

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff

(Università degli Studi di Milano)

THE EMERGENCE OF LINGUISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE MULTILINGUAL CONTEXT OF EARLY MODERN UKRAINE

On the occasion of this important anniversary of the Mohylian Academy, I would like to remember an eminent scholar whose fascinating and groundbreaking work first appeared in Kyiv between 1910 and 1918 (with a later edition in 1924) ¹. I am referring to the first volume of F. I. Titov's History of the Cave Monastery's typography, the "Типография Киево-Печерской Лавры. Исторический очерк, 1606–1616–1916 гг." (Kyiv, 1916), and the "Матеріали для історії книжної справи в XVI–XVIII вв." (Reprint Köln 1982; in actual fact printed in 1918 as "Приложения" to the former volume), which contain a considerable number of forewords to the books edited in the Mohylian printing house. For good reasons, in his Introductions to the reprints of "Матеріалів" and "Типография", edited by H. Rothe, M. Erdmann and and Walter Kroll, the latter underlined the pioneering character of Titov's book, which gave evidence of Ukraine's plurilinguism and perfectly grasped the importance of "Введение" and "Посвяти" in the 16–17th century: a "genre" – Kroll maintains – which would not be taken into consideration again by slavists in the USSR and in the West until the 1980 s. ²

Before moving on to the main point of this paper, I would like to underline Titov's skill in making clear through the lines that these "Введение" were key to bringing late Renaissance and Baroque Ukrainian literature so close to Western patterns and distinguishing it – both in form and content – from Russian pre-petrine culture. To be sure, it sounds slightly extravagant when Titov calls prince Stefan Sviatopolk-Chetvertyn's'kyi – a representative of high Ukrainian shliakhta and a pan of the Polish state – a dvorianin, but he had no better terminology at his disposal at that time ³.

¹ Rothe H. Einführung // *Титов Ф. Матеріали для історії справи на Україні в XVI–XVIII вв.: Всезбірка передмов до українських стародруків* (Kyiv, 1924). – München, 1982. – S. 1–3. *Титов Ф. И. Типография Киево-Печерской Лавры.* – Böhlau, Köln, 2000.

² Kroll W. Statt einer Literaturgeschichte // *Титов Ф. И. Типография.* – S. X–XII, XVII–XVIII, with the quoted bibliography.

³ *Титов Ф. Введение* // *Матеріали.* – С. 7. "Vvedenie" is originally dated 1. October 1918.

He wrote during WW1, just when the Russian Empire collapsed, Kyiv was about to experience the first possibilities of independent statehood and would soon be overrun by foreign armies: the spirit of the time is evident even in the erudite work of the protoierei Fedor Titov, who makes use of traditional – Russian, imperial – terminology, but expresses his pride in the specific cultural and linguistic features of the Hetmanate and its differences with Russia.

Titov was among the first to draw attention to the trilingual nature of 17th c. Ukrainian culture. In his account of the Cave Monastery printing house, he devoted an entire chapter to Polish printings, describing the prefaces and some parts of the books¹. In his “Введение” to “Матеріали”, he hinted at a “difference” between Polish “predmovy” and “slaviano-russkie predislovii” not only in language, but in character and content². Also in “Матеріали”, he stressed the importance of Latin and Polish in the Mohylian Academy’s scholarly and teaching work and printed the “Введение” of some of the most important books in Polish, beginning with Kal’nofois’kyi’s “Teratourgema”, Sakyvych’s “Paterikon”, polemical works about Cyril Laskaris’ Calvinism, Baranovych’s “Lutnia”, Galiatovskij’s “Messiasz Prawdziwy”, and ending with Stefan Iavors’kyj’s “Pełnia nieubyaiaęcey sławy”. These are just some of the most outstanding Polish language works printed in the Kyivan printing house, but they aptly represent the glory of the Polish-language cultural and religious orthodox tradition and highlight the role of the Mohylian school as the defender of the Eastern “true faith”. Interestingly, a considerable part of the polemic which opposed Orthodox writers and printers to the Catholic Church in the works chosen by Titov emphasizes the opposition to “heresy” (mostly Calvinism)³. Titov also singled out the leading genres of Ukrainian literature of the time: panegyric literature written by and devoted to prominent figures of the Kyivan metropolitanate (which remained dominant during the Hetmanate until the times of Ian Ornovs’kyi, Varlaam Iasyns’kyi, Stefan Iavors’kyi, Ioasaf Krokovs’kyi, and Prokopovych’s famous “Epinikion” for Peter’s victory), polemic literature, comments on doctrinal and other religious literature, homiletic literature.

In his Introduction to “Матеріали”, Titov stressed the glory of the Laura and its printings, and devoted several pages to the use of “Ukrainian” language in the works of Mohyla and other writers. Though he sometimes ambiguously used “russkij” as an equivalent to “ukraïns’kyi”, the latter clearly indicated for him the проста руська мова and he correctly explained the use of this linguistic code with the need to bring liturgical and sacred books closer to laymen, thus encouraging the correct fulfillment of religious life not only in monasteries, but in the whole of Orthodox society during the full liturgical cycle. Titov

¹ *Тітов Ф.* Типографія. (Reprint Köln etc. 2000). – С. 279–312.

² *Тітов Ф.* Введение. – С. 8.

