

Osnova and the Origins of the Valuev Directive

Michael Moser

University of Vienna, Institute of Slavic Studies

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Institute of Central European Studies, Budapest

Abstract: After the Crimean War, Ukrainian intellectuals utilized the temporary liberalization in the Russian Empire to extend the use of the Ukrainian language beyond the spheres of folklore and fine literature, to develop Ukrainian into a modern standard language, and to set measures to disseminate this language among speakers of Ukrainian. These processes were reflected, inter alia, in the journal *Osnova* (*The Foundation*) of 1861-62. As my study shows, when the Russian administration issued the Valuev Directive in 1863, it did not ban the Ukrainian language as such, but it effectively banned its standardization and dissemination.

Keywords: modern Ukrainian standard language, journal *Osnova* (*The Foundation*), standardization of the Ukrainian language, polyfunctionality of the Ukrainian language, discourse on the Ukrainian language, Panteleimon Kulish.

1. THE VALUEV DIRECTIVE AS A BAN OF STANDARDIZATION

One of the most obvious intentions of the Valuev Directive (1863) was to hamper the development and dissemination of the Ukrainian language, which precisely in the early 1860s developed into a standard language in the modern sense of the word. The features that comprised a standard language were listed by linguists of the twentieth century, but the linguists' findings were actually little more than a reformulation of the national programs of the nineteenth century. By that period of time, language developers—including Ukrainian ones—perfectly understood that in the theatre of contested tongues, the idioms they wanted to establish as modern languages in their own right would be recognized only under certain conditions: namely, if these varieties were not merely used in everyday communication or folklore, but also functioned as written and spoken languages with unified norms in all societal domains and were accepted among all members of the envisioned speech community. Moreover, these language developers realized that the norms established by the codifiers required active dissemination among the speech community. To that end, they designed primers and textbooks containing language that matched that of widely acknowledged and increasingly more refined grammars and dictionaries. At the same time, the

language developers understood that varieties that were established as standard languages had to be acknowledged across the boundaries of regions in which various dialects of the envisioned language territory were practiced.¹ They were also aware that the standard languages would function in the long run only if their “polyfunctional” use was granted, i.e., if the languages would be used in various public domains such as institutions of learning, courts of law, and the media, etc. If the language developers could reasonably argue that the varieties they wished to standardize had the benefit of a century-long history, this immensely contributed to the general legitimization of their projects.

Not only were the language developers themselves cognizant of these requirements, so too were their opponents, who routinely argued that languages that they did not wish to see on the linguistic map were underdeveloped “jargons,” “patois,” or “dialects” of other languages that did not meet the above-mentioned criteria. In this regard, the Valuev Directive is not unique.

During the first decades of the nineteenth century, Ukrainian was used as a written language only in the earliest collections of Ukrainian folk songs (1819: Mykola Tsertelev; 1827 and 1834: Mykhailo Maksymovych; 1833-38: Izmail Sreznevskii, etc.) and in belletristics (beginning with Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneida* [*Aeneid*] of 1798 up to the works of Taras Shevchenko). As early as 1834, the ethnic Russian and Ukrainophile Izmail Sreznevskii of Kharkiv wrote the following lines:

As of today, it need not to be proven to anyone or anything that Ukrainian (or, as others prefer labelling it: Little Russian) is a language and not a dialect of Russian or Polish, as some have argued. And many are convinced that this language is one of the richest Slavic languages; that it barely ranks behind Bohemian [Czech] regarding its abundance of words and expression, Polish regarding its picturesque [character] or Serbian regarding its pleasant character. [They believe that] this language, which is not yet fully developed, can already compare with the full-fledged languages regarding the flexibility and syntactic richness, [and its] poetic, musical, and picturesque [syntax].

But can it or shall it in the current situation continue its development and turn into a language of literature, and then, of society, as was partially the case earlier, or is it doomed to stay forever a language of the simple folk, to unceasingly degenerate, to gradually wither and die away between

¹ A minimal catalogue of features that comprise a standard language (“*literaturnyi iazyk*” according to Isachenko) was offered in 1958 by the Russian émigré of Ukrainian descent Aleksandr Isachenko, who wrote about “polyvalency,” “codification,” “general obligatoriness,” and “stylistic differentiation” (42).

the thorns of other languages, in order to finally disappear off the face of the earth without leaving behind a trace of memory?

No, whatever fate awaits it, whatever flippancy or coincidence might occur to it, it will not disappear, and even if it does not have any hope for literary glory, it will leave behind its songs and dumas [Cossack folk songs, M.M.], and will long be remembered like the language of troubadours and skalds. (Sreznevskii 134-35; see also Taras Koznarsky's study in this volume.)²

In the years to come, innovative writers like Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnov"ianenko and particularly Taras Shevchenko convincingly proved that Ukrainian-language literature was to be taken seriously (Grabowicz 242). Henceforth, the question was whether the Ukrainian language would also become a competitor of Russian as a standard language. As of the mid-nineteenth century, Russian had only recently been developed into a written language with fairly stable norms;³ it was not yet a firmly

² All translations are mine, if not indicated otherwise. Original Russian quotes will be provided sparingly, only as needed to clarify the meaning, due to lack of space. Original Ukrainian quotes will be offered more amply because it is the history of the Ukrainian rather than the Russian language that is discussed here. Sreznevskii's fragment is of such outstanding significance that it shall be fully quoted in the Russian original: "Въ настоящее время, кажется, уже не для кого, и не для чего доказывать, что языкъ Украинскій (или какъ угодно называть другимъ: Малороссійскій) есть языкъ, а не нарѣчіе—Русскаго или Польскаго, какъ доказывали нѣкоторые; и многіе уверены, что этотъ языкъ есть одинъ изъ богатѣйшихъ языковъ Славянскихъ; что онъ едва ли уступитъ на пр. Богемскому въ обилии словъ и выраженій, Польскому въ живописности, Сербскому въ пріятности; что этотъ языкъ, который, будучи еще не обработанъ, можетъ уже сравниться съ языками образованными, по гибкости и богатству Синтаксическому—языкъ поэтическій, музыкальный, живописный.—Но можетъ ли, долженъ ли онъ въ настоящихъ обстоятельствахъ продолжать свое развитіе, и сдѣлаться языкомъ литературы, а потомъ и общества, какъ было отчасти прежде, или же его удѣлъ остаться навсегда языкомъ простаго народа, безпрерывно искажаться, мало помалу вянуть, гложуть среди терній другихъ языковъ, и наконецъ исчезнуть съ лица земли, не оставивши по себѣ ни слѣда, ни воспоминанія?—Нѣтъ! какая бы участь ни ожидала его, чтобы ни дѣлало съ нимъ легкомысліе и случай, онъ не исчезнетъ, и еслибъ даже онъ не имѣлъ надежды на славу литературную, онъ оставитъ свои пѣсни и думы, и долго будетъ памятенъ подобно языку Труверовъ и Скальдовъ."

³ I fully subscribe to the following view: "While the Modern Russian period is usually reckoned from Pushkin's time, standardized language whose norms started to form in the late 1800s stabilized in the middle of the twentieth century" (Comrie et al. 3-4).

established standard language; most importantly, it was not broadly disseminated among the envisaged speech community.⁴

After Nikolai I died on 2 March (Old Style: 19 February) 1855 during the Crimean War (1853-56), and Aleksandr II “the Liberator” succeeded him, the Ukrainian movement was immediately marked by new major achievements that considerably broadened the sphere of Ukrainian language use. In 1856-57, Panteleimon Kulish published two volumes of *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi* (*Notes on Southern Rus*). Although the body of Kulish’s text was written in Russian, this collection was extremely important because its rich Ukrainian-language folkloristic, ethnographic, and literary materials were recorded in an entirely new orthography, the “Kulishivka,” which contributed to the further distancing of Ukrainian from Russian and laid the foundation for modern standard Ukrainian orthography. In 1857, Kulish published not only the first Ukrainian-language novel, titled *Chorna Rada* (*The Black Council*), but also a primer (*Hramatka*) (Luckyj).

Kulish’s primer—along with several other primers that were published in those years—marked a significant new stage in the development of the “Little Russian” language, which was henceforth increasingly used (1) in many text fragments which extended beyond the sphere of *belles-lettres*, and (2) in an environment that left no doubts regarding the seriousness of the Ukrainian language project. In fact, as the beginnings of Ukrainian-language school education were quite modest (Ukrainian could originally be employed merely in private “Sunday” schools with one to three hours of teaching), the significance of those primers can hardly be overestimated (on Kulish’s primer see below) (Koliada).⁵

⁴ This was first and foremost a result of the immense backwardness of the educational system of the Russian Empire. In 1856, in nine Ukrainian gubernias almost 98 percent of Ukrainian children did not even receive elementary education (Koliada). Consequently, a free command of the Russian language was not widespread among non-Russians of the empire, excluding the slim strata of the elites. Moreover, the Modern Russian Standard Language (to the extent that it had been created) remained alien even to the overwhelming majority of Russians themselves.

⁵ In terms of standardization, the primers anticipated full-fledged codification, as feared by the Slavophiles (see Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 375 and the end of this article). Nonetheless, various histories of the Ukrainian “literary” language pay almost no attention to the primers. David Saunders offers another reason why imperial authorities initially tended to welcome Ukrainian primers written by Ukrainians themselves: the fact was that in the spring of 1859, Ukrainian-language primers printed in the Latin alphabet “surfaced in Right-Bank Ukraine” (Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 35). On the primers

Shortly afterward, the year 1861 marked another breakthrough of immense significance. Beginning in January of that year, the protagonists of the Ukrainian national movement published a Ukrainian journal titled *Osnova* (*The Foundation*). Not only did the 21 issues and several thousand pages of this “thick journal” significantly contribute to the formation of a distinct “Little Russian” consciousness and a heightened awareness of Ukrainian national ambitions, they also proved, to an ever increasing extent, that the Ukrainian language could be successfully used for intellectual articles and political or other news of the day, despite the fact that most nonbelles-tristic materials were written in Russian.

Finally, when the Russian imperial authorities commissioned Kulish to translate from Russian into Ukrainian the manifesto of 1861 that announced the abolition of serfdom, Ukrainian was close to playing a certain role in the administrative sphere. There is no doubt that this translation would have played a significant role as proof of the fact that Ukrainian—the alleged peasant language—could be used for official texts, but Kulish’s text was unfortunately not published, largely because Kulish was unwilling to react adequately to (apparently justified) criticism (Vashkevich).

Another obvious sign of the tremendous boom of the Ukrainian language in the early 1860s was Pylyp Morachevs'kyi’s Ukrainian translation of the Bible. Morachevs'kyi began translating the New Testament into modern Ukrainian in the little town of Nizhyn at the turn of the 1860s. In March 1860, he sent his manuscript of the Gospels of Matthew and John to Metropolitan Isidor in St. Petersburg with a request for a blessing of the translation for publication.⁶ In September 1860, Metropolitan Isidor rejected Morachevs'kyi’s translation of the Gospels of Matthew and John, but Morachevs'kyi, instead of being discouraged, embarked on a full translation of the Gospels, which he completed soon afterward (Nimchuk, “Ukrains'ki perekłady,” 26-27; Vulpius 127).

Compared to the eruptive development regarding the functionality of the Ukrainian language, codificational efforts clearly lagged behind, despite the fact that the protagonists of the Ukrainian movement in the 1860s were well aware that Aleksey Pavlovs'kyi’s slim “Grammar of the Little Russian Dialect” published in 1818, for example, was not meant to serve as a codificational work. After Pavlovs'kyi’s work, no subsequent grammar of the Ukrainian language was published in the Russian Empire until 1905,

of the time see again Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 38-39 and 40-41.

⁶ Morachevs'kyi was a teacher working in Nizhyn who had published his first Ukrainian-language poems as early as the 1830s and had submitted his *Dictionary of the Little Russian Language* in 1853 to the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences.

and no larger manuscripts of any grammar are preserved. Accomplishments in the sphere of lexicography were quite modest as well. The greatest achievement was Pavlo Bilets'kyi-Nosenko's Ukrainian-Russian differential *Dictionary of the Little-Russian, or South-East Russian Language* (1838-43) with about 20,000 entries, which remained unpublished until the 1960s (Nimchuk, "Persnyi velykyi slovnyk," 10-11).⁷ New efforts in the lexicographical sphere were made precisely on the eve of the Valuev Directive. In 1861, Kulish informed the readers of the first issue of *Osnova* ("Ob izdaniі ukrainskago slovaria," 333-34) that he planned to publish a dictionary, and Mykola Zakrevs'kyi's *Dictionary of Little Russian Idioms* and the first volume of Kalynyk Sheikovs'kyi's *Attempt at a Little Russian Dictionary* appeared in print that same year (Kulish, "Ob izdaniі ukrainskago slovaria," 333-34; see below). Also in the first issues of *Osnova*, Mykhailo Levchenko published an important study on Ukrainian terminology, where he, in accordance with widespread puristic programs of those days, suggested the vernacularization of dozens of international, mostly Latin- and Greek-based terms; soon afterward, Petro Iefymenko complemented these suggestions in a similar contribution to *Osnova* (see below).⁸

2. LANGUAGE AS PART OF A PROGRAM

As early as 1847, during the examinations regarding the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, Kulish reported that the members had "planned to write short textbooks in the Little Russian on sacred and civil history, geography, arithmetics and agriculture" (Kravchenko; see also Iefremov). The program remained unchanged until the early 1860s, when Ukrainian intellectual leaders began organizing themselves in so-called *hromadas* in St. Petersburg and in several cities of Ukraine: Their primary goals were, according to the Kyiv *Hromada* leader Volodymyr Antonovych, "the ethnographic, juridical and geographic study of the land" and "the production of textbooks for the people" written in the Ukrainian language (Miiakovskii 138-39). In fact, thanks to Kyiv's *Hromada*, some popular works on arithmetic and geography (*De-shcho pro svit Bozhyi* [*Something About God's World*]) appeared in print, while further plans to publish a

⁷ A copy of Bilets'kyi-Nosenko's dictionary reached Kulish by the early 1860s. A few decades later, Borys Hrinchenko worked with the manuscript (Nimchuk, "Persnyi velykyi slovnyk," 16). In contrast, Bilets'kyi-Nosenko's manuscript of Ukrainian grammar was lost altogether.

⁸ More than a decade later, in 1874, Levchenko published the first authoritative *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary*.

“complete collection of Little Russian songs, a Little Russian dictionary, a textbook on geography, etc.” did not materialize (on further books, see Zhytets'kyi, “Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv,” 93-94; see also Remy and Johannes Remy’s study in this volume). As Antonovych argued, what kept the Kyiv *Hromada* together was the conviction “in the societal use of education of the popular masses” and the opinion “that the education of the popular masses will proceed faster and more successfully in this land if it is conducted in the Little Russian language, which is more comprehensible to the local people” (Miiakovskii 138-39).⁹

The imperial government initially did not severely hamper the initiatives regarding education of the popular masses. As late as 1862, the government even supported the establishment of courses for village teachers, where the Ukrainian activist Pavlo Zhytets'kyi could train future teachers according to his own views, which foresaw that instruction “1. should not proceed in contradiction to the popular world view” (“*nesuperechno narodn'omu svitohliadu*”) and “2. should be provided in the popular language” (“*narodnii iazyk*”) (“Z istorii kyivs'koi ukrains'koi hromady,” 178-80). “Those were the times,” Zhytets'kyi recalled, “when the Ministry of National Education turned to the gymnasium councils with the question of whether the popular language should be allowed in the Ukrainian school, and not one of the southern gymnasia denied that”; “those were the times when [Mykola] Kostomarov turned to the Minister of Education [Evgraf] Kovalevskii with the question of whether there was some hope for the introduction of the Ukrainian language into the *gymnasia* and received from him the answer: ‘There should be schoolbooks, [that’s all]’ (“*aby byly uchebnyky*”)” (“Z istorii kyivs'koi ukrains'koi hromady,” 180).

One of the earliest important initiatives in the schoolbook sphere was Kulish’s ambitious primer of 1857, which was widely praised by his contemporaries and republished in an abbreviated version in 1861 (Kravchenko). In general, Kulish’s achievements as a protagonist and a manager of Ukrainian “national education” were remarkable during that period. After establishing a printshop in St. Petersburg, he published, along with the primer, several dozen inexpensive Ukrainian-language popular brochures (Kravchenko).

⁹ The pragmatic side of the early Ukrainian national movement is evidenced by the Hromada’s heterogeneous ethnic composition. It included three Jews, one Serb, several Poles, Germans, and Russians from all social strata, all of whom took an active part in the discussions of various Ukrainian-language manuscripts which were read aloud and edited during the meetings (Zhytets'kyi, “Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv,” 123; see below).

Kulish's preface to his primer of 1857 is an intriguing illustration of the Ukrainian movement's programmatic focus on national emancipation via the education of the popular masses in the popular (national) language. According to Kulish's outline, only Ukrainian-language primers guaranteed a quick and successful dissemination of literacy in Ukraine. Literacy was important because without it, commoners would remain helpless victims of their betrayers and abusers. Those who acquired literacy in the Ukrainian language would subsequently be able to learn Russian and Church Slavonic as well, and they would learn it more quickly (Kulish, *Hramatka* 1-2). The last chapter of Kulish's primer offered a "Word to the Literate" ("Slovo do pys'mennykh") which underscored the exceptional role of the native tongue and at the same time mapped the territory of the national movement on the vast territory stretching from the Carpathian Mountains to the River Don. In Kulish's view, whoever neglects or forgets the God-given native tongue takes the risk of ceasing to be part of the nation (here *plemia* "tribe"). The nation is defined by its language; it is God-given, unlike man-made states. The Ukrainian nation transgressed state borders, and Austrian "Ruthenians" were undoubtedly part of it (Kulish, *Hramatka* 146-49).

Kulish was a person of major significance in the development of the Ukrainian language in those years. Not only was the new orthography that ultimately became popular during the *Osnova* period his creation. He also contributed immensely to the intellectualization of the Ukrainian language because he played a leading role among those authors who used the Ukrainian language not only for belletristic works (Ohienko 149; see also Dolzhykova's recent dissertation).

