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Przemyśl as a center of Ukrainian language-building (1815–1918)

For many centuries, the city of Przemyśl has been a multicultural and multilingual place, where Poles and Ukrainians (“Ruthenians”)\(^1\) have lived together with other nationalities, first and foremost, with Jews and Germans. According to the Encyclopedia of Ukraine, the population of Przemyśl developed between 1830 and 1910 in the following way: in 1830, out of 7,538 inhabitants, 1,508 were Greek Catholics (and thus, as a rule, Ukrainians) —“a significantly larger number than in most other centers in Galicia”\(^2\) — and, in fact, a significantly larger number than in most other city centers of the entire Ukrainian language area.\(^3\) The percentage of Greek Catholic city dwellers remained stable in the following decades, while the population kept increasing: 1880 — 22,000 (43.6 percent Roman Catholics, 34.5 percent Jews, 21.4 percent Greek Catholics); 1900 — 46,300 (46.0 percent Roman Catholics, 30.6 percent Jews, 22.5 percent Greek Catholics); 1910 — 54,700 (46.7 percent Roman Catholics, 29.5 percent Jews, and 22.5 percent Greek Catholics).\(^4\)

During the first decades of the 19th century, the Ukrainian nation- and language-building process significantly lagged behind the Polish one. As far as lan-

\(^1\) П. Ісаїв, В. Кубійович, *Перемишль*, [in:] *Енциклопедія українознавства. Перевидання в Україні*, vol. 6, Львів 1996, pp. 2005–2010. Here: р. 2007. In this essay, I use the terms “Ukrainian” and “Ruthenian” as synonyms, despite the fact that “Ruthenian” could have a broader meaning (including Belarusians) and the name “Ukrainian” came into being in Galicia only during the last third of the 19th century.


\(^4\) П. Ісаїв, В. Кубійович, *Перемишль....*
guage-building is concerned, the general norms of the Polish written language had already been largely established prior to the age of nationalism, namely during the second half of the 16th century. In terms of corpus planning, the issues of the standardization of Modern Polish concerned details such as the spelling of “narrowed vowels” etc. The major challenge was the dissemination of the standard language among the majority of the Polish-speaking population and a new, modernized way of standardization which served that purpose. Onufry Kopczyński’s Grammar for National Schools, 1778–1781 and Samuel Bogumił Linde’s outstanding Słownik języka polskiego (Dictionary of the Polish Language, 1807–1814), inter alia, were genuine milestones in that respect.

As far as Ukrainian was concerned, the situation was quite different. The rich traditions of the early modern “Ruthenian” (i.e., Ukrainian and Belarusian) written language had considerably declined since the second half of the 17th century. In the course of the 19th century, it ultimately turned out that Modern Standard Ukrainian was to be codified on a new foundation. The early modern written language was too distant from the genuine vernacular varieties — and it was too obviously oriented toward Polish. Nonetheless, initially, some intellectuals in Galicia, as opposed to their brethren in the Russian Empire, occasionally attempted to build upon those early modern traditions in some genres well into the second half of the 19th century.

After the Hapsburg Crown land of “Galicia and Lodomeria” was created in 1772, the representatives of the Ukrainian elites usually continued to use Polish as their predominant language of high culture; under certain conditions, Latin and then, increasingly, German fulfilled that role. Ukrainian was first and foremost used as a peasant language that was spoken on a dialectal basis in villages and smaller towns; moreover, it was undoubtedly used to a certain extent in the market places and streets of cities like Przemyśl or Lviv, primarily among peasants who visited the cities (some of them undoubtedly spoke mixed Ukrainian-Polish idioms, about which very little is known). Generally, however, Ukrainians who moved to the cities tended to adopt Polish as their everyday language. The Ukrainian nobility had adopted a Polish identity since the second half of the 16th century. Moreover, at least until the mid-19th century, there was virtually no Ukrainian — and Ukrainian-speaking — bourgeoisie, as frequently bemoaned by contemporary national activists. A Polish saying of those times had it that the “Ruthenian” nation was made up of “chłop i pop,” i.e., of “peasant(s) and priest(s).” Furthermore, many Poles tended to believe that the “Ruthenians” (“Rusini”) merely constitut-

