

UDC 811.161.2-112
DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188656

Mykola PANTYUK

PhD hab. (Education), Professor, Vice-rector on the science of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (pantyuk@mbigmir.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7336-6714>

ResearcherID: X-8503-2019

Borys SAVCHUK

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Professor of the Bogdan Stuparik Pedagogy Department, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko Street, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76018 (boris_savchuk@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2256-0845>

ResearcherID: <https://publons.com/researcher/2903385/boris-savchuk/>

Микола ПАНТЮК

доктор педагогічних наук, професор, проректор з наукової роботи Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (pantyuk@mbigmir.net)

Борис САВЧУК

доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри педагогіки імені Богдана Ступарика Прикарпатського національного університету імені Василя Стефаника, вул. Шевченка, 57, Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76018 (boris_savchuk@ukr.net)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Pantyuk, M., & Savchuk, B. (2019). Cyrillic and Latin alphabets in Ukrainian discourse of Halychyna in the 30s of the XIXth – at the beginning of the XXth centuries. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 13, 50–59. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188656

**CYRILLIC AND LATIN ALPHABETS IN UKRAINIAN DISCOURSE
OF HALYCHYNA IN THE 30s OF THE XIXth – AT THE BEGINNING
OF THE XXth CENTURIES**

Abstract. The purpose of the research: to show the character, features, dynamics of the development of Ukrainian discourse on the choice of the Cyrillic or Latin alphabets as an alphabetical system for the formation of Ukrainian literary language in Halychyna in the 30-ies of the XIXth – early XXth centuries through the prism of unfolding its two main stages. **The research methodology** is based on the principles of scientific knowledge, objectivity, historicism and general scientific (analysis, synthesis, comparison) and special-historical methods (historical-genetic, periodization, historical-systemic, historical-typological). **The research novelty** consists in the systematic reconstruction of the unfolding of a public discourse on the choice of the alphabetical system of Cyrillic or Latin for the formation of Ukrainian literary language in Halychyna; substantiation of the periodization of this process, which is manifested in the personification and display of its essence, nature, tendencies,

features at two stages of development: the first, covering the 30-ies – 50-ies of the nineteenth century and consists of two phases separating the “Spring of the Peoples” in 1848 and the second, which dates to the 60-ies of the nineteenth – the beginning of the twentieth centuries when a substantive understanding of the phenomenon of “alphabet wars” began, which appeared in the emergence of a number of source and analytical studies, which greatly influenced the further study of this problem. **The Conclusions.** Thus, the social discourse in Halychyna in the 1830-ies – early XXth centuries according the choice of an alphabet system – Cyrillic or Latin – for codification of the Ukrainian literary language is a distinctive phenomenon in the history of the culture of the Ukrainian people and the formation of its literary language. Each party had its own compelling arguments, so there was no perfect solution to the problem. The supporters of the Cyrillic alphabet argued that it was a symbol of Ukrainian identity, and its replacement with Latin would lead to a split in the Ukrainian movement, enhance its polonization, slow down the development of national culture, and not bring the Ukrainian literary language closer to European one. Latin adherents were correct in arguing that it more accurately conveyed the features of the Ukrainian vernacular in writing, and that Church Slavonicisms in Cyrillic prevented the formation of the Ukrainian literary language on a lively national basis. The alphabetical discourse became an important factor in the development of the Ukrainian national social movement and a marker of the ideological orientations of its participants.

Key words: Halychyna, “alphabet war”, public discourse, Cyrillic alphabet, Latin alphabet.

КИРИЛИЦЯ І ЛАТИНИЦЯ В УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ ДИСКУРСІ ГАЛИЧИНИ У 30-х рр. XIX – НА ПОЧАТКУ XX СТ.