Kulish played this role even in his earlier years, while he still tended to idealize the folk language. The best illustration of the idealization, essentialization, and historization of the Ukrainian vernacular of those years is perhaps Kulish's unpublished treatise of 1858 titled "Dvi movi, knyzhna i narodna" ("Two Languages: The Literary and the Folk Language"). In this treatise, Kulish described the Russian written language as a further development of "the scholastic written language" ("*skholastychna pys'menna mova*") of Ukraine, i.e., Ukrainian Church Slavonic ("this dead, anti-popular language"; "*sia mertva, protynarodnia mova*") but argued that regardless of whether this bookish language was used by learned Muscovites or learned Ukrainians, "neither the simple Ukrainian nor the simple Muscovite regard[ed it] as relatives of their [genuine own] songs"¹⁰ (27). Therefore, as Kulish argued, it had been

¹⁰ "которихъ ні простий Українець, ні простий Москаль не вважає родичами піснямъ своїмъ."

observed that people remembered “written verses, even if people heard them a hundred times,” considerably worse than an “unwritten song that a man sometimes heard only once” (“Dvi movi,” 28): a person was simply better prepared to receive and remember information conveyed in his or her native language. Therefore, some wise individuals (“*rozumni holovy*”) recognized the “fresh power” (“*svizhu sylu*”) of “the simple and unlearned word of the peasants” (“*proste i nevchene slovo selian*”) and increasingly “disavowed the bookish language” (“*zanedbavshy movu pys'mennu*”), in that particular case, Russian (Kulish, “Dvi movi,” 29).

3. OSNOVA

Kulish’s significance for the Ukrainian movement can indeed hardly be overestimated: none other than he initiated the establishment of a Ukrainian journal or, in other words, a journal of the Ukrainian movement precisely at the time when he published his primer (Dudko, “Nerealizovani zhurnal'ni plany”). Only after the imperial authorities informed Kulish, on 20 November 1858, that he personally was not allowed to run a journal, his brother-in-law Vasyl' Bilozers'kyi assumed the task (Dudko, “Zhurnal *Osnova*”; see also Miller 76).

The monthly journal *Osnova*, which appeared between January 1861 and October 1862, served as the major organ of the Ukrainian national movement. Although most Ukrainian-language materials of *Osnova* were belletristic or folkloristic—whereas “historical, literary, polemical, economic, pedagogical and musicological articles, memoirs, diaries, correspondence, news, bibliographies and reviews” (“*Osnova* [Saint Petersburg] [Foundation]”) were prevalently written in Russian—*Osnova*’s contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language during that period is considerable. First, the development of the Ukrainian language was one of the most important and frequently discussed subjects in the journal.¹¹ Second, it deserves full attention that some of the journal’s

¹¹ *Osnova*’s significance for the history of the Ukrainian language has not been sufficiently highlighted in linguistic literature. The sections in Mykhailo Zhovtobriukh’s classic monograph on “The Language of the Ukrainian Press” are in general more revealing than those chapters in various “Histories of the Ukrainian Literary Language,” where the focus is more often than not on the language of (fine) literature, and not on the rise of the standard language (Zhovtobriukh 225-38, 253-57). The information in Ohienko’s (149-50) as well as in Chaplenko’s monographs (109-11, etc.) is very scarce; the same applies to Rusaniv’skyi’s textbook of 2001, although the latter monograph features a chapter on “the broadening of the

nonbelletristic contributions of *Osnova* were published in Ukrainian, regardless.

There was no particular focus on language problems in Mykola Kostomarov's most influential essays ("Mysli o federativnom nachale v Drevnei Rusi" ["Reflections Regarding the Federative Beginning of Ancient Rus'"] in *Osnova* 1, 1861; "Dve russkiiia narodnosti" ["Two Rus(s)ian Nationalities"] in *Osnova* 3, 1861), where Kostomarov "delineated the Ukrainians' independent historical and cultural development vis-à-vis that of the Russians and Poles" since the Middle Ages ("Osnova [Saint Petersburg] [Foundation]").¹² Neither was language a focus in other important contributions to *Osnova* (Kostomarov's articles "Pravda Poliakam o Rusi" ["The Truth about Rus' for the Poles"] in *Osnova* 10, 1861; "Istoricheskaia nepravda i zapadno-rossiiskii patriotizm" ["A Historical Lie and West Russian Patriotism"] in *Osnova* 7, 1862; Volodymyr Antonovych's "Moia ispoved" ["My Confession"] in *Osnova* 1, 1862; Kulish's "Poliakam ob Ukraintsakh" ["On the Ukrainians for the Poles"] in *Osnova* 2, 1862, or Tadei Ryl's'kyi's "Neskol'ko slov o dvorianakh pravago berega Dnepra" ["A Few Words on Noblemen from the Right Bank of the Dnipro"], *Osnova* 11-12, 1861). The fact that contributors to *Osnova* nonetheless viewed the Ukrainian language as an issue of outstanding significance is, however, illustrated by Levchenko's article "Mesta zhitel'stva i mestnyia nazvaniia rusinov v nastoiashchee vremia" ("Contemporary Places of Settlement and Local Names of Ruthenians") in the very first issue of *Osnova*, where Levchenko "mapped"¹³ the Ukrainian national territory based on the definition of "Ruthenians"¹⁴ as one single tribe ("*odno plemia*") characterized by varying names, but common "origin, customs, and language" ("*proiskhozhdienie, byt i iazyk*"), with a clear focus on the latter

functions of the Ukrainian language" (see Moser, "Die Ukrainer auf dem Weg zur Sprachnation").

¹² Every issue of *Osnova* featured a quotation from Volodymyr Monomakh on its title page, "I wish weal for the brotherhood and the Rus' land" ("Добра хочю братъи и Руськѣй Земли" in Old Rus'ian). This can be viewed as another striking example that the Ukrainian national movement viewed the origins of the Ukrainian nation not only to be in the Cossack period, but in medieval Rus'.

¹³ On *Osnova*'s general role in Ukrainian "mapping" through travelogues or the delineation of the Ukrainian information space, which included territories outside the Little Russian gubernias as well as territories of the Austrian Empire, see the interesting study by Kotenko.

¹⁴ Levchenko consciously employed this historical name for all "Little Russians"/"Ruthenians"/"Ukrainians," although he did not regard Belarusians as representatives of the same nation.

(264).¹⁵ Many other contributions to *Osnova* also focused on language problems.

3.1. OSNOVA'S LANGUAGE POLEMICS

Particularly in some of the later polemical contributions to *Osnova*, the legitimization of the Ukrainian language played a very important role, as evidenced by Zhytets'kyi's "Otvēt 'Dniu,'" ("Reply to *The Day*") and several contributions by Kulish, particularly his "Otvēt moskovskomu 'Dniu'" ("Reply to *The Day*") his "Otvēt na pis'mo s iuga" ("Reply to a Letter from the South"), his "Lysty s khutora" ("Letters from the Homestead") and his "Prostonarodnost' v ukrainskoi slovesnosti" ("Folk Customs in Ukrainian Literature").

3.1.1. Zhytets'kyi's "Reply to 'The Day'"

Zhytets'kyi's article in the March 1862 issue of *Osnova* was a reaction to Vladimir Lamanskii's July 1861 article titled "Natsional'naia bestaktnost'" ("National Tactlessness"), one of the earliest quite aggressive attacks against the Ukrainian movement put forth in the Russian press (see Miller 92; Dudko, "Iz rozshukiv," 54-57). Zhytets'kyi contended that contrary to Lamanskii's argumentation, neither was the Ukrainian movement—and with it the development of the Ukrainian language—artificial, nor did it actually contradict Russian patriotism. According to Zhytets'kyi, "the Little Russian language," as "a language of villages and not of civilized towns," was "the creation of the national spirit, and not of a literary guild" ("Otvēt 'Dniu,'" 5).¹⁶ The fact that some Ukrainians had adopted the Russian language did not at all prove their genuine Russianness, because other Ukrainians had assimilated with the Poles, although—as Zhytets'kyi might

¹⁵ Interestingly, he tried to immediately relate national costumes to dialects ("narodnye govory") (Levchenko, "Mesta zhitel'stva i mestnyia nazvaniia Rusinov," 265). Also of particular interest are the remarks on the language of the "Pinchuky" in Mokhranytsia's essay, where the author insisted on the Ukrainianness of the Pinchuky based on their language. Petro Iefymenko, however, reported on Ukrainians outside the Little Russian gubernias who "go to church and cross themselves [like all other Ukrainians], only their language is such that even we will not comprehend it" ("Вони у церкву ходять и хрестятця, тільки мова якась така, що й ми не розберемь," 191).

¹⁶ "Малорусскій языкъ—языкъ сель, а не цивилизованныхъ городовъ Малорусская литература—созданіе народнаго духа, а не литературнаго цеха."

have added—Ukrainians could hardly be Russians and Poles (and Hungarians, etc.) at the same time. By analogy, as Zhytets'kyi noted, all those “Gallicized Russians” (“*ofrantsuzhennye Russkie*”) whom he had personally met—Russians who had actually experienced serious difficulties in articulating themselves in Russian—were all simply French (Zhytets'kyi, “Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 3).

In reference to the development of the Ukrainian language, Zhytets'kyi correctly underscored that “the language of scholarship” is, in general, never “created at once, nor is the language of literature” (“Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 6). In Germany, as the “classical country of scholarship,” Latin had predominated until the eighteenth century, until “the progressive people of thought” finally created their national organ.” In Russia, nothing similar happened during that period of time (Zhytets'kyi, “Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 6); Russian literature (and with it the Russian language) remained “almost a *terra ignota*” even for the Russian people (“*narod*”) themselves, while for “Little Russians, who had for ages spoken their own language” (“*Malorussy, izdavna govoriavshie na svoem sobstvennom iazyke*”), it remained alien even more so. As Zhytets'kyi argued, “the Great Russian language,” be it the vernacular or the literary language, was simply “not the closest and the most direct organ of the Little Russians,”¹⁷ nor could this language be viewed as “all-Russian,” because Ukrainians had “not introduced the popular elements of their speech into the system of the Russian literary language”¹⁸ (“Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 7-8). The Slavophile all-Russian pathos of the time was thus false from the outset (Zhytets'kyi, “Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 6).

Zhytets'kyi did not at all deny the common Church Slavonic traditions, but he maintained that their significance was minor, because Church Slavonic did not function as “the language of popular consciousness” (“*iazykom narodnago soznaniia*”) (“Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 8). Therefore, even if it was correct that “Little Russian” learned men exerted considerable impact on Church Slavonic in the time of Peter I, this did by no means historically oblige the Little Russians to adopt forever the Russian language as “the language of schools and scholarship” (“*iazykom shkoly i nauki*”) (Zhytets'kyi, “Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 9). After all, there were on the whole as many “Little Russian” as “Great Russian” scholars, and, as Zhytets'kyi added, although none of them had greatly succeeded on an international level yet, Russian had become a language of scholarship so recently that Little Russians would be able to catch up quickly (“Otvēt ‘Dniu,” 16). Why should “genuine all-Russian” patriots thus try to “erase from the all-Russian nature

¹⁷ “Великорусскій языкъ—и народный и литературный, не есть ближайшій и прямой органъ Малоруссовъ.”

¹⁸ “не внесшіе народныхъ элементовъ своей рѣчи въ составъ русскаго литературнаго языка.”

an additional force that had recently emanated in Shevchenko's poetry?"¹⁹ (Zhytets'kyi, "Otvēt 'Dniu," 16)²⁰

Zhytets'kyi agreed with the view that "Little Russians" and "Great Russians" shared "common memories beginning from the first period of their historical life" as well as "common societal, religious and even scholarly interests" in the contemporary imperial context ("Otvēt 'Dniu," 16). He contended that "the Great Russian and the Little Russian nationalities are related to each other, and there has been a historically proven mutual attraction between them,"²¹ and he did not hesitate to write about an "internal unity" ("*vnutrennee edinstvo*") of the two nationalities. Zhytets'kyi added, however, that this kind of "unity" was strong enough to not be threatened by the existence of a distinct "Little Russian" language and literature, while the much greater threat was the "Russian patriotism" cherished by the Slavophiles, because it was in fact "Great Russian patriotism," as evidenced, inter alia, by widespread Great Russian (arrogant) attitudes toward so-called *khokhly* (a derogative term for Ukrainians) ("Otvēt 'Dniu," 9-11).²²

According to Zhytets'kyi, Shevchenko with his poetry and Kostomarov with his article on "Two Rus' Nationalities" had ultimately proven that "the Little Russian people" were spiritually "more similar to themselves than to any other."²³ Therefore, it had to go "its own way" ("*svoeiu dorogoi*"), even if the destination might be a common Russian one (Zhytets'kyi, "Otvēt 'Dniu," 17). Those who sincerely appreciated the Ukrainian language neither cared about those Poles who viewed it as "a peasant language" ("*khlopskoi movoi*," italics in the original) nor about those Great Russians who, like Lamanskii, labelled it with "a French expression" ("*frantsuzskoe vyrazhenie*") as "a patois" (Zhytets'kyi, "Otvēt 'Dniu," 14). At a time when

¹⁹ "вычеркнуть из общерусской природы еще одну силу, такъ ярко засіявшую недавно въ поэзіи Шевченка?"

²⁰ After all, as Zhytets'kyi and others argued, Shevchenko's Russian-language works were only average ("дюжинныя произведенія"; Zhytets'kyi, "Otvēt 'Dniu" 19).

²¹ "Великорусская и Малорусская народности родственны другъ другу, что между ними дѣйствительно существуетъ взаимное тяготѣніе."

²² "Ask a Great Russian commoner about his opinion of the Khokhol? . . . he will probably tell you that the Khokhol has a Khokhol soul, that he is not the same as our brother from Orel or Vladimir, and that even his language is not Russian [the latter word is written phonetically, emphasizing a (Great) Russian accent]" ("Спросите у Великорусскаго простолюдина, каковаго онъ мнѣнія о хохлѣ? . . . онъ навѣрное вамъ скажетъ, что у хохла и душа хохлацкая, что онъ не то-что нашъ братъ—Орловскій или Володимірскій, что у него и рѣчь не расѣйская.")

²³ "Малорусскій народъ въ самомъ строѣ своей духовной природы похожъ болѣе на самого-себя, чѣмъ на кого-нибудь."

Russian attacks against alleged Ukrainian separatism were becoming increasingly aggressive, Zhytets'kyi was eager to declare that Ukrainian activists (“we”) themselves understood that any (political) separation from “all-Russian life” (“*ustraniia sebia ot uchastiia v obshcherusskoi zhizni*”) would run counter to the course of history. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian movement was inevitable, because “the fate of the Ukrainian language and literature depends on the nation itself, which, according to its own development and defined by the internal necessity of its nature, will adopt from Russian education not what good and generous people might give but what the national genius (“*narodnyi genii*”) regards as imperative, thereby reserving the right to impact on Russian literature in turn”²⁴ (Zhytets'kyi, “Otvēt 'Dniu” 21).

3.1.2. Kulish Polemicizing

In his reply to an article in the Moscow newspaper *The Day*, Kulish reacted to one of the notorious lists of words shared by Ukrainian and Russian that was proposed by a certain Sokovenko. Not surprisingly, Kulish pointed to the fact that many parallels extended beyond the Russian-Ukrainian area, that most seemingly identical words were actually not identical, and that many other words separated Ukrainian from Russian (“Otvēt moskovskomu ‘Dniu’”).

In his more intriguing “Reply to the Letter from the South,” Kulish reacted to attacks expressed in an unpublished letter to the editors. Kulish rejected the reproach that his orthography, which was basically the orthography of *Osnova*, was the matter of a “patriot-and-a-bit-of-an-egoist” (“*patriot-nemnozhko-egoist*”) (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 41). Regarding his opponent’s statement that Ukrainian literature simply did not convey “genuine knowledge,” Kulish wisely responded that the genuine development of the Ukrainian language had begun only two years earlier and that other cultures, too, had faced or were still facing similar problems, including, of course, Russian culture.

Kulish proudly pointed to Austrian-ruled “Galicia,” where school education and judicial proceedings were conducted “in the generally accessible South Russian language” (“*na obshchedostupnom iuzhnorusskom*

²⁴ “судьба Украинского языка и литературы зависит отъ самого народа, который, по мѣрѣ своего собственнаго развитія, опредѣляясь изъ внутренней необходимости своей природы, усвоить изъ Русской образованности не то, что дадутъ ему добрые и великодушные люди, а то, на что укажетъ ему его народный геній, съ правомъ, въ свою очередь воздѣйствовать и на Русскую литературу.”

iazkye”),²⁵ and juxtaposed Galician with “Little Russian” accomplishments in a very intriguing way (especially if one takes into account the early date of this text, which thus anticipates frequent statements of the post-Valuev period) (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 41-42):

With us in Ukrainian literature the belletristic direction prevails (partly, out of necessity), with them—the pragmatic direction. Neither of them will remain without fruitful consequences. We would not have to exchange for a long time, if only we received the material opportunity. What lacks in their language is what we have; what lacks with us is what they have. If everybody works separately, both parts of the South-Russian people will build their word, as the chief engine of life. (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 42)²⁶

As the following sections demonstrate, Kulish and his contemporaries were perfectly aware that the process of language building was a complex process dependent on concrete political, societal, and economic factors:

It is boring to look from aside how slowly this thing is developing; a number of unfavourable circumstances might even make one believe in its hopelessness. But we who do not look at this issue from outside, who give their lives for it and do not see or understand how we can use it more worthily[,] we do not regard it as hopeless if only for the reason that it results from a desire for just weal for ourselves and the others.

From these words you see that I do not wear the rose-tinted spectacles you advise me to get rid of. I see only too well in what an unenviable state is the issue for which I spent the best years of my life. If you wish to know the truth, I am even not confident that I myself will live up to its new or better state, but I am deeply convinced that the future weal of many honourable people depends on that issue, and for the

²⁵ An anonymous contributor to *Osnova* reacted as early as February 1861 to the enthusiasm for the Galician written language of *Slovo* (which was later called “*iazychiie*” by Ukrainian populists) and stated clearly that this written language could not serve as a model for Ukrainians of the Russian Empire (“Otvēt sovremennoi letopisi”). Andrii Pesterzhets'kyi raised his voice against the Russian appraisals of “*iazychiie*” in a remarkable contribution to *Osnova* as well. Fragments from a letter by the Muscophile Iakiv Holovats'kyi, who promoted the works of the Galician populist Volodymyr Shashkevych (“Шаськевич”), were published in the Kulishivka-orthography (!).