---

5 Z. Klemensiewicz, Historia języka polskiego, Warszawa 1985. See above all the 3rd volume (pp. 495–797).
6 M. Moser, Причини до історії української мови, Вінниця 2011, pp. 75–111.
7 Ibidem.
8 See ibidem, pp. 303–666.
9 В. Гнатюк, Національне відродження австро-угорських українців (1772–1880 рр.), Відень 1916, р. 3.
ed a community within the Polish nation that shared certain distinctive features such as peculiar dialects and, first and foremost, a different faith. The traditional markers of the Ruthenian identity were under threat. At the turn of the 19th century, even some priests did not know the Cyrillic alphabet, and only a few well-educated clerics had a good command of the liturgical language, i.e., Church Slavonic. The vast majority of Ruthenians were illiterate.

After the Napoleonic wars, however, the age of enlightenment and the age of nationalism eventually reached Galicia’s Ruthenians. In the so-called “Vormärz” period, Przemyśl, or, more precisely, the Greek Catholic episcopal see of Przemyśl quickly developed into one of the most important centers of Ukrainian nation- and language-building. Initially, this happened primarily thanks to the leading clerics who struggled for the establishment of their language as a language of instruction in the elementary schools of Galicia, arguing that “Ruthenian” was a separate language in its own right and emphasizing that Greek Catholic bishops should be allowed to issue pastoral letters in “Ruthenian” or (Ruthenian) Church Slavonic, not only in Latin, Polish, or — later — German.

Of outstanding importance in that regard was Ivan Mohyl’nyč’kyj (born 19 August 1778, Ulucz, Brzozów district — 24 June 1831, Przemyśl), who served as a director of Przemyśl’s Greek Catholic cathedral chapter. Mohyl’nyč’kyj graduated from Przemyśl’s gymnasium in 1795 and subsequently studied theology at the University of Lviv. In the following years, he served as a priest and church administrator in various places of the Przemyśl eparchy. As the director of Przemyśl’s eparchial administration and a school inspector, Mohyl’nyč’kyj successfully contributed to the development of Greek Catholic parochial schools; he also established a Przemyśl-based Ruthenian learned society (1816) and a school for Greek Catholic church singers and teachers (1817). Apart from that, Mohyl’nyč’kyj was a genuine pioneer in the instruction and study of the Ukrainian language. In 1815, [10]

---


12 I.e., the period between the Napoleonic wars and the Revolution of March 1848.


14 All place names and administrative units are indicated in the current official forms. It deserves to be mentioned that virtually all persons mentioned in this essay were born and raised in villages.

15 For a short biography see Лірвак з-над Сяну.Перемиські друки середини ХІХ століття, organised: В. Пилипович, Перемышль 2001.
he published a Catechism, whose language was still largely based on early modern Ruthenian models.¹⁶ In 1816, a primer followed; initially, it was written in a quite curious mixture of Ruthenian Church Slavonic and vernacular elements, with a strong admixture of Polonisms. It should be emphasized that the language of both works, particularly that of the primer, was significantly amended in their frequent re-editions. Mohyl’nyč’kyj himself thoroughly edited the language of the second edition of his primer which appeared in 1819.¹⁷ Besides, despite the fact that only about ten per cent of the children of Galicia actually attended schools during the entire “Vormärz” period¹⁸, it should be kept in mind that Mohyl’nyč’kyj’s primers as well as the later primers that often oriented toward Mohyl’nyč’kyj’s model were beyond doubt much more widely read than many other (of the quite rare) Ruthenian-language books that were printed between 1772 and 1848. Moreover, particularly those texts of the primers that were devoted to the Galician peasants’ everyday life gave clear proof of the fact that Galician Ukrainian vernacular varieties could successfully be used in writing, and that the idea of a vernacular-based standardization of “Ruthenian” was realistic.¹⁹