³ *Тітов Ф.* Типографія. – С. 285–292.

also stressed that Mohyla's changes in the order and wording of such important religious texts as Антологія and Акафісти were not only legitimate because of his authority as Metropolitan and Ekzarch ¹ (that means a direct representative of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch – a very significant hierarchical position which is seldom properly acknowledged by Western scholars), but also apt to make them more “approachable”, “usable” by both the pupils of the College and by laymen. Such an explanation concerns not only Slavonic texts (Church Slavonic or проста мова), but also Polish language printings in the 1630s and 1640s, as Kal'nofois'kyi shows when he declares that he wrote his book of miracles “also” for the Russian reader for his elevation (“napisał y tobie Rusakowi do zbudowania”) ².

Titov wrote his “Матеріали” in 1918, amidst the turmoil of war and revolution. It is remarkable that the book (the former “Приложения”) was reprinted in 1924, during the “ukrainizaciia” ³. His choice of the texts to be printed reflect some of his “political” and ecclesiastic ideas, and may appear somewhat contradictory. He devoted considerable space to Elisei Pletenets'kyi and quoted passages where the unity of the orthodox peoples (Russians, Serbs, Bosnians, Macedonian, Moldavians and Valakhians, Bulgarians) was underlined, he even wrote about the first writers and printers as “convinced Slavianophils” (so for Zakharia Kopystens'kyi and Pamvo Berynda, including Halych Russians) ⁴. At the same time he chose to print the full text of Kasian Sakovych's “Bipm” for the death of Petro Sahaidachnyi, one of the first documents of the nascent Cossack identity which developed together with the scholarly and literary tradition of the Kyivan school. Titov also printed the full text of two sermons by Kopystens'kyi, whose language he considered “razgovornyi ukrainskii jazyk” ⁵: a definition which certainly does not fit modern linguistic knowledge and terminology (проста мова was also a codified language, not only разговорный язык!), but is significant for Titov's world-view and time, when the importance of the “simple language” began to be acknowledged, though its linguistic status was little known.

Titov's “Ukrainophilia” (if you will allow me this somewhat too modern term) also led him to criticise the editors of the Учительное Евангелие printed in 1616 in Ev'e, whom he accused of denigrating their “own national language” (“свой родной язык южно-русский”) which was considered “vulgar” (“подлый”) and “simple, common” (“простейший”), in contrast with the

¹ *Titov Ф.* Типография. – С. 291, instead, correctly underlines Mohyla's function as ekzarch. Cf. also, about the importance of this function in the time of S. Iavors'kyi, the groundbreaking book by *Живов В. М.* Из церковной истории времен Петра Великого. Исследования и материалы. – М., 2004.

² *Titov Ф.* Матеріали. – С. 521.

³ *Rothe H.* Einführung. – S. 1–3.

⁴ *Titov Ф.* Введение. – С. 10–11.

⁵ *Titov Ф.* Матеріали. – С. 12.

nobility, excellence and subtlety of Church Slavonic. Today we probably appreciate the terms “vulgar” and “simple” more appropriately, that is not in any way derogative, but is the result of Ukraine’s familiarity with the Western linguistic thought of 16th-17th century authors: indeed, the term “vulgar”, added by the editors of *Ev’eto* their проста мова, may be considered equivalent to the Latin *vulgaris* which, applied to *lingua* indicates the new languages spoken and written by the peoples of the new European states – Italian, French, English, Polish – side by side with Latin. Titov lived in a period when both Romantic and Positivist philosophy opposed all kinds of “ancient” language (often considered antiquated and conservative) to new languages interpreted as progressive and representing the “spirit of the nation”. Instead, the editors of the *Ev’e Uchitel’noe Evangelie* till considered Church Slavonic to be the most prestigious language of the Eastern Slavs, they were probably not as erudite as Italian or French philologues, their desire to translate the Gospels may have been purely intuitive and dictated by practical needs, nonetheless they grasped the fact that “simple” language was worth being written and was needed to promote evangelical thought and religious knowledge among people of all classes, and not just monks and the church hierarchy. Moreover, for the 17th century it was normal to consider ancient languages more prestigious than the new, national languages. This was equally true of Greek and Latin in the West and for Slavic in the Orthodox East of Europe. It took decades (in some countries, centuries) of polemical literature to have “vulgar tongues” recognized as equal to the ancient ones.

Titov’s acknowledgement of the importance of проста мова goes hand in hand with his recognition that Church Slavonic was still dominant and prestigious for such erudite monks as Elisei Pletenets’kyi, whom Kopystens’kyi praised as a defender of the “Slavonic language” (№ 15 of “Матеріали”, приложения). As it appears in Titov’s Preface, the polemical attitude against “Latinists” made Elisei consider the Slavonic language superior to Latin, because it was capable of expressing in one word ideas and theological concepts which in Latin need several words or periphrases¹. Thus, Titov’s choice of texts reflects the duality of self-perception of the Kyivan Cave monastery as a center of all-Slavic religion and culture and, at the same time, the bearer of the nascent identity of Rus’ as a religious and ‘ethnic’ community: on the one hand, the “pan-Slavic” perception of Church Slavonic as the religious and sacred language of the whole of *Slavia orthodoxa* (Bulgarians, Serbians, Macedonians, Bosnians, Rumenians, as in Pletenets’kyi’s Prefaces) and the pride of Ruthenian monks to act as teachers for the other Orthodox Slavs, while on the other, awareness that their new language gained expressivity, adaptability to various genres and styles, morphological and lexical codification. In a word, through his choice of Prefaces and Dedications, Titov suggests that проста

¹ *Титов Ф. Матеріали. – С. 74.*

мова was on the way to becoming a literary language in the modern sense of the term.

Titov correctly points out that Zakharii Kopystens'kyi's sermons and some passages from Berynda's forewordstestify that, though venerating Church Slavonic and acknowledging its role in pan-Slavic religious ideology (which, by the way, Berynda shares with many other learned monks of his time), these writers considered it necessary to develop a more comprehensible "simple language", in order to make biblical, liturgical and other books more accessible. To make texts of all kinds "understandable" sounds like a leitmotiv in any declaration concerning the choice of language in the texts published by Titov.

