Myxajlo Lučkaj — A Dissident Forerunner of Literary Rusyn?[*]

ANDRII DANYLENKO

A pan-Slav literary standard or local vernacular?

THE first published grammar of Church Slavonic as used in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, *Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena*,[1] appeared in 1830 in Budapest. Written by the priest-scholar Mychajlo Lučkaj (Pop) (1789–1843), this grammar was hailed by a member of the 'Ruthenian Triad', Ivan Vahylevyč, as 'one of the best in its genre', especially in comparison with the German-language grammar of Josyf Levyc´kyj.[2]

Andrii Danylenko is a Lecturer in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures at Pace University, New York.

[1] *Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena seu Vetero-Slavicae, et actu in montibus Carpathicis Parvo-Russicae, ceu dialecti vigentis linguae. Edita per Michaelem Lutskay*, Budae, 1830 (hereafter, GSR); for a facsimile reprint of the original and a Ukrainian translation, see Mychajlo Lučkaj, *Hramatyka slovjano-rus´ka*, ed. P. M. Lyzanec´, trans. P. M. Lyzanec´ and J. M. Suk, Kyiv, 1989 (hereafter, HSR). However, the first reprint was prepared by Oleksa Horbač ten years earlier: Michaelis Lutskay, *Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena*, ed. Olexa Horbatsch [Horbač], Munich, 1979 (= *Grammatici Ucraini*, vol. 2) (hereafter, *Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena*).

[2] K. S. Svěncyckij, *Materialy̆ po istoriy vozroždenija Karpatskoj Rusy. I. Snošenija Karpatskoj Rusy s˝ Rossiej v˝ 1-oj polovině XIX věka*, L´viv, 1905 (hereafter, *Materialy̆ po istoriy vozroždenija Karpatskoj Rusy*), p. 147. Joseph Lewicki [Levyc´kyj], *Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien*, Przemyśl, 1834 (hereafter, *Grammatik der ruthenischen Sprache*), received very poor reviews, including critical comments by Levyc´kyj's teacher, Jernej Kopitar (Osyp Makovej, 'Try halyc´ki hramatyky. Dodatky', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 84, 1903, pp. 59–96 [p. 68]). Following Vahylevyč, Ivan Bryk, 'Josyf Dobrovs´kyj i ukrajins´ki hramatyky' (hereafter, 'Josyf Dobrovs´kyj'), in Jiří Horák et al. (eds), *Josef Dobrovský 1753–1829. Sborník statí k stému výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského. K I. sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze (6.–13. X. 1929)*, Prague, 1929, pp. 23–43 (p. 35), wrote that Levyc´kyj confused Church Slavonic with the vernacular, thereby producing the grammar of a virtual language. Mychajlo Voznjak, *Halyc´ki hramatyky ukrajins´koji movy peršoji polovyny XIX st.*, L´viv, 1911

As stated in the *Praefatio* to the GSR, Lučkaj wanted to write a textbook of Church Slavonic for students at the Greek Catholic Seminary in Užhorod for two reasons. First, the *Grammar* of Avram Mrazovič[3] was hardly suitable for teaching and, second, Josef Dobrovský's *Grammar*[4] was 'extensive' and 'too expensive'.[5] For this reason the

[2] *Continued*
(hereafter, *Halyc´ki hramatyky*), pp. 92–94, maintained that, leaning on the 1825 edition of August Wilhelm Tappe's *Russian Grammar* (see n. 42), Levyc´kyj described an 'unnatural, macaronic language'. Clearly, Levyc´kyj's *Grammar*, despite an ambivalent assessment by Izmail Sreznevskij, 'Donesenija ad˝junkt-professora Sreznevskogo g. Ministru narodnogo prosveščenija' (hereafter, 'Donesenija'), *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveščenija*, 37, part 4, 1843, pp. 45–74 (p. 56), see Voznjak, *Halyc´ki hramatyky*, p. 108), could hardly compete with those of Lučkaj and Oleksij Pavlovs´kyj (1818), see ns 47, 134.

[3] As was first argued by Vasyl´ Symovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena M. Lučkaja' (hereafter, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena'), *Naukovyj zbornyk tovarystva "Prosvěta" v Užhorodě za 1930–31. rôk*, Užhorod, 7–8, 1931, pp. 217–306 (pp. 304–05, n. 4), Lučkaj made use of the second edition of Mrazovič's grammar, *Rukovodstvo k˝ slavenstěj grammaticě ispravlennėj vo upotreblenie slavenoserbskix˝ narodnyx˝ učilišč˝* (Budym˝ [Buda], 1811; first edition, Vienna, 1794). This work was heavily modelled on Meletij Smotryc´kyj's *Slavonic Grammar* (first edition, Vievis, 1619) (see Valerij Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, Bratislava, 1939 [hereafter, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*], p. 12) that also influenced Arsenij Kocak's grammar (see n. 7). According to G. I. Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk v cerkovno-slavjansko-russkoj grammatike Michaila Popa-Lučkaja' (hereafter, 'Russkij jazyk'), in *Karpatorusskij sbornik. Podkarpatskaja Rus´ v čest´ Prezidenta T. G. Masarika. 1850–1930*, Užgorod, 1930, pp. 259–311 (p. 311), Lučkaj followed Kocak (whose grammar was first published as early as 1990) and Dobrovský (see n. 4).

[4] The impact of Dobrovský's writings on nineteenth-century Ukrainian linguistic thought is well established (Ivan Bryk, 'Josyf Dobrovs´kyj i ukrajinoznavstvo' [hereafter, 'Josyf Dobrovs´kyj'], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 141–43, 1925, pp. 1–35). Thus, in the *Epilogus* to his GSR, p. 176, Lučkaj credits the influence of the Czech founder of Slavic philology. Indeed, many scholars emphasized a slavish imitation of Dobrovský's *Grammar* (Josef Dobrowsky [Dobrovský], *Institutiones linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris, quae quum apud Russos, Serbos aliosque ritus Graeci, tum apud Dalmatas glagolitas ritus Latini Slavos in libris sacris obtinet*, Vindobonae, 1822 [hereafter, Dobrovský, *Institutiones*]) by Lučkaj who 'excerpted whole paragraphs from the text, for example in the sections on orthography and syntax' (Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 13; see Bryk, 'Josyf Dobrovs´kyj', p. 42). The most thorough analysis of Lučkaj's Church Slavonic in its dependence on Dobrovský's *Institutiones* was offered by Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena'. It is no wonder that the authority of Dobrovský was long maintained in Subcarpathian Rus´ and Galicia where the Church Slavonic literary tradition lived up to the late nineteenth century (Andrii Danylenko, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian. From the History of an Undeclared Contest between Right- and Left-Ukraine in the 18th c.' [hereafter, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian'], *Die Welt der Slaven*, 53, 2008, 1, pp. 82–115). However, Dobrovský was notoriously reluctant to introduce Ukrainian into his classification of the Slavic languages (B. Ljapunov, 'Dobrovskij i vostočno-slavjanskie jazyki' [hereafter, 'Dobrovskij i vostočno-slavjanskie jazyki'], in Jiří Horák et al. (eds), *Josef Dobrovský 1753–1829. Sborník statí k stěmu výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského. K I. sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze (6.–13. X. 1929)*, Prague, 1929, pp. 114–37), albeit as early as 1808 Josef Dobrowsky [Dobrovský] (ed.), *Slavin. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der slawischen Literatur, Sprachkunde und Alterthümer, nach allen Mundarten*, Prague, 1808, pp. 189–95, published excerpts from Johann Christian Engel's *Geschichte der Ukraine und der ukrainischen Cosaken, wie auch der Königreiche Halitsch und Wladimir* (Halle, 1796) about the Ukrainian Cossacks. Thus, Josef Dobrowsky [Dobrovský] (ed.), *Slovanka. Zur Kenntniss der alten und neuen slawischen Literatur, der Sprachkunde nach allen Mundarten, der Geschichte und Alterthümer*, Prague, 1814 (hereafter, Dobrovský, *Slovanka*), p. 209, did not take heed of the Ukrainian fricative *h*, although he was baffled by the pronunciation of *i* in place of the etymological *o* in one-syllable words as found in Kotljarevs´kyj's works, e.g., *big* for *bog*

ultimate goal was to give an account of the local version of Church Slavonic, 'Ruthenica, aut Карпато-рȣскаѧ' used in Rusʹ ('Russia'), Poland, Galicia, Bukovyna and Subcarpathia.[6]

Quite in the spirit of Arsenij Kocak,[7] Lučkaj's purpose in standardizing Carpatho-Ruthenian (or, sometimes, Carpatho-Rusyn) was to show to what extent the local (Rusyn) dialect deviated from its mother tongue (Church Slavonic), hence introducing the Rusyn speakers into a wider Slavic cultural context.[8] In this respect, Simovyč was right to regard Lučkaj's *Grammar* not only as the first textbook and grammar of regional Church Slavonic, but also as the first scientific description of the Subcarpathian (or, to use the traditional designation, Transcarpathian) dialect.[9] In Soviet Ukraine, in congruence with the popular theory of the formation of New Standard Ukrainian, Lyzanecʹ claimed that Lučkaj gave primarily 'an account of the Ukrainian vernacular in Transcarpathia as compared with contemporary Church Slavonic'.[10]

Interestingly enough, the above populist thesis echoes with the language programme of Lučkaj and other Rusyn intellectuals, especially Ivan Fogarašij (Berežanyn), who are all associated with the Viennese circle.[11] While defending Church Slavonic as an Orthodox pan-Slavic

[4] *Continued*
[! — A. D.] 'God', *bik* for *bok* 'side' and the like. Sometimes, Dobrovský was inclined to treat the Ukrainian literary tradition as Great Russian (Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 220), although he was aware of the differences in the Ukrainian and Great Russian recensions of Church Slavonic (Bryk, 'Josyf Dobrovsʹkyj', p. 25). Generally, Dobrovský was familiar with, to use his German-language terminology, 'Kleinrussisch' or 'malorussisch' which, however, had not yet acquired by the early nineteenth century an authoritative standing comparable with Russian and other Slavic languages, cf. K. Čechovyč, 'Josyf Dobrovsʹkyj i ukrajinsʹka mova', *Slavia*, 9, 1931, 4, pp. 697–725.

[5] GSR, p. xvi.
[6] Ibid., pp. viii–ix.
[7] A long-time professor of theology at the Krasnyj Brid (Hg. Krásny Brod), Mukačeve (Hg. Munkács) and Marijapovč (Hg. Máriapócs) monasteries, Kocak wrote two versions of the *Ruthenian Grammar* which never found its way into print during his lifetime: the Mukačeve witness (first studied by Ivan Panʹkevyč in 1927) and the Marijapovč witness, dating to 1772–78. Modelled on the *Slavonic Grammar* of Meletij Smotrycʹkyj (1619), the *Latin Grammars* of Manuel Álvares (*c.* 1536–70) and Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1522), and the *Russian Grammar* of Michajlo Lomonosov (1755), Kocak's treatise offers a regional description of Church Slavonic. In accordance with the contemporary language practice in Subcarpathia, he identifies the *jazỳkʺ slavenskij* with the *jazỳkʺ russkij*, as detectable from the title *Hrammatyka russkaja, syrěčʺ pravyla yzvěščatelnaja y nastavytelnaja o slovosloženyi slova jazỳka slavenskaho yly russkaho* [. . .] (Danylenko, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian', pp. 93–94).

[8] GSR, pp. vi–xv; see Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 260; P. M. Lyzanecʹ, 'Hramatyka Mychajla Lučkaja "Slavo-Ruthena"' (hereafter, 'Hramatyka Mychajla Lučkaja'), *Ukrajinsʹka mova v školi*, 1962, 1, pp. 67–73 (pp. 67–68).

[9] Symovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 305; see Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 494, V. V. Nimčuk, 'Zakarpatsʹkyj hovir', in *Ukrajinsʹka mova. Encyklopedija*, Kyiv, 2000, pp. 174–76.

[10] Lyzanecʹ, 'Hramatyka Mychajla Lučkaja', p. 67.