As early as 1818, the Austrian imperial administration knighted Mohyl’nyč’kyj for his significant achievements regarding the development of schools (he was raised to the rank of “Ritter” »knight«).²⁰ During his lifetime, Mohyl’nyč’kyj significantly helped to enact Maria Theresia’s introduction of compulsory schooling of 1774 (which entered into force in Galicia three years later). He achieved even much more, because he was also ready to protest against imperial instructions if necessary. In the early 1820s, when the Hapsburg administration attempted to restrict the use of Ruthenian and Church Slavonic in public documents of the Greek Catholic church, Mohyl’nyč’kyj reacted with a letter explaining that Ruthenian was a separate language with its own dignity and that Greek Catholic hierarchs were entitled to use Church Slavonic in their pastoral letters. Subsequently, Mohyl’nyč’kyj developed these ideas in a remarkable treatise entitled Vidomist’ o ruskom iazyce (Information about the Ruthenian Language). The treatise was most likely destined to serve as an introduction to grammar that was authored by Mohyl’nyč’kyj as well. While the grammar itself remained unpublished until the eve of the First World War, the Vidomist’ was published in Polish, Russian, and German translations (from the 1820s) and thus exerted a considerable impact on

¹⁶ М. Мозер, Причинки…, pp. 384–388.
¹⁷ Ibidem, pp. 389–419.
¹⁹ М. Мозер, Причинки…, pp. 389–419.
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international intellectual debates of the first half of the 19th century. In this treatise, Mohyl’nyckyj argued in a scholarly manner that Ruthenian (which, in his view, covered Ukrainian and Belarusian) was a separate language and not a dialect of either Polish or Russian and that it was not identical with Church Slavonic either. Moreover, Mohyl’nyckyj gave proof of the rich literary traditions of the Ruthenian language and thus laid a solid foundation for further work in the field of Ukrainian language- and nation-building.

While Przemyśl’s Greek Catholic Bishop Myxajlo Levycz’kyj (16 August 1774, Pistyn, near Ivano-Frankivs’k — 14 January 1858, Lviv, appointed Bishop of the Eparchy of Przemyśl in 1813, ordained the Metropolitan of Lviv in 1816, Bishop of Przemyśl from 1813, Metropolitan Archbishop in Lviv from 1816) had a somewhat ambiguous attitude toward the Ukrainian language on a vernacular basis, his successor Ivan Snihurs’kyj (18 May 1784, Berestjany, Lviv Oblast — 24 August 1847, Przemyśl) wholeheartedly supported all efforts to develop Przemyśl into a genuine center of Ukrainian language-building. During the years of his bishopric (1818–1847), a whole group of intellectuals gathered in Przemyśl’s Greek Catholic episcopal see, which ran a printshop of its own and which, incidentally, developed into a leading center of Ukrainian church music.21 Furthermore, it is important to note that Snihurs’kyj himself strongly supported the efforts at nation- and language-building in his see; he underlined the social prestige of Ukrainian in that he occasionally used a Ruthenian vernacular-based written language in his pastoral letters.22 As far as the development of the Ukrainian language is concerned, Mohyl’nyckyj’s most important contemporaries and successors were: Ivan Lavrivskyj (15 May 1773, Terka, a village on the border of the Lemko and the Boiko region — 25 July 1846, Przemyśl), Josyf Levycz’kyj (24 May 1801, Baranivci, Lviv Oblast — 24 May 1860, Drohobyč) and Josyf Lozyns’kyj (20 December 1807, Hurko, Przemyśl area — 11 July 1889, Javoriv, Lviv Oblast).