²⁶ “У насъ въ украинской литературѣ преобладаетъ (отчасти и по-необходимости) направление беллетристическое, у нихъ—реальное. Ни то, ни другое не останется безъ плодотворныхъ послѣдствій. Обмѣняться не долго, лишь бы открылась матеріальная возможность. Чего недостаетъ въ ихъ языкѣ, то есть у насъ; чего у насъ недостаетъ, есть у нихъ. Работая каждый въ одиночку, обѣ части южнорусскаго народа созидаютъ свое слово, какъ главнаго двигателя жизни.”

achievement of that weal I count on the force of things, societal moral, the spirit and the requirement of time, and not at all on whatever “energetic and talented persons.” [sic] Generally we, as individuals, cannot achieve a lot. The success of our actions depends on the level of understanding for the force of things. Relying on this force, we look at ourselves as ancillary organs serving to justify more or less the instinct of societal life. (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 42)

Kulish frankly admitted that by the time he wrote his text, Ukrainian literature (or language development, as we might add) had not achieved much with regard to both quantity or diversity, but like Zhytets'kyi, he correctly relativized this observation inasmuch as he added that such a developmental stage had been or still was typical of many other literatures (or languages) (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 43).

Finally, Kulish refuted his opponent’s statement that Ukrainian literature was produced only for peasants (“Otvēt na pis'mo,” 43), and concluded with some remarks regarding the problems of introducing Ukrainian as a language of school education. As commoners usually lacked sufficient funds to afford textbooks, he argued for the need to establish literacy societies (Kulish, “Otvēt na pis'mo,” 44).

Regarding the stereotype of Ukrainianness as a mere countryside phenomenon, it has to be admitted that Kulish was, however, partly responsible for its confirmation himself: in his Ukrainian-language “Letters from the Homestead,” which he had published under the pseudonym “homestead dweller,” Kulish had expressly juxtaposed “the Ukrainian path” with urban civilization (particularly, “stony Moscow and groundless St. Petersburg” (“*kamiana Moskva, bezodnii burkh*”) and the so-called “old teaching” (“*stara nauka*”) of the countryside with “their teachings” (“*ikh nauki*”), i.e., the teachings of the urban dwellers, and their “weekly new trends” (“*shcho-tyzhnia novyi mody*”) (“Lysty s khutora,” 1: 310-11).²⁷ Moreover, Kulish was uncautious enough to link this view to *Osnova* itself, when he concluded his first “Letter” with the sentence, “You are publishing your *Osnova* for us, the Ukrainians (*pro nas, Ukraintsiv*), so you should also know how we think about that” (“Lysty s khutora,” 1: 318).

In his second and third letters, Kulish contended that civilization bore in itself the danger of alienating the younger from the older generation, and described “progress” as an “urban deception” (“*omana horodians'ka*”) at

²⁷ In a programmatic editorial dated January 1862, the editors emphasized that the problem of educating the popular masses was not a matter of “fashion” (“*moda*”) and added, “Fashion will not attach our people, as it artificially attaches the higher classes” (“*Мода къ нашему народу не привьется, какъ прививается она искусственно къ высшимъ классамъ*”) (“*Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'*,” 1: 91).

the expense of the countryside (“Lysty s khutora,” 2: 229). According to his outline, language was part of that deception, as “they,” the others, had created “for themselves some impossible language in the towns,” and “they” kept “squeezing human minds into it from early childhood” despite the fact that “only one percent of God’s people live in prosperity in the towns”²⁸ (Kulich, “Lysty s khutora,” 2: 229-30). “They,” the “literate urban dwellers,” had furthermore “for ages neglected our illiterate people with its unprinted language and in their minds turned into alien people,”²⁹ as had “our writers” (“*nashy pys'mennyky*”), who had allied with those urban dwellers, written books in “some kind of academic style” (“*akademychnim iakymysia sklodom*”), and been eager to spread “one academic book language from one sea to the other, like some big fishnet.”³⁰ As a result, the simple folk had “had no access to literacy unless they refuted their simple and expressive native word,”³¹ so much so that sending children to the schools equaled “giving them away to the Muscovites” (Kulich, “Lysty s khutora,” 3: 25-26).³²

At that point, however, “a new force—nationality” (“*nova syla—narodnist*”)—had arrived. It was Ukrainian writers such as Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko, Shevchenko, or Oleksandr Konys'kyi who introduced this force into literature and thereby “made us relatives to each other, united us into a brotherly family and confirmed our Ukrainian nature for all time”³³ (Kulich, “Lysty s khutora,” 3: 29-30). It was thus “the word” (i.e., the Ukrainian language) that had, according to Kulish, “consolidated our new brotherly union, our new Ukrainian family”³⁴ (Kulich, “Lysty s khutora,” 3: 31).

According to the vision of that freshly proclaimed “new village philosophy” (“*nova selians'ka fylosofya*”), “the time will come when people from huts, and not from palaces will be the great judges of art, scholarship

²⁸ “они собі якусь неподобну мову въ городахъ повисижували, та й ламлють підъ неї людський розумъ зъ малого мальства . . . що намъ по тому всѣму, коли въ городахъ тілько сота доля Божого люду живе въ достаткахъ . . . ?”

²⁹ “занедбали здавна вже письменні городяне нашъ сільський неписьменний людъ зъ ёго недрукованою мовою.”

³⁰ “одну книжню академичню мову одъ моря до моря, мовъ який невідъ.”

³¹ “не було сѣму людові иншого ходу въ письменство, тільки мусивъ рідного простого и виразного свого слова зректися.”

³² Kulish also touched upon the alienating role of Russian imperial schools in his important essay “Folk Customs in Ukrainian literature” (“Prostonarodnost',” see above).

³³ “Вона насъ родичами поміжъ собою поробила, у братню семью зъєдначила и наше українське суть на віку вічні утвердила.”

³⁴ “Словомъ скріплевсь новий союзъ братерський, нова сімья українська. . . .”

and secular justice itself.”³⁵ At that point, “we [i.e., the village dwellers] will start our social work and, as a great community, maybe in one century achieve more than you [i.e., the urban dwellers] as a small community did in ten”³⁶ (Kulish, “Lysty s khutora,” 2: 230-31). Thus, while promising profound social change, Kulish called upon his readers “to preserve their native language and their native customs with a loyal heart”³⁷ (“Lysty s khutora,” 2: 230-31).³⁸

Another important contribution to the language polemics in *Osnova* was Kulish’s article titled “Folk Customs in Ukrainian literature” (see Kostomarov, “O prepodavanii” with many similar arguments). As Kulish argued, Ukrainians did not need such literary critics as Vissarion Belinskii (who had no friendly attitude toward the Ukrainian movement), because they “did not test the vital sense of their works in the closed society of enthusiasts for literature, but submitted it directly to the people, to those strata who will not waste their time in reading, because they need it for their most urgent labours and businesses” (“Prostonarodnost’,” 2). Kulish then praised *Osnova* as the “so far only Ukrainian literary organ” and stated with regard to the Ukrainian movement that “regardless of whether our names will be forgotten or whether they will shine in the firm monuments

³⁵ “настане таке время, що съ хать, а не съ палатъ, зачнуть великі судді художества, науки та й самої правди мирської виходити.”

³⁶ “оттоді ми до гуртової роботи кинемось и, може, въ одинъ вікъ більше діла великою громадою вробимо, аніжъ ви въ десять віківъ малою уробили.”

³⁷ “мови рідної и свого рідного звичаю вірнимъ серцемъ держітеся.”

³⁸ Despite the largely rural character of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian intellectuals’ great concern for the countryside, the Ukrainian national movement was originally not a rural phenomenon. *Osnova* did not really focus on the countryside either. In the May 1862 issue of *Osnova*, Konys’kyi deplored that *Osnova* “published a lot of news about towns, but very little about villages, despite the fact that *Osnova* has to be, above all, the voice of the village people, their needs, and their everyday life, and has to ‘protect’ them from the danger that ‘a foreign language crawls into the villages and destroys the pure peasant language and popular life’” (“Въ Основі чимало друковано вістей про городи, и дуже, дуже мало про села,—тоді-якъ Основа повинна бути першъ усёго голосомъ сільского [sic] люду, ёго нуждъ, ёго щоденного життя,—повинна обороняти ёго одъ неправдъ и не допускати, щобъ чужий духъ, або чужа мова, прокрадаючись у села, нікчемничила чисту селянську мову и народне життє”) (“Z starykh sanzhar,” 11). This comment prompted the editors to reply: “*Osnova* is for everybody, for the entire community, for the entire people—be it urban or rural. Perhaps, the honourable Mr. Perekhodovets’ [Konys’kyi’s pseudonym] has not read *Osnova* well enough; otherwise, he would not criticize us.” (“Основа—про всіхъ, про всю громаду, про весь народъ—городський и сільський. Мабуть, в.-п. Переходовець не добре вчитався въ Основу; а то бъ не нарикавъ на насъ”) (Konys’kyi, Comment on *Osnova*).

of popular life, i.e., in the works of great writers—the presentiment of the upcoming revival of the Ukrainian tribe (*Ukrainskago plemeni*) should sweetly warm every soul in its striving toward infinity” (“Prostonarodnost’,” 5).

Kulich again maintained that Ukrainians and Great Russians had jointly created the artificial Russian standard language, while the (Ukrainian) vernacular was increasingly limited to the sphere of “songs and conversations of people who, due to the lack of their literary education, could not express themselves differently” (“Prostonarodnost’,” 2, 6). The major quality of this language was that “it expressed life with all its rich characteristics and testified to its harmony thanks to the multitude of outstanding works of folklore literature.” Due to these qualities, it could not be ignored in the long run (Kulich, “Prostonarodnost’,” 7).

Kulich addressed the problem that Russification produced an intergenerational gap and added an interesting gender-related observation. As he argued, boys whose mothers and nannies had still spoken to them in the vernacular were more exposed to Russification than girls who attended schools even less frequently than boys (which Kulich, by the way, criticized harshly). Therefore, Ukrainian women had preserved the beauty of the Ukrainian language, while their sons continually valued their mothers’ tongue even if they lacked the opportunity to use it. Finally, as soon as Ukrainian folk songs appeared in print, “we” [i.e., those sons] “saw more clearly than before how wonderful this language is,” a language “about which not a word is mentioned in the textbooks and of which our teachers make fun of from their lecterns” (Kulich, “Prostonarodnost’,” 7).

At that point, “we” [i.e., the Ukrainian national activists] “stepped down from the heights of our schools into the popular mass,”³⁹ and “the simple idea that we speak and feel what millions of people untouched by textbooks speak and feel supplied our intellectual powers with young freshness” (Kulich, “Prostonarodnost’,” 8). Henceforth, the intellectuals paid increasing attention to “the simple folk’s Ukrainian life” (*prostonarodnaia ukrainskaia zhizn*), and thus devised a “new teaching” (*novaia nauka*) which contributed to the cognition of the free human mind⁴⁰ (Kulich, “Prostonarodnost’,” 8).

Kulich repeatedly emphasized that not individual activists, but only the Ukrainian people as such would decide whether the Ukrainian national movement and the development of the Ukrainian language was “an utopian fantasy of only a few people” (*utopicheskoiu fantazieiu tol’ko nemnogikh*

³⁹ “мы радостно нисходили съ училищныхъ высотъ въ простонародную толпу.”

⁴⁰ “въ ряду предметовъ, подлежащихъ вѣдѣнію свободного ума человеческого.”

liudei') or not ("Prostonarodnost'," 9).⁴¹ According to his outline, Shevchenko's and Kvitka's works had ultimately proven the power of the Ukrainian word which had the potential to affect every Ukrainian regardless of his or her social status or actual home region, even outside the Little Russian gubernias (Kulich, "Prostonarodnost'," 9), while the publication of *Osnova* marked a new stage in the development of the Ukrainian "nationality," a nationality that had no insincere political ambitions and (contrary to the Moscow Slavophiles) embraced the values of "European civilization" (Kulich, "Prostonarodnost'," 10).

3.1.3. Defending the Official Use of the Ukrainian Language

Several polemical articles featured in *Osnova* highlighted the problem of Ukrainian language usage in the schools of the "Little Russian" gubernias. In the first issue of the journal, Levchenko reported on Mr. Schwarz, an ethnically German law student of Kyiv University, who, despite his ethnic background, maintained "the wonderful method of teaching in the popular language" and despite his difficulties actually reached his students ("Iz Anan'eva," 330).

Another author, Stepan Pohars'kyi, obviously tried to convince the Russian authorities of the need for Ukrainian-language primers while reporting that the Poles, who did not refrain from regarding the "South-Russian land" as "our land" and "our provinces," had already begun distributing their own Ruthenian-language primers ("*Elementarze w Rusińskim języku*") written in Polish orthography and in accordance with their Polish national ideology (14).

Pavlo Chubyns'kyi, in a particularly intriguing contribution, deplored the fact that even in those few schools that actually existed in the Ukrainian villages children spent four years learning "the church and civil script, writing, the four (basic) arithmetic operations and church singing," but "all that" was "studied mechanically" based on "a primer, then the book of hours and the Psalter," while only outdated books were used for teaching "civil reading" (56). As he contended, the state of the village schools thus "completely contradicted life" itself, and the schools, which were no less than "one of the most serious punishments for the children," buried "anything vital, happy, anything young" in them (Chubyns'kyi 57). Consequently, Chubyns'kyi called for reforms. In his view, clergymen were not useful partners, because their education had turned them into

⁴¹ Kulish polemically remarked that precisely the ideas of the Slavophiles were such utopian fantasies.

scholastics who were not even able to deliver sermons in a language comprehensible to the people (Chubyns'kyi 58-59).⁴² Much more was to be expected from the few volunteers who descended from “the ruling classes” and “sacrificed themselves” for the education of the commoners, but only the establishment of a pedagogical institute for training village school teachers would solve the problem (Chubyns'kyi 58-59). Students of such institutes should be educated, inter alia, in agriculture as well as in the sphere of laws which were relevant to the peasants. Only in that case should the peasants be ready to trust them (Chubyns'kyi 60).

An anonymous contributor to the “Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'” (“Contemporary South-Russian Chronicle”) made it clear that “we regard the Sunday schools as a temporary institution,” and called for the establishment of Ukrainian-language everyday schools (3: 115). Moreover, this undisclosed author criticized the outdated and boring methods of alphabetization and insisted on the establishment of “genuine popular schools” with appropriate teachers, practice-oriented teaching programs, and desperately needed “schoolbooks, particularly in the native language” (“Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis',” 3: 117). The author generally deplored the lack of books “in the Little Russian language,” specifically of books for “the people”⁴³ (“Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis',” 3: 118).

⁴² Fedir Vovk devoted a separate article to the village priests in “South-Western Rus’,” who had once been united with the people, but then were Polonized due to a desire for “civilization.” This had alienated the priests from the commoners, who, largely due to the priests’ preference for the Polish language, saw in them “something not native to them, but something Polish and Uniate” (“что-то не свое родное, а польское, униятское”) (Vovk 41). In their sermons, the priests used “a scholastic, half-Russian, half-[Church] Slavic language” (“схоластический, полурусский, полуславянский языкъ”), which the parishioners did not understand (Vovk 49-50). Therefore, the priests should finally learn the “rich language” (“богатый языкъ”) of the “South-Russian people” (“южно-русский народъ”), which “is able to express any vital thought and feeling” (“способный выразить всякую живую мысль и чувство”) (Vovk 51). In their own families as well as in their contacts with the parishioners, the priests should use “the native Ukrainian language” (“родной, украинский языкъ”). As “the priest is most often the only learned person in his parish, society waits from his support for the great task of educating the popular masses” (“Священникъ, большею-частью, единственное учившееся лицо въ своемъ приходѣ, и общество ждетъ отъ него содѣйствія въ великомъ дѣлѣ народнаго образования”) (Vovk 51). On a judgment of the priests that was quite close to that of Vovk, see “Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis',” 1: 90. The quality of sermons depended not only on the language, but also on style, as the editors of *Osnova* alluded to when they reprinted another article in the July 1861 issue of *Osnova* (see “Otchego propoved' inogda byvaet bezsil'na”).

⁴³ “на этомъ языкѣ нѣтъ тѣхъ именно книгъ, которыхъ требуетъ народъ”

Without such prints, pupils were in fact forced to use “Great Russian books” (“*knigi velikoruskiiia*”), where they, however, “*did not understand anything without an explanation*” (“*chitaia ikh bez ob'iasneniia nichego ne ponimaiut*”) (“*Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis*,” 3: 118; emphasis in the original).

Oleksandr Horodys'kyi, while discussing the question “What our people should be taught and how,” maintained that Russian could not be used in elementary education because “pupils understand this language only with difficulty” (10). To prove this, Horodys'kyi referred to a report by Konys'kyi, who had recently asked the best pupil of a school to read a Russian-language text about judges and found that the pupil “read” fluently, but was unable to sum up the content. Allegedly, this best pupil—a girl—subsequently read the same (or probably a rather similar) text in Kulish’s primer in Ukrainian and fulfilled her task “satisfactorily” (on this episode and related alleged evidence see also Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 36-37). Moreover, Horodys'kyi reported that in one of the Poltava schools, the parents of 114 out of 157 pupils opted for Ukrainian as the language of education, whereby 23 of those pupils were ethnic Russians (10; see also Kravchenko).

In the following, Horodys'kyi interestingly elaborated on the linguistic effects of Russian-language teaching, and in fact described the rise of what would later be labelled as “*surzhyk*”:

South Russians, when they acquire literacy in the Great Russian language, adopt an ugly dialect that resembles neither of the two languages. With their semi-educatedness, this ugly dialect becomes the reason for their separation from their families and generally from their milieu. They look down at their village fellows and regard the *Khokhol-Muzhyk* business as too low for themselves. Therefore, education takes away working hands from the village business The instruction in the Great Russian language thus involves moral harm and is the major reason why the village population looks at education without sympathy. (11)⁴⁴

In conclusion, Horodys'kyi added that Ukrainians seriously suffered from the fact that they were constantly exposed to “the sermon, the court of

⁴⁴ “Южноруссы, обучаясь грамотѣ на языкѣ великорусскомѣ, приобрѣтають уродливый говоръ, не похожий ни на тотъ, ни на другой языкъ. При полубобразованности, уродливый говоръ служить поводомъ къ выдѣленію ихъ изъ своихъ семействъ и вообще изъ своей среды; на односельянъ они смотрять свысока, и занятія хохлацкія-мужицкія считаютъ для себя низкими. Отъ этого грамотность отнимаетъ отъ сельскихъ занятій рабочія руки Такимъ образомъ, обученіе на великорусскомъ языкѣ вноситъ нравственную порчу и составляетъ главную причину того, что сельское народонаселеніе смотритъ на грамотность неблагопріятно.”

law, and education” in an alien language (“*ne na svoem iazyke*”), although the tsar’s administration had itself experienced “how difficult it is to make oneself clear in the Great Russian language” (“*kak trudno iz’iasniat’sia na velikorusskom iazyke*”) when it attempted to convey to Ukrainians the essential rulings of the abolition of serfdom on 19 February 1861 in the Kyiv and Katerynoslav (today: Dnipro) gubernias and finally decided to use “the South Russian language” (“*iazzyk iuzhnorusskii*”) in their written addresses to the population (12).

