



Title	The Ukrainian Bible and the Valuev Circular of July 18, 1863
Author(s)	Danylenko, Andrii
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 28, 1-21
Issue Date	2010
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/47617
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	ASI28_001.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

Articles

The Ukrainian Bible and the Valuev Circular of July 18, 1863

ANDRII DANYLENKO

On July 18 of 1863, a circular sent by Pëtr Valuev,¹ Russia's minister of internal affairs, to the censorship committees imposed restrictions on Ukrainian-language publications in the Russian Empire. In accordance with this document, the Censorship Administration could "license for publication only such books in this language that belong to the realm of fine literature; at the same time, the authorization of books in Little Russian with either spiritual content or intended generally for primary mass reading should be ceased."² The genesis of this circular, which was incorporated into a later act limiting Ukrainian-language publishing, namely, the so-called Ems Decree of May 18, 1876, has been the focus of numerous studies. Various historians (Fedir Savčenko, David Saunders, Alexei Miller, Ricarda Vulpius) tackled the emergence of the Valuev Circular from various points of view that appear sometimes complementary, sometimes kaleidoscopic, while covering loosely related aspects of the problem. In this paper, the Valuev Circular will be addressed in the context of the appearance of modern translations of the Holy Scriptures into vernacular Ukrainian, thus expanding conventional approaches to the initiation of prohibitive measures against the Ukrainian language.

ON THE GENESIS OF THE CIRCULAR

Among circumstantial theories, premised on some secondary aspects of the genesis of the Valuev Circular, deserving of attention is Remy's recent attempt to treat the appearance of anti-Ukrainian edicts as an incidental intrusion of the individual into the historical chain of events. While discussing the situation with Ukrainian-language publications after the Valuev Circular, Jo-

This article is based on work supported by a 2009 research grant from Dyson College at Pace University (New York) and a 2009–2010 Foreign Visitors Fellowship Program sponsored by the Slavic Research Center of Hokkaido University.

- 1 The editorial commission of *Acta Slavica Iaponica* agreed with me to use in this article the linguistic system of transliteration as recommended by the American Committee of Slavists, although with some exceptions for Ukrainian such as the Middle Ukrainian "ы" rendered with the help of *ÿ*; see George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979, p. 21). Some conventional English forms for personal and geographical names are preferred if they exist in current usage.
- 2 Alexei Miller, *The Ukrainian Question* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2003), p. 264.

hannes Remy brought attention to the fact that from 1874 to 1876, eighteen such publications circumvented the limits of the Circular, with seventeen editions appearing in Kyiv.³ The most plausible explanation, according to him, is the corruption of one of the two censors in this city, namely a certain Il'ja Puzyrevskij. However, as Remy had to admit, even after his dismissal, in the first months of 1876, six additional publications appeared that clearly violated the Valuev Circular.⁴ For the case of the Circular aimed at banning educational literature in Ukrainian, one can also mention David Saunders's claim that Valuev might have been affected by some other indirect factors.⁵ Among these, Saunders chose the debate between the right-wing journalist Mixail Katkov (1818–1887) and the Ukrainophile historian and writer Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885) that took place in the summer of 1863. In fact, as Saunders admitted, his interpretation of the said debate as provisional was influenced by some of his predecessors, including the pioneering work by Mixail Lemke. Among other things, Lemke contended that the press polemic between Katkov and Kostomarov was enough in itself to explain Valuev's edict.⁶

The said polemic, important as it may appear in dotting all the ideological *i's*, delineated only in general a vector of future contention between the Ukrainophiles and their opponents in the Great Russian cultural establishment.⁷ Moreover, one can hardly regard this polemic as the immediate pretext for the anti-Ukrainian measure of 1863. Karkov's reasoning can be reduced to a few theses, none of which could prove the alleged complicity of the Ukrainophiles with Polish plotters, although in some cases, the subversive activities of the Ukrainians were more than obvious. Thus, in one of his articles published in *Moskovskie Vedomosti* [Moscow News] dated June 21, 1863 (O. S.), Katkov

3 Johannes Remy, "The Valuev Circular and Censorship of Ukrainian Publications in the Russian Empire (1863–1876): Intention and Practice," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 49:1–2 (2007), p. 88.

4 Remy, "The Valuev Circular," pp. 108–109.

5 David Saunders, "A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 17:3–4 (1993), pp. 365–377.

6 Mixail Lemke, *Èpoxa cenzurnyx reform 1859–1865 godov* (St. Petersburg: M. V. Pirožkov, 1904), pp. 294–309.

7 The issue of ethnic terminology, as evidenced in nationalism studies, is very sensitive. Certain details aside, I will use in this paper concomitantly the terms *Ukrainian* and *Little Russian* next to *Rusyn* depending on the historical and geopolitical context. The term *Rusyn(s)* would refer to the Ukrainians living in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, primarily in Galicia (cf. Galician *Rusyns*), and *Little Russian(s)*, to the Ukrainians residing within the borders of the Russian Empire. The term *Ukrainian* will be used as a common name to denote Ukrainophiles or Little Russians conceived of by the Ukrainophiles as a part of a separate (Ukrainian) "imagined community" in the nineteenth century. Yet, in all the above cases, the name *Ukrainian* may be employed as a generic term, thus covering different sociocultural and geopolitical representations of the historical community of Ukrainians. Additionally, the learned term *Ruthenian(s)* conventionally refers to the Ukrainians living in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

chastised the “new Cyrils and Methodiuses” (implying the Kyiv-based Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius suppressed by the regime of Nikolas I) who popped up with unusual primers in order to declare the existence of a so-called Little Russian language.⁸ Finally, he added, one famous professor (Kostomarov) had solemnly opened a nationwide fund-raising subscription for publishing Little Russian books that could be a product of the Polish intrigue.⁹ In another article, Katkov contended that, while defending cultural Little Russian particularism, the Ukrainophiles unwittingly became a docile instrument in the hands of enemies of both Russia and Ukraine, in particular, of the “Polish zealots” – “[W]e can see in Ukrainophilism an adroit plot, we can see herein a sad delusion, and finally, we can see a pitiful naiveté and stupidity.”¹⁰ The Polish plotters, Katkov maintained, would gladly pretend to be Ukrainophiles themselves in order to ultimately influence the Great Russian people.¹¹ Quite imperatively, Katkov summed up that “Ukraine has never had its own history, never been a separate state; the Ukrainian people are an authentic Russian people, an indigenous Russian people, and essential part of the Russian people, without which it can hardly remain what it is now.”¹² While positing the artificiality of the *ukrainskij* [Ukrainian] people and its *ukrainskij* language, Katkov drew the following conclusion (to be later incorporated into the text of the Valuev Circular): “The Little Russian tongue has never existed and, despite all the efforts of the Ukrainophiles, still does not exist.”¹³

Overall, such circumstantial theories may look conjectural in relation to the imperial bureaucratic apparatus ineffectual as it was at that time. It is therefore worthwhile remaining within the confines of mainstream explanations of the 1863 anti-Ukrainian circular. This position becomes even peremptory since, in this study, I will take into consideration another seemingly circumstantial fac-

8 M. N. Katkov, *1863 god. Sobranie statej po pol'skomu voprosu* (Moscow 1887), p. 276.

9 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 276.

10 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 699.

11 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 277.

12 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 278.

