Die Welt der Slaven LIII, 2008, 82-115.

THE FORMATION OF NEW STANDARD UKRAINIAN

From the History of an Undeclared Contest Between Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine in the 18th c.

1. The question of cultural priority: Austro-Hungarian or Russian Ukraine?

The emergence of New Standard Ukrainian (NSU) has long been in the focus of manifold studies, dealing primarily with the alleged break in the literary tradition in the Ukrainianian lands. There are Ukrainian scholars (Ivan Bilodid, Myxajlo Žovtobrjux, Vitalij Rusanivs'kyj, Vitalij Peredrijenko) who, sometimes in conformity with political expediency, have asserted continuity in the development of literary Ukrainian since the Middle Ages. According to them, Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj, who ushered in the new Ukrainian literature in 1798, was a follower of the previous literary tradition rather than a creator of the new standard language (Synjavs'kyj 1928; Shevelov 1966, 14). In contrast to the above scholars, the populist theory posits the demise of the previous literary tradition prior to the formation of NSU (Fedot Žylko, Olexa Horbatsch, Svitlana Jermolenko, and Larysa Masenko).

However, neither of the two groups has ever seriously challenged Russian Ukraine as a cradle of new *belles-lettres*, where NSU was first engendered and subsequently flourished in the works of the Xarkiv Romanticists (cf. Moser 2004a). This fact is remarkable from an historical perspective, inasmuch as all literary varieties of Middle Ukrainian are purported to have died out in Austro-Hungarian Ukraine, despite the enlightened policies of Maria Theresa and Joseph II (Fellerer 2005, 11f., 84-88), and in Russian Ukraine, where Russian was introduced into all spheres of public life after a series of administrative reforms by Catherine II in the 1760s-1780s. The only way out of this situation, as Masenko (1995, 44) pointed out, was to formulate NSU on the vernacular, choosing Southeast Ukrainian as the most fitting (homogeneous) dialect foundation for this language. In other words, prior to Tsar Alexander II's decree (1876) which prohibited the printing of all texts except for *belles-lettres* and historical records, Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna could participate in the development of NSU only indirectly (Shevelov 1966, 18, 25-36). The problem lay in outdated, pre-romanticist literary traditions combined with the booming of 'jazyčije' (Ukr. *язичіє*) cultivated in these lands, with numerous and differentiated dialects.

One of the first dissenting voices belongs to Strumins'kyj (1984) who advanced another opinion, premised on the populist thesis about Galicia as "a Ukrainian Piedmont", especially vis-à-vis the constitutional rights of

Austrian-ruled Ukrainians guaranteed by the rather liberal constitution of 21 December 1867 (Moser 2004a, 126). According to Strumins'kyj (1984, 44f.), who emphasized an overall socio-linguistic degradation in both eastern and western Ukraine in the 18th c., the Ukrainian language should rather have been centered in Galicia in the 19th c., with at least partial support from the Uniate Church and the Austrian government; it was developed instead in Russian Ukraine, where it received no support from the Church or Imperial state. Strumins'kyj (ib.) argued that a Galician basis would have ensured for modern Ukrainian a better link with its Slavonic and Ruthenian past, inasmuch as in Galicia this past was not erased by decrees of the Moscow Patriarchs, Peter I, or the Holy Synod. He concluded that modern literary Ukrainian had started "in the wrong time and place"; this is why "the consequences of failures and missed opportunities are still felt today, especially east of the Zbruch river" (ib.).

The above reasoning seems too impressionistic. First, it is not clear why NSU emerged in the most socio-linguistically endangered region, to wit, in Russian-ruled Ukraine – i.e., the former Hetmanate and 'Sloboda' Ukraine, which had been fully integrated into the Russian Empire from 1764, the year of the forced resignation of the last Hetman Kyrylo Rozumovs'kyj, until 1782, when Catherine II began to introduce provincial reforms in the Hetmanate. Second, how did this unofficial language, in Strumins'kyj's words, "for private enthusiasts", without any support from the government, survive in Russian-ruled Ukraine despite draconic language regulations, especially those of 1876-1881? Nor was it absorbed by the language officially cultivated in Galicia in the late 19th-early 20th c.

Some arguments offered by Moser (2004a) with an eye to revising an outdated concept of 'jazyčije' in Ukrainian linguistics appear no less debatable (see Fellerer 2005, 11, 83). Rightly criticizing the lopsided assessment of the place of Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna in the history of Ukrainian literary culture, Moser (2004a, 126) argues that the non-fictional genres developed in these lands might serve as models of literary standardization, brought about by the multifunctionalism of Galician Ruthenian ('prostaja mova') as compared with Ukrainian in the Hetmanate. According to Moser, the retention of Ruthenian, albeit with a disproportionate number of Church Slavonicisms, in catechisms and homiletic works even after 1848-1849, strengthened the hereditary ties of a wide range of very popular and commonly read texts to an earlier period in the history of Ukrainian culture (ib., 142f.). Accordingly, some texts, compiled in the so-called 'jazyčije', encompassing variegated linguistic material, should be treated as a serious contribution to the formation of the new literary language based on the vernacular. Moser doubts whether one could expect the Galician Ukrainians to begin all at once writing scholarly

articles, ecclesiastical documents, and secular non-fictional texts, all in the pure standard vernacular (ib.).

Moser (2004a, 123) is right to question the modern, simplified interpretation of 'jazyčije' as referring indiscriminately to all Galician literary works not written in the vernacular in the 18th c. (Ohijenko 1950, 202), all varieties of Ruthenian used before 1848-1849, except for the language of the 'Rusian Triad', and the language practice of the West Ukrainian Russophiles in the first third of the 20th c. (Fellerer 2005, 248f.)[1]. Yet Moser's outline of the language standards used in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna in the 18th and even more, in the 19th c. supplies no convincing answer to the question of why those speakers did not adopt NSU created by 'private enthusiasts' in the lands which were less expected to develop a full-fledged literary language. This may be elucidated by certain vicissitudes in the socio-political life of Russian and Polish Ukraine, especially after Galicia and Transcarpathia were absorbed within the Austro-Hungarian state.

When studying the above problems, one should approach relevant linguistic material systematically, *bi-regionally*, to wit, tracing socio-linguistic patterns that emerged in the Ruthenian lands in the 16th-, 17th-, and early 18th-century Ukraine on both banks of the Dnieper. This will allow us to cardinally revise the conclusions drawn by Strumins'kyj and Moser. Among other theses, I venture to prove that, under socio-cultural conditions in the Hetmanate and 'Sloboda' Ukraine, NSU *did* emerge in the

[1] Unlike the theories of 'jazyčije' usually termed a mixture of Church Slavonic with a plethora of Russian, old bookish (Ruthenian), and West Ukrainian dialect elements (cf. Muromceva 2000), there is a comprehensive classification offered by Žovtobrjux (1963, 156) who proposed to distinguish between two types (developmental rounds) of 'jazyčije'. The 'bookish jazyčije', used in the 18th to the early 19th c., was in fact a conglomerate of Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension and Ruthenian ('prostaja mova') with many borrowings, while the 'new jazyčije' is a variety of Russian ('Russoruthenisch') with a number of Ruthenian elements, depending on the age, education, and experience of the speaker (Moser 2004a, 124). A new approach, in terms of "postcolonial theory and modern linguistics", is found in Rusinko (2003, 234-239). Trying to reconceptualize the Transcarpathian literature written in 'jazyčije', she argues that this type of language, as motley and awkward as it was, kept alive cultural specificity and served as a defense against denationalization. Speaking about grammatical errors found in abundance in the "Subcarpathian recension of Russian", Rusinko (ib., 237) maintains that for the Rusyns, whose adoption in the 19th c. of Russian was a subversive manoeuvre against Magyar culture, any abrogation or appropriation of Russian was unintended. However, this look at the 'jazyčije' is less likely to be useful in a linguistic study. Providing a socio-cultural background with a help of post-colonial terminological apparatus, the author fails to place this specific socio-linguistic phenomenon in the *all*-Ukrainian language context and explain the reason behind the pejorative assessment of this macaronic jargon in Right- and, especially, Left-Bank Ukraine. It is not either clear from Rusinko's interpretation why a similar, regional "recension of Russian" did not emerge in Dnieper Ukraine in the 18th c. or later.

right time and place. In other words, I believe that NSU could hardly be centered in Galicia which, with its slightly modernized socio-linguistic patterns in the Baroque spirit, was less likely to ensure for modern Ukrainian a natural link with its past.

2. The socio-linguistic situation in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna

2. 1. Concocting 'narodnŷj cerkovno-russkij jazŷk'"[2]

In the late 17th-early 18th c., both Polish and Russian Ukraine inherited from the previous period a well-defined pattern of bilingualism, i.e., Church Slavonic of the Meletian version vs. 'prostaja mova' (Ruthenian) (Danylenko 2006a); a similar bilingualism was traceable in Transcarpathia (Rusinko 2003, 91-98). However, deviations from the ideal dichotomy were inevitable under changing conditions in different parts of the Ukrainian lands – in Galicia along with Transcarpathia (after the first partition of Poland in 1772), and the Hetmanate state along with 'Sloboda' Ukraine, located on Muscovite territory but colonized by Ukrainian Cossacks in the 17th c. Yet, despite some similarities, the socio-linguistic degradation of the 'prostaja mova' and Meletian Church Slavonic in both parts of Ukraine was provoked by different socio-cultural and political circumstances.

The deplorable situation of the Orthodox Ukrainian Church and the level of education in the Ruthenian lands in the 17th c. (Franko 1891, 285f.) made Galicia and Transcarpathia vulnerable to assimilationist pressure from the dominant Roman Catholic culture. The Union with Rome, occurring in 1646 in Transcarpathia and in 1697-1700 in L'viv, could hardly have brought about immediate changes into the socio-cultural situation of Right-Bank Ukraine. To raise the educational level in 1775 a Royal Greek Catholic general seminary was established at the Church of St. Barbara in Vienna. At this institution, known as the Barbaraeum, eleven of the forty-six places were reserved for seminarians from the eparchy of Mukačeve (Rus. Mukačevo) (Rusinko 2003, 65). In place of the Barbaraeum, disbanded in 1784, and the Greek Catholic seminary in L'viv (1783), a new institution of higher education, the Studium Ruthenum (1787-1809), was established at L'viv University at the behest of Emperor Joseph II, in order to prepare the Uniate clergy for the philosophical and theological departments, whose scholarly level was far from satisfactory (Fellerer 2005, 87f.). As in the primary schools, the language of instruction, according to the Austrian officials, had to be Ruthenian (Ruthe-

[2] Throughout the paper I use the linguistic system of transliteration as recommended by the American Committee of Slavists. Note that the front (ѣ) and back (ъ) jers are rendered only for the Middle Period by one or two prime acutes (', '') correspondingly; for this period only, *ў* stands for the *jery* (ы) (Shevelov 1979, 21).

nisch) which, in 1786, was declared "Landes-, Volks- und Nationalsprache" (Ohonovs'kyj 1889, 100; Franko 1891, 284f.), although they were not clear as to which 'Ruthenisch' they meant (Magocsi 1984, 53; Fellerer 2005, 87).

Apparently, the local intellectuals were faced with the same problem. In 1851, Ivan Harasevyč, an eyewitness to the events of this period, offered a triple definition of the language of instruction in the Studium Ruthenum – *narodnyj cerkovno-russkij jazyk"* 'vernacular Church-Rusian language', *russkij jazyk"* 'Rusian language' (Ruthenian), and *rodnoj jazyk"* 'mother tongue' (Levyc'kyj 1902, 118). Closer to an understanding of the real nature of this language was Ohonovs'kyj (1889, 12, 50-58), according to whom the Galician professors, including Petro Lodij, Andrij Pavlovyč, Myxajlo Harasevyč and others, began teaching "in the extinct Church Slavonic language" (*v" mertvôm" cerkovno-slavjan'skôm" jazycě*) (Franko 1891, 284f.). Church Slavonic as the language of instruction, with "involuntary Ukrainianisms and Polonisms" as well as Russianisms (Moser 2004b, 318)[3], appeared to be less than suitable for this purpose[4]. This is why the

[3] According to Moser (ib.), the textbooks prepared (translated from Latin) by Petro Lodij and Theodor Zaxarijasijevyč (Ohonovs'kyj 1889, 51-54), were written in "late Church Slavonic of the East Slavic recension", although he maintains that, to take Lodij's text as an example, this language contained "some elements of contemporary literary Russian". The above definition of the language appears somewhat vague. In this respect, Szőke (2002) outlines a more dynamic picture of Church Slavonic as used in Galicia and Transcarpathia throughout the 18th c. I agree with him that, during this period, Church Slavonic in these lands underwent a switch from Ukrainian (Meletian) recension to the Russian. In other words, the language of Lodij could hardly reflect the pre-Meletian (all-East Slavic) stage. To ascertain the Russian recension of Church Slavonic used in the Studium Ruthenum, one should account not so much for the statistics as for the general tendency realized, however, in particular cases to different degrees. Remarkably, Moser (2004b, 318) admits that Lodij and Zaxarijasijevyč intended to compile their textbooks in "the lofty style of literary Russian of the mid-18th c.", to wit, in Church Slavonic of the Russian recension.