Мета дослідження: показати характер, особливості, динаміку розвитку українського дискурсу щодо вибору кирилиці або латиниці як азбучної системи для формування української літературної мови в Галичині у 30-х рр. XIX – на початку XX ст. крізь призму розгортання його двох основних етапів. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах наукового пізнання, об'єктивності, історизму та методах загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, порівняння) і спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, періодизації, історико-системний, історико-типологічний). **Новизна дослідження** полягає у системній реконструкції розгортання суспільного дискурсу щодо вибору азбучної системи кирилиці або латиниці для формування української літературної мови в Галичині; обґрунтуванні періодизації цього процесу, що виявляється у персоніфікації та показі його суті, характеру, тенденцій, особливостей на двох етапах розвитку: першому, що охоплює 30 – 50-ті рр. XIX ст. і складається з двох фаз, які розділяє «Весна народів» 1848 р., та другого, який припадає на 60-ті рр. XIX – початок XX ст., коли розпочалося предметне осмислення феномену «азбучних війн», що виявилось у появі низки джерелознавчих й аналітичних студій, які значною мірою вплинули на подальше вивчення цієї проблеми. **Висновки.** Суспільний дискурс у Галичині в 30-х рр. XIX – на початку XX ст. щодо вибору азбучної системи кирилиці або латиниці для кодифікації української літературної мови становить самотутнє явище в історії культури українського народу та становленні його літературної мови. Кожна зі сторін, яка обстоювала свою позицію, мала переконливі аргументи, тож не було ідеального варіанту розв'язання проблеми. Прихильники кирилиці доводили, що вона є символом української ідентичності, а її заміна на латиницю призведе до розколу в українському русі, посилить його колонізацію, загальмує розвиток національної культури, не наблизить українську літературну мову до європейської. Прибічники латиниці мали рацію, коли стверджували, що вона точніше передає особливості української народної мови на письмі, а церковнослов'янськи кирилиці перешкоджають формуванню української літературної мови на живій народній основі. Азбучний дискурс став важливим чинником розвитку українського національного суспільного руху та маркером ідейних орієнтацій його учасників.

Ключові слова: Галичина, «азбучна війна», суспільний дискурс, кирилиця, латиниця.

The Problem Statement. The confrontation on linguistic issues accompanies the development of human civilization. It creates contradictions in the social, ethnic, intellectual environments of individual countries, affects relations with neighbouring peoples, and leaves

a deep mark on national memory, history, and literature. This telling example is the story of the three hundred years of confrontation between the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets in Ukraine. Its vivid episode became the so-called alphabet wars in the 30-ies – 50-ies of the nineteenth century in Halychyna. It is a phenomenal fact that the local phenomenon, at first glance, became a subject of discourse that encompassed a wide range of Ukrainian and European cultural figures and scholars of the XIXth – early XXth centuries.

We consider the “alphabet wars” as a socio-cultural movement of the enlightened Ukrainian circles of Halychyna and the confrontation between different ethnopolitical factors of the Habsburg monarchy caused by the efforts to introduce the Latin alphabet instead of Cyrillic into the Ukrainian writing. The participants in the Ukrainian public discourse on this issue were church activists, community activists, scholars, who advocated the preservation of the old or the introduction of new linguistic and cultural models. Its important component was the accumulation of sources and scientific studies on the language and alphabetical confrontation.

The Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. The historiography of the problem of confrontation in the line «Cyrillic – Latin alphabets” in Halychyna has more than a hundred and fifty years of tradition, interdisciplinary character (history, linguistics, etc.) and is represented by the work of modern Ukrainian (M. Barchuk, M. Vakulenko, S. Zabrovarnyi, M. Lesiuk, V. Moiseienko, I. Raikivskyi, N. Sovtys, F. Steblii, O. Sukhyi, Ye. Tymchenko, I. Chornovil), Polish (K. Dvornik, Ya. Kozik, D. Novatska, A. Sviatek), Russian (O. Miller, O. Ostapchuk, N. Pashaieva, L. Sofronova, L. Shchavynska), Austrian and German (A. Wendland, M. Moser), Canadian and American (P. R. Magocsi, K. Struve) researchers. Focusing on the vicissitudes of the “alphabet wars” of the 30-ies – 50-ies of the XIXth century, the scientists differently, often contradictory and fragmentary, reflect their course and overlook the continuation of this discourse in the 60-ies of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries.

The Purpose of the Research: to show the character, features, dynamics of the development of Ukrainian discourse on the choice of the Cyrillic or Latin alphabets as an alphabetical system for the formation of the Ukrainian literary language in Halychyna in the 30-ies of the XIXth – early XXth centuries through the prism of unfolding its two main stages.