A number of shorter *Osnova* reports and “news” from various places of Ukraine focused on school issues. Vasyl’ Shevych offered two first-hand reports on the Sunday school of Lubny (Poltava gubernia) and its program (“*Iz Luben*”; “*Z Luben*”). An itinerary offered information on schools, libraries, and book shops in Hadiach (Kyvaiholova). The June 1861 issue of *Osnova* featured a report on “schools recently established in the south,” in which the author insisted on “the establishment of schools in every village,” while another anonymous author discussed contemporary didactic methods as applied in Ukrainian textbooks (“*Uchilishcha*,” 107; Sh-rl-v-i).

In the August 1862 issue of *Osnova*, yet another anonymous contributor returned to the question “In which language should one teach the people?” (*Na kakom iazyke dolzhno obuchat’ narod?*).⁴⁵ The author responded to an attack against “the distribution of literacy in South-Western Russia” in the Ukrainian language, which had appeared in the “Works of the Kyiv Theological Academy” in May 1861. He unequivocally argued that “the renaissance and the development of the South Russian nationality on a new foundation” was “a completed fact”⁴⁶ and in full accordance with “invincible life” (“*nepobedimaia zhizn*”) as well as “the logics of events, as in other similar cases” (“*logika sobytii, kak i v drugikh podobnykh sluchaiakh*”) (“*Na kakom iazyke*,” 1). The author argued that literacy was above all an instrument of education and since Ukrainian was certainly a language in its own right, as proven by the leading (Vienna-based) Slavist Franz Miklosich, there could be no doubt about the legitimacy of Ukrainian-language schools in Ukraine (“*Na kakom iazyke*,” 3-4). As the author pointed out, any attacks against the allegedly “poor Little Russian literature” were unjustified because the same argument could be put forth not only against Serbs and Bulgarians, but also against Great Russians themselves, who should in that case study English, German, or French, because these literatures were “more developed” (“*Na kakom iazyke*,” 5). In fact, however, the author contended that “our people, as every other people, should be taught literacy above all in the *native*

⁴⁵ See a very brief outline of this article in Zhovtobriukh 233-34.

⁴⁶ “Обновление и развитие южнорусской народности на новыхъ началахъ— есть совершающийся фактъ.”

language” (“*na ego rodnom iazyke*”), although he added that they should be taught Great Russian as well (“*Na kakom iazyke,*” 6). In accordance with many of his contemporaries, the author regarded one of the major advantages of the developing Ukrainian standard language to be the fact that it was very close to the genuine vernacular. Moreover, he expressed his confidence that even the Russian language would over the course of time develop in that direction (“*Na kakom iazyke,*” 10). Finally, the author refuted any stereotypical allegations that the Ukrainian movement was a Western intrigue (“*Na kakom iazyke,*” 11) and correctly argued that if there were opponents of the Ukrainian language among Ukrainians themselves, this was not really a surprise, as not so long ago, many Russians had still preferred to learn French instead of Russian (“*Na kakom iazyke,*” 12).

In the very last issue of *Osnova*, Oleksandr Stoianov published another intriguing article with the telling title “*Nepravdivost' i ravnodushie—glavneishiia pomekhi k rasprostraneniuu gramotnosti*” (“*Untruthfulness and Indifference Are the Major Obstacles to the Spread of Literacy*”). Stoianov’s contribution was a reply to another aggressive attack against the Ukrainian movement, namely Ksenofont Govorskii’s (Hovors'kyi’s) comments related to an article published by Stoianov himself in a Russian newspaper *Vestnik* (*The Herald*) in September 1862. While Govorskii had accused Stoianov and his everyday school in Kyiv of “dark regional interests” (“*temnye oblastnye interesy*”), Stoianov claimed that he, as a teacher of a Sunday school, had initially attempted to teach the children in Russian, but soon found that he had to “depart forever from that kind of absurd pedagogical experiment” (74, 77). Stoianov thus concluded from his own experience that at least initial teaching had to be offered in a language that was “comprehensible and native” (“*poniatnyi, rodnoi*”) to the child, although he assured his readers that “no one rejects the Great Russian language (this would be as absurd as to *exclusively* impose it), just like no one rejects any other language as an instrument of knowledge and development”⁴⁷ (77).

Moreover, Stoianov maintained that contrary to Govorskii’s accusations, Russian was in fact regularly used in the everyday school, especially in the higher classes, while Ukrainian was actually used only occasionally, inter alia, due to the lack of Ukrainian-language textbooks. As Stoianov indicated, only the lower classes of the school he supervised actually concentrated on Ukrainian (78). Concluding, Stoianov bitterly complained about attacks against the supporters of the “Ukrainophile

⁴⁷ “Никто не отвергаетъ великорусскаго языка (это было бы такъ же нелѣпо, какъ и исключительно навязывать его), такъ точно, какъ не отвергаетъ всякаго другаго языка, какъ средства для знанія и развитія.”

movement” in Kyiv, who were exposed to various serious denunciations in the press without any opportunity to defend themselves (82):

A person who studies the ethnography of the South-Russian land (“*Iuzhnorusskago kraia*”) and thereby convinces himself in the peculiarity of the South-Rus(s)ian people (“*Iuzhnorusskago [sic] naroda*”) in the ethnographic sense is what they call a separatist. A person who, on the basis of positive philological facts, acknowledges the Little Russian language (“*Malorusskii iazyk*”) as a language and not a dialect (“*iazykom, a ne narechiem*”) is called a separatist by them too. They call a separatist a person who studies the history of the South-Rus(s)ian people (“*Iuzhnorusskago [sic] naroda*”) and sees its specific national type (“*natsional'nyi tip*”) operate in that history. Finally, they call a separatist a man who dares to state that one has to conduct instruction in a native and understandable language (“*na rodnom, poniatnom dlia nego, iazyke*”) for a boy so that he will understand what he reads! (83)

Interestingly, Stoianov added a brief remark in reference to Govorskii’s allusions regarding Stoianov’s non-Ukrainian name.

Oh, Mr. Editor, would you really believe that the development and the convictions of a man depend on the occasional combination of letters in his surname? Would you really believe that a man who has been raised on the land and nurtured by the land where he lives, whereas he remembers his far fatherland only by tradition (“*pomniashchii tol'ko po predaniu svoiu dalekuiu rodinu*”), would you really believe that a man amidst an honest people whom he is obliged to serve would not be an alien outgrowth (“*chuzhim narostom*”), a polyp, if he just remained inactive or impended in empyreal dreams and mechanics—or scholastics-grown theories . . . After all, not everyone’s convictions exclusively depend on his origins (“*ot proiskhozhdeniia*”). (87-88)

Stoianov once again confirmed that contrary to widespread myths, the protagonists of the Ukrainian national movement did not at all view it in narrow ethnic terms (see also Valentyna Shandra’s study in this volume).

3.2. OSNOVA AS A PLATFORM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

The development of the Ukrainian language was a major component of *Osnova*’s program from the beginning. Vasyl' Bilozers'kyi’s editorial of September 1861 confirmed the following:

The subject of *Osnova* remains the same: the comprehensive and objective study of the South-Russian land and the South-Russian people (“*Iuzhnorusskago kraia i Iuzhnorusskago naroda*”). The direction will not

change either. It has deserved general appraisal, and we can only repeat the chief principles that have always guided and will guide the editors: the esteem for personal rights, for the people and the nationality (“*k narodu i narodnosti*”), and the removal of enmity in the sphere of rank, nation and religion (“*ustranenie soslovnoi, national'noi i religioznoi vrazhdy*”) as well as of any misunderstandings through the elucidation of the dark questions of our contemporary and past life.

The guiding idea of *Osnova* will be enlightenment in the popular spirit (“*prosveshchenie v narodnom dukhe*”). The editors, while rejecting any exclusivity or isolation, at the same time regard it as harmful cosmopolitanism⁴⁸ too, as it sooner or later turns into complete indifference regarding the local national benefits and needs. The communication with other nationalities (“*s drugimi narodnostiami*”) is necessary and fruitful for every nation, but it brings genuine benefit only to those societies that take their major vital force from their native soil

While acknowledging the significance of each nationality in the general life of humankind, we should attempt to understand our national peculiarities, our natural vital resources that have not been adopted from anyone in the first place,⁴⁹ we should strive to occupy among the other peoples (“*mezhdru drugimi narodami*”) the same place that an active family member occupies in the circle of the other members of the family.

Based on that foundation, we regard as necessary and *generally useful* the further development of the Ukrainian popular [or rather national, M.M.] language and literature⁵⁰ The question whether our literature [or language, M.M.] should or should not exist has until recently been a topic of discussion for many; but life itself has decided it positively No one can say now that there is no Ukrainian literature, as they used to say and write before.⁵¹ (2)

According to Bilozers'kyi, those who dedicated themselves to the development of the Ukrainian language regarded their efforts as “necessary not only for the Ukrainians, but for the whole Slavic world” (3). Interestingly, Bilozers'kyi, too, paid particular attention to “the Russian nationality in Galicia” (“*rusaskaia narodnost' v Galitsii*”), which had until recently been oppressed “as if there were no Rus' in Galicia at all” (“*budto*

⁴⁸ The editors regarded this remark on cosmopolitanism as so important that they reiterated it in the January 1862 issue of *Osnova* (“*Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'*,” 1: 82).

⁴⁹ “наши національнѣя особеннѣя, наши природнѣя, ни у кого не заимствованныя, средства существованѣя.”

⁵⁰ “дальнѣйшее развитѣе украинскаго народнаго языка и словесности.”

⁵¹ “Вопросъ—быть или не быть нашей словесности? еще недавно составлялъ предметъ спора для многихъ; но его разрѣшила утвердительно сама жизнь Никто теперѣ не скажетъ, что украинской словесности нѣтъ, какъ, бывало, говорили и писали прежде.”

Rusi v Galitsii net vovse"), whereas now the "Galician Ruthenians," who spoke "the Ukrainian language" and felt sympathy with "our literature," had established their own journal (Bilozers'kyi had in mind *Slovo*), and their "native language"—"the Ruthenian language" ("*rusinskii . . . iazyk*")—was being used in the schools and courts of law (3). Even through their attire, the Galician youth underscored their "Ruthenianness" vis-à-vis the Poles and (Austrian) Germans, as Bilozers'kyi reported (3). Bilozers'kyi's article thus provided another example that the Galicians' success in the sphere of national policy greatly inspired the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire even prior to the Valuev Directive and before the slogan of Galicia as a Piedmont was coined (Moser, *Ukrains'kyi P'iemont?*).⁵²

Osnova did not cease to publicize the use of the Ukrainian language in belletristics. For example, the editors introduced a short story written by a certain Pavlo Shulika who, as an author "stemming directly from the people," allegedly proved that the "tenderness of feelings, of the language, of the expressions," which some opponents of the Ukrainian movement regarded as "imposed" on the Ukrainian people by Ukrainian writers, was genuine.

The major achievement in those years was, however, the development of the Ukrainian language in the nonbelletristic sphere. The fact that most nonbelletristic materials of *Osnova* were still written in Russian can partly be explained by the fact that the contributions had to be comprehensible to non-Ukrainophones, as was the case with polemics against Russian authors. There were, however, other reasons: Ukrainians had little experience in using their language in an intellectualized sphere, so their language still lacked the necessary terminologies and stylistic resources.

As late as July 1862, Ivan Novyts'kyi,⁵³ in the introduction to his notes "Z Taraitsy (Kyivs'koi hub.)" ("From Taraitsa [Kyiv gubernia]") criticized the style of other contributors to *Osnova*, but, more importantly, frankly

⁵² Elsewhere, the editors of *Osnova* published fragments from an Austrian statistical report concerning the "Ruthenians" of Austria ("Rusiny"). In the introduction to a bibliographical survey of Austrian "Ruthenian" publications they clearly stated that "modern Ruthenian literature" is still very young ("нынѣшня Русинская литература еще очень молода"). Its beginnings can be traced to the time when the Austrian government followed the well-known rule of *divide et impera* and, frightened by the movement of the Polish noblemen party, allowed the Ruthenians in 1849, along with various concessions, to print books in Russian civic letters ("русскими гражданскими буквами [гражданкою]") ("Bibliograficheskii ukazatel"). *Osnova* also published an announcement for *Slovo*, which included a text by Bohdan Didyts'kyi written in his outdated language ("*iazychiie*") ("Galitsko-russkaia gazeta 'Slovo'").

⁵³ Novyts'kyi still used the Russian form of his name.

admitted that he himself, as one of the leading Ukrainian activists of the time, was afraid that he would perhaps not fare better:

I have for a long time planned to address you in our native Ukrainian language, but I was always afraid that the result would not be very elaborated or *forged*, as Mr. Sheikovs'kyi [a contemporary author of one of the first Ukrainian dictionaries and contributor to *Osnova*, M. M.] says (precisely this is, pardon, sometimes the case in *Osnova*, too). One author writes as he cuts bread, the other one, unfortunately, has a good thought, but has to look for the (appropriate) word in his pocket. However, I think to myself, if you are afraid of the wolf you cannot go into the wood either. One has to try: “Whatever will be, will be—and only what God gives will be.” (87-89)⁵⁴

As Andrii Pesterzhets'kyi explained in the April 1861 issue of *Osnova*, “only those write in South-Russian” who felt “the call to write in the people’s language” and who were eager to “preserve their language from influences that might have made them alien to the people” as much as possible (26). Pesterzhets'kyi’s and others’ vision was that the study of the vernacular equaled the study of the people’s “physiognomy.” In other words, he argues that the language is the people’s physiognomy (i.e., a reflection of its “true character”) although loans are necessary, for it was in fact impossible to maintain a “purely popular” shape of a language in contemporary intellectual discussions, which were simply not part of the Ukrainian peasants’ mental and linguistic world (Pesterzhets'kyi 27). Pesterzhets'kyi did insist, however, that Ukrainian-language texts were necessarily texts written in the language of the commoners:

Briefly, if we talk to the simple people in their language (“*govoria k prostomu narodu ego iazykom*”), we reach an immediate interaction with its world view, because the words and concepts that we use are their own, and they are organically tied to their internal world. (28)

Whoever was guided by these principles would consistently try to use the Ukrainian language only like a genuine peasant. In a modernizing world, such linguistic behaviour would, however, have run counter to the

⁵⁴ “Давно вже зібрався я заговорити до вась нашою ріднёю українською мовою, та все боявсь, щобъ не вийшло воно (якъ отъ, часомъ, не прогнівайтесь, бува й въ Основі) дуже робляне, коване, якъ каже в.-п. д. Шейковський. Інший пише, якъ хлібъ ріже, а інший, бідолаха, думку має добру, та за словомъ мусить лазити у кишеню. Але, думаю собі, вовка боятись, то й въ лісь не йти,—треба спробувать: ‘що буде, то буде,—а буде те, що Богъ дасть.’”

inevitable intellectualization of the Ukrainian language. It is thus noteworthy that Pesterzhets'kyi himself wrote his contribution in Russian.

Konys'kyi was one of those national activists who most actively pushed for a consistent use of the Ukrainian language. In the first issue of *Osnova*, he programmatically wrote the following:

We think, Sir, that *Osnova* has to be kept in the native Ukrainian language . . . So we will hope, anyways, that over the course of time, *Osnova* will entirely be written in our dear language. The Ukrainian language is not only appropriate for verses; one can speak and talk in it *about all our affairs*, as in any other language. With this in mind, I am sending you the first news in our language; maybe, wiser people will react to my letter from other regions and write more appropriately. This is how we will increasingly reach the point when we will write about everything in Ukrainian. After all, is it not a shame if you have to creep into your neighbour's pocket for a word? Do we really not have our own one? The time has come to finally think about our own literary language. ("Z Poltavy (dekabr' 1860)," 1: 319)⁵⁵

The following remarks from Ivan Ohienko's *Istoriia ukrains'koi literaturnoi movy (History of the Ukrainian Language)* are interesting in this respect:

Konys'kyi reports that in 1860, the Poltava people once required that the then projected monthly journal *Osnova* be entirely printed in the Ukrainian language. Kulish objected to that and argued that this could not be done, because the Ukrainian language was not sufficiently elaborated. Konys'kyi himself suggested at that point that somebody should attempt a translation of Shakespeare into the Ukrainian language. This idea evoked laughter with Kulish, and he declared that "Only our great-grandchildren will probably see Shakespeare in our language." (150)⁵⁶

Similarly, an eyewitness reported on his meeting with *Osnova*'s editorial staff in March 1862. The visitor was surprised to see that these

⁵⁵ "Ми собі такъ мизькуємо, добродію, що "Основа" повинна бути на рідній українській мові Отъ же ми все-таки будемо сподіватися, що, чимъ-дальшъ, "Основа" вся буде въ нашій любій мові. . . . Українська мова годитця не для одніхъ віршів; на їй и теперъ можна говорити й писати про все наше, такъ-таки, якъ и на іншихъ. Такъ собі думаючи, пишу до васъ первіи вісті по-нашому; може, на мій листъ обізвуться зъ другихъ сторонъ розумніши люде и придатніше напишуть. Оттакъ, по-троху, по-троху, та й дійдемъ до того, що про все писатимемъ по-українськи. Бо чи тожъ-таки не соромъ—лізти до сусіда в кишеню за словомъ? хиба у насъ свого нема? Пора, пора намъ подуматся до власної літературної мови."

⁵⁶ Later, Kulish himself translated some of Shakespeare's works.

“ardent adherents of anything Little Russian” (“*goriachie priverzhentsy vsego malorossiiskago*”) who frequently spoke about “the legitimization, the dignity and great importance of the popular language” (“*slyshalos' nemalo o prave, dostoinstve i vazhnom znachenii narodnogo iazyka*”) usually did so in Russian and only occasionally inserted isolated “Little Russian phrases, sayings, fragments of folk songs,” or they began talking Ukrainian and soon switched to Russian (Dudko, “Zhurnal”).