Ivan Lavrivskyj graduated from Przemyśl’s gymnasium and then moved to Lviv where he, having finished his studies, became a supervisor of Lviv’s Greek Catholic Seminar and a professor of the University of Lviv. In 1820, Lavrivskyj returned to Przemyśl, where he played a major role in the organization of the episcopal chapter, serving, inter alia, as the director of the Greek Catholic print shop and the director of the school for Greek Catholic church singers and teachers.23 In 1837, he adopted and translated into Ruthenian a methodological guide

---

22 М. Мозер, Причинки…, pp. 483–493.
for teachers of parochial schools, which remained in manuscript until 1909. In 1838, he published a remarkable re-edition of Mohyl’nyč’kyj’s primer, bringing the language much closer to the vernacular. Inspired by Samuel Bogusław Linde and building on it, he also finished large parts of a voluminous Ruthenian-Polish-German dictionary, which have not been published to date either.

Josyf Levyc’kyj and Josyf Lozyns’kyj published new grammars of the Ruthenian language. Josyf Levyc’kyj’s German-written grammar of 1834 was far from ideal in that it codified a plethora of bookish forms that were not characteristic of the vernacular. Nonetheless, this grammar deserves full attention, because it was, in fact, the first printed grammar that was intended to standardize one of the versions of modern Ukrainian. Josyf Lozyns’kyj’s Polish-written grammar, whose history extended to the 1830s as well, was undoubtedly of higher quality. However, after it appeared in 1846, it was soon outdated. In 1849, after Jakiv Holovac’kyj was appointed a professor of the Ruthenian language and literature at the University of Lviv, his grammar of 1849 enjoyed considerably stronger institutional support.

As expected, all of the above-mentioned grammars clearly reflected the understandable fact that up to the 1860s, Ukrainian language-building in Galicia was generally oriented toward Galician norms and paid little attention to the language of Ukrainian literary works from Russian-ruled Ukraine. At the same time, it should be emphasized that the terminological discrepancies notwithstanding, virtually all Galician intellectuals of that period were perfectly aware of the fact that the “Ruthenian” language of the Hapsburg Empire and the “Little Russian” language of the Russian Empire constituted one single “Ruthenian or Little Russian” language (as they often labeled it), and that the “Ruthenians” of the Hapsburg
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24 Методика чи не успоблен’е до замътъноносното справованя оурияду учителскъ для оуичители и помощниковъ о. г. къ въ школахъ тръпъалянъ и паразфалъны оотъ Іоанна Лавровского, Архъд′якона к. II. зъ нъмецкого оуложено и до ооличностии оекъ рускыхъ застосовано. Въ Перемышли, въ друкарни Сиійской [1837], [ин:] Матеріали до історії галицько-руського шкільнництва XVIII і XIX вв. Збірки І. Свєнціцького, Ю. Кмівта, С. Томашівського й І. Кревецького, ед. С. Томашівський, Львів 1909, pp. 111–150.


27 For all grammars mentioned in this essay see М. Возняк, Галицькі граматики української мови першої половини XIX ст., Львів 1911.

28 Oleksa Pavlovs’kyj’s grammar of 1818 was of course closer to Modern Standard Ukrainian because it described southeastern dialects and was not intended to serve as a model of standardization; in fact, it was just a brochure that merely offered a quite modest sample of paradigms and forms that differed from Russian, as well as a rather small Ukrainian-Russian glossary.

29 J. Loziński, Grammatyka języka ruskiego (mało-ruskiego), Przemyśl 1846.
Empire and the “Little Russians” of the Russian Empire constituted one single nation.30

