 2001: 93–122.
- Moser 2002. Michael Moser. Prüfsteine des Austroslavismus: Das „Allgemeine Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich“ und die „Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Oesterreichs“. In: Crossroads of Cultures: Central Europe. Ed. Ivo Pospíšil. Brno 2002: 75–129.
- Moser 2002a. Michael Moser. Ruthenisch oder Russisch? Die Sprache der ukrainischen Russophilen in der Habsburgermonarchie. Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 48 (Beiträge für den Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Ljubljana/Laibach 2003): 99–115.
- Moser 2002b. Михаэль Мозер. Что такое „прóстая мова“? Studia Slavica [Academiae Scientiarum] Hung[aricae] 47/3–4: 221–260.
- Moser 2003. Michael Moser. Das Ukrainische („Ruthenische“) der galizischen Polonophilen zwischen 1830 und 1849. Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie 62, no. 2 (2003): 311–358.

- Moser 2003a. Michael Moser. Konzeption der ukrainischen Elementarbuch „Руско-славенскій Букварь“ z 1847 r. In: *Ukraina między językiem a kulturą. Studia Ruthenica Cracoviensia* 1. Ed. Bożena Zinkiewicz-Tomanek and Adam Fałowski. Cracow 2003: 65–70.
- Moser 2004. Michael Moser. „Jazyčije“ – ein Pseudotermine der sprachwissenschaftlichen Ukrainistik. *Studia Slavica [Academiae Scientiarum] Hung[aricae]* 49, nos. 1–2 (2004): 121–47 = Міхаель Мозер. „Язичіє“ – псевдотермін в українському мовознавстві. *Збірник Харківського історико-філологічного товариства. Нова серія*. Т. 10, 2004: 207–32.
- Moser 2004a. Michael Moser. Das Ukrainische im Gebrauch der griechisch-katholischen Kirche in Galizien (1772–1859). In: *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache – Українська мова в церквах*, hrsg. v. M. Moser, Vienna 2004 (*Slavische Sprachgeschichte*, Bd. 1): 151–241.
- Moser 2004b. Michael Moser. Review of Wendland 2001. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 63/1, 2004: 237–247.
- Moser 2004c. Michael Moser. Wechselbeziehungen zwischen slavischen Sprachen (bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts). *Welt der Slaven* XLIX, 2004: 161–82.
- Moser 2004d. Michael Moser. Die sprachliche Erneuerung der galizischen Ukrainer zwischen 1772 und 1848/1849 im mitteleuropäischen Kontext. In: *Contemporary Cultural Studies in Central Europe*. Ed. Ivo Pospíšil and Michael Moser. Brno 2004: 81–118.
- Moser 2005. Michael Moser. Sind der „Relativisator“ *to* und die Syntax anderer Enklitika als klare Beweise für die Authentizität des Igorlieds zu werten? *Studia Slavica [Academiae Scientiarum] Hung[aricae]* 50, 2005/3–4: 267–282.
- Moser 2005a. Міхаель Мозер. Українська („руська“) версія „Общого Вѣстника законовъ державныхъ и правительства“, „Вѣстника законѡвъ державныхъ для королевствъ и краѣвъ въ державной думѣ заступленныхъ“ (1870–1895/1896) і „Вістника законів державних для королівств і країв заступлених в раді державній“ (1895/1896–1918). In: *Австрія й Україна в контексті європейської інтеграції та співробітництва. Матеріали науково-практичної конференції*. Ред.: Міхаель Мозер, Віктор Андрющенко. Відень – Київ 2005: 33–45.
- Moser 2005b. Michael Moser. Some Viennese contributions to the development of Ukrainian terminologies. In: *Ukraine's re-integration into Europe: A historical, historiographical and political urgent issue*. Ed. Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff and Giulia Lami. Alessandria 2005 (*Slavica* 9): 139–180.
- Moser 2005c. Michael Moser. Slavischsprachige Kommunikation auf dem Prager Slavenkongress von 1848. In: *Litteraria Humanitas XIII. Austrian, Czech and Slovak Slavonic Studies in Their Central European Context*. Ed. Ivo Pospíšil, Michael Moser, and Stefan M. Newerkla. Brno 2005: 47–72.
- Moser 2006. Міхаель Мозер. Важливий крок в історії підручників з української мови: Перші два видання букваря Івана Могильницького (Буда 1816 р., Львів 1819 р.). In: *Studia Russica* XXII, 2006: 89–114.
- Moser 2006a. Michael Moser. Panegyrika für griechisch-katholische Bischöfe und die galizisch-ukrainische Erneuerung – Josyf Levyc'kyjs „Стихъ во честьъ Jero Преосвященствѣ Куръ Іоаннѣ Снѣгѣрскомѣ“ von 1837. In: *Iter philologicum*.

- Festschrift für Helmut Keipert zum 65. Geburtstag. Ed. Daniel Bunčić and Nikolaos Trunte. München 2006 (Die Welt der Slaven. Sammelbände – Сборники 28): 125–137.
- Moser 2006b. Міхаель Мозер. Перші кроки народної «русинської мови» в шкільництві уторських русинів-українців – „Наука свѣцка“ в букварі Івана Кутки (в порівнянні з її подільсько-галицькою попередницею „Полѣтикою свѣцкою“). In: Микроязики – Язики – Интеръязыки. Сборник в честь ординарного профессора Александра Дмитриевича Дуличенко. Ред.: А. Кюннап – В. Лефельдт – С. Кузнецов. Тарту 2006: 126–141.
- Moser 2006c. Michael Moser. Review of Розмова – Бесѣда. Das ruthenische und kirchenslavische Berlaumont-Gesprächsbuch des Ivan Uževyč. Mit lat. und poln. Paralleltext hrsg. v. Daniel Bunčić and Helmut Keipert. Munich 2005. Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 52, 2006: 249–251.
- Moser 2007. Michael Moser. “Ruthenische” (ukrainische) Sprach- und Vorstellungswelten in den galizischen Volksschullesebüchern der Jahre 1871 und 1872. Vienna 2007 (Slavische Sprachgeschichte, Bd. 2).
- Moser 2007a. Michael Moser. Philologie als Schlüssel zu den nach morphologischen Prinzipien adaptierten Polonismen im Russischen. Studia Slavica [Academiae Scientiarum] Hung[aricae] 52 (Festschrift for Prof. István Nyomárkay): 299–308.
- Moser 2007b. Міхаель Мозер. Слов’янська ідея в середовищі галицьких русинів (українців) перемиської єпархії (1830–1848/49 pp.). In: Amoenitates vel lepores philologiae (Venceslao Durano vulgo Twardzik dicto septuagenario tota philologorum turba gratulans dedicat). Ed. Roman Laskowski and Roman Mazurkiewicz. Cracow: 416–427.
- Moser 2007c. Michael Moser. Zur Genese des allrussischen Geschichts- und Sprachmythos in der Kiewer „Synopsis“. In: Wort – Geist – Kultur. Gedenkschrift für Sergej S. Averincev. Ed. Juliane Besters-Dilger, Heinz Miklas, Gerhard Neweklowsky, and Fedor B. Poljakov. Frankfurt am Main 2007: 219–285. Cf. Ukrainian translation in Moser 2008, pp. 162–222.
- Moser 2008a. Michael Moser. Taras Ševčenko und die moderne ukrainische Schriftsprache – Versuch einer Würdigung. Nördlingen 2008.
- Moser 2008b. Michael Moser. Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting: The Galician Variant of the Ukrainian Language and Anti-Ukrainian Discourse in Contemporary Internet Sources. In Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe. Ed. Larissa Onyshkevych and Maria Rewakowicz. Armonk/New York – London, England 2009: 316–335.
- Moser 2008c. Міхаель Мозер. Чи намагався Олександр Духнович створити русинську літературну мову? Україна модерна 13, № 2: 222–35, see also Moser 2011: 627–40.
- Moser 2008d. Michael Moser. “Austroruthenisch?” – Der Wiener “Вѣстникъ” als Zeitung “für die Ruthenen des österreichischen Staates.” In: Die Ukrainer (Ruthenen, Russinen) in Österreich-Ungarn. Eine geteilte Nation und ihr Sprach- und Kulturleben im Blickfeld von Wien und Budapest. Ed. Michael Moser and András Zoltán. Vienna 2008: 29–100.

- Moser 2009. 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. Juliane Besters-Dilger and Fedor Poljakov. Frankfurt am Main etc. 2009: 289–322.
- Moser 2009a. Michael Moser. Did Aleksandr Dukhnovych strive to create a Rusyn literary language? In: Best – Stepien 2009: 63–80.
- Moser 2009b. Michael Moser. Einige phonologisch markierte Metapolonismen in Kyrylo Trankvilion-Stavrovec'kyjs „Перло многѣѣнное“. In: Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia byzantina. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag. Ed. Dagmar Christians, Dieter Stern, and Vittorio S. Tomelleri. Munich: 430–447.
- Moser 2010. Міхаель Мозер. «Граматика руського языка» Івана Панькевича та галицька українська мова в Підкарпатській Русі. In: Korotova 2010: 68–93.
- Moser 2011. Міхаель Мозер. Причинки до історії української мови. Харків: Харківське історико-філологічне товариство. Вінниця 2011.
- Moser 2011a. Міхаель Мозер. Український П'ємонт? Дещо про значення Галичини для формування, розбудови й збереження української мови. Львів, Київ 2011.
- Moser 2011b. Michael Moser. Macht und Kodifikation in der Subkarpatischen Rus' (1919–1944). In: Власт и кодификация. Изд.: Диана Иванова. Пловдив: 98–112.
- Moser 2011c. Міхаель Мозер. „Русини“ й „руська мова“ в галицьких граматиках першої половини XIX століття. In: Українська мова в Галичині: історичний вимір (Серія „Історія мови“). Ред.: Ярослав Ісаєвич – Міхаель Мозер – Наталія Хобзей. Львів 2011: 9–54.
- Moser 2011d. Ukrainian and Belarusian in Alexander Issatschenko's "Geschichte der russischen Sprache." In: Florilegium in honorem Alexandri Isačenko. Ad iubilaum centenarium oblatum. Ed. A. Eliáš and L. Matejko. Bratislava: 59–73. www.coolart.sk/grafika_11.../FLORILEGIUM_2011_web%20nahlad.pdf (08–06–2011).
- Moser 2012. Michael Moser. Deutsche Klassik auf Galizisch-Ruthenisch – Schillers „Bürgschaft“ in Josyf Levyc'kyjs Übersetzung aus dem Jahr 1841. In: Schnittpunkt Slavistik. Ost und West im wissenschaftlichen Dialog. Festgabe für Helmut Keipert zum 70. Geburtstag. Tl. 2: Einflussforschung. Ed. Irina Podtergera. Bonn: 41–70.
- Moser 2012a. Міхаель Мозер. Тарас Шевченко і сучасна українська мова: спроба гідної оцінки. Переклав з німецької Володимир Кам'янець. Українська наукова бібліотека НТШ. Ч. 32. Львів 2012 (Серія „Історія мови“).
- Moser 2012b. Міхаель Мозер. 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. Ed. Andrii Danylenko and Serhii Vakulenko. (Die Welt der Slaven. Sammelbände 42). Munich and Berlin 2012: 154–180.
- Moser 2013. Michael Moser. Language Policy and the Discourse on Languages in Ukraine under President Viktor Yanukovych (25 February 2010–28 October 2012). Stuttgart 2013.
- Moser forthcoming. Міхаель Мозер. Мовні конфлікти в міжвоєнній Підкарпатській

- Русі: «Граматика руського языка» Івана Панькевича в соціолінгвістичному контексті.
- Moser forthcoming a. Michael Moser. The Valuev Circular and the language that "did not, does not and cannot exist." In: a volume devoted to the 150th anniversary of the Valuev Circular, ed. Michael Moser.
- MU. Універсали Івана Мазепи 1687–1709. Ред.: І. Бутич. Київ, Львів 2002.
- MU II. Універсали Івана Мазепи 1687–1709. Т. 2. Ред.: І. Бутич, В. Ринсевич. Київ, Львів 2006.
- Mušinka 2002. Mikuláš Mušinka [Микола Мушинка]. Hlasy predkov–Голоси предків. Prešov 2002.
- Mušinka 2002a. Микола Мушинка. „Іван Панькевич та сучасний стан дослідження його спадщини“. В: Ivan Paňkevyč a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály. Ed. Mikuláš Mušinka. Prague 2002: 10–26.
- "Myslyvec" 2007. „Мисливець“. 02–01–07. Форум „Мовні та міжнаціональні питання“. <http://forum.pravda.com.ua/read.php?4,1825251,page=1>.
- "Myxel'son." Олександр Михельсон. Депутат Колесниченко – нацист. Доказ. 05–10–2011. <http://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/mykhelson/4e8c91a8b70bd/>.
- "MZS RF." МЗС РФ: ніхто не платитиме за російську мову в Україні. 18–10–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1337/18/>.
- "Na Bukovyni." На Буковині дискримінують україномовні школи. 27–01–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1079/18/>.
- "Na 9 knig." На 9 книг на русском языке приходится только одна на украинском. 14–09–2010. <http://www.unian.net/rus/news/news-395854.html>.
- Nakonečnyj 2001. Євген Наконечний. Украдене ім'я. Чому русини стали українцями. Львів 2001.
- "Na Luhanščyni." На Луганщині батьки учнів україномовної школи оголосили голодування. 18–02–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1106/18/>.
- "Nardep." Нардеп: Табачник до сих пор не обеспечил школьников учебниками. 09–09–2011. <http://obozrevatel.com/politics/nardep-tabachnik-do-sih-por-ne-obespechil-shkolnikov-uchebnikami.htm>.
- Naumovuč 1849. Гриць Мазниця або Мужь заманенний. Комедія в трох действиях. І. Х. Покепина Молієра із французского переложена Іваном Наумовичем. Во Львовѣ 1849.
- Naumovuč 1851. Иванъ Наумовичъ. «Псалом веснянный». Зоря Галицка. Ч. 25. дня 17/29 марта 1851: 207–208.
- Naumovuč 1866. [Ivan Naumovuč]. «Отъ Львова (Поглядъ въ будущность)». Слово, 27 липня (8 серпня) 1866: 1–2.
- Naumovuč 1876. Катехись пчоловодства. Составленъ Иваномъ Наумовичемъ, приходникомъ Скалата. Въ Коломыѣ 1876.
- Naumovuč 1876a. Настуня. Ивана Наумовича повѣсть. Коломыя 1876.
- Naumovuč 1881. Научный Мѣсяцесловъ на рокъ 1881, изданный Иваномъ Наумовичемъ приходникомъ въ Скалатѣ. Накладомъ издателя. Львовъ 1881.