[11] In 1833, Fogarašij (Fogorossě, Fogarassy) published *Rusʹko uhorsʹka ili mad̦erska hrammatika. Orosz Magyar Grammatika. Rutheno Ungarica Grammatica* (Vienna, 1833) premised on the same theoretical tenets as Lučkaj's *Grammar*.

literary standard, these scholars also paid attention to the local vernacular language which had long remained unknown to the proponents of early pan-Slavism.[12] Thus, as early as 1826, in a survey of the Slavic languages and literatures, Pavel Josef Šafárik contended that the Rusyn people ('die Russniakei') of East Galicia, Bukovyna and North Hungary were, from the linguistic and historical viewpoints, a sort of *terra incognita*; the latter assertion came as a true surprise since Šafárik was aware that their language was genetically connected with Little Russian ('Kleinrussisch').[13]

By all accounts, Lučkaj's *Grammar* is a major contribution to the literary renaissance in the western Ruthenian lands, including Subcarpathia, Galicia and Bukovyna. It is not surprising that, for his efforts in the national awakening of all Rusyns, the author was mentioned by Ján Kollár in canto 65 of his *Slávy dcera* as belonging to the pantheon of Slavic leaders, which includes also the Russians Polikarpov and Karamzin, the Poles Knapski, Linde and Kopčinski, the Ruthenians Zyzanij and Smotryc´kyj, the Czechs Komenský and Dobrovský, and the Serb Karadžić.[14] In the light of such assessments of Lučkaj's patriotic and cultural activities, endorsed by later students (Vahylevyč, Gerovskij, Pogorelov, Pletněv, Simovyč, Lyzanec´), it is necessary to ascertain the contribution of Lučkaj in the formation of literary Rusyn by placing his linguistic theory as outlined in the *Grammar* of 1830 in the context of his literary practice.

The appearance of the GSR, containing a synopsis of the author's language programme, was arguably triggered by the continuous decline of Church Slavonic despite the educational reforms of Bishop Andrij Bačyns´kyj (1732–1772–1809) which were ushered in by the 1777 *Ratio Educationis* of Maria Theresa's government. At that time, however, in the deplorable situation of the Orthodox culture and education, so-called 'kitchen Latin' was extensively used by priests, trained in Latin at the Trnava and Eger seminaries, and even by their wives.[15] In this vein, Lučkaj preferred to compile his major works, including a six-volume history of Subcarpathian Rus´, *Historia Carpato-Ruthenorum. Sacra, et civilis (antiqua, et recens usque ad praesens tempus)*, in Latin; although losing its pre-eminence in scholarship, Latin was still the official language of Hungary.[16]

[12] Elaine Rusinko, *Straddling Borders: Literature and Identity in Subcarpathian Rus´*, Toronto, ON, Buffalo, NY and London, 2003 (hereafter, *Straddling Borders*), p. 94.

[13] Paul Joseph Schaffarik [Šafárik], *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*, Ofen, 1826, p. 141.

[14] Ján Kollár, *Slávy dcera. Lyrickoepická báseň v pěti zpěvích*, Prague, 1885, p. 450.

[15] Evmenij Sabov, *Christomatija cerkovno-slavjanskich i ugro-russkich literaturnych pamjatnikov*, Ungvar, 1893 (hereafter, *Christomatija*), p. 190.

[16] P. M. Lyzanec´, 'Mychajlo Lučkaj — vidomyj linhvist, fol´kloryst ta istoryk' (hereafter, 'Mychajlo Lučkaj'), in *Naukovyj visnyk Užhorods´koho universytetu. Serija filolohična*, 1, 1995,

Since the bulk of Lučkaj's works was written in Latin, including those works on the local literary tradition and language, one might expect that his early, pan-Slavicist linguistic ideas were only utilized in the collection of fifty-seven sermons for popular instruction (1831), prepared in Church Slavonic.[17] Viewed as an attempt to create a new

[16] *Continued*
pp. 29–32 (p. 31); Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 95. Incidentally, Lučkaj's *Historia Carpato-Ruthenorum* was liberally employed by Ioann (Ivan) Duliškovyč in his historical study of the Carpatho-Rusyns, *Istoričeskie čerty ugrorusskich* (Ungar, 1874–77), that in some places looks like a literal translation of Lučkaj's text. Latin was also used in Lučkaj's history of the eparchy of Mukačeve, *Historiae Dioecesis Munkacsiensis*, where chapter 57, *Historia Missionis Ruthenorum ad Ducatum et Aulam Principis Lucensis*, deals with his stay in Lucca, Italy, in 1829–31 at the invitation of Prince Carlo Ludovico Bourbon, a pretender to the throne of Greece, see J. Hordyns´kyj, 'Osnovanje hr.-kat. Cerkvy v knjazivstvi Ljukka v Italiji' (hereafter, 'Osnovanje hr.-kat. Cerkvy'), *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 125, 1918, pp. 55–89; František Tichý, 'Michail Lučkaj' (hereafter, 'Michail Lučkaj'), in Miloš Weingart (ed.), *Slovanský sborník věnovaný Jeho Magnificenci Prof. Frantiku Pastrnkovi*, Prague, 1923, pp. 215–20 (pp. 219–20). In 1840, Lučkaj outlined a Latin-language project of the Rusyn-Latin-Hungarian-German dictionary, where the Rusyn part had to be based both on the liturgical and vernacular languages since the priest should supposedly not only understand Church Slavonic but also communicate with his parishioners (Lyzanec´, 'Mychajlo Lučkaj', p. 30). Of particular interest is Lučkaj's earlier Latin-language study, *Vocabularium et Alphabetum aethiopicum*, first mentioned by Tichý, 'Michail Lučkaj', p. 215. Written in 1815 in Vienna, the manuscript was donated in 1817 by the author to the library of the eparchy of Mukačeve; it has been housed in the Užhorod University library (sign. XIX. *c* 220). The study provides a script, a short vocabulary, texts (prayers), and numerals in Ge'ez, Coptic and Amharic, furnished with brief grammatical comments (T. L. Tjutrjumova and J. I. Šternberg, 'Rukopis´ 1815 g. ukrainskogo učënogo M. Lučkaja (ob efiopskich jazykach)', in *Semitskie jazyki. Materialy konferencii po semitskim jazykam. 26–28 oktjabrja 1964 g.*, Moscow, 1965, 1, pp. 135–40). Although amateurish and largely derivative from the works of Hiob Ludolf (1624–1704), this is the first account of Ge'ez (Ethiopic, an ancient South Semitic language) in the East Slavic scholarship; as early as 1829, Ethiopic was introduced into the curriculum of Charkiv University (ibid.).

[17] Mychayl Lučkaj, *Cerkovnÿę besědÿ. na vsě neděly roka na poučenie narodnoe*, 2 parts, Budapest, 1831 (hereafter, CS). In addition to linguistic, religious, and historical works, Lučkaj authored secular verse. While visiting Užhorod in 1845, the Slovak writer and priest Bohuš Nosák, a member of L'udovít Štúr's group, wrote down a short philosophical poem, 'A Paraphrase of Ovid', dictated by Lučkaj. Bohuš Nosák, 'Listi z ňeznámej zeme k L.', *Orol Tatránski*, 1, 1845, 10, pp. 77–80 (p. 79), published the poem in his own transcription: *Už vo mnie starina, mečesja sidina,/ Už smorčki starosti, počali mi rosti,/ Už život i sila zahibat iz tila,/ čtož mladu ljubilo teper už nemilo*. Having transliterated this poem back into Cyrillic, František Tichý, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka na Podkapatské Rusi*, Prague, 1938 (hereafter, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka*), pp. 40–41, 165, found its language surprisingly reminiscent of that of another priest-scholar, Vasyl´ Dovhovyč (1783–1849). The latter left unpublished *Poemata Basilii Dóhovits* (1832) (housed today in the Museum of Ukrainian Culture in Svidník, Slovakia), containing a preface, an autobiography, a bibliography and a collection of 190 poems (131 in Latin, 41 in Hungarian, and 18 in Rusyn vernacular) (Ivan Macyns´kyj, 'Kinec´ XVIII – perša polovyna XIX st. ta žyttja i dijal´nist´ Vasylja Dovhovyča. Do dvochsotoji ričnyci vid narodžennja (1783–1849)'; 'Poemata Basilii Dóhovits' (hereafter, 'Kinec´ XVIII – perša polovyna XIX st.' and 'Poemata Basilii Dóhovits'), *Naukovyj zbirnyk Muzeju ukrajins´koji kul´tury u Svydnyku*, 10, 1982, pp. 23–110, 113–232). Among other parallels, Tichý cited the obsolete verb **mekty* as used by Lučkaj (*mečesja* 3 sg. pres.) and Dovhovyč (*serce sja meče*, 'the heart is excited'); cf. OCS *mъk-* 'movere' (Franz Miklosich, *Lexicon Palaeo-slovenico-Graeco-Latinum*, Vindobonae, 1862–65, p. 385), Lemkian *mykatysja*, *myčusja* (1 sg. pres.) 'rush' (Ivan Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby dlja piznannja uhorsko-ruskich hovoriv' (hereafter,

literary standard, the sermons should be placed in the wider context of Lučkaj's linguistic ideas. They are discussed in his *Praefatio* and illustrated throughout the *Grammar*, which appeared one year before the publication of the above-mentioned collection of sermons.[18]

In the *Praefatio*, Lučkaj makes his patriotic goals perfectly clear while arguing that the language of his people is different from the other Slavic languages ('a Polonica, Russica et Bohemica diversam linguam').[19] Yet, despite considering the native dialect a separate language, he does not intend to write its grammar. All educated peoples have two distinct languages — 'lingua eruditorum et Communis plebis'; he insists on the distinction between a spoken language for the common people and a written (Church Slavonic) language for the educated Slavs.

In fact, no literary language is identical with the plain language since the peasant is not born with those ideas and concepts which the educated person acquires by means of reading and study.[20] Regrettably, all the Slavic peoples, including very small communities in Moravia, Carinthia, Lusatia and Carnolia, strive to create literary languages based on the local vernaculars. According to Lučkaj, this tendency endangers the very existence of the individual dialects through their absorption by foreign languages — 'et per alias linguas absorberi faciat'.[21]

[17] *Continued*
'Znadoby'), *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 27–30, 1899, pp. 1–276; 40, 44, 1901, pp. 1–224; 45, 1902, pp. 225–80 (1899, p. 235); see Borys Hrinčenko, *Slovar´ ukrjins´koji movy*, 2 vols, Berlin, 1924, 1, p. 959). Overall, the poems by Dovhovyč and Lučkaj as reproduced by Tichý, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka*, pp. 163–64, 165, manifest a similar mixture of bookish (Church Slavonic) and vernacular forms. Both coming from a peasant background, Dovhovyč and Lučkaj made friends as early as 1818. In 1825–28, Dovhovyč was a local priest in Lučkaj's native village, Velyki Lučky. Both of them reserved Church Slavonic and Latin for the scholarly discourse; not a single work compiled by Lučkaj in Rusyn vernacular found its way into print during his lifetime, while Dovhovyč published only one verse in Latin and one verse in the vernacular. Yet both appreciated creative use of the vernacular language in versification. Suffice it to mention that Lučkaj included in his *Grammar* (GSR, p. 173) one of Dovhovyč's verses, 'Zaspěvaj mi zozulen´ko' (Macyns´kyj, 'Poemata Basilii Dóhovits', p. 178).

[18] The two works were prepared by Lučkaj during his stay (1829–31) in Lucca in the court of Prince Carlo Ludovico Bourbon, a well-known benefactor who had previously acquainted himself with some Rusyn intellectuals at the church of St Barbara in Vienna (Hordyns´kyj, 'Osnovanje hr.-kat. Cerkvy'). Called by Lučkaj 'paradysus', the above years proved to be the most creative in his life (Vasylij Hadžega, 'Mychayl Lučkaj (ur. 19.XI.1789, umer 3.XII.1843). Žyttjepys y tvorŷ' [hereafter, 'Mychayl Lučkaj'], *Naukovyj zbornyk tovarystva "Prosvěta" v Užhorodě za 1928–29. rôk*, Užhorod, 6, 1929, pp. 1–128). Back in Užhorod, Lučkaj was always, to use his own words, 'so burdened with eparchial duties' that he constantly struggled to 'bring profit to his people in the field of literature' (GSR, pp. xii–xiii).