The Statement of the Basic Material. Character, dynamics, tendencies of public discourse development on formation of the Ukrainian literary language on the basis of Cyrillic or Latin alphabets were determined by the socio-political development in Halychyna in the XIXth – at the beginning of the XXth centuries and appealing to the experience of other Slavic peoples, who encountered similar problems.

After three divisions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century, Ukrainian Halychyna and the part of the Polish lands that were artificially integrated into the province – the crown region of the Kingdom of Halychyna and Lodomeria, were departed to Austria. With the formation of the dualistic Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1867, Halychyna gained a cultural autonomy, but the Poles had advantages in administering it. Under these conditions, the Russian-Ukrainian population of the region remained a denationalized ethnic mass for a long time: the nobility and the most educated Greek Catholic clergy were colonized; the parish clergy were not characterized by a high level of education and national consciousness; the peasantry self-identified on the basis of religion. This ethno-cultural situation created the ground for polonization and germanization in the linguistic sphere and led to the fact that the study of the original culture of the Ruthenians-Ukrainians of the region was initiated by foreigners, who represented it in their linguistic dimensions.

We distinguish two main stages in the development of the discourse on the line of confrontation “Cyrillic or Latin alphabets”. In the first one, covering two “alphabet wars” of 1833 – 1837 and 1858 – 1859, we distinguish two phases, the boundary between which of them became the “Spring of the Peoples” in 1848; the second stage – the 60-ies of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries – presented the first experience of understanding the essence and consequences of the “alphabet wars” in the source and scientific studies.

The prologue to the first “alphabet war” was two events. The first one related to the initiative of the Greek Catholic Metropolitan Mykhailo Levytskyi of Halychyna to introduce the Russian (Ukrainian) language study in Eastern Halychyna. The officials and Roman Catholic clergy, who reformed public school in the region from 1815 to 1818, insisted on maintaining the Polish-language schooling and printing of Ukrainian educational literature in Latin. The situation was then resolved by the intervention of Emperor Franz I, who spoke on the side of the Halychynan Ruthenians (Siropolko, 2001, pp. 509–514).

The second event is related to the appearance in 1833 of the collection of Waclaw Zaleski from Olesko (in 1848 – 1849 he was the governor of Halychyna) “Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego” (“Polish and Russian Songs of Halychynan People”), where Ukrainian works were printed in Polish. In his introduction, the author assured that soon all Slavic peoples would switch to Latin, because the Cyrillic alphabet is a sign of a lower “non-European” culture, which hinders its integration with the European one (Waclaw z Oleska, 1833). The book has resonated in Ukrainian, Polish, Czech, Austrian cultural circles.

Some researchers believe that this event triggered the first “alphabet war” of 1833/1834 – 1837. More justified its beginning is associated with the appearance in 1834 on the pages of the literary weekly publication “Rozmaitości” the article “O wprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego” (“On the introduction of the Polish alphabet into Russian writing”) by the famous priest and philologist Yosyp Lozynskyi. He claimed that the Russian language was “unprocessed”, “illiterate”, “uneducated” and still not literary, because all the property was written in Church Slavonic. Inspired by the ideas of the Slovenian linguist Bartholomew Kopitar, Y. Lozynskyi argued that instead of the traditional but already “dead” Cyrillic alphabet, which does not correspond to the phonetic basis of the Russian language, the Polish “abecadło” (alphabet) should be introduced, the letters of which are “very capable” of transmitting “every Russian sound”, so they are more rational, better suited for reading and writing (Lozinskiy, 1834).

Justifying the core principle of “one sound – one letter”, Y. Lozynskyi argued that a complex and cumbersome system of letters and their names in the Cyrillic alphabet made their reading different and made it difficult to remember the sounds they indicated. And the alphabetical reform eliminates these shortcomings and brings the Russian language closer to European literature (Lozinskiy, 1834). Demonstrating the expediency of such changes, in 1835 Y. Lozynskyi published in Latin alphabet the folk collection “Ruskoje wesile” (“Russian wedding”) (Lozinskiy, 1835).

This performance produced the effect of a “time bomb” that detonated until the beginning of the twentieth century. The discourse was initiated by the three most resonant speeches of the opponents, reflecting the essence and the course of the first “alphabet war”, which unfolded in the form of a heated debate between representatives of the Russian spiritual state and secular intelligentsia.