- Naumovych 1884. Знѣмченый Юрко. Комедія въ 2 дѣйствіяхъ. Написавъ Иванъ Наумовичъ 2-е изд. Коломыя 1884.
- Naumovych 1886. Поученія о земледѣльствѣ: Изъ письмъ Ивана Наумовича зъ г. 1874 и 1875. ч. 1 (Изданія Общества имени М. Качковского). Февраль 1886, Ч. 123. Во Львовѣ 1886.
- Naumovych 1886a. И. Гр. Наумовичъ. «Осмотръ политичный». Слово. Львовъ. Середа 19. (31.) Октобр. 1866: 1–3.
- Naumovych 1904. Гриць Шпачокъ. Написавъ Иванъ Наумовичъ. Їтбитка зъ книжочки „Луць Заливайко“. Коломыя 1904.
- Naumovych 1906. [I. Naumovych]. Золотая книжочка для сельскихъ господарей. Изъ власной практики уложивъ Иванъ, господарь, щобы всѣ знали, якъ коло землѣ ходитися мае. Перепечатано изъ старої книжки. Вторый накладъ. Коломыя 1906.
- Naumovych 1907. Катехись пчоловодства. Составленъ Иваномъ Наумовичемъ. Коломыя 1907.
- Naxlik 2000. Євген Нахлік. «Княжа Русь у творчості західноукраїнських романтиків». Шашкевичіяна. New Series, vols. 3–4. Lviv and Winnipeg 2000: 42–63.
- Nebeská 1996/1999. Iva Nebeská. Jazyk. Norma. Spisovnost. Prague 1996/1999.
- Nekvapil 2007. Jiří Nekvapil. On the relationship between small and large Slavic languages. Small and Large Slavic Languages in Contact (International Journal of the Sociology of Language 183). Ed. Roland Marti and Jiří Nekvapil. Berlin and New York 2007: 141–160.
- Netreba 2004. Наталія Нетреба. Постать Лаврентія Зизанія крізь призму лінгвогеографії. В: Школи, постаті, проблеми. Ред. П. Гриценко і Н. Хобзей. Львів 2004 (Діалектологічні студії 4), 231–239.
- “nickpro” 2006. 08–12. Трагедия Украины: борьба между двумя украинскими языками [...]. <http://dirty.ru/comments/152766>.
- Nimčuk 1964. Василь Німчук. Лексис Лаврентія Зизанія. Синоніма славеноросская. Київ 1964.
- Nimčuk 1980. Василь Німчук. Лаврентій Зизаній. Граматика словенска. Київ 1980.
- Nimčuk 2005. Василь Німчук. Українські переклади Святого Письма. In: Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache – Українська мова в церквах. Ed. Michael Moser (Slavische Sprachgeschichte, Bd. 1). Vienna 2005: 15–64.
- “Odessa nevozmožna.” Одесса невозможна без русского языка – Костусев. 07–06–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/06/07/100321_Odessa_nevozmozhna_bez_russkogo_ya.html.
- “Odesskie vlasti.” Одесские власти разрешили почти 80 школам вести обучение на украинском и русском языках. 11–07–2011. <http://ukranews.com/ru/news/ukraine/2011/07/11/47955>.
- “Odesskij mitropolit.” Одесский митрополит Агафангел: “Львов – это наша Чечня”. 07–06–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/06/07/100278_Odesskiy_mitropolit_Agafangel_.html.
- Ohijenko 1949/1995. Іван Огієнко (Митрополит Іларіон). Історія української літературної мови. Вінніпег 1949 (repr. Київ 1995).

- Ohloblyn 1960/2001. Олександр Оглоблин. Гетьман Іван Мазепа та його доба. Нью Йорк, Париж, Торонто 1960 (2-е вид. Нью Йорк, Київ, Львів, Париж, Торонто 2001). <http://litopys.org.ua/coss3/ohl06.htm>, http://ukrainaforever.narod.ru/mazepa_ogloblin1.htm.
- Ohloblyn 1962/1996. Олександр Оглоблин. Малоросійська Колегія. В: Енциклопедія українознавства. Словникова частина. Т. 4. Київ 1996 (Оригінал 1962): 1451.
- Ohloblyn 2008. Oleksander Ohloblyn. "Mazepa, Ivan." Encyclopedia of Ukraine: The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine. <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/pages/M/A/MazepaIvan.htm>, updated 2008.
- Ohloblyn – Petrenko 1962/1996. О. Оглоблин – П. Петренко. Куліш Пантелеймон. Енциклопедія українознавства. Словникова частина. Т. 4. Гол. ред.: В. Кубійович. Київ 1996 (first published 1962).
- Ohonovs'kyj 1880. Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache von Dr. Emil Ogonowski. Lemberg 1880.
- "Opinion." European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission). Opinion on the Draft Law on Languages in Ukraine. Adopted by the Venice Commission at its 86th Plenary Session (25–26 March 2011). Opinion no. 605 / 2010 CDL-AD(2011)008. On the basis of comments by Mr Sergio Bartole (Substitute Member, Italy), Mr Jan Velaers (Member, Belgium), Mr Marcus Galdia (DGHL Expert). Strasbourg, 30 March 2011. www.venice.coe.int.
- "Opinion 2." European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission). Opinion on the Draft Law on Languages in Ukraine. Adopted by the Venice Commission at its 89th Plenary Session (Venice, 16–17 December 2011). On the basis of comments by Mr Sergio Bartole (Substitute Member, Italy), Mr Jan Velaers (Member, Belgium). Strasbourg, 19 December 2011. Opinion no. 651/2011. www.venice.coe.int.
- Opys 1961. Опис рукописів Т. Г. Шевченка. Відп. ред.: О. І. Білецький. Київ 1961.
- "Opytvannja." Соціологічні опитування. Яка мова для Вас є рідною? (динаміка, 2006–2008). 19–10–2008. http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/article.php/poll.php?poll_id=290.
- Orlyk 1862. Пилип Орлик. Исторические акты. Письма Орлика къ Стефану Яворскому [1721]. Основа: Южно-русскій литературно-ученый вѣстникъ. № 10, 1862: 1–28.
- Osnova 1861–1862. Основа. Южно-русскій литературно-ученый вѣстникъ. Петербургъ 1861–1862.
- Padiak 2009. Valerii Padiak. The Reduction of the Status of the Rusyn Language to that of a Ukrainian Dialect as Part of the language policy of the USSR on the terrain after the Annexation of Subcarpathian Rus'. In: Best – Stepien 2009: 81–88.
- Padjak 2008. Валерій Падяк. Языкова ситуація на Підкарпатській Русі: проблеми и перспективы. In: Pljiškova 2008: 63–72.
- Panašenko 1993. В. В. Панащенко. Органи управління та їх канцелярії на Гетьманщині XVIII ст. In: DD 1993: 5–22.
- Pan'kevych 1923. Ivan Paňkevič [Pan'kevych]. "Jazyková otázka v Podkarpatské Rusi." In Podkarpatská Rus. Obraz poměru přírodních, hospodářských, politických,

- církevních, jazykových a osvětových. With 53 ills. and 2 maps. Ed. J. Chmelař, S. Klima, and J. Kelas. Prague 1923.
- Pan'kevyč 1938. Іван Панькевич. Українські говори підкарпатської Русі і сумежних областей. App. with 5 dialectological maps. № 13, Звучня і морфологія. Прага.
- Pan'kevyč 2002. Іван Панькевич. „Мій життєпис“. In: Ivan Paňkevyč a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály. Red.: Mikuláš Mušínska. Praha 2002: 81–105.
- Pan'kevyč 2002a. Панькевич, І. Додаток. In: Ivan Paňkevyč a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály. Red.: Mikuláš Mušínska. Praha 2002: 159–65.
- “Partija Rehioniv.” «Партія регіонів» пропонує встановити статус російської мови як регіональної у половині областей України, – законопроект. 29–08–2011. http://news.dt.ua/SOCIETY/partiya_regioniv_proponue_vstanoviti_status_rosiyskoyi_movi_yak_regionalnoyi_u_polovini_oblastey_ukr-86857.html.
- Partyc'kyj 1871. Руска читанка для низшихъ клясъ середнихъ шкѣлъ, Ч. II. У Львовѣ 1871 (Накладомъ товариства „Просвѣта“). Зъ друкарнѣ К. Будвайсера.
- Pašaeва 2001. Нина Пашаева. Очерки истории русского движения в Галичине. Москва 2001. See also: Ukrainskie stranicy. www.ukrstor.com/ukrstor/paszaeva_oczerk.html
- Pašaeва 2013. Нина Пашаева. И. Г. Наумович как общественный, политический и религиозный деятель Галичины второй половины XIX века. http://www.ukrstor.com/ukrstor/paszaewa_naumovicz.html.
- Pauly 2009. Matthew D. Pauly. Tending to the “Native Word”: Teachers and the Soviet Campaign for Ukrainian-Language Schooling, 1923–1930. Nationalities Papers 37/3, 2009: 251–276.
- Peredova 1933. Передова: 16 років пролетарської диктатури. Більшовик України, 1933, 12: 1–12.
- Peredrijenko 1979. В. А. Передірієнко. Формування української літературної мови XVIII ст. на народній основі. Київ 1979.
- “Perohanyč.” Юрій Пероганич. Українська Вікіпедія – на другому місці в світі. 06–01–2012. <http://www.slovoidilo.com/novyny/ukrayinska-vikipediya-na-drugomu-mistsi-v-sviti.html>.
- Peštič 1958. Сергей А. Пештич. «Синопис» как историческое произведение. In: Труды отдела древнерусской литературы, vol. XV, 1958: 284–298.
- Petrovs'kyj 1929. Г. Петровський, Промова на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 р. In: Budivnyctvo 1929: 54–58.
- Plishkova 2009. Anna Plishkova. Language and National Identity: Rusyns South of Carpathians (Series: East European Monographs, vol. 14). New York.
- Pljishkova 2008. Русинський язык меджі двома конгресами. Збірник рефератів з III. Меджінародного конгресу русинського языка, Краків, 13.–16.9.2007. Ред.: Анна Плішкова. Пряшів 2008.
- Plokyh 2006. Serhii Plokyh. The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus. Cambridge 2006.
- Poliščuk 2003. В. Полищук. Канадская диаспора. “Sergey’s” (11-16-03) contribution to the forum <http://forum.mediaport.info/read.php?39,8641,332212> or <http://>

- lifeinua.blogspot.com/2007/04/i-i-i-4.html (only for registered members on 07–11–07, free access before).
- Pop 2005. Ivan Pop. "Pan'kevych, Ivan Artemovych." In: Magocsi – Pop 2005: 370–371.
- Popov 1933. М. М. Попов. Про націоналістичні ухили в лавах української парторганізації і про завдання боротьби з ними. Червоний Шлях 1933, 7: 109–126.
- Postyšev 1933. П. П. Постишев. Радянська Україна – непохитний форпост великого СРСР. 3 промови на об'єднаному листопадовому пленумі ЦК і ЦКК КП(б)У. Червоний Шлях 1933, 8–9: 245–260.
- Postyšev 1933a. П. П. Постишев. Особливості сучасного етапу і завдання боротьби за більшовицьке збирання, обмолот і хлібоздавання (Fn. Перероблені стенограми промов на четвертому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У і об'єднаному пленумі Харківського обкому й облвиконкому.). Більшовик України, Нр. 7–8 (1933): 1–18.
- "Prezentovano." Презентовано практичну інструкцію з реалізації лінгвоциду українофобами. 09–09–2011. <http://slovoidilo.com/novyny/prezentovano-praktychnu-instruktsiyu-z-realizatsiyi-lingvotsydu-ukrayinofobamy.html>.
- "Prezydent." Президент Києво-Могилянки виступив против Дмитрия Табачника. Из-за ксенофобии. 16–03–2010. <http://www.ostro.org/news/article-90411/>.
- "Prezydent rozkrytykuvav." Президент розкритикував Табачника і сказав, що доля його "невідома". 30–06–2011. <http://www.newsru.ua/ukraine/30jun2011/tabaki.html>.
- "Prinjatje novogo." Принятие нового закона о языках усилит языковое разделение в обществе, предупреждают учёные. 14–09–2010. <http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/14sep2010/langsci.html>.
- Procko 1979. Bohdan P. Procko. The Rise of Ukrainian Ethnic Consciousness in America During the 1890's. In: The Ukrainian Experience in the United States. A Symposium. Ed. Paul R. Magocsi. Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. Sources and Documents Series) 1979: 51–67 (+ discussion 68–71).
- Prylypko 1966. Н. П. Прилипко. Норми називного відмінка однини прикметників середнього і жіночого роду в говорах української мови. В: Українська лінгвістична географія. Ред.: Ф. Т. Жилко. Київ 1966: 103–10.
- Pugh 2009. Stefan M. Pugh. The Rusyn Language: A Grammar of the Literary Standard of Slovakia with Reference to Lemko and Subcarpathian Rusyn. Munich 2009.
- Pylypenko 1923. S. Pylypenko. Odvertij lyst [*sic*, in Latin letters]. Червоний Шлях 1923, 6–7: 267–268.
- Pylypovuč 2004. Готель «Під Провидінням» - Репертуар українського театру в Перемишлі 1848–1849 рр. Ред.: В. Пилипович. Перемишль 2004: 119–171.
- Rabus 2008. Achim Rabus. Die Sprache ostslavischer geistlicher Gesänge im kulturellen Kontext (ser.: Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes, tom. LII). Freiburg im Breisgau 2008.
- "Rada maje namir." Рада має намір зняти 50%-у квоту на кількість української музики в теле- і радіоефірі. 01–02–2011. <http://www.ukranews.com/uk/news/>

- ukraine/2011/02/01/36337.
- "Rada skasovuje." Рада скасовує 50%-ву квоту на трансляцію українських виконавців. 02–02–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1089/18/>.
- "Rada znyzyla." Рада знизила квоту українських творів в ефірі до 25%. 03–11–2011. <http://www.ukranews.com/uk//news/ukraine/2011/11/03/56979>.
- Radziejowski 1987. Janusz Radziejowski. The Communist Party of Western Ukraine, 1919–29. Edmonton 1987.
- Rakovs'kyj 1923. Х. Раковський. П'ять років Української Радянської Влади. Промова тов. Х. Г. Раковського на урочистому засіданні Харківської Міськради від 16-го липня ц. р. Червоний Шлях 1923, 4–5: 88–106.
- Rakovs'kyj 1923a. Х. Раковський. Новий етап в радянському союзному будівництві. Червоний Шлях 1923, 1: 69–88.
- Ramač 2008. Юлиан Рамач. Актуальні проблеми войволянського варіанта русинського язика. Проблеми стандардизації. In: Pljiškova 2008: 88–90.
- RB: Розмова – Бесѣда. Das ruthenische und kirchenslavische Berlaumont-Gesprächsbuch des Ivan Uževyč. Mit lat. und poln. Paralleltext hrsg. v. Daniel Bunčić und Helmut Keipert. Munich 2005.
- "Rehionaly." "Регіонали" знову проштовхують в дитсадки російську мову. 21–01–2012. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2012/01/21/6924222/>.
- Repertuar 1995. Репертуар української книги 1798–1916. Матеріали до бібліографії, т. 1: 1798–1870. Ред.: А. І. Крушельницька. Львів 1995.
- Revyuk 1931: Emil Revyuk. Polish Atrocities in Ukraine. New York City. Available online: <http://archive.org/details/polishatrocities00revy>.
- Richardt 1957. Rosemarie Richardt. Polnische Lehnwörter im Ukrainischen. Wiesbaden 1957.
- Ričyc'kyj 1929. А. Річицький. Стан УСРР в Радянському Союзі (Уривок з статті А. Річицького в „Більшовику України“ ч. 2 та 3 1928 р. „До проблеми ліквідації колоніальності та націоналізму“). Budivnytstvo 1929: 171–188.
- Rogov 1966. Александр И. Рогов. Русско-польские культурные связи в эпоху Возрождения (Стрыйковский и его Хроника). Москва 1966.
- Romaniv 1997. О. Романів. Олександр Барвінський і наукове товариство ім. Шевченка. In: Олександр Барвінський 1847–1927. Матеріали конференції, присвяченої 150 річниці від дня народження Олександра Барвінського. Львів, 14 травня 1997 р. Львів 1997: 91–100.
- Rossolinski-Liebe 2010. Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe. Review of Höhne, Steffen; Ulbricht, Justus H. (Hrsg.): Wo liegt die Ukraine? Standortbestimmung einer europäischen Kultur. Köln 2009. In: H-Soz-u-Kult, 21–06–2010. <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2010-2-218>.
- Rothe 1976/1977. Hans Rothe. Die älteste ostslawische Kunstdichtung (1575 bis 1647). 2 vols. Cologne and Vienna 1976/1977.
- Rothe 1983. Hans Rothe. Einleitung. In: Synopsis, 1–140.
- Rusalka 1837. Rusalka Dniestrovaia. Ruthenische VolksLieder. Buda 1837.
- Rusalka 1837/1972. Русалка Дністрова. Фотокопія з видання 1837 р. Вступна стаття: О. І. Білецький. Київ 1972.