13 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 278. A striking parallelism is found in the following excerpt from the 1863 circular about education in Little Russian: “Not only has the very question of the benefit and possibility of the use of this dialect in schools not been solved, but even raising this question meets with indignation on the part of the majority of Little Russians, who have often spoken their minds in the press. They prove with great conviction that there was not, is not, and cannot be any special Little Russian language, and that their dialect, as used by uneducated folk, is the same Russian language, only corrupted by Polish influence” (Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, pp. 263–264, 266). Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 107, assumed that the coincidence of dates and wording in some of Katkov’s articles written in the course of the discussion of anti-Ukrainian measures in 1863 was not accidental. Clearly, Valuev was sifting through the most convincing arguments advanced by Russian conservatives with an eye to substantiating an administrative ban on Ukrainian-language publications with religious and educational contents.

tor in the translation of the Holy Gospels into Ukrainian that antedated the first serious round of censorship of Ukrainian publications in 1863 and, as Ricarda Vulpius tried to prove, could provoke the appearance of this circular.¹⁴ I will be arguing that the translation of the Holy Scriptures could hardly contribute to the enactment of the Valuev Circular. Moreover, one of my main claims will be that the translation of the Gospels by Pavlo Moračevs'kyj (1806–1879) was not potentially dangerous or harmful to the all-Russian project as compared with the translation by Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819–1897) (in collaboration with Ivan Puljuj (1845–1918), a native of Galicia) some ten years later. Unlike Moračevs'kyj's local vernacular with a handful of borrowings, the latter translation was written, to use Katkov's words, "in a special Little Russian language, further developed, expanded, and revised by the Ukrainophiles."¹⁵

Since the subject of this paper is the Ukrainian Bible in the context of the imperial censorship of Ukrainian-language publications, I will briefly touch on two major explanatory trends in contemporary nationalism studies focusing on the Valuev Circular. Tentatively called here sociohistorical and sociolinguistic correspondingly, the demarcation line between these trends looks essentially fuzzy, both terminologically and methodologically. In order to ascertain the extent of the Ukrainian Gospels' influence on the initiation of prohibitive measures against the "Little Russian dialect," it would be expedient to gauge the presence of the religious component as discussed within each of the two trends.

To begin with, as early as 1930, Fedir Savčenko saw the reason behind this measure in the Empire's mistrust of Ukrainian intellectuals (Ukrainophiles) and fear of Polish nationalists, although he considered such fears groundless.¹⁶ Saunders claimed that all the anti-Ukrainian edicts of 1847 (after the suppression of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius), 1863, and 1876 were a result of the Russian authorities' determination to prevent Ukrainian peasants from receiving primary education in their native language.¹⁷ Saunders admitted, however, that, even if the Ukrainophiles and Polish nationalists were not of overriding importance in the genesis of the edicts, they might have contributed significantly to the feverish atmosphere in which Valuev prohibited the publication of all Ukrainian-language literature directed at the common people.

14 Ricarda Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion. Russifizierungspolitik und ukrainische Nationsbildung 1860–1920* (Wisbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag); Rikarda Vul'pius [Ricarda Vulpius], "Jazykovaja politika v Rossijskoj imperii i ukrainskij perevod Biblii (1860–1906)," *Ab Imperio* 2 (2005), pp. 191–224.

15 Katkov, *1863 god*, p. 696.

16 Fedir Savčenko, *The Suppression of the Ukrainian Activities in 1876: Reprint of the Kyiv 1930 edition* (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970), pp. 200–203; cf. Remy, "The Valuev Circular," p. 90.

17 Saunders, "A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863"; David Saunders, "Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: the Valuev Edict of 1863," *The International History Review* 17:1 (1995), pp. 23–49.

While unwittingly expanding on Savčenko's approach, Alexei Miller posited the idea of general competition between the Ukrainian and all-Russian projects of that time, when the special regional patriotism of the Little Russians was acceptable to the advocates of the all-Russian nation concept of the Empire.¹⁸ Only the gradual increase in the subversive activities of the Ukrainophiles and especially the outbreak of the Polish rebellion in 1863 could have overbalanced, according to him, the state of affairs in the broader segments of the educated public. Suffice it to say that in 1861, when the Ukrainian journal *Osnova* (Foundation) began to appear, the Russian cultural establishment that had so eagerly welcomed the Ukrainian movement only two decades earlier opposed the new publishing venture. By this time, former "Ukrainophiles" like Mixail Pogodin and Ivan Aksakov, not to mention Mixail Katkov, had become convinced that the further encouragement of the Little Russian language and culture would only vitiate the development of an all-Russian culture and nation.¹⁹

18 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, pp. 20–30, 109–112.

19 Olga Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the 'Little Russian Solution,' 1782–1917," in Andreas Kappeler et al., eds., *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945)* (Edmonton, Toronto: CIUS, 2003), pp. 182–214. To take Pogodin's change of heart as an example, he was the first to launch an assault on the very idea of Ukrainian identity. His attacks on the Ukrainian language in 1856 gave the signal for an overall change in the stance of Russian intellectuals toward their Little Russian compatriots. In particular, Pogodin reversed his earlier belief that the Ukrainian language went back to Kyivan Rus', asserting that its language was identical to Russian, whereas the Ukrainian people were merely interlopers from the Carpathian mountains (M. P. Pogodin, "Zapiski o drevnem russkom jazyke," *Izvestija Akademii Nauk po otdeleniju russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 5 (1856), pp. 70–92; see Paul Bushkovitch, "The Ukraine in Russian Culture 1790–1860," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39:3 (1991), p. 362). Major counterarguments to Pogodin's theory were advanced in a passionate rejoinder by an old friend of his, Myxajlo Maksymovyč (1804–1873), the Ukrainian cultural historian (see N. Maksimovič, *Sobranie sočinenij* 1 (Kiev: M. P. Fric, 1876), pp. 130–145; Maksimovič, *Sobranie sočinenij* 3 (1880), pp. 183–211). A later reverberation of the dispute between Pogodin and Maksymovyč is traceable to the debate of Ivan Aksakov in the newspaper *Moskva* (Moscow) and Katkov's *Moskovskie Vedomosti*, the principal organ of militant Russian nationalism, with Kuliš, a Ukrainian writer and national awakener, in 1867. This time, the bitter contention about the role of the Ukrainian language and culture might have been instigated by some Galician Russophiles striving for spiritual, linguistic, and cultural unity with Russia. In contrast to their thesis about the Ukrainian people as a part of the all-Russian nationality, Kuliš expressed moderate federalistic views, according to which Russian could be a language of intercultural communication among all the Slavic peoples who, nevertheless, could cultivate their own literary languages (Je. K. Naxlik, *Pantelejmon Kuliš. Osobyist', pys'mennyk, myslytel'. Naukova monohrafija u dvox tomach* (Kyiv: Ukrajin's'kyj pys'mennyk, 2007), vol. 1: *Žyttja Pantelejmona Kuliša*, pp. 237–239). Interestingly enough, Bushkovitch found it difficult to substantiate Pogodin's change of mind from the existing literature, and Saunders offered several explanations of Katkov's change of track after the outbreak of the Polish Uprising of 1863. The abundant literature on his life and career, including the liberal period of 1856–1862, is likely to present all possible arguments, as Saunders in "A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863," p. 366, tenably claimed.

In fact, Miller's theory about competition between the two projects has much in common with Olga Andriewsky's reconstruction of the Russian-Ukrainian discourse of the nineteenth century. Already in her 1991 doctoral dissertation on the politics of the national identity of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, and especially in her subsequent publications, Andriewsky convincingly argued that much of the instability inherent in the modern Russian-Ukrainian relationship is rooted in two distinct and sometimes competing visions of identity and "Russianness," two different cultural paradigms and, ultimately, two different political models.²⁰ One vision is founded on the idea of an ancient Ukrainian-Russian land and people who voluntarily submitted to Polish and, later, Russian monarchs on the basis of legal covenants that guaranteed its specific corporate rights.²¹ The other vision emphasizes the postulate of an all-Russian nation – the idea that Little Russians and Great Russians shared a common "Russian" identity based on a common Orthodox heritage and a common historical destiny.²² Promoted initially by Orthodox clerical circles in Ukraine who built the first intellectual bridges between Ukraine and Muscovy, the idea of an Ukrainian-Russian nation found its full expression in the *Synopsis*, a history of the origins of the Slavo-Russian people (*Slaveno-Rossijskij narod*) published in Kyiv in 1674 under the patronage of Inokentij Gizel [Innozenz Giesel], the archimandrite of the Caves Monastery.²³

20 Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," pp. 196–198.