There is, however, nothing extraordinary about the fact that many authors still felt more comfortable with Russian if a neutral prosaic intellectualized style seemed appropriate, because this stylistic layer had in general been well-established in Russian by the 1860s, but was just being developed for Ukrainian. Actually, this might precisely be one of the reasons why *Osnova*’s “questions to” and “replies from” the editors, e.g., were all exclusively kept in Russian in the first issue of *Osnova* (1861: 332-33 [“Voprosy redaktsii,” “Otvety redaktsii”]) and mostly written in both languages later (see *Osnova* 5, 1861: 77-78 [“Ot redaktsii”]; *Osnova* 6, 1861: 174-75 [“Otvety redaktsii”]).⁵⁷

Attentive readers could, however, not overlook certain signs that the Ukrainian language was meant to occupy broader space in the nonbelletristic sphere of *Osnova* over the course of time. One very clear indication was the fact that beginning in January 1862, the title pages of *Osnova* featured Ukrainian names of months (which did not completely coincide with the contemporary standard names).⁵⁸

More importantly, nonbelletristic Ukrainian-language prose texts were featured in *Osnova* beginning from the very first issue. Again, it was Kulish who took a leading role as the author not only of his above-mentioned “Letters from the Homestead,”⁵⁹ but also of his book reviews (“Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok” [“Review of Ukrainian Books”]), his historical works (“Khmel'nyshchyna” [“The Khmelnyts'kyi Period”]; “Vyhovshchyna” [“The Vyhovs'kyi Period”]; “Ystoriia Ukrainy od naidavniishykh chasiv” [“The History of Ukraine from Most Ancient Times”]), a report on a trip to Ostrih

⁵⁷ Only occasionally, these materials from the editors were kept in Ukrainian only (see “Od redaktsiy,” *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1861, p. 34, about half a page); the usage of both languages predominated (“Od redaktsiy,” *Osnova*, vol. 8, 1861, pp. 9-10), and even exclusively Russian-language materials are encountered in later issues as well (*Osnova*, vol. 9, 1861, pp. 193-94, ironically titled “Od redaktsiy” in Ukrainian).

⁵⁸ “Січень (январь), Лютий (февраль), Березіль (мартъ), Квітень (апрѣль), Травень (май), Червець (іюнь), Липець (іюль), Серпень (августъ), Жовтень (сентябрь)” (“*zhovten*” is October in Modern Standard Ukrainian).

⁵⁹ Published in *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 310-18, *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, pp. 227-32; *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1861, pp. 25-32; *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1861, pp. 143-56; *Osnova*, vol. 11-12, 1861, pp. 122-28.

("Znaidenyi na dorozhi lyst" ["A Letter Found on a Road"]), and a report on the anniversary of Shevchenko's death ("Rokovyny po Shevchenkovi, misiatsia liutoho, 26-ho dnia, 1862 roku" ["The Anniversary of Shevchenko's Death, 26 February 1862"]), etc.

Other noteworthy Ukrainian-language contributions included Konys'kyi's discussion of Ukrainian primers ("Nas'ki hramatky" ["Our Primers"]) and his report on a trip to the Kherson region ("Lyst z dorohy" ["A Letter from the Road"]), Volod'ko Nechua's "Pro doshch (Sproba)" ("About Rain (An Essay)"), and Iakiv Kukharenko's study on cattle in the Black Sea region, which featured Ukrainian-language statistical materials ("Vivtsi i chabany v Chornomori" ["Sheep and Shepherds in the Black Sea Region"]), etc.

Lev Zhemchuzhnykov's report on Taras Shevchenko's funeral ("Vospominanie o Shevchenke; ego smert' i pogrebenie," ["Remembering Shevchenko, His Passing and His Funeral"]) and Mykhailo Maksymovych's article "Znachenie Shevchenka dlia Ukrainy, provody tela ego v Ukrainu iz Peterburga" ("Shevchenko's Significance for Ukraine, the Transfer of His Body to Ukraine from Petersburg") included several speeches and letters in the Ukrainian language.⁶⁰

Although Kostomarov wrote almost all his contributions to *Osnova* in Russian, his brief article "Khrystyian'stvo y kripatstvo" ("Christianism and Serfdom") in the March 1862 issue was kept in Ukrainian, and Marusia Denysenko's "Lysty Ukrainky" ("Letters of a Ukrainian Woman") completed the list of the most interesting nonbellesitric Ukrainian-language materials of *Osnova*.

Dozens of short "news" items from various regions of Ukraine were written in Ukrainian as well, although the majority of them were kept in Russian. Borys Poznans'kyi's and Ryl's'kyi's correspondences offered precise information on the economy and agriculture, including calculations, in Ukrainian.⁶¹ Vsevolod Kakhov's'kyi published "Lyst do 'Osnov'ian'" ("A Letter to the *Osnova* People") with an interesting report on the situation after the liberation from serfdom. The June 1862 issue offered another visible sign that *Osnova* authors wanted to establish Ukrainian as a serious language in its own right. It featured two schemes of a building with explanations in the Ukrainian language.⁶²

Osnova thus emitted clear signals that Ukrainian could and should be used not only to celebrate the Cossack past or the peasant present, but also

⁶⁰ Moreover, *Osnova* posthumously published several letters by Shevchenko, and some letters addressed to him. Zhovtobriukh (256) identifies some of these nonbellesitric texts of *Osnova*.

⁶¹ Published in *Osnova* vol. 8, 1861, pp. 88-91, *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1862, p. 84.

⁶² See *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1862, pp. 266-67.

to discuss contemporary intellectual, political, and economic problems. *Osnova's* contribution earns even more credit as the "Chernigovskii listok" ("Chernigov Feuilleton"), which was edited between July 1861 and August 1863 by Leonid Hlibov, featured numerous Ukrainian-language literary works, but only a handful of Ukrainian-language nonbelletristic works, namely Matvii Nomys's two reviews of Sheikovs'kyi's dictionary, Konys'kyi's two correspondences from Poltava, and two brief anonymous correspondences (Zhovtobriukh 239).

Only a small portion of the national polemics of *Osnova* was, however, written in Ukrainian, which might, again, partly be explained by the envisioned circle of readers. Curiously, it was thus not a Ukrainian, but the Pole, Tadeusz Padalica, who used Ukrainian first in this sphere, while arguing for the Polish character of Ukraine's territories in an open letter to Volodymyr Antonovych. Interestingly, the editors sarcastically responded to Padalica's language in a brief polemical (Ukrainophone) introduction to his text: "Mr. Padalica engages himself for the lords' side so ardently that he even wrote his letter in our language" (Padalica 136).⁶³

Aside from Padalica's letter, one of the several contributions to the discussion of the Jewish-Ukrainian national encounter and the (non-pejorative) use of the word "zhyd" (the historically neutral noun denoting Jews, see, e.g., Polish "żyd") in the Ukrainian language was written in Ukrainian as well: namely, Mytrofan Aleksandrovych's essay "De-shcho pro zhydiv" ("Something About the Jews").

In general, the *Osnova* authors were perfectly aware that in order to use Ukrainian in intellectual discussions on a broader scale, considerable work in the development of the Ukrainian language was yet to be done. In the May 1862 issue of *Osnova*, Kostomarov once again praised the recent achievements of Ukrainian belles-lettres, but remarked that "still, the most essential thing is missing, which would provide our ambitions with solidity and fruitfulness," in that "as long as this language has not become the guide of general human education, all our writings in that language are a void heyday, and our offspring will label them the result of caprice" ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 1).⁶⁴ According to Kostomarov,

the people ["naroda"] should learn, the people want to learn; if we do not provide the people with the instruments and means to learn in their own

⁶³ "Панъ Падалиця такъ горяче вступаеця за свою панську сторону, що ажъ написавъ свій листъ по-нашому."

⁶⁴ "пока на южнорусскомъ языкѣ не будутъ сообщаться знанія, пока этотъ языкъ не сдѣлается проводникомъ общечеловѣческой образованности, до-тѣхъ-поръ всѣ наши писанія на этомъ языкѣ—блестящій пустоцвѣтъ, и потомки назовутъ ихъ результатомъ прихоти."

language, they will learn in an alien one, and our nationality will perish along with the education of the popular masses. ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 2)⁶⁵

While admitting the great difficulty of the endeavour ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 5-6), the Ukrainian intellectual leader called upon his colleagues to focus on elementary scholarly works. In Kostomarov's opinion, to translate "into the South-Russian language Humboldt's 'Cosmos' or Mommsen's 'Roman History'" would have been "laughable" at that point, but he importantly added that simply "the time had not yet come" ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 2).⁶⁶ At the outset, Kostomarov regarded books for elementary education as considerably more important: "along with primers, a brief sacred and church history, a catechism, fragments from the teachings of the Holy Church Fathers and the people's favourite saints' lives, as well as an explanation of the liturgy" ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 2-3).⁶⁷ Also, books on "arithmetic, cosmography, geography, etc.," were to be prepared, so that the people would familiarize themselves "with the most important aspects of science" ("*s vazhneishimi storonami estestvoznaniia voobshche*") (Kostomarov, "Mysli iuzhnorussa," 3). Finally, Kostomarov pleaded for the publication of a "grammar of the native language," which would help the people "get acquainted with the construction of the human word,"⁶⁸ and of a "small book designed to convey to the people the major foundations of their situation in the state and their legal rights"⁶⁹ ("Mysli iuzhnorussa," 3).⁷⁰

⁶⁵ "Народъ долженъ учиться, народъ хочетъ учиться; если мы не дадимъ ему средствъ и способовъ учиться на своемъ языкѣ—онъ станетъ учиться на чужомъ—и наша народность погибнетъ съ образованіемъ народа."

⁶⁶ "Смѣшно было бы, еслибъ кто-нибудь перевелъ на южнорусскій языкъ "Космосъ" Гумбольта, или Римскую исторію, Момзена: для такого рода сочиненій еще не пришло время."

⁶⁷ "кромѣ букварей, въ настоящее время необходимы для народа: краткая священная и церковная исторія, катихизисъ, отрывки изъ поученій святыхъ отцевъ церкви, изъ житій любимыхъ народомъ святыхъ, и объясненіе богослуженія". Kostomarov underscored that despite the different preferences among "fashionable progressives" ("модные прогрессисты"), it would have been a mistake to impose any "materialism" on the people, who were only ready to accept education "in the Orthodox Christian spirit" ("въ православно-христіанскомъ духѣ").

⁶⁸ "надобно составить грамматику роднаго языка, по которой бы народъ ознакомился съ построеніемъ чловѣческаго слова."

⁶⁹ "книжечку, въ которой сообщить народу главныя основанія его положенія въ государствѣ и его юридическхъ правъ."

⁷⁰ Interestingly, Kostomarov did not call for historical works (including his own) because, in his view, history was too complicated for elementary education: "As opposed to others, we do not contend that history should be introduced into this

The Ukrainian intellectual leaders were perfectly aware that corpus and acquisition planning of languages depended on pragmatic and sociopolitical factors. So too was Kostomarov, who called upon “prosperous people living in Little Russia” (“*liudi sostoiatel'nye, zhivushchie v Malorossii*”) to practically “demonstrate their love for the people” (“*pust' pokazhut svoiu liubov' k narodu na dele*”), and provide funds for the publication of the above-mentioned books as well as for the establishment of schools with “the native language” as the language of instruction (“*Mysli iuzhnorussa*,” 3; see also Kostomarov, “*O prepodavanii*,” which cited many similar arguments).

In conclusion, Kostomarov replied to those “defenders of state unity who believe that for the tranquility of the state one has to forcibly bring down to a single common denominator all popular customs and ways of life” (“*Mysli iuzhnorussa*,” 4). He, too, stated clearly that “the state and the people are not identical” and correctly argued that due to such a misunderstanding, a state often tended to preferably treat only one of its peoples. Precisely because the state and its peoples cannot be identified, Kostomarov labelled as unjustified any accusations of Ukrainian separatism. As he put it, no people would want to separate from a state that satisfies their needs. Even more so, “the South Russian and the Great Russian nationalities” were not only “united” due to political necessity; they were also “connected by their related faith and origin” (Kostomarov, “*Mysli iuzhnorussa*,” 4).

In the August 1862 issue, the *Osnova* editors reported on the rise of literacy societies in Odesa, Kharkiv, Poltava, and Kyiv (which were banned in the long run), complained about the lack of funds for village libraries, and argued that Ukrainian-language books should not be translations from other languages, particularly Russian, but should be written originally for the Ukrainian people by authors who not only knew the language well, but who were also well acquainted with their subject⁷¹ (“*Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'*,” 8: 23). While summing up the achievements in the sphere of corpus planning, the editors reported on seven primers which included fragments from sacred history, arithmetic, etc., a textbook on

plan of elementary education. History is a kind of science that requires a great deal of previous knowledge and a significant stage of development: without that it is useless.” (“*Исторіи, вопреки нѣкоторымъ, мы не считаемъ нужнымъ вводить въ этотъ планъ первоначальнаго воспитанія. Исторія есть такая наука, которая требуетъ уже большого запаса предварительныхъ свѣдѣній и значительной степени развитія: безъ того—она бесполезна*”) (“*Mysli iuzhnorussa*,” 3).

⁷¹ “кто не только хорошо знаетъ языкъ, но и тотъ предметъ, который изложенъ въ книгѣ.”

arithmetic that had been reviewed in *Osnova*, and several manuscripts, particularly a sacred history and a catechism as well as Morachevs'kyi's translation of the Gospels, which was at that time being reviewed by the Holy Synod (the editors did not mention Morachevs'kyi's name) ("Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'," 8: 23). Finally, the editors announced that they had learned from a letter received from Kyiv (in fact, the Kyiv *hromada*) that a geography of Ukraine and a general geography, a brief study of natural history, a comparative overview of Ukrainian agriculture and village handicraft, a collection of parables from the Gospels, a leaflet with selected fables, a reader about meteorological and biological phenomena, a volume with stories about other countries, and a Russian-Ukrainian dictionary had been prepared ("Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'," 8: 23-24). The authors emphasized the need for a Russian-Ukrainian dictionary, "because we do understand the Ukrainian speech, but for our current endeavour—the composition of books—where we have to think for a long time about each word, such a dictionary will be of great help" ("Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'," 8: 24).⁷² The authors of the letter described the methods of their work on the dictionary as follows:

We distributed among ourselves all that has been written in Ukrainian up to now; some picked literary works, others old legal documents, chronicles, etc.; everyone among us was to extract all those words which occurred in the individually selected book; subsequently, all contributors will unite and edit the extracted words. We have found good people who financially support our endeavour, so that we have sufficient funds for the publication of the dictionary May our brethren not despair even if confronted with scarce material opportunities; funds can be found, as we can assure them. ("Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'," 8: 24)⁷³

The *Osnova* editors added that another Russian-Ukrainian dictionary was being prepared in St. Petersburg and indicated that all this happened despite the fact that the Slavophile Mikhail Katkov argued that the

⁷² "ибо украинскую рѣчь мы понимаемъ, а въ теперешнемъ нашемъ дѣлѣ, въ составленіи книжекъ, гдѣ приходится надъ каждымъ словомъ долго думать, такой словарь доставитъ великую помощь."

⁷³ "мы подѣлили между собою все что было написано до сего времени по-украински; одни взяли литературныя произведенія, другіе старинныя акты, лѣтописи и прочее; каждый изъ насъ долженъ выбрать всѣ слова, встрѣчающіяся въ избранной имъ книжкѣ; затѣмъ выбранныя слова будутъ соединены въ-одно подъ общею редакцію. Нашлись добрые люди, которые помогаютъ намъ въ этомъ дѣлѣ деньгами, такъ-что на изданіе словаря у насъ средствъ достанетъ пусть наши братья не падаютъ духомъ при видѣ скудныхъ матеріальныхъ средствъ: средства найдутся, въ этомъ мы можемъ увѣрить ихъ."

Ukrainian language was unnecessary simply because the Russian language had allegedly been created for Great Russians and Little Russians ("Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'," 8: 24-25). Furthermore, they argued that similar attacks should serve as a motivation for even more energetic work.

The Ukrainian activists were not naïve; they generally recognized the significance of the financial aspects of their movement. In August 1862, Zosym Nedoborov's'kyi published a Ukrainian-language article in which he called upon "everyone—the rich and the poor one—whoever loves his Country [sic, capitalized] and his people"⁷⁴ for support, and added Kostomarov's address, where donations should be sent. Nedoborov's'kyi declared that although a translation of the Gospels, a sacred and church history, a geometry, and a cosmography were being prepared at that time, funds could also be provided for other works (13-14).

Konys'kyi deplored in his Ukrainian-language "news" from the Poltava region that the editions of Shevchenko's *Kobzar* (*The Bard*) as well as Kulish's literary almanac *Khata* (*Home*) were too expensive for Ukrainian peasants (who, as he emphasized, would have been willing to purchase them). Consequently, Konys'kyi called for more inexpensive Ukrainian-language editions ("Z Poltavu," 71-72) and added that particularly "an inexpensive herald in the Ukrainian language" ("*deshevyi vistnyk na ukrainskii* [sic] *movi*") would, in the long run, contribute considerably to the establishment of a "pure literary and at the same time popular Ukrainian language" ("*chysta literaturnia y, razom, narodnia ukrains'ka mova*") ("Z Poltavu," 72).

Arkadii Ionin stated outright in another article from 1862 that there would be Ukrainian-language textbooks as soon as the appropriate funds were provided, and Kostomarov added information about concrete funds and donors, while the editors added the names of even more donors.⁷⁵

In the final *Osnova* issue (April 1862), the landowner Dmytro Zapara once again emphasized the utmost significance of funds for Ukrainian-language schools, where, as he argued, instruction had to be provided according to the best methods and based on the best textbooks written by the best authors (such as Kostomarov and Kulish) (1-5). Zapara called upon

⁷⁴ "Зазиваємо на трудъ и на помічь усякого—и багатого и вбогого—хто тільки любить свою Країну, свій народъ."

⁷⁵ In the early 1860s, Kostomarov organized fundraising events in St. Petersburg. On 6 April 1863, i.e., when *Osnova* had already ceased to exist, the program of one such evening included Ukrainian music and literature as well as the reading of historical and programmatic works. In particular, Kostomarov read "about instruction in the local language in Southern Rus'," because funds were specifically raised for the publication of Ukrainian-language textbooks (Bukhbinder).

the editors of *Osnova* to more actively contribute to the fundraising process and to publish the donors' names. Those merchants, according to Zapara, who dressed in "semi-national clothes" ("v polunatsional'nyi kostium") realized all too well that the Ukrainian national movement was after all useful for themselves because they needed the Ukrainian market (5).