This suggests an incipient sense of identity which implies the various components and images of the future Ukrainian nation as being conceived in modern categories. In Titov's prefaces and texts, identity implies both the chivalric tradition of Cossackdom (e.g. in the funeral panegyric for Petro Sahajdachnyi), as well as the Orthodox faith and its tradition: the real actors of the two "founding myths" of Ukrainianness (the Cossacks and the Church) were often in political opposition, but also had very deep common roots in the idea of the Cossacks as defenders of the faith. As a myth, Cossacks and Church became a unique marker of identity. In his Kazanie for Elisei Pletenets'kyi's death, Zakharii Kopystens'kyi praised the noble origin of the archimandrite's family, and Elisei himself as a "knight" ("Конний ездец... то ест Новаго Ілліи в Россіи") and as a "valiant soldier" ("Жорнер добрый и рицер дельный")¹. Thus, the typically Polish terminology and conceptual form (the "knight of Christ"), became an identifying marker of Ukrainianness when Kopystens'kyi praised the life of Elisei, one of the most typical representatives of all-Slavic monastic ideology and of Church Slavonic language and culture.

Titov's choice of forewords and dedications testifies to the scholar's awareness of the plurality of linguistic identification marks of 17th century Ukrainian culture. What really emerges from his collection of texts, however, is the fact that the use of several languages and the differentiation of Church Slavonic and the "vulgar tongue" were connected mostly with functional and practical goals, with the need to give a broad group of readers access to religious literature which was the main identifying marker of Ruthenian (and more specifically Ukrainian) society. Titov can be credited with considering the three languages (or four, if Slavonic and *просва* мова are thought of as two languages) used in 17th century Ukraine almost as equal. He sometimes hints that there may have been functional differentiation in their use. However, he never seems to have posited the question of the personal, authorial reasons for a writer to choose one language rather than another. My further question in this paper is: When did a preacher or a poet choose a particular language not only for practical purposes of communication, but also for enhancing the culture of his

¹ *Титов Ф.* Матеріали. – С. 119.

peopleby “voluntarily” opting for the “vulgar tongue”? When did new, modern, and specific linguistic awareness arise in the Ukrainian mindset, more specifically in its literary production? And why did authors consciously choose one or another language? To what extent was the linguistic choice simply “code-switching” and to what extent was it linked to awareness of belonging to a Ukrainian Early Modern “state” (the Hetmanate), a Ukrainian society (shliakhta, burghers, monks, administration and military ranks, high and low clergy, etc.) and a Ukrainian “people” (or even nation)?

This is neither the time nor the place to discuss the works of Meletij Smotryc’kyi, which Titov did not include in his selection of prefaces. His complex and multifaceted approach to the plural nature of linguistic use in Ukraine has been examined in depth by D. Frick, whose articles and books offer the best information to any reader interested in the questions we are discussing here ¹.

Let me briefly consider instead the works of Silvestr Kosov and Afanasii Kal’nofois’kyi. I argued in previous papers that their decision to use Polish for their glorification of the Cave Monastery in Baroque terms was connected to the fact that this was the Commonwealth’s language of high literature and communication, and the ‘messages’ the works were intended to convey were addressed to the influential ranks of the Polish establishment in order to convince them of the excellence of the Orthodox faith and doctrine ². In his Preface, however, Kal’nofois’kyi stresses that his aim was to teach the Ukrainian reader about the value of the holy places in Kyiv: this may indicate that the author’s goal was similar to the aim which Simeon Polockii set himself for his translation of the Акафіст into Polish and Baranovych for the “Lutnia Apollinowa” and the “Żywoty świętych”, written to satisfy the wish of Orthodox believers who preferred to read in Polish, but were to be “protected” against “Latin Catholic heresies”. From such a point of view, when investigating Kosov’s and Kal’nofois’kyi’s choice of Polish, we should postulate that their audiences were not only the Polish political and ecclesiastic authorities, but also (or mainly?) the Orthodox readers of the Hetmanate who loved, or were used to, reading in Polish, but needed to have erudite historical and doctrinal texts in the most prestigious language of the state they inhabited, without any dangerous influences of Catholic “heretical” religious doctrine.

Thus, functional and practical goals of understanding and religious edification seem to determine the authors’ linguistic choices. However, both the social typology and the education of the author and his readers may have been

¹ Frick D. Meletij Smotryc’kyj and the Ruthenian Language Question // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. – 1985. – Vol. IX, no. 1–2. – P. 25–52; Collected works of Meletij Smotryc’kyj / With an introduction by David A. Frick. – Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. – 1987. – P. V–XXXVIII; Frick D. A. Meletij Smotryc’kyj. – Cambridge, Mass., 1995; *Idem*. Rus’ Restored: Selected Writings of Meletij Smotryc’kyj 1610–1630. – Cambridge, Mass., 2005.