[4] The professors and students of the Studium Ruthenum would have made much progress, had they resorted to the vernacular as found in the first secular books, "Polětyka svěckaę" and "Knyžycę dlę hospodarstva", published by the Basilian press in Počajiv in 1770 (L'viv, 1790, 2nd ed., as a supplement to a primer) and 1788 respectively for the Uniate parochial schools. Recommended in the preface for a practice exercise in reading, "Knyžycę" (along with the smaller "Polětyka") did not fit well into the general conception of the literary language as envisaged by the Uniate Church at that time. First, based on East Polissian, "Knyžycę's" language looked native primarily to the speakers of the local dialects in the Kyjiv and Braclav regions, Volhyn', and Podolja, while the West Volhynian basis of the language of "Polětyka" looked "more native" to the Volhynians. Second, the Uniate clergy seemed to have concern for national interests, including the *dignitas* of the literary standard, only through the prism of the catholic tenets. An overall degradation of the educational and cultural level in Austro-Hungarian Ukraine can also explain why the Uniates failed to publish a printed Bible in the vernacular which could have served as a model for the national standard language (Strumins'kyj 1984, 34). Remarkably, despite the drastic language legislation in the Russian Empire as compared

professsors, sometimes instigated by their students who were, in general, poorly prepared for University studies, often resorted to straight Polish (Ohonovs'kyj 1889, 53; Strumins'kyj 1984, 36). Thus, the Studium Ruthenum became a total failure from the standpoint of national revival and the normalization of the local literary language(s) in Polish and Hungarian Ukraine, especially as compared with the clear-cut dichotomy of the 'prostaja mova' vs. Meletain Church Slavonic obtaining in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Unlike the Ukrainians in the Hetmanate state, the Ruthenians abandoned the linguistic achievements of the previous period, thus eliminating any chance to create a new standard language on the basis of the vernacular (Ohonovs'kyj 1889, 53). That was one of many missed opportunities which could hardly be rectified by the activities of Varlaam Šeptyc'kyj in L'viv and Andrij Bačyns'kyj (Bacsinszky) in Mukačeve (Muncács) and Užhorod (Ungvár) who, after the disbandment of the Barbaraeum, resisted efforts to close the Užhorod seminary and opposed a government order that Rusyns from Transcarpathia were to attend the Hungarian seminary at Eger (Rusinko 2003, 68).

In Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna, neglected by the Habsburg administration until the enthronement of Joseph II (Ohonovs'kyj 1889, 116-122), there were no such cultural institutions as the ancient L'viv Fraternity, Kyjiv Cave monastery, Kyjiv Fraternal College (Academy since 1701), or even the contemporary Xarkiv College, founded in 1726 at the behest of Epifanij Tixorskij, bishop of Belgorod, himself a graduate of the Kyjiv Academy, an institution open to students of all social strata (Lebedev 1885, 7f.).

2.2. Regionalizing Ruthenian

The year 1720 heralded radical changes in the status of Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension in both parts of Ukraine. In Russian-ruled Ukraine, on the occasion of the publication of the "Menologion" by the Kyjiv Cave Monastery press in 1718 (Titov 1924b, 517), Peter I signed an *ukaz* forbidding the Kyjiv and Černihiv presses to print anything but the canonic church books (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 5-8)[5]. The Metropolitan-

with the Austro-Hungarian state, the first complete translation of the New Testament into Ruthenian was prepared in Russian-ruled Ukraine by Pylyp Moračevs'kyj in 1860-1862. Only because of the Valuev Circular of 1863, the translation, acclaimed by Aleksandr Vostokov and Izmail Sreznevskij, was published only in the early 20th c. (Nimčuk 2005, 26-30).

[5] This book – МИNОΛОГІѺN ТѠN АNѠNУМѠN АКОΛОУѲІѠN сієсть М(ѣсѧ)цословъ общаго послѣдованїѧ – was one of the last to be published by the Kyjiv Cave Monastery press before it burnt down in the fire of 1718; fortuitously, this book played a fateful role in the history of the book printing in Russian Ukraine (Titov 1924b, 517f.).

ate could not tolerate the mention of the Kyjiv Cave Monastery on the title page as the stavropegial monastery of the Patriarchate of Constantinople:

> Ставропигїи с(вѧ)тѣйшаго Вселе(н)скаго Ко(н)ста(н)тїнопо(л)ска Патрїархи (Titov 1924b, 517).

In the same year 1720, a Uniate Synod was convened in Zamostja (Pol. Zamościa) with en eye to strengthening the ties of the Uniate Church with Rome. As Afanasij Šeptyc'kyj (1686-1746), bishop of L'viv, wrote in his epistle, this particularly applied to correcting "Slavonic books, in case some deviations and conflicts are found [in them]", which appeared at odds with the Catholic doctrine (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 60f.). In obedience to the decisions of the Zamostja Synod, in 1722 a corrected catechism, "Sobranye prypadkov" kratkoe y duxovnўm" osobam" potrebnoe", was published in the Basilian monastery of Suprasl' (Voznjak 1924, 103), exacerbating the division of Rus' into Orthodox and Catholic sections since the late 16th c. (Plokhy 2001, 148f.). The text of "Sobranie prypadkov"" was compiled in three languages: Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension, the 'prostaja mova' with a plethora of Polonisms, and Polish (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 60)[6]. This book was accompanied by the "Leksikon" syrěč slovesnyk" slavenskij", where explanations of obscure Slavonic words were provided in Polish, unlike Pamvo Berynda's "Leksikon" slavenorosskij y ymen" tl"kovanie" (1627) where the definitions were written in the 'prostaja mova'. The "Leksikon"" was purportedly conceived and co-authored by Metropolitan Leon (Luka) Kiška (1668-1728), one of the active participants of the Uniate Synod of 1720, who was aware of the deplorable state of Church Slavonic among the Greek Catholic clergy (Labyncev-Ščavinskaja 2003, 259f.):

> Съ неисчетною болестїю, и ꙗзвою оутробы неоудобъ исцѣлною; изѡбрѣли Искусителїе, или Ексаминаторове, поставлѧемыхъ въ Іерейство Людей, ꙗко сотный Іерей, едва Славенскїй разумѣетъ ꙗзыкъ, невѣдай что чтетъ, въ Б(о)жестве(н)ной Службѣ съ погибелїею своеѧ, и порученныхъ Паствѣ его (Leksikon",41).

The Polish-language explanation in the "Leksikon"", which was still popular among the lower clergy and the Uniate believers in the 19th c., is quite revealing[7]. Unlike the Hetmanate, where the fate of the vernacular

[6] Leaving aside for the moment the problem of the delimitation of Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian texts as discussed by Belarusian scholars, it is worth citing here Žuraŭski (1967, 356) who believed that "Sobranie prypadkov"" had been the last book to be written (in part) in Middle Belarusian, to wit, the 'prostaja mova' (see Danylenko 2006a, 80-85).

[7] This vocabulary, purportedly modeled on the Slavonic part of Berynda's dictionary, was reprinted by the Basilian press in Počajiv in 1751 as an addendum to the collection, "Bohoslovia nravoučitelnaę", and also in 1756, although it was dropped in later four editions prepared in Počajiv and two in L'viv; the vocabulary, however, appeared as a

and chancellery language seems to be stable until the death of Hetman Danylo Apostol in 1734 and beyond, in Galicia Polish was a language of everyday oral and written communication not only of the Uniate clergy but also of the townspeople, including the Ruthenians (cf. Fellerer 2005, 11-18).

The 'prostaja mova' was gradually ousted and even absorbed by Church Slavonic in those genres which had usually been written in Ruthenian in the previous period, e.g., in anthologies comprising didactic articles, lives of saints and other popularizing religious texts. Thus, a didactic collection, "Besědỹ paroxialnię" […] of 1789, published in Church Slavonic (*slavensko-ruskij jazỹk´*) in Počajiv, was originally a translation from Polish, a fact which made the publisher justify in his preface the choice of Slavonic instead of the 'prostaja mova' (Voznjak 1924, 104). There are other collections of sermons compiled in the local variety of the literary language ('jazyčije') with a strong admixture of Polish (Žitec-kij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 60-62; Nimčuk 2005, 24f.), as attested as early as in the "Katexysys" dlja nauky Uhroruskim" ljudem'" of Joseph De Camelis, published in 1698 in Trnava[8]. Of still greater interest is a Ruthenian translation (1794) of the above collection of parochial sermons, "Nauky paroxialnię". Originally translated from Italian into Polish and then Church Slavonic, these sermons were written in the "prostỹj, i pospolitỹj jazỹk" Ruskij", i.e., 'common and vernacular Ruthenian language' (Voz-njak 1924, 104; Nimčuk 2005, 25). However, this common language could hardly be juxtaposed with the literary standard of the 'prostaja mova' as cultivated in the mid-17th c. at the Kyjiv College by Lazar Baranovyč, Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj, and especially Ioanykij Galjatovs'kyj (Rusanivs'kyj 2001, 119-123). Chronologically, the language of "Nauky paroxialnię" is reminiscent of Ruthenian as used in the late 16th-early 17th c. with a lot of Polonisms, in particular in the syntax and lexicon

separate book in Počajiv in 1804 (Kalužnjackij 1886), and has been used even in the 20th c. in those Orthodox communities which use Polish as a main means of communication (Labyncev–Ščavinskaja 2003, 264f.). All in all, the "Leksikon'" was so designed as to meet the needs of speakers with a low competence of Church Slavonic.

[8] The "Catechism" originally was written in Latin by Joseph De Camelis (1641-1706), the first Greek Catholic Bishop of Mukačeve, who, a Greek by origin, was educated in Rome and unfamiliar with the local language. The Latin text was translated into Church Slavonic by a Galician monk, Ivan Kornyc'kyj, which may speak about the level of knowledge of this language in Galicia at that time. The language of the translation is a mix of Ruthenian, to wit, Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension, and Polish. There are so many Polonisms in the text that one wonders whether this is the Ruthenian language at all inasmuch as the Polish terms are substituted for the corresponding Orthodox Church terms, e.g., *sakrament* in place of ESl. *tajnstvo* or *tajna* 'secret,' *prỹkazỹnja* instead of ESl. *zapovědy* 'comandments'; among other obvious Polish borrowings, one can mention *vedluh"* 'according', *zvlašča* 'in particular', *protyvko* 'against', and the like (Gerov-skij 1934, 490).

(Danylenko 2006a). Indeed, in the text of the Ruthenian preface, in contrast to its Church Slavonic 'Vorlage' (Voznjak 1924, 104f.), there are many Polonisms interspersed with Church Slavonicisms, e.g., *vedluh″* 'according to' (Tymčenko, 202), *ažebŷ* 'in order to' (ib., 9) *v″ povšexnosty* 'in general', *al'bo* 'or' (ib., 20) next to *svjataho* (gen.) 'holy', *v″ hlavě* (loc.) '(in the) chapter'. According to Peredrijenko (1979, 54), the language of this collection, as well as of "Sěmę slova božię" (1772), also published in Počajiv, is very close to the local vernacular found in manuscript sermons and various miscellanea, in particular those authored by the priests Ihnatij (1666) and Tesljovciv (17th c.) in Transcarpathia, and by Illja Jaremec'kyj-Bilaxevyč in Bukovyna (18th c.):

> А(х) мнѣ, бѣдной, тепе(р) зоря моя ясная за(и)шла о(т) мене! Где (ж) я сына своего коханаго зна(и)ду, о(т) якихъ сторонъ сподѣватися буду? (Bukovyna, 1747–1775) (Peredrijenko 1979, 53).

The mixed language of "Nauky paroxialnię" looks anachronistic from the standpoint not only of its structure and (loan) elements, but its socio-linguistic status and dialect foundations. The translator, Julian Dobrylovs'kyj, is not sure whether "words and means of their expression" as used in the common vernacular in the Ruthenian lands of Poland can be understandable to the speakers of local dialects in Volhyn', Podolja, [Dnieper] Ukraine, Polissja (Strumins'kyj 1984, 33, 38):

> въ русской сей простой въ Полщы звычайной и посполитой бесѣдѣ, слова и способи ихъ вираженіа суть рожніи и не всѣмъ єднаковіи: на Волыню иншіи, на Подолю и на Оукраинѣ иншіи, въ Полѣсю иншіи, ведлугъ своєгѡ звычаю маютъ люде якобы свойственный свой ꙗзыкъ и иншій способъ бесѣды и словъ вираженіа (Peredrijenko 1979, 61; Voznjak 1924, 105).

Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] (1900, 62f.), who was skeptical of any cultural progress in Polish and Hungarian Ukraine from the late 17th c. onward, treated the translator's appeal to use the common language as outdated, even alien to the spirit of Orthodoxy in the 16th-17th c. Putting aside confessional arguments, important though they may be in the socio-cultural life of the Ruthenians after the Union of Brest in 1596, it is obvious that the translator considers Ruthenian as a regional language unfamiliar to the bulk of Ukrainians. His attitude toward the vernacular is quite practical, not least aimed at the revival of the previous standard of the 'prostaja mova' used by the Orthodox nobility in their struggle against Catholicism and the schism which confronted both Ruthenian churches from 1596 onward[9].