- Rusanivs'kyj 2001. Віталій Русанівський. Історія української літературної мови. Київ 2001.
- "Russian Patriarch blesses." Russian patriarch blesses Ukraine's new president, calls for Slavic unity. 25-02-2010. <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100225/158006482.html>.
- "Rusyn" 2007. Второе нашествие яничар. Форум „Я – Anti-Orange”. www.anti-orange-ua.com.ru/index.php/content/view/1421/44/.
- S: Свобода. [Various subtitles, places of publications etc. (see par. 2). 1893 ff.]. All older issues available online: <http://www.svoboda-news.com/arxiv.htm>.
- "Senk" 2006. 10–14. Український Форум/Українська мова. Галицька мова. http://www.ukrcenter.com/forum/message.asp?message_id=76184&forum_name=%D3%EA%F0%E0%BF%ED%F1%FC%EA%E0%20%CC%EE%E2%E0&page=1.
- "Serdjuk." Марія Сердюк. Працівника ДАІ м. Одеси звільнили незаконно – В. Колесніченко. Українські Національні Новини. Обізнаність громадян єднає країну. 28–01–2011. <http://www.unn.com.ua/ua/exclusive/28-01-2011/223001/>.
- Sereda 1999. Остап Середа, Національна свідомість і політична програма ранніх народовців у східній Галичині (1861–1867). Вісник Львівського університету. Вип. 34, 1999: 199–214.
- Sereda 2001. Ostap Sereda, "Whom Shall We Be?" Public Debates over the National Identity of Galician Ruthenians in the 1860s. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 49, 2001: 200–212.
- Sereda 2003. Ostap Sereda, "[The] Shaping of a National Identity: Early Ukrainophiles in Austrian Eastern Galicia, 1860–1873." Unpublished PhD dissertation. Budapest 2003.
- Sereda 2006. Ostap Sereda. From Church-Based to Cultural Nationalism: Early Ukrainophiles, Ritual-Purification Movement and Emerging Cult of Taras Shevchenko in Austrian Eastern Galicia in the 1860s. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 40/1, 2006: 21–47.
- Shkandrij 1992. Myroslav Shkandrij. Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s. Edmonton 1992.
- Sirka 1980. Ann Sirka. The Nationality Question in Austrian Education: The Case of Ukrainians in Galicia 1867–1914. Frankfurt am Main 1980 (*Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3, Bd. 124*).
- SJP. Słownik języka polskiego. T. 1–11. Red.: W. Doroszewski. Przedruk elektroniczny (Polskie wydawnictwo naukowe). Warsaw 1997.
- Skrypnyk 1923. М. Скрипник, Начерк історії [sic] пролетарської революції на Україні. Червоний Шлях 1923, 1: 89–112.
- Skrypnyk 1929. М. Скрипник. Промова на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 р. In: *Budivnyctvo*: 31–34.
- Skrypnyk 1929a. М. Скрипник. Про причини й джерела розламу в КПЗУ. (Доповідь т. Скрипника на пленумі ЦК і ЦКК КП(б)У 13-III-1928). In: *Budivnyctvo* 1929: 239–251.
- Skrypnyk 1929b. М. Скрипник. З приводу економічної платформи націоналізму.

- [Промова на дискусії в Інституті марксизму з приводу статті М. Волобуєва, вміщеної в Нр. 2,3 журн. «Більшовик України».] *Budivnytstvo* 1929: 188–193.
- Skrypnyk 1930: М. Скрипник. Спілка Визволення України. Передрук з „Ком. Інтернаціоналу“, Нр. 11 від 20-го квітня 1930 р. N.p.
- Skrypnyk 1930a. М. Скрипник. Спілка Визволення України. Більшовик України. Нр. 8, 30 квітня 1930: 11–24.
- Skrypnyk 1930b. Н. Скрипник. Союз Освобождения Украины. Коммунистический Интернационал, Нр. 11 (241), 20 апреля 1930 г.
- Skrypnyk 1931. М. Скрипник. Зближення й злиття націй за доби соціалізму. (Всеукраїнська Академія Наук. Соціально-економічний відділ. Труди комісії для вивчення національного питання). Харків 1931.
- Skvorcov 2007. Дмитрий Скворцов. Українці – найписемніша нація світу. Единое отечество. www.otechestvo.org.ua/main/20072/2121.htm or Православное информационное агентство Русская линия. www.rusk.ru/st.php?idar=111270.
- Slovar' 11–17. Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв. Москва 1975ff.
- Slovyk 1964. Словник мови Шевченка. Відп. ред.: В. С. Ващенко. 2 vol. Київ 1964.
- Słownik XVI. Słownik Polszczyzny XVI w. Ed. F. Peptowski. Vol. XXIII, P–PHY. Ed. K. Wilczewska. Warsaw 1995.
- Smal'-Stoc'kyj – Gartner 1913: Stephan v. Smal-Stockyj [sic] – Theodor Gartner. Grammatik der ruthenischen (ukrainischen) Sprache. Vienna 1913.
- Smolin 2007. Михаил Смолин. Украинафильство в России. Идеология раскола. Москва: Пути русского имперского сознания. См.: Смолин, Михаил: Украинафильство в России. Идеология Раскола. Единая Русь: Публицистика. http://ukrstor.com/ukrstor/smolín_ukrainofilstvo.htm.
- Snihurs'kyj 1844. Іоанн Снѣгурскі [sic], Бжїєю милостію Єпископъ Перемышльскій, Самбѣрскій, и Саноцкій [...] [brochure without title page]. ВЪ Перемышля 1844.
- Sokolov 2005. Леонид Соколов. Русский язык для Украины – не иностранный. В: Единая Русь. www.edrus.org/content/view/186/63/.
- Sokolov 2007. Леонид Соколов. Русская либеральная интеллигенция и политическое украинофильство. Единая Русь. Публицистика. http://ukrstor.com/ukrstor/sokolov_lib-int.html.
- Solchanyk 1985. Roman Solchanyk. Language Politics in the Ukraine: Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages. Ed. Isabelle Kreindler. Berlin etc. 1985: 57–105.
- SP 1997. Słownik języka polskiego. 11 vols. Ed. Witold Doroszewski. Electronic reprint. Warsaw 1997.
- Srez. Измаиль Срезневскій. Матеріали для Словаря древнерусскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ. ВЪ 3-х тт. Москва 1895–1903 (repr. Moscow 1958).
- SRJa XI–XVII. Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв. Москва 1975ff.
- SRJa XVIII. Словарь русского языка XVIII века. Ленинград (> Санкт-Петербург) 1984ff.

- SRNG. Словарь русских народных говоров. Москва – Ленинград (Санкт-Петербург) 1965ff.
- "SŠA." США хочуть, щоб Україна скочувалася до "дебілізму екваторіальних країн", вважає Табачник. 31–05–2011. <http://newsru.ua/ukraine/31may2011/tabtefft.html>.
- Stalin 1936. И. Сталин. Статьи и речи об Украине. Киев 1936.
- "Stanovyšče." Становище української мови в Україні в 2011 році. Аналітичний огляд. 09–11–2011. Рух добровольців «Простір свободи». www.dobrovol.org. Сприяння: Інтернет-видання «Тексти». www.texty.org.ua.
- Steblij 1992. F[eodosij] Steblij. Die slawische Idee bei den Ukrainern in Galizien vor, während und nach der Revolution 1848. In: Die slavische Idee: Beiträge am Matija Majar-Ziljski-Symposium vom 6. bis 10. Juli 1992 in Tratten/Pošišče, Kärnten. Ed. Andreas Moritsch. Bratislava 1992: 91–108.
- Steblij 2004. Феодосій Стеблій. "Русини" – забутий автограф Маркіяна Шашкевича. В: Шашкевичіана. New Series, vols. 5–6. Lviv and Winnipeg 2004: 558–571.
- Stenografičeskij 1882. Стенографический отчетъ изъ судебной росправы по дѣлу Ольги Грабаръ и товаришей, обжалованныхъ о преступленіе головной зрады изъ §. 58 бук. в. карн. зак. Управитель: С. Гучковский. Львовъ 1882.
- Stepnjak 1933. М. Степняк – Поети „Молодої музи“. Стаття. Червоний Шлях 1933, 1: 147–196.
- Stökl 1983. Günther Stökl. Russische Geschichte. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 4., erweiterte Auflage. Stuttgart 1983.
- Stryj. Maciej Strykowski. Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka y wszyskiej Rusi Kijowskiej, Moskiewskiej, Siewierskiej.... Königsberg 1582.
- "Students'ki akciji." Студентські акції проплачуються західними фондами, впевнений Табачник. 25–04–2011. <http://newsru.ua/ukraine/25may2011/sbnhyue.html>
- Studyns'kyj 1895. Студинський, Кирило. Адельфотесь – граматика видана у Львові в р. 1591. Записки Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка VII, 1895/III: 1–42.
- Studyns'kyj 1905. Кореспонденція Якова Головацького в літах 1850–62. Ред.: Кирило Студинський. Львів 1905 (Збірник фільологічної секції Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка VIII + IX).
- Studyns'kyj 1907. К. Студинський. Польські конспірації серед руських питомців і духовенства в Галичині в роках 1831-1846, № 1. Записки Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка 80, 1907: 129–133.
- Stukenbrock 2007. Anja Stukenbrock. Sprachnation / Sprachnationalismus als Gegenstand linguistischer Diskursanalyse. In: Diskurslinguistik nach Foucault. Theorie und Gegenstände. Ed. Ingo H. Warnke. Berlin 2007: 213–246.
- Subtelny 1975. On the Eve of Poltava: The Letters of Mazepa to Adam Sieniawski, 1704–1708. Ed. O. Subtelny. New York 1975.
- SUM. Словник української мови. 11 тт. Ред.: Іван Білодід. Київ 1970–1980.
- SUM XIV–XV. Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст. 2 тт. Ред.: Лідія Гумецька. Київ 1977.
- SUM XVI–XVII. Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – першої половини XVII ст. Відп. ред.: Д. Г. Гринчишин. Львів 1994ff.

- "Suvorov." A[?]. IO[?]. Суворов. Русский язык в Украине – дежа-вю?, Партия регионов. www.partyofregions.org.ua/contrprop/resonance/440c15efd97ae/.
- Svjencic'kyj 1866. [Pavlyn] Svientsits'kyi. "Rękopisy pozostałe po ś. p. I. Wagilewiczu." In: Siolo. Pismo zbiorowe, poświęcone rzeczom ludowym ukraińsko-ruskim. Zeszyt III. Lwów 1866: 159–68.
- "Svoboda." "Свобода" вимагає покарати Табачника за відправку українських студентів до прокремлівського табору. 09–08–2010. <http://www.newsru.ua/ukraine/09aug2010/seliger.html>.
- Synopsis. Sinopsis, Kiev 1681. Facsimile mit einer Einleitung von Hans Rothe. Cologne and Vienna 1983 (Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven, Bd. 17).
- Sysyn 2003. Frank Sysyn. The Image of Russia and Russian-Ukrainian Relations in Ukrainian Historiography of the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries. In: Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945). Ed. Andreas Kappeler, Zenon Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen. Edmonton: 108–143.
- Šafařík 1842. P[avel J][osef] Šafařík. Slovanský národopis. Prague 1842.
- Šapoval–Prystajko–Zolotar'ov 1997. Юрій Шаповал – Володимир Пристайко – Вадим Золотарьов. ЧК-ГПУ-НКВД в Україні: особи, факти, документи. Київ 1997.
- Šaškevyčijana 1996. Пашкевичіяна. Нова серія. Т. 1: Маркіян Пашкевич і національне відродження; т. 2: „Руська трійця“, її оточення, послідовники і дослідники. Львів, Броди, Вінніпег 1996ff.
- Šesták 1992. Miroslav Šesták. Die Slawische Idee bei den Tschechen bis zum österreichischen Ausgleich. In: Die slawische Idee: Beiträge am Matija Majar-Ziljski-Symposium vom 6. bis 10. Juli 1992 in Tratten/Pošišče, Kärnten. Ed. Andreas Moritsch. Bratislava 1992: 37–48.
- Ševčenko 1964. Тарас Шевченко. Повне зібрання творів у шести томах. Гол. ред.: М. К. Гудзий. Т. 6: Листи. Нотатки. Фольклорні записи. Київ 1964.
- Ševčenko 2003. Тарас Шевченко. Повне зібрання творів у дванадцяти томах. Т. 6: Листи. Дарчі та власницькі написи. Документи, складені Т. Шевченком або за його участю. Київ 2003.
- Ševel'ov 1963. G. Y. Shevelov, History of the Ukrainian Language. The Modern Period (Nineteenth-Twentieth Centuries). In: Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia. Prepared by Shevchenko Scientific Society, Ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč, 2 vols., vol. 1, Toronto 1963: 501–511.
- Ševel'ov 1966. G. Y. Shevelov. Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798–1965. Ihre Entwicklung unter dem Einfluß der Dialekte. Wiesbaden 1966.
- Ševel'ov 1979. George Y. Shevelov. A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language. Heidelberg.
- Ševel'ov 1989. George Y. Shevelov. The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900–1941): Its State and Status. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Monograph Series. Cambridge, Mass. 1989.
- Ševel'ov 1983/1991. Юрій Шерех [= Шевельов]. Кулішеві листи і Куліш у листах. In: idem, Третя сторожа: Література. Мистецтво. Ідеології. Балтимор – Торонто 1991: 32–75 (first published 1983 and also as foreword to Kuliš 1984).