[19] Ibid., p. xii.
[20] Ibid., p. viii.
[21] Ibid., pp. vi–vii.

Lučkaj believes that Church Slavonic, a language of the Bible, is an Orthodox pan-Slav literary standard. While providing some deviating (local) traits of Carpatho-Rusyn in his *Grammar*, the author aims only to demonstrate a similarity between Church Slavonic and his native dialect which, unlike other Slavic languages, resonates with the Slavonic of the Bible.[22] Additionally, a comparison of Carpatho-Rusyn forms with Church Slavonic is likely to solve an unresolved problem: whether Croatian, which was hailed in Russia is the language of the Bible as early as 1828, or Carpatho-Rusyn as most reminiscent of Church Slavonic. It is clear to the author that his native vernacular, though deviating from all other Slavic dialects ('ab omnibus reliquis Dialectus differret'), almost 'coincides with Church Slavonic' ('ferme convenirent'), thus showing slight differences ('paucae differentiae') with its mother tongue.[23] Even the illiterate Rusyns can easily understand biblical Slavonic used in the Church, while the educated people resort to more biblical expressions than colloquial. Finally, Lučkaj argues that, in earlier times, there was no need for a separate grammar of the Carpatho-Ruthenian vernacular language ('linguae Ruthenicae distincta Grammatica [...] superflua esse censebatur') as Rusyn speakers retained the traditional, uncorrupted Slavonic.[24]

To sum up, Church Slavonic in Subcarpathian Rus´ is a literary language of the Rusyn *literati* as Lučkaj writes. The local vernacular demonstrates certain deviations from Church Slavonic. They are so allegedly infinitesimal that these differences hardly challenge the Slavonic foundations of the two systems. Here Lučkaj follows Dobrovský who, as early as 1814, identified Carpatho-Ruthenian ('Ruthenisch') with Old Church Slavonic ('Altslawonisch'), a thesis[25] which remained critical throughout the 1830s in the language programme of the Rusyn intellectuals mentored in Vienna by Kopitar.[26]

---

[22] Ibid., p. ix.

[23] Ibid., p. viii.

[24] Ibid., pp. xv–xvi.

[25] Dobrovský, *Slovanka*, p. 104; see Bartholomäus Kopitar, *Kleinere Schriften*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Vienna, 1857, 1, p. 283. This view fitted well into the contemporary genealogical grouping of the Slavic languages into two major classes. In his critical assessment of August Ludwig Schlözer's linguistic ideas, Dobrovský elaborated a dualistic classification of Slavic languages. According to him (Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. IV), *Russica* (East Slavic) together with *Slavica vetus* and *Illyrica seu Serbica* belonged to one group *A*; earlier, he argued even that 'Church Slavonic is not a separate, but an old Serbian dialect' (Dobrovský, *Slovanka*, p. 168; also Wenceslaw Hanka (ed.), *Dobrowsky's Slavin. Botschaft aus Böhmen an alle slawischen Völker* [...], Prague, 1834, pp. 20, 244). This theory is consonant with the pre-Romanticist view that treated Slavic vernaculars as a result of corruption of the literary (written) languages (Ljapunov, 'Dobrovskij i vostočno-slavjanskie jazyki', pp. 126–27).

[26] See Mychajlo Teršakovec´, 'Vidnosyny Vartolomeja Kopitara do halyc´ko-ukrajinskoho pys´menstva', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 94, 1910, pp. 84–106; 95, 1910, pp. 107–54 (pp. 84–95). Among the Rusyn pan-Slavists, one should single out Ivan Fogarašij, the dean at the church of St Barbara in Vienna (1820–34) (Hordyns´kyj,

The above equation confused some students of Lučkaj's *Grammar*. From Šafárik and Sreznevskij,[27] scholarly tradition had taken for granted that Lučkaj mixed two languages in his *Grammar*, Church Slavonic and vernacular Rusyn (Voznjak, Tichý, Rusinko).[28] A dissenting view was first expressed by the Russophile linguist Gerovskij, according to whom, Lučkaj was particularly 'consistent and strict' in distinguishing between Church Slavonic and the Russian (*russkij*) language proper; hence Lučkaj authored purportedly the first grammatical account of a true Russian vernacular ('podlinnaja russkaja narodnaja reč´').[29] While extolling Lučkaj's opposition to the replacement of Church Slavonic with Russian vernacular, another Russophile linguist, Pogorelov, accused his predecessors of superfluous assessment of the GSR; he argued that Lučkaj 'meticulously, attentively distinguishes the Carpatho-*Russian* forms and expressions from the Church Slavonic', thus rebutting linguistic separatism of the individual dialects replacing their 'mother' dialect.[30]

---

[26] *Continued*
'Osnovanje hr.-kat. Cerkvy', p. 63). In his *Rusyn-Hungarian Grammar* (see n. 11) and especially in a letter written under the pen-name of Ivan Berežanyn to Ivan Orlaj (1771–1829), he admits that native dialects might be studied, albeit without acquiring the status of literary languages; this is why he is clearly opposed to the compilation of separate Slavic grammars which are prone to distance the Slavic dialects from each other and, what is more disastrous, Church Slavonic (Svěncyckij, *Materialy po istoriy vozroždenija Karpatskoj Rusy*, p. 55). In the letter to Orlaj, while comparing Carpatho-Rusyn with Church Slavonic and Great Russian, Fogarašij seems to be more 'vernacular-oriented' than Lučkaj. Ivan Pan´kevyč, 'Chto buv Ivan Berežanyn — Mychajlo Lučkaj čy Ivan Fogarašij?', *Naukovyj zbornyk tovarystva "Prosvěta" v Užhorodě za 1930–31. rôk*, Užhorod, 7–8, 1931, pp. 168–88), correctly identified Ivan Berežanyn with Ivan Fogarašij; he also noted that, unlike Lučkaj, Fogarašij admitted for Carpatho-Rusyn the change of *l* into *v* [w] 'at the end of words in the past tense, as well as in some nouns' such as *molyv´* 'entreat', *movyv´*, *hvaryv* 'speak' (all m. sg. pret.), *vovk* 'wolf', *vovna* 'cotton' and so on (Svěncyckij, *Materialy po istoriy vozroždenija Karpatskoj Rusy*, p. 49); cf. the preterits *vil* 'wind, weave', *glagolal* 'speak', *nesl* 'bring', *tvoril* 'do, make' in Lučkaj (GSR, pp. 3, 117). Some of the above forms retain the back *jer* which, together with the front *jer*, may, according to Lučkaj (ibid., pp. 10, 11, 13), be dropped both in the word-medial and in the word-final position (cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, pp. 267, 306–307, 462).

[27] Pawel Josef Šafařík [Šafárik], *Slowanský národopis*, 2nd edn, Prague, 1842, p. 29; Sreznevskij, 'Donesenija', p. 49.

[28] Oleksa Horbač, 'Lučkajeva "Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena"' (hereafter, 'Lučkajeva "Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena"'), in Lutskay, *Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena*, pp. 192–201 (p. 195), argued somewhat disconcertingly that the mixture of the two languages was a result of Lučkaj's 'erroneous treatment of the relationship between the two languages'. Lyzanec´, 'Hramatyka Mychajla Lučkaja', p. 73, 'Mychajlo Lučkaj', p. 31, cautiously stated that 'the two languages are often confused' in Lučkaj's *Grammar*, which was, basically, 'a grammar of Church Slavonic of the periods of the 18th to early 19th cc., though with a great number of vernacular elements'.

[29] Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 311.

[30] Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 9; see Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 304, n. 4.

Codifying the codified?

In order to reconcile the above-mentioned scholarly opinions, purportedly reflecting Lučkaj's linguistic ambivalence,[31] it would be useful to follow Simovyč's line of argumentation. According to him,[32] Lučkaj's, unlike Dobrovský's Church Slavonic, gave an account of Slaveno-Ruthenian (cf. *slavenorosskij* or *slavenorossijskij jazȳkʺ*) as used in the Ruthenian lands from the seventeenth century onward.[33] While treating Church Slavonic as the only possible Rusyn literary language, Lučkaj deemed it possible to resort to vernacular elements in order to explain Slavonic phenomena. As a result, the author amalgamated two language systems into one, thus deviating from Dobrovský's view of a pure Slavonic. By the same token, Lučkaj filled in gaps in Dobrovský's *Institutiones* which was notoriously lacking in comparative Ukrainian material. This is why Gerovskij was right to treat Lučkaj as 'neither innovator nor reformer' from the linguistic viewpoint.[34] For this reason, Lučkaj was rather a traditionalist, while propagating Church Slavonic as first codified by Meletij Smotryc´kyj in 1619 and subsequently enriched by local elements in various territories wherever the Slavonic liturgy was in use.[35]

---

[31] Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 95.

[32] Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', pp. 305–06.

[33] Cf. Andrii Danylenko, 'On the Names of the *prostaja mova* in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth' (hereafter, 'On the Names of the *prostaja mova*'), *Studia Slavica Hung.*, 51, 2006, 1–2, pp. 97–121.

[34] Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 311, also admitted that Lučkaj's language was 'the Slaveno-*Russian* language [*slavjano-russkij jazyk*] adjusted to [. . .] that Russian [*russkij*] vernacular which had been familiar to the author of the *Grammar* since his childhood'. While placing the Slavonic language of Lučkaj in a (Great) Russian paradigm (see Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, pp. 330–31), Gerovskij stopped short of expanding on this assumption, and emphasized instead Lučkaj's efforts to distinguish between Church Slavonic and his native (*russkij*) vernacular. However, Lučkaj's recommendations appear in some places more descriptive than prescriptive, thus compromising on a synthesis of literary (Slavonic) and vernacular elements. To give an example, Lučkaj notes the vernacular ('less educated') pronunciation of the etymological *o* as Hungarian *ü*, Gallic [French] *u* (e.g., *pop — püp*), or *ï* and *ě* (e.g., *pïp*, *pěp* 'priest'), as well as Romanian *ou* (or ɤ) (e.g., *kɤn´* 'horse'); he suggests, nevertheless, two dots be used over the letter, thus implying that the sound is changeable: 'Sed hic eadem est reflexio, quae circa *e* facta est, in ore cultiori retinetur utriusque Literae genuinus suus sonus. Et his possent duo puncta pro signo deservire mutati soni' (GSR, p. 5).

[35] Smotryc´kyj's *Grammar*, which served as the authority for the Slavonic language before the appearance of Dobrovský's *Institutiones* in 1822, was reprinted by the Orthodox Romanians in Snagov (1697) and Rîmnicul-Vîlcea (1755) (Diomid Strungaru, 'Gramatica lui Smotriţki şi prima gramatică romînească', *Romanoslavica*, 4, 1960, pp. 289–307). In Muscovy, Smotryc´kyj's *Grammar* underwent several stages of Great Russification. As early as 1648, first Great Russian features were introduced into one of the later editions of the *Grammar*, which appeared in Moscow anonymously because of the author's conversion to the Uniate Church. A solid Great Russian admixture is discernable in the 1721 edition, prepared for publication by Fëdor Polikarpov, as well as in a strongly Russified version of 1723 produced by Fëdor Maksimov, the subdeacon at the St Sophia Cathedral in Novgorod. See Miloš Weingart, 'Dobrovského *Institutiones*. I. Církevněslovanské mluvnice před Dobrovským', in *Sborník filosoficke fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě*, 1, 1923, 16, pp. 635–97 (pp. 688–90).