Josyf Levyc’kyj and Josyf Lozyns’kyj also took an active part in the lively debates about the Galician Ukrainian national and linguistic identity that evolved in the Central European press of the 1830s and 1840s. Josyf Lozyns’kyj played a crucial role in the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia31 in that in 1835 he published the folkloristic study Ruskoje wesile. The fact that he printed this text in the Latin alphabet evoked the so-called “First Alphabet War” which was in fact a very peaceful intellectual discussion that ultimately strengthened not only the position of the Cyrillic alphabet, but also the Ruthenians’ awareness of their linguistic identity in general.32 After 1848, when Russophile ideas spread increasingly among those Galician Ukrainian intellectuals who had lost their faith in the future of the Ukrainian nation and language, Lozyns’kyj frequently called for the need to develop a standard language on a vernacular basis instead of orienting toward or simply adopting Russian.33 Levyc’kyj contributed significantly to the “visibility” of Ruthenian as a language of dignity inasmuch as he, since the second half of the 1830s, published several translations of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s and Friedrich von Schiller’s ballads.34 Also, Levyc’kyj was among the first who used a vernacular-based written language in panegyrical poems devoted to Greek Catholic bishops and metropolitans and thus introduced Ruthenian into high-style religious literature that had up to then been taboo for Ukrainian vernacular varieties in both the Austrian and Russian Empires.35 Finally, Levyc’kyj is an interesting symbol of the link between Ukrainian national activists of the older and younger generations, as he was the priest who baptized the outstanding Ukrainian intellectual Ivan Franko in the village of Nahujevyči (near Drohobyč) in 1856. Moreover, as Franko tells us in his autobiography, the Ukrainophone books that Levyc’kyj left with the peasants of Franko’s home village were among Franko’s first readings.36

During the years 1848 and 1860, when Hryrorij Jaxymovyč (16 February 1792, Pidbirci, Lviv Oblast — 29 April 1863, Lviv) was Przemyśl’s Greek Cath-

32 M. Moser, Причинки…, pp. 303–331.
33 Much attention is paid to J. Lozyns’kyi, [in:] M. Lysyk, Stanovlenni i rozvitok ukrain’koj movu v Halychin’i, Ivano-Frankivs’k 2014.
olic Bishop, the significance of Przemyśl’s see as a center of Ukrainian nation- and language-building decreased, although initially Jaxymovyc’ himself undoubtedly played an eminent role, inasmuch as he took a leading part in the organization of the “Supreme Ruthenian Council”, the first political organization of Galician Ukrainians, and in the first official “Council of Ruthenian Scholars”, which primarily discussed current issues of Ukrainian nation- and language-building. Both events took place in Lviv, which, after the Revolution of 1848, clearly surpassed Przemyśl in all respects. In the following years, Jaxymovyc’ and — even more so — his successor, Toma Poljans’kyj (15 October 1796, Bartne, Gorlice area — 11 November or 30 October 1869, Przemyśl, Bishop from 1860 to 1867) witnessed the growing significance of the secular Ukrainian national movement, while the role of clerical centers and clerical intellectual kept diminishing (most secular activists of that period, however, still originated from clerical families). Poljans’kyj himself was a good symbol of the transition: In the 1840s, he had participated in issuing Ivan Snihurs’kyj’s Ruthenian-language pastoral letters; during the Revolution of 1848–49, he took an active part in organizing Przemyśl’s “Ruthenian Council,” which was primarily dealing with secular national politics; moreover, he helped to organize the first Ukrainian-language theater plays in Przemyśl, collaborating with colleagues from the episcopal see and the local lawyers Ivan Ajtalevych Vitošynskyj and Myxajlo Poljans’kyj.