² As early as 1918 Titov already exactly described Kosov’s goals: *Титов Ф.* Типографія. – С. 290.

no less important. Indeed, social origins, cultural background and schooling experiences seem to have been most significant for the language choice of the writers mentioned. Kosov came from a wealthy noble family and studied in several Polish colleges and in Olomouc. A fervent supporter of the Orthodox faith, Kosov was also a founder of the new Mohylianschool system based on teaching in Latin and imposing the Jesuit model of education: the printing of beautiful books narrating the glory of the spiritual center of Kyivan tradition was needed to enhance Mohyla's reforms. Moreover, creating an elitarian culture for the Ruthenian people and the Ukrainian 'nation' in Polish and Latin was a political means to oppose the tradition of Brotherhood schools based on Greek Byzantine tradition and Church Slavonic language. The choice of the Polish language for the "Paterikon" aimed to enhance the prestige of the described object for both the elitarian Ukrainian readers and the Polish authorities, at the same time being part of the political struggle between two models of culture as well. On the other hand, Polish was probably chosen for social and biographical reasons too, linked to the author's Polish schooling and his job as a philosophy and rhetoric teacher, which connected him more with Latin and Polish than with Church Slavonic or *проста мова*.

Similar considerations are valid for Baranovych's Polish poetry, but his kaleidoscopic and ambiguous personality explains how skilled he was in adapting to the needs of his audience. In order to satisfy his political ambitions and plans connected with the Muscovite court elites, he chose to write in the Slavonic language of the Church: in actual fact he had no other choice. Baranovych's linguistic choice of Polish had more complex roots. When he published his sumptuous editions of religious poems in Polish verses, "Lutnia Apollinowa" and "Żywoty świętych", his choice of language satisfied two main purposes: first, to offer the Ukrainian Orthodox believers who liked or were able to read in Polish rather than in Church Slavonic, a "pure" reading of religious texts (meditations, lives of saints) not contaminated by the "heresy" of the Polish religious poetry of the Counterreformation; second, to be able to compose orthodox Baroque poetry in Polish, exploiting all the clichés, imagery, metrical and stylistic devices which the poet mastered perfectly due to his education in Polish Jesuit colleges. Another aim may have been to show that Ukrainian Orthodox poets were able to write just as well as the many religious poets of Catholic Poland. His personal ambitions should not be underestimated in this respect, but Baranovych was a fairly pragmatical Church leader: when he wanted to convince the Tsar to join the Anti-Ottoman Holy League and to print his books in Moscow, he wrote in quite elaborate high Slavonic, when necessary for the society of the Polish Commonwealth he wrote in Polish. I would not deny that Baranovych had a sincere desire to demonstrate his good will towards the Polish establishment: in his well known poem "Rusin do Polaka coś po polsku gdaka" he

invites Poles to write poems in “Ruthenian”, because the Ruthenians were simple, had no knowledge of Latin or Polish, and would appreciate verses in their own language. In this way Baranovych offered friendship to Poles, enhanced the need to create a Christian league, diminishing the importance of the language (“Wolność mają poetowie, / Jako w bajkach, tak i w mowie”), but also put Ukrainian *проста мова* on a par with the prestigious language of the Commonwealth. In conclusion: in pursuing his very pragmatic political aims, the poet/preacher also resorted to rhetoric in order to persuade (*movēre*) his audience. Baranovych’s linguistic choices were dictated by practical and functional needs, but were also rooted in the schooling he received in the Jesuit colleges of the Commonwealth and at the initial stages of the Mohylian college, when Polish was the most sophisticated and prestigious language of the upper echelons of society.

Biographical reasons may partially explain Kal’nofois’kyi’s choice of language too: he was certainly influenced by Kosov and his milieu, but his origins from a noble family from Galicia may have contributed to his Polish linguistic background (the fact that Kosov had to revise Kal’nofois’kyi’s writings probably reflects his lower intellectual and cultural level, rather than his linguistic ideas).

One decade earlier than Kosov, Kasian Sakovych had written his famous, highly original funeral panegyric for hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi. It elaborated many of the Polish myths (the “golden liberty”, the knight skilled in handling both pen and sabre, the comparison with Jan Zamoyski, etc.) in a Ukrainian mood, but it was written in *проста мова*, probably because it celebrated the Cossack hetman and the Ukrainian historical memory (going back to Volodymyr and the times of baptism) and was addressed to a broad public where secular listeners were numerous: the Cossack elites, burghers, lower ranks of the army and citizens as well. What explains the different linguistic choice made by Sakovych compared to Kosov and Kal’nofois’kyi? He is credited with having been a devoted teacher, investing time and effort in explaining Latin grammar, lexis and syntax to his pupils with equivalent words and phrasing in Ukrainian and Polish. A supporter of Brotherhood schools and of the need to elevate the level of knowledge among Ukrainians, he was in continuous contact with the plurilingual situation of Ukrainians of different classes, laymen and clerics. As the son of a priest and a tutor in the Kisiels family, he may have been more inclined to a good use of *проста мова*, although he wrote in Polish and Latin when dealing with philosophical or doctrinal subjects or with his own conversion to Catholicism. His ability to write in various languages, and his remarkable linguistic and philological skills probably suggested the most appropriate language for him to use in a variety of situations according to the people he was addressing, the subject matter and the milieu.

In the cases of Kosov and Baranovych we may conclude that their choice of Polish was for rhetorical reasons, in order to persuade (lat.:movēre) their “external” public (the Polish political and intellectual elites) of the rights and dignity of the Ukrainian Orthodox tradition. In the case of Sakovych’s panegyric for Petro Sahaidachnyi, the language was chosen mainly for social reasons: the message was addressed to the “internal” Cossack Ukrainian public and the language had to be not only as clear as possible, but also the direct expression of the socium of the celebrated person and the citizens. Constant contact with teaching duties in a family may also have underpinned his ability and willingness to use проста мова in elevated literary works. Later, when he finally converted to Uniatism, then to Latin Catholicism, Sakovych expressed himself mainly in Polish and Latin, the languages of his education and the languages which represented the elevated culture of the Western Church and society, the new milieu in which he now moved.