21 In a most explicit manner, this view was outlined by Kuliš in his long epic poem *Ukraina* (Ukraine, 1843) and historical essay *Povest' ob ukrainskom narode* [Tale about the Ukrainian People](1846). In the 1890s, Kuliš offered a somewhat modified version of his initial stance. The Kyivan Rus', according to him, was a historical cradle of the Ukrainians, whence everything Ukrainian had to be regarded as "Old Russian." By contrast, Muscovy/Russia was a later formation on the northeastern outskirts of the Old Russian lands, whence came the (Ukrainian) name *Novorusčyna* "New Rus'" referring to modern Russia. Accordingly, as Kuliš argued in a comment to his poem *Kuliš u pekli* [Kuliš in Hell], there was never a Ukrainian motherland or a Ukrainian language since the "Old Russian" language was a progenitor, first of all, of the Polish language and then of the Muscovite vernacular; see Pantelejmon Kuliš, *Tvory 2* (L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1909), p. 546. His 1846 historical essay had already provoked a polemic with Kostomarov in whom Kuliš saw a Ukrainian Westernizer and Christian humanist, who was rather listless towards nationalism and who wrote that he did not wonder that people who have choice between what is their own and what is foreign choose the latter since man strives after the better and what is foreign is better (George Luckyj, *Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 36). Clearly, Kostomarov was less passionate about the cultural and political model of the Ukrainophiles as compared with Kuliš before the ban on the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius.

22 Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," pp. 196–198.

23 The *Synopsis* was published in thirty editions between 1674 and 1881 and translated into several languages (Sergej Maslov, "K istorii izdanij kievskogo 'Sinopsisa,'" *Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk SSSR* 101:3 (1928), pp. 341–348), while remaining the only textbook in primary schools on the history of Russia. As Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 22, pointed out, the elements of a historical scheme as outlined in the

According to Andriewsky, the Little Russian component became gradually but radically devaluated by the Russian cultural establishment between 1830 and 1860.²⁴ Finally in 1863, aroused by the Polish revolt of 1830–1831 and heightened by the discovery of the secret Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius in 1847, Russia's crushing defeat in the Crimean War, and the Polish Uprising of 1863, these anxieties found their expression in the first prohibitions against the Ukrainian language and literature.²⁵ Consequently, as Miller argued, the Holy Synod was not the instigator of prohibitive measures and the translation of the Gospels, first made in Russian-ruled Ukraine by Moračevs'kyj, has never been an initial pretext for repressing the Ukrainian language.²⁶ As Basil Dmytryshyn argued, translation of the Holy Scriptures into Ukrainian could hardly develop into such a crisis inasmuch as under the auspices of the Russian Bible Society, the Bible had been translated into over fifty languages, including Kalmyk, Turkish, and Čuvaš.²⁷

At this point, the other, sociolinguistic explanation of the Valuev Circular comes fully into play. The major proponent of this view is Vulpius who approached the policy of Russification in Ukraine in the years 1860–1920 primarily through the prism of the translation of the Bible into vernacular Ukrainian.²⁸ Remarkably, the first page of her book-length study opens with a statement that the translation of the Bible into Ukrainian was the immediate reason behind Valuev's decision to limit the scope of "Little Russian" publications pri-

Synopsis that refer to the unity of Great and Little Russia can be found in all comprehensive Russian histories. The *Synopsis* culminated in the idea of ethnic affinity between the two Rus' nations first explicitly expressed in the famous *Protestation* of the Orthodox hierarchy (1621) who asserted that the Ruthenians shared one faith and mode of worship and one origin, language, and set of customs (Serhii Plokhly, *The Origin of the Slavic Nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 230); for an explanation of the corresponding linguistic terms *rus'kyj*, *rossijskij*, *slavenskij*, and the like, see Andrii Danylenko, "On the Name(s) of the *Prostaja Mova* in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth," *Studia Slavica Hung.* 51:1–2 (2006), pp. 97–121.

24 Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," pp. 199–200.

25 Cf. Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, pp. 97–112.

26 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, pp. 97–112. While maintaining an objective (multidimensional) approach to the problem of the origins of the 1863 circular, Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," p. 210, was too quick to straightforwardly claim that "the immediate pretext" for the Valuev Circular was, in fact, the prospect of the publication of a "Little Russian translation" of the New Testament – a possibility that the Kyiv Censorship Committee, the governor-general of Kyiv Province, and, ultimately, the minister of internal affairs deemed dangerous and harmful; cf. Remy, "The Valuev Circular," p. 90; Mykola Tymošyk, "Cenzura ukrajins'koho drukovanoho slova jak čynnyk nyščennja ukrajinstva: do 130-riččja Ems'koho ukazu," *Ukrajins'ka mova* 3 (2006), pp. 9–11.

27 Basil Dmytryshyn, "Introduction," in Savčenko, *The Suppression of the Ukrainian Activities*, pp. xviii–xix.

28 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, pp. 125–133, 139–140; Vul'pius [Vulpius], "Jazykova-ja politika," pp. 194, 198, fn 22.

marily to belles-lettres. Moreover, while leaning on Kappeler, she continued that, with the Russification growing more pronounced in the whole Empire after the Polish Uprising, assimilation processes became more accentuated in Ukraine.²⁹ According to her, no other government measure was more effective in hindering the formation of the Ukrainian nation, albeit adding *en passant* in a footnote a proviso that the publication of the Ukrainian Bible was most likely not the only factor leading to the anti-Ukrainian circular of 1863.³⁰ In this context, Vulpius mentions official debates about the activities of the Kyiv *hromada* [Kyiv community], as well as the Polish Uprising that could have engendered “fantasies” in the imperial milieu about a similar scenario being concocted in Ukrainophile circles.³¹

In accordance with Vulpius’s reasoning, the appearance of the Ukrainian Gospels could purportedly infringe upon the *dignitas* of the Russian language, thus breaching its function as a lingua franca in the Little Russian territories.³² Logically, her argumentation seems tenable in the light of a gradual crystallization of the all-Russian nation concept in place of the old idea of the sacral unity of *Slavia Orthodoxa* instrumental since the time of Archimandrite Inokentij Gizel (1600–1683) and especially Metropolitan of Kyiv Jov Borec’kyj († 1631).³³

29 Andreas Kappeler, “Aspekte der ukrainischen Nationalbewegung im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert,” in Guido Hausmann et al., eds., *Ukraine: Gegenwart und Geschichte eines neuen Staates* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2003), pp. 28–29; Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 15.

30 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 118, Vulpius [Vulpius], “Jazykovaja politika,” p. 198, fn 22.

31 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 132, fn 50; cf. Dmytryshyn, “Introduction,” p. xvii.

32 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 133.

33 As Plokhy, *The Origin of the Slavic Nations*, pp. 230–231, noted, the most compelling case for the ethnic affinity between the two Rus’ nations (Ruthenians and Muscovites) was made by Jov Borec’kyj. In a letter of August 1624 to Mixail Romanov, he compared the fate of the two Rus’ nations to that of the Biblical brothers Benjamin and Joseph. Borec’kyj called upon the Muscovite tsar (Joseph) to help his persecuted brethren. A later interpretation of the ethnic affinity, with a tinge of the Enlightenment, is found in Semen Divovyč’s *Razhovor Velikorossii s Malorossieju* (1762), written in the form of dialogue in which Little Russia tells Great Russia that she swore fealty to the Russian tsar, not to Great Russia. Andriewsky, “The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse,” p. 196, fn 35, argued that, together with most Cossack chronicles, this work emphasized the postulate of an ancient and sovereign Ukraine-Rus’, which voluntarily submitted to Russian monarchs. The same idea was crystallized as early as 1728 in the drama *Mylost’ Božija ...Ukraynu ...svobodyvošaja* (1728), ascribed as early as 1865 by Maksymovyč (Maksimovič, *Sobranie sočinenij* 3 (1880), pp. 730–734) to Feofan Prokopovyč (1681–1736), a Russian-Ukrainian theologian who elaborated Peter the Great’s reform of the Russian Orthodox Church and was a strong promoter of the idea of one united Russian nation that he called *rossijskii narod*, *rossijskii rod*, and *rossiane* (Plokhy, *The Origin of the Slavic Nations*, p. 275). Of interest is an expression as used in the preface to the *Book of Hours* published in Kyiv in 1616 by Hieromonach Zaxarija Kopystens’kyj of the Kyiv Caves Monastery: *ot’ naročityx’ mest’ v Rossii Kijovskix’*, that is “from the mentioned places in Kyiv, in Russia”; see Xvedir Titov, *Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Vkraini v XVI–XVIII v.v. Vsezbirka peredmov do ukrajins’kyx starodrukiv* (Kyiv, 1924), p.