The first public reaction was an article “Odpowiedź na zdanie o zaprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego” (“Response to the statement on the introduction of

the Polish alphabet into Russian literature”) by the priest and linguist Yosyf Levytskyi in the same weekly publication “Rozmaitości” (№ 52). As it turned out later, it was a plagiarism of D. Zubrytskyi’s handwriting, but then, in 1834, it became the first deployed platform for supporters of the Cyrillic alphabet. Its main arguments were as follows: Cyrillic was created especially for the Eastern Slavs, had a long tradition of use. The Cyrillic letters are not spelled by their names, so it is able to adequately reflect the letter of sound of the Ukrainian language, while the Poles borrowed Latin and were forced to add dialectical characters to their alphabet, so the sounds [ʃ], [ʃʲ], [ʧ], [x] in the Polish language are indicated by several letters and in Ukrainian – by one. The introduction of the principle of “one sound – one letter” will lead to the emergence of new homonyms, and the use of additional characters will only complicate the spelling (Text and commentary are contained: Vozniak, 1925; 1929).

In the context of the development of the Ukrainian national revival, arguments of ethno-cultural character were important. The Cyrillic alphabet became a symbol of the national identity of the Halychynan Rusyns, so the conversion to Latin “will not be understood by descendants”, will cause a split in the Ukrainian movement, will lead to increased polonization, and will harm the development of Ukrainian culture. It is unclear at what expense the Russian books will be reprinted in case of conversion to Latin, because earlier its use by Uniates for the printing of liturgical books was conditioned by the lack of costly Cyrillic fonts. It was argued that the promotion of Ukrainian literature should not be facilitated by the change of the alphabet, but by the creation of outstanding works that would be interesting for translations in other languages (Vozniak, 1925; 1929).

A significant social resonance and influence on the subsequent discourse was made by the Polish-language brochure “Alphabet and Abecadło” by Markiy Shashkevych, who, being a student of the seminary, showed a broad outlook and a deep knowledge of the problem. Recognizing the “good intentions” of Y. Lozynskyi and affirming the active development of folk literature in the Slavic peoples, M. Shashkevych emphasized the essence and meaning of the annexation of the Russian literature to European literatures. If it was the introduction of other people’s references and ways, then literary language would not reflect the way of thinking, soul and life of the people. If one joined in order for a European to be able to better read Slavic works, then what kind of European literature should be guided, since there were as many peoples, as many individual literatures (Shashkevych, 1836).

Having shown the variance in the graphic correspondences in Cyrillic letters of *ж, с, и, у, ч* (*zh, s, sh, ts, ch*) which exists in the Slavic languages, M. Shashkevych argued that the adoption of the alphabetic system of one of them would not solve the problem, because then the spelling would not be understood by the other Slavic peoples and they would have a distorted vision of the Russian language, and the Slavic unity would not benefit from this. He believed that the alphabet was not the primary literary language, but should clearly reflect it. Therefore, it is worthwhile to focus on the living vernacular and solve this case based on its properties, features and laws of development. Refuting the advantages of the Abecadło over the Cyrillic alphabet, M. Shashkevych put forward his famous principle of “write as you hear, read as you see” (Shashkevych, 1836), which he later realized in the famous “*Rusalka Dnistrova*” (Dniester Mermaid), published by the so-called “*hrazhdanka*” (reformed Cyrillic).

Y. Lozynskyi gave sharp responses to the speeches of Y. Levitskyi and M. Shashkevych, but they were not published then because of censorship; so, in order not to violate the logic of the course of discourse, we will recall this episode later.

Thus, the first “alphabet war” of 1833/34 – 1837 defined the essence and format of discourse in the “Cyrillic or Latin” dilemma as an important component of the ethnocultural

development of Ukrainian Halychyna and actualized the need for its solution. It identified a situation where, despite the perception of the Russian intellectual elite of Cyrillic as a symbol of national identity, a matured understanding of the need for its perfection to codify the Ukrainian literary language. The next decade was accompanied by public and private discussions on ways, principles of creating a new, closer to the national language, “Halychyman-Russian” alphabet, introduction of “hrazhdanka”, the need to approach different Slavic languages, etc.