The *Osnova* editors clearly conducted their own "language policy," too. Beginning with the first issue, the journal included lists of "words difficult to understand," i.e., fragments of Ukrainian-Russian differential dictionaries. The second issue featured Kulish's letter to the editor with a critical review of the first list, while "the editors" (i.e., Vasyli' Bilozers'kyi) reported that they had developed the idea to add these word lists only during the publication process and that they primarily based the list on the authors' usage (Kulish, "Pis'mo k redaktoru").

In the April 1861 issue, the editors explained their "language policy" more explicitly in a note to their readers. They declared that no nation has "a more precious treasure than its native word," and while "not long ago, it seemed that our Ukrainian word will either completely perish or transform into another language and appear in alien clothes—because literate people had already forgotten their native language" ("Od redaktsii," 30)⁷⁶—many Ukrainians from the Little Russian gubernias and other regions "from all ends of Ukraine, from the Dnister and Danube region, from Odesa, the Crimea, the Black Sea region and the Caucasus, from Moscow, Kazan, Astrakhan and all regions"⁷⁷ had sent their contributions to *Osnova* and thereby demonstrated that this treasure had not yet been lost ("Od redaktsii," 31). The editors confirmed that they were willing to leave the contributors' language unedited, only if this language was in accordance with the vernacular:

Our Ukrainian language, as you yourselves know, has in itself great weight and power; all that has gone through the hearts and minds of an uncounted family that has for ages lived and still lives in our wide Ukraine,—all is reflected in our native language We, God forbid, are not planning to lead our guest through narrow doors, as we from *Osnova* have said from the beginning: may every good man write as he pleases and in the way that he is used to from childhood; however, we have to

⁷⁶ "нема скарбу дорогшого надъ ёго рідне слово . . . ще недавно здавалося, що наше Українське слово або зовсімъ зникне, або переробитця у иншу річъ, виступить у чужій одежі,—бо вже забували рідню мову люде письменні"

⁷⁷ "зъ усіхъ кінцівъ України, зъ надъ Дністра и Дунаю, зъ Одеса [sic], Криму, Чорноморіи и Кавказу, изъ Москви, Казані, Астрахані и зъ иншихъ сторінъ"

consider whether the people genuinely speak the same as we do when we want to express something in a particular case. (“Od redaktsii” 31)⁷⁸

Finally, *Osnova* served as a platform for discussions of concrete measures of standardization. Mykola Hatstsuk published a comprehensive review of various Ukrainian orthographies in the July 1862 issue of *Osnova*. Curiously, Hatstsuk was not in favour of *Grazhdanka*-based orthographies⁷⁹; he even practically employed the traditional Cyrillic script (elsewhere, not in *Osnova*) and underscored it, as did most Galicians, whom Hattasuk expressly labelled as “completely identical with the Little Russians of the Russian Empire in terms of language and popular customs”⁸⁰ (“O pravopisaniiah,” 9).

In another review article published in May 1862, Aleksei Hattasuk offered an interesting general assessment of the level of Ukrainian language standardization (“Bibliografiia”). Hattasuk agreed with many of his contemporaries that the further development of the Ukrainian language was necessary inasmuch as the Russian language was not comprehensible to Ukrainians (“Bibliografiia,” 54), and inasmuch as Miklosich had proven that the Ukrainian language was a distinct language (Hattasuk, “Bibliografiia,” 55). Hattasuk briefly overviewed the history of Ukrainian language development beginning from Kotliarevs'kyi's *Aeneid* and emphasized the great significance of the most recent revival of the Ukrainian language, which, as he argued, had set in in 1855, “after six years of involuntary silence” (“*posle 6-letniago nevol'nago molchaniia*”) (“Bibliografiia,” 54). Hattasuk was, however, highly critical of the achievements in the sphere of standardization:

There has been much talk since then (since the appearance of Kotliarevs'kyi's *Aeneid*) about the nation, its language and literature (“*o narode, o ego iazyke i literature*”), but to date not one single grammar, not

⁷⁸ “Наша Українська мова, якъ и самі, здорові, знаєте, має въ собі велику вагу и силу; все, що перейшло черезъ серце и розумъ незлічимої семі, котра зъ давніхъ-давенъ жила и живе на нашій Україні широкой,—все одзначалось въ нашій рідній мові . . . Ми, боронь Боже, не думаемо проводить дорогу гостю тісними дверима, якъ и зпершу въ ‘Оснoві’ сказано; нехай коженъ добрий чоловікъ пише якъ уподобавъ и змалку наслухався; тільки треба пильної уваги—чи такъ же якъ-разъ веде народъ річъ въ тімъ случаі, який хочемо повідати.”

⁷⁹ The *grazhdanka* was introduced by Peter I in 1708 instead of the traditional Cyrillic script that had a different shape and used several letters that were abolished in the *grazhdanka*.

⁸⁰ “съ совершенно намъ тождественными по языку и быту народному—Галичанами.”

one single somehow comprehensive and useful dictionary has appeared, which would familiarize the learned world and enlightened society with the wealth of material of that huge branch of the Slavic languages,⁸¹ whereas the Slavic West has edited both a grammar and a dictionary almost for every dialect, even if it is only of secondary importance. Thanks to the closeness of our Red Russian dialect (“*nashego chervonorusskago narechiia*”) [i.e., the “Galician dialect,” M.M.], only this dialect has, for a long time, had two grammars, although they are not completely satisfactory; however, no dictionary of that dialect exists either. (“*Bibliografiia*,” 52)

Hattsuk correctly stated that Oleksei Pavlovs'kyi's grammar “cannot truly be regarded a grammar of the Little Russian language, even if it has this title” (“*Bibliografiia*,” 52; [the grammar was in fact titled “Grammar of the Little Russian *Dialect*,” emphasis added, M.M.]). In reference to the language used by Kulish and the language of *Osnova* (“if one can use this label regarding the language of various contributors to this journal”), Hattsuk positively assessed their “solid tone” and urged his readers to orient themselves toward those intellectualized variants of Ukrainian. In conclusion, he contended that despite all of the accomplishments, no standard language existed yet, and too few materials had been collected to create a suitable dictionary of Ukrainian, be it a dictionary of the language of his period or a historical dictionary (Hattsuk, “*Bibliografiia*,” 60-61). In that situation, as Hattsuk wisely argued, any new work on Ukrainian affairs was to be wholeheartedly welcomed (“*Bibliografiia*,” 60-61).⁸²

As mentioned above, Kulish announced in the first issue of *Osnova* that he was compiling a Ukrainian dictionary due to his “desire to help elucidate the Ukrainian nationality”⁸³ (“*Ob izdani*”). In the second issue, Kulish explained that he had learned that Sheikovs'kyi was working on another dictionary and declared that he would therefore wait with his own version (“*Literaturnyia izvestiia*”). Several months later, *Osnova* published a review of Sheikovs'kyi's dictionary by B. Lazarevs'kyi, which severely but convincingly criticized Sheikovs'kyi's work, not only for its incorrect explanations of words, its incompleteness, and its unjustified polemics with such contemporaries as Kulish, but also for its “artificial” orthography. Most importantly, the reviewer remarked that “the time has come for us to agree on one [standard]” (Lazarevs'kyi 61).

⁸¹ “съ богатствомъ матерьяла этой огромной вѣтви славянскихъ языковъ.”

⁸² Interestingly, Hattsuk argued that Ukrainian was, in general, closer to Slovak and Czech than to Polish, especially regarding syntax and phonetics. In his view, Ukrainian was close to Polish only in the sphere of vocabulary (Hattsuk, “*Bibliografiia*,” 64).

⁸³ “желание содѣйствовать уясненію украинской народности.”

Sheikovs'kyi did have the opportunity to defend himself in another contribution (Sheikovs'kyi), but the last *Osnova* text on his dictionary was another very critical review written by Hattsuk (“Опыт”).

Interestingly, *Osnova* was apparently the organ that featured the first two brief studies on Ukrainian child language. In the September 1862 issue, Ivan Novyts'kyi supplemented a list of 45 words which a certain L. Hashchenko had published thirteen months earlier (Novyts'kyi, “Eshche o detskikh slovakh”).

Konys'kyi contributed his anonymous Ukrainian-language discussion of recently published primers and methods of native language instruction titled “Our Grammars” in January 1862 (“Nas'ki hramatky”). Konys'kyi insisted that everything in the primers had to be written “in our language” (“*ponashomu*” [sic]), and contended that the primers should include as many folkloristic materials as possible⁸⁴ (“Nas'ki hramatky,” 77).⁸⁵ He, too, maintained that the time for the unification of a distinct Ukrainian alphabet and orthography had come (Konys'kyi, “Nas'ki hramatky,” 78).⁸⁶ Most importantly, Konys'kyi offered the following advice regarding the treatment of various Ukrainian dialects:

One shall select the best variants or versions of the songs, etc., regardless if they are, so to speak, not mine, not Podolian or, not from the Desna region. And as the Poltava-Chyhyryn language is most widely regarded as the best language, one shall select the latter for other works, in order to create a common Ukrainian language. (“Nas'ki hramatky” 78)⁸⁷

Kulich addressed the question of the dissemination of Ukrainian-language literature in the same January 1862 issue in his Ukrainian-

⁸⁴ “Братъ въ граматки коли не все, то яко мога більше, що зложено самимъ народомъ.”

⁸⁵ Also, Konys'kyi maintained that textbooks had to meet the most severe standards, because “a textbook has to be a sacred thing for the child, like the father, like the mother, like everything holy” (“Книжка зъ наукою повинна бути для дитини святощо, якъ батько, якъ мати, як усе святе; Konys'kyi, “Nas'ki Hramatky” 82).

⁸⁶ “We believe, and Mr. Kulish will certainly agree, that since we have our own language we should also have our own orthography—it makes no sense to follow the example of others!” (“Ми думаємо, и певно шановний д. Кулішъ на те згодитця, що коли у насъ своя мова, то повинна бути и своя азбука – нічого за чужимъ приводомъ ходити!”)

⁸⁷ “Братъ пісні и д. луччого складу, чи то редакції, и луччої мови, не вважаючи, що се, мовъ, не мое, не По-дольське тамъ, чи за-Десенське; а якъ за луччу мову найбільшъ вважається Полтавсько-Чигиринська то братъ сю остатню, зоставляючи свою мову для другого діла – для спорудження української огульної мови.”

language “Review of Ukrainian books” (“Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok”). He came to the conclusion that in the bookshops of Kyiv, no books published in Ukraine were available: “There is nothing!” (“*Nichoho nema!*”) (Kulish, “Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok,” 1: 59). Since he regarded literature as “part of the common civic cause,”⁸⁸ Kulish called for further work, so that those writers of the Moscow newspaper *The Day* who regarded the Ukrainian movement as nonsense (“*durnytsia*”) would not ultimately be proven right. Kulish encouraged Ukrainian writers to orient themselves toward those writers who had “built” other literatures, such as Dante, Petrarch, Goethe, Schiller, and also Pushkin and Mickiewicz, whose “speech” had been, as Kulish put it, “most widely heard in the whole country even if you had taken the pen away from their hands”⁸⁹ (Kulish, “Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok,” 1: 60). Again, what Kulish had in mind was not only literary content, but also language. He pointed to Shevchenko as the example who had succeeded in being listened to because he had benefitted from his numerous travels across Ukraine, where he consistently listened to wise and eloquent people (Kulish, “Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok,” 1: 60-62). In his criticism of two recent publications, Kulish praised one of the authors for “writing well in our language” (“*pyshe po-nashomu harazd*”), but blamed him for certain remnants of what he labelled as “the old literary fashion” (“*staroi mody slovesnoi*”) and described as a tendency toward exaggerated self-irony (“*liubymo z sebe troshky pokepkuvaty*”) (“Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok,” 1: 63). With regard to the second author, Kulish strongly encouraged him to “purify” (“*obchyshchav*”) his language of foreign elements (“Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok,” 1: 63).

The most important puristic contribution of *Osnova* and, in fact, the most important Ukrainian puristic contribution of the time, had little to do with stereotypical fantasies of a “pure nation” with a “pure language.” Levchenko’s “Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii” (“Note on Ruthenian Terminology”) was a rather consistent part of a didactic program. In his introduction, Levchenko argued that after the peasant liberation, a new desire for education among both “Ruthenians” and Great Russians was only natural and that at that point, those who had enjoyed the privilege of receiving education were now obliged to pass on their knowledge. Also, it was their duty to see to the creation of scholarly terminologies (Levchenko, “Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii,” 183). The Russian scholarly terminologies applied in the textbooks of the Russian Empire were primarily of Western European origin and often stemmed from the Middle

⁸⁸ “словесность частин[а] спільного діла громадського.”

⁸⁹ “Се такі були люде, що візьми вь ёго зь рукъ піро та поставь ёго середь народнєй ради, то ёго мова найчутнійша буде по всьму краю.”

Ages, when scholarship had still been a matter of closed elitist circles (Levchenko, "Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii," 183). But now education was turning into a common good, so much so that new, generally understandable ("obshcheponiatny") scholarly terms had to be created (Levchenko, "Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii," 183). Levchenko contended that such terms were to be in compliance with "the spirit of the popular language," so that the nation ("narod") could easily adopt them in the long run, and in the best case, children would understand them without further explanation ("Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii," 184). Levchenko added that this was even more important in a situation that strongly suffered from a lack of teachers, like that in Ukraine ("Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii," 184). Levchenko's general argument was quite convincing, even if not all of his terms were adopted into modern Ukrainian: was it really necessary to use the word "ekliptika" ("the eclipse") in the Ukrainian or Russian context if Polish children easily understood the expression *droga ziemi* (the way of the Earth) ("Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii," 184-85)? Levchenko's list of suggested terms was later supplemented by Petro Iefymenko, again on the pages of *Osnova* (Iefymenko).

The fact that *Osnova* editors were fully aware of the journal's mission as a platform for the broadening of the functions of the Ukrainian language is evidenced by the fact that they not only publicized Kulish's "History of Ukraine from the Oldest Times" as "a generally accessible history of Ukraine in the Ukrainian language" ("obshchedostupnaia istoriia Ukrainy na ukrainskom iazyke") but also published, as mentioned above, Kulish's Ukrainian-language historical works on the Khmel'nyts'kyi and Vyhovs'kyi periods, as well as the first chapter of his "History of Ukraine from the Oldest Times." Moreover, they introduced the latter text with the following Russian-language note:

The author submitted the present first chapter of a history of Ukraine at our strong request. We would like to demonstrate with the introduction to this voluminous work of our valued collaborator the degree to which the Ukrainian language can be used for a rigorous scholarly outline of such an important subject as history . . . (Introductory Note to Kulish, "Ystoriia Ukrainy")⁹⁰

Similarly, the editors, in an introduction to Nechua's Ukrainian-language text "About Rain," announced further publications of that kind,

⁹⁰ "Предлагаемая первая глава истории Украины сообщена намъ авторомъ по нашей неотступной просьбѣ. Намъ хотѣлось показать началомъ этого обширнаго труда почтеннаго нашего сотрудника, въ какой степени языкъ украинскій способенъ къ строгому научному изложенію столь важнаго предмета, какъ исторія."

particularly a study by Stepan Nis, who “had already for a long time applied his command of the folk language to scholarly subjects”⁹¹ (Introductory Note to Nechuia and Kulish). The editors concluded their introduction with the call: “Lord, let us witness as soon as possible the time when one will be able to express in our native Ukrainian language everything felt and understood by the Ukrainian soul” (Introductory Note to Nechuia and Kulish).⁹²

Kulish added yet another introduction to Nechuia’s text. In his “Ustnia mova z nauky” (“Oral Speech on Scholarship”), he elucidated the intriguing background of this study, which was in fact a result of contemporary discussions in the *Hromadas*:

In between our other conversations, I raised the topic that we do not have any scholarship in our native language. I said, “It is not good, dear *Hromada* members, that we love our native word, but do not hear from anywhere that our children are taught in our language! . . . If there existed such a school in our times in which you could speak in your native language about everything you want, we would still not find many teachers who would be able to speak in their own language about every scholarly matter We need to get prepared at least a little bit in advance. May one person study one discipline and the other another one. May he decide for himself how to deal with that discipline in the native language and then present to the community part of it as if the community were his pupils and he were their teacher. While listening, we will take notes about what can be criticized if he expressed something in the wrong way or made mistakes regarding the content. This will teach and train the other community members as well.” . . .

There were some people who listened to me. They discussed who could hold speeches on which scholarly issues, and so the honourable Volod’ko Nechuia made his attempt—he told us “about rain” as if we were uneducated peasants. We listened to him with pleasure and asked him to put his speech on paper, and we submitted it for publication to *Osnova*. May this speech serve as an example for good people how the great issue of native education has to be initiated . . . (29-30)⁹³

⁹¹ “котрий давно вже приложивъ свое знатте надорнѣи мови до научнихъ предметивъ.”

⁹² “Дай намъ Боже швидче того часу дїждати, коли можна буде нашою рідною мовою ясно виявити усе, що чує и розуміє душа Українця.”

⁹³ “Поміжъ иншими беседами нашими, знявъ я слово про те, що нема въ насъ жадної науки, рідною мовою зложеної. ‘Не гарне діло, панове громадо,’ мовлявъ я, ‘що ми свое рідне слово любимо, а ніде не прочуємъ, щобъ учено дітей по-нашому! . . . Коли бъ оце заразъ передъ нами була така школа, въ котрій про що хочъ говори ріднимъ словомъ, то не багато зъ насъ обібралось би такихъ учителівъ, що змогли бъ висловитись по-своєму про всяку річъ

Of course, not only scholarship was important for the dissemination of the Ukrainian language in the public sphere. In June 1861, *Osnova* featured an anonymous Ukrainian-language sermon (see “Ob iarmarkakh [do sil'skikh (sic) parafiiian]” [“On Fairs (to the Village Parishioners)”]). The editors introduced it by indicating that none other than Shevchenko had brought it from the Kyiv area and praised it as an example of how priests should talk to their parishioners’ “poetic and sentimental hearts” (“*do ego poetichnego, chulogo sertsia*”) “in our language” (“*po-nashomu*”) (Introductory note to “Ob iarmarkakh”). The editors did not mention the fact that the Podolian priest Vasyl' Hrechulevych had published Ukrainian-language sermons and catechetical works in the Russian Empire not only in 1849 and 1852, but also as recently as 1856 and 1859 (Nakhlik 123-24; see also Moser, “Clerics and Laymen”).