With regard to the vernacular admixture in Church Slavonic as normalized by Lučkaj, I will limit myself to a few representative dialectal phonetic and morphosyntactic features.[36]

To begin with, Lučkaj admits a Ukrainian pronunciation of *ě* as *i*: 'Rutheni, huc inclussis Galliciae, et parvae Russiae Incolis velut accentuatum *î*'.[37] In other nouns, while discussing nom. pl. endings, he equates *ě* (from -*ie* as in *pastўrě* 'pastors') with *ú* 'cum accentu' (orthographically, *ŭ*).[38] Moreover, he traces back variegated pronunciations of Slavic *ě* in the triplex pronunciation of this sound at the time of St Cyril, that is, 'a sharp or accented *i*' (ѣ), 'a crude or deep *i*' (ы), and 'a middle *i*' (и).[39] This is why St Cyril purportedly invented separate characters for each of these *i*'s. Hence the short-form *běl* (m. sg.) 'white' and masculine singular preterits *bўl* 'be' and *byl* 'beat'.[40]

Unlike Dobrovský, according to whom Slavic *g* (г) corresponds to Greek γ and Latin *g*, Lučkaj maintains that this letter in the initial and final positions should be pronounced as Latin *h*, while in the medial position it is similar to *ch* (χ) as in *lehkij* 'light'.[41] He argues that only in a limited number of Slavic and loan words, including *nigdў* 'never', this letter is sounded as *g* in Ruthenian, while the Russians and Serbs

[35] *Continued*
Church Slavonic of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) recension served also in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries as the norm for literary Illyrian sanctioned by Catholic *Propaganda*. It is worth mentioning the *Grammatica compilata in Illirico* by Archbishop Vicko Zmajević of Zadar (1640–1745) premised on Smotryc´kyj and some 'local authors'; Smotryc´kyj's *Grammar* was also used as the appropriate 'Illyrian' textbook for the Glagolitic Illyrian seminaries of Zadar and Almissa (Omiš). See Micaela S. Iovine, 'The "Illyrian Language" and the Language Question among the Southern Slavs in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt (eds), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, 2 vols, New Haven, CT and Columbus, OH, 1984, 1, pp. 101–57 (pp. 129–30, 142).

[36] An exhaustive list of phonetic and grammatical deviations in Lučkaj's *Grammar* in comparison with Dobrovský's *Institutiones* was provided by Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena' (see Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk'). As far as the phonetic traits are concerned, the 'underlying deviations' should be distinguished from the surface level of representation, that is, spelling since letters and sounds are routinely confused by Lučkaj.

[37] GSR, p. 4.

[38] Ibid., pp. 39, 40.

[39] Ibid., p. 5; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 28.

[40] GSR, pp. 5–6. Remarkably, Lučkaj transcribes и as *i*: Гаврило, *Havrilo*', and ы as *u* in *nigdu* 'never' (ibid., p. 3) which, in our transliteration, are *Havrylo* and *nihdў* or *nigdў* as an old Polish borrowing in Ruthenian (Jevhen Tymčenko, *Materialy do slovnyka pysemnoji ta knyžnoji ukrajins´koji movy XV–XVIII st.*, ed. V. V. Nimčuk and H. I. Lysa, 2 vols, Kyiv and New York, 2002, 1, p. 512). Throughout this article I use the linguistic system (or, in some rare cases, Cyrillic itself) to cite examples. With an eye to rendering the late Middle Ukrainian orthography/phonetics, 'ы' is transliterated with the help of *ў*, while one and two prime acutes stand for the front and back *jers* correspondingly. See George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, Heidelberg, 1979 (hereafter, *A Historical Phonology*), p. 21. The latter system conveniently applies to the nineteenth-century Galician orthography.

[41] GSR, pp. 2–3; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 2.

pronounce this letter in 'the Greek vein' ('more Graecorum'). Traditional (Church) Ruthenian pronunciation applies also to some other letters such as ♦ which should be sounded as *pht* and not Latin *th* as recommended by Dobrovský.[42]

Lučkaj never softens the hushing sounds and *c*, e.g., *kažu* (1 sg. pres.) 'say' or *ovča* (voc.) 'sheep'.[43] He consistently introduces 'hard spelling' in different grammatical forms such as voc. sg. and acc. pl.[44] One can mention here Lučkaj's recommendation to always write *o* after *ž*, *š*, *č*, and *šč* in the stressed position, e.g.: *žoltyj* 'yellow', *čort* 'devil' instead of *želtyj* and *čert*, although *češu* (1 sg. pres.) 'comb'.[45]

Lučkaj treats non-pleophonic (*CRaC*) and pleophonic (*CoRoC*) sequences in the word-initial position as parallel Church Slavonic and vernacular with an alternating *a* and *o* correspondingly, e.g.: *hlas* — *holos* 'voice', *hlad* — *holod* 'famine', *slanina* — *solonina* 'salted meat', and other pairs with Church Slavonic forms excerpted primarily from Dobrovský; compare also *prasę* — *porosę* 'piglet'.[46] In some places, Lučkaj cites vernacular (pleophonic) forms as Church Slavonic proper such as *volocjuha* 'rake, scapegrace' or *xvorost, soloma* next to Dobrovský's *xvrast* 'brushwood', *slama* 'hay'.[47] On the other hand, in the *Cantilenae Populares* Lučkaj substitutes Church Slavonic forms for the vernacular (pleophonic), while breaking up rhyme in some lines as in the pair *dražě*

[42] GSR, pp. 3, 6; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 3. Lučkaj's comparison of the letter ѯ with English *th* ('aut Anglico *th*') seems to be completely out of place. In fact, he borrowed this *tour de force* from August Wilhelm Tappe's *Neue theoretisch-praktische russische Sprachlehre für Deutsche* [. . .] (St Petersburg, Riga and Leipzig; most likely, 6th edition, 1826) (Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 259, n. 2).

[43] GSR, p. 17; cf. *mažju* (1 sg. pres.) 'smear', *ovčę* 'sheep' in Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, pp. 39.

[44] GSR, pp. 37, 40.

[45] Ibid., p. 3.

[46] Ibid., pp. 15–16, 24. Lučkaj (ibid., p. 30) also cites a diminutive *korovlę* 'cow' with a cluster labial + *l´*; similar *l´*-forms ascertained themselves especially firmly in the native dialect of Lučkaj. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 39, cites a long list of such forms attested in this region, in particular in Velyki Lučky: *zdorovlja* 'health', *žereblja* 'foal', *levlja* 'lion-cub', *olovljanyj* 'stannic' and the like (see *Atlas ukrajins´koji movy* (hereafter, AUM), Kyiv, vol. 2: *Volyn´. Naddnistrjanščyna, Zakarpattja i sumižni zemli*, 1988, map 74). Clearly, one deals here with the generalization of *l´* at the expanse of *j* after labials on all morphological boundaries which happened in Podolja, Dniester and, independently, in Subcarpathia in the mid-seventeenth century (Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology*, p. 505); see n. 79.

[47] GSR, p. 25; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, pp. 221, 288. The lexeme *volocjuha* is attested in Pamvo Berynda (V. V. Nimčuk (ed.), *Leksykon slovenoros´kyj Pamvy Beryndy*, Kyiv, 1961, p. 13): *běhun˝: volocjuha*. Remarkably, the latter form is also found in Alekesej Pavlovič Pavlovskij [Pavlovs´kyj], *Grammatika malorossijskogo narěčija. Pribavlenie k Grammatike malorossijskogo narěčija*, ed. Olexa Horbatsch, Munich, 1978 (= *Grammatici Ucraini*, vol. 1) (hereafter, *Grammatika* and *Pribavlenie*, correspondingly), p. 29. In 1828, Pavlovs´kyj, *Pribavlenie*, pp. 15–16, declared his preference for Southeast Ukrainian. Generally, Lučkaj indiscriminately cites Slavonic and vernacular forms side by side: *dy̌mnyk* 'house without a chimney', *dubnyk* 'oak forest' next to *zakonyk* 'iuris consultus' or *děvka* 'girl', *kurka* 'hen' as opposed to *ručka* (dim.) 'hand' (GSR, p. 25; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, pp. 48, 305–16).

(loc.) 'road' [in place of *dorozě*] ~ *nebozě* (loc.) 'poor woman'.[48] An analogous treatment applies to the Common Slavic sequence *āRC/ăRC*. According to Lučkaj, both the *a*- and *o*-forms are acceptable in Subcarpathian Slavonic: 'Praepositio ρaз in compositis ᴧ mutat in ᴏ: ρoзρꙋ́ᴃᴀти, ρoз-ꙋ́ᴧ', 'the preposition *raz* changes *a* into *o* in compounds'.[49] In folk songs, however, and examples cited 'in communi Ruthenica', Lučkaj prefers, nevertheless, forms with -*a*-.[50]

In addition to the above examples,[51] other morphosyntactic features come into consideration. Similarly to Dobrovský, who was critical of the replacement of the accusative masculine in plural with the genitive, purportedly under (Great) Russian influence, Lučkaj declared his opposition to this practice; he consistently supported the Rusyn 'correct' accusative of the type *prodam volў* (acc. pl.) 'I will sell oxen', *kuplju kony* (acc. pl.) 'I will buy horses'.[52]

[48] GSR, p. 172. Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 282, n. 4, and Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 24, cautioned about taking Church Slavonic forms for Slovakisms as evidenced in the *Specimina Styli Ruthenici* (including folk songs and sayings) in the GSR, pp. 168, 174, 154, e.g.: *vrabeľ* 'sparrow', *mlada* (f. sg.) 'young', *prohvaryt* (3 sg. fut.) 'say' (cf. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 236, 1902, p. 232). Yet, despite a sizeable number of Slovakisms (Bohemianisms) in Rusyn vernacular from the late sixteenth century on (Tichý, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka*, pp. 19–20), one should not confuse them with East Slavic sequences of consonant + vowel + consonant, emerged after the phonemic loss of *jers*. Thus, alleged Slovakisms of the type *mohol* (m. sg. pret.) 'be able' are likely to display old (East Slavic) variation in the phonetic realization of emerging sonorant clusters after the *jer* shift, e.g.: *moholъ* (m. sg. PAP) 'be able' (1229), *molytovъ* (gen.) 'prayers' (1284) and the like (Michael S. Flier, 'Final Sonorant Clusters in East Slavic' [hereafter, 'Final Sonorant Clusters'], in Robert A. Maguire and Alan Timberlake (eds), *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists. Bratislava, August–September 1993. Literature. Linguistics. Poetics*, Columbus, OH, 1993, pp. 251–69 [p. 252]). A similar variation is observed in the masculine preterit forms like *privedol* 'lead', *pomohol* 'help' next to *privel*, *mohl* in Lučkaj's *Sermons* (CS, 2, pp. 103, 24, 239, 240, 267), see n. 86.

[49] GSR, p. 16. A similar distribution was attested by Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 120, in Lučkaj's native dialect.

[50] Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 283. Occasionally, Lučkaj resorts to the vernacular *o*-form as found in the expression *daj ty bože rozuma* 'det tibi Deus rationem' (GSR, p. 115). The genitive *rozuma* 'wisdom' occurs here with the Slavonic ending -*a*, although Lučkaj (GSR, p. 36) admitted both -*a* and -*u*, emerged purportedly from the dative, for the genitive masculine in singular. In Lučkaj's native dialect, the noun *rozum* occurs primarily with the *a*-ending, cf. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 63; Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 276.

[51] It is worth mentioning neuter forms in -*ę* [ʼa] which allegedly contracted from the Slavonic forms in -*ïe* (GSR, p. 24): *dublę* (coll.) 'oak woods' (with a dialect epenthetic *l*), *bўlę* (coll.) 'grass', *hvozdę* (coll.) 'nails' from *dubïe*, *bўlïe*, *hvozdïe* and so forth (ibid., p. 49). Lučkaj seems to indiscriminately follow Dobrovský who in the preface to *Lehrgebäude der russischen Sprache* of Antonín Jaroslav Puchmayer (Prague, 1820) treated Ukrainian forms in -*ja* (ꙗ) as a result of contraction of the final part in the bookish forms in -*je* (ᴃє) (Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 257). What is also remarkable about the above vernacular forms in -*ę* is the lack of gemination of palatalized consonants as observed in the Transcarpathian dialects (AUM, 2, maps 94, 362), in particular in the native dialect of Lučkaj (Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 51).

[52] GSR, p. 148; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, pp. 615–18; Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', pp. 274–75.