[9] That was typical of the Uniate nobility who drew a clear distinction between its Ruthenian origin and its denominational allegiance. Unlike the Orthodox believers who emphasized its ethnoreligious ties with the entire Ruthenian nation, the Uniate nobility rather represented that part of the Polish-Lithuanian nobiliary political nation that was conscious of its Ruthenian origin (Plokhy 2001, 150f.). In other terms, confessionali-

Interestingly, a similar attitude toward the language was espoused by the most vocal opponent of De Camelis, the Orthodox priest Myxail Andrella of Rosvyhove (1637-1710), who produced a voluminous anti-Uniate polemical literature. He also applied, in particular in his "Obrona věrnomu každomu čl(o)v(ě)ku" (1697-1701), a "macaronic discourse" that mixed Church Slavonic with numerous vernacular forms, and with Russian, Hungarian, Greek, Latin, and Polish borrowings (Rusinko 2003, 45f., 47; Dežë[Dezső] 1981). His was a unique linguistic hybridization, inspired by his stance against the Greek Catholic Church – "The Uniates sin much, since you pray to the devil" (Petrov 1921, 290). The hyperbolic style of Andrella reflects linguistic and cultural tendencies shared by both the Uniate nobility and their Orthodox opponents in Hungarian and Polish Ukraine:

> Mïchaél Rahoza бысть uniatem, бо былъ лакомца и блазнемъ римскимъ, не знал истинную // святыхъ едну христіянскую вѣру, отъ Христа посѣянную пшеницю. […] Сей чловекъ, сосудъ вражій, чрътувъ, Петръ Петровичъ megszakat belü, то есть, слѣпый и килы носящъ между голенома своима, из села, названого Секуль. Знаю его, // я его, бомъ я былъ въ дому егожъ (Petrov 1921, 291).

"Katyxysis" malўj yly nauka pravoslavno-xrystianskaę" (1801), written by Ioann (Ivan) Kutka (1750-1814), a professor at the Mukačeve theological school, differs in its more polished realization and literary *gusto*, but displays a similar attitude to the 'prostaja mova'. With an eye to making its content understandable to the broad population of this region, Kutka used as simple a language as he could invent, combining Church Slavonic with bookish (Ruthenian) and vernacular elements, somewhat loosely identified by Rusinko (2003, 9, 93) as "a modified Slaveno-Rusyn", to wit, Church Slavonic of the Subcarpathian recension (see Magocsi 1984, 68f.). Kutka did not sharply differentiate between Church Slavonic, which by the end of the 18th c. had undergone a recension-switch from Ukrainian to Russian[10], and the local vernacular (Udvari 1997a)[11]:

---

zation of the religious denominations was likely to bring about different treatments of the *prostaja mova* and its foundations in the future.

[10] Aside from the first Transcarpathian primer prepared by De Camelis (1699), this switch seems to have begun in the time of the publication of the Greek Catholic primer of bishop Myxail Ol'šavs'kyj (Manuel Olsavszky) in 1746. At any rate, it is fully reflected in the primer of bishop Ivan Bradač (János Bradács) (1770). The dominance of the Russian recension in this text became obvious and Ukrainian features, so characteristic of earlier books, are hardly discernable at all (Szőke 2002, 204). Little wonder that such a drastic change as found in this primer made the Greek Catholic authorities to ban it from further printing and circulating in the schools.

[11] Kutka's "Catechism" has been very popular. It was published 11 times, its last edition appearing in 1931 (Udvari 1997a, 186). According to Rusinko (2003, 93), the people became comfortable with Kutka's language over the course of the 19th c. and identified it as a native literary standard. However, the fact that Church Slavonic still holds its positions in Transcarpathia is anachronistic, inasmuch as in all Slavia Orthodoxa, in partic-

> В. Есть ли хвалителноє, и пожиточное дѣло въ нашомъ набоженствѣ своимъ матернымъ ѧзыкомъ службу Б/о/жую слухати?
> О. Такъ єсть: воистинну хвалителное, и пожиточное дѣло:
> Бо въ нашомъ набоженствѣ не токмо слухати, и видѣти, але и разумѣти возможно службу Б/о/жую, котра дѣлѧ народа ѡ/т/правлѧетсѧ (Kutka, 107).

The majority of the old bookish elements seem to have made their way into the "Catechism" of Kutka from the works of the bishops Bizáncij and, even more, De Camelis (Udvari 1997b, 108) who published a primer (1699) and "Catechism" (1698), to instruct his flock in the ideological precepts of the Greek Catholic Church, both written "in the common tongue according to the comprehension of the people" (*dialektom" vedluh" ponjatja narodu*) (Magosci 1984, 68, see fn. 5). As in the works of his predecessors, the bulk of Polish borrowings in the "Catechism" of Kutka date to the (Early) Middle Ukrainian period and are attested in other works extant from Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine of that time, e.g., *nedbalost'* 'carelessness' (Kutka, 18; see Tymčenko-M, 2, 481) next to MPol. *niedbałość* 'neglegentia' (StPol., 5: 170); *zazdrosť* 'envy' (Kutka, 41, 42, 156; see Tymčenko-M, 1, 269) next to MPol. *zazdrość*, *zazrość* 'inridia' (StPol., 11, 248); *cnota* 'virtue' (Kutka, 67; Tymčenko-M, 2, 471) next to MPol. *cnota* 'morum honestas' (StPol., 1, 315); *nabožen̆stvo* 'church service; religion' (Kutka, 13; Tymčenko-M, 1, 447) next to MPol. *nabożeństwo* 'pietas' (StPol., 5, 17); *zbyťočnaja* (f.) 'excessive' (Kutka, 162; Tymčenko-M, 1, 303) next to MPol. *zbyteczny* 'reliquus' (StPol., 11, 281); *okrutniy* (pl.) 'cruel' (Kutka, 174; Tymčenko-M, 2, 40) next to MPol. *okrutny* 'crudelis' (StPol., 5, 565), and many others. Regarding some of the Polonisms, it is difficult to say whether they are old borrowings in the 'prostaja mova' or contemporary dialectisms, e.g., *barzo* 'fast' (Kutka, 10, 16), *všťtko* 'all; everything' (ib., 14), *usylovatysja* 'try' (ib., 80), and others (Udvari 1997a, 188).

There are several local dialect traits in the "Catechism". In the morphology, one can mention dative singular masculines of the type *mužovy* (dat.) 'man' (Kutka, 148), Lemkian *pro* 'for' and *dělę* 'for', used in questions and answers correspondingly. In the phonology, of interest are the umlaut *e* > *'a* in the post-*jers*-fall *j*-clusters like *sluxanja* 'listening' (ib., 104) and others next to Slavonic forms of the type *soyzvolenie* 'permission', *blahoslavenie* 'blessing' (ib., 150), and the change *e* > *o* after postdentals, which is of relatively late provenance in this region (Shevelov 1979, 154), e.g., *prišol"* (m. sg. pret.) 'come' (Kutka, 35) or *(diecesiy) munkačovskię* (gen. sg. f.) '(of) the Munkács (Mukačeve) Eparchy' in the title of the "Catechism" (ib., 1; Udvari 1997a, 187).

Still more arresting are the Church Slavonic foundations of the text, with many features pertaining to the Russian recension. In addition to the

---

ular within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Church Slavonic has been losing its multifunctionalism, thus becoming limited to the church use (Szőke 2002, 204).

genitive singular ending *-aho/-jaho* in adjectives, e.g., *Raę zemnaho* 'earthly paradise' (Kutka, 35), deserving attention are the genitive singular feminine ending *-ija/-yja*, e.g., *pohybely věčnyę* (gen.) 'eternal death' (ib., 35), the accusative plural masculine ending *-yja*, e.g., *dobryję učynkŷ* (acc.) *čynyty* 'make good deeds' (ib., 168), the nominative-accusative plural feminine ending *-ija/-yja*, e.g., *tělesnyję bědy* 'corporal troubles' (ib., 35), and the nominative–accusative plural neuter ending *-yja* as in *tělesnyję čuvstva* 'corporal feelings' (ib., 30), and similar archaic Slavonic forms. Despite a sizable number of Church Slavonicisms, the main anachronism of the language of Kutka's "Catechism" lies not so much in the use of Church Slavonic or old (Polish) loan forms as in a peculiar mix of features excerpted from different language systems. This mix is variously based on Church Slavonic (with features of the Russian recension) with an admixture of old (bookish) Ruthenian and local elements, and on the 'prostaja mova' with a plethora of Slavonicisms and regional forms. It is not surprising to encounter in the text many hybrid forms, like a Slavonic perfect consisting of the phonetically vernacular *esme*, where the final *-e* emerged as a result of the coalescence of *i* and *y*, and a past participle, e.g., *esme prohněvali* 'we have angered' (ib., 34).

A similar situation with the language used in Galicia and even more, in Transcarpathia is found in a few prescriptive works prepared (but never published) in the late 18th c. by Arsenij Kocak, a long-time professor of theology at the Krasnyj Brid (Krásny Brod), Mukačeve (Munkács) and Marijapovč (Máriapócs) monasteries. Among his works dealing with Church Slavonic grammar, one should mention two versions of "Hrammatyka russkaja": the Mukačeve (first studied by Ivan Pan'kevyč in 1927) and the Marijapovyč, dating to 1772-1778. Modeled on the Slavonic grammar of Meletij Smotryc'kyj (1619), the "Latin Grammars" of Manuel Álvares (c. 1536-1570) and Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1522), and the "Russian Grammar" of Mixajlo (Mixail) Lomonosov (1755), Kocak's treatise offers a regional description of Church Slavonic. He identifies the *jazŷk" slavenskij* with the *jazŷk˝ russkij*, as detectable from the title "Hrammatyka russkaja, syrěč˝ pravyla yzvěščatelnaja y nastavytelnaja o slovosloženyi slova jazŷka slavenskaho yly russkaho". As was the language practice in Transcarpathia at that time, Kocak easily introduced dialect features, in particular the retention of *hy*, *ky*, *xy*, the ending *-me* in the present tense of 1 pl., and vernacular elements into his local version of Church Slavonic, e.g., the change *e* > *o* after postdentals, *sabovstvo* 'tailoring', *čyžmarstvo* 'shoe-making', and other regionalisms (Kocak-D, 70). Kocak omitted the letter *g* (ґ) from his list of consonants (Gerovskij 1934, 493), although it is attested sporadically throughout the text of the grammar, e.g., *orfografija* next to *orfohrafija* 'orthography', *etymologija* 'etymo-

logy', *dogma* 'dogma' (Kocak-D, 22). The process of hybridization is most conspicuous in his section on morphology, especially in the paradigms of parallel Slavonic vs. vernacular forms.

Non-Slavonic (vernacular and dialect) elements interplay with archaic forms in a verse preface, where Kocak expresses his desire for the enlightenment of his compatriots who deserve having their own literary (Slaveno-Ruthenian) language and grammar (Gerovskij 1934, 492), since "having studied all the languages of Europe for love of learning", he realized that "only the wretched Rusnaks alone" are "simpletons":

> Всѣ убо языки в Европѣ сущія
> Увѣдѣхъ зѣло любомудрствующія.
> Єдины точію, єдины мѣзерны Руснакы (!)
> Мняху мнѣ быти, аки спростакы (Kocak-D, 75).

Despite some structural similarity to the grammar of Smotryc'kyj, Kocak's grammar was designed as an innovative work. While trying to synthesize the cultural tradition of the (Uniate) east with western scholarship and experience, Kocak's purpose in standardizing local Church Slavonic was, according to Rusinko (2003, 93), to facilitate the translation of Latin books for use by Greek Catholics, thus countering Orthodox influence. In fact, the latter had become rather feeble by that time, a situation which was made worse by a 1693 Jesuit censorship law, and the Austro-Hungarian imperial ban of 1770 on the importation of Cyrillic books from beyond the borders of the realm, and by the total predominance of Latin in institutes of higher education[12]. Gerovskij (1934, 492) claims that Kocak's grammar reflected the outdated norms of Church Slavonic, as codified by Smotryc'kyj and his followers in the l7th c., but not much earlier norms, inasmuch as Kocak was purportedly unfamiliar with Old Church Slavonic texts (Kocak-D, 21).

2.3. Swinging back to diglossia?

The socio-linguistic situation in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna in the 18th c. was becoming precarious, especially after the Greek Catholic clergy, educated in Latin, became the main custodians of the regional self-identification and linguistic tradition fostered previously by the Orthodox Church. In the 17th c., a radical transformation of the confessional border in the Ruthenian lands split the formerly united Metropolitanate of Kyjiv,

[12] After the death of Bishop Andrij Bačyns'kyj (András Bacsinszky) in 1809, Latin became the language of management and housekeeping at the Užhorod Seminary – tailors, locksmiths and other workers had to keep their records in Latin (Kocak-D, 6). Nedzěl'skij (1932, 85) writes that, under pressure of Latinized ecclesiastical culture, this language came to be used in everyday life in the households of priests, even by priests' wives.

with the Uniates ending up on the Catholic side. The Uniate hierarchy ceased to be Orthodox in the eyes of Jesuit proselytizers and Orthodox intellectuals alike (Plokhy 2001, 145-175). Socio-linguistically, the Uniates found themselves between two secular-religious *dignitae*: Polish-Latin and Ruthenian-Church Slavonic. In the 18th c., chafing under the nation's subjugation to Roman Catholic culture, the Greek Catholic Church of Right-Bank Ukraine anachronistically retained Church Slavonic as the main literary language. As a result, the status of Church Slavonic, and even more the 'prostaja mova', fell well below that of the 17th c. The 'prostaja mova', albeit supported in the Metropolitanates of L'viv and Mukačeve and the Basilian monastery of Počajiv, was relegated to a secondary role. Therefore the two languages interpenetrated each other more often than not, with the emphasis generally being on Church Slavonic in both religious and non-religious texts (Shevelov 1979, 702).