Only a few years later, on 17 February and 29 November 1625, the monk Zakharii Kopystens’kyi wrote the two funeral orations mentioned above in honour of Elisei Pletenets’kyi, the former archimandrite and director of the Cave Monastery Typography, who had passed away on 29 October 1624¹. The first oration, devoted to a monastic leader and pronounced in a monastic milieu, is written in руська мова: some typical Church Slavonic wording and phrasing, when biblical examples or sacred historical persons are mentioned, do not change the “Ruthenian” linguistic system. The second oration is addressed “to the sons of the Catholic Church of any ecclesiastic or secular state”. In actual fact, Kopystensk’yi wrote almost all of his works in проста мова, but there is some difference in the choice of a Church Slavonic or Middle-Ukrainian register respectively. In the first homily the Slavonic typology is much more evident in the initial part (devoted to the explanation of the “Thema” [Ev. Ioann, 11, O Lazare i o sestrax ego plachushchix] with biblical examples), while the Ukrainian register increases in the second and third parts. The former is devoted to the deeds and merits of Pletenets’kyi, and invites every “people”, all social groupings to mourn and join in prayer (the invitation follows a spiritual and civil hierarchy: monks of every age and dignity, archimandrites, presbyters and diacons, nuns, priests and church singers, printers and engravers, warriors on land and sea, the poor, beggars, friends, servants, subjects of all kind, children and any other kind of person). An alternation of Church Slavonic and проста мова strikes the reader also in the Second Foreword to the Comments of Chrisostomos on the Acts of the Apostles, where the author switches from Ruthenized Slavonic to plain проста мова when he addresses Kostiantyn Dolmat, the nobleman who funded the edition.

¹ Титов Ф. Матеріали. – С. 12–13, 110–125 (№ 20), 147–171 (№ 25).

Kopystens'kyi's use of Church Slavonic and проста мова may be connected to various factors. He belonged to the lower шляхта, but had studied in brotherhood schools and apparently had no experience of higher education in Polish institutions. His works have a didascallic character: to introduce translations of the Church Fathers' Homilies and other sacred literature, to preach, to oppose Uniatism. All these genres implied a strong connection with the "spoken word", direct speech addressed to a reader or listener whom the author considered present in spirit if not in the flesh. Homiletics is the genre where проста мова was best represented throughout the 17th century, as the voluminous works by preachers such as Galiatovs'kyi or Radyvylovs'kyi testify. Before being summoned to Moscow by Peter I., Dmytro Tuptalo composed some of his most beautiful sermons in проста мова. His friend Stefan Iavors'kyi also used the Ukrainian "vulgar tongue", but variations in register and linguistic code are more evident. The best example is given by the nuptial sermon for the wedding of Mazepa's nephew (1698), where he changed from Church Slavonic to проста мова with the same ease as Kopystens'kyi had done, in accordance with the change in the communication situation: in the initial, doctrinal part of the sermon, Iavors'kyi's language is dominantly Church Slavonic; hybrid Slavonic characterizes the following antilutheran polemic; in the last part, addressed to laymen, more specifically to the bride and the groom as if in a personal dialogue, the preacher uses plain проста мова, using many expressions coming from the lower, spoken register of the language. In all these cases, the linguistic choice implies the author's desire to be understood and to adapt himself to the subject and the audience, sometimes it reflects simple code-switching. The latter is particularly evident in the well-known letter exchange between Javors'kyi and Tuptalo in 1707–1708 ¹.

As Teresa Chynczewska ² and other scholars pointed out years ago, several "defences" of the "Ruthenian" language were written in political and juridical contexts already in the 16th century. The case of Wasyl Zahorovs'kyi, who recommended his children to be taught first in руська мова, then in the other languages of Ukraine, is well known. The contemporary use of four languages by many writers continued throughout the 17th, and even at the beginning of the 18th century. Unfortunately, theoretical reflections on the linguistic choice are scanty, but an evolution in time may be observed. As we have seen, sometimes the status of languages is indicated in the first decades of the 17th century already and the voluntary choice of some author appears here and there

¹ Федотова М. А. Эпистолярное наследие Димитрия Ростовского. Исследование и тексты. – М., 2005.

² Chynczewska-Hennel T. The National Consciousness of Ukrainian Nobles and Cossacks from the End of the Sixteenth to the Mid-Seventeenth Century // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. – 1986. – Vol. X, no. ¾. – P. 379–382.

in forewords and texts. Social aspects of linguistic thought of the 17th century are no less interesting.

In Titov's collection of Prefaces and Dedications special attention should be given to Pamvo Berynda's Dedication to Fedor Kopystens'kyi¹, a very particular text which was printed only in some copies of the "Беседа Іоанна Злароуєра", edited by Berynda in the Kyivan typography in 1623. In this Dedication the author praises the high social position, and level of education and erudition of the whole noble family of the Kopystens'kyis ("in this ancient and virtuous family there were the Mitre and the Lance", they were well versed in Philosophy and Theology, in Politics and Ethics) and their glorious deeds in war against Tatars and Turks. However, after a two-page description of the most prominent churchmen, monks and bishops, the author goes back to Fedor, a poorly distinguished lay member of the family, and considers it noteworthy that he was "proficient" in several foreign languages. What is new here, is the fact that Berynda does not mention Greek, Latin or Slavonic, the languages which had cultural and sacred dignity. He mentions the foreign "living languages", German and Hungarian. One may guess that Fedor Kopystens'kyi, who remained a layman and a soldier, had received basic education in some school or college. However Berynda praises him for having learned modern languages in "practical" circumstances, when he served in the Emperor Rudolf's army and took part in the victories against Tatars and Turks. Berynda does not mention Ukrainian (руська мова) among the languages known by the "rycar" Kopystens'kyj, nor does he mention Polish, the two languages that every member of shliakhta was implicitly supposed to know. This suggests that modern, living languages were not a subject for learning, nonetheless Berynda considered these languages important enough to be an "ornament", a "virtue" of the noble family he wanted to praise. What also matters, is that Berynda considers German and Hungarian "real" foreign languages, while failing to mention Polish, Church Slavonic Latin or руська мова: the latter, were "normally" used languages in the Ukrainian lands of the Commonwealth, they were all considered "our" languages. This suggests the existence of a sort of "plurilingualism", where totally different languages (such as Latin, Polish, проста мова and Slavonic) were part of a unique system and could be used according to various situations of communication and in various functions². The choice

¹ Тітов Ф. Матеріали. – С. 82, 84 (№ 15).