Osnova actively publicized the view that the Ukrainian language was to become a broadly used language in its own right. Even regarding the matter of language alone, adherents of the Ukrainian movement had every reason to regard *Osnova*, as Zhytets'kyi put it, “not only as a scholarly-literary, but also as a national-political organ”⁹⁴ (“Z istorii kyivs'koi ukrains'koi hromady,” 181).

In conclusion, it should be added that even without a valid codification, the Ukrainian language of *Osnova*—or even more than that, the language of Ukrainian-language printed texts in the Russian Empire, had reached a remarkably high level of homogeneity (this does not mean, of course, that no dialectal or other variations occurred) (see also Zhovtobriukh 257). On the eve of the Valuev Directive, Ukrainian was clearly on the verge of becoming a full-fledged Slavic standard language in the Russian Empire.

научню Треба намъ заздальгидь хочъ помалу готовитись. Нехай одинъ візьметця за одну науку, а другий за другу, та й помізкує самъ собі, якъ би її рідною мовою зложити, та, прийшовши въ громаду, и проговорить частину яку, такъ, ніби громада—єго учні, а вінъ учитель. Ми жъ, слухаючи, будемо записувати, противъ чого можна змагатись, коли не такъ висловився, або не туди розумомъ кинувъ. Отъ и иншимъ громадянамъ буде наука и сама практика. . . . Спасибі імъ, знайшлись такі люде, що мене послушали: змовились, кому про які речі научні мову въ громаді мати, и оце високоповажний Володько Нечуя спробовавъ свого слова—росказавъ намъ ‘про дощъ’ такимъ складомъ, якъ ніби ми були невчені селяне. Залюбки ми єго слухали и просили, щобъ вінъ положивъ свою мову на паперъ, та й подали до друку у Основу. Нехай ся мова иде по добрихъ людяхъ на взіръ, як треба велике діло рідної освіти розпочинати.”

⁹⁴ “органом не тільки науково-літературним, але і національно-політичним.”

4. THE BEGINNING OF THE END

Security agencies had never ceased to keep an eye on the Ukrainian movement. In late January 1860, “the secret police raided the home of one Petro Zavads'kyi” in Kharkiv (Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 41). As early as May 1861, the imperial administration had received the first anonymous denunciations claiming that in Russia, “a separate society of Little Russians nurtured by the spirit of a certain patriotism”⁹⁵—with most of them linked to Kyiv or Kharkiv universities—were dreaming of “Little Russia’s liberty” and “the restoration of Little Russia” (Miiakovskii 135). One informant described the movement, particularly in the sphere of the Kyiv *Hromada*, as follows:

These are young and ardent free thinkers who try everything to realize their idea of the liberty of Little Russia and strive to approach the simple folk, teach it literacy and instill in them the ideas of the past glory of Little Russia and the beauties of liberty so that in the long run they will act to the detriment of the monarchy, as soon as the simple folk’s minds fall under their impact. With that intention, as far as we know, the Little Russian journal *Osnova* is being edited, propaganda materials in the Little Russian language are being distributed, a history of Ukraine is being written, and an everyday people’s school is being administered by Kyiv University. With that intention, finally, young people go to various places in Little Russia and Ukraine [!]. (Miiakovskii 135-36)⁹⁶

Influential sections of the Russian imperial administration felt alarmed too. In July 1861, when the empire’s Main Censorship Administration was asked what the Metropolitan of Kyiv was expected to do with the six thousand copies of Shevchenko’s primer which he had received, the censors “condemned out of hand the idea that they might be distributed

⁹⁵ “особое общество малороссов, пропитанных духом какого-то патриотизма, общество.”

⁹⁶ “Это молодые и пылкие вольнодумцы, употребляющие все усилия к осуществлению лелеемой ими мысли о свободе Малороссии и старающиеся сблизаться с простым народом, научать его грамоте и постепенно внушать ему мысли о бывшей славе Малороссии и о прелестях свободы, с той именно целью, дабы впоследствии, когда умы простого народа покорятся их влиянию, действовать во вред монархии. С этою-то целью, сколько известно, издается малороссийский журнал „Основа“, рассылаются пропаганды (! [this is Miiakovs'kyj’s exclamation mark, M.M.] на малороссийском языке, пишется история Украины, и существует в Киевском Университете ежедневная народная школа, и с этою же целью выезжают молодые люди в разные местности Малороссии и Украины.”

among the ecclesiastical schools of Ukraine” (Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 40), arguing that the primer’s intention was

to call back to life the Little Russian nationality, the gradual and durable fusion of which with the Great Russian nationality into a single indissoluble whole ought to be the subject of pacific but nevertheless constant endeavours on the part of the government. (F. A. Iastrebov qtd. in Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 41)

Throughout the year 1861, then, various Russian journals and newspapers published several critical articles attacking the Ukrainian movement—in fact, some of the best articles of *Osnova* were responses to these attacks. The Russian government also “temporarily” closed down all Sunday schools in the Russian Empire on 12 June 1862, which particularly affected the Ukrainian movement, as it basically relied on Sunday schools only (Zhytets'kyi, “Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv,” 93).

In September 1862, none other than Petr Valuev wrote that a Kharkiv-Kyiv secret society whose leaders had been found guilty of criminal activity in May 1860 had obviously been trying, “under the pretense of disseminating literacy to prepare the common people for participation in the fulfillment of [their] secret goals” (qtd. in Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 41-42).

Shortly afterward, in November 1862, a governmental commission investigated the case of another small group of people headed by Aleksandr Stronin, a teacher of the gymnasium in Poltava, and Vasyl' Shevych, the director of a Sunday school in Lubny in the Poltava region. According to the commission’s findings, this group of people had “contributed to the formation of circles inciting, under the disguise of an education society, the people’s dissatisfaction with the government and strived towards the separation of Little Russia” (Gurevich 169; see also Saunders, “Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II,” 40-41; and Shandra’s study in this volume).

In this atmosphere of growing paranoia, prospects for the Ukrainian movement appeared increasingly disastrous. All of a sudden, every major initiative in the sphere of language development was apparently doomed to fail. *Osnova* had been in deep trouble for a long time, largely due to notorious mismanagement and a lack of subscribers and funds (Bernshtein 198-208). As late as February-March 1863, the editors received permission from the censorship committee to publish the final (September 1862) issue of the journal (Kotenko 43). However, the journal soon collapsed and any attempts to establish a new one remained unsuccessful. On 28 February 1863, Kulish interestingly wrote in a letter to Oleksii Alchevs'kyi in Kharkiv: “The fall of *Osnova* has put us, Ukrainians, in a complicated and uneasy situation. Now we have to remain silent regarding anything the

Great Russians are voicing about us” (Zhytets'kyi, “Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv,” 7).⁹⁷

On another front, Morachevs'kyi's full translation of the Gospels had initially been positively reviewed in the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences. The leading Russian scholars Aleksandr Vostokov and Izmail Sreznevskii had literally called the text “wonderful.”⁹⁸ They had maintained that thanks to Morachevs'kyi's translation, “the Little Russian dialect superbly passes the exam and annihilates any doubt regarding the possibility to express [in it] the high ideas of mind and elevated emotions of the heart,” so much so that “beyond doubt,” Morachevs'kyi's translation would “perfect the literary formation of the Little Russian dialect” (Nimchuk, “Ukrains'ki perekłady sviatoho pys'ma,” 27). In April 1862, however, the president of the Russian Academy of Sciences forwarded the manuscript to the Holy Synod, which reviewed it for more than a year. While the year 1863 still witnessed the publication of Stepan Opatovych's popular “Opovidannia z Sviatoho Pysanyia” (“Histories from the Holy Writ”) in St. Petersburg as well as Ivan Babchenko's Ukrainian-language sermons (“Poucheniia na malorossiiskom iazyke, Sviashchennika Ioanna Babchenka”) in Kharkiv (see also Moser, “Clerics and Laymen”), the Holy Synod's negative decision was ultimately anticipated by the secular Valuev Directive (Vulpius 134, 301; 131-33).

⁹⁷ “Основа своимъ падениемъ поставила насъ Украинцевъ, въ затруднительное и неловкое положеніе. На все, что скажутъ о насъ Великороссіяне, намъ поневолю придется молчать.”

⁹⁸ Andrii Danylenko offers quite a negative assessment of Morachevs'kyi's translation. His criticism, however, pays almost no attention to the translation itself, but draws from Morachevs'kyi's apparently limited talent as a poet and, in a very awkward manner, dismisses Morachevs'kyi's translation as a text that “remained within the literary semantics of the vernacular paradigm (*kotliarevshchyna*) set up by Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi” (Danylenko 16). The translation of the Bible was in fact incompatible with Kotliarevs'kyi's “vernacular paradigm.” Danylenko's view of the Kulish translation is no less astonishing: Miklosich, who had been commissioned to assess Kulish's text, cannot be reproached for the fact that he only knew something that Danylenko labels as “the first draft of the translation” (18). After all, it was Miklosich's task to assess precisely the draft! Only following Miklosich's critique did Kulish begin collaborating with the Galician Ivan Puliui and leaning toward the rules of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Danylenko's argument that Morachevs'kyi's translation played almost no role regarding the Valuev Decree and that it was virtually not “dangerous and harmful to the all-Russian project”—because, unlike Kulish's translation, it was not “the first successful experience in harmonizing different variants of literary Ukrainian as used in the two parts of Ukraine” (19)—is disproven by almost every document concerning the decree.

Beginning in January 1863, when the Polish insurrection shook the Russian Empire, the imperial secret police commissioned Nikolai Annenkov—the newly-established Kyiv Governor General—to stop the activities of the Kyiv *Hromada*, because it allegedly had intense contacts with Polish organizations, “disseminated among the people liberal ideas and for that end published popular Little Russian books” (Miller 98; on the course of events, see also Tairova-Iakovleva). As the *Hromada* was not an official institution, it could not, however, simply be shut down. Other measures were to be taken.

In early March 1863, Vasili Dolgorukov, the chief of the gendarmerie, received a denunciatory letter (dated February 1863) that was apparently written by an Orthodox cleric or a group of clerics (Miller 99). The letter read as follows:

From Shevchenko’s dust a whole band of zealous separatists and haters of Russia has arisen. Now their major nest is in Kyiv, but some of them have formed a group around *Osnova*, in which almost every article smells like revolution and the separation of Little Russia. These people have attracted to their party in Kyiv and Petersburg some notable persons, who are blind to reality. The plotting of these revolutionaries may seem rather innocent for now, but it anticipates big results—beginning with the separation of the language, it strives towards the separation of Little from Great Russia and a federation with Poland; if Poles did not nurture hopes regarding these gentlemen they would not carry their current issue so far and do so in such a barbarian manner. While pursuing their goals, the *Khlopomans*⁹⁹-separatists did everything they could to get into their hands the education of the popular masses, to impose on the village schools their inflammatory primers and textbooks. As soon as they saw, however, that the Little Russian people and clergy rejected their unrequested favour with indignation they began acting from above and arrived at the following conclusion: “If we successfully fabricate a translation of the Holy Writ into the half-Polish dialect of the Little Russian (“*polupol’skoe narechie malorussov*”), our cause will be won; our intrigue looks innocent and even idle at first sight—perhaps we will fool them! Subsequently, it will not be difficult to add to this firm rock the separation of language, then life, and then nationality.”¹⁰⁰ (Miiakovskii 141)

In the course of the official correspondence, Annenkov wrote:

Having succeeded in the translation of the Holy Writ into the Little Russian dialect, the adherents of the Little Russian party will achieve, so to

⁹⁹ *Khlopoman*, “lover of the peasantry,” was one of the labels attached to the protagonists of the Ukrainian national movement (see Hillis).

¹⁰⁰ “обособление языка, потомъ жизни, потомъ національности.”

speak, the acknowledgment of the distinct Little Russian language. Subsequently, they will not stop at this point and [will] announce, based on the separate language (“*samostoiatel'nosti malorossiiskago iazyka*”), their aspirations for Little Russia’s autonomy. (Miller 100)

On 27 March, Dolgorukov forwarded Annenkov’s letter to the tsar, and the tsar commissioned the imperial institutions to take action against the publication of Morachevs'kyi’s Bible translation as well (Miller 101). Clearly, the Bible translation was, however, only part of the problem.

On 2 April 1863, Annenkov contacted Valuev, the Russian Minister of the Interior, and forwarded his own letter as well as the anonymous denunciatory letter of February 1863 to him, and on 17 June, Valuev wrote to Dolgorukov that he “fully shared” Annenkov’s views (Miller 102-03). In the meantime, Annenkov had revealed in his letter to the Russian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Gorchakov that he regarded it as his task to “ultimately consolidate in Western Russian life the complete identity of local societal principles with Eastern Russian life and, consequently, the totality of Russian national unity” (Miller 101).¹⁰¹

In May 1863, the Russian imperial institutions, in harmonious orchestration with the Slavophile press, initiated another particularly aggressive campaign against the Ukrainian movement. After an initial provocation that evoked no resonance, Katkov attacked Kostomarov’s concept of “two Russian nationalities” as “a scandalous and preposterous sophism” in an article for his *Moskovskie Vedomosti* (*Moscow News*) of 22 June (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 370-71).¹⁰² Moreover, Katkov harshly criticized Kostomarov’s fundraising campaign for the Ukrainian movement (which he himself had formerly supported) and depicted the Ukrainian movement as follows:

Enthusiastic propagators of Little Russian literacy in sheepskin hats began to appear in Ukrainian villages and to set up Little Russian schools, contrary to the efforts of the local priesthood, who along with the peasants did not know how to repel these uninvited enlighteners. Booklets began to appear in the newly invented Little Russian language. Then a professor with a literary reputation formally opened a nation-wide subscription-list to collect money for the publication of Little Russian books and booklets. (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 371-72)

¹⁰¹ “утвердить окончательно за жизнью всей Западной Руси совершенное тождество коренных общественных начал с жизнью Руси Восточной и, следовательно, полноту Русского народного единства.”

¹⁰² On Katkov’s close relations with Valuev and Russian imperial institutions, see Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov.”

Finally, Katkov, who must have known better, did not even refrain from claiming that the Ukrainian intellectuals were “in the hands of [Polish] intriguers” and that “we know that the most fanatical of the Polish agitators expect that their concerns will benefit, sooner or later, from Ukrainophilism” (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov” 372).¹⁰³

Kostomarov responded with two essays in *The Day* of 6 July 1863 (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 372-73)¹⁰⁴ and with a lengthy article for the Russian newspaper *Golos* (*The Voice*) titled “Pravy li nashi obviniteli?” (“Are Our Accusers Right?”). In this article, Kostomarov argued that if one were ready to accept the argument that only the best-elaborated languages should be employed as languages of instruction, then the language of instruction in the Russian Empire should be French. Moreover, Kostomarov assured his readers that the establishment of Ukrainian as the language of instruction in the schools of the Russian Empire did not entail that Ukrainians should not know Russian at all, but that the languages of education simply had to be as close to the folk languages as possible during a period when education was to encompass the popular masses.¹⁰⁵ Those, however, who thought that Ukrainian was a dialect not only overlooked that Ukrainian was remarkably homogenous on a vast territory, they also forgot a very simple truth: “You will not delineate the boundary between what shall be labelled as a dialect or a language, gentlemen; according to the same features, what is a dialect for you is a language for us” (Kostomarov, “Pravy li nashi obviniteli”).¹⁰⁶

As Kostomarov correctly underscored, the differences between Ukrainian and Russian could not simply be explained by Polish influence, but even if this were correct, another simple truth would have rendered it meaningless:

¹⁰³ Katkov, too, felt motivated to refer to the Ruthenians of Galicia and Transcarpathia. He, however, emphasized the alleged historical linguistic Russianness of those realms: “Even in distant Austrian-ruled Galicia the language of the Ukrainian natives had been close to Russian until recently. The language of the Hungarian part of Ukraine was almost wholly Russian” (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 372).

¹⁰⁴ The second article was in fact a reply to an editorial comment on the first article (Saunders, “Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov,” 373).

¹⁰⁵ Precisely for this reason, as Kostomarov argued, the Russian literary language itself was increasingly developing toward the Russian vernacular as well (Kostomarov, “Pravy li nashi obviniteli”).

¹⁰⁶ “грань между тѣмъ, что назвать нарѣчіемъ и что языкомъ, вы не проведете, господа; по однимъ и тѣмъ же признакамъ для васъ—нарѣчіе, для насъ—языкъ.”

Every Little Russian knows that it [the Ukrainian language] was the speech of his fathers, his grandfathers, and his forefathers, that he absorbed it with his mother's milk, that this is his holy legacy; and this is sufficient . . . [If t]he Little Russian dialect does not please you, then fine for you. We, however, like it. (Kostomarov, "Pravy li nashi obviniteli")¹⁰⁷

Kostomarovs' extensive reply to Katkov's accusations never appeared in print. Instead, the imperial censors informed him—prior to the Valuev Directive!—"not only that the article was unsuitable for publication, but also that he was not to be allowed to continue publishing educational literature in Ukrainian" at all (Saunders, "Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov," 374). Kostomarov had no idea what had happened.

On 27 June 1863, Minister Valuev had received another anonymous denunciatory letter regarding the Ukrainian movement; the letter had been forwarded to him by the head of the Kyiv Censorship Committee. Most importantly, this document had stated:

The very mention of the question of using this dialect in school is greeted on part of most Little Russians with consternation. They argue convincingly that a [distinct] Little Russian language did not, does not, and cannot exist, and that its dialects as spoken by the simple folk are the same as the Russian Language, with the exception of some corruptions from Poland. (Miller 109)

In his accompanying letter to Valuev, the chief of the Kyiv Censorship Committee had complained that he was unable to ban the Ukrainian publications because their content was usually harmless. On 18 July 1863, finally, Valuev issued the decree that seemed to "resolve" this problem.

Works Cited

- Aleksandrovykh, Mytrofan (pseudonym: Olel'kovych, Mytro). "De-shcho pro zhydiv." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 71-75.
- Bernshtein, Mykhailo. *Zhurnal "Osnova" i ukrains'kyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50-60-kh rokiv XIX st.* Akademiia nauk Ukrain'skoi RSR, 1959.
- "Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'." Introduction. *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1862, p. 105.
- Bilozers'kyi, Vasyli'. (В. Бѣлозерскій).¹⁰⁸ Editorial. *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1861, pp. 2-7.