- Ševel'ov 1991. Юрій Шерех [=Шевельов]. Навколо Шевченка. In: idem. Третя сторожа. Балтимор – Торонто 1991: 17–143.
- Ševel'ov 1998. Юрій Шевельов. Українська мова в першій половині двадцятого століття (1900–1941): Стан і статус. Чернівці 1998 (translation of Ševel'ov 1989).
- Ševel'ov 1998a. Юрій Шевельов. Русь. В: Енциклопедія українознавства т. 7, Перевидання в Україні. Львів 1998 (first published 1973): 2652.
- Ševel'ov 2002. Юрій Шевельов. Історична фонологія української мови. Харків 2002 (Translation of Ševel'ov 1979).
- Ševel'ov 2003. Юрій Шевельов. Внесок Галичини у формування української літературної мови. Київ 2003 (translation of Ševel'ov 1966).
- Šlixter 1933. О. Шліхтер. Посилимо більшовицьку пильність на фронті боротьби за здійснення ленінської національної політики на Україні. Більшовик України 1933, 9–10, Липень–серпень: 58–79.
- Štec' 1996. Микола Штець. Українська мова в Словаччині (Соціолінгвістичне та інтерлінгвістичне дослідження). Prešov 1996.
- Štec' 2002. Штець, М. Іван Панькевич і питання літературної мови Закарпаття та східної Словаччини. In: Ivan Paňkevyc a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály. Red.: Mikuláš Mušinka. Praha 2002: 36–44.
- “Štohrin.” Ірина Штогрін. Другу офіційну/державну «проштотуватимуть» знизу. 22–03–2011. <http://slovovidilo.com/polityka/drugu-ofitsijnu-derzhavnu-proshtovchuvatymut-znyzu.html>.
- “Šturman” 2005. 10–03. Секрет самобытности галичан. Форум «Я – Anti-Orange». http://www.anti-orange-ua.com.ru/forum/viewtopic.php?printertopic=1&t=44&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=0&finish_rel=-10000.
- Šums'kyj 1923. О. Шумський. Стара й нова Україна. Червоний Шлях 1923, 2: 91–110.
- Šums'kyj 1924. О. Шумський. Політична ситуація в Східній Галичині. Червоний Шлях 1924, 1–2: 83–91.
- Šums'kyj 1929. О. Шумський. Промова на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У. Budivnyctvo 1929: 25–31.
- Šums'kyj 1929a. О. Шумський. Промова на засіданні Політбюра 20-XI-26 р. Budivnyctvo 1929: 104–109.
- Šums'kyj 1929b. О. Шумський. Лист до Політбюра ЦК КП(б)У. Signed: 3 лютого 1927 року. Budivnyctvo 1929: 134–135.
- Švorc 2003. Peter Švorc. Krajinská hranica: Medzi Slovenskom a Podkarpatskou Rusou (1919–1939). Prešov 2003.
- “Ta.” Атанайя Та. Концепція мовної освіти в Україні: з великої хмари та малий дощ? 26–04–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1175/5/>.
- “Tabačnik – na vuxod.” Табачник - на выход, правительству - приготовиться? 02–09–2011. <http://podrobnosti.ua/analytics/2011/09/02/789192.html>.
- “Tabačnik oговорilsja.” Табачник оговорился, перепутав Украину с Россией. 30–08–2011. <http://ru.tsn.ua/ukrayina/tabachnik-ogovorilsya-pereputav-ukrainu-s->

rossiey.html.

"Tabačnik otvetil." Табачник ответил на обвинения в шовинизме. 04-03-2011.

<http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/1192982-tabachnik-otvetil-na-obviniya-v-shovinizme>.

"Tabačnik vystupaet." Табачник выступает за отмену дубляжа фильмов на украинский язык. 06-04-2010. <http://news.bigmir.net/print/ukraine/263718/>.

"Tabačnik хоčet." Табачник хочет, чтоб в школах преподавали на русском. 13-12-2010. <http://politics.comments.ua/2010/12/13/216293/tabachnik-hochet-chtob-shkolah.html>.

"Tabačnyk kaže." Табачник каже, що українських шкіл не закривають - лише російські. 23-03-2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1141/18/>.

"Tabačnyk nadrukuvav." Табачник надрукував українським школам російські букварі. 18-05-2011. <http://tyzhden.ua/News/22799>.

"Tabačnyk ne zadovolenyj." Табачник не задоволений якістю української мови у ЗМІ. 06-04-2011. http://zaxid.net/home/showSingleNews.do?tabachnik_ne_zadovolenyi_yakisty_u_ukrayinskoyi_movi_u_zmi&objectId=1126473.

"Tabačnyk radyt'." Табачник радить батькам "енергійніше" боротися за "язык". А Київ вважає російськомовним. 14-03-2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1130/18/>.

"Tabačnyk: školy." Табачник: школи закриваються, оскільки в країні не вистачає дітей. 04-03-2011. <http://ukranews.com/uk/news/ukraine/2011/03/04/38683>.

"Tabačnyk vykyne." Табачник викине зі шкільного курсу предмет "історія України"? 18-02-2012. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2012/02/18/6959003/>.

"Tabačnyk xytro." Табачник хитро просуває російську мову у школи. 13-12-2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1030/18/>.

"Tabačnyk zajavu." Табачник заявив, що закрив всього 114 шкіл, вузи самі йдуть на ліквідацію. Проте поспілкуватися з опонентами відмовився. 02-07-2011. <http://www.newsru.ua/ukraine/02jul2011/tabachnik.html>.

"Tabačnyk zaminyt'." Табачник замінить мовний конкурс Петра Яцика. 16-05-2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1185/18/>.

"Tabačnyk zapevnjaє." Табачник запевняє, що відставки не боїться: місце на Байковому кладовищі він вже має. 18-05-2011. http://newsru.ua/ukraine/18may2011/tab_baj.html.

Tairova-Jakovleva 2007. Татьяна Таирова-Яковлева. Мазепа. Москва 2007.

"Tanja" 2006. 11-20. Форум „Галицкий империализм”. <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.

Taranenko 2004. О. О. Тараненко. Суржик. В: Українська мова. Енциклопедія. Київ 2004: 665-668.

Tichý 1938. František Tichý. Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka na Podkarpatské Rusi. V Praze 1938.

Ткач 2007. Людмила Ткач. Українська літературна мова на Буковині в кінці XIX – на початку XX століття. Джерела і соціокультурні чинники розвитку. Чернівці 2007.

Толочко 1998. Петро Толочко. Що або хто загрожує українській мові? Київ

1998. Украинские страницы. http://ukrstor.com/ukrstor/toloczek_htoaboscozagrozhujeukrmovi.html.
- "Tret' ukraincev." Треть украинцев хотят сделать русский вторым государственным, а половине - не хватает денег на одежду. 26-10-2010. <http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/26oct2010/languages.html>.
- Troxanovs'kyj 1935. Мелетій Трохановський [anon.]. Буквар: Перша книжечка для народних шкіл. Львов 1935.
- Trunte 1985. Cyrillus Tranquillus Stavroveckij: Perlo mnohocennoje. Ed. and comm. Hartmut Trunte. Vol. I : Edition. Vol. II: Text. Cologne and Vienna 1985.
- Тум. Євген Тимченко. Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV-XVIII ст.: У 2 кн. Київ, Нью-Йорк 2002.
- Тумофійів 1923. Проф. В. Тимофіїв. Сучасні завдання хемії. Червоний Шлях 1923, 2, н.р. [Table of Contents.]
- Тумошенко 1959-1961. Хрестоматія матеріалів з історії української літературної мови. Чч. 1-2. Упорядкував П. Д. Тимошенко. Київ 1959-1961.
- Тумошенко 1964: П. Д. Тимошенко. Із спостережень над лексикою листування Т. Г. Шевченка українською мовою. In: Джерела мовної майстерності Т. Г. Шевченка. Збірник статей. Відп. ред.: І. Білодід. Київ 1964: 30-48.
- "U Donec'ku." У Донецьку суд не дозволив міській раді закрити українську школу. 31-01-2012. [http://slovoua.com/news/u-doniets%27ku-sud-nie-dozvoliv-mis%27kii-radi-zakriti-ukrayins%27ku-shkolu?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+Slovoua+\(СловоUA%3A+мовні+новини\)](http://slovoua.com/news/u-doniets%27ku-sud-nie-dozvoliv-mis%27kii-radi-zakriti-ukrayins%27ku-shkolu?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+Slovoua+(СловоUA%3A+мовні+новини)).
- "U Kyjevi." У Києві заперечили Табачнику - столиця не російськомовне місто. 01-04-2011. http://gazeta.ua/articles/life/_u-kievi-zaperechili-tabachniku-stolicya-ne-rosijskomovne-misto/377376.
- "U novomu." У новому підручнику Бандера буде вбивцею, а Сталін – переможцем. 04-06-2010. <http://tsn.ua/ukrayina/u-novomu-pidruchniku-istoriyi-bandera-bude-vbivceyu-a-stalin-peremozhchem.html>.
- Udvari 2000. Іштван Удварі [István Udvari]. Образчики. З історії пудкарпатських русинув. XVIII. століття. Изгядованія з історії культури и языка. Ужгород 2000.
- Udvari 2007. Іштван Удварі [István Udvari]. Гадор Стрипський, народописник, бібліограф, языкознатель, товмач (Ser.: Studia Ukrainica et Rusinica Nyíregyháziensia, vol 21). Nyíregyháza 2007.
- "Ukraina Kolesnichenko." Украина. Колесниченко заявил, что Майдана-2 не будет. 22-11-2010. <http://www.newsland.ru/news/detail/id/589883/cat/94/>.
- "Ukrainians fight." Ukrainians Fight to Rename Towns. 28-03-2011. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=htlfd-x8w4k>.
- "Ukrainskii patriot" 2005. 08-04. <http://www.patent.net.ua/intellectus/forum/1/193/ua.html>.
- "Ukrainskij jazyk." Украинский язык - объединительная сила общества, считает Янукович. 09-11-2010. <http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/09nov2010/mova.html>.

- "Ukrajina vytratyt'." Україна витратить 1,6 млн гривень на регіональні мови. 18–06–10. http://zaxid.net/home/showSingleNews.do?ukrayina_vitratit_16 mln_griven_na_regionalni_movi&objectId=1104882.
- "Ukrajinci Sevastopolja." Українці Севастополя волають про допомогу. 30–03–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1151/5/>.
- Ukrajinizacija 2003. "Українізація" 1920–30-х років: передумови, здобутки, уроки. Відп. ред.: Валерій Смолий. Київ 2003.
- Ukrajins'ka mova 2005. Українська мова у XX сторіччі: історія лінгвоциду. Документи і матеріали. Упорядники: Л. Масенко, В. Кубайчук, О. Демська-Кульчицька. Київ 2005.
- Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk 1953–1963. Українсько-російський словник. Гол. ред.: І. М. Кириченко. Тт. 1–6. Київ 1953–1963.
- Ul'janov 1966/1996/2003. Николай Ульянов. Происхождение украинского сепаратизма. Мадрид 1966. Reprint: Москва 1996. Internet: last modified in 2003 www.lib.ru/POLITOLOG/ulianow_ukraina.txt.
- Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej. Instytut Neofilologii. 18–06–2011. <http://www.ap.krakow.pl/regulamin/>.
- URS 1953–1963. Українсько-російський словник, т. I–VI. Гол. ред.: І. М. Кириченко. Київ 1953–1963.
- Uspenskij 2002. Борис А. Успенский. История русского языка (XI–XVII вв.). Издание 3-е, исправленное и дополненное. Москва.
- "U Venkomissii." У Венецианской комиссии двойные стандарты, потому что «мы рылом не вышли». Колесниченко. 14-04-2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/04/14/92634_U_Venetsianskoy_komissii_dvoynie_.html.
- Vadžra 2007a. Ukraina [in Latin letters]: от мифа к катастрофе. [An interview with Andrej Vadžra]. Полярная звезда. http://zvezda.ru/politics/2007/05/19/ukraina_2.htm.
- "Vadžra." Андрей Ваджра. Эксперты США утверждают, что для 83 % украинцев родной язык – русский. (dating from 15–09–2008). 22–12–2011. <http://r-u.org.ua/analit/russ/6445-news.html>.
- Vadžra 2007. Андрей Ваджра. Ukraina [in Latin letters]. Миф „Украинского языка.“ Лебедь № 528, 2007. www.lebed.com/2007/art5026.htm.
- Vahylevyč 1845. Grammatyka Języka małoruskiego w Galicii, ułożona przez Jana Wagilewicza – Грамматика Азыка малорусского въ Галиції, сочиненная Иваном Вагилевичемъ. Lwów 1845.
- Vakulenko 2007. Serhii Vakulenko. The European Dimension Within the Current Controversy over the Ukrainian Language Standard. In: Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe. Ed. Larissa Onyshkevych and Maria Rewakowicz. Armonk/New York – London, England 2009: 297–315.
- Vakulenko 2009/2012: С. В. Вакуленко, 1933-й рік в історії української мови: чинна норма та правописна практика (на прикладі редакційної політики газети „Комуніст“). In: Філологічні студії: Збірник наукових праць. За заг. ред. Л. А. Лисиченко. Харків 2009, 27–41. A slightly revised version was published online on 3 December 2012:

- <http://historians.in.ua/index.php/ukrayinska-mova/488-cerhiy-vakulenko-1933-ii-rik-v-istorii-ukrainskoi-movy-chynna-norma-ta-pravopysna-praktyka-na-pryklyadi-redaktsiinoi-polityky-hazety-komunist>.
- Van'ko 2007. Юрій Ванько. Класифікація [sic] і головні знаки Карпатських Русинських діалектів. В: Русинський язык. Ed. Paul Robert Magocsi. Opole 2004 (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich) [here 2d ed. 2007]: 67–84.
- Van'ko 2008. Юрій Ванько. Формованя койне з літературних штандартів. In: Pljiškova 2008: 15–24.
- Vasmer 1986–1987. Макс Фасмер [Max Vasmer]. Этимологический словарь русского языка. В 4 тт. Перевод с нем. и доп. О. Н. Трубачева. Изд. 2-е. Москва 1986–1987 [first ed. of the German original: Heidelberg 1950–1958].
- “Venkomissija.” Венецианская комиссия пытается дестабилизировать ситуацию в Украине, – Колесниченко. 25–03–2011. http://lb.ua/news/2011/03/25/89702_Venetsianskaya_komissiya_deystvuet_.html.
- “Verxrada.” Верховна Рада України відмовила Д.Табачнику у введенні російської мови у дитсадках. 21–12–2011. <http://slovoua.com/news/vierkhovna-rada-ukrayini-vidmovila-d-dot-tabachniku-u-vviedienni-rosiis%27koyi-movi-u-ditsadkakh>.
- “Viktorovyč.” Яна Вікторович. Тому що “професор”. 21–09–2004. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2004/09/21/3002574/>.
- Vinok 1846. Вѣнок Русинам на обжинки. Уплѣв Иван Б. Ѳ. Головацкій. Ч. первая. У Вѣдни 1846.
- Vinok 1847. Вѣнокъ Русинамъ на обжинки. Уплѣвъ Иван Б. Ѳ. Головацкій. Ч. вторая. У Вѣдни 1847.
- Vistnyk 1850. Вѣстникъ. Повременное письмо посвященно политическому и нравственному образованію Русиновъ Австрійскои державы. Рочникъ I.
- Vistnyk 1866. Вѣстникъ. Часопись урядова. Рочникъ XVIII.
- “Viter” 2006. 11–20. Форум «Галицкий империализм». <http://www.fraza.com.ua/zametki/20.11.06/30832.html>.
- “Vlada.” Влада Донецька оскаржила існування української школи. 21–02–2012. <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2012/02/21/6959118/>.
- “Vladimir” 2007. 06–27. Posted on: Viktor Yanukovich. Personal Information Server, <http://www.ya2006.com.ua/eng/forum/4682278f19404/> (deleted between 07–02–07 and 07–11–07).
- “V Odesi.” В Одесі прийняли програму розвитку російської мови. 08–04–2011. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1164/18/>.
- “V Odessa.” В Одессе отказались от украинского языка. 10–12–2010. <http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/10dec2010/otmenaq.html>.
- “Voin” 2007. 06–23. vlasti.net. Сеть независимых журналистов. <http://www.vlasti.net/index.php?Screen=news&id=214765>.
- Voznjak 1911. Михайло Возняк. Галицькі граматики української мови першої половини ХІХ ст. (Студії і матеріали до історії української філології I). Львів 1911.
- Voznjak 1911a. Михайло Возняк. Граматика Лаврентія Зизанія з 1596 р. Записки Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка ХХ, 1911, т. I: 5–38, т. II: 11–87.