Of greater interest, however, is a pair of the accusative masculines '*kraję* aut *kraj*' for the Rusyn singular declension.[53] According to Simovyč, the form *kraję* can be associated with the representative Ukrainian accusative-genitive for the inanimates of the type *napysaty lysta* 'write a letter' where forms like *lysta* refer to what may be called 'incomplete objectivization'.[54] Unlike the genitive singular of masculine animate nouns in the direct object position, Lučkaj posited the accusative-genitive in parallel use with the accusative-nominative for inanimates, e.g.: *naklady ohnę* (gen.) 'put some fire' next to *podpaly ohen´* (acc.) 'set fire'.[55]

The vernacularizing trend is exemplified in the accusative plural desinence -*y* introduced by Lučkaj for masculines instead of -*ę* as found in Dobrovský.[56] Lučkaj believes that the use of -*ę*, first codified by Smotryc´kyj, is likely to infringe upon 'orthography and content', therefore confusing the accusative plural with the genitive singular. The same argument is applicable to the genitive singular in -*ę* (soft) which occurs in parallel use with the desinence -*y* for feminine nouns in Church Slavonic (*volę* and *voly*), since in books printed in the Ukrainian Church Slavonic ('in libris impressis'), one employs only the desinence -*y*, e.g., *zemly* (gen.) 'earth'.[57] A similar explanation holds true for the vocative singular ending(s). In addition to the regular vocative singular in -*e* for masculines of the type *rabe* 'slave', *brate* 'brother', and *sy̆ne* 'son' next to the rare desinence -*u*, Lučkaj introduces the vernacular desinence -*u* for the velar stems ('Propria in gutturals excuntia'), specifically in diminutives such as *bratyku* 'brother', *kumyku* 'godfather', as well as personal name *Jas´ku*.[58] For this case, one should recall Lučkaj's observations, though provoked by the expansion of the vernacular vocative in -*u*, about the place of Rusyn elements in the literary standard. According to him, this desinence was not found in contemporary Church Slavonic grammars because their authors took into consideration primarily church books, although a true language is not limited to the biblical texts: '[. . .] lingua vero nulla exhausta esset in S. Bibliis'.[59] Lučkaj is ready to radically adapt tradition with an eye

[53] GSR, p. 34.

[54] Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 285, n. 2; cf. Andrii Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica. Ukrainian in Context*, Munich, 2006, pp. 213–14.

[55] GSR, p. 36.

[56] Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 471.

[57] GSR, pp. 40, 42, 44.

[58] GSR, p. 37; cf. Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 470. Lučkaj cites the latter form as *jazku* (GSR, p. 34). Yet it is tempting to agree with an emendation proposed by Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 286, who identified the form with a popular personal name of that time, *Jas´ku*. In discussion of the vocative forms, this emendation looks more plausible in comparison with *jazy̆ku* 'language' in the Ukrainian-language edition of the *Grammar* (HSR, p. 77).

[59] GSR, p. 37.

toward accommodating linguistic reality. Clearly, this is a programme that could hardly be accomplished under the prevailing circumstances in Subcarpathian Rus´ and Galicia at that time.

Quite randomly, Lučkaj introduces vernacular or, rather, regional elements into his literary standard. In the verbal morphology, the following Slavonic and vernacular forms are used indiscriminately: *nesty*, *nosyty*, *prynoševaty* 'bring', *ply̆vu* (CSl. *plovu*), *plovaty* 'swim'; *žiju*, treated by Lučkaj as Slavonic, next to allegedly a newer form *žyvu*: '*znavu*, *pljuvu*, etc. pro *žiju*, *plěju*, *znaju*, *pljuju*'.[60] Lučkaj does not see any difference between *v* in *žyvu* and *znavu* which are of different provenance: *znau/znavu*, *znaješ*, *znaje*, *znaut'* in Lučkaj's dialect.[61] It comes as a great surprise since the use of *v* in *znavu* suggests a connection with the *v* used by the common people before *o* and *u* in such words as *voče* [*voko*] 'eye', *vuxo* 'ear', *von* (*vyn*) 'ille', *vudica* 'water', a sound change not recommended by Lučkaj for the literary standard.[62]

The above examples demonstrate no real discrepancy between Lučkaj's theoretical views and his language practice.[63] His theory admits that *Ruthenica*, while 'coinciding with Old Church Slavonic', might have undergone slight changes as compared with the biblical language.[64] These changes, according to Lučkaj, were not taken into consideration by Dobrovský together with Mrazovič and Tappe. Consequently, Lučkaj explains Church Slavonic phenomena with the help of native (Rusyn) elements, thus lacking Dobrovský's authoritativeness, although that was not because of Lučkaj's poor philological training and linguistic intuition only.[65] Anchored in the Ruthenian literary tradition, Lučkaj closely followed the Ruthenian practice of using Meletian Church Slavonic as a literary language mixed with local vernacular elements. This explains why Lučkaj was not supposed to distinguish between Slavonic and vernacular elements in the literary standard as codified in his *Grammar*. However, what he might be preoccupied with was, rather, a ration of native (both vernacular and Slavonic) and traditional Slavonic elements in his newly revised Slavonic standard.

In quest of a missing component

A possible conflict in Lučkaj's language programme might have been conditioned by a *lacuna* obtaining in the former Ruthenian dichotomy of two complementary written languages (bilingualism), Church

---

[60] GSR, pp. 81, 89; cf. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 76; 1901, p. 87.
[61] Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 273, Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 77.
[62] GSR, p. 18.
[63] Cf. Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 311.
[64] GSR, pp. viii–ix.
[65] Cf. Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 306.

Slavonic vs. *prostaja mova*. In Subcarpathian Rusʹ and Galicia, the *pros-taja mova* was gradually pushed out and absorbed, by the end of the eighteenth century, by Church Slavonic. This happened in those genres which had previously been written in Ruthenian, that is, in anthologies comprising didactic articles, lives of saints and other popularizing religious texts.[66] Lučkaj might have been aware of the discrepancy between Church Slavonic and the low cultural and educational level of the local Greek Catholic clergy and *literati*, let alone of the common people. Thus, despite the earlier mentioned 'coincidence' of Carpatho-Rusyn with Church Slavonic, Lučkaj might have been particularly concerned with the problem of audience capability and intelligibility of Church Slavonic, 'vernacularized' as it appears in his grammar. This is why Lučkaj deemed it necessary to couple the publication of the *Grammar* with a preparation of the above-mentioned collection of fifty-seven sermons during his stay in Lucca. Unexpectedly however, in the latter book, Lučkaj demonstrated a somewhat different way of creating a new literary standard. While exalting Slavonic as a sacred tongue and the only possible literary language for the Rusyn people, Lučkaj was also obliged to limit possible application of Rusyn vernacular during the liturgical service, a conceptual formula of the language poli-cies spread throughout the entire Ruthenian lands by post-Tridentine Catholicism.[67]

In the preface to the *Sermons*, Lučkaj sketches out a seemingly new vision of literary Rusyn as compared with that discussed in the *Praefacio* in the GSR. Yet, upon close inspection, the 'new' vision appears deeply anchored in the Ruthenian 'linguistic democratism' dating back to Cyril and Methodius's programmic principles.[68] To begin with, the author takes it for granted that the biblical style is difficult to understand. However, since the vulgar tongue (*jazy̆k prosty̆j*) is not appropriate for lofty concepts of faith and moral, Lučkaj opts for a safer, 'middle path'. Accordingly, he intends to employ what is aptly expressed in Rusyn and what is easily comprehensible from the biblical language. For the Rusyn people do not like too vulgar a language, but

[66] Danylenko, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian', p. 89.

[67] A similar solution of the above conceptual problem was articulated by a famous defender of Ruthenian Orthodoxy against the Reformation and post-Tridentine Catholi-cism, Ivan Vyšensʹkyj. Emblematic in Vyšensʹkyj's beliefs was his staunch opposition to the presence of the vulgar tongue in the liturgy. Yet, what was more important and reminiscent of the position concerning Latin and Slavic vernacular taken by the Roman Church, was his statement on vernacular usage. According to Vyšensʹkyj, after the liturgy the biblical lections must be 'explained and interpreted' in the vulgar tongue, that is, 'poprostu', so that people might understand (Harvey Goldblatt, 'On the Language Beliefs of Ivan Vyšens'kyj and the Counter-Reformation', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 15, 1991, pp. 17–34 [p. 13]).

[68] Cf. Danylenko, 'On the Names of the *prostaja mova*', pp. 115–17.

are pleased by a middle [language]; this is why his intention was to explicate and enlighten in an intelligible manner.[69]

Overall, Lučkaj aimed at creating a new plain language to be utilized beyond liturgical texts for 'comprehensible interpretation and teaching' [of the common people] (see n. 67). According to Rusinko, a standard language created by Lučkaj was artificial at its core, thus provoking totally different reactions of his compatriots.[70] However, despite a wide array of opinions expressed by various scholars,[71] his sermons became favourite reading for the common people.[72] In this respect, it is expedient to determine what exactly may appear 'attractive' in the language of Lučkaj's *Sermons*.

In its phonetics, one encounters confusion of *ě* with *y* [i], *e*, and *ę*, as well as of *y* [i] with *e*, thus reflecting bookish orthographic tradition or local pronunciation, though in some cases obscured by other factors, as in *pěsmě* (loc.) '(Holy) script', *cělkom* 'completely' next to *cyloe* (n. sg.) 'whole'.[73] The Slavonic initial *je*- is sometimes replaced by a vernacular *o*-, e.g.: *jezero* next to *ozero* 'lake', although always in *jedin* 'one' and its derivatives, perhaps under a secondary influence of Sk. *jeden*.[74]

[69] Ѩзык со всѣм простый прото не оупотреблах, ибо на высокïа поатïа Вѣры, и морала недостаточный есть [...]. Стїл же библическïи не легко поразꙋмѣваетса. Средним пꙋтем безопаснѣйше ити, мнѣ видѣлоса. Что порꙋски израдно выражаетса, а что из библическаго легко разꙋмѣетса оупотреблати смыгал есмь са. Сам бо народ рꙋскїй со всѣм простый ѩзык во Церкви не любит, но тѣшитса средним. Мое же намѣренїе было разꙋмѣтелно бесѣдовати, и оучити (CS, 1, Preface).

In the above excerpt and hereafter, I omit stressing marks. In some cases, they were erroneously put by the compositors or Lučkaj himself. Already in his *Grammar* (GSR, p. 138), he admitted that accent in Rusyn dialect is very complicated; the latter could be a sequel to the interference of different dialect stressing patterns (Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', pp. 298–300; see Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 21).

[70] Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 94.

[71] Sabov, *Christomatija*, p. 194, sorted out three components in the language of Lučkaj's *Sermons*: the Church Slavonic, bookish and local Rusyn, all mixed under the influence of Latin-Greek syntax. With its motley language, Lučkaj, according to Sabov, was a devout follower of Kutka's, although he surpassed his teacher. In 1938, Tichý, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka*, p. 40, argued that the *Sermons* were written in Church Slavonic (see P. M. Lyzanec´, 'Mychajlo Lučkaj i joho hramatyka'; HSR, pp. 5–39 [p. 12]), although in 1923 he still believed that the language of the *Sermons* was vernacular with an admixture of Church Slavonic elements (Tichý, 'Michail Lučkaj', p. 220; Horbač, 'Lučkajeva "Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena"', p. 193). Quite in the same vein, Rusynko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 94 (see Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 23), hypothesized that the language of the *Sermons* is a mixture of the Church Slavonic he presented in his *Grammar* and Rusyn dialect which he employed in the poetic supplement. An extreme opposite opinion was expressed by Hadžega, 'Mychayl Lučkaj', p. 58, according to whom, the *Sermons* were compiled in 'a perfect vulgar tongue'. However, Bryk, 'Josyf Dobrovs'kyj', p. 33, argued that Lučkaj's language programme 'triggered fatal consequences' for the development of literature and national movement in Subcarpathian Rus´ and Galicia.