This could tentatively explain why the chief procurator of the Holy Synod Major General Aleksej Axmatov was guided through the process of reviewing Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Gospels by secular authorities, including the Third Department (Russia's political police) and Ministry of Internal Affairs. Thus, in reply to Valuev's inquiries, Axmatov wrote that the translation had been put under scrutiny of the bishop of Kaluga. Shortly, not willing to put the bishop in an embarrassing situation, the chief procurator ordered him to stop reviewing Moračevs'kyj's translation, thereby following instructions prepared beyond ecclesiastical censorship.³⁴

Paradoxically, the hierarchy of factors that, as Vulpius suggested, proved decisive for the enactment of the 1863 Circular, is a mirror-image reflection of the scenario as reconstructed by Miller for the early 1860s.³⁵ He claimed that the Circular appeared to be the corollary to the complex bureaucratic process and nationalistic shift in public opinion predetermined largely by the Polish Uprising of 1863, with the translation of the Bible playing second fiddle in the process of preparing "a directive to the Censorship Administration to license for publication only such books in this [Little Russian] language that belong to the realm of fine literature." In compliance with the directive, "the authorization of books in Little Russian with either spiritual or intended generally for primary mass reading should be ceased."³⁶

WAS IN THE BEGINNING THE WORD?

I am prone at this point to endorse the latter explanatory scenario in which the role of Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Gospels into vernacular Ukrainian tends to be minimized and put alongside a series of other publications allegedly leading to the prohibitive regulation of 1863. My arguments fall into two kinds: objective (extralinguistic) and subjective (linguistic proper).

Speaking objectively, the translation of the Gospels according to John and Mark into Ukrainian undertaken in the early 1860s by a Little Russian residing in a remote town in the Russian Empire was not something unusual. In fact, as early as December 1812, Alexander I authorized the foundation of the Imperial Russian Bible Society. Launched under the inspiration of John Paterson (1776–1855) of the British and Foreign Bible Society, its purpose was to spread

6. It should be noted in this respect that, unlike *rossijskij* (with an *omega*) or *rossijskij* referring to the common Ruthenian (Orthodox) people of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a parallel form was perceived differently in Muscovy where, already in the late sixteenth century, it was associated with the Russian autocratic ruler and his state (Andrii Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica: Ukrainian in Context* (München: Otto Sagner, 2006), p. 126). Tentatively, the beginning of the all-Russian nation vision of Russian (imperial) identity is traceable to the above terminological difference of the word *rossijskij/rossijskij*.

34 Remy, "The Valuev Circular," p. 95; Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, pp. 133–134.

35 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 124.

36 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 264.

the Holy Scriptures in the languages of the Russian Empire, while membership was open to representatives of any Christian confession. As if emulating its British counterpart, Russian society began with providing the scriptures in oriental and other “exotic” non-Russian languages, for example, Kalmyk, Mongol, Tatar, Yiddish, Judeo Tatar, Georgian, Latvian, Estonian, and so forth. By 1826, the Society had translated, printed, and distributed more than five hundred thousand copies of the Holy Scriptures in over forty languages, including twenty-six languages spoken in the Russian Empire.³⁷ By a decree of February 1816, Alexander I granted to the Society the right to publish the New Testament as a modern Russian edition, with a complete Russian translation first appearing in 1823. The Russian Psalter was published in 1822, and the non-circulating Russian Octateuch, by 1825. However, the opposition of the upper clergy left the translation of the whole Bible under the supervision of the St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy’s rector and subsequently Moscow Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) unfulfilled.³⁸ Only in 1859, at Alexander II’s behest, did the Holy Synod finally authorize the unabridged Russian translation of the Holy Scriptures. The four Gospels were published in 1860, while the whole text of the New Testament appeared in 1862. Finally, the full text of the Bible went to press in 1876, a year after the Russian translation of *Das Kapital*.³⁹

With the publication of the Russian Bible in the early 1860s, one could expect that the Holy Synod would pursue the same policy in providing the Holy Gospels to Little Russian nationals. Indeed, nothing bode ill. To begin with, a priest from Podolja, Vasyľ Hrečulevyč, prepared several collections of sermons in Ukrainian that all went to press in St. Petersburg – *Propovedi na malorossijskom’’ jazyke* [Sermons in Little Russian](1849), *Besedy katexizičeskie* [Catechistic Conversations](1856 and 1859), and *Besedy o semi spasitel’nyx’’ tainstvoax’’* [Conversations about Seven Life-saving Sacraments](1859). The first of these collections underwent thorough editing by Kuliš at the request of Hrečulevyč’s son. The language of the revised edition was positively reviewed by some Russian Slavophiles who all praised “the most pure dialect of the southern Russian speech” of this publication.⁴⁰

In general, the year 1863 proved particularly rich in homiletic Ukrainian-language publications. Thus, a famous theologian and church historian, Filaret (Humilevs’kyj), archbishop of Černihiv, published in Ukrainian *Slovo protyv vraždebnykiv, xtyvyx do donosiv* [A Word against Enemies Avid for De-

37 A. N. Pypin, “Rossijskoe Biblejskoe Obščestvo,” *Vestnik Evropy* 8 (1868), p. 694.

38 Stephen K. Balden, “Printing the Bible in the Reign of Alexander I: Toward a Reinterpretation of the Imperial Russian Bible Society,” in Geoffrey A. Hosking, ed., *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine* (London: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 67–68.

39 A. A. Alekseev, “Pervyj russkij perevod Novogo Zaveta v izdanii 1823 goda,” in L. N. Smirnov et al., eds., *Rol’ perevodov Biblii v stanovlenii i razvitii slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov* (Moscow: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN, 2002), p. 35.

40 Naxlik, *Pantelejmon Kuliš*, vol. 1, pp. 123–124.

nunciation].⁴¹ The Holy Synod also allowed the printing of Stepan Opatovyč's *Opovidannja z'' Svjatoho Pysanyja* [Stories from the Holy Scriptures] (St Petersburg) that was largely influenced by the popularity of the second edition of Hrečulevyč's *Propovedi*. Interestingly, Opatovyč's *Opovidannja* were made possible with the help of money raised by Kostomarov in the 1860s toward the publication of the Ukrainian Bible.⁴² The work of Opatovyč became so popular and influential in the formation of the high/confessional style of new literary Ukrainian that examples from his *Opovidannja* were cited in the two major Ukrainian dictionaries, Jevhen Želexivs'kyj's *Little Russian-German Dictionary* (Lviv, 1886) and Borys Hrinčenko's *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (Kyiv, 1907). In 1881, five years after the enactment of the Ems Decree banning publication of "any original works or translations" in the "Little Russian dialect,"⁴³ an anonymous author asked rhetorically how the second printing of Opatovyč's *Opovidannja* made its way into press in 1875.⁴⁴ This question seemed particularly intriguing since the work of Opatovyč was published in so-called *kulišivka*, a phonetic script proscribed by the imperial administrative regulation because of its radical difference from the all-Russian orthography.⁴⁵ Finally, to continue the list of Ukrainian-language publications dating back to 1863, Ivan Babčenko published in Xarkiv *Poučenijska na malorossijskom'' jazyke* [Instructions in the Little Russian Language].⁴⁶

The above collections were particularly popular among both the literati and the Little Russian commoners. This is why the translation of two Gospels submitted by Moračevskyj to the Holy Synod might not look impressive from the point of view of its alleged impact on the subversive activities of the Ukrainophiles. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain why the Holy Synod took the manuscript into good consideration that was conducive to eventual publication; it was however, abruptly halted by the Valuev Circular.⁴⁷ As was noted above, nothing augured any difficulty for Moračevs'kyj's translation. Corrected and revised at the end of 1860, the manuscript was forwarded by the translator to Isidor, metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novgorod, for permission for its publication. However, in April 1861 Moračevs'kyj received

41 V. V. Nimčuk, "Svjaščenne Pisanie na ukrainskom jazyke," in Smirnov et al., eds., *Rol' perevodov Biblii*, p. 45.

42 See Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 134.

43 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 267.