Meanwhile, by the end of the 18th c. the former 'bilingualism' had given way to 'diglossia' in Right-Bank Ukraine. Expressions of 'diglossia' included: the identification of *rus(s)kij* with *slavenskij*; regional normalization and codification of a literary "Slaveno-Rusyn" (Slaveno-Ruthenian) language opposed to the everyday vernacular language; and use of "Slaveno-Rusyn" as a language of instruction (cf. Uspenskij 2002, 386-388). Since the distance between Church Slavonic and the vernacular, with heterogenous admixtures, became blurred due to the multilingualism of the local intellectuals, one can hardly chart a borderline between the two corresponding systems in literary practice. This hybrid came to be called 'jazyčije'. Impressionistic and pejorative as it may appear *from the perspective* of NSU, this term covers at least four language types (groups) for the period of 1772 to 1859: (1) Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension, (2) the late 'prostaja mova' with numerous Church Slavonicisms and Russianisms, (3) "Slaveno-Rusyn" (Russoruthenisch) alongside Russian with various admixtures, and, finally, (4) an attempted precursor of NSU based on the vernacular, sometimes with heavy interference from Church Slavonic, Polish, and/or Russian (Moser 2004a, 141f., 2005, 154f.). Aside from the last group, rarely attested until the appearance of the 'Rusian Triad' in 1837, all other types are premised on Church Slavonic foundations, as found for instance in the circulars of Bishop Andrij Bačyns'kyj (András Bacsinszky) (1732-1772-1809) (Udvari 2003).

3. The socio-linguistic situation in the Hetmanate and 'Sloboda' Ukraine

3.1. Expanding the old bilingualism

The socio-linguistic situation in the Hetmanate and 'Sloboda' Ukraine in the 18th c. was very threatening, yet less precarious than that in Western Ukraine. In the East, gradual change in favor of Russian was 'encouraged'

by a series of decrees issued by the Russian Synod and Russian emperor. In 1720, Peter I signed a notorious 'ukaz' forbidding the Kyjiv and Černihiv presses from printing anything but the canonic church books. Later decrees, issued by the Russian Synod in September 1721, January and December 1721, and March 1728, introduced further restrictions in the use of the Ukrainian recension in the Church (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 5-8). Despite all these decrees, the Meletian Church Slavonic as a language of instruction and administration in Little Russian eparchies kept its position tenaciously until the end of the 18th c., when on 27 March 1785 Catherine II issued a decree readjusting eparchial boundaries in the Hetmanate state and 'Sloboda' Ukraine.

Furthemore, a series of educational reforms aimed at introducing uniform education for parish priests and strengthening theological studies, in particular at the Kyjiv Academy, weakened local customs in the late 18th c. In the early 1780s, Samuel Myslavs'kyj (1731-1796), metropolitan of Kyjiv, who was particularly dismayed by the mixture of Ukrainian, Polish, and Latin in the language of the students and faculty of the Academy, promoted the status of Russian by introducing its literary standard, spelling and pronunciation, into the classes of poetry and oratory. In addition, he requested that the courses of calculus, history, geography, and French be conducted in the Great Russian language[13]. That was not the only example of his reformist activities. As early as 1769, Samuel Myslavs'kyj, then bishop of Belgorod, prescribed that instruction in Russian, modeled on Mixajlo Lomonosov's "Russian Grammar" (1755; 2nd ed., 1757) be introduced into the curriculum of Xarkiv College. A special emphasis in his circular was placed on Great Russian orthoepy and stylistics[14]; all philosophical debates were to be conducted in Russian,

[13] Samuel Myslavs'kyj's impetus was so strong that some teachers admitted, in a special petition submitted at his name, that they could hardly follow his instructions fully because they were not able to get rid of their Little Russian accent (Askočinskij 1856, 343). In February 1784, in order to improve the situation, Myslavs'kyj invited a certain Dmitrij Sigirevič from the Trinity Sergius Seminary to teach poetry, "according to the rules of poetry published in Moscow, and oratory, according to the rules of Mister Lomonosov" (Titov 1924a, 255). Myslavs'kyj also dispatched three best students of the Kyjiv Academy, Mykyta Sokolovs'kyj, Pavlo Lohynovs'kyj, and Danylo Domontov, to Moscow University to acquire Great Russian pronunciation and accent (Askočinskij 1856, 342). Generally, the pro-imperial reformist activities of Myslavs'kyj should be treated objectively, in the all-imperial context. As a patriot of his *alma mater*, he intended first of all to elevate the status of the Academy, thus putting it on the same level with Moscow University (Titov 1924a, 254f.).

[14] Here and henceforth, the terms 'Little Russian' and 'Great Russian' refer to two separate East Slavic linguistic-cultural peoples, as they were routinely called in the eighteenth-century Hetmanate and in the Russian Empire alike. Despite its imperial coloring, these terms date back to the Byzantine opposition as introduced in 1143 by Neilos Doxopater (Danylenko 2006c, 52f.). In the 1330s, the term 'Little Rus" was applied to

theological in Russian or Latin; and essays had to be written in a language different from "the deep Slavonic and common rude vernacular" (Lebedev 1885, 61). Albeit replete with a sizable number of Great Russianisms, Latinisms, and fewer Polonisms, the language of instruction in Xarkiv College was Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension. The Kyjiv Academy, due to longer traditions than Xarkiv, seemed to be more secure, although as early as 1765 the Russian language was taught as a separate discipline at this school (Titov 1924a, 247).

Despite changes in the administration and curriculum over the first part of the 18th c., the Kyjiv Academy steadily flourished in 1701-1760s, remaining an important cultural and educational center, with old traditions confirmed by the 1694 and 1701 charters of Aleksej Mixajlovič and Peter (the future Emperor Peter I), and accepting all Orthodox Christian students coming from different parts of the Russian Empire and beyond (Titov 1924a, 159-240). Thus, during her stay in Kyjiv in 1744, the Empress Elizabeth was greeted with the Fourth "Rithm"" (Ode) of the panegyric "Avhustějšej nepobědymoj Imperatryčě", authored by prefect Manuel (Myxajlo) Kozačyns'kyj (1699-1755) in "three dialects [comprising] Slavonic as [a language] natural and most abundant (*preyzobylnějšyj*) in Europe, Latin as most famous in the art of philosophical reasoning, Polish as [a language] bordering with Kyjiv" (ib., 170). Remarkably, the greeting text was compiled in standard Meletian Slavonic without the vernacular admixture (Askočinskij 1856, 97f.) observable in less lofty genres (sermons, moralizing texts, school drama and poetry, chronicles) (Rusanivs'kyj 2001, 126-129). As Kozačyns'kyj pointed out in his introduction, the panegyric had not been published in "sacred Hebrew and sage Greek", as well as German, not because of the lack of expertise of the professors but only because of the lack of the corresponding typefaces in the press (Askočinskij 1856, 515; Erčić 1980, 232).

Kozačyns'kyj did introduce vernacular and bookish elements in some secular works, in particular in the treatise "Philosophia Aristotelica ad mentem Peripateticorum Tradita" (1745), written in Latin, Polish, and

---

the whole Principality of Galicia-Volhynja (Witkowski 2003) and, in the early 17th c., came to Kyjiv from the western Ukrainian lands. Metropolitan Iov Borec'kyj (†1631) established the tradition of viewing the Little Russians and the Great Russians as brothers who together constitute a family. Only later, Muscovite Rus', rooted in its dynastic and patrimonial way of thinking, accepted such a vision of unity (Plokhy 2001, 290f.). I use Little Rus(sia) terminology in the non-imperial, ethno-linguistic sense, thus showing differences between the Ukrainians and Russians and their languages within the boundaries of the Russian Empire, as well as between Ukrainians (Little Russians) in the Hetmanate and Ukrainians (Rusyns) in Austro-Hungarian Ukraine. The name 'Ukrainian' will be used as a generic term, overlapping semantically with the modern, post-romanticist understanding of this concept.

Church Slavonic, and dedicated to Prince Oleksij Rozumovs'kyj, a former Ukrainian Cossack and the morganatic husband of Empress Elizabeth, and his brother, Prince Kyrylo Rozumovs'kyj, the would-be last Hetman of Ukraine (Erčić 1980, 239). Taken as a whole, "Philosophia" belongs to the genre of panegyric, albeit it contains a philosophical part, based on the public debates which took place at the Kyjiv Academy on 17 March 1745 [O.S.]. The latter was compiled in Latin and Slavonic, while the panegyric itself was in the above-mentioned three languages (Vakulenko 2004, 541f.). Meletian Slavonic at its core, "the Slavonic dialect" used in the panegyric reveals Ukrainianisms, e.g., *zaležyty* 'depend', *ręsnyj* 'abundant', *zakamenělij* 'petrified', with the prefix *za-* in place of Slavonic *o-*, sporadic use of the letter *y* in place of *ě*, and the like (Željeznjak 1965, 163f.)[15].

It is no wonder that Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension survived longest at the Kyjiv Academy, where multilingualism was a pivotal principle of its functioning (Vakulenko 2004, 550), despite the fact that ever more colloquialisms and Russian Church Slavonicisms began penetrating school poetry and dramas, as fostered in the schools of the Hetmanate in the 1730s. A drama by Heorhij Konys'kyj, "Voskresenie mertvỹx'" (1746), though written in solid Meletian Church Slavonic, presents interesting examples of the vernacular: *prijšlo* (n. sg. pret.) 'come' (Voskresenie, 160), *nexaj prijmet* (3 sg. imp.) 'accept' (ib., 161), *z ženoju* 'with the wife' (ib.), diminutives like *lěsok"* 'forest' (ib., 166); there are also Russianisms like *vodka* (ib.. 169), and others. A colloquial tinge to Church Slavonic is observable in other dramas, e.g., in "Trahedokomedija o nahraždenniy v sem" světě pryiskannyx" děl'" (1742) by Varlaam Laščevs'kyj, and "Vlastotvornij obraz" čelověkoljubija Božija" (1737) by Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj, containing both Russianisms and Ukrainianisms.

Despite the vernacularizing tendency observable from the early 18th c. onward, Meletian Church Slavonic seemed to retain its solid position in the system of bilingualism, turning, however, from the opposition of two standard languages into the opposition of styles within one genre. Thus, in 1705 young Feofan Prokopovyč wrote his drama "Vladymir", slavenorossijskix" stran" knjaz" y povelytel'" in codified Meletian Church Slavonic, albeit using some Slavonic elements as a stylistic device in his satirical description of the lower clergy, in particular names of the pagan priests

[15] The case of Kozačyns'kyj seems to illustrate a historical switch from the Greek-Slavonic period in the culture of Humanistic and Baroque Ukraine, as reflected most aptly in the Meletian metalinguistical doctrine, to the 'Latin-Slavonic' (Vakulenko 2004, 549f.). A situation of multilingualism, obtaining in this period grew out of a natural cultural context, unlike the Petrine Russian society, where the coexistence of different languages was more practical than cultural (Brogi Bercoff 1995).

Žeryvol, Kurojad, Piar referring to their gluttony and hard drinking (Tixonravov 1898, 152). However, the drama "Mylostʹ Božija […] Ukraynu […] svobodyvšaja" (1728) (Mylostʹ), ascribed as early as 1865 by Maksimovič[Maksymovyč'] (1880) to Prokopovyč, reflects a peculiarly Baroque distribution of two standard languages, predominantly 'slavenorosskij (slavenorossijskij) jazŷk' vs. 'prostaja mova', used in one lofty genre. Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, Ukraine, the Messenger, and the Chorus speak Church Slavonic, permeated, however, with bookish (Ruthenian) and vernacular elements, as in the edifying monologue of the Hetman:

> Что Богъ дастъ, тѣмъ довольни суще, ни коея
> Не обидите ни чимъ братіи своея:
> Кто лѣсокъ добрый, или хуторецъ порядный,
> Кто ставъ, кто луку, кто садъ имѣетъ изрядный
> Болѣть или завидѣть тому не хотите,
> Якъ бы его привлащить къ себѣ не ищите (Mylostʹ, 94).