Another aggravation and politicization of the Ukrainian discourse on this problem (the second phase of the first stage) was caused by the “Spring of the Peoples” in 1848. It accelerated the political and cultural self-organization of Halychynan Ukrainians, which appeared in the emergence of the first national political organization, the Main Russian Council, the Ukrainian newspaper “Zoria Halytska”, the Department of Russian Literature at Lviv University, in holding a congress of Russian scholars, etc.

The actualization of the issue of national self-identification of Halychynan Rusyns led to the transformation of discourse into a Cyrillic or Latin dilemma. Previously, it was primarily linguistical in nature. The proponents of different positions understood the importance of the Cyrillic alphabet as a symbol of “Russianness”, so with good intentions they sought practical ways to solve it in order to enhance the status of the Russian language and its use in various spheres of public life. From now on, apart from the linguistic aspect, this issue is becoming a factor of exacerbation of interethnic and internal political confrontation and a kind of marker of its participants’ division.

The confrontation between Cyrillic and Latin in Halychyna’s public discourse at that time became a form of conscious confrontation between the Ukrainian and Polish national attributes. This is proved by the analysis of propaganda texts, proclamations, poems, spread during the “Spring of the Peoples”, which testify that the alphabet became a symbolic symbol of different models of the language and types of a literary standard. Admittedly, it was Latin that fixed the vernacular closer to a live spoken language, and the Cyrillic alphabet – Church Slavonic, related to cultural and church tradition.

Indicative in this sense was “Dnewnik ruski” (“A Russian Journal”) – the body of formed in 1848 Polonophilic organization “Cathedral Ruthenian”, which was published by a former member of the “Russian Trinity” Ivan Vahylevych. Its Latin publication was intended to demonstrate the pro-Polish cultural and civilizational orientation of the Halychynan Ruthenians.

The herald of the second “alphabet war” was the appearance in 1858 of a Ukrainian-language collection with the eloquent title “Nowyi poezyi małoruskii t. j. pisny, dumy, dumki, chory, tanci, ballady etc. w czystom jazyci Czerwono-Rusyniw, wedła żytia zwyczaiw ich i obyeczaiw narodnych” (“New Little Russians poetry, songs, thoughts, choirs, dances, ballads, other in pure Russian language, in accordance with the customs of the people”), which was published in Latin by the Polish folklorist L. Węgliński (*O neudobnosti*, 1859; Franko, 1986).

Its criticism was made by historian B. Didytskyi, who in the article “New Poetry of the Little Russian in Pure Language of Red-Rusyns” (“Collection” of supplement to the magazine “Vestnik”, Vienna, 1858), emphasizing the low artistic and grammatical level of the collection, proved unfit Latin usage in Russian. Public interest in it quickly faded, because at the beginning of 1859 his thorough work “On the inconvenience of the Latin alphabet in the Russian writing – the reasoning of Bohdan A.D.” appeared. In it, the broad erudition intersected with the author’s ideological commitment. Through the prism of historical ex-

cursion and comparison with the alphabets of other peoples, he proved the advantages of the Cyrillic alphabet, which most closely matched the spirit of the Russian language. Based on the analysis of two dozen European languages that were built in Latin, the author of the work B. Didytskyi argued that because of significant differences, none of them was suitable for the Russian literary language, which could be reformed only on the main ancient monuments of the 10th – 11th centuries. The only expedient principle of spelling, he considered etymological spelling (*O neudobnosti*, 1859).

At this time, the linguistic and alphabetical issue went beyond the Ukrainian intellectual circles. The ambiguous reaction among the parish clergy, which had a significant impact on the peasantry, was caused by a letter issued by the government of Vienna to Bishop Spyrydon Lytvynovych, which called for avoiding the use the so-called dialect (“paganism” – an artificial mixture of Church Slavonic and vernacular. Auth.) in sermons and spreading it among believers. Among the parish priests there were many Muscophiles, who began to attack the “ancient traditions” of the use of Church Slavonic in various spheres of life (*Korespondent-siia*, 1905, pp. 420–424).