² As far as I know, comparative investigations about the relationship of Ukrainian plurilingualism with the ideas of diglossia and linguistic hybridism, as formulated for Muscovite Russia first by: Успенский Б. А. История русского литературного языка. – München, 1987, later by: Живов В. М. Очерки исторической морфологии русского языка XVII–XVIII веков. – М., 2004; *Idem*. Language and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia. – Boston, 2009. – P. 1–64, are only in a very initial phase: they may be useful for a better understanding of the evolution of Early Modern Ukrainian. Іа. Ісаєвич hints at the differences between diglossia and Ukrainian plurilingualism: "Der Buchdruck und die Entwicklung

could be determined by the author's degree of culture, his social background, his schooling, the character of the person spoken to and the situation of communication. What is not always clear is how far the individual choice of an author was influential and conscious.

Be it as it may, Berynda's praise of the fact that Fedor Kopystens'kyi spoke/wrote in German and Hungarian appears to be a rare case where, already at the beginning of the 17th century, languages were singled out as "really foreign", in the same sense we understand this word today. Probably it is not by chance that Berynda was not only an erudite monk, but acted in very "practical" domains such as typography and lexicography. If it is true that he was of Rumanian (or Oriental) origin, his experiences as a man of mixed identity may also have had an impact on his linguistic approach.

The scarcity of theoretical expressions for the linguistic ideas and choices of the Ruthenian people in the 17th c. does not imply a lesser sense of distinctiveness and identity in terms of culture, religion or administrative and juridical organization. However, there are a few cases where a text suggests the need for an author to have and to create what we consider a modern literary language, capable not only of being understood, of creating stylistic differentiation and literary art, but also of being a "marker of identity" of a given socium or an Early Modern 'nation.' For a consciously expressed desire to write in such a language (which we may consider "literary language" in the modern sense of the word), covering different registers and styles and being the expression of a people/nation, we have to wait until the end of the 17th century.

One poet who effectively tried to provide a theoretical formulation to the need for writing poetry in "our" руська мова at that time was Ivan Velychkovs'kyi. In the Preface to his collection of poems "Млеко", he remarked that "many peoples have not only rhetorical, but also poetical works printed in their native tongue; they are a consolation for [these peoples] themselves and stimulation for their descendants" ¹. Velychkovs'kyi's distinction between rhetorical and poetical works may be interpreted as an acknowledgement

der Literatursprachen in der Ukraine (16.-1. Hälfte des 17. Jh.)" (Zeitschrift für Slawistik. – 1991. – Т. 36, № 1. – S. 40–52.)

¹ Уважаючи я, иж многий народове, зважа в науках обфитующе, много мают не тылко ораторских, але и поетицких, чудне а мистерне, природным их языком, от высоких разумов составленных трудолюбий, которыми и сами ся тьшат, и потомков своих довьпы остряют, я, яко истинный сын Малороссійской отчизны нашеи, болѣючи на то сердцем, иж в Малой нашей Россіи до сих частаковых нѣ от кого тыпом выданных не оглядаю трудоу, з горяиivosti моеи ку милой отчизнѣ, призвавши бога и божию матку и [святых], умыслилем, иле зможность подлого [довць]пу моего позволяяла, нѣ з которые значнѣйшыи штуки поетицкіе руским языком выразити, не з якого языка на рускій оныя переводачи, але власною працею моею ново на подобенство инородных составляючи, а нѣ которые и цѣле рускіе способы вынайдуочи, которые и иншым языком анѣ ся могут выразити (*Величковський Іван*. Твори. – К., 1972. – С. 70–71).

of the existence and importance of a well developed prose literature (or oratory poems), while poetry in проста мова still lacks the variety of forms and refinement found in contemporary Baroque poetry of other peoples. For Velychkovs'kyi the key issue was for such poetry to be printed: "In our homeland Malorosia" ("[в] Малоросійскої отчизны; в Малой нашей Россіи") – the poet writes – nobody has printed poetical works ("до сих час таких нѣ от кого тѣломъ выданных не оглядаю [поетицких] трудов"), therefore "as a good son of my homeland" ("яко истинный сын Малоросійскої отчизны нашей") I decided to create in the "Rusian language" (рускимъ языкомъ) poems ("штуки поетицкіє") similar to the many poems printed in other languages. No less important is the poet's declaration that he does not translate, but creates "forms which can be used only in our language" ¹. All this indicates that Velychkovs'kyi was thinking of a well organized literary structure which would aptly represent Ukraine's participation in the literary and cultural system of European countries of his time, where both rhetorical prose and inventive poetry were represented. His choice as an author and a "good son of the homeland" was for modernity: his goal was to have a literary system expressed in the most advanced forms of prose in the various genres of the 17th century, and Baroque poetry that would satisfy the need for moral and religious teaching, but also elicit "marvel" and "inventiveness" (Довицѣн, Lat.: acumen, also: ingenium), the whole in printed form. This is a well structured and complex ideal of modernity.