- Voznjak 1912. Михайло Возняк. З-за редакційних куліс Вістника та Зорі Галицької. Записки Наукового товариства імени Шевченка CVII, 1912: 73–109.
- Voznjak 1936. Михайло Возняк. У століття «Зорі» Маркіяна Шашкевича (1834–1934): Нові розшуки про діяльність гуртка. Львів 1936.
- “Vpixatines” 2004. 20–04. Язык – вопрос государственной важности. Твоя мова. помещено от Впихатинец (20 апреля 2004 г.). <http://www.mova.org.ua/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=152>.
- “VRU.” ВРУ відмовилася підтримувати українську мову. 21–05–2010. http://zaxid.net/home/showSingleNews.do?vru_vidmovilasya_pidtrimuvati_ukrayinsku_movu&objectId=1103018.
- “Vslid.” Вслід за НПУ ім. Драгоманова “Рускій Мір” привезли Харківському державному університету будівництва. 06–12–2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/1022/18/>.
- Vynnyčenko 1933. Ст. Винниченко. Нові береги. Червоний Шлях 1933, 2: 176–186.
- Wendland 2001. A. V. Wendland. Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915 (Studien zur Geschichte der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie XXVII). Vienna 2001.
- Witkowski 2006. Wiesław Witkowski. Nowy słownik zapożyczeń polskich w języku rosyjskim. Cracow 2006.
- Worth 1974. Dean S. Worth. Slavonisms in the *Uloženie* of 1649. Russian Linguistics 1974/1: 225–249.
- Wytrzens 1988. G. Wytrzens. Der Wiener ruthenische Schriftsteller Nikolaj Nagy und seine Dichtungen. Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 34, 1988: 151–157.
- “Xarkov” 2007. 06–23. <http://www.vlasti.net/index.php?Screen=news&id=214765>.
- XU. Універсали Богдана Хмельницького. Ред.: В. Смолій та ін. Київ 1998.
- Xudaš 1992. Михайло Л. Худаш. Алфавітно-правописні принципи Й. Лозинського. Й. І. Лозинський, Українське весілля. Ул. і ред.: Р. Ф. Кирчів, С. А. Онисенко. Київ 1992: 26–44.
- Xvylja 1929. Промова тов. Хвиля на березневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1927 року. In: Budivnyctvo 1929: 125–129.
- Xvylja 1929a. М. Хвиля. Що таке теорія боротьби двох культур? In: Budivnyctvo 1929: 161–163.
- Xvylja 1930. Пролетаріят і практичне розгортання культурно-національного будівництва. Більшовик України 1930, 13–14: 38–55.
- Xvylja 1933. А. Хвиля. Викорінити, знищити націоналістичне коріння на мовному фронті. Більшовик України. Нр. 7–8 (1933): 42–56.
- Xvyl'ovuj n.y. М. Х. В якому відношенні до „хвильовізму” всі ті”. In: Budivnyctvo 1929: 259–267.
- Zajec' 1933. В. Заєць. Документ доби. Про Головків роман „Мати”. Червоний Шлях 1933, 3: 136–152.
- Zales'kyj 1969. А. М. Залеський. Частка ся у південно-західних говорах української мови. В: Українська діалектна морфологія. Ред. Ф. Т. Жилко. Київ 1969: 94–109.

- Zaliznjak 2004. Андрей А. Зализняк. Древненовгородский диалект. Второе издание, переработанное с учетом материала находок 1995-2003 гг. Москва 2004.
- "Za nakazom." За наказом Табачника ліквідовано сектор сприяння освіті рідною мовою. 05-08-2010. <http://www.newsru.ua/ukraine/05aug2010/tabak.html>.
- Zatons'kyj 1927. В. Затонський. Національна проблема на Україні. Харків 1927.
- Zatons'kyj 1929. В. Затонський, Про підсумки українізації. З доповіді на червневому пленумі ЦК КП(б)У 1926 року. In: *Budivnytstvo* 1929: 7-24.
- Zavadka 2000. Б. Завадка. Юліан Вислобоцький – послідовник Маркіяна Шашкевича. В: Шашкевичіяна. Нова серія, вип. 3-4: 214-221.
- Zorja Halyc'ka 1848. Зоря Галицка. Письмо часове, виходить що тыждень разъ во второкъ. Ч. 1, 15 Маа 1848, Въ Львовѣ.
- Žáček 1958. Slovanský sjezd v Praze roku 1848: sbírka dokumentů. Ed. Václav Žáček. Prague 1958.
- Žeguc 1965. Ivan Žeguc. Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen der Karpato-Ruthenen 1848-1914 (Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München 28). Wiesbaden 1965.
- Želexivs'kyj 1886. Малоруско-німецький словар. Т. 1. Ул.: Є. Желеховский. Т. 2. Ул.: Є. Желеховский, С. Недільский. Львів 1886.
- Želexivs'kyj 1923. Проф. Желехівський: Принцип відносності. Ім'я Ейнштейна. Червоний Шлях 1923, 1: 113-126.
- Žovtobryx 1963. Михайло Жовтобрюх. Мова української преси (до середини дев'яностих років XIX ст.). Київ 1963.
- Žylko 1958. Федот Т. Жилко. Говори української мови. Київ 1958.
- Žylko 1966. Федот Т. Жилко. Нариси з діалектології української мови, 2-е переробл. вид. Київ 1966.
- "7% ukrajinciv." 7% українців вважають проблему статусу російської мови основною, – експерт. 14-09-2010. <http://nbb.com.ua/news/946/18/>.
- "400 ukrajins'kux osvityjan." 400 українських освітян поїхали до Москви на Дні освіти і науки України в РФ. 16-09-11. http://zaxid.net/home/showSingleNews.do?400_ukrayinskih_osvityan_poyihali_do_moskvi_na_dni_osviti_i_nauki_ukrayini_v_rf&objectId=1236291.

With regard to all web sources cited in "Contemporary Anti-Ukrainian Myths about the History of the Ukrainian Language, or: Does Ukrainian Have a History?" and "Colonial Linguistic Reflexes in a Post-Soviet Setting: The Galician Variant of the Ukrainian Language and Anti-Ukrainian Discourse in Contemporary Internet Sources": all websites were visited between 20-03-2007 and 04-07-2007. Last checks were made on 6 December 2007.

With regard to all web sources cited in "Language Politics in Contemporary Ukraine (25 February 2010-25 February 2012)": all websites were visited between 10-03-2011 and 26-11-2012.

Index

- Ahafanhel (Orthodox metropolitan of Odesa), 607
Ajzenštok, Ijeremija, 34
Aleksievič, Fedor, 19
Aleksievič, Ivan, 128, 131
Aleksievič, Petr, 128, 131
Aleksievná, Sof'ja, 128, 131
Aleksij Mixajlovič (tsar of Muscovy), 19, 194, 357
Anderson, Benedict, 241, 337
Andrej Bogoljubskij (Rus' prince), 11 n. 7
Anisimova, V., 589
Anna Pavlovna (grand duchess of Russia), 277 n. 27
Arđan, Ivan 413, 413 n. 10
Askol'd (prince of Kyiv), 106, 116, 118
Auer, P., 140
Azarov, Mykola, 605, 610
Ažnjuk, Bohdan, 418
- Babyč, Nadija, 310
Bača, Jurij, 276 n. 26, 278, 285 n. 32, 290, 293
Bach (Austrian minister), 266
Bačyns'kyj, Andrij, 473
Badan-Jarovenko, Oleksandr, 531 n. 161
Balan, Borys, 414
Balyč'kyj, Vsevolod, 497, 523, 530 n. 154
Bandera, Stepan, 15, 588, 693, 613
Baranovyč, Lazar, 121 n. 1
Bardas, Jakiv, 151
Barvins'kyj, Oleksander, 309–10, 314, 317, 319–22, 324–28, 330–31, 335, 335 n. 24, 336, 366, 374
Batu (Tatar khan), 192. 79
Baulin, Pavel, 13, 589, 591–92
Beck, Anton, 245, 247 n. 1
Belej, Ljubomyr, 473 n. 5, 474
Benedek, András, 480
Beneš, Eduard, 476
Berger, Kathleen, xiii
Bernatovyč, Volodymyr, 309
Berynda, Pamva, 190
Beskyd, Antin, 476
Bilous, Bohdan, 382–83
Bilous, Myxajlo, 391
Bilozers'kyj, Mykola, 322
Birec'kyj, Ivan, 236–237, 241, 472
Blumštejn, V. *See* Korjak, V.
- Bodjans'kyj, Osyp, 282–83
Bogdanovič, Ippolit, 232
Bondarenko, Olena, 611
Borovykovs'kyj, Levko, 196, 196 n. 96
Bortnyk, Ruslan, 615
Borys, Jurij, 482–83, 483 n. 5, 485
Boryś, Wiesław, 91
Bourhis-Landry, Richard, 348
Bowring, Bill, 615
Božesku, Aurika, 617
Brock, Peter, 192, 192 n. 76
Brodij, Andrij, 476
Brückner, Aleksander, 49, 55, 60, 62
Budzynski, W., 442
Bulaxovs'kyj, Leonid, 34
Bunčić, Daniel, 66 n. 2, 77, 77 n. 1, 78, 78 n. 5, 80–81, 84–89
Burger, Hannelore, 352, 374
Butovs'kyj, Oleksander, 150–51
Butyč, Ivan, 122–123
Buzyna, Oles', 15
Byron, George Gordon, 321–322
- Čajkovs'kyj, Mariano, 411 n. 2
Čaplenko, Vasyľ', 307, 310, 338
Casimir III the Great (king of Poland), 60
Catherine II (empress of Russia), 192 n. 82
Certelev, Nikolaj, 172 n. 4, 195, 196 n. 94
Cerularius. *See* Michael I Cerularius
Chomiak, Mirosława, 227, 479, 481
Cieglewicz, Kasper, 235, 379, 379 n. 4
Cooper, Robert L., 348
Čornovol, Ihor, 245
Csopey, László, 285, 245, 452, 454, 455 n. 20, 456 n. 23, 459 n. 25–29, 460 n. 30–32, 460 n. 34–37, 461 n. 38–44, 461 n. 46–47, 462 n. 48–52, 462 n. 54–55, 463 n. 59, 463 n. 62, 463 n. 64–66, 464 n. 67, 473
Čubar, Vlas, 485 n. 10, 497, 500, 500 n. 53, 501, 507, 507 n. 84, 511 n. 93
Curkovs'kyj, Antin, 413
Cyril, Saint, 194, 194 n. 88, 424
- Dal', Vladimir, 147–149, 153, 158, 160–161
Dante Alighieri, 321–322
Danylo Romanovyč (king of Rus'), 15–16, 16 n. 19, 187, 192, 192 n. 79, 469
De Baluze, Jean Casimir, 122

- De Berlaimont, Noël, 77–79, 82, 89
 Dem'ian, Hryhorij, 192 n. 78
 Demjan, Luka, 447
 Denikin, Anton, 435
 Derkach, Denis, 124
 Deržavin, Gavriil, 232
 Didyc'kyj, Bohdan, 28 n. 42, 245–46, 263, 267, 271, 284, 308, 315–16, 351, 360, 365, 374, 406
 Djačan, Pylyp, 360
 D'jačenko, H., 363 n. 32
 Dmytriv, Nestor, 412–13
 Dobe, Ivan, 276 n. 26
 Dobrjans'kyj, Antin, 233, 351
 Dobrjans'kyj, Stefan, 242
 Dobrovský, Josef, 181, 181 n. 34, 183, 233
 Dobržans'kyj, Oleksandr, 248 n. 6
 Dolgorukij, Vasilij, 135
 Doncov, Dmytro, 537, 537 n. 194
 Dorošenko, Dmytro, 571
 Doroškevyč, Volodymyr, 503 n. 64, 566
 Dovženko, Oleksandr, 524, 609
 Dragan, Antin, 414
 Drahomanov, Myxajlo, 21, 21 n. 26, 34, 317, 336, 344–45
 Drozdovskij, Nikolaj (Drozdovs'kyj, Mykola), 378–79
 Dubiel-Dmytryszyn, Sebastian, 474 n. 6
 Duličenko, Aleksandr, 473, 476
 Durdykivs'kyj, Volodymyr, 513 n. 101
 Duxnovyč, Oleksandr, 252–53, 263, 278–79, 288, 283 n. 33, 290–93, 296, 327, 382, 447, 450–52, 450 n. 10, 473
 Dyr (prince of Kyiv), 106, 116, 118
 Dzendzelivs'kyj, Josyp, 192 n. 76, 452, 455 n. 20
 Dzeržinskij, Feliks, 613
 Džjuba, Ivan, 31 n. 53

 Elspaß, Stephan, 348 n. 18
 Eminger, Karl, 266
 Epik, Hryhorij, 525
 Ėpštejn, Jakov, 484
 Erstenjuk, Mykola, 508 n. 85, 524, 534

 Fałowski, Adam, 77 n. 2
 Fed'kovyč, Jurij, 346 n. 15
 Fedorčuk, Stanislav, 609
 Fejsa, Myxajlo, 474
 Filipovyč, Atanasij, 48
 Fitilëv, Mykola. *See* Xvyl'ovyj, Mykola
 Flier, Michael, 139
 Fontański, Henryk, 227, 479, 481

 Franko, Ivan, 222, 306, 315, 318, 329, 339 n. 2, 345–46, 345 n. 13, 358 n. 15, 372 n. 48, 385 n. 12
 Franko, Zinovija, 339 n. 2
 Franz I (emperor of Austria), 358
 Franz Joseph I (emperor of Austria), 254