Taking advantage of the lively public debate, the Halychynan alderman Agenor Gołuchowski decided to legislate his old intentions to introduce the Polish alphabet into the Russian written language and addressed the initiative to the Ministry of Education and Cults in Vienna. Officials supported it and, considering various options for its solution, settled on the project of the Czech Ministry secretary Joseph Grecek. It was published in May 1859 in the brochure “Über der Vorschlag das Ruthenische mit lateinischen Schriftzeichen zu schreiben” (“On a proposal to write in Russian with Latin letters”). The author had a deep understanding of the alphabet problem in the languages of the Slavic peoples and a sincere desire to solve it in relation to the Russian language. He argued that the creation of a secular literary language based on Ancient Slavs prevented the use of a lively vernacular for that reason, causing them to be mixed. Therefore, even writers trying to write in the vernacular were forced to use the Church Slavonic forms. The exit from the situation was seen in the “adaptation” to the Russian language of the Cyrillic alphabet or the Czech alphabet (Simovych, 2005, pp. 45–67).

Such a “Czech version” did not suit A. Golukhovskiyi, who tried to stop russification and strengthen the polonization of the Rusyns of Halychyna. He sent to the Ministry proposals of the Ukrainian school inspector Ye. Cherkavskiyi, concluded according to the activity examination results of the head of the department of Russian language and Russian literature of Lviv University Ya. Holovatskiy, who was accused of Muscophilia. He was suggested being dismissed from the post and, in order to prevent russification, introduce the Latin alphabet into the Russian language and a bilingual education in lower grammar schools (Franko, 1986, pp. 624–625).

To resolve this issue, a representative commission of 13 persons was set up, which met in June 1859 in the Halychynan governorate in Lviv. After a heated debate, the immediate introduction of the Latin alphabet was voted by J. Jireček and Ye. Cherkavskiyi, while its gradual introduction was led by four government representatives and school inspectors. But most members of the commission, represented by Russian priests and public figures, including Y. Lozynskiyi, argued for the preservation of the Cyrillic alphabet (Simovych, 2005).

Contrary to this decision, A. Golukhovskiyi submitted to the Ministry of Education a project to introduce a Polish alphabet for publishing Russian textbooks and newspapers. However, following the commission’s decision, the Government of Vienna issued a decree on 25 July 1959, according to which Ukrainian books were still to be printed in Cyrillic; Polish

works in school textbooks – in Latin, and the use of “hrazhdanka” was banned (Simovych, 2005; Franko, 1986).

This event can be considered the end of the second “alphabet war”, which introduced new features in the development of discourse on this issue. It went beyond the professional discussions of representatives of the Halychynan-Russian clergy, who, despite different views, wanted to give the Ukrainian literary proper status and bring it closer to both the vernacular and European literatures. Linguistic and alphabetical contradictions became one of the factors of the split in the Ukrainian national movement and a sign of belonging to its different currents: Ukrainophilic (Narodovetska), Muscophilic, Polonophilic, etc.

At the second stage of discourse development in the 1960-ies – at the beginning of the 20th century, in the first place was the problem of understanding the phenomenon of “alphabet wars”, which appeared in the emergence of a number of source and analytical studies, which greatly influenced the further study of this problem.

The work of O. Makovei “From the history of our philology. Three Halychynan grammars” became significant. Following the evolution of the linguistic and alphabetical issue of the Halychynan Ruthenians since the beginning of the nineteenth century, the author thoroughly reconstructed the course of the first “alphabet war”. In the appendices he published the first article by Y. Lozynskyi, which in 1834 initiated the alphabetical controversy (Makovei, 1903, pp. 77–81) and introduced into the circulation of his unpublished manuscripts the above-mentioned “Response to the review of Mr. Markiyan Shashkevych” (Makovei, 1903, p. 81–83) and “The joint response of Y. Lozynskyi to Y. Levytskyi and M. Shashkevych” (Makovei, 1903, pp. 84–86), as well as two little-known works of 1936 and 1844 on the introduction of the abecadło into the Russian writing.

The accumulation of source materials was accompanied by discussions about their identification and an in-depth study of various aspects of the “alphabet wars”. Thus, the article “O zaprowadzeniu Abecadła polskiego zamiast kirylicy do ruskiej pisowni” (“About the introduction of the Polish alphabet instead of the Cyrillic alphabet into the Russian writing”), which was invented by the academician V. Shchurat, was dated December 1934, and was attributed to M. Kmytskyevych by the pseudonym (Shchurat, 1908). However, having analyzed its contents (frankly Ukrainian-phobic) and other external features, M. Vozniak proved that it belonged to the pen of D. Zubrytskyi, in particular it was the beginning of his article “Apologia Cyryliki czyli azbuki ruskiej” (“Apology of the Cyrillic or Russian alphabet”) (Vozniak, 1925).