¹⁰⁷ "Каждый малорось знаетъ, что она была рѣчь отцовъ, дѣдовъ, прадѣдовъ его, что онъ ее всосалъ с материнымъ молокомъ, что она его святое достояніе; и этого довольно . . . Вамъ не нравится малорусское нарѣчіе, на здоровье вам. А намъ оно нравится."

¹⁰⁸ Cyrillic original versions of names are added if widespread name forms differ significantly from those actually used in the cited works or when they vary in publications. Cyrillic original versions of various word forms in titles are added if a

- Bukhbinder, Naum. "Lyst M. Kostomarova do I. P. Kornilova. Podav Naum Bukhbinder." *Za sto lit. Materialy z hromads'koho i literaturnoho zhyttia Ukrainy XIX i pochatkiv XX st.*, vol. 6, 1930, pp. 122-23. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/zsl01.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Chaplenko, Vasyli'. *Istoriia novoi ukrains'koi literaturnoi movy (XVII st.-1933 r.)*. Printed by A. Orel, 1970.
- Chubyns'kyi, Pavlo (П. Чубинский). "Dva slova o sel'skom uchilishche voobshche i ob uchilishche dlia sel'skikh uchitelei." *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1862, pp. 54-61.
- Comrie, Bernard, et al. *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*. Clarendon P, 1996.
- Danylenko, Andrii. "The Ukrainian Bible and the Valuev Circular of July 18, 1863." *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, vol. 28, 2010, pp. 1-21. <http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/publicitn/acta/28/01Danylenko.pdf>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Denysenko, Marusia. "Lysty Ukrainky." *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1862, pp. 108-115.
- Dolzhykova, Tetiana. *Movna osobystist' Panteleimona Kulisha*. Dissertation abstract. Instytut movoznavstva im. O. I. Potebni, 2004. <http://referatu.net.ua/referats/7569/153683>. Accessed 9 June 2017.
- Dudko, Viktor. "Iz rozshukiv pro *Osnovu*." *Spadshchyna: Literaturne dzhereloznavstvo. Tekstolohiia*, vol. 4, 2009, pp. 7-58.
- . "Nerealizovani zhurnal'ni plany Panteleimona Kulisha (1857-1858 rr.)." *Humanitarna osvita v tekhnichnykh vyshchykh navchal'nykh zakladakh*, vol. 11, 2005, pp. 327-40.
- . "Zhurnal *Osnova* iak proekt peterburz'koi ukrains'koi hromady." *Historians.in.ua*. <http://historians.in.ua/index.php/statti/456-viktor-dudko-zhurnal-osnova-iaak-proekt-peterburzkoj-ukrainskoj-hromady>. Accessed 13 Dec. 2012.
- "Galitsko-russkaia gazeta 'Slovo.'" *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1861, pp. 81-83.
- Grabowicz, George G. "Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century. A Formulation of the Problem." *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, edited by Peter Potichnyj et al., Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies P, 1992, pp. 214-44.
- Gurevich, P. "Delo o rasprostraneni malorossiiskoi propagandy." *Byloe: Zhurnal posviashchennyi istorii osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniia*, vol. 7, no. 19, 1907, pp. 169-75. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/byloe.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Hatstsuk, Mykola. (Микола Гацукъ). "O pravopisaniiah, zaiavlennykh ukrainskimi pisateliami s 1834 goda po 1861 g." *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1862, pp. 1-23.
- Hatstsuk, Aleksei. (Ал. Гатцукъ). "Bibliografiia." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1862, pp. 52-73.
- . (Ал. Гатцукъ). "Opyt iuzhnorussskago slovaria K. Sheikovskago." *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1862, pp. 93-113.
- Hillis, Faith. "Ukrainophile Activism and Imperial Governance in Russia's Southwestern Borderlands." *Kritika*, vol. 13, no. 2, Spring 2012, pp. 301-26.
- Horodys'kyi, Oleksandr. (А. Городиський). "Chemu i kak učit' nash narod." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1862, pp. 7-25.

transliterated form looks particularly unfamiliar from a contemporary point of view. Hard signs at the end of words are generally neglected in transliterated forms.

- Iefremov, Serhii. "Prosvitni zakhody Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'koho bratstva." *Svitlo*, vol. 4, 1913, pp. 3-8.
- Iefymenko, Petro. "Po povodu zametki g. Levchenka 'O rusinskoj terminologii.'" *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1861, pp. 182-93.
- Introductory Note to Kulish. "Ystoriia ('Исторія') Ukrainy ('Україну')." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1861, p. 79.
- Introductory Note to Nechuia and Kulish. *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, p. 30.
- Introductory Note to "Ob iarmarkakh." *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1861, p. 78.
- Ionin, Arkadii. "Po-povodu narodnykh uchebnikov." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1862, p. 6.
- Isachenko, Aleksandr. "Kakova spetsifika literaturnogo dviiazychiia v istorii slavianskikh narodov?" *Voprosy iazykoznaviia*, vol. 7, no. 3, 1958, pp. 42-45.
- Kakhovs'kyi, Vsevolod. "Lyst do 'Osnov'ian,'" *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 56-59.
- Koliada, Nataliia. *Rozvytok nedil'nykh shkyl v Ukraini: Druha polovyna XIX-pochatok XX st.* Dissertation abstract, Instytut pedahohiky APN Ukrainy, 2004. http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis64r/81/cgiirbis/64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=ARD&P21DBN=ARD&Z21ID=&Image_file_name=DOC/2004/04knmpps.zip&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Kony's'kyi, Oleksandr (pseudonym: Oleksandr Perekhodovets') (anonymous). "Nas'ki hramatky." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 64-82.
- . Comment on *Osnova*. vol. 5, 1862, p. 11.
- . "Lyst z dorohy." *Osnova*, vol. 10, 1861, pp. 145-48.
- . "Z Poltavu (dekabr' 1860)." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 319-22.
- . "Z Poltavu." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1861, pp. 71-74.
- . "Z starykh sanzhar (Poltavs'koho povitu). 29 kvitnia 1862 r." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1862, pp. 11-16.
- Kostomarov, Mykola. "Khrystyiian'stvo y kriptatstvo." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 9-12.
- . (Н. И. Костомаровъ). "Mysl' iuzhnorussa. O prepodavanii na iuzhnorusskom iazyke." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1862, pp. 1-6.
- . "O prepodavanii na narodnom iazyke v Iuzhnoi Rusi." *Golos*, vol. 94, 1863. <http://litopys.org.ua/kostomar/kos40.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- . "Pravy li nashi obviniteli." Edited by Iu. A. Pinchuk, *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, vol. 7, 1990, pp. 140-46. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/kostomar/kos39.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Kotenko, Anton. "Do pytannia pro tvorennia ukrains'koho natsional'noho prostoru v zhurnali *Osnova*." *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, vol. 2, 2012, pp. 42-57.
- Kravchenko, Oksana. "Zahal'na kharakterystyka pidruchnykiv dlia ditei za avtorstvom Panteleimona Kulisha." *Aktual'ni problemy slov'ians'koi filolohii. Seriia: Lihvistyka i literaturoznavstvo. Mizhvuzivs'kyi zbirnyk naukovykh stattei*, vol. XX, 2009, pp. 260-65. <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/16572/29-Kravchenko.pdf?sequence=1>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Kukhareenko, Iakiv. "Vivtsi i chabany v Chornomori." *Osnova* 5, 1862, pp. 29-39.
- Kulish, Panteleimon. "Dvi movi [sic], knyzhna i narodna." *Ukraina: Naukovyi tr'okhmisiachnyk ukrainoznavstva*, vol. 3, 1914, pp. 22-34. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/ukr03.htm>. Accessed 11 May 2015.
- . *Hramatka*. Typohrafiia P. A. Kulisha, 1857.

- . "Khmel'nyshchyna." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1861, pp. 1-15.
- . "Literaturnyia izvestiia." *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, p. 263.
- . (pseudonym: Khutorianin). "Lysty s khutora." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 310-18.
- . (pseudonym: Khutorianin). "Lysty s khutora. Lyst II." *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, pp. 227-32.
- . (pseudonym: Khutorianin). "Lysty s khutora. Lyst III." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1861, pp. 25-32.
- . "Ob izdaniu ukrainskago slovaria." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 333-34.
- . "Otvēt moskovskomu 'Dniu,' na pomeshchennuiu im v nr. 23 stateiku g. Sokovenka: *O stepeni samostoiatel'nosti malorusskoi literatury.*" *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 36-40.
- . "Otvēt na pis'mo s iuga." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 41-45.
- . "Perehliad ukrains'kykh (українських) knyzhok." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 57-64.
- . "Perehliad ukrains'kykh (українських) knyzhok." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 48-53.
- . "Pis'mo k redaktoru." *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, pp. 1-9.
- . "Prostonarodnost' v ukrainskoi slovesnosti." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 1-10.
- . "Rokovyny po Shevchenkovi, misiatsia liutoho, 26-ho dnia, 1862 roku," *Osnova* vol. 3, 1862, pp. 22-27
- . "Ustnia mova z nauky. Slovo z boku." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 29-30.
- . "Vyhovshchyna." *Osnova*, vol. 11-12, 1861, pp. 1-15.
- . "Ystoriia Ukrainy ('Исторія України') od naidavniishykh chasiv." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1861, pp. 79-107.
- . (pseudonym: P. Neobachnyi). "Znaidenyi na dorozhi lyst." *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, pp. 233-38.
- Kyvaiholova, Ivan. "Z Hadiacha, Poltav's'koi hub." *Osnova*, vol. 10, 1861, pp. 150-51.
- Lazarev's'kyi, B. (Б. Лазаревский). "Izvestie o iuzhnorusskom slovare g. Sheikovskago." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 57-61.
- Levchenko, M. "Iz Anan'eva (Khers. gub.) (20 dekabria 1860)." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 330-31.
- . "Mesta zhitel'stva i mestnyia nazvaniia Rusinov v nastoiashchee vremia." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1861, pp. 263-66.
- . "Zametka o rusinskoj terminologii." *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1861, pp. 183-86.
- "Literaturnyia izvestiia."¹⁰⁹ *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, p. 263.
- Luckyj, George Stephen Nestor. "Kulich, Panteleimon." *The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.
<http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\K\U\KulichPanteleimon.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo. "Znachenie Shevchenka dlia Ukrainy, provody tela ego v Ukrainu iz Peterburga." *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1861, pp. 1-38.
- Miiakovskii, V. "'Kievskaia gromada': Iz istorii ukrainskogo obshchestvennogo dvizheniia 60-kh gg." *Letopis' revoliutsii*, vol. 4, 1924, pp. 127-50.
<http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/letr01.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.

¹⁰⁹ This is a note from the editors.

- Miller, Aleksei. "Ukrainskii vopros" v politike vlastei i russkom obshchestvennom mnenii (vtoraia polovina XIX veka). Aleteiia, 2000.
- Mokhranytsia, Iu. "Neskol'ko slov o Pinchukakh." *Osnova*, vol. 10, 1861, pp. 125-27.
- Moser, Michael. (Mikhael' Moser). "Clerics and Laymen in the History of the Modern Standard Ukrainian Language." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 37, no. 1-2, 2012, pp. 39-60.
- . "Die Ukrainer auf dem Weg zur Sprachnation—Kritische Anmerkungen zur Ukrainistischen Sprachhistoriographie." *Die Ukraine. Prozesse der Nationsbildung*, edited by Andreas Kappeler, Böhlau, 2011, pp. 97-110. <http://r2u.org.ua/forum/viewtopic.php?f=25&t=1891>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- . *Ukrains'kyi P'iemont? Deshcho pro znachennia Halychyny dlia formuvannia, rozbudovy i zberezhennia ukrains'koi movy*. Smoloskyp, 2011.
- "Na kakom iazyke dolzhno obuchat' narod."¹¹⁰ *Osnova*, vol. 8, 1862, pp. 1-12.
- Nakhlik, Ievhen. *Panteleimon Kulish. Osobystist', pys'mennyk, myslytel'. T. 1: Zhyttia Panteleimona Kulisha*. Ukrains'kyi pys'mennyk, 2007.
- Nechuia, Volod'ko. "Pro doshch (Sproba)." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 30-36.
- Nedorovs'kyi, Zosym. "Y moia lepta." *Osnova*, vol. 8, 1862, pp. 13-14.
- Nimchuk, Vasyli'. "Pershyi velykyi slovnyk ukrains'koi movy Pavla Bilets'kohosenka." *P. Bilets'kyi-Nosenko. Slovnyk ukrains'koi movy*, edited by Vasyli' Nimchuk, Naukova dumka, 1966, pp. 5-37.
- . "Ukrains'ki pereklady sviatoho pys'ma." *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache – Ukrain'ska mova v tserkvakh*, edited by Michael Moser, LIT-Verlag, 2005, pp. 15-64.
- Novyts'kyi, Ivan. (И. Новицкий). "Eshche o detskikh slovakh." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1862, pp. 118-19.
- . "Z Taraity (Kyivs'koi hub.)." *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1862, pp. 87-89.
- "Ob iarmarkakh. (Do sil'skikh [sic] parafiiian)." *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1861, pp. 72-78.
- "Od redaktsii." *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1861, pp. 30-37.
- Ohienko, Ivan. *Istoriia ukrains'koi literaturnoi movy*. Lybid', 1995.
- "Osnova (Saint Petersburg) (Foundation)." *The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine. The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\O\OsnovaSaintPetersburgIT.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- "Otchego propoved' inogda byvaet bezsil'na." Reprinted from *Khersonskiiia eparkhial'nyiia vedomosti*. *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1861, pp. 27-30.
- "Otvēt sovremennoi letopisi russkago Vestnika." *Osnova*, vol. 2, 1861, pp. 256-59.
- Padalica, Tadeusz. "Pan Padalica, do pana Vladymyra Antonovicha (Tadeusz Padalytsa. 15 oktobriia 1861 roku. Z Ukrainy)." *Osnova*, vol. 10, 1861, pp. 136-41.
- Pesterzhets'kyi, Andrii. (А. П-кий). "Zametka o narodnom iazyke." *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1861, pp. 21-29.
- Pohars'kyi, Stepan. (Степанъ Погарскій). "O narodnom obrazovanii i o sredstvakh dlia izdaniia uchebnikob [sic] na Ukrainskom iazyke." *Osnova*, vol. 7, 1862, pp. 1-23.

¹¹⁰ The name of the author appears as "G. T".

- Remy, Johannes. "The Valuev Circular and Censorship of Ukrainian Publications in the Russian Empire (1863–1876): Intention and Practice." *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 49, no. 1-2, 2007, pp. 87-110.
- Rusaniv's'kyi, Vitalii. *Istoriia ukrains'koi literaturnoi movy*. ArTek, 2001.
- "Rusiny." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 78-80.
- Saunders, David. "Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov: A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3-4, 1993, pp. 365-77.
- . "Russia and Ukraine Under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863." *The International History Review*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1995, pp. 23-50.
- Sheikov's'kyi, Kalynyk. "Po povodu iuzhnorusskago slovaria." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1862, pp. 90-92.
- Shevych, Vasyl'. (Васи́лій Шевичъ). "Iz Luben (Poltavskoi gub.). Lubenskaia voshkresnaia shkola." *Osnova*, vol. 5, 1861, pp. 74-76.
- . (Василь Шевичъ). "Z Luben (Poltavskoi gub.)." *Osnova*, vol. 10, 1861, pp. 148-50.
- Sh-rl-v-i, I. K. (I. K. Ш-рл-в-й). "Ob obuchenii gramote voobshche, i ob arithmetike (арифметикъ) D. Moroza." *Osnova*, vol. 8, 1862, pp. 36-44.
- Shulika, Pavlo. Comment on "De znaishov, de zahubyv." *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1862, p. 70.
- "Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'." *Osnova*, vol. 1, 1862, pp. 81-110.
- "Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 100-40.
- "Sovremennaia iuzhnorusskaia letopis'." *Osnova*, vol. 8, 1862, pp. 1-25.
- Sreznetskii, Izmail. "Vzgliad na pamiatniki ukrainskoi narodnoi slovesnosti. Pis'mo k professoru I. M. Snegirevu." *Ucheniia zapiski imperatorskago Moskovskago Universiteta*, vol. 2, no. 6, 1834, pp. 134-50.
- Stoianov, Oleksandr. (А. Стояно́въ). "Neppravdivost' i ravnodushie—glavneishiia pomekhi k rasprostraneniui gramotnosti." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1862, pp. 74-89.
- Tairova-Iakovleva, Tat'iana. "'Valuevskii 'tsirkuliar' i zapret ispol'zovaniia ukrainskogo iazyka." *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2013, pp. 55-60.
- "Uchilishcha, obrazovavshiiasia na iuge v poslednee vremia." *Osnova*, vol. 6, 1861, pp. 79-107.
- Vashkevich, Grigorii. "Perevod P. A. Kulisha na ukrainskii iazyk manifesta 19 fevralia 1861 goda i polozheniia o krest'ianakh." Ottisk iz zhurnala *Kievskaiia starina*, 1905. <http://litopys.org.ua/rizne/kulmanif.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Vovk, Fedir. (pseudonym: Iastrubets'). "Otnosheniia sel'skikh sviashchennikov k narodu v iugozapadnoi Rusi." *Osnova*, vol. 4, 1862, pp. 37-53.
- Vulpius, Ricarda. *Nationalisierung der Religion. Russifizierungspolitik und Ukrainische Nationsbildung (1860-1920)*. Harrassowitz, 2005.
- Zapara, Dimitrii. "Mysli iuzhnorussa. Iziumskago uezda zemlevladelets Dimitrii Zapara." *Osnova*, vol. 9, 1862, pp. 1-5.
- Zhemchuzhnykov, Lev. "Vospominanie o Shevchenke; ego smert' i pogrebenie," *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1861, pp. 1-21.
- Zhovtobriukh, Mykhailo. *Mova ukrains'koi presy*. Vydavnytstvo akademii nauk Ukrain's'koi RSR, 1963.

- Zhytets'kyi, Ihnat. "Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv." *Ukraina: naukovyi dvokhmisiachnyk ukrainoznavstva*, vol. 1, 1928, pp. 91-125. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/ukr14.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Zhytets'kyi, Pavlo. "Otvēt 'Dniu.' Kiev, 11 dekabria 1861 goda." *Osnova*, vol. 3, 1862, pp. 1-2.
- . "Z istorii kyivs'koi ukrains'koi hromady. Promova Pavla Zhytets'koho na Shevchenkovykh rokovynakh." *Zapysky naukovooho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, vol. 116, no. 4, 1913, pp. 177-89. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/zntsh05.htm>. Accessed 12 May 2015.