In the 1860s, precisely the building where those theater plays had been staged (“Dim pid provydinniam”, “The House under Providence”) became the center of the Przemyśl branch of the learned society “Rus’ka besida”, where Anatol’ Vaxnjany (19 September 1841, Sieniawa — 11 February 1908, Lviv), a former student of theology who originated from the Przemyśl region and who worked as a secondary school teacher of the Ukrainian language in Przemyśl for some period of time, organized the first Shevchenko concert in the Austrian Empire (19 March 1865). Vaxnjany was one of the genuine pioneers of the new generation of national activists (“populists”) who, since the early 1860s, insisted that Galician Ruthenians or, as they increasingly labeled themselves, Ukrainians, should orient their language to vernacular varieties and generally accept as a model the Ukrainian language that was used in literary works of “Greater Ukraine”, particularly in
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37 Jaxymovyc’ continued distribution of pastoral letters in a language that was at least partially close to the vernacular (see M. Moser, Причини..., pp. 474–505).
38 The population of this village fell victim to the forced population exchange between Poland and the Soviet Union after WWII and the “Аkcja Wisła”.
39 See the introduction to Готель “Під Провидінням”: репертуар українського театру в Перемишлі 1848–1849 pp., organised: В. Пилипович, Перемишль 2004.
40 The population of this town fell victim to the forced population exchange between Poland and the Soviet Union after WWII and the “Аkcja Wisła”.
Taras Ševčenko’s poems. Vaxnjanyn, who spent most of his adult years in Lviv and Vienna and not in Przemyśl, took a leading part in the development of the early populist Ukrainophone press and the arrangement of new, populist textbooks for Ukrainian-language teaching. Vaxnjanyn was also elected the first president of the populists’ most important learned society “Prosvita” (“Enlightenment”) (1868–1870). As a student of philosophy at the University of Vienna, Vaxnjanyn established the first organization of Ukrainian students in the imperial capital “Sič” (“Cossack Camp”), which exerted a considerable impact on Ukrainian intellectual milieus in general, as well as on the imperial attitudes toward Austria’s “Ruthenians” (Ukrainians). In the 1890s, Vaxnjanyn was a leading promoter of the so-called “New Era” movement, which introduced a rapprochement between Ukrainians and Poles and ultimately led to the groundbreaking achievements of the Ukrainian national movement (first and foremost, the introduction of the so-called “phonetic” alphabet, in fact the so-called “Želexivka” (see below) in Ukrainian classes of Galicia and Bukovyna in the academic year 1894/5). Anatol’ Vaxnjanyn did write some literary works, too, but apart from the sphere of politics and cultural management, it is his role in the history of Ukrainian music that deserves particular attention. From the late 1860s, Vaxnjanyn established several musical associations; in 1903, he founded the renowned Lysenko Higher Institute of Music in Lviv. His compositions include Kupalo, the first Ukrainian opera in Galicia (with his own libretto, 1870–92).

Przemyśl’s secondary schools traditionally played an important role in the biographies of many individuals who contributed to the development of the Ukrainian language. This was true even before 1888, when the second Ukrainophone gymnasium in the world (after Lviv’s Academic gymnasium) was established in Przemyśl.

Jevhen Želexivs’kyj (24 December 1844, Xyševyči, Lviv Oblast — 18 November 1885, Stanislav »Stanisławów, today Ivano-Frankivs´k«) was one of the people who graduated from Przemyśl’s secondary school and even — for a short period of time — served as one of its teachers (or, more precisely, as an assistant teacher before he left for Stanislav). During his brief lifetime, Želexivs’kyj created...

---

43 Ibidem.
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one of the best dictionaries in the history of Ukrainian lexicography (Little-Russian–German Dictionary, 2 vol., published posthumously in 1886), which greatly contributed to the consolidation of those principles of Ukrainian orthography (the so-called “Желехівка”) that were introduced in Ukrainophone schools in 1893/4 (see above) and remained valid in Galicia and Bukovyna until the end of the First World War.47

Another prominent teacher of Przemyśl’s Ukrainian gymnasium who contributed to the development of the Ukrainian language was Vasyl´ Ščurat (24 August 1871, Vysloboky, Lviv Oblast — 27 April 1948, Lviv). After studying in Lviv and Vienna, where Ščurat finished his doctoral studies with the renowned scholar Vatroslav Jagić, Ščurat became one of the leading western Ukrainian intellectuals of the first half of the 20th century, who worked as a philologist (with a focus on literary studies), a poet, a translator, and, not least, a leading organizer of Ukrainian scholarship. Ščurat was a real member of the National Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society and one of its most important directors (1915–1923). During the years of national oppression that followed the years after the First World War, he helped to organize the Lviv (Underground) Ukrainian University and served as its rector (1921–1923). Ščurat soon reacted to Soviet anti-Ukrainian terror, renouncing his membership in the Soviet “All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences” in 1930. He survived the Second World War and died in Lviv in 1948. Between 1898 and 1934, Ščurat worked as a teacher in the secondary schools of Przemyśl, Brody, and Lviv.48 Also, it should be noted here that Ščurat has a special place in Przemyśl’s intellectual history because he coined the expression “Vienna-Przemyśl circle,” referring to Przemyśl’s Ukrainian intellectuals of the first half of the 19th century.49