Looking ahead, we note that in the 20-ies of the twentieth century, M. Vozniak, thoroughly analyzing this work, showed the disparaging attitude of D. Zubrytskyi to the Halychynan national language, which he called “Slavic-Polish”, “Polish-Russian”, and argued that it could not become the basis for the Russian literary language. At the same time, M. Vozniak proved that the materials of this article were frankly rewritten by Y. Levytskyi and published in the prescribed article in 1834 “Response to the statement on the introduction of the Polish alphabet into Russian literature” (Vozniak, 1925; Vozniak, 1929).

On the eve of World War I, the alphabetical dilemma “Cyrillic or Latin” intertwined with the problem of spelling (phonetic or etymological) into a tangle of contradictions that emerged in numerous manifestations when discussing various issues of a national political and cultural life.

This phenomenon was revealed in the analytical and polemical exploration of V. Shchurat, who, finding out the genesis of the Cyrillic alphabet, varieties of Ukrainian Latin and “hrazh-

danka”, compared them with the peculiarities of these components of literary languages of different Slavic peoples. The author showed that their complicated transformation in Halychyna led to the formation of a “new kind” of Ukrainian “hrazhdanka”, recognized by the Government of Vienna. Despite the oppression of the Russian tsar, it was “accepted” in the Dnieper Ukraine and became a manifestation of the ethno-cultural unity torn apart by the state borders of Ukraine (Shchurat, 1916).

The most notable achievement of this stage of discourse, which most influenced its subsequent course, was the “canonized” by the scientists of Franko’s work “The Alphabet War in Halychyna in 1859” (1913), which remains the most cited in the studies to this day. It is characterized by a thorough knowledge of the sources and an understanding of the literary languages formation peculiarities of the Slavic peoples, the experience of using them in Latin alphabet, etc. This was reflected in a comparative analysis of the retrospectives of their development and a synthesized analysis of the course of the “alphabet wars” in Halychyna (Franko, 1986). However, it is difficult to explain why the author unexpectedly interrupted the presentation of the material in describing the sharp confrontation surrounding the Latinization of the Ukrainian writing.

A separate page in linguistic-alphabet discourse is the fundamental work of the well-known scientist and public figure Kyrylo Studynsky, who, on the basis of source materials, private letters and official documents, showed the prerequisites and systematically reconstructed the course of the first and second “alphabet wars” against the backdrop of national revival process of Halychynan Ukrainians in the 30-ies – early 60-ies of the nineteenth century. In addition to two volumes of fundamental work, “Correspondence of Yakiv Holovatskyi...” (Korespondentsiia, 1905; Korespondentsiia, 1909), important studies of this problem are presented in his studios “Polish Conspiracies among Russian Citizens and the Clergy in Halychyna in 1831 – 46” (1907), “Lviv Theological Seminary in the Times of Markiyan Shashkevych (1829 – 1843)” (1916) and the others. In the spirit of the classical scheme of positivist historiography (a fact-event in chronology, their interrelation, generalization, evaluation), K. Studynsky proposed the first fairly clear and complete matrix of “alphabet vicissitudes” with their main actors, focusing on the figures of the “Russian trinity”. It is clear from this that this achievement has been substantially researched and used by I. Franko in the aforementioned work “The Alphabet War in Halychyna in 1859”, which became more popular due to its accessibility (Franko, 1986).

The Conclusions. Thus, the social discourse in Halychyna in the 1830-ies – early XXth centuries according the choice of an alphabet system – Cyrillic or Latin – for codification of the Ukrainian literary language is a distinctive phenomenon in the history of the culture of the Ukrainian people and the formation of its literary language. Each party had its own compelling arguments, so there was no perfect solution to the problem. The supporters of the Cyrillic alphabet argued that it was a symbol of Ukrainian identity, and its replacement with Latin would lead to a split in the Ukrainian movement, enhance its polonization, slow down the development of national culture, and not bring the Ukrainian literary language closer to European one. Latin adherents were correct in arguing that it more accurately conveyed the features of the Ukrainian vernacular in writing, and that Church Slavonicisms in Cyrillic prevented the formation of the Ukrainian literary language on a lively national basis. The alphabetical discourse became an important factor in the development of the Ukrainian national social movement and a marker of the ideological orientations of its participants.