One question arises: why did Velychkovs'kyi apparently ignore such poetic achievements as Kasian Sakovych's "Вірші" for the death of Petro Sahaidachnyi (printed in Kyiv 1622), or the panegyric poems devoted to Mohyla and other hierarchs of the Orthodox Church, such as "Eucharisterion" and other similar collections of laudatory poems written in the 1630s in проста мова? They were printed and were part of the patrimony of the Mohylian college, but he maintains that there was no printed poetry in Ukraine in "our language". Likewise, he must have been familiar with the poems written in the forewords and dedications of the Bibles and doctrinal books printed in Ostroh, Kyiv and other 17th century printing houses. The only explanation I can see for this "oblivion" to previously printed poetry in Middle Ukrainian is that the latter did not suit the taste of Baroque "conceptistic" poetics, as represented by the abundant Polish and European literature of the 17th century. Velychkovs'kyi was probably also familiar with the panegyric poems that had already been printed for Mazepa in the 1680s. As in the case of Baranovych's poetry, the problem was that these authors had

¹ In spite of this programmatical declaration, however, in his poetical works Velychkovs'kyi translated epigrams by Ovid, Martialis, Owen and other Latin poets showing how the original text should be rendered in Middle Ukrainian. What "translation" means for Velychkovs'kyi and his time still needs to be investigated.

chosen the prestigious Polish language, only resorting to проста мова or Ruthenized Church Slavonic for sermons or polemical literature. The Poltava priest's deliberate linguistic choice appears clearer against this background.

As is well known, Ivan Velychkovs'kyi wrote typical Baroque, figural and "gongoristic" poetry. In Chernihiv, between 1680 and 1683, he had printed a collection of laudatory poems in Polish sapphic strophes ("Lucubratiuncula"), a poetic diptych where lofty verses, with numerous quotations from the Bible, Ovid and other Latin poets were offered to Bishop Lazar Baranovych, the patron of the printing house where the poet worked: the first part is devoted to the Bishop's patron saint Lazar, who died and resurrected 4 days later, the second was a laudation of the Bishop himself¹.

The Ukrainian language collections of poems "Zegar z poluzegarkom" (1690) and "Mleko" (1691) were written when the author lived in Poltava as a priest. Their "architecture" is well constructed, figural poetic compositions are beautiful and metaphorical images have some original flavour. The 24 hours of the poetic clock "Zegar" are represented as two parts of the Metropolitan's (Jasyn'skyj) vestments: blessed by the Virgin, they will help the head of the Kyivan Church to fulfill his mission. The graphic aspect of the manuscript is also significant: the subtitle ("Poluzegarok") of the daily part of the hours is written in cinnaber, while the second part, the night, is in black ink. The religious symbology of "Mleko" testifies to the poet's good doctrinal knowledge and his skill in representing religious truths and feelings with aesthetically appealing images. The poems themselves are not inferior to many other poems of the same time. The artifices and poetic inventiveness of the many tropes and curious verses Velychkovs'kyi offers as examples for imitation matched the Latin language treatises circulating in the Mohylian College and other schools in Ukraine. All this notwithstanding, the Poltavian priest's verses have no real poetic or literary value that could rank them above the dozens of similar collections of poems written, and sometimes published in 17th century Ukraine.

In the light of the Predmova, however, "Mleko" should be re-evaluated for highlighting the evolution of linguistic awareness, even of the Ukrainian identity as a nation. The poet's declared aim of wishing to create and print a work of literature that could place Ukraine on a par with other important European peoples is a landmark in the history of Ukraine's literary and linguistic self-

¹ For biographic and literary comments: *Петров Н. И.* О словесных науках и литературных занятиях в Киевской академии от начала и ее преобразования в 1819 году // Труды Киевской духовной академии (далі – Труды КДА). – 1866 (июль). – С. 305–330; 1867 (январь). – С. 82–118; *Колосова В., Кречотень В. І.* До питання про життя і творчість Івана Величковського // *Величковський Іван.* Твори. – С. 16–36. I had no access to the more recent book by: *Бадрак Б. М.* Творчість Івана Величковського. – Донецьк, 2006.

identification. In the light of Velychkovkyi's words quoted above, "Zegar" and "Mleko" can be considered as a tribute to his mentor and master, Lazar Baranovych, and to other Polish language poets who had written similar poems, but in Polish. Regrettably, however, his Ukrainian language poems were never printed, he apparently failed to gain any advantage from the dedication-sand poems written for such high ranking church hierarchs as Baranovych and Jasyns'kyj and he quickly fell into oblivion until the 20th century.

As mentioned above, Velychkovs'kyi had had certain predecessors since the late 16th century, but – as far as I know – very few (or none) of these ever expressed any kind of theoretical thought about the need to emulate other European nations that wrote and printed "inventive" poetry in their own tongue. Further insight into Titov's collection of forewords and other Early Modern literary works may afford us a better understanding of the evolution of the linguistic consciousness of authors who wrote with similar ease in two or three languages. Much has been clarified over the last few decades about the codification, evolution and function of проста мова, and about the linguistic choices of 16th–17th century Ukrainian (and generally Ruthenian) poets and writers ¹. Much, however, still needs to be investigated.

One aspect that may not have been taken into due consideration is the influence that social origins, schooling, profession and contacts with other people may have exerted on authors and their choice of one language or another. Further insight may also shed light on the relationship between identity awareness and the functional use that authors more or less voluntarily attributed to their "Ruthenian" or "Ukrainian" language.