This brief outline of Przemyśl as a center of Ukrainian language-building during the “long 19th century” would certainly not be complete without mentioning one of the most renowned alumni of Przemyśl’s Ukrainian gymnasium, Ivan Zilyns´kyj (22 May 1879, Krasna »Korostenka« near Krosno — 21 April 1952, Prague). Zilyns´kyj, who finished his doctoral studies at the University of Vienna, became one of the pioneers of Ukrainian dialectology at an early stage of his career. Zilyns´kyj “lectured at the Lviv (Underground) Ukrainian University (1921–25) and Cracow University (1926–39), where he became a professor of Slavic philology at Prague University.”50 Zilyns´kyj’s

47 Г. Півторак, Желехівка, [in:] Українська мова: енциклопедія, ed. В. М. Русанівський et al., Київ 2013.
49 О. Маковей, З істориї нашої філології. Три галицькі граматики (Іван Могильницький, Йосиф Левицький і Йосиф Лозинський), Львів 1903, p. 56.
studies on western Ukrainian dialects and general Ukrainian linguistics (first and foremost, phonetics) have not lost their outstanding scholarly value, nor have the materials that he collected for a linguistic atlas of Galicia (most of which were published posthumously). In 1938, Zilyns’kyj published an autobiographical book devoted to his school years in Przemyśl’s gymnasium.

Even during the interwar period, Przemyśl did not cease to be a center of the development of the Ukrainian language, thanks to such philologists as Kostiantyn Čexovyč (21 April 1896, Chyrzynka — 6 February 1987 Tczew, Poland; Čexovyč graduated from Przemyśl’s gymnasium) or Jevhen Hrycak (7 January 1890, Pyratyn, Lviv Oblast — after 22 October 1945, Slovakia; Hrycak worked as a teacher in Przemyśl’s gymnasium in 1922–1939). After the long silence that followed the most painful chapters of Ukrainian-Polish relations, the traditions of the documentation and study of Przemyśl’s Ukrainian and Ukrainophone heritage were revived after 1989, primarily thanks to the South-Eastern Research Institute (established 2 February 1990 by Stanislaw Stępień, born 6 June 1952 in Klimontów Sandomierski), the East European State Higher School in Przemyśl (established in 2000), and thanks to individual activists such as, first and foremost, Włodzimierz Pilipowicz (Volodymyr Pylypovyč, born 17 December 1950 in Zabrost Wielki in the Olsztyn area, to a family that was deported from Ruda Żurawiecka), whose numerous precious publications convincingly remind us of the fact that Przemyśl’s Ukrainian heritage is an indispensable part of its cultural richness.
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Перемишль як центр розбудови української мови (1815–1918 pp.)

Резюме

Одразу після наполеонівських воєн Перемишль із своїм багатонаціональним населенням став одним із найважливіших центрів розбудови української мови. У Перемишлі діяв Іван Могильницький, числення для історії української мови досі недооцінене. У Перемишлі грекокатолицький єпископ Іван Снігурський активно сприяв розвиткові інтелектуальних кіл, які ще до революції 1848–1849 рр. досягнули чимало для розбудови української культури й мови (Іван Лаврівський, Йосиф Левицький, Йосиф Лозинський). Після революції 1848–1849 рр. значення Перемишля для розбудови української мови дещо впало, проте й надалі деякі провідні постать серед світських діячів були тісно пов’язані з Перемишлем, зокрема з його гімназією (Анатолій Вахнянин, Євген Желецький, Василь Щурат, Іван Зілинський).

Ключові слова: історія української мови, стандартизація, центри стандартизації, Перемишль, руська мова

Przemyśl jako centrum rozwoju języka ukraińskiego (1815–1918)

Streszczenie


Słowa kluczowe: historia języka ukraińskiego, standaryzacja, centrum standaryzacji, Przemyśl, język ruski