 Gajdoš, Marián, 477
 Galjatovs'kyj, Ioanikij, 48, 51, 54, 90
 Gartner, Theodor, 368 n. 44, 435 n. 27, 463 n. 58–60, 584 n. 316
 Gawatowicz, Jakub, 39, 226
 Gela, Andrij, 413 n. 11
 Geraščenko, Georgij, 24, 25, 31, 588, 591–92, 595
 Gerovs'kyj, Heorhij, 449 n. 9
 Gerovs'kyj, Jakiv, 382
 Gizel', Innokentij, 18, 18 n. 23, 105, 105 n. 1
 Gnedič, Nikolaj Ivanovič, 172 n. 4
 Gnidskowski, Michael. *See* Hnidkovs'kyj, Myxajlo
 Goebbels, Joseph, 31
 Goehrke, Carsten, 9
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 221, 223, 232, 321–22, 430
 Gogol', Nikolaj (Hohol', Mykola), 19
 Gołębiowski, Łukasz, 178
 Golycyn, Vasilij, 127–128, 130–132, 133 n. 13
 Golovkin, Gavriil, 135
 Gołuchowski, Agenor, 27, 248, 248 n. 5, 249
 Gorčinskaja, Katya, 607–8
 Gorham, Michael, 607
 Grabowicz, George G., 299, 307 n. 4
 Graziosi, Andrea, 482–83, 517, 523 n. 132
 Grebënka (Hrebinka), Jevhen, 22, 22 n. 28, 32, 172 n. 4, 196, 196 n. 94, 196 n. 96, 198, 198 n. 114, 307–8, 339
 Greč, Nikolaj, 192 n. 82
 Groener, Wilhelm, 512, 577
 Guagnini, Alexander, 115 n. 8
 Gžyc'kyj, Volodymyr, 579

 Habsburg dynasty, 356, 388
 Hadzewych, Roma, 414
 Hafner, Sebastian, 246
 Hajdoš, Istvan, 617
 Halka, Ieremija. *See* Kostomarov, Mykola
 Haleško, Raisa, 414
 Hancov, Vsevolod, 510 n. 89, 522
 Hanka, Václav, 230–31
 Hanudel', Zuzana, 448 n. 6
 Harajda, Ivan, 477
 Hatcuk, Mykola, 344

- Havryševyč, Vasyl', 226, 398 n. 24
Hentschel, Gerd, 141 n. 2
Herberstein, Sigismund von, 115
Herder, Johann Gottfried, 337
Hermajze, Osyp, 503 n. 64, 566
Herman, Hanna, 606
Heym, Georg, 579
Hibel, Katarzyna, xiii
Himka, John–Paul, 217–18, 218 n. 177
Hitler, Adolf, 31 n. 52, 530, 607
Hlibov, Leonid, 346
Hnidkovs'kyj, Myxajlo (Gnidkowski, Michael), 279–80, 293–95
Hofeneder, Philipp, xiii
Höfinghoff, Marina, xiii
Hohol', Mykola. *See* Gogol', Nikolaj
Holoskevych, Hryhorij, 510 n. 89, 522
Holovac'kyj, Ivan, 245–47, 248 n. 5, 250–53, 255, 263, 267, 269, 271–72, 281
Holovac'kyj, Jakiv, 28 n. 42, 172 n. 5, 182–83, 183 n. 43, 184–86, 186 n. 50, 195–96, 196 n. 94, 197–99, 205–11, 208 n. 146, 208 n. 148, 209 n. 149, 209 n. 150, 211 n. 156–59, 212 n. 161, 213 n. 162–67, 214 n. 169–70, 215–18, 215 n. 171, 216 n. 173–74, 217 n. 175–76, 224, 230–31, 233, 237, 244, 245–46, 269, 272–73, 279, 306, 308, 311, 315–16, 323–24, 334–35, 340 n. 5, 342, 382
Homer, 313–14
Homyk, Stefan, 427
Hončarenko, Ivan, 579
Horbač, Oleksa, 225
Hordijenko, Dmytro, 525
Hornjatkevych, Andrij, 597 n. 36
Horobkevych, Sydir. *See* Vorobkevych, Sydir
Horthy, Miklós, 445, 477
Hrabar, Ol'ha, 392
Hrabovs'kyj, S., 598
Hrebinka, Jevhen. *See* Grebënka, Jevhen
Hrinčenko, Borys, 34, 336, 345–46, 522, 549
Hruševs'kyj, Myxajlo, 14, 16, 16 n. 19, 26, 26 n. 37, 30, 30 n. 49, 34, 65, 336, 345, 345 n. 13, 482 n. 2, 487 n. 15, 503 n. 64, 510, 566, 591, 591 n. 12, 596 n. 31
Hruška, Hryhorij, 411–15, 412 n. 5, 412 n. 7, 442
Hrycak, Jaroslav, 171, 218 n. 177, 251, 358 n. 15, 385, 385 n. 12, 393
Hryn'ko, Hryhorij, 491, 491 n. 28, 497, 545 n. 216
Hrynevce'kyj, Serhij, 615
Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, Petro, 172 n. 4, 198, 198 n. 114
Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, Semen, 301–2
Humeč'ka, Lukijana, 44–45
Humenčyk, Ol'ha, 614
Hynylevyč, Hryhorij, 242–43, 243 n. 28
Ioakim (patriarch of Moscow), 90
Ihor (Rus' prince), 106, 116, 118–19
Ilarion (metropolitan of Kyiv), 18, 18 n. 23
Il'ič. *See* Lenin, Vladimir
Il'nyč'kyj, Vasyl', 317–18, 350, 352
Isačenko, Aleksandr, 347 n. 17
Isajevyč, Jaroslav, 65
Iskra, Ivan, 135
Ivan the Terrible (Groznyj) (tsar of Muscovy), 18, 18 n. 23
Ižakevyč, H., 142
Jabur, Vasil, 449, 449 n. 7–8, 453
Jakymovyč, Avskentij, 123
Jalovyj, Myxajlo (Špol', Julijan), 498, 525, 532 n. 167
Janovs'kyj, Petro, 145–47
Janukovyč, Viktor, 590, 601, 605, 605 n. 3, 606–7, 610, 615, 619
Jaroslav Osmomysl (Rus' prince), 371–72
Jaroslav the Wise (Rus' prince), 192, 192 n. 79
Javors'kyj, Ivan, 136, 529
Javors'kyj, Matvij, 509–10, 534
Javors'kyj, Stefan, 18
Jaxymovyč, Hryhorij, 232, 384
Jedlins'ka, Ul'jana, 446
Jefimenko, Hennadij, 526
Jefremov, Oleskandr, 615
Jefremov, Serhij, 30, 30 n. 50, 31 n. 51, 143, 143 n. 4, 437, 503 n. 64, 507, 507 n. 84, 509–10, 522, 535, 566, 570–71, 576
Jireček, Alois, 27
Johansen, Myxajlo, 496, 496 n. 46, 545–46, 546 n. 218, 547–53, 557, 559–61, 561 n. 286, 565
Jordan, Petr, 234
Joseph (archduke of Austria), 277 n. 27
Joseph II (emperor of Austria), 192, 192 n. 79, 371–73
Jugashvili, Ioseb Besarionis dze. *See* Stalin, Joseph
Juhas, Myxajlo, 442–43
Julianovič, Ivan. *See* Kulik, Izrail' Judelevič
Jurčenko, 589, 594, 597, 598 n. 37
Jurij Dolgorukij (Rus' prince), 11 n. 7, 370–72
Juščenko (Yushchenko), Viktor, 34 n. 54, 602, 604, 606–7, 609, 611, 613–15
Juzefovyč, Myxajlo, 329 n. 18

- Kahanovyč, Lazar (Mojseevič, Lazar), 31, 34, 491 n. 29, 497–98, 503–5, 504 n. 67–68, 505 n. 73, 507–9, 507 n. 82, 529, 529 n. 153, 531, 531 n. 162, 546, 548–56, 559, 561–63, 565–66, 568
- Kahanovyč, Naum, 519, 542 n. 210
- Kaljannikov (Kaljannyk), Ivan, 582
- Kamiński, Jan Nepomucen, 235
- Kamusella, Tomasz, 337
- Kapnist, Vasyľ, 172 n. 4
- Kapral', Mixail, 481
- Kapral', Myron, 64–65, 476
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović, 179
- Karamzin, Nikolaj, 188, 189 n. 63, 190 n. 67, 193 n. 84, 195
- Karevin, Aleksandr, 4–5, 12, 14–15, 22–23, 25, 28, 30, 30 n. 50, 31, 35, 587, 590
- Karpluk, Maria, 113–14, 113 n. 6, 114 n. 7
- Katrenko, Oleksander, 433
- Keipert, Helmut, 70 n. 4, 77–78, 80, 82, 89–90
- Keppen, Petr, 175, 200 n. 123
- Kerča, Ihor, 449, 453, 480
- Kiparsky, Valentin, 149 n. 7
- Kirill (patriarch of Moscow), 607
- Kistjakivs'kyj, Oleksander, 329 n. 17
- Kivalov, Serhij, 618
- Ključevskij, Vasilij, 11 n. 7
- Kloss, Heinz, 76
- Klymončuk, Oksana, 616
- Kočubej, Vasyľ, 135, 136 n. 17
- Kočyš, Mykola, 478
- Kohut, Zenon, 105, 120, 158 n. 13
- Kolesničenko, Vadym, 608 n. 4, 610–15, 612 n. 6, 617–18
- Kolesnikov, A., 589, 595
- Kollár, Ján, 230, 236, 242
- Kolodij, M. 432
- Kommodova, Natalija, 609
- Konaševyč-Sahajdačnyj, Petro (Ukrainian hetman), 192, 192 n. 79, 192–93 n. 82, 373
- Konečný, Stanislav, 477
- Konstankevyč, Ivan, 412–13
- Konys'kyj, Oleksander, 314, 322, 328
- Kopczyński, Onufry, 231
- Kopitar, Jernej (Bartholomäus), 231, 233
- Kopitar, V., 172 n. 5
- Kopylenko, Oleksandr, 525
- Kopyns'kyj, Isaja, 18, 18 n. 23
- Korjak (Blumštejn), V., 31, 31 n. 51
- Kornienko, Mixail, 613
- Kornilov, D., 589, 594
- Korol'ov, Pylyp, 300
- Kosior, Stanislav, 509, 511 n. 93, 514–17, 524, 526, 533, 533 n. 175, 543, 545–50, 552–53, 555–68, 556 n. 226, 580
- Kostel'nyk, Havrylo, 473, 473 n. 5, 474
- Kostiuk, Hryhory, 525
- Kostomarov (Kostomarov), Mykola (Halka, Ieremija), 25, 196, 196 n. 96, 198, 198 n. 114, 235, 306, 311, 324 n. 16
- Kostusjev, Oleksij, 619
- Kotljarevs'kyj, Ivan, 21–22, 21 n. 24–26, 22 n. 28, 32, 141–42, 172 n. 4, 177, 190–91, 198–99, 198 n. 114, 199 n. 115, 305–8, 339, 339 n. 2, 345, 375
- Kutuzov, Mixail, 192 n. 82, 193 n. 82
- Koval's'kyj, Vasyľ, 351, 358
- Krajňak, František, 477
- Kravčenko, Osyp, 413–4, 413 n. 10, 413 n. 12
- Kravciv, Bohdan, 411, 412 n. 6, 414, 417–18
- Krawchenko, Bohdan, 482–83
- Krylovskij, Amfrosij, 65–66, 69
- Kryms'kyj, Ahatanhel, 494, 507–8, 507 n. 84, 517, 517 n. 122, 522
- Kubajčuk, Viktor, 518
- Kudrjavcev, Sergej, 543
- Kul'abka, Ivan, 158
- Kuliš, Mykola, 509
- Kuliš, Pantelejmon, xii, 25, 27–28, 28 n. 42, 33–34, 235, 305–6, 307 n. 4, 309–30, 310 n. 6, 311 n. 7, 312 n. 9, 314 n. 10–11, 315 n. 12, 321 n. 13, 322 n. 14, 324 n. 15, 325 n. 16, 329 n. 17–18, 332–36, 333 n. 10–21, 334 n. 22, 335 n. 24, 344–46, 345 n. 14, 352, 372 n. 48, 374–75, 585, 587, 597, 599
- Kulyk (Kulik), Izrail' Judelevič (Julianovič, Ivan), 30–31, 31 n. 51
- Kulyk, Volodymyr, 603
- Kun, Béla, 475 n. 7
- Kuncevyč, Ivan, 432
- Kurbas, Les, 524
- Kurbskij, Andrej, 18, 18 n. 23
- Kuropas, Myron, 412–13, 413 n. 9–10, 416 n. 13, 417–18, 418 n. 14
- Kurylo, Olena, 34, 438, 521
- Kuz'mič, Volodymyr, 525
- Kuzelja, Zenon, 265, 353 n. 4, 356, 356 n. 12, 359 n. 17, 360 n. 20, 360 n. 22–23, 362 n. 25, 363 n. 27, 363 n. 29, 363 n. 34, 364 n. 35, 367 n. 38–40, 368 n. 41, 368 n. 43–44, 372 n. 50, 373 n. 52, 452, 455 n. 20, 459 n. 25–29, 460 n. 30–37, 461 n. 38–47, 462 n. 48–52, 462 n. 54–55, 463 n. 59, 463 n. 62–63, 463 n. 65–66, 464 n. 67