44 V., "[Review of] Svjate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu. Movoju rus'ko-ukrains'koju perekalaly vku-pi P. A. Kuliš y dr. Y. Puljuj. Lviv. 1880," *Vestnik Evropy* 87:1-2 (1881), p. 896.

45 A. I. Miller and O. A. Ostapčuk, "Latinica i kirillica v ukrainskom nacional'nom diskurse i jazykovej politike Rossijskoj i Gabsbugskoj imperij," *Slavjanovedenie* 5 (2006), p. 34; for an English-language version, see Alexei Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism* (New York: Central European UP, 2008), pp. 67-92.

46 Vasyľ Nimčuk, "Ukrajins'ki perekłady Svjatoho Pys'ma," in Michael Moser, ed., *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache* (Wien: Lit Verlag, 2005), p. 25.

47 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, pp. 133-134.

a negative answer quite in congruence with the future restrictive regulation initiated by Valuev. Disappointed but not wholly disillusioned, Moračevs'kyj completed translation of the remaining two gospels together with the Acts of the Apostles and sent the entire translation to the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, asking for an evaluation by specialists and eventual recommendation for publication. Convened by a famous Slavist and former Ukrainophile, Izmail Sreznevskij (1812–1880), a special commission also consisting of academicians Aleksandr Vostokov (1781–1864) and Aleksandr Nikitenko (1804–1877), positively reviewed the translation, which, according to them, was an exceptional work from the religious and philological points of view. In particular, they wrote:

From the first point of view, one can ask, first of all: is the Little Russian dialect, at the modern level of its literary development and formation, able to teach the divine and greatest truths that are found in the New Testament? The translation, we believe, answered this question more than compellingly. The Little Russian dialect in it, one can say, stood the test successfully and dismissed any doubt, shared by the majority, about the capability to express sublime ideas of reason, sublime feelings of the heart, without appearing vulgar, without making them rude, without paralyzing them. Moračevs'kyj's translation proves completely that both the nature or character of the words and the quality of the Little Russian expressions have never failed either the dignity or meaning of the thoughts rendered by them... There is no doubt that the translation of the New Testament by Moračevs'kyj will mark a new epoch in the literary education of the Little Russian dialect.⁴⁸

In its resolution, the Department of Language and Philology of the Imperial Academy of Sciences stated that Moračevs'kyj coped with his translation brilliantly despite numerous pitfalls faced by him during his work. One of the major problems lay in a lack of special devices in Little Russian able to render equally aptly everyday needs and abstract concepts and “ideas belonging to the highest intellectual sphere.”⁴⁹ Highly versed in Little Russian, the translator, according to the resolution, found inspiration in “the simplicity of the greatness of the Holy truths” and managed to extract from his native dialect such expressions and constructions that, despite their common character, most adequately chime in with the lofty meaning of thoughts rendered by them.⁵⁰ Cognizant of the spiritual and religious significance of Moračevs'kyj's translation, the Department asked the president of the Imperial Academy to appeal to the Holy Synod for permission to publish the translation. Consequently, the manuscript was sent over to Archbishop Grigorij (Mykola Mytkevyc) of Kaluga who praised the translation. As a witness recollected, Archbishop Grigorij,

48 V. Naumenko, “F. S. Moračevskij i ego literaturnaja dejatel'nost,” *Kievskaja starina* 79:12 (1902), pp. 475–476.

49 Naumenko, “F. S. Moračevskij,” p. 477.

50 Naumenko, “F. S. Moračevskij,” p. 477.

a native of Černihiv, was crying over Moračevs'kyj's translation and extolling the virtues of its language and stylistics.⁵¹

Nevertheless, the Holy Synod disregarded the recommendation of the Imperial Academy of Sciences and its own experts, banning publication of the Ukrainian Gospels in compliance with recommendations of the secular authorities entreated by conservative patriots to protect the (Orthodox) faith from a split. Suffice to mention here an anonymous letter sent as early as March 1863 to Prince Dolgorukov, the head of the Third Department and chief of gendarmes, about the political consequences of the publication of the Holy Scriptures in the "miserable Little Russian dialect."⁵² Written by somebody from the upper clergy, the letter pleaded with Dolgorukov to employ every available means to protect the (Orthodox) faith from profanation and the fatherland from a dangerous schism. The author(s) must have been extremely annoyed by the Third Department's sluggishness in dealing with the escapades of the *xlopomany* (Ukrainophiles from traditionally Polonized families) as a part of the "Polish intrigue."⁵³

There was, however, a rare voice of dissent among the fiery supporters of the 1863 Circular in the Tsarist government, namely Alexander Golovnin, the minister of public education. Known for his liberal reforms within the universities, he expressed in a memorandum dated July 20, 1863, serious reservations about Valuev's ban on the publication of Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Holy Gospels. Golovnin argued in particular that "the Little Russian translation of the Gospels in the local dialect, corrected by the ecclesiastical censorship, is one of the most glorious endeavors that mark the present reign."⁵⁴ He believed that the authors "strove to elaborate grammatically on every language or dialect and, for this reason, to write in it and publish is rather useful from the view of public enlightenment and deserves full esteem." This is why, he argued, the Ministry of Public Education had an obligation to encourage these attempts and contribute to them, while the Holy Synod had the most sacred obligation to disseminate the New Testament among all the citizens of the Empire in all languages, and it would be a true holiday of our Church if every household had a copy of the New Testament in an intelligible dialect.⁵⁵ But this was "the voice of one crying in the wilderness" (Mt 4:3), which was not capable of changing the decision made by the government and approved by the tsar under pressure from Mixail Katkov and other conservative publicists.⁵⁶

Overall, the above dissonance within the imperial administration epitomized a revealing moment in government policy, when some ministers were

51 Naumenko, "F. S. Moračevskij," p. 477; Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 129.

52 Kyrylo Studyns'kyj, ed., *P. O. Kuliš (Materijaly i rozvidky)*, part 2 (L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1930), pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

53 Savčenko, *The Suppression of the Ukrainian Activities*, p. 200.

54 Lemke, *Èpoxa cenzurnyx reform 1859-1865 godov*, p. 306.

55 Lemke, *Èpoxa cenzurnyx reform 1859-1865 godov*, pp. 295-309, 305.

56 Tymošyk, "Cenzura ukrajins'koho drukovanoho slova," pp. 9-11.

leaning towards thinking in terms of modern nationalism, while others, including Golovnin, remained stuck in the Enlightenment imperial ideal mostly of “pre-nationalistic” Russia of the first half of the nineteenth century.⁵⁷ To be sure, translations of the Holy Scriptures in local vernaculars have been of overriding importance in the education and creation of a new national literary tradition.⁵⁸ This is why Moračevs’kyj’s translation could, in general, contribute to the feverish atmosphere in which the anti-Ukrainian circular was being prepared in 1863. However, the abundance of homiletic literature published in Little Russian and the self-confidence of Moračevs’kyj, who easily communicated with ecclesiastical and secular administrations about his translation, prompts us to concur with Miller that the Circular was envisioned as a temporary measure.⁵⁹ The Circular was so designed as to “hold back” the advancement of Ukrainophilism, including the appearance of the Ukrainian Bible as one in a series of Ukrainian-language publications. The ban appeared to be a corollary to the complex bureaucratic process and nationalistic shift in public opinion, predetermined for the most part by the Polish Uprising of 1863 and, to a lesser extent, Ukrainophile activity.⁶⁰