In addition to Meletian Slavonic transitional to Ruthenian, the high style is created with the help of Russianisms/Russian Slavonicisms, e.g., *nyvočto* 'to naught' (Mylostʹ, 82), *vydyte* (2 pl. pres.) 'see' (ib., 82), *nežely* 'than' (ib., 85), and the like; remarkably, there are only a few Polish (some of Latin or German origin) forms long ago adopted in Ukrainian, like *čekaty* 'wait' (ib., 79) and *murʺ* 'wall' (Lat. *murus*) (ib., 81), *štuka* 'art' (Gr. *Stück*) (ib., 94) (Tymčenko-M, 1, 440, 2, 447, 502).

Yet the Cossacks, the Amanuensis, and some other 'stock characters' speak the 'prostaja mova', which in some places look very colloquial and tinged with the vernacular, for example in a post-battle scene (Mylostʹ, 85). The overall impression is that the author distinguishes between Church Slavonic and the 'prostaja mova', although not as two complimentary standard languages (bilingualism) but two different styles. Tending to interpenetrate one another in some places, Church Slavonic and Ruthenian are opposed at the same time to the vernacular elements which are attested in both languages used by different characters in reference to everyday life.

From the second quarter of the 18th c., vernacular features appeared increasingly, especially in stylistically marked contexts, as in the well-known monologue of a peasant in Act I (scene 1) of Heorhij Konys'kyj's "Voskresenie mertvŷxʺ" (1746) (Voskresenie, 158; Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 26f.). Later, the vernacularizing process was observable in almost all secular genres, and with less success, in more and more religious texts (Peredrijenko 1979, 26). Most interesting in this respect is the language of the interludes which had become quite popular since Jakub Gawatowicz's "Intermedia dwoie" (1619), especially in the 18th c. Chronologically, one should first mention the nine interludes from the Dernovo (near Kam'janka-Buz'ka) anthology of the late 17th-early 18th c., which reveals

West Ukrainian dialect features with many vernacular elements (Hordyns'kyj 1930)[16]. Following West European and Polish traditions (Voznjak 1919, 5-17)[17], these interludes, nevertheless, reveal several peculiar traits. According to Hordyns'kyj (1930, 88), the interludes are still influenced by the bookish language of the 17th c., including Polish and Latin borrowings, and are rather close to the school drama and poetry. This influence is still obvious in some contextually and stylistically marked places, in particular in the final scene of Interlude 6a about the Cossack, Pole, and German:

> алечъ що било то било, панове я вас Святи вєншовати пришовъ,
> мене перогами витайте запорозця, Х(ристо)с воскресъ
> и всѣхъ дѣдковъ з пекла вигнав и въсе пекло рострєсъ,
> би наполънилъ триумъфомъ веселимъ Голови вашѣ;
> щоби били здорови при вашихъ и нашѣ
> и пойдетъ (Hordyns'kyj 1930, 31).

The above connection is found in the interludes of Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj (1736, 1737), showing fewer Polish and Russian borrowings, and of Heorhij Konys'kyj (1747), which, influenced by Great Russian literary fashion (Petrov 1911, 364f.), manifest a solid northern Ukrainian type, albeit with ever more supradialectal features. The latter fact may be tentatively elucidated in light of the theory of Petrov (ib., 319), who assumed a collective authorship of Dovhalevs'kyj's interludes. Indeed, only students representing different regions of Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine were able to offer such a synthetic picture of life in all parts of the Ukrainian lands. This wide representation might have also contributed to the normalization of the vernacular language used by Dovhalevs'kyj and Konys'kyj. In this eclectic process, features from different dialects, primarily

[16] There are more than fifty interludes extant from the 17th-18th c. Among those pertaining to the period under consideration, most interesting are anonymous "Proljog na Voskresenie Xrystovo" and "Yntermedyja na try personě: Baba, děd" y čort"" in a manuscript collection of 1719 (Ternivci, near L'viv), "Yntermedii na roždestvo xrystovo" in Huščyns'kyj Deacon Ioann Danilověč's "Miscellanea" of 1771-1776, "Dialoga, il razhovor pastўrej" in a manuscript of 1763 found in the binding of the textbook on rhetoric published in Kyjiv in 1729 (Peretc 1905, 1909, 1910; Voznjak 1919). The vernacular literary tradition cultivated in this genre is traceable in the comic dialogues of Ivan Nekraševyč, a poem by Anton Holovatyj (1792) (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 119-121), and, to be sure, Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's "Natalka-Poltavka" (1818) and "Moskal'-Čarivnyk" (1819) (Hordyns'kyj 1930, 92; Shevelov 1979, 710).

[17] Hordyns'kyj (1930, 179-202) devoted a separate chapter to the Polish influence on Ukrainian interludes. Tracing this influence with some caution, the author finds some obvious parallels in the interludes from Dernovo and some Polish comedies. Interestingly enough, first Ukrainian (Ruthenian) interludes were found in the Polish dramas, as was the case of Jakub Gawatowicz's interludes in "Tragaedia albo wizerunek śmierci przeświętego Jana Chrzciciela […]" (1619), the interludes in "Comuna duchowna Ss. Borysa y Hleba" (17th c.) (Markovskij 1894), an interlude in "Władysław Jagiełło" (1663) (Peretc 1905).

North Ukrainian, were chosen. Among those features, one may cite: the diphthongization of etymological *o* and *e*, as reflected in spellings like *žunka* 'wife', *vun"* 'he' or *prynjus* (m. sg. pret.) 'bring' (Dovhalevs'kyj, 105, 112); the use of *e* in place of unstressed etymological *ě* or *ę*, e.g., *svetoe* (n.) 'holy', next to *dětmi* (pl. inst.) 'child' (ib., 105); the dispalatalization of *r'*, e.g., *trascju* (acc.) 'fever'; the use of the conjunction *da* (64x) next to *ta* 'and' (15x); and other representative features (Markovs'kyj 1962, 104f.). This language type can be traced back to the Polissian vernacular standard used in the late 14th through 16th c., while subsequent deviations found throughout the Ruthenian lands became ever more differentiated, as seen in new literary genres. Western Ukrainian features in the interludes of Dovhalevs'kyj and Konys'kyj may have arisen due to active contacts in the Kyjiv palatinate and Kyjiv itself as a new cultural center, where the Kyjiv Fraternal College began accepting ever more Ukrainians (Rusyns) from Polish Ukraine, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna (Titov 1924a, 106f., 159-162).

Overall, one can see in the language of the interludes the source for a vernacular standard, based on supradialectal features, albeit with an admixture of regionalisms bequeathed by tradition. Dialectally, the language of the interludes demonstrates a switch from South Ukrainian, via (East) Polissian, to Poltava dialect foundations, which heralds a gradual vernacularizing tendency observable in most secular and even some ecclesiastic genres (Peredrijenko 1979, 58-64). The ultimate result was NSU. Though active at the outset of this process, Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna subsequently fell behind in the shaping of NSU, producing only sporadic samples of vernacular literary output.

Despite the pressure of the vernacularizing factor, the bilingualism obtaining in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth seems to have been retained in the Cossack chronicles. However, the Great Russians were steadily exiting from the Little Russian linguistic mode and instead amalgamating the European high style with the Church Slavonic literary tradition (Xjutl'-Fol'ter[Hüttl-Folter] 1987; Issatschenko 1974, 253f.). In 1710, Hryhorij Hrabjanka, a regimental flag-bearer (subsequently, regimental judge (1717) and colonel of Hadjač (1730)), completed a chronicle of the Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj (first published in 1793). In this work, Church Slavonic was used as an emphatic stylistic device (Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] 1900, 10-12): e.g., *mnozy smertiju umroša* 'many died (by a death)' (Hrabjanka, 69), with an archaic instrumental; aorists like *porazyša* (3 pl.) 'hit' and *umroša* (3 pl.) (ib., 21); numerous non-pleophonic forms of the type *hrady* (pl.) 'city' (ib., 21), *bran'* 'battle' (ib., 64). To create a lofty atmosphere of heroic events, the author consciously archaizes some stylistically non-marked and ordinary

forms, e.g., *o česom" zry* 'about what, see' (ib., 231). However, Hrabjanka could not restrain himself from using vernacular forms, e.g.: confusion of *i* and *ě*, as in *plynyša* (3 pl. aor.) 'captivate' (ib., 237); new gemination; the soft *c'*; no neutralization of voiced obstruents before a morpheme/word boundary as in *od togo vremeny* 'from that time' (ib., 189); *ikavism*-forms like *pyd" (< pod")* 'under'; participial (preterital) forms in *-v* (< *l"*) like *zdobuvšysja* 'having achieved'; the use of the verbal suffix *-uva-* as in *xožuvaly* (pl. pret.) 'walk', and the like.

A mirror-image situation is found in the language of the chronicle of Samuel Velyčko of 1720, which also glorified the heroic Cossack past. The basis of this language is the typical 'prostaja mova' as practiced in the 17th c. Yet, as a former amanuensis highly versed in the administrative language, Velyčko could not resist applying some clichéd devices acquired over several years of service, first in the house of General Judge Vasyl' Kočubej (1699-1708) and later in the General Military Chancellery. In some places, "his style is clerical with a good deal of Polonisms which were so abundant in the language of that period", e.g., *corka* 'daughter' (Velyčko, 67, ib., 8; Tymčenko-M, 2, 472), *ukontentovaty* 'satisfy' (Velyčko, 64; Tymčenko-M, 1, 376), *ponevaž"* 'because' (Velyčko: 67; Tymčenko-M, 2, 167), *šyderstvo* 'mockery' (Velyčko, 67; Tymčenko-M, 2, 493) alongside a few Great Russianisms. Church Slavonicisms, sometimes awkwardly used in place of the Ruthenian equivalents, are also found in Velyčko, especially in stylistically lofty and pathetic passages, a fact which allowed Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj] (1900, 73) to characterize Velyčko's "Cossack language" as "motley". The following vernacular features come into consideration: *uvojšol"* 'enter' (3 sg. pret.) (Velyčko, 67, ib., 8); *ščos* 'something' (ib.: 8); *z"božža* 'grains' with the new gemination in place of the *j*-cluster; the analogical derivative *svynnjamy* (pl. instr.) 'pig' (ib., 19), first attested in 1609 (Žytec'kyj 1941, 76; Šaxmatov 1915, 306); *Zaporožže* (Velyčko, 67, ib., 8) with the final *-e*, according to the old (northern Ukrainian) tradition; Slavonic *prolytije* 'spilling' (ib., 7); the synthetic future tense form *musětymeš"* (2 sg. fut.) 'must' (ib., 66); *požaluvaly* (pl. pret.) 'award' (ib., 98) with the *-uva*-suffix, and so forth.

Nevertheless, Velyčko's variegated language was hierarchically arranged, representing different styles rather than different languages, as was the case with the hybridization of Church Slavonic in the "Catechism" of Kutka or Andrella's anti-Uniate polemical literature. Overall, unlike Hrabjanka's Church Slavonic combined with Ukrainian vernacular and even Russian elements, Velyčko is more committed to the 'prostaja mova'. Thus, the two authors represent opposite poles on the former scale of bilingualism.

3.2. Swinging forward to the 'trilingualism'?

Returning to the vernacular of the interludes and, to a lesser extent, the chronicles, diaries, letters, and practical literature, the period from 1760s to 1790s represents a curious distribution of the two languages belonging to the former bilingualism, Church Slavonic vs. Ruthenian, and the vernacular, which was persistently gaining ground in different genres cultivated in Russian-ruled Ukraine. In this respect, Ivan Nekraševyč, a graduate of the Kyjiv Academy in the 1760s and long-time priest of a village parish near Kyjiv, is a prominent figure in Left-Bank Ukraine. Very popular in his time, though largely underestimated today (Petrov 1911, 466f.), his literary works were written in three standard languages: Church Slavonic, with an admixture of Ukrainianisms and Russianisms, the 'prostaja mova', typical of lower-level clergy who were close to the townspeople and gentrified Cossacks, and finally the vernacular. This vernacular is used not only in comic dialogues, reminiscent of the interludes, such as "Jarmarok"" (1790), "Pismo […] k hnědinskomu svjaščenniku Ioannu Filěpoviču" (1791), and "Zamŷsl"" (late 18th c.)[18], but also in "Yspověd"" (1789), which appears more complex in its languages and genre, going beyond a typical satirical dialogue (Nekraševyc, IX). Apart from the Ukrainianized Church Slavonic of the priest, the only few dialect features of text of "Yspověd"" are concentrated in the replies of a young woman and can be reduced to the use of *u/ju* in place of the etymological *o*, as in *muj* 'my', *torjuk"* 'last year' (ib., 12, 13). The language of the male parishioner is almost free of dialectisms, e.g., *bělše* 'more', *hrexěv"* (gen. pl.) 'sin' next to Polissian *horuju* (1 sg. pres.) 'be sad' with the dispalatalized *r* (ib., 11). On the whole, the language of this text, along with other works of Nekraševyč, shows an embryonic synthesis of more bookish, traditional elements with less bookish, East Polissian elements, together with a lack of Polonisms and Russianisms.

Nekraševyč seems to represent a transitional period of 'trilingualism', comprising Church Slavonic (*slavenorosskij jazŷk")* vs. Ruthenian ('prostaja mova') vs. the vernacular, where the first two were gradually yielding in their traditional genres under the pressure of Great Russian.