- Kuzio, Taras, 479, 607
 Kviring, Ėmmanuil, 489–90, 490 n. 23, 497, 545–58, 560–61, 563–65
 Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko, Hryhorij, 22, 22 n. 28, 32, 196, 196 n. 94, 196 n. 96, 198, 198 n. 114, 306–8, 326, 339, 339 n. 2, 595, 595 n. 28
 Kyj (legendary prince of Kyiv), 106, 108, 112, 116
 Kyrylenko, Ivan, 525
 Laborec' (prince of the White Croats), 469
 Larin, Jurij (Lur'e, Mixail), 497, 508
 Lavrivs'kyj, Ivan, 175–76, 200 n. 123
 Ławrowski, Julian, 390
 Lazarevs'kyj, Fedir, 301
 Lazarevs'kyj, Myxajlo, 301
 Lebed', Dmitrij, 490–91, 490 n. 27, 497
 Lenec, K., 139
 Lenin, Vladimir (Il'ič), 482 n. 2, 483–85, 483 n. 5, 486 n. 13, 488, 488 n. 17, 490, 490 n. 25, 515, 515 n. 111, 531, 531 n. 161, 531 n. 165, 535, 538–39, 540 n. 204, 544, 579, 581, 613
 Leontovyč, Teodor, 236, 238
 Lesiv, Mykhailo (Łesiów, Michał), 90, 265
 Lev Danylovyč (Rus' prince), 191, 356–57
 Levkovyč, L., 579
 Levyc'kyj, Ivan, 246, 276 n. 26, 279 n. 29, 381
 Levyc'kyj, Josyf, 26, 172 n. 4–5, 176–79, 176 n. 17, 177 n. 19, 190–91, 198, 198 n. 114, 200–201, 200 n. 124–25, 201 n. 128, 221–24, 221 n. 3, 222 n. 4, 231–33, 244, 296 n. 36
 Levyc'yj, Kost', 249, 414
 Levyc'kyj, Myxajlo, 173, 220–21, 231
 Levyc'kyj, Orest, 133
 Levyc'kyj, Ostap, 351, 366, 368, 373–76
 Lisovs'ka, Nastja. *See* Roksoljana
 Lixinin, Dinis, 127–28
 Ljapunov, Boris, 5, 18, 591
 Ljubčenko, Panas, 491, 491 n. 30, 507, 513–14, 526, 546–62, 547 n. 219, 555 n. 224, 562 n. 287, 564–68
 Lomonosov, Mixail, 18, 21, 21 n. 25, 190, 190 n. 68, 231, 330–31, 333, 333 n. 20
 Losiv, Ihor, 598, 598 n. 41, 599 n. 42–44
 Lotoc'kyj, Volodymyr, 413
 Lozyns'kyj, Josyf, 172 n. 5, 180–82, 182 n. 35–36, 184–85, 193–96, 193 n. 84, 204–5, 205 n. 136, 225, 231, 233–34, 340
 Lozyns'kyj, Myxajlo, 520
 Lučkaj, Myxajlo, 172 n. 4, 176 n. 17, 201, 201 n. 126, 204
 Luckyj, George, 306, 309, 309 n. 5, 310 n. 6, 311–12, 311 n. 7, 312 n. 9, 315 n. 12, 318, 322–24, 322 n. 14, 324 n. 15, 329 n. 17–18, 333 n. 21, 334 n. 22, 335 n. 24
 Luc'kyj, Maksym, 610
 Ludolf, Heinrich Wilhelm, 149 n. 7
 Lukaševyč, Platon, 180
 Lur'e, Mixail. *See* Larin, Jurij
 Lyashka, Ivan, 123
 Lybid (Libeda) (legendary princess of Kyiv), 108, 115
 Lysjak, Teodor (Bohdan), 235, 281
 Lytvyn, Volodymyr, 611, 615
 Machek, Václav, 50
 Macuka, A., 589, 594
 Macyns'kyj, Ivan, 477
 Magocsi, Paul Robert, 377 n. 1, 391, 411, 449, 471 n. 1–2, 472–73, 476–81, 480 n. 9
 Majs'kyj, Myxajlo, 525
 Makar, Stefan, 413
 Maksim Grek, 18, 18 n. 23
 Maksymovyč (Savryč), Karol', 505 n. 73, 529 n. 153
 Maksymovyč, Myxajlo, 32, 195–96, 196 n. 94, 196 n. 96, 282–83, 306–8, 307 n. 4, 310, 310 n. 6, 313, 324, 334–35, 344, 448 n. 6
 Makuch, Andrij, xiii
 Malynovs'kyj, Myxajlo, 344
 Marčuk, N., 222
 Maria Theresa (empress of Austria), 192, 192 n. 79, 192–93 n. 82, 371–72
 Martin, Terry, 484, 486 n. 13, 488, 488 n. 17, 491, 495, 524–25, 525 n. 135, 538, 542, 542 n. 211, 543 n. 213
 Masaryk, Tomáš, 468
 Masenko, Larysa, 141, 143, 603
 Matejko, Lubor, 601 n. 1
 Mazepa, Ivan (Ukrainian hetman), xii, 121–24, 121 n. 2, 126–30, 133–37, 133 n. 14, 136 n. 18
 Mazuka, Ljudmyla, 604
 Medvedev, Dmitrij, 612
 Medvedev, Sil'vestr, 18, 18 n. 23
 Meek, F.J., 434 n. 25
 Meller, Vadym, 525
 Men'sikov, Aleksandr, 133, 135
 Metelko, Fran Serafin, 231
 Methodius, Saint, 194, 194 n. 88, 424
 Metlyns'kyj (Mohyla), Amvrosij, 196, 196 n. 96, 198, 198 n. 114
 Michael I Cerularius (patriarch of Constantinople), 194, 194 n. 88
 Michalewicz, Mikołaj, 233
 Mickiewicz, Adam, 321–22

- Miechowita, Maciej, 111 n. 4, 119 n. 10
 Miklosich, Franz, 246, 318
 Miller, Aleksej, 311
 Misiak, Małgorzata, 474, 474 n. 6
 Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Antin, 222–23, 452
 Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Ivan, 173–76, 174 n. 10, 176 n. 16–17, 178, 182, 186–91, 189 n. 63, 190 n. 67, 197, 199–200, 230–31, 340, 447
 Mohyla, Petro (metropolitan of Kyiv), 18, 18 n. 23, 320
 Mojseevič, Lazar. *See* Kahanovyč, Lazar
 Molotov, Vjačeslav, 523
 Monastyr's'kyj, Arkadij, 617
 Mončalov's'kyj, Osyp (Josyp), 377–79, 378 n. 2, 382–85, 384 n. 11, 390 n. 14, 391, 393–94, 405–6
 Moračev's'kyj, Pylyp, 343
 Morlovych M., 433
 Moser, Michael, xiv, 3, 6–9, 12 n. 10, 17, 19, 22, 24–25, 29, 32–35, 40 n. 2, 44, 66, 66 n. 2, 68–69, 70 n. 4, 77, 90, 105, 111, 122, 123 n. 3, 130 n. 10, 141–43, 141 n. 1, 142 n. 3, 153, 156, 160, 219–20, 221 n. 3, 225–26, 229–32, 229 n. 2, 243, 245, 247–48, 252 n. 10, 252 n. 12, 253, 269, 272–73, 291, 299, 301 n. 2, 304–5, 305 n. 1, 306 n. 2, 311, 311 n. 7, 316, 321, 321 n. 13, 333, 341–43, 350, 350 n. 1–2, 351 n. 3, 352, 354, 356, 365–66, 365 n. 36, 368, 373 n. 54, 374 n. 55, 377 n. 1, 378, 378 n. 1, 379 n. 4, 381 n. 6, 391 n. 15, 395, 398, 406–7, 412, 422–23, 426, 434, 435 n. 26, 446, 450 n. 10, 454, 459 n. 25, 471–73, 476–77, 587, 597, 599, 601 n. 1
 Mox, Rudolf, 198, 198 n. 114
 Mrazović, Avram, 233
 Mstyslav Izjaslavyč (Rus' prince), 356–57
 Murav'ev, Mixail, 482, 482 n. 2
 Mušynka (Mušinka), Mykola, 445, 445 n. 3
 Myhalyč, Mykola, 252, 278, 296
 Myrnyj, Panas, 346
 Myshuha, Luka (Luke), 414
 Myxel'son, Oleksandr, 611

 Nakonečnyj, Jevhen, 370 n. 46
 Naumovyč family, 380
 Naumovyč, Grigorii, 378–79
 Naumovyč, Ivan, xii, 342, 350 n. 2, 377–89, 378 n. 1–3, 391–95, 391 n. 16, 392 n. 17–18, 396 n. 22, 398, 398 n. 24, 399 n. 25, 400–406, 586
 Naumovyč, Maria, 378–79
 Naxlik, Jevhen, 190 n. 71
 Nebeská, Iva, 347 n. 17
 Nečuj-Levyc'kyj, Ivan, 25, 34, 336, 345–346, 429–30, 591, 591 n. 12, 596, 596 n. 35
 Nedil's'kyj, Sofron, 345
 Nekvapil, Jiří, 348
 Nestor the Chronicler, 18, 18 n. 23, 190, 195
 Netreba, Natalja, 41–43, 41 n. 4–6, 42 n. 7, 60
 Nevyc'ka, Iryna, 475
 Nicholas I (emperor of Russia), 382
 Nikov's'kyj, Andrij, 503 n. 64, 522, 566
 Nimčuk, Vasyľ, 13, 39–46, 48–61, 40 n. 3, 318
 Nod' (Nagy), Mykola, 252, 274–77, 276 n. 26, 292, 296
 Novák, Stefan, 473

 Ohijenko, Ivan, 143, 310, 318, 537, 537 n. 194
 Ohloblyn, Oleksander, 122, 143, 312
 Ohonov's'kyj, Omeljan, 14, 174 n. 10, 317–18, 447–48, 448 n. 6
 Oleh (Rus' prince), 106, 116, 118
 Ol'ha (Rus' princess), 106–7, 109–11, 114–19, 356–57
 Oleska, Waclawa, 172 n. 4, 195, 196 n. 94
 Oliner, Andrij. *See* Xvylja, Andrij
 Olynyk, Marta, xiii
 Orlyk, Pylyp, 122, 135–36, 136 n. 18
 Orwell, George, 590 n. 11
 Osinčuk, Jurij, 13
 Osypov, Mykola, 537

 Padjak (Padiak), Valerij, 476, 481
 Padura, Tomasz, 172 n. 4, 235
 Palacký, František, 242
 Pan'kevyč, Ivan, xiii, 445–50, 448 n. 6, 450 n. 11–12, 452, 455 n. 21, 457–61, 460 n. 35, 464–66, 468, 469–70, 472
 Panašenko, V., 144
 Panč, Petro, 525
 Partyc'kyj, Omeljan, 312, 314, 317, 319–20, 324, 345, 366, 374
 Pašaeva, Nina, 29, 378 n. 2, 586
 Pauly, Matthew, 492–94, 493 n. 34, 493 n. 36–38, 498, 510, 520, 520 n. 126
 Pavlenko, Parxom, 145, 148
 Pavlenko, Serhij, 135
 Pavlov's'kyj, Oleksander, 306, 340
 Pavlov's'kyj, Oleksij, 190
 Pavlyk, Myxajlo, 391 n. 16
 Peredrijenko, Vitalij, 121, 142
 Pešek, Josef, 445
 Peštič, Sergej, 105
 Peter I (emperor of Russia), 18–19, 105, 122, 133–35, 133 n. 14, 136 n. 18, 143, 143 n. 4, 156, 192 n. 80, 192–93 n. 82

- Petljura, Symon, 482 n. 2, 487 n. 14, 497
 Petőfi, Sándor, 430
 Petrenko, P., 312
 Petrovs'kyj, Hryhorij, 548
 Petrovyč, H., 172 n. 5
 Piłsudski, Józef, 504, 512–13, 514 n, 106, 529, 577
 Pisoc'kyj, Anatolij. *See* Ričyc'kyj, Andrij
 Pjatakow, Georgij, 488, 488 n. 17
 Pliškova, Anna, 449, 449 n. 7–8, 453, 475–77
 Plochy, Serhii, 105, 471
 Podolyns'kyj, Vasyl', 238–41
 Pogodin, Mixail, 179, 230
 Polacki, Simjaon, 18, 18 n. 23
 Polians'kyj, Tomaš, 221
 Poliščuk, V., 589–90
 Polons'kyj (Ukrainian teacher), 534, 534 n. 183
 Poltava, 133
 Pop, Ivan, 448 n. 6, 450 n. 11, 475 n. 7, 476
 Popov, Nikolaj, 482, 485, 491 n. 28, 524, 525 n. 137, 526–32, 527 n. 142, 542, 579
 Popovyč, Stepan, 480
 Popovyč, Vasylij, 222
 Postyšev, Pavel, 523–24, 526, 531, 531 n. 161, 532 n. 171, 533–34, 533 n. 175, 540, 540 n. 206, 542–43, 581
 Potij, Ipatij (Uniate metropolitan of Kyiv), 59
 Potocki, Andrzej, 384, 391
 Potoc'kyj', Teodor, 411 n. 2
 Poznans'kyj (Soviet official), 517, 518 n. 123
 Procko, Bohdan, 411–12, 412 n. 5–7, 413 n. 10
 Procyk, Roman, xiv
 Prokopovyč, Teofan (Feofan), 18, 111
 Prylypko, N., 221
 Prystajko, Volodymyr, 35
 Puljuj, Ivan, 314 n. 10, 318, 321, 345 n. 14
 Puškin, Aleksandr, 321–22, 327, 330, 339
 Putin, Vladimir, 606–8
 Putina, Ljudmila, 606
 Pylypenko, Serhij, 495–96, 496 n. 45, 545–50, 552–56, 558, 560, 563, 567
 Pylypovyč, Volodymyr, 219, 230 n. 3, 381

 Rabus, Achim, 66 n. 2
 Radomysl'skij-Apfel'baum, Ovsej-Gershon.
 See Zinov'ev, Grigorij
 Radziejowski, Janusz, 505 n. 73
 Rákóczi princes, 194, 194 n. 88
 Rakovs'kyj, Ivan, 252, 276–77, 276 n. 26, 277 n. 27, 285, 285 n. 32, 287–88, 292, 295, 296
 Rakovs'kyj, Xrystyjan, 483 n. 4, 488, 488 n. 18–19, 545–68, 555 n. 224, 558 n. 249

 Ramač, Julijan, 481
 Ranke, Leopold von, 3
 Razumovskij, Kirill Grigor'evič, 156, 158
 Rej, Mikolaj, 55
 Revyuk, Omeljan (Emil), 414
 Richardt, Rosemarie, 90
 Ričyc'kyj, Andrij (Pisoc'kyj, Anatolij), 509
 Rjuryk (legendary Rus' prince), 111, 115, 119, 356–57, 369–70
 Roksoljana (Lisovs'ka, Nastja), 356–57
 Rogov, Aleksandr, 106
 Roman Mstyslavyč (Rus' prince), 15, 356–57
 Romaniv, O., 309, 374
 Rossolinski-Liebe, Grzegorz, 4 n. 2, 31 n. 53
 Rostovs'kyj, Dmytrij. *See* Tuptalo, Dmytrij
 Rothe, Hans, 105
 Rudnyc'kyj, Jaroslav, 265, 353 n. 4, 356, 356 n. 12, 359 n. 17, 360 n. 20, 360 n. 22–23, 362 n. 25, 363 n. 27, 363 n. 29, 363 n. 34, 364 n. 35, 367 n. 38–40, 368 n. 41, 368 n. 43–44, 372 n. 50, 373 n. 52, 452, 455 n. 20, 459 n. 25–29, 461 n. 38–47, 462 n. 48–52, 462 n. 54–55, 463 n. 59, 463 n. 62–63, 463 n. 65–66, 464 n. 67
 Rudnyc'kyj, Stepan, 520
 Rumjancev, Petr, 192–93 n. 82
 Rusanivs'kyj, Vitalij, 121, 310, 338–39, 341, 344–46

 Šafařík, Pavel Jozef, 172, 181–82, 181 n. 33–34, 194, 230, 236, 242
 Samojlovyč, Ivan (Ukrainian hetman), 122
 Šapoval, Jurij, 35
 Šarovol's'kyj, Ivan, 522
 Šaškevyč, Markijan, 172, 198, 198 n. 114, 224–25, 230, 309, 340 n. 5
 Šaškevyč, Volodymyr, 309
 Satanovs'kyj, Arsenij, 18
 Savčenko, Klym, 146, 150
 Savryč, Karol'. *See* Maksymovyč, Karol'
 Savyč, Semen, 136 n. 17
 Šček (legendary prince of Kyiv), 106–7, 112, 116
 Schiller, Friedrich, 221, 221 n. 3, 232, 321–22
 Schmidt, Johann Adam, 386–87
 Ščupak, Samijlo, 30, 31 n. 51
 Šechovyč, Severyn, 270
 Senkus, Roman, xiii
 Šeptyc'kyj, Andrej, 473 n. 5
 Serbens'ka, Oleksandra, 139
 Serdjuk, Marija, 611
 Sereda, Ostap, 308–9, 373 n. 53, 378 n. 3