In this respect, it is worthwhile adducing several well-known facts from the history of the Ukrainian cultural revival in 1856–1864, both connected with the name of Kuliš, a prominent figure in the contemporary national movement.⁶¹ I will mention the first Ukrainian periodical *Osnova* that, after long delays due to censorship, began to appear in St. Petersburg in 1861. The main thrust of its editorial policy, shaped largely by Kuliš, was to promote knowledge of Ukrainian culture in all its aspects (from history and literature to Sunday schools and textbooks). Politically, this periodical pursued a moderate course leading to gradual reforms while conducting polemics with some extremist Russian journals and Russophile Galician opinions.⁶² Remarkably, leaving aside routine censorship, no prohibitive measures were taken against this major nationalistic periodical. In fact, the journal ceased publication in 1862. The reasons for its demise were numerous, though no official ban came into play. The real reason lay in the lack of financial support by Ukrainian landowners and an infinitesimally low number of subscribers.⁶³

57 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 118.

58 Roland Sussex, “Lingua Nostra: the Nineteenth-century Slavonic Language Revivals,” in Roland Sussex and J. C. Eade, eds., *Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth-century Eastern Europe* (Columbus, Oh: Slavica Publishers, Humanities Research Center, Australian National University, 1985), p. 115.

59 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 124.

60 Miller, *The Ukrainian Question*, pp. 124–125.

61 Naxlik, *Pantelejmon Kuliš*, vol. 1, pp. 103–210.

62 Luckyj, *Pantelejmon Kulish*, p. 104.

63 M. D. Bernštejn, *Zhurnal “Osnova” i ukrajins’kyj literaturnyj proces kincja 50–60-x rokov XIX st.* (Kyiv: Akademija nauk Ukrajin’skoji RSR, 1959), pp. 198–208.

In March 1861, despite his previous sentencing due to his embroilment with the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius in 1847, Kuliš was officially invited to translate the Emancipation Edict of February 19 into Little Russian. Understanding the seriousness of this assignment, Kuliš convened a meeting of the St. Petersburg Ukrainian *hromada* asking for collegial assistance in coin-ing administrative terms. The draft of the translation was criticized, however, by State Secretary Vladimir Butkov who insisted that the translation should be based on expressions intrinsically comprehensible to the local peasantry. Most interestingly, some of Butkov's comments were quite reasonable while pointing to some legal subtleties left unnoticed by the translator in such forms as *hospodar* meaning "proprietor" rather than "master" or *radovnyčyj* referring to a participant in a meeting rather than in a village assembly or gathering (of peasants). Some other emendations made in the State Council of Imperial Russia appeared in tune with the all-Russian terminology, which were purportedly comprehensible to both Great and Little Russians.⁶⁴ Not persuaded by the bureaucrat's suggestions, Kuliš gave up the idea of adjusting his translation to meet the demands of the tsarist administration that looked, in some cases, substantiated.

Another telling fact is the inducement of Kuliš to serve in Warsaw after the defeat of the Polish Uprising of 1863, which was provided by the Russian government and Kuliš's friends who had close ties to it. Condemned by most of his compatriots, who treated his service in Warsaw as a servile desire to please his Russian masters, Kuliš's career was very fast and productive resulting in his appointment to the post of director of the Ecclesiastical Department in the Commission for Internal Affairs.⁶⁵ His attitude to Poland was notoriously ambivalent. On the one hand, he loved Polish literature, while on the other, like many contemporary Ukrainians, he hated the Roman Catholics and Polish nationalism. The chief culprit in instigating the Uprising of 1863, according to him, was clerics who had finally to be curbed. This is why he also deplored the influence of the Uniate (Greek-Catholic) Church in the Xolm (Chełm) region.⁶⁶ Hence, he was more than willing to promote the Russian language in local schools in order to sweep aside Catholic influence and stop Polish interference in Ukrainian. This stance, influenced not by imperial policy but by the attitude of one with Cossack roots toward the coercive Polish acculturation of the past, was clearly outlined in one of his letters addressed to Ivan Puljuj, his collaborator in the translation of the Gospels into Ukrainian.

For our language, we should rather have Old Bulgarian instead of Polish. Whenever you cannot come up with something, use a Slavonic word (or form): this will never cause harm. In due course, it will be substituted by a

64 G. Vaškevič, "Perevod P. A. Kuliša na ukrainskij jazyk manifesta 19 fevralja 1861 g." i "Položenija o krestjanax," *Kievskaja starina* 2 (1905), pp. 324–341; 3 (1905), pp. 423–460.

65 See Naxlik, *Pantelejmon Kuliš*, vol. 1, p. 211–244.

66 Naxlik, *Pantelejmon Kuliš*, vol. 1, p. 227.

common word. As far as Polish is concerned, you must avoid it as much as possible.⁶⁷

VERNACULAR TRIVIALIZATION OR LOFTY EUROPEANIZATION?

For all the above reasons, Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Gospels seemed to be one in a series of religious editions in vernacular Ukrainian circulating without serious restrictions in the Russian Empire. A possible publication of this translation could hardly bring a radical change in the situation of primary education in the native language. At the beginning of 1862, up to six Ukrainian primers by different authors including Kuliš and Ševčenko were published in St. Petersburg and Moscow.⁶⁸ What is more important, the translation of the Gospels was made not by a staunch Ukrainophile like Kostomarov or Kuliš but by a loyal and deeply religious Little Russian, conscious that his translation would benefit his people morally and spiritually.⁶⁹

Additionally, Moračevs'kyj's career testified to the limited poetic and linguistic scope of his translation. Inspector at the Nižyn Lyceum of Prince Bezborod'ko in the years 1849–1859, Moračevs'kyj authored a number of second-rate poems both in Russian and Ukrainian. A series of Great Russian patriotic Ukrainian-language verses, compiled in the vernacular mode, appeared in Kyiv in a collection with a characteristic title *Do čumaka, abo vojna jahlo-xrancuzo-turec'ka u 1853 y 54 rokax* [To the Čumak, or the English-French-Turkish War in the Years 1853 and 1854].⁷⁰ In general, as Serhij Jefremov pointed out, Moračevs'kyj as a writer proved to be an incidental phenomenon in Ukrainian literature and therefore his literary output hardly warranted discussion in greater detail.⁷¹ On the whole, nobody would ever have remembered this provincial literatus had he not showed a keen interest in the local vernacular, first in the compilation of *Slovar' malorossijskaho jazŷka* [Dictionary of the Little Russian Language] and his translation of the Holy Scriptures that, with the parallel Church Slavonic text, was posthumously published by the Synodal press in Moscow in 1906–1911.