[72] As early as 1834, excerpts from the *Sermons* were published (with a number of typos) by Levyc´kyj, *Grammatik der ruthenischen Sprache*, Appendix, pp. 55–59, as a sample of 'Ruthenian dialect' used in Subcarpathian Rus´ (cf. Tichý, *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka*, pp. 156–57).

[73] CS, 1. pp. 195, 299, 247.

[74] Ibid., 2, pp. 149, 153, 197, 198; 1, p. 144; AUM, 2, maps 55, 55a.

Confusion of the prefixes *o-* and *u-* is observed in Slavonic forms, albeit occasionally this occurs also in vernacular lexemes. Thus, it is likely to reflect actual phonetic changes attested, among other dialects with *ukannja*, in the Bukovyna-Pokuttja, Hucul and Maramureş dialects: *ohostil* (m. sg. pret.) 'treat', *utrava* 'poison' alongside *ukryvdyš* (2 sg. fut.) 'offend', *uženylsja* (m. sg. pret.) 'get married' and so forth.[75] Due to the local distinction of *y* [i] and *ў* [y], parallel forms of the type *mўlosernўmy* (inst. pl.) and *myloserdnўj* (m. sg.) 'merciful' are quite rare.[76]

The intelligibility of the 'new' plain language seems not to be contingent on maintaining etymological sounds in the newly closed syllables as evidenced in *pozor* 'attention'; Pogorelov found only one example of the *u*-reflex of the etymological *o* in the word *stul* 'table'.[77] More remarkable, however, is a parallel use of non-pleophonic (*CRaC*) and pleophonic (*CoRoC*) sequences in accordance with Lučkaj's prescription in the GSR: *vo zlatě, y srebrě* 'in gold and silver' next to *zolota y srebra* (gen.) 'gold and silver', *hlavě* (loc.) next to *holovў* (gen.) 'head'.[78] A similar parallelism is observed in a series of reflexes of the old root-internal sequences *rъ* and *rь*. Thus, alongside new Slavonic *krov´* 'blood' and *krovlęnu* (acc. f.) 'bloody',[79] Lučkaj makes use of all possible Carpathian forms, such as: *kyrvavyt* (3 sg. pres.) 'shed blood' with the *yr*-reflex prevailing in the Lemkian dialects (also *berveno* 'log', *krevavoju* (instr. f.) 'bloody'),[80] possibly under East Slovak influence, next to more regular, northern and eastern Carpathian *krўxtў* 'crumbs', *xrўbet* 'spine' and the like.[81]

Assimilation of voicing in the sequences voiced + voiceless or, in terms of phonemic protensity, mediae + tenues, tends to be consistently rendered on the morphological boundaries; this reflects a

---

[75] CS, 1, pp. 204, 137; 2, pp. 211, 271; Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 17; Ivan Pan´kevyč, *Narys istoriji ukrajins´kych zakarpats´kych hovoriv*, Prague, 1: *Fonetyka* (hereafter, *Narys*), 1958, p. 96.

[76] CS, 2, p. 49.

[77] Ibid., 2, pp. 129, 278; Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 24.

[78] CS, 1, pp. 141, 300, 25; 2, pp. 290, 267; cf. GSR, pp. 15–16, 24. Some non-pleophonic forms were likely to be influenced by Slovak (Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 24; Pan´kevyč, *Narys*, pp. 66–67, 114). This influence is traceable in *cvět, ocvětete* (3 sg. fut.) 'fade' (CS, 2, pp. 85, 62) coupled with *květ* 'blossom' (ibid., 2, p. 6), a parallelism which is attested in contemporary south-west Ukrainian, including some Lemkian and Bojkian dialects, cf. AUM, 2, map 120; Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology*, p. 56.

[79] CS, 2, pp. 236, 74. As in his *Grammar*, Lučkaj often resorts to the epenthetic *l*, which was particularly characteristic of his native dialect (see n. 46), cf. *koplet* (3 sg. pres.) 'dig', *klamleš* (2 sg. pres.) 'offend', *ljublęščię* (acc. pl.) 'loving' and *ožyvęty* 'revive' (ibid., 1, pp. 212; 2, pp. 171, 51, 52). Deserving attention are numerous forms of the lexeme *omočyt´* 'dip' like *omolčavyj* (m. sg. PPP) (ib. 1, 190), *omolčeny* (pl. PPP) (ib. 2, 6) (ibid., 1, p. 190; 2, pp. 2, 6; Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 27).

[80] CS, 1, p. 131; cf. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 24; AUM, 2, maps 69, 70.

[81] Pan´kevyč, *Narys*, 68; CS, 2, pp. 13, 276. Nevertheless, Lučkaj seems to prefer *ry-* over the *yr*-reflex, cf. hyperstic *korablekrўšenie* next to *korablekrušenie* (CS, 1, pp. 332, 34; Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 25).

historical tendency in south-west Ukrainian to develop neutralization
before all obstruents.[82] Despite some fluctuations, the following spell-
ings are quite common in the language of the *Sermons*: *tęško* 'difficult',
tęššij 'more difficult' next to *tęžko* or *vorožky* 'fortune-tellers', *rětko* 'rare-
ly', *nahatcě* 'in [his] mind' next to *hadky* 'thoughts', *nedoětky* 'leftovers',
sosdan (m. sg. PPP) 'create', *ys počatku* 'from the beginning'.[83] Excessive
(affective) voicing, typical generally of the Hucul dialects, is observed
in such derivatives as *zvěrypyvo* 'ferociously', *zvěrypovaty* 'be rife', *hromiy*
'lame'.[84] Spelling of voiced consonants before voiceless ones, especially
if not required by the traditional orthography, is particularly revealing:
bezpokojstvię (gen.) 'restlessness', *vozprięly* (pl. pret.) 'accept'.[85]

Among other phonetic fluctuations in the *Sermons*,[86] one finds
occasional attestations of the second dispalatalization of *r´*.[87] Thus,
alongside *večery* (gen., dat.), *večerju* (acc.), Lučkaj writes *večerў* (gen.)
'supper', *povtoraemoe* (n. sg. PrPP) 'repeat', *postrўhaetsę* 'have one's hair
cut', *červakov* (gen. pl.) 'worm', albeit *vynar´* 'distiller'.[88] For the above
examples, one can tentatively posit the influence of adjacent Slovak on
the Lemkian dialects or even of mixed reflexes of *r´* as found in the
writings extant from the area centered around L´viv and extending
westwards into the Lemkian territories.[89]

[82] Andrii Danylenko, 'From *g* to *h* and again to *g* in Ukrainian. Between the West
European and Byzantine Tradition?' (hereafter, 'From *g* to *h* and again to *g* in Ukrainian'),
Die Welt der Slaven, 50, 2005, 1, pp. 33–56 (pp. 49–51).

[83] CS, 1, pp. 7, 134, 137, 211, 214, 247, 136; 2, pp. 12, 25. A regressive assimilation in
(de)voicing seems to be completely established in the language of Lučkaj. Suffice it to
mention the form *lekše* 'more easy' (ibid., 1, 242) as compared with *lexa* (f.) 'easy' in the
Huklyvyj Chronicle under the year 1798 (Pan´kevyč, *Narys*, pp. 116–17). Presumably, the
language of Myxajlo Grygašij/Hryhaš(ij) (1758–1823), a compiler of this and other entries
in the Huklyvyj chronicle, might have experienced a setback in the case of *h*, devoicing it
before voiceless stops as was the case in East (and North) Ukrainian, characterized by
phonemic protensity (Danylenko, 'From *g* to *h* and again to *g* in Ukrainian', pp. 49–51).

[84] CS, 1, p. 189; 2, pp. 95, 213. Pan´kevyč, *Narys*, p. 119.

[85] CS, 1, pp. 216, 218.

[86] It is worth adding here confusion of the prepositions/prefixes *s″* 'with', *yz″* 'from',
v″z/voz- 'with, to' coalesced in *s*, with *i*- obtaining the optional status, whence *smahatysja,
ysmўhatysja, yzmўhatysja* from *v″z″mahatysja* 'try, compete'; parallel reflexes, *šč* and *č*, of **tj*,
e.g., *kuščy* (pl.) next to *kučy* (gen.) 'house; heap' (CS, 1, pp. 1, 41; 2, p. 160); narrowing of *e*
after palatals as found in *yščy* next to *ešče* 'more' (ibid., 1, p. 214), the alternation of *v*- (<
vъ) : *u*- as found in *vzoru* (dat.) ~ *uzorom* (instr.) 'pattern' (ibid., 2, p. 158; 1, p. 26); dissimila-
tion of *v* ~ *l* as reflected in the (Common Slavic) doublet *osloboden* ~ *osvoboden* (m. sg. PPP)
'liberate' (ibid., 2, pp. 103, 83), as well as other fluctuations in series, e.g., *pomyslenię* (gen.)
'intention' (ibid., 1, p. 64), *skurkamy* (instr.) 'skins' (ibid., p. 142), *dnesnўi* 'today's' (ibid., 2,
p. 173). The preterit *mohol* (m. sg.) 'be able' (ibid., 1, p. 142) seems to be an East Slavic
development (Flier, 'Final Sonorant Clusters'; see n. 48). A similar argumentation applies
to Lemkian *větor* 'wind' (CS, 1, p. 306), despite a secondary influence of Slovak *vietor*, cf.
West Polissian *vitor* ~ *vit'or* (AUM, 2, map 40); one is less sure about *mysel'* 'thought' next
to Slk. *mysel'* (Verchratskyj, *Žandoby*, 1901, p. 33)

[87] Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology*, p. 637.

[88] CS, 1, pp. 118, 138; 2, pp. 78, 146.

[89] Pan´kevyč, *Narys*, p. 112.

Noun morphology demonstrates a mixture of old and new para-digms. To take the masculine declensional type as an example, the singular masculine paradigm employs in the genitive the desinence *-a* or *-u*, derived, according to Lučkaj from the dative, e.g.: *vzoru* ~ *vzora* 'pattern'; the *ĭ*-stem masculines take in the genitive the desinences *-y* and *-e*, e.g.: *puty* ~ *pute* 'way', albeit in the GSR Lučkaj cites correctly Church Slavonic *puty* but *dne*.[90] In the dative, the masculines take pre-dominantly the desinence *-u* (from the *o*-stem) as in *žyvotu* 'life', *robotnuky* 'worker'.[91] Strangely enough, only one *a*-stem masculine adopts the *o*-stem desinence *-ovy*: *korčmarevy* 'innkeeper', although Lučkaj admitted it for Rusyn and, with some reservations, for Slavonic.[92] The latter desinence is not attested in the locative singular where, instead, Lučkaj uses the vernacular desinence *-ě*, supported by the bookish tradition, e.g.: *domě* 'house' next to *vozdusě* 'air', with the velar alternation; the desinence *-u* is not attested with velar stems, albeit *verxu* is cited in the *Grammar*, e.g.: *žyvotu* next to *žyvotě* 'life', *světu* 'light'.[93] In the instrumen-tal, the author distinguishes hard and soft declensions, while occasion-ally confusing some forms, e.g.: *tovaryšem* (instr.) 'friend', *tovarem* (instr.) 'commodity', *sȳnom* (instr.) 'son' next to *žalom, žalem, žal'em* (instr.) 'pity' (ib. 1, 1, 94); cf. also parallel *putem* and *putiem* (instr.) 'way' under the influence of the feminine *ĭ*-stem.[94]

In the nominative plural, the masculines, with sporadically alternat-ing velar stems, take the Slavonic desinence *-y* [i], e.g.: *srodnyky* 'kin', *učenyky* next to *učenycy* 'followers'; vernacular nominative plural in *-ȳ* is attested in *holosȳ* 'voices'.[95] The neuter *uxo* 'ear' is used in free variation in the nominative plural: Lučkaj employs the former dual *ušy*, albeit obviously prefers a new plural (former dual) form *uxa*.[96] In the genitive plural, the masculines take both Church Slavonic and vernacular desi-nences of the type *člen* ~ *členov* (gen.) 'members';[97] such parallel forms are quite numerous, e.g.: *otec* ~ *otcev* (gen.) 'fathers', *hrěx* ~ *hrěxov* (gen.) 'sins',[98] albeit the vernacular ending seems to prevail: *plodov* (gen.) 'fruits', *rokov* (gen.) 'years', *sluhov* (gen.) 'servants' and the like.[99]

Remarkably, in the instrumental plural, Lučkaj uses masculines with predominantly vernacular desinences, especially with *-a-*, e.g.: *ovošč'my*

---

[90] CS, 1, pp. 26, 29, 33; 2, p. 223; GSR, pp. 36, 41.