- Šesták, Miroslav, 229
- Ševčenko, Taras, xii, 21–23, 21 n. 24–26, 23 n. 29–30, 28, 32, 34, 198, 198 n. 114, 235, 297, 299–305, 300 n. 1, 301 n. 2, 308–12, 314–17, 321–29, 321 n. 13, 336, 342–45, 346 n. 15, 352, 369, 374–75, 406–7, 423, 425–26, 454, 469, 506 n. 78, 585, 594–95, 595 n. 28, 597
- Ševel'ov, Jurij (Shevelov, George), 7, 9, 32–34, 40–42, 42 n. 8, 44, 44 n. 10, 47–50, 53–54, 56, 58, 60–61, 63, 92, 121 n. 1, 131 n. 11, 221–23, 310–11, 314, 314 n. 10, 316–17, 333 n. 19, 336, 336 n. 25, 338 n. 1, 353 n. 4, 357 n. 13, 363 n. 31, 374, 377, 408, 448–49, 482 n. 1, 484–85, 484 n. 8, 485 n. 11–12, 487, 487 n. 14, 488 n. 18–19, 490–91, 490 n. 26, 492 n. 32–33, 493–95, 495 n. 40, 497, 498 n. 47, 505 n. 71, 508–10, 509 n. 87, 517 n. 122, 519, 520–27, 521 n. 128–30, 526 n. 140, 531 n. 163, 541 n. 210, 542, 542 n. 211–212, 543 n. 214, 544, 544 n. 215, 545 n. 216, 561, 571 n. 306, 582–83, 582 n. 314, 583 n. 315, 584 n. 316, 599
- Šexovych, Severyn, 270, 382–83
- Shkandrij, Myroslav, 494
- Shklar, Gene, 411 n. 1
- Sieniawski, Adam, 121 . 2
- Sijak, Ivan, 520
- Simovych, Vasyl', 522
- Sineus (legendary Rus' prince), 111, 119
- Sinkevych, Ivan Xryzostom, 235
- Sirka, Ann, 352
- Šiškov, Aleksandr, 190 n. 67
- Skaryna, Francysk, 191
- Skjar, Volodymyr, 601
- Skovoroda, Hryhorij, 18, 315–16
- Skrypnyk, Mykola, 436, 482 n. 2, 484 n. 7, 493, 493 n. 35, 501, 505, 505 n. 73, 505 n. 75, 507–13, 507 n. 82, 508 n. 85, 517–18, 520–22, 520 n. 127, 521 n. 129, 524–25, 527, 530–32, 530 n. 156–59, 531 n. 160–62, 531 n. 165, 532 n. 170, 534–35, 534 n. 183–83, 538–41, 539 n. 202–3, 540 n. 205, 541 n. 209, 545–53, 555–68, 556 n. 225, 557 n. 227, 558 n. 246–47, 559 n. 260, 569 n. 301, 569 n. 303, 570, 570 n. 304, 573 n. 308, 577, 580
- Skvorcov, Dmitrij, 16, 589, 594–95
- Slavynec'kyj, Jepyfaniy, 18, 18 n. 23
- Slisarenko, Oleksa, 525
- Šlixter, Oleksander, 510, 541, 581
- Smal'-Stoc'kyj, Roman, 368 n. 44, 435 n. 27, 463 n. 58–60, 584 n. 316
- Smerečyns'kyj, Serhij, 537, 537 n. 195–96
- Smolin, Mixail, 21, 23, 26, 30, 591
- Smotryc'kyj, Herasym, 45, 57–58
- Smotryc'kyj, Meletij, 18, 18 n. 23, 330–31, 333
- Snihurs'kyj, Ivan, 220–22, 231
- Snylyk, Zenon, 414
- Sokolov, Leonid, 21, 25, 595
- Solchanyk, Roman, 482–85, 482 n. 2, 483 n. 4, 484 n. 7, 487–88, 487 n. 16, 490, 491 n. 28, 492–93, 497, 544
- Solodub, Petro, 529 n. 153
- Sorokin, Viktor, 607
- Špol', Julian. *See* Jalovyj, Myxajlo
- Špyhovs'kyj (Špyhoc'kyj), Opanas, 196, 196 n. 96
- Sreznevskij, Izmail, 50, 127 n. 7, 134 n. 16, 183, 195–96, 196 n. 94, 196 n. 96, 206, 282–83, 322 n. 14
- Stadion, Franz, 25, 385–86
- Stalin, Joseph (Jugashvili, Ioseb Besarionis dze), 35, 476, 484, 486–88, 488 n. 19, 490, 491 n. 29, 498–99, 506, 508–10, 511 n. 93, 523, 528, 530–31, 530 n. 158, 531 n. 161, 531 n. 165–66, 533 n. 173, 535, 539, 540 n. 204, 541–42, 541 n. 208, 544, 581, 588, 599, 607–8, 613
- Stanica, Marko, 232, 233 n. 4
- Stanislavs'kyj, V'jačeslav, 122, 128
- Staryc'kyj, Myxajlo, 346
- Steblij, Feodosij, 172, 172 n. 5, 229
- Štec', Mykola, 475, 477
- Stech, Marko R., xiii
- Stepnjak, M., 578
- Šternberg, Vasilij, 301
- Stetkevych, Osyp, 413, 413 n. 12
- Štohrin, Iryna, 608 n. 4
- Stökl, Günther, 11 n. 7
- Storoženko, Oleksa, 346
- Strykowski, Maciej, 59, 105–6, 106 n. 3, 109, 111–14, 111 n. 4, 113 n. 6, 115 n. 8, 116–17, 119 n. 10–11, 120
- Stryps'kyj, Hijador, 446, 473
- Studyns'kyj, Kyrylo, 39, 227, 245, 248 n. 4, 249–50, 253 n. 15, 258, 272, 276 n. 26, 277 n. 27, 279, 281, 305, 308, 381–82, 522
- Stukenbrock, Anja, 337
- Subtelny, Orest, 121 n. 2
- Šums'kyj, Oleksandr, 437, 485 n. 10, 491, 491 n. 29, 493 n. 35, 497–98, 498 n. 48, 500–501, 501 n. 62–63, 504–7, 504 n. 68, 505 n. 72–73, 505 n. 76, 506 n. 78–79, 507 n. 83, 522, 529, 529 n. 152–53, 531 n. 165, 532 n. 167, 535, 545–55, 551 n. 222, 555 n. 224, 557–67, 560 n. 280, 562 n. 289
- Šust, Roman, 66 n. 1

- Suvorov, A., 29
 Suvorov, Aleksandr, 192–93 n. 82
 Svjatoslav Ihorevyč (Rus' prince), 110, 117, 119, 469
 Svjencic'kyj, Ilarion, 180, 191, 192 n. 76, 193, 522
 Švorc, Peter, 475
 Syvdync'kyj, Anatolij, 346
 Sydor, Dmytro, 480
 Sylma, Myxajlo, 521
 Symonenko, Petro, 615
 Synjavs'kyj, Oleksa, 521–22
 Sysyn, Frank, xiii, 66 n. 1, 105
 Szczepanowski, Stanisław, 368
- Tabačnyk, Dmytro, 607–11
 Tairova-Jakovleva, Tat'jana, 121–22, 133, 136 n. 18
 Taranenko, Oleksandr, 138–40
 Tauchmann, Michael, xiii
 Tefft, Jon, 607
 Teodor Korijatovyč (Rus' prince), 469
 Terlec'kyj, I., 172 n. 5
 Teršakovec', Vasyl', 414
 Tichý, František, 475
 Tkač, Ljudmyla, 33
 Tkačenko, Borys, 518–19
 Točenyj, Ivan, 123
 Toločko, Petro, 4 n. 1–2, 5, 596–7, 596 n. 35, 597 n. 36
 Tolstoj, F., 301
 Tolstoj, Petr, 145–46
 Topolyns'kyj, Kyrylo, 198, 198 n. 114
 Trankvilion–Stavrovec'kyj, Kyrylo, 90, 92, 103
 Trockij, Lev, 490, 490 n. 25
 Troxanovs'kyj, Meletij, 474
 Troxymenko, Mykola, 438
 Trunte, Nikolaos (Harmut), 90–91, 102
 Truvor (legendary Rus' prince), 108, 111, 119
 Tuptalo (Rostovs'kyj), Dmytrij, 18, 18 n. 23
 Tyčyna, Pavlo, 525
 Tymčenko, Jevhen, 44–57, 59–61, 73, 83–84, 86, 88, 91, 93 n. 5, 94 n. 6–7, 95 n. 8, 95 n. 10, 96, 11–12, 98 n. 16, 99 n. 17, 100 n. 19–21, 101 n. 22, 101 n. 24–25, 102 n. 26–27, 126, 131
 Tymofijiv, V., 548
 Tymošenko, Petro, 299, 303, 309
 Tyščenko, Julija, 604
- Udvari, István, 473
 Ul'janov, Nikolaj, 4, 12, 14–15, 18–19, 22–25, 24 n. 32, 28–30, 587
- Uspenskij, Boris, 19
 Ustyjanovyč, Mykola, 198, 198 n. 114, 447, 452
 Uvarov, Sergej, 339
 Uževyč, Ivan, 53, 57, 77–89, 77 n. 3, 78 n. 4, 80 n. 6
- Vadžra, Andrej, 5–6, 21–24, 26–27, 28 n. 42, 589, 594–95, 604
 Vaganjan, Vagaršak, 508, 518
 Vahylevyč, Ivan, 179–80, 191–92, 192 n. 80, 192 n. 82, 195, 201–3, 217–18, 224, 230–31, 340 n. 5
 Vakulenko, Serhij, 526, 578, 585, 597, 599
 Valuev, Petr, xi, 21, 28–29, 29 n. 46, 311–12, 323, 335, 343, 375, 599
 Van'ko, D., 432, 453, 481
 Vasmer, Max, 60, 94, 147, 152, 370 n. 45
 Vaxnjany, Anatol', 317, 319–20
 Veresaj, Ostap, 312, 322
 Vernads'kyj, Volodymyr, 435
 Verxrac'kyj, Ivan, 329, 344, 376
 Vojcexovyč, Ivan, 172, 4
 Vojtkovskij, Vasilij, 277 n. 27
 Voljan, Vasyl', 333
 Voljans'kyj, Ivan, 433
 Volobuev, Mixail, 508–9, 509 n. 86
 Volodymyr Monomax (Rus' prince), 18, 18 n. 23
 Volodymyr the Great (Rus' prince), 106, 186, 187 n. 51, 190, 192, 192 n. 79, 192–93 n. 82, 260–63, 356–57, 368–72, 469
 Vološyn, Avgustyn, 447–48, 476–77
 Vorobkevyč (Horobkevyč), Sydir, 366
 Vostokov, Aleksandr, 180
 Vovčok, Marko, 22, 346
 Voznjak, Myxajlo, 40–41, 44, 48, 173 n. 6, 174–76, 174 n. 10, 176 n. 17, 179–80, 181 n. 32, 182 n. 35, 182 n. 42, 183 n. 43, 190 n. 68, 192, 192 n. 76, 192 n. 82, 200, 200 n. 123–25, 201 n. 126, 247–48, 247 n. 1, 249 n. 5
 Vynnyčenko, S., 578
 Vynnyčenko, Volodymyr, 567
 Vyšens'kyj, Ivan, 18, 18 n. 23, 52, 57
 Vysloboc'kyj, Julijan, 245–47, 248 n. 5, 252, 255, 260, 264, 267, 270–73, 280, 296, 297
 Vyšnja, Ostap, 525
- Wendland, Anna Veronika, 248 n. 4, 350 n. 2, 371 n. 47, 378 n. 3, 383 n. 10, 391 n. 16, 392 n. 17–18, 393, 393 n. 21
 Witkowski, Wiesław, 110–11, 134 n. 16, 148, 152–53, 159–60, 162
 Worth, Dean S., 90

- Wytrzens, Günther, 274, 276 n. 26
 Xmel'nyc'kyj, Bohdan (Ukrainian hetman),
 177, 192, 192 n. 79, 192–93 n. 82, 194, 357
 Xolodnyj, Hryhorij, 510 n. 89, 513 n. 101
 Xoryv (legendary prince of Kyiv), 106, 108,
 112, 116
 Xruščev, Nikita, 543
 Xudaš, Myxajlo, 225–26
 Xvyľ'ovyj (Fitiľev), Mykola, 498, 500, 504–5,
 504 n. 68, 505 n. 73, 506 n. 80–81, 524, 529,
 529 n. 152, 532 n. 167, 535, 553
 Xvyľja (Olintar), Andrij, 30, 31 n. 51, 506–7,
 506 n. 80–81, 517, 525–26, 535–41, 537 n.
 195–97, 542 n. 210, 546, 549, 551–53, 558,
 562, 565, 578
- Yarosevych, Irena, 414
 Yurkevich, Myroslav, xiii
 Yushchenko, Viktor. *See* Juščenko, Viktor
- Zabila, Viktor, 196, 196 n. 96, 198, 198 n. 114
 Žáček, Václav, 242
 Zajec', V., 578
 Zaleski, Bronisław, 301
 Zaleski, Waclaw, 235
 Zales'kyj, A., 223
 Zaliznjak, Andrej, 4 n. 2, 6–11
 Zap, Karel František, 172 n. 5, 241
 Žatkovyč, Jurij, 447, 450–52
 Zatoň's'kyj, Volodymyr, 482 n. 2, 484, 484 n. 6,
 498–99, 510, 526, 542, 542 n. 210, 546–50,
 552, 554–57, 555 n. 224, 559–61, 564–67
 Zavadka, B., 245
 Zborovs'kyj, Vasyl', 270, 297–98
 Žeguc, Ivan, 249
 Želexivs'kyj, Jevhen, 344–45, 354 n. 8–10,
 367 n. 40, 372 n. 49, 372 n. 51, 416, 454,
 455 n. 19, 459 n. 25–29, 460 n. 30–37, 461 n.
 38–47, 462 n. 48–52, 462 n. 54–55, 463 n. 59,
 463 n. 62–66, 464 n. 67, 547, 552, 585
 Želexivs'kyj, Justyn, 232–33
 Želizo, Jov, 325
 Zerov, Mykola, 503 n. 64, 566
 Zinov'ev, Grigorij (Radomysl'skij-Apfel'baum,
 Ovsej-Gershon), 490, 508
 Żółkiewski, Stanisław, 357
 Żolkovs'kyj family, 356–57
 Zolotar'ov, Vadym, 35
 Žovtobrjux, Myxajlo, 219, 253–54, 343 n. 8
 Zubryc'kyj, Denys, 32, 307, 307 . 4, 310 n. 6,
 324, 334
 Žulyns'kyj, Mykola, 594 n. 24
 Żylko, Fedot, 219, 221–25, 227, 354, 359
- Zyzanij, Lavrentij, 39–50, 41 n. 6, 53, 55,
 57–63, 103, 103 n. 28
 Zyzanij, Stefan, 52