In terms of subjective argumentation, Moračevs'kyj remained within the literary semantics of the vernacular paradigm (*kotljarevščyna*) set up by Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj (1769–1838), popularly known as the “father” of modern Ukrainian literature. Published in 1798, his travesty of Virgil's *Aeneid*, the burlesque *Enejida*, ushered in the new Ukrainian literature in the vernacular. In effect, up to the mid-nineteenth century, but surely beyond it as well, Ukrainian literature existed largely if not exclusively as a regional addendum to an impe-

67 Studyns'kyj, ed., *P. O. Kuliš (Materijaly i rozvidky)*, part 2, pp. xxvii, 9.

68 Pantelejmon Kuliš, “Nas'ki Hramatky,” *Osnova* 1 (1862), pp. 64–82.

69 Dmytryshyn, “Introduction,” p. xviii.

70 Naumenko, “F. S. Moračevskij,” 79:11, pp. 177–178, 79:12, p. 460.

71 Serhij Jefremov, *Istorija ukrajins'koho pys'menstva*, 4th rev. ed. (Kyiv, Leipzig: Ukraïns'ka nakladnja, 1924), vol. 1, p. 374.

rial all-Russian literature.⁷² This is why, though envisioned primarily for Little Russian consumption, Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Holy Gospels was implicitly oriented toward a broad all-Russian audience. Thus, transposed into the regional vernacular, Moračevs'kyj's translation appears to be one of the multiple manifestations of self-assertion in the context of Russian-Ukrainian relations. It is not therefore accidental that his translation was anchored primarily in the Church Slavonic and Russian texts. The so-called Elizabeth Bible of 1751 could serve as the principle *vorlage*, while the Russian Gospels published in 1823 by the Imperial Russian Bible Society was likely to show him the scope of the use of Church Slavonic. Only when the entire translation of the Gospels was completed did Moračevs'kyj demonstrate some interest in comparing his text with the Latin, French, German, and Polish translations of the New Testament. In the final draft of the translation, Moračevs'kyj jotted down some excerpts in several languages, though not a single example was provided in Hebrew or Greek.⁷³

Neither stylistically nor strictly speaking linguistically could Moračevs'kyj's translation compete with the later translations of Kuliš and Puljuj, hastily

72 George G. Grabowicz, "Between Subversion and Self-assertion: The Role of *Kotliarevščyna* in Russian-Ukrainian Literary Relations," in Kappeler et al., eds., *Culture, Nation, and Identity*, pp. 215–216.

73 V. I. Sreznevskij, "Oxrannaja opis' rukopisnogo otdelenija biblioteki Imperatorskoj akademii nauk," *Izvestija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 16:4 (1902), pp. 090–091. Moračevs'kyj did not translate from the Church Slavonic original word for word. In this respect, his position is reminiscent of that taken by the translators of the New Testament into vernacular Russian in 1816–1823. According to the instructions prepared by Archimandrite Filaret, the then St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy rector, the translation should be oriented toward the Greek *vorlage*, with the Church Slavonic version serving as specific guidelines for choosing linguistic means (Aleksiev, "Pervyj russkij perevod Novogo Zaveta," p. 9). In other words, the translators could choose a Church Slavonic device in case they did not find an appropriate expression or form in the vernacular standard. One can draw some other parallels between Moračevs'kyj's work and the Russian translation of 1823. First, in both cases, we deal with translations completed before the final normalization of the corresponding literary languages. Second, initially, the Russian Bible Society planned to publish the Russian translation with a parallel Church Slavonic text, an idea abandoned immediately before sending the translation to press. On the other hand, Moračevs'kyj's translation was published with a parallel Church Slavonic text in 1906–1911 in Moscow (Nimčuk, "Svjaščennoe Pisanie na ukrainskom jazyke," p. 48). Finally, the Synodal editions of the Russian (1860) and Ukrainian Gospels (1906–1911) differed from the first vernacular translations. Leaving aside differences in the formation of literary Russian as compared with new standard Ukrainian, the editors tried, in both cases, to reverse the vernacular nature of the two translations. Generally, with an eye to making the text loftier, the editors tended to resort to Church Slavonic as the major archaizing device; see Aleksiev, "Pervyj russkij perevod Novogo Zaveta," pp. 32–35; H. Arpolenko, "P. Moračevs'kyj i peršyj povnyj pereklad Sv. Jevanhelija novoukrajins'koju movoju," *Volyn'-Žytomyrščyna* 10 (2003), *Žytomyr*, pp. 212–220.

and groundlessly dismissed by Vulpius as a low-quality work.⁷⁴ To corroborate her opinion, the author mentioned Franz Miklosich (1813–1891), a prominent Slovenian-Austrian Slavist, who criticized Kuliš's translation as being a paraphrase rather than a close translation of the original Greek text. Vulpius also claimed that Kuliš's translation did not receive a single positive review.⁷⁵

To begin with Miklosich's critique, it should be noted that by early 1871, this Slavist had read only the first draft of the translation.⁷⁶ Later, assisted by Puljuj, who had just finished his theological and philosophical studies at the University of Vienna, Kuliš translated the Gospels in accordance with the strict rules set up by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Representing different literary traditions, the two translators were persistently searching for a verbal medium able to satisfy not only Little Russians but also Galician Rusyns. Moreover, unlike Moračevs'kyj's limited vision of his work, Kuliš and Puljuj tried to expand the stylistic mode of their translation through the prism of the Church Slavonic, Russian, Polish, Serbian, German, Latin, English, and French translations. Their translation of the Gospels was published in late 1871, with each gospel appearing anonymously and under a separate cover. Only nine years later, in 1880, was the whole text of the New Testament, with the names of the translators, published under the imprint of the Ševčenko Scientific Society in L'viv. As early as 1885, a representative of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Vienna, Edward Millard, made it clear that the Bible Society would be ready to buy the copyright of the Ukrainian edition of the Gospels. As a result, in 1887 and 1893, the New Testament appeared in its entirety as a publication of the Bible Society in Vienna.

As far as the issue of positive reviews is concerned, one should disregard a few slanted pieces authored by Ivan Franko (1856–1916), a Galician writer and long-time nemesis of Kuliš.⁷⁷ By contrast, a much more balanced appraisal was formulated in an anonymous review published in 1881 in *Vestnik Evropy*.⁷⁸ After a survey of the history of Ukrainian translations of the Holy Scriptures, the author dwelt briefly on Kuliš's major religious translations, including his latest of the New Testament in 1880. According to the reviewer,⁷⁹ this translation stood out in comparison with translations made by the two Galician populists Markijan Šaškevyč (1811–1843), a famous member of the *Rus'ka trijcka* [Russian Triad], and Antin (Antonij) Kobyljans'kyj (†1910),⁸⁰ as well as several

74 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 135.

75 Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion*, p. 135.

76 Studyns'kyj, ed., *P. O. Kuliš (Materijaly i rozvidky)*, part 2, pp. xxvii–xxviii.

77 A. Danylenko, "Xaj dufaje Srul' na Pana': do istoriji stosunkiv I. Franka z P. Kulišem," in L. A. Lysyčenko et al., eds., *Filolohični studiji* (Xarkiv: Xarkivs'kyj nacional'nyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. H. S. Skovorody, 2009), pp. 354–363.

78 V., "[Review of] Svjate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu."

79 V., "[Review of] Svjate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu," pp. 896–897.

80 A. Danylenko, "The Holy Gospels in Vernacular Ukrainian: Antin Kobyljans'kyj (1874, 1877) vs. Pantelejmon Kuliš (1871)," *Welt der Slaven* 55:1 (2010), pp. 83–104.

fragments from the Holy Scriptures translated and published by some Russophiles with an eye to counterbalancing Kuliš's work. Among the linguistic achievements of Kuliš and Puljuj, the reviewer mentioned their liberal use of Church Slavonic and other loan forms in contrast to Kuliš's poetic paraphrases of some biblical books in 1869. Overall, the reviewer concluded, the translation of Kuliš and Puljuj was "the most comprehensible [Ukrainian] translation of the Holy Scriptures," and "much closer to vernacular Ukrainian than, for instance, the well-known Synodal publication of the New Testament... in the Great Russian language."⁸¹

Despite certain shortcomings, its appearance in Galicia became a perennial event. The leading role of Kuliš, a representative of Dnieper Ukraine, who initiated the project and edited the whole text, can hardly be overestimated. Moreover, vis-à-vis the stylistic and dialectal variance of Kuliš's language, which differed from the dialectal and stylistic uniformity of Moračevs'kyj's work, Kuliš's translation may be aptly called, to use the words of Oleksa Horbač, "the labor pangs of a unified Ukrainian literary language."⁸² In fact, this was the first successful experience in harmonizing different variants of literary Ukrainian as used in the two parts of Ukraine. One can therefore legitimately claim that Kuliš's translation, and not that of Moračevs'kyj, proved potentially more dangerous and harmful to the all-Russian project. It is interesting to note that until the enactment of the Ems Decree of May 18, 1876, one could easily order a copy of this or any other Ukrainian-language publication from abroad. After 1876, however, the number of copies of the Ukrainian Gospels circulating among the common people was very low. These copies were largely used in the sect of *stundists*, zealots practicing Bible reading and ignoring external rites of worship.⁸³