[18] Oleksij Pavlovs'kyi, who declared in his "Grammatyka malorossijskago narěčija" (1818; written in 1805) his preference for the southeastern dialects, singled out four significant works of Ukrainian literature, including the "Enejida" and Nekraševyč's "Zamŷsl"" (Gram., 111). Most remarkably, he considered the former as an achievement in the burlesque genre only, thus becoming the first critic of Kotljarevs'kyj's oeuvre (Shevelov 1958, 74). Conversely, the language of Nekraševyč does not look less normalized in comparison with that of Kotljarevs'kyj, both having a large number of elements that were later incorporated into new standard Ukrainian.

3.3. 'Great-Russification' of 'Little Russian'

Elsewhere (Danylenko 2007), I argued that the 'prostaja mova' as used in the administration resisted massive russification roughly till the early 1780s, years of the final integration of the Hetmanate into the Russian Empire, but remaining, despite an ever-growing Russian interference, Ukrainian at its core. Of interest in this respect is 16 May 1721 [O.S.], when Hetman Ivan Skoropads'kyj issued a decree on translating the old law books of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth "from the Polish language into our Rusian language" (*ruskoe naréčie*) or, "local language" (*zdéšnee naréčie*), a plan which was never completed. As early as 1728, in the time of Hetman Danylo Apostol, Russian Emperor Peter II ordered that the books be translated into Great Russian (*velikorossijskij jazyk"*) (Lazarevskij 1887). However, the Hetmanate's Code of Laws, prepared by 1743, was ultimately translated into the Little Russian variety of the standard language of the Russian Empire, which remained throughout the entire 18th c. bidialectal – southern (Little Russian) and northern (Great Russian) (Strumins'kyj 1984, 19, 25). This is why the process of russification was hardly discernable in Little Russian society, with its long tradition of bilingualism in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In other words, the process of russification or, to put it more precisely, 'Great-Russification' of Church Slavonic of the Ukrainian recension (Meletian Church Slavonic) might be conceived as a natural stage in the development of the 'slavenorosskij jazŷk"', albeit with the number of Ukrainian Slavonic and properly Ukrainian elements almost reduced to little more than symbolic presence (Shevelov 1970, 7f.).

'Great-Russification' was never seriously sabotaged by the Ukrainian élite. The majority of the Little Russian nobles were inclined to view the empire as their own state – an empire that so many Little Russians had helped to develop, in the fields of science, philosophy, culture, and even administration (Kohut 1988, 258-276). The language used was, in preromanticist terms, *neither* Russian *nor* Ukrainian. In the eyes of the Little Russians, it was the same 'język" slavenskij' which had been taught at L'viv, Ostrih, and Kyjiv, and was regularly placed on an equal footing with Greek and (higher than) Latin in the early 17th c. For the Great Russians, it was the language which had long served their cultural and ecclesiastical interests. However, the situation of 'bidialectal Church Slavonic', with differences in pronunciation and inflexion, could not exist indefinitely and warranted a one-version solution. Eventually, the Little Russian variety of Church Slavonic, along with Ruthenian, began to be frequently criticized as a linguistic corruption (Vasilij Tred'jakovskij, Mixail Lomonosov), while the Great Russian variety gradually became a model for all the Orthodox. Suffice it to mention here the dramas "Trahedyja

[…] o smerty […] Uroša pjataho y o padenyy Serbskaho carstva" (1798) and "Blahoutrobye Marka Avrelyja" (1744, Kyjiv, and 1745, L'viv), written in Serbia by a Ukrainian, Manuel (Myxajlo) Kozačyns'kyj, in Meletian Church Slavonic, yet demonstrating already traits of Synodal Russian (Petrov 1911, 280-286)[19].

In mixed, secular-religious genres, Hryhorij Skovoroda (1758-1791) created a new language standard which incorporated much from Church Slavonic, standard Russian, and Ukrainian, with certain elements from Latin and Greek, but which so far has eluded any strict definition. Skovoroda made a linguistic revolution, although not in favor of vernacular Ukrainian or Meletian Slavonic, thus producing a language even more distant from the 'prostaja mova' than Church Slavonic (Shevelov 1994). The final replacement of the Little Russian variety of Church Slavonic seems to have happened by the early 19th c. Suffice it to mention that the anonymous, vituperative anti-Russian political tract "Istorija Rusov" (ca. 1810), the last eloquent apology for the Hetmanate and Cossack rights and privileges, was written in Great Russian (Kohut 1988, 271). Yet, at the same time, the abundance of Ukrainianisms and Church Slavonicisms (of the Meletian standard) found in this work also showed a strengthening of the Little Russian component in the common Russian language in the late 18th c. (Shevelov 1970).

In the first half of the 18th c., the Great Russian variety of the common language did not yet prevail in private correspondence and diaries, notably in the "Diariuš" (1722) and "Dnevnik" (1727-1753) of Mykola Xanenko (1691-1760), General Flag-Bearer in the administration of the Hetman. The first diary has a Ukrainian coloring and contains whole scenes written in the 'prostaja mova', with minimal Polish and Russian borrowings. A somewhat different language is found in the "Dnevnik", whose author tries to hide the Ukrainianness lurking behind his newly acquired Great Russian (Danylenko 2007). Generally, entries in the early 1750s

[19] The influence of Kozačyns'kyj along with other East Slavic theologians and professors working in Serbia in the first half of the 18th c., on the literary culture of the Serbs was significant. Yet, it is Kozačyns'kyj, who taught first at the Collegium slavono-latino carloviense and then, after the death of Metropolitan Vikentij Jovanović in 1737, at the Collegium Vissarionio-Pavlovicsianum Petrovaradinense till 1739, who exerted the most substantial influence in propagating Meletian Church Slavonic among the Serbs, who also borrowed some Ukrainianisms from Kozačyns'kyj's works (Željeznjak 1965). However, in the case of his "Trahedyja" (originally, "Trahedokomedyja, soderžaščaja v" sebě trynadesęt dějstvij"), which was written in 1733 in Sremski Karlovci (Serbia) and first published in 1798 in Budapest, its structure, as well as the language were thoroughly revised for this publication by one of his students, Jovan Rajić; all other witnesses, including the Budapest manuscript, the witnesses made by Sava Rajković and Spiridon Jovanović, might have undergone a similar revision, thus presumably showing fewer Ukrainian features as compared with the *Vorlage* of 1733 (Erčić 1980, 249f., 424-430).

demonstrate a transitional phase in the development of the 'prostaja mova' in this genre, whence comes a parallelism of forms at all levels. To give an example in the morphosyntax, the preposition *do* used in Ukrainian with the genitive of direction, appears in parallel use with the Russian counterpart *v"* used with inanimates in the accusative, e.g., *v" Moskvu* (acc.) *do polkovnika* (gen.) 'to the colonel in [to] Moscow' (Dnevnik, 482) alongside the more archaic *k"* in a synonymous dative construction, e.g., *k" Moskvě* (dat.) 'to Moscow' (ib., 491). Xanenko seems to prefer passive constructions, although in the majority of the cases they are chancery clichés, e.g., *pysma y posylka otpuščenỹ* 'letters and a package have been sent' (ib., 497), which are paralleled by impersonal constructions with the predicative forms in *-to* and *-no* and the accusative direct object. In most cases the neuter object may be used in agreement with a neuter form of the short present participle, e.g., *sočyneno donošenie* 'a denunciation has been written' (ib., 483). In the phonetics/orthography, the following examples appear illustrative: *nočoval"* (m. sg. pret.) ~ *perenočeval"* (m. sg. pret.) 'spend a night' (ib., 491, 481), *vězyt" 'visit'* ~ *vizytoval"* (m. sg. pret.) (ib., 482) alongside *vyzytovaly* (pl. pret.) 'visit' (Diariuš, 13), and so forth. In the vocabulary, deserving attention are parallel forms like *zanemohla* (f. sg. pret.) 'fall ill' ~ *xorovala* (f. sg. pret.) 'be ill' ~ *bolezn'* 'sickness' (ib., 179, 482).

Though I have no exact statistics, the number of Great Russian elements seems to have increased in the language of Xanenko in the 1750s. In some entries of the "Dnevnik" it is difficult to determine the provenance – Russian, Ruthenian, or Church Slavonic – of particular elements. The criterion of historical perspective as discussed by Peredrijenko (1979, 97f.) seems inadequate from the synchronic point of view, inasmuch as the Little Russians still considered themselves in the mid-18th c. to be co-creators of a common Russian standard language of a new synthetic type which was replacing Church Slavonic in the church service. The ever-growing influence of Great Russian in the mid-18th c. was facilitated as much by the expediency of career advancement as by the absence of a purely secular tradition in the use of Church Slavonic (Shevelov 1979, 703). This is why, in introducing Great Russian elements into his language, Xanenko seems to identify them mistakenly as Church Slavonic, therefore elevating the style of his narrative, appropriate to his high-rank position in the administration of the Hetmanate.

A similar example is the diary of Jakiv Markovyč, covering the years 1717-1767. Markovyč's language demonstrates fewer bookish elements, except for those wholly adapted in the 'prostaja mova', and more vernacular and even colloquial forms (Lazarevskij 1893, XIII; Horobec' 1979, 6f.). Over decades, his language shows no radical changes in grammar,

phonetics, or vocabulary. Indeed, what would one expect from a Little Ukrainian nobleman, looking all his life long after his numerous farmsteads in the countryside (Modzalevskij 1912, 392f.)? To take as an example the years 1723 and 1734, bounding a period of relative stability in the Hetmanate, there are copious perfect forms with the preterital meaning in the corresponding entries of the diary. However, 1 sg. forms prevail under the year 1723, e.g., *polučylem"* 'I received', *otpysalem"* 'I wrote a reply', but very rare under the year 1734 (Markovyč, 1, 49), while 1 pl. forms are quite common under the year 1734, e.g., *obědalysmo* 'we had dinner' next to *vozvratylys'* 'we returned' (ib., 3, 341, 351). Under the latter year, the author retains stylistically marked forms like the obsolete aorist *podpyjaxom"* 'I got drunk' (ib., 1, 49, 3, 342) and some Ukrainian phonetic features, e.g., the hypercorrect forms with *f*, as in *futor* 'farmstead' (for *xutor*). The overall impression is that, despite a newly-acquired Great Russian coloring, the language of Markovyč remains Ruthenian at its core, though with a sizable number of vernacular and colloquial elements:

> Пятокъ. 25. День былъ зранку съ морозцемъ, а после тепелъ, хмаренъ и тихъ, такова жъ и ночь. Ездилъ я до Сваркова рано, где осмотрѣлъ палей и мосту нового, теперь дѣлаючогося, оттоль повернулся и заездилъ до футора и съ футора домой (Markovyč, 3, 347).

Among vernacular morphonetic features, I will cite substantive forms with the new gemination, e.g., *pysannja* (gen.) 'writing' (ib., 1, 49), *prynjattju* (instr.) 'receiving' (ib., 1, 52), *žalovannja* (gen.) 'salary' (ib., 3: 342). In the phonetics, in addition to *futor"* 'farmstead' (ib., 1, 53), with the hypercorrect *f* instead of *x*, next to *futro* 'fur' (ib., 57) with the new *f* (Gr. *Futter*), deserving attention are *pysara* (gen.) 'scribe' (ib., 1, 49) with the dispalatalized *r*, *ujšol"* (m. sg. pret.) 'leave' (ib., 1, 50), *mynjat'* 'change' with *y* reflecting the new [i] in place of the *jat'* (ib., 1, 53), *švakhr* 'brother-in-law' (ib., 3, 343) with the new *g*, marked by the digraph *kh* (кг), and the like (Danylenko 2007).

Overall, the narrative style and language of Markovyč's diary differ from Xanenko's "Diariuš". The probable reason, as I have already hypothesized, was that Xanenko compiled his diary as a semi-official document which he was ready to share with his compeers, as with the "Diariuš yly žurnal" kept at the General Military Chancellery in 1722-1750. After the arrest and death of Pavlo Polubotok in 1723, Markovyč was for his remaining life very cautious, and conspicuously eschewed discussing politics in his diaries. Wholly concentrated on improving his fortune, personally managing his large estate, Markovyč more often than not tended to the vernacular of his peasants and contractors – resulting, as compared with the language of Xanenko, in a more variegated combination of ele-

ments, drawn from the high style (Church Slavonic/Russian), middle style (Ruthenian), and low style (East Ukrainian vernacular).