Acknowledgments. We express a sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Franko, I. (1986) Azbuchna viina v Halychyni 1859 r. [Alphabet War in Halychyna 1859]. In *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50-ty t.* (Vol. 47, pp. 549–650). Kyiv: Nauk. dumka. [in Ukrainian]

Korespondentsiia. (1905). Korespondentsiia Yakova Holovatskoho v litakh 1850–62 [Correspondence of Yakiv Holovatskyi in 1850–62]. Vydav K. Studynskyi. *Zbirnyk Filolo-gichnoi seksii NTSh, Lviv, 8–9*, 392 p. [in Ukrainian]

Korespondentsiia. (1909). Korespondentsiia Yakova Holovatskoho v litakh 1835–49 [Correspondence of Yakiv Holovatskyi in 1835–49]. Vydav K. Studynskyi. *Zbirnyk Filologichnoi seksii NTSh, Lviv, 11–12*, 452 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lozinskiy, J. (1834). O wprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego [On the introduction of the Polish alphabet into Ruthenian literature]. *Rozmaitości. Lwów, 29*, 228–230. [in Polish]

Lozinskiy, J. (1835). Ruskoje wesile [Ruthenian wedding]. Peremyszl: W Typografii Władczynój gr. kat., 153 p. [in Ukrainian]

Makovei, O. (1903). Z istoriyi nashoi filolohii. Try halytski hramatyky (Ivan Mohylnytskyi, Yosyf Levytskyi i Yosyf Lozynskyi) [From the history of our philology. Three Halychynan grammars (Ivan Mohylnytskyi, Yosyf Levytskyi and Yosyf Lozynskyi)]. *Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, LI*, 1–58. [in Ukrainian]

O neudobnosti. (1859). *O neudobnosti latynskoi azbuki v pismennosti ruskoj, rozsuzhdenie Bogdana A.D.* [On the inconvenience of the Latin alphabet in the Russian writing – the reasoning of Bogdan A.D.]. Vien, 47 p. [in Russian]

Shashkevych, M. (1836). *Azbuka i abecadło. Peredruk z unikalnoho oryhyalalu z 1836 r.* [Alphabet and Abecadło. Reprint of unique original from 1836]. Vinnipeg, 1969. XVII p.; 30 p. [in Ukrainian]

Shchurat, V. (1908). *Ukrainski dzherela do istorii filosofii: ist.-filosof. Nacherk* [Ukrainian sources for the history of philosophy: historical and philosophical sketch]. Lviv: Nakladom Mykh. Petrytskoho. 32 p. [in Ukrainian]

Shchurat, V. (1916). Kyrylytsia i hrazhdanka, yikh pokhodzhenie i natsionalnyi kharakter [The Cyrillic alphabet and hrazhdanka, their origin and national character]. *Dilo, Lviv. 24, 26, 29, 30 veresnia*. [in Ukrainian]

Simovych, V. (2005). *Movoznavstvo. Pratsi u 2 t. T. 1* [Linguistics. Works in 2 volumes. Vol. 1]. Chernivtsi: Knyhy XXI. 510 p. [in Ukrainian]

Siropolko, S. (2001). *Istoriia osvity v Ukraini* [History of education in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 912 p. [in Ukrainian]

Vozniak, M. (1925). Avtorstvo azbuchnoi statti z 1834 r. [Authorship of an alphabet article from 1834]. *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka. Pratsi Filologichnoi sesii. Lviv, CXXXVI–CXXXVI*, 107–118. [in Ukrainian]

Vozniak, M. (1929). Apolohiia kyrylytsi Denysa Zubrytskoho. [Dodatok] Apologia Cyryliki czyli azbuki ruskiej [Apology of the Cyrillic alphabet by Denys Zubrytskyi]. *Yuvileinyi zbirnyk Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka, SL*, 121–141. [in Ukrainian]

Wacław z Oleska. (1833). *Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego* [Polish and Ruthenian songs of the Halychyna people]. Lwów, XLXII p. [in Polish]

*The article was received on May 22, 2019.
Article recommended for publishing 06/11/2019.*