The modernity of Velychkovs'kyi's intuitions stimulates further questions. Was it by chance that he never became a monk, but remained a priest?

¹ After the groundbreaking book by: *Witkowski W.* Język utworów Joanicjusza Galatowskiego. – Kraków, 1969, major achievements have been reached by: *Мозер М.* Причинки до історії української мови. – X., 2009. Useful are also the works by: *Besters-Dilger J.* Le facteur linguistique dans le processus de construction nationale en Ukraine // L'Ukraine dans la nouvelle Europe / Ed. J. Besters-Dilger et. al. – Paris: CNRS Editions, 2005. – P. 41–81; "Modalität im Sprachkontakt. Die ukrainische "Prosta mova" (2. Hälfte 16. Jh.)" // Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives / Eds. Hansen B., Karlík P. – München, 2005. – P. 239–258. A very clear synthesis of the Ruthenian linguistic situation is still represented by: *Isaevych Ja.* Der Buchdruck und die Entwicklung der Literatursprachen in der Ukraine. – S. 40–52. Some comparative insights may be given by: *Nedeljković O.* The linguistic Dualism of Gavriilo Stefanović Venclovic and Prosta Mova // *Studia Slavica Mediaevalia et Humanistica* Riccardo Picchio dicata / Ed. M. Colucci et al. – Roma, 1986. – P. 592–610. It would be impossible to mention here even the most relevant literature on the subject. Worth mentioning is the recent book by: *Пивторак Г.* Українці: звідки ми і наша мова. Дослідження, факти, документи. – К., 2014, whose points of view may be controversial, but offer new perspectives for research. Additional informations and new perspectives will certainly appear in the forthcoming book *The Battle for Ukrainian: A Comparative Perspective* / Ed. by Michael S. Flier and Andrea Graziosi. – Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1917.

More generally, was it by chance that the first poems in *простя мова* were written in the 16th–17th century in urban, bourgeois or recently ennobled Ivovian (or ostrohan) milieu? That a teacher was probably the author of the “Ljament” of 1636? That Velychkov’skyi’s sense of distinctiveness and his desire to emulate the achievements of “other peoples” is so similar to the formulations of Taras Shevchenko in his Foreword (also “Peredmova”!) to the planned edition of 1847? Of course, Shevchenko did not know Velychkov’skyi and monks too wrote in *простя мова*, prose and verses. Shevchenko’s linguistic choices were embedded in the Herderian identification of nation and language, in the culture of Romanticism and in the Peoples’ Spring. However, it is hard to ignore the similarities in the formulation of the linguistic ideas in our two respectively Baroque and Romantic poets. Like Velychkov’skyi, Shevchenko observed that each nation in Europe had poets and printed books in their own language. Shevchenko expressly formulated the provocative idea that some poets preferred to write in the language of an Empire, while other chose to remain faithful to their “native” tongue; Velychkov’skyi’s position on this point is only implicit, but his desire to create artistic poetry in his own language (*pryrodnyj jazyk*) “for the consolation of present readers and the education of future generations” sounds very similar to Shevchenko’s “Peredmova” and indicates that he took his distance from both the Byzantino-Slavic community and the Polish Commonwealth. The didactic purpose of the priest of Poltava may also find some parallelism with the didactic purposes Shevchenko expressed in his “Peredmova”, more specifically in the wish to become a teacher at Kyiv University in 1846 and to print a *Буквар* for popular schools in the final years of his life. Though linked to external, and quite different reasons, it is striking that both poets, Velychkov’skyi and Shevchenko, had their programmatic Prefaces printed only many decades (the former even centuries) later.

Analogies between Velychkov’skyi and Shevchenko are purely typological, but the “popular” origin and the continuity of strict ties with the common people link the literary and linguistic choices of both the Baroque and the Romantic poet to the social and educational context in which they were born and lived.

The issue needs to be investigated and new texts need to be analysed. To conclude, I would just like to recall that among the 16th–17th century Polish poets considered “Ukrainians”, the nearest to the real Ukrainian worldview was not the erudite Klonowic, a representative of Poland’s upper classes, but the brothers Zimorowic, who were sons of a Ukrainian artisan. As already mentioned, Kasian Sakovych did not belong to an aristocratic or rich family either. He worked as a teacher: true, he wrote his dogmatic and polemic literature in Polish, but his highly inspired and valuable poetic work was in *простя мова*, and Polish was mainly used after his conversion to

Greek or Latin Catholicism. It is probably not by chance either that Dmytro Tuptalo, a lower ranking Cossack son who never studied outside Ukraine, was a master in using highly sophisticated *посота мова* in his Ukrainian sermons. On the contrary, the Polish schooled Iavors'kyi rarely used the "vulgar tongue" and wrote mostly in Polish, Latin and hybrid Church Slavonic. One may argue that the most artful defence of the Ukrainian religious and "ethnic" tradition was written by Meletii Smotryts'kyi in Polish: his father represented the Brotherhood tradition and wrote in hybrid Church-Slavonic and Middle Ukrainian language, but the Polish writing Meletii had studied abroad and belonged to the higher ranks of Ukrainian society, in both intellectual and social hierarchical terms.

Here it is impossible to clearly interpret the ambiguous relationship between an author's linguistic choice, and his origins, schooling and readings. I conclude by drawing attention to the striking similarities between a 17th century poet who had remained rather obscure until recently, and the arch-poet of Ukrainian Romantic literature and national identity. Both were sons of lower classes, both had close contacts with their people. Their education followed completely different paths, but typological analogies are striking and their voluntary choice of the "природный язык" offers a new example of continuity between Baroque and Romantic Ukrainian culture.