In sum, imperial Russian was not alien to the Ukrainian nobles who were likely to treat this language as a common creation of the Little and Great Russians living together since the late 17th c. One should treat this stance as a continuation of the seventeenth-century search of the Orthodox nobility for new forms of ethnoreligious identity after the schism of 1596 (Plokhy 2001, 175). The point is that, since the time of Metropolitan Iov Borec'kyj, the stress on the historical, religious, ethnic, and cultural ties with Muscovite Rus' and later imperial Russia has been an important component of the Little Russian idea developed by the Kyjivan clergy and defended by the Cossack élite and Cossackized nobles (ib., 290f.). Regarding the common Russian language, the Little Russians of the 18th c. were not preoccupied with the ratio of native (both vernacular and Church Slavonic) and Great Russian elements in the language, labeled 'slovenskij rosyjskij' (1592) or 'rossijskij' (1614, 1637) since the late 16th c. (Danylenko 2006b, 103-105, Maksimovič 1877). More important, especially in education and in the development of secular genres, was the structuring of Little and Great Russian elements and their subsequent normalization in the language system. One of the first attempts to synthesize the two languages into one standard was undertaken by Ivan Pereverzev (†1794), a graduate of Xarkiv College, in his primer, "Kratkie pravyla rossijskago pravopysanija, yz" raznÿx" grammatyk" vybrannÿja, y po svojstvu ukraynskago dialekta dlja upotreblenija malorossijanam" dopolnennÿja v" Xar'kově", compiled in Xarkiv and published in Moscow in 1782 (2nd ed., 1787)[20]. Among other Little Russian features, Pereverzev cautioned against the confusion of *y* [i] and *ÿ* [y] in words like *mylo* 'nicely' ~ *mÿlo* 'soap' (§ 25), *y* [i] and *ě* [ě] in words like *nykto* 'nobody' ~ *někto* 'somebody' (§ 34); he also noted a common confusion of the prepositions *s"* and *z"* by the Little Russians (§ 56), the use of the nominative in place of the accusative after transitives, e.g., *kupyl rabočie volÿ* 'he bought working oxen' (§ 74). Most interesting is Pereverzev's treatment of г, which is pronounc-

[20] I would like to thank Serhij Vakulenko (Xarkiv Pedagogical University, Ukraine) who kindly provided me with a copy of Ivan Pereverzev's "Rules", collated on the basis of two editions of 1782 and 1787. In the title of the primer, Pereverzev made use of the common opposition in the 18th c., the "ukraynskij (dialekt")" vs. "malorossijskij (jazÿk")", which refers, in general, to modern distribution of northeastern and northern Ukrainian dialects. Thus, according to Pereverzev (§ 10), the etymological *o* is pronounced as *i* in the closed syllables in 'Little Russian', e.g., *mij styl* in place of *moj stol* 'my table,' while in 'North Little Russian' this sound is realized as a diphthong, i.e., *svuoj kuon'* in place of *svoj kon'* 'one's own horse'. Clearly, the adjective 'Ukrainian' as found in the title refers to 'Sloboda' Ukraine, i.e., northeastern Ukrainian, and the adjective 'Little Ukrainian' is used as a *genus*-term, whence 'North Little Ukrainian' denoting North Ukrainian.

ed in (common) Russian (1) as *x* [x], both word-finally and before 'hard consonants', e.g., *Box"* 'God', *mjaxkoj* (m. sg.) 'soft'; (2) as "Latin *g*" in "many Russian words", e.g., *govorju* (1 sg. pres.) 'talk', although this sound is more appropriate to foreign words (either with Latin *g* or Greek *γ*) like *grammatyka* 'grammar', *geometrija* 'geometry', *Golfo dy Bengala* 'Gulf of Bengali'; and (3) as *v*, in the genitive case of the type *evo* instead of *ego* (gen.) 'his' or *syl'navo* instead of *syl'nago* (m. gen.) 'strong' (§ 14). While endorsing the Muscovite pronunciation of the unstressed *o* in Russian as *a*, Pereverzev noted incorrect use of *i* in place of the unstressed *e* as in *málin'koj* instead of *málen'koj* 'small' (§ 48).

The language program of Pereverzev is typical of that time and its reverberations are felt into the late 19th c. (Danylenko 2006c, 335-355). According to him, literary Russian is a conglomerate of Great and Little Russian elements: its grammar based primarily on Great Russian, and the phonetics on Little Russian/Ukrainian features. I agree with Wakulenko[Vakulenko] (1999, 388f.) that Pereverzev's choice of particular features in the new literary standard is mostly random. However, the interplay of Great Russian and Little Russian elements might have been more systematic. The point is that, while switching from the Little Russian mode to German and French purism in selecting lexical items, the Great Russians synthesized the European lofty style with the Church Slavonic tradition. Premised on Lomonosov's "Russian Grammar", Pereverzev closely followed the main normalizing trend of secularization and Europeanization of Russian in the Petrine epoch. In his model, there was an ever-shrinking place for the Little Russian tradition in the Russian language. Indeed, Pereverzev could allot for the Little Russian tradition only 'limited space' in the phonetic make-up of the new standard, reduced to the pronunciation of *g* and some unstressed vowels as non-reduced sounds (ib., 387f.).

4. Settling accounts

By the end of the 18th c., the influence of Russian, and in particular the Russian recension of Church Slavonic, was so strong that it began penetrating the furthermost parts of Slavia orthodoxa, including Transcarpathia and Bukovyna, where the low cultural and educational level of the local Greek Catholic clergy and *literati* did not allow them to play an active role on a par with their western Catholic (Polish and Hungarian) neighbors. Therefore, the recension-switch in Austro-Hungarian-ruled Ukraine proved to have much more far-reaching results, ultimately leaving the Galicians and Rusyns with an outdated variant of Church Slavonic, permeated with a sizable number of variegated admixtures. The Ukrainians in Russian-ruled Ukraine, however, seem to have retained

what was irevocably lost in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna, to wit, a principle of bilingualism, which, despite the 'Great-Russianization' of Meletian Church Slavonic, eventually transformed into a new opposition of Great Russian vs. 'new' 'prostaja mova' (New Standard Ukrainian) with the advancement of Romanticism in the early 19th c.

In the newly-formed opposition, there was no place for the 'old' 'prostaja mova' as used in the 17th c. First, it was reduced to a limited number of genres, primarily humorous and pathetic-sentimental (Franko 1904, 307f.), cultivated by clerks, wandering students, and low-ranking clergy. Moreover, the number of its speakers drastically shrank, since the bulk of the Ukrainian gentry was ready to break with the traditions of the Hetmanate and, with an eye to assimilating into the Russian imperial nobility, switch to Great Russian, which gave them more opportunities for imperial careers (Kohut 1988, 258f.). Second, the demise of the 'old' 'prostaja mova' was accompanied by a change in its dialect foundations, from Southwest Ukrainian to Polissian – the initial center of radiation of the 'prostaja mova' in the late 14th to late 16th c. (Danylenko 2006a, 109f.) – to Southeast Ukrainian. The new dialect foundations precluded the 'prostaja mova' of the new type from complete disintegration because of the uniformity of its dialects, which were elevated by the Xarkiv Romanticists to a new, literary status.

The above change of dialect foundations, already traceable in the 17th c. (Žovtobrjux 1970, 28f.), seems to have been completed by the end of the 18th c. in the works of Klymentij Zinovijiv, Ivan Nekraševyč, Ivan Kotliarevs'kyj, and other writers. Premised on morphonetic and, to a lesser extent, syntactic features, I am inclined to identify the new standard, based on Southeast Ukrainian, as the 'new' 'prostaja mova', with the ratio of vernacular elements tending to outweigh the native bookish and Slavonic elements. Yet the novelty lay not in new vernacular elements in the literary mainstream, since the 'new' 'prostaja mova' emerged from the 'old' 'prostaja mova' of the 17th c., but in the redistribution (normalization) of these elements, reflecting changes primarily in poetic and fictional genres, but not in the burlesque.

To sum up, the formation of the 'new' 'prostaja mova' as a genetic continuation of the 'old' 'prostaja mova' in Russian Ukraine was not fortuitous at all. Despite the imperial integration of the Hetmanate, the development of the 'prostaja mova' was not thwarted by the decrees of the Russian Emperor and the Holy Synod. Having given up, under Russian influence, their common Church Slavonic legacy, the Little Russians, still committed to the idea of bilingualism, developed the vernacular tradition in their literary culture, traceable in some genres from the early 17th c. onward. Metaphorically speaking, the Little Russians owe a lot to Great

Russian for having contributed to the crystallization of their new, vernacular standard.

In Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna, the Greek Catholic clergy, who found themselves unexpectedly the only defenders of a separate ethnoreligious Ruthenian regional identity, advanced the idea of *one* literary language, based on Church Slavonic, though with a wide range of admixtures. For the 17th and 18th c., this was an anachronistic solution to the language question in the Ruthenian lands. As a result, this part of Ukraine did not break through the cultural confines of the 17th c. with the free interplay of styles, genres, and language standards typical of the Baroque period. Unlike Russian-ruled Ukraine, where Great Russian was treated as a new member of the 'old' bilingualism, Austro-Hungarian Ukraine introduced diglossia, triggering the identification of 'jazŷk' russkij" with "jazŷk' slavenskij", leading to the emergence of a regional mixed (Slaveno-Rusyn) language, a hybrid labeled 'jazyčije'[21].

It follows that, as a continuation of the old Ukrainian literary tradition cultivated since the late 16th c., NSU was more likely to emerge in Russian-ruled Ukraine and less likely to emerge in Galicia, which along with Transcarpathia and Bukovyna were lagging behind the vernacularizing efforts of the 18th and the early 19th c. Only in the 1860s, after a synthesis of national styles into one language standard by Pantelejmon Kuliš and Taras Ševčenko, Austro-Hungarian Ukraine joined the all-Ukrainian developmental trend, expanding eventually into literary criticism, the humanities, and science.

Bibliography

Askočinskij, V. 1856. *Kiev s drevnejšim ego učiliščem Akademieju*, vol. 2. Kiev.

Brogi Bercoff, G. 1995. Plurilinguism in Eastern Slavic culture of the 17th century. The case of Simeon Polockij. In: *Slavia. In honorem Slavomíri Vollman septuagenarii* 64 (1-2), 3-14.

Danylenko, A. 2006a. 'Prostaja mova', 'Kitab', and Polissian standard. *Die Welt der Slaven* 51, 80-116.

— 2006b. On the Name(s) of the *Prostaja Mova* in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 51, 97-121.

— 2006c. *Slavica et Islamica – Ukrainian in context*. München.

— 2007. Mykola Khanenko: "With a dispatch of seven cucumbers fresh…": a case study of linguistic mentality in the eighteenth-century Hetmanate. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (forthcoming).

[21] Consequently, this term appears historically well grounded, especially from the vantage point of the old literary tradition as cultivated in both parts of Ukraine, and hardly warrants substantial revision as suggested by Moser (2004a) and implicitly by Udvari (2003, 286) who believes that the 'jazyčije' "is the result of a long and natural development based mostly on the language used in the circulars of bishop András Bacsinszky" (Andrij Bačyns'kyj).

Dežë[Dezső], L. 1981. O jazyke ukrainskogo polemista M. Andrelly i zakarpackoj "narodnoj literatury" XVII v. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 27, 19-52.
Diariuš = Bodjanskij, O. (ed.). 1858. Diariuš" ili žurnal" […], načenšijsja 1722 godu, i okončennyj v" tom" že godu […], Nikolaem" Xanenkom". In: *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete* 1, 1-74.
Dnevnik = Lazarevskij, A. (ed.). 1884. *Dnevnik general'nogo xoružogo Nikolaja Xanenka 1723-1753 g.* Kiev (Supplement to *Kievskaja starina*).
Dovhalevs'kyj = Interljudii Mitrofana Dovgalevskogo. 1897. In: *Kievskaja starina* 58 (9), 90-117 (Supplement to *Kievskaja starina*).
Erčić, V. 1980. *Manuil (Mixail) Kozačinskij i njegova traedokomedija*. Beograd.
Fellerer, J. 2005. *Mehrsprachigkeit im galizischen Verwaltungswesen (1772-1914)*. Köln, Weimar, Wien.
Franko, I. 1891. Galicko-ruskij "Savoir vivre". *Kievskaja starina* 10, 281-299.
— 1904. Južnorusskaja literatura. In: Brokgauz, F.A., I.A. Èfron (eds.). *Èniklopedičeskij slovar'*, vol. 41. Sankt Peterburg, 300-326.
Gerovskij, G. 1934. Jazyk Podkarpatské Rusi. *Československá vlastivěda*, vol. 3: *Jazyk*. Praha, 460-517.
Gram. = Pavlovskij, A. 1818. *Grammatika malorossijskogo narečija*; 1822. *Pribavlenie k Grammatike malorossijskogo narečija*. Sankt Peterburg (Horbatsch, O. (ed.). 1978. *Ukrajins'ki hramatyky*, vol. 1. München).
Hordyns'kyj, Ja. 1930. *Z ukrajins'koji dramatyčnoji literatury XVII-XVIII st. Teksty i zamitky*. L'viv 1930. (Pam'jatky ukrajins'koji movy i literatury. 8.)
Horobec', V.Jo. 1979. *Leksyka istoryčno-memuarnoji prozy peršoji polovyny XVIII st*. Kyjiv.
Hrabjanka = Hrabianka, H. 1990. *The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, introduction by Yuri Lutsenko. Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts. 9.)
Issatschenko, A. 1974. Vorgeschichte und Entstehung der modernen russischen Literatursprache. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 37, 235-274.
Kalužnjackij, E. 1886. K bibliografii cerkovno-slavjanskix pečatnyx izdanij v Rossii. *Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk* 42 (1), 1-46.
Kocak-D = Dzendzelivs'kyj, Jo.O., Z. Hanudel' (eds.). 1990. *Hramatyka Arsenija Kocaka*. Svidník.
Kohut, Z.E. 1988. *Russian centralism and Ukrainian autonomy. Imperial absorption of the Hetmanate. 1760s-1830s.* Cambridge/MA.
Kutka = Kutka, Ioann. 1997. *Katyxysis" malÿj* [...], ed. by I. Udvari. Nyíregyháza.
Labyncev, Ju.[A.], L.[L.] Ščavinskaja. 2003. Belorussko–ukrainskoe uniatskoe liturgičeskoe prostranstvo i sredstva podderžanija ego germenevtičeskoj odnorodnosti v XVII-XIX vv. In: Engelking, A., R. Huszcza (eds.). *Pogranicza języków – Pogranicza kultur. Studia ofiarowane Elżbiecie Smułkowej*. Warszawa, 250-264.
Lazarevskij, A. 1887. Universal getmana Skoropadskogo o perevode "knig pravnyx" na malorusskij jazyk. *Kievskaja starina* 47 (12), 788-789.
— 1893. Predislovie. In: Lazarevskij, A. (ed.). *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbija Jakova Markoviča (1717-1767 gg.)*. Kiev, I-XVI (Supplement to *Kievskaja starina*).
Lebedev, A.S. 1885. Xar'kovskij Kollegium kak prosvetitel'nyj centr Slobodskoj Ukrainy. In: *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete* 5, 1-103.
Leksikon" = Labyncev, Ju.A., L.L. Ščavinskaja (eds.). 1995. *Suprasl'skij cerkovnoslavjanskij slovar' 1722 g.* Minsk.
Levyc'kyj, I.E. 1902. Pohljad na rozvij nyzšoho y vyššoho škil'nyctva v Halyčyni v rr. 1772-1800 y rozvij rus'ko-narodnoho škil'nyctva v rr. 1801-1820. In: Franko, I. (ed.). *Materijaly do ku'turnoji istoriji Halyc'koji Rusy XVIII-XIX viku*. L'viv, 103-144. (Zbirnyk istoryčno-filjosofičnoji sekciji Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka. 5.)