[91] CS, 1, p. 247; 2, p. 240.

[92] Ibid., 2, 17; GSR, pp. 32–33, 36.

[93] CS, 1, pp. 7, 86, 244; 2, pp. 55, 286; GSR, p. 38.

[94] CS, 1, pp. 1, 70, 94, 153, 250, 213; 2, pp. 187, 194, 253; cf. Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 29.

[95] CS, 1, pp. 1, 5, 28; 2, p. 51; GSR, p. 32.

[96] CS, 1, p. 248; 2, pp. 172, 307, 308 and so on; GSR, p. 48.

[97] CS, 1, p. 256; 2, p. 222.

[98] Ibid., 1, pp. 35, 9; 2, pp. 249, 118; cf. Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 29.

[99] CS, 2, pp. 3, 25, 871.

(instr.) 'fruits' and *praotcamy* (instr.) 'forefathers' next to a rare form *jazỹky* (instr.) 'tongues', *sojuznyky* (instr.) 'allies'.[100] Among the neuters, of interest are instrumentals *očymy*, *očamy* 'eyes' and an old dual *očyma* that occurs more often than not in compliance with the recommendation in the *Grammar*.[101] In accordance with the *Grammar*, Church Slavonic and vernacular desinences again are shared by masculines and neuters in the locative plural, e.g.: *hrěsex* (loc.) 'sins', *hoděx* (loc.) 'years', *dělěx* (loc.) 'matters', *želanyix* (loc.) 'wishes' next to *polkax* (loc.) 'shelves', *hrobax* (loc.) 'coffins' and the like.[102]

Taken as a whole, the above diversity of instrumental and locative endings manifests a slightly more advanced stage in the vernacularizing tendency as compared with the nominal morphology in written Rusyn in the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries.[103]

Verbal morphology also demonstrates variance in different forms. For instance, in the 2 sg. non-past Lučkaj uses both Church Slavonic -*šy* [ši] and vernacular -*š*, e.g.: *želaešy* next to *želaeš* 'wish'.[104] However, the 1 pl. non-past takes sporadically the vernacular ending -*me*, applied likewise to Church Slavonic lexemes: *xoščeme* 'want', *veržeme* 'throw', *lamleme* 'break' as opposed to *yspỹtaem* 'ask';[105] the same holds true of the 1 pl. imperative of the type *davajme* 'let us'.[106] The past is rendered by different tense forms. Lučkaj often resorts to aorists of the type *yspolnyx* (1 sg.) 'accomplish', *pomre* (3 sg.) 'die', *zabludyša* (3 pl.) 'stray'.[107] Yet, as is evidenced from the examples below, the author favours

---

[100] Ibid., 1, p. 283; 2, pp. 25, 13, 130

[101] Ibid., 1, p. 4; 2, pp. 47, 64, 164, 207 an so on; GSR, p. 128.

[102] Ibid., p. 41, cf. Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 276; CS, 1, pp. 78, 146; 2, pp. 169, 164, 226.

[103] Ivan Pan´kevyč, 'Zakarpats´kyj dialektnyj variant ukrajins´koji literaturnoji movy XVII — XVIII vv.', *Slavia*, 27, 1958, pp. 171–81 (pp. 176–77); L. Dežě [Dezsö], 'O jazyke ukrainskogo polemista M. Andrelly i zakarpatskoj "narodnoj literature" XVII v.', *Studia Slavica Hung.* 27, 1981, pp. 19–52 (p. 29); cf. also a younger form *pravam* 'rights' next to *katom* and *mučytelem* 'torturers' (CS, 1, p. 32). One should also keep in mind a similar distribution of old and younger desinences in the instrumental and locative plural as was observed in the native dialect of Lučkaj in the early twentieth century (Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 276). This fact is at odds with Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 32, according to whom, Lučkaj employed different forms in the *Sermons* quite arbitrarily.

[104] CS, 2, p. 99.

[105] Ibid., 1, pp. 3, 32; 2, pp. 152, 214; cf. GSR, p. 111.

[106] CS, 2, p. 69. Lučkaj maintained that the 1 pl. ending -*me* was in fact not vernacular by origin but archaic (GSR, pp. 111–12). Leaning on Dobrovský, *Institutiones*, p. 558, who encountered the 1 pl form *esme* 'be' in the Ostroh Bible, p. 534a (1580–81), Lučkaj advanced a rather conjectural theory in order to explain the use of other 1 pl. desinences. Thus, the old -*e* dropped later in Church Slavonic; the thematic verbs retained -*m*, while the athematic verbs either kept the old desinence or added -*ỹ* (GSR, p. 112). However, the expansion of -*mo* and, dialectally, -*me* might have begun from athematics, while being triggered by a phonetic development, that is, by the coalescence of *i* and *y* in the fifteenth century in the bulk of Ukrainian dialects (Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology*, p. 374; cf. Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', pp. 292–93).

[107] CS, 1, pp. 143, 250, 295.

perfect tense forms, sometimes contaminating various elements and utilizing both bookish and vernacular perfects.

Aside from a bizarre amalgam of the aorist and perfect tense forms, *az esm' sotvoryx* 'I created', accompanied by the personal pronoun *az*,[108] all perfect tense forms in Lučkaj are commonly comprised of the present-tense auxiliary tending to become fixed to participial forms, phonologically not as a suffix, but an enclitic, e.g., *mučylemsę* 'I tormented myself', *čulysme* 'we heard'. These forms are not attested in the *Grammar* but are commonplace in various Transcarpathian dialects.[109] In some cases, the auxiliary is not minimally degrammatized, whence its use as a separate word in such forms as *věrovaly este* (pl.) 'you [have] trusted' and even *sohrěšylyesme* 'we [have] sinned'.[110] In spoken discourse, the perfect tense turns into a true preterit in both Church Slavonic and Rusyn, a process heralded by the demise of the auxiliary and the introduction of a personal pronoun: *ja nemohol* 'I could not', *tŷ mŷslyl* 'you thought', and also *prynesl* '[he] brought', *vpal, y yzdoxl* '[he] fell down and died'.[111] Sporadically, instead of the *l*-preterit of the verb *yty* 'go', Lučkaj makes use of the old past active participle in *-(d)˝* as in *on pryšed* 'he came'.[112] In some cases, this participle reveals residual gerundival predicativity: *javylsę Ioan* [...], *yzšed yz pustŷny hlaholjušče*, literally, 'John showed up, having come from the desert, while speaking'.[113]

The vocabulary of the *Sermons* is particularly heterogeneous. This is not, however, an incoherent hybrid of Church Slavonic, vernacular and loan words, but rather a multilayered lexical system which, depending on the topical focus, tends to highlight different elements.

---

[108] Ibid., 1, p. 133.

[109] Ibid., 1, p. 97; 2, 194; cf. Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, pp. 86–87.

[110] CS, 1, p. 153; 2, p. 200.

[111] Ibid., 1, p. 70; 2, pp. 19, 194, 229; for other examples, see Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 39; cf. GSR, pp. 113, 117. The variety of forms that reflect consecutive stages in the process of the univerbation are all used by Lučkaj as preterits. They seem to manifest two different patterns in the disappearance of the auxiliary as observed in 1) the preterit with the auxiliary fused with the participle as found in today's western Transcarpathian dialects (see Ivan Pan´kevyč, *Ukrajins´ki hovory Pidkarpats´koji Rusy i sumežnych oblastej. Z pryložennjam 5 dijalektolohičnych map*, Prague, 1938, part 1: *Zvučnja i morfolohija*, pp. 313–15), and 2) the inflectional univerbation of participle in *-l* in East Slavic (see Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, pp. 260–61). Lučkaj was likely to favour the latter pattern for his literary standard. This is why he stopped short of introducing a vernacular derivative of the aorist suffix *-ch-* blended with the auxiliary verb in the perfect tense form as found in his native dialect under the influence of East Slovak (Gerovskij, 'Russkij jazyk', p. 290; Verchratskyj, 'Znadoby', 1899, p. 83). Early attestations of such peculiar derivatives as *pryęly echmo* 'we have accepted' are found in the *Ladomyr Gospel* copied in the seventeenth century from a Volhynian text (Ivan Pan´kevyč, Kil´ka zamitok do ostanku aorysta v zakarpats´kych hovorach', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, 141–43, 1925, pp. 1–5 (p. 2).

[112] CS, 1, p. 231; 2, p. 13.

[113] Ibid., 1, p. 270.

In congruence with the Ruthenian baroque tradition observable routinely in earlier Subcarpathian texts,[114] Lučkaj occasionally introduces parallel, vernacular and bookish lexemes, thus tuning in to the meaning of the most murky form: *uboh, y žebrak* 'poor man', *xvorota, bolězn´* 'illness', *ne udobno (ne po dęcě)* 'not convenient', *xot´ (lem, lyš)* 'although', *uedynenie, y samotnost´* 'solitude', *ostatnyj raxunok, ščet* 'account', *obrędy, ustavy* 'customs', *yz kyrnycy ystočnyka* 'from the well', *usta — rot* 'mouth', *děty y čada* 'children'.[115] Sometimes, Lučkaj does not shy away from supplying an overtly lexicographic explanation like *sluku to est´ horbatu* (acc.) 'a humpbacked [woman]'.[116] To take the lexeme *utęmyme* (1 pl. non-pres.) 'understand' as another example, the author glosses it with the help of Latin — *prostonarodnoe vy̆raž<e>nie, utęmyty, observare, reflectere se*; a Latin gloss is also used for another vernacular word — *vynar´ (pincerna vinočerpec)*.[117]

While speaking about theological issues as such intelligibly, Lučkaj makes use of synonyms from different registers and languages. The following doublets and triplets come into consideration: *lěk ~ medycěna ~ lěkarstvo* 'medicine', *xvorota ~ bolězn´ ~ neduh* 'illness', *kyrnyca ~ ystočnyk* 'well', *buręn ~ ternię* 'tall weeds', *stezę ~ put´* 'road', *hadka ~ my̆sl´* 'thought'.[118] Such synonyms are interspersed with borrowings from Latin, Hungarian, and West Slavic: *natura* (Lat.) ~ *pryroda* 'nature', *chosen* (Hg.) ~ *polza* 'benefit', *borběl´* (Hg.) ~ *bradbrej* 'barber', *obmanovaty ~ klamaty* (Slk., Cz.) 'lie'.[119]

Despite Lučkaj's preference for Latin as a scholarly language, there are quite a few Latin forms in the *Sermons* designed primarily for the common people: *machyna* 'machina', *věpery̆* (pl.) 'vipera', *sentencię* 'sententia', *persona* 'person', *polycyja* 'politeness' (?).[120] There is a limited

---

[114] Cf. J. A. Javorskij, *Novye rukopisnye nachodki v oblasti starinnoj karpatorusskoj pis´mennosti XVI–XVIII vekov*, Prague, 1931, pp. 65, 78–80; Andrii Danylenko, 'Polemics without Polemics: Myxajlo Andrella in Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Literary Space', *Studia Slavica Hung.*, 53, 2008, 1.

[115] CS, 1, pp. 142, 214, 39; 2, pp. 25, 66, 105, 74, 27, 205; 1, p. 214.

[116] Ibid., 2, p. 64.

[117] Ibid., 2, p. 200, 83.

[118] Ibid., 2, pp. 66, 77, 105, 241, 171, 80, 166, 3, 9, 195; 1, pp. 306, 136.

[119] Ibid., 2, pp. 254, 255, 25, 130; 1, 39; Jan Gebauer, *Slovník staročesky*, 2 vols, Prague, 1970, 2, pp. 37–38; L. Dežë [Dezsö], 'K voprosu o vengerskich zaimstvovanijach v zakarpatskich pamjatnikach XVI–XVIII vv.', *Studia Slavica Hung.* 7, 1961, pp. 139–76 (pp. 160, 173).