In conformity with the political momentum of 1905, when Moračevs'kyj's translation was undergoing revision toward publication, Pavlo Žytec'kyj ostentatiously preferred Moračevs'kyj's language to that of Kuliš and Puljuj.⁸⁴ He argued that their text was written somewhat awkwardly, while the overall style of the translation of the New Testament lacked consistency and uniformity, especially in its vocabulary. However, that was a biased assessment. Nimčuk assumed that the critic overstated possible blemishes in the language of Kuliš and Puljuj with an eye to raising the merits of Moračevs'kyj's transla-

81 V., "[Review of] Svjate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu," p. 898.

82 Oleksa Horbač, "Movostyl' novitnix perekladiv Sv. Pys'ma na ukrajins'ku narodnju movu 19-20 vv.," *Ukrajins'kyj Vil'nyj Universytet. Naukovi zapysky* 13 (1988), München, p. 51.

83 N. Kostomarov, "Malorusskoe slovo," *Vestnik Evropy* 1 (1881), pp. 404-405; see Andrij Starodub, "Nevidome svidčennja pro pošyrennja ukrajins'koho perekladu Novoho Zapovitu na terytoriji Naddniprojans'koji Ukrajinu u 80-ti roky XIX stolittja," *Ukrajins'kyj arxeohrafičnyj ščoričnyk* 8/9 (2004), pp. 620-628.

84 Pavel Žiteckij, "O perevodax evangelija na malorusskij jazyk," *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 10:3-4 (1905), pp. 29-30.

tion, which he recommended for publication in Russia.⁸⁵ However, it should be repeated again that Kuliš's translation was, in fact, more dangerous to the imperial authorities than Moračevs'kyj's work, being confined within the constraints of the "Little Russian solution," that is, a larger Russian identity that would allow room for the existence of a distinct Ukrainian branch.⁸⁶

It is not therefore incidental that, despite persistent efforts, Kuliš's translation was not allowed in the Russian Empire while circulating mainly among the Galician Rusyns and the diaspora. Efforts to gain access to the Ukrainian Bible for Central Ukraine and Russia were carried on mostly through foreign embassies, including that of Japan, and intermediaries and scholarly intervention (Russian Academy of Sciences in 1904) but all to no avail. While Moračevs'kyj's banned translation finally went to press in Russia, Kuliš's translation was still barred from Russian Ukraine. It was not until the 1917 Revolution that his translation appeared in 1928 in Kharkiv, published by the Ukrainian Union of Baptists.⁸⁷

MORAČEVŠ'KYJ OR KULIŠ? SETTLING ACCOUNTS

Notwithstanding the criticism of some populists, the significance of Kuliš and Puljuj's translation is hard to overestimate for Russian-ruled Ukraine. It is needless to remind ourselves that after the Valuev Circular of 1863 and especially the notorious Ems Decree of 1876, the development of literary Ukrainian was much hindered, although the process of ethnic and primarily cultural reaffirmation of identity in these lands never ceased to exist. For this reason, under current political conditions in Russian-ruled Ukraine, a remarkable role in the common revival of interest in the popular language, its "upgrading" to a lofty level, was played by the translation of the Holy Scriptures by Kuliš and Puljuj. By contrast, with its avoidance of foreign words, the use of folk phonetics and folk etymology, vulgarisms and diminutives, and other features of the narrative *à la moujik*,⁸⁸ Moračevs'kyj's translation remained both objectively and subjectively on the outskirts of the formation of new standard Ukrainian and ultimately a modern and stable Ukrainian identity.

85 Nimčuk, "Ukrajins'ki pereklady Svjatoho Pys'ma," p. 37.

86 Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," p. 199.

87 Luckyj, *Panteleimon Kulish*, pp. 151–152.

88 Jurij Sheveljov [George Y. Shevelov], "Kuliševi lysty i Kuliš u lystax," in Jurij Luc'kyj [George Luckyj], ed., *Vybrani lysty Pantelejmona Kuliša, ukrajins'koju movoju pysani* (New York, Toronto: Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1984), p. 21. While Shevelov's focus is on the epistolary genre, he is describing the modality of *kotljarevščyna* as such. To rephrase Grabowicz's question as to what degree these features describe and exhaust Moračevs'kyj's style remains open (Grabowicz, "Between Subversion and Self-assertion," p. 224). At any rate, stylistically speaking, the language of Moračevs'kyj's translation is reminiscent of the vernacular as found in the prose of Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnovjanenko (1778–1843), Petro Hulak-Artemovs'kyj (1790–1865), or Jevhen Hrebinka (1812–1848).

What is more important for the progress of intellectual life in Left-bank Ukraine is that the work on the translation and its appearance in Galicia, controversially as it might have been discussed in contemporary Galician periodicals, stirred first of all the minds of Little Russian intellectuals artificially divorced from publications in Ukrainian while raising their national consciousness and contributing to the development of a standard literary language. Made in accordance with the ethnographic literary mainstream of his time, the translation of Moračevs'kyj's translation would never compete seriously with the translation co-authored by Kuliš and Puljuj had the two works in a timely manner been published in the Russian Empire. Thus, Moračevs'kyj's translation was not, and I agree herein with Miller, an initial pretext for limiting the scope of Ukrainian-language publications. As fate would have it, his translation was merely the last one in a row of similar Ukrainian-language religious editions circulating without major restrictions in the Russian Empire. However, the influx of such publications took the imperial authorities unawares as to what language policy to choose in maintaining the multinational state. Regrettably, during the period from 1863 to 1876 in trying to catch up with its more experienced neighbor, the Austrian Empire,⁸⁹ the Russian government opted for a less challenging, that is, punitive option leading in the long run to strengthening of the awkward policy of Russification on an all-imperial scale.

89 The status of the Ukrainian language in the Austrian Empire, and after the Compromise of 1867, the Austrian-Hungarian Empire was rather precarious. Before the revolution of 1848, with a diglossia of German and Polish flourishing, Ruthenian (*Ruthenische*) did not enjoy any official status. In the early 1850s, and for a short period of time only, all official documents in the Empire were published not only in German but also, in Galicia, in Ruthenian along with Polish as provincial languages (*Landessprachen*). However, as a result of the language bills approved in 1866 and 1869, Polish became in place of German a lingua franca in Galicia, thus reducing the sociolinguistic status of Ruthenian almost to nil (Jan Fellerer, *Mehrsprachigkeit im galizischen Verwaltungswesen (1772–1914)* (Köln: Wiemar, 2005), pp. 104–105, 146–156). During the era of so-called neo-absolutism, the Austrian authorities, trying to diminish the influence of the Russian state on the Ruthenians through Cyrillic publications, made an attempt to introduce a Latin-based script instead of the Cyrillic alphabet. In 1859, Josef Jireček (1825–1888), a Czech literary historian and politician, elaborated on a proposal for the Ruthenians to employ Latin letters with additional diacritics, which was criticized by the local literati (Vasyľ Simovyč, “Josef Jireček i ukrajins'ka mova,” in George Y. Shevelov, ed., *Ukrainian Linguistics: Studies and Articles* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1981), pp. 339–389; see Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism*, p. 75ff.) After its failure to introduce the Roman alphabet, the Austrian government tried to put restrictions, unobtrusive as they may seem in comparison with a similar measure subsequently taken by the tsarist government, on the use of the Cyrillic alphabet (Fellerer, *Mehrsprachigkeit im galizischen Verwaltungswesen*, p. 144). In fact, albeit without excessive politesse, the Russian authorities were following in the steps of the neighboring Austrian Empire that had gained by that time much experience in dealing with its numerous Slavic subjects.