Magocsi, P.R. 1984. The language question among the Subcarpathian Rusyns. In: Goldblatt, H., R. Picchio (eds.). *Aspects of the Slavic language question*, vol. 2: *East Slavic*. New Haven, 65-86.

Maksimovič[Maksymovyč'], M.A. 1877. Ob upotreblenii nazvanij Rossija i Malorossija v Zapadnoj Rusi. In: Maksimovič, M.A. *Sobranie sočinenij*, vol. 2. Kiev, 307-311.

— 1880. O dvux stixotvorenijax "Plač' Maloj Rossiy" i "Mylost' Božija". In: Maksimovič, M.A. *Sobranie sočinenij*, vol. 3. Kiev, 730-734.

Markovskij, M. 1894. Južno-russkie intermedii iz pol'skoj dramy "Comunia duchowa Ss. Borysa y Hleba". *Kievskaja starina* 46, 32-45.

Markovs'kyj, Je. 1962. Do xarakterystyky movy ukrajins'kyx intermedij XVII-XVIII stolit'. In: Bilodid, I.K. (ed.). *Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy*. Xarkiv, 97-124.

Markovyč = Lazarevskij, A. (ed.). 1893. *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbija Jakova Markoviča*, part 1: *1723-1725*; 1895, part 2: *1726-1729*; 1897, part 3: *1730-1734*. Kiev (Supplement to *Kievskaja starina*).

Masenko, L.T. 1995. Do problemy spadkojemnosti staroji pysemnoji tradyciji v novij ukrajinskij movi. *Movoznavstvo* 4/5, 39-45.

Modzalevskij, V.L. 1912. *Malorossijskij rodoslovnik*, vol. 3: *L.-O.* Kiev.

Moser, M. 2004a. "Jazyčije" – ein Pseudoterminus der sprachwissenschaftlichen Ukrainistik. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 49, 121-147.

— 2004b. Movnyj svit l'vivs'koho "Studium Ruthenum". In: *Současná ukrajinistika. Problémy jazyka, literatury a kultury. K 65. narozeninám prof. Josefa Anderše. Sborník článků. 2. Olomoucké symposium ukrajinistů 26.-28. srpna 2004*. Olomouc, 316-325.

— 2005. Das Ukrainische in Gebrauch der griechisch-katholischen Kirche in Galizien (1772-1859). In: Moser, M. (ed.). *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache*. Wien, 151-241.

Muromceva, O.H. 2000. Jazyčije. In: Rusanivs'kyj, V.M., O.O. Taranenko (eds.). *Ukrajins'ka mova. Encyklopedija*. Kyjiv, 745.

Mylost' = Bodianskij, O. (ed.). 1858. Mylost' Božija, Ukraynu ot" neudob" nosimyx" obid" ljadskix" črez" Bohdana Zynovija Xmel'nyc'koho preslavnoho vojsk" Zaporožkix" Hetmana, svobodyvšaja […]. In: *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete* 1, 75-78, 79-100.

Nedzěl'skij, E. 1932. *Očerk karpatorusskoj literatury*. Užhorod.

Nekraševyč = Kistjakivs'ka, N. (ed.). 1929. *Tvory Ivana Nekraševyča (rozvidka ta teksty)*. Kyjiv. (Satyryčne ta pobutove pys'menstvo XVIII v. 1.)

Nimčuk, VV. 2005. Ukrajins'ki pereklady Svjatoho Pys'ma. In: Moser, M. (ed.). *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache*. Wien, 15-64.

Ohijenko, I. 1950. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*. Vinnipeg.

Ohonovs'kyj, O. 1889. *Istorija literatury rus'koji*, part 2 (1). L'viv.

Peredrijenko, V.A. 1979. *Formuvannja ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy XVIII st. na narodnij osnovi*. Kyjiv.

Peretc, V.N. 1905. K istorii pol'skogo i russkogo narodnogo teatra. (Neskol'ko intermedij XVII-XVIII stoletija). I-VII. *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk* 10 (1), 51-104; 1909, XI-XII, 14 (1), 125-159; XV-XVII, 15 (4), 151-190.

Pereverzev = Pereverzev, I. 1782 (2nd ed., 1787). *Kratkija pravyla rossijskago pravopisanija, iz" raznyx" grammatyk" vybrannyja y po svojstvu ukraynskago dialekta dlja upotreblenija malorossijanam" dopolnennyja v Xar'kově*. Moskva.

Petrov, A. 1921. *Materialy dlja istorii Ugorskoj Rusi*, vol. 7: *Pamjatniki cerkovno-religioznoj žizni ugrorussov XVI-XVII vv. 1. Poučenija na evangelie po Njagovskomu spisku 1758 g., 2. Iereja Mixaila "Oborona věrnomu čl(o)v(ě)ku". Teksty*. Petrograd. (Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk. 97/2.)

Petrov, N.I. 1911. *Očerki iz istorii ukrainskoj literatury XVII i XVIII vekov. Kievskaja iskustvennaja literatura XVII-XVIII vv., preimuščestvenno dramatičeskaja*. Kiev.

Plokhy, S. 2001. *The Cossacks and religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. Oxford.

Rusanivs'kyj, V.M. 2001. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*. Kyjiv.
Rusinko, E. 2003. *Straddling borders. Literature and identity in Subcarpathian Rus'*. Toronto.
Shevelov, G.Y. 1958. Die "Grammatik der kleinrussischen Mundart" von Pavlovskij und ihr Autor. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 27, 49-89.
— 1966. *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798–1965. Ihre Entwicklung unter dem Einfluß der Dialekte*. Wiesbaden.
— 1970. Zum Problem des ukrainischen Anteils an der Bildung der russischen Schriftsprache Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 16, 5-33.
— 1979. *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg.
— 1994. Prolegomena to studies of Skovoroda's language and style. In: Marshall, R.H.Jr., Th.E. Bird (eds.). *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An anthology of critical articles*. Edmonton, Toronto, 93–132.
StPol. = Nitsch, K. et al. (eds.). 1953-2002-. *Słownik staropolski*, vol. 1-11-. Wrocław, Kraków, Warszawa.
Strumins'kyj, B. 1984. The language question in the Ukrainian lands before the nineteenth century. In: Goldblatt, H., R. Picchio (eds.). *Aspects of the Slavic language question*, vol. 2: *East Slavic*. New Haven, 9-47.
Synjavs'kyj, O. 1928. Z verxovyn novoji literaturnoji ukrajins'koji movy. Pro movu Iv. Kotljarevs'koho. *Zbirnyk istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu UAN* 76 (2), 206-210.
Szöke, L. 2002. Reprint editions of Old Subcarpathian literacy. *Studia Slavica Hungarica.* 47, 202-205.
Šaxmatov, A.A. 1915. *Očerk drevnejšego perioda istorii russkogo jazyka*. Petrograd.
Titov, Xv. 1924a. *Stara vyšča osvita v kyjivs'kij Ukrajini. XVI-poč. XIX v*. Kyjiv. (Zbirnyk istoryčno–filolohičnoho viddilu VUAN. 20.)
— 1924b. *Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Vkrajini v XVI-XVIII v.v. Vsezbirka peredmov do ukrajins'kyx starodrukiv*. Kyjiv. (Zbirnyk istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu VUAN. 17.)
Tixonravov, N.S. 1898. Tragedokomedija Feofana Prokopoviča "Vladimir". In: Tixonravov, N.S. *Sočinenija*, vol. 2. Moskva, 120-155.
Tymčenko = Tymčenko, Je. (ed.). 1930-1932. *Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koho jazyka*, parts I-II. Xarkiv.
Tymčenko-M = Tymčenko, Je. 2003. *Materialy do slovnyka pysemnoji ta knyžnoji ukrajins'koji movy XV-XVIII st*., 2 parts, ed. by V.V. Nimčuk. Kyjiv.
Udvari, I. 1997a. Vmisto posleslova. In: I. Udvari (ed.). *Ioann Kutka, Katyxysis" malŷj* [...]. Nyíregyháza 1997, 184–189.
— 1997b. Katexizys Ioanna Kutky (Buda, 1801). Karpatorusyns'kyj ključovyj tvir počatku XIX st. In: Bolek, A. et al. (eds.). *Słowianie Wschodni.Między językiem a kulturą.* Kraków, 105-111.
— 2003. The circulars of András Bacsinszky, Bishop of Munkács (1732-1772-1809), belonging to the period of Maria Therese. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 48, 283-304.
Uspenskij, B.A. 2002. *Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI-XVII vv.)*, 3rd ed. Moskva.
Vakulenko, S. 2004. Slavizzazione della terminologia scolastica nella *Filosofia aristotelica all'avviso dei peripatetici* di Manujlo Kozačyns'kyj. In: Siedina, G. (ed.). *Mazepa e il suo tempo. Storia, cultura, società*. Alessandria, 541-563.
Velyčko = *Samijla Velyčka Skazanije o vojně kozackoj z Poljakami*. Kyjiv 1926. (Pam'jatky ukrajins'koho pys'menstva. 1.)
Voskresenie = Konys'kyj, H. 1929. Voskresenie mertvŷx". In: Rjezanov, V. *Drama ukrajins'ka*, vol. 1: *Starovynnyj teatr ukrajins'kyj*; part 6: *Dramy-moralitety*. Kyjiv, 153-184.
Voznjak, M. 1919. *Počatky ukrajins'koji komediji*. L'viv.
— 1924. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 3: *Viky XVI-XVII*, part 2. L'viv.
Wakulenko[Vakulenko], S. 1999. Sprachvergleich und Sprachkonstruktion bei Iwan Perewersjew. In: Gipper, H., G. Haßler, P. Schmitter (eds.). *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprache im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster, 381-391.

Witkowski, W. 2003. O historii wyrazów *Małoruś* (//*Małorosja*) i *Małoruski*. In: Zinkiewicz, B. et al. (eds.). *Studia Ruthenica Cracoviensia* 1: *Ukraina między językiem a kulturą*. Kraków, 8-13.
Xjutl'-Fol'ter[Hüttl-Folter], G. 1987. Jazykovaja situacija petrovskoj èpoxi i vozniknovenie russkogo literaturnogo jazyka novogo tipa. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 33, 7-21.
Željeznjak, I.M. 1965. M. Kozačyns'kyj i literaturna mova serbiv druhoji polovyny XVIII st. In: Bilodid, I.K. (ed.). *Z istoriji ukrajins'koji ta inšyx slov'jans'kyx mov*. Kyjiv, 157-170.
Žiteckij[Žytec'kyj], P. 1900. *Eneida Kotljarevskogo i drevnejšij spisok eë v svjazi s obzorom malorusskoj literatury XVIII veka*. Kiev.
Žovtobrjux, M.A. 1963. *Mova ukrajins'koji presy (do seredyny dev'janostyx rokiv XIX st.)*. Kyjiv.
— 1970. Davni tradyciji v novij ukrajins'kij literaturnij movi. *Movoznavstvo* 2, 27-40.
Žuraŭski, A.I. 1967. *Historyja belaruskaj litaraturnaj movy*, vol. 1. Minsk.
Žytec'kyj, P. 1941. *Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII v.* L'viv.

Pace University, New York Andrii Danylenko
(adanylenko@pace.edu)