[120] CS, 1, pp. 25, 32; 2, pp. 231, 188. As far as Latin interference is concerned, some syntactic constructions should not be taken at face value, in particular with the *accusativus cum infinitivus* (see Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 42), e.g.: мыслили себе (acc.) быти во совершенной безопасности 'they thought that they were absolutely safe' (CS, 2, p. 123). In addition to the domestic influence, Latin interference in syntax was also channelled at that time through Ruthenian writings extent from the period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Moreover, Lučkaj could hardly disregard Greek patterning as represented in Ruthenian religious texts, in particular the *dativus cum infinitivus*, e.g.: Бог хощет каждому человѣку (dat.) спастиса 'God wants everybody to be saved' (ibid., 1, p. 138), or the

number of Slovak (and Czech) borrowings in the text (see fn. 48). In fact, most of the alleged Slovakisms/Bohemianisms cited by Pogorelov might have been earlier mediated by Polish (also from other languages) and mastered by Lučkaj in conformity with the Ruthenian literary tradition.[121] To take entries under the letter *b* as examples, they are all naturalized lexemes since the sixteenth century, e.g.: *blazenstvo* 'foolishnes', *blyskanę* 'lightning', *brytkyj*, *bўdlęta* (pl.) 'calf', all attested in the dictionaries of Lavrentij Zyzanij (1596), Pamvo Berynda (1627) and Pavlo Bilec´kyj-Nosenko (Pryluky, Černihiv province) (1838–43).[122] Almost all entries under the letter 'v' are also long naturalized or indigenous lexemes, adjusted however to the West Slavic analogous forms such as ESl. *vzor* 'look, appearance' ~ WSl. 'model'.[123] They are the following: *vah* (Gr.) 'libra', *važyty* 'weigh', *vlastnoju ruku* 'in one's own hand',[124] *verxnost´* 'superiority' (attested in the chronicle of Samuil Velyčko of 1720),[125] *vўstupytysę* 'step outside; divorce', *větor* (dial.), *vynajty* 'figure out' (attested in the chronicle of Hryhorij Hrabjanka of 1710).[126] There are but two obvious Slovakisms under this letter: *vўhvarka* 'excuse' and *vўsměvaty* 'mock', cf. Slk. *výhovorka* and *vysmievat'*.[127] A similar distribution is typical of other entries cited by Pogorelov.

---

[120] *Continued*
nominativus cum infinitivus, e.g., видатса плачати очи (nom.) 'the eyes seem to be crying' (ibid., 2, p. 306) (see Andrii Danylenko, *Predykaty, vidminky i diatezy v ukrajins´kij movi: istoryčnyj i typolohičnyj aspekty*, Charkiv, 2003, pp. 256–62). On the other hand, the syntax of the *Sermons* is replete with Ukrainian vernacular constructions, especially the so-called genitive case of 'incomplete objectivization' (Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, pp. 213–14; see n. 54), e.g.: [. . .]слово Божіє, со небесе снишло рода человѣческаго (acc./gen.) наꙋчити правды (gen.) 'The God's word descended to teach the truth to the mankind' (CS, 1, p. 70). Remarkably, such vernacular constructions occur in a more formal, theological discourse, thus demonstrating an embryonic blending of the new, 'common' style. This is why Lučkaj's theological writing is densely saturated with aphoristic sayings like [. . .]ветхшое платіє бꙋдет ваша одежда, и четыри дески вѣчнаа полата 'rags will be your clothes and four planks [will be] your palace' (ibid., 1, p. 253).
[121] Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, pp. 48–52.
[122] Cf. Jevhen Tymčenko, *Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajins´koho jazyka*, Charkiv, Kyiv, 1, 1930 (hereafter, HD), pp. 101, 61, 140, 145, 161. The only Slovakism cited by Pogorelov from the *Sermons* under the letter 'b' is *bytka* 'fight', cf. Slk. *bitka* in Štefan Peciar (ed.), *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, Bratislava, 1968 (hereafter, *Slovník*), 1, p. 47. The latter is attested from the late seventeenth century onward, in particular in the late eighteenth-century *urbar* language (István Udvari, *A Mária Terézia-féle Úrbérrendezés Ruszin nyelvῠ forrásai*, Nyíregyháza, 2005 [= *Studia Ukrainica et Rusinica Nyíregyháziensia*, vol. 6], p. 85).
[123] HD, p. 238; Peciar, *Slovník*, 5, p. 351.
[124] CS, 1, p. 25; 2, p. 278. The latter expression is clearly a Polish cliché. From the mid-seventeenth century onward more and more Ruthenian charters were signed in Polish (*ręką własną*, *renkon własnon*, or *ręką swą*) not only by noblemen but also by Orthodox and Uniate clergy (Antoine Martel, *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes, Ukraine et Russie Blanche 1569–1667*, Lille, 1938 [= *Travaux et mémoires de l'Université de Lille. Droit et lettres*, vol. 20)], p. 255).
[125] CS, 2, p. 296; cf. HD, p. 219.
[126] CS, 1, pp. 63, 77; 2, p. 193; cf. HD, pp. 458, 421; cf. fns 48, 86.
[127] CS, 2, pp. 134, 223; see Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ètjudy*, p. 48; Peciar, *Slovník*, 5, pp. 220, 294.

Mimicking Lomonosov?

Rusinko argued recently that Lučkaj (along with Fogarašij) proposed a theory of styles reminiscent of Lomonosov's high, middle and low styles, inasmuch as Lučkaj himself declared his intention to follow in his *Sermons* a 'middle path' instead of the vulgar language of the commoners.[128] However, our analysis refutes Rusinko's and her predecessors' attempts at placing Lučkaj's language in the Great Russian context only.[129] One can also hardly agree with the alleged conflict in Lučkaj's theory about a pure Slavonic as the only possible Rusyn literary language and his language practice resulting in the creation of a mixed, 'middle' language.[130] To put it bluntly, the only possible conflict in the case of Lučkaj tends to be traced back to the embryonic dissonance between his intuitive ethnic romanticism, which admits the integration of the vernacular language in artistic forms, and his commitment to the traditional distinction of Church Slavonic and the plain language.[131]

What is more important for our case is that, in his language programme, Lučkaj overtly emphasizes the principle of bilingualism which, despite the vernacularizing tendency observable from the late seventeenth to the early eighteenth centuries onward, was traditionally cultivated in the entirety of Ruthenian lands. A lonely defender of this principle in Austria-Hungary, Lučkaj, nevertheless, did not follow the 'Little Russians' along with their disciples among the Galician Ukrainophiles who, while remaining faithful to the idea of bilingualism, aimed at bolstering the vernacular trend in their literary culture. Faced with the rift between the *literati* and the peasantry in Subcarpathain Rus´, Lučkaj tried to recompensate by bringing Church Slavonic in the GSR closer to the common people more practically than theologically. Quite in the spirit of Meletij Smotryc´kyj he also introduced vernacular and, to a lesser extent, bookish elements into his standard since the old *prostaja mova* was long deceased by that time in Galicia and Subcarpathia.

Lučkaj seemed to be cognizant of the missing element in the traditional bilingual system of written Ruthenian. Thus, while rejecting the vernacular language as a basis for the second (parallel) literary

[128] Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 94.

[129] To name just one of them, Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, pp. 54–55 (also Gerovskij 1930, 311), believed that Lučkaj tried in vain to create a separate [Russian] literary language for such a small fraction of the Russian [East Slavic] people; moreover, as compared with the literary standard codified by that time by Karamzin, Žukovskij and Puškin, his undertaking was purportedly beyond his capabilities. In other words, Lučkaj was doomed to fail. Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 304, n. 4, was first to criticize the above 'Great-Russian' approach to Lučkaj's language and his literary output, arguing that his contribution could hardly be reduced to the cultural context of contemporary Great Russian intellectual milieu.

[130] Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 94.

[131] Simovyč, 'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', p. 230.

standard to be used in theological texts like the *Sermons*, Lučkaj under-
took to synthesize the Church Slavonic foundation with a wide array
of regional and non-native elements. Ultimately, he created the new
'middle' plain language that structurally seems to be a continuation of
the 'old' *prostaja mova* in contrast to Church Slavonic in the seventeenth
century.[132] However, while working on the 'new' literary standard,
Lučkaj followed not the model set by Lomonosov in Russia but, rather,
the practice of Archimandrite Hryhorij and brass Mychajlo Vasylevyč
who in the Peresopnycja Gospel (1556–61) made an attempt to combine
Church Slavonic with the *prostaja mova* rather than with the local vulgar
tongue. Among Lučkaj's immediate forerunners, a similar language
attitude is displayed in Ivan Kutka's (1750–1814) *Katyxysis˝ malȳj yly
nauka pravoslavno-chrystianskaę* (1801). With an eye to making its content
understandable to the broad population of Subcarpathian Rus´, Kutka
used as simple a language as he could invent, combining Church
Slavonic with bookish (Ruthenian) and vernacular elements. However,
unlike Lučkaj's much secularized 'middle' language, the language of
Kutka's *Catechism* remained Meletian Slavonic at its core, albeit with a
touch of Great Russian features.

Overall, Lučkaj's linguistic views are anchored in the Ruthenian
principle of bilingualism, Church Slavonic vs. *prostaja mova*, with the
vernacularazing tendency embedded beyond. This is why his linguistic
legacy looks purportedly ambivalent or 'fairly poor' in the cultural
context of contemporary Galicia, Subcarpathia and Bukovyna.[133]
One should bear in mind, however, that in these territories the Greek
Catholic clergy, who became unexpectedly the main custodians of a
separate ethnoreligious Ruthenian regional identity, advanced the idea
of *one* literary language, largely premised on Church Slavonic. As I
pointed out elsewhere, for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,
this was an *anachronistic* solution to the language question in these
lands,[134] whence the identification of *jazȳk˝ russkij* with *jazȳk˝ slavenskij*

---

[132] Cf. Danylenko, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian', pp. 109–11.

[133] Cf. Rusinko, *Straddling Borders*, p. 95; Pogorelov, *Karpatorusskie ėtjudy*, p. 53.

[134] Danylenko, 'The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian', p. 111. According to Simovyč,
'Grammatica Slavo-Ruthena', pp. 230–31, the appearance of Pavlovs´kyj's *Grammar* (see n.
47) in Russian-ruled Ukraine was a 'logic corollary' to the replacement of Meletian Church
Slavonic by Great Russian. In fact, with the principle of bilingualism retained in the
(former) Hetmanate and *Sloboda* Ukraine, the 'Great-Russianization' of Church Slavonic
of the Ukrainian recension brought about a new opposition of Great Russian vs. 'new'
prostaja mova (New Standard Ukrainian). Yet, despite all the differences between the latter
plain language and the 'old' *prostaja mova* of the seventeenth century, the genetic ties
between the two can hardly be denied. George Y. Shevelov, 'Ukrainian', in Alexander
M. Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz (eds), *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and
Development*, New Haven, CT, 1980, pp. 143–60 (p. 153). Unlike Lučkaj's new 'middle' plain
language based largely on Church Slavonic, in the southeastern Ukrainian 'new' *prostaja
mova*, with the advancement of Romanticism in the early nineteenth century, the ratio
of vernacular elements tended to outweigh Slavonic and native bookish elements.

and the emergence of a regional mixed (Slaveno-Rusyn) language, commonly dubbed *jazyčie*.

In conclusion, viewed in the regional context, Lučkaj's language programme appears, in the main, innovative in comparison with a continuum ranging from the vulgar tongue via lofty Slaveno-Rusyn to Great Russian in the works of most Rusyn and Galician national awakeners. Yet, unlike Kotljarevs´kyj and the Kharkiv Romanticists in Russian-ruled Ukraine who developed New Standard Ukrainian ('new' *prostaja mova*) in opposition to Church Slavonic/Great Russian, Lučkaj took 'inside' first steps to secularize Church Slavonic, albeit remaining within the confines of the old literary tradition.