SUMMARY

The article focuses on the means of verbalization of the axiological opposition of humility and pride in the printed and handwritten Ukrainian Didactic Gospels of the 17th century, written in the Old Ukrainian language. Despite the ambiguous perception of humility and pride in modern society, the homiletic texts of early modern Ukraine testify to their unequivocal evaluation in the light of the New Testament ethical paradigm. The “lexicon of humility and pride” of the modern Ukrainian language dates back to religious texts of early modern Ukraine, which convey humility and pride by both Church Slavonic words and the words of “prosta mova” (simple speech), as well as their derivatives and semantic equivalents. In the old Ukrainian sermons for the Sunday of the Pharisee and the Publican, humility and pride are expressed by the cognitive metaphor of spatial orientation (up and down). In the Didactic Gospels, the axiological evaluation of humility and pride is shaped by means of evaluative adjectives, synonymous and compositional repetitions, antithetical and comparative constructions, predicates with the semantics of necessity, purpose, and command.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojami nuolankumo ir išdidumo aksiologinės opozicijos verbalizavimo būdai XVII a. spausdintose ir rankraštinėse didaktinėse evangelijose, parašytose senaja ukrainiečių kalba. Šiuolaikinėje visuomenėje nuolankumo ir išdidumo suvokimas vėliau išsiskyla jutykį nevienareikšmiškas, vis dėlto ankstyvųjų laikų Ukrainos homiletikos tekstai liudija, kad pagal Naujojo Testamento etinę paradigmą jie buvo vertinami viena reikšmiškai. Šiuolaikinės ukrainiečių kalbos nuolankumo ir išdidumo reikšmes perteikiant leksika kilusi iš ankstyvųjų laikų Ukrainos religinių tekstų, kurie apima ir bažnytinės slavų, ir „prosta mova“ (paprastos
INTRODUCTION

The values comprising the axiosphere of a culture are subject to many transformations throughout history both in terms of their content and hierarchical connections. These values lie at the core of worldview orientation, while also shaping the social ideals and social behavior of the carriers of this culture (Lebedko 2003: 179–180, 199–200). The spiritual culture of early modern Ukraine was dominated by Christian values, as attested by copious evidence from the language, culture, philosophy and history of the 16th and 17th centuries (Ohijenko 1970: 30–57). Research of the Ukrainian language use in the explanation of ethical values in written monuments of this period will contribute to a better understanding of the historical and cultural processes of Eastern Europe and will help us better respond to the socio-humanitarian challenges of today.

Shifts in worldview paradigms and socio-cultural processes lead to changing values and transformation of their expression in language and culture. In modern society, some Christian ethical values are not accepted as unequivocally as they used to be in the past. The ethos of modern democratic society is shaped by virtues other than the traditional virtues of Christian ethics, the established lists of which date back to late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

According to modern philosophical and sociological research, humility is no longer perceived as one of the main ethical values by people of the 21st century (Dobko 2013: 53; Button 2005: 840; Kellenberger 2010: 321; Hare 1996: 235; Richards 1988: 253–254; Levko 2017: 22–26), but it is still considered a value in religious discourse and spiritual culture.

In the Christian ethics, humility is defined as one of the seven main virtues in opposition to the mortal sin of pride. Notions of the axiological opposition of humility and pride were formed under the influence of the New Testament ethics and the Christian ascetic tradition. As a result of the Christianization of Europe and the ensuing spread of education and literacy, these ideas were adopted by the national cultures of European nations. The appearance of religious texts in the Old Ukrainian language in the 16th and 17th centuries played an important role in shaping the value opposition of humility and pride in the Ukrainian language and culture.

Every value exists in binary opposition with an anti-value, thus reflecting the binary nature of human thinking. In particular, ethical values are counterposed to virtues and vices, or positive and negative characteristics of the inner world, such as good – evil, light – darkness, righteousness – sin, humility – pride, chasti-
ty – debauchery, anger – mildness, and so on. The linguistic representation of each value should be considered within the binary opposition with its anti-value, because along with its own definition, each value can be perceived as a denial of the anti-value in a bipolar semantic opposition. For example, humility is often treated as “negation of arrogance, vanity, pretentiousness and invidious pride” (Roberts, Wood 2020: 363).

This article is a continuation of our study of Christian values in the Ukrainian spiritual culture and their presentation in the modern Ukrainian language, as well as in Ukrainian Bible translations, fiction and media discourse (Levko 2018a, 2018b, 2018c). The purpose of this article is to explore the principles of explication of ethical values in the religious written monuments of Ukraine in the 17th century with the focus on the axiological opposition of humility and pride.

The material of our research comprises the Didactic Gospels of the 17th century, written in the Old Ukrainian language (“prosta mova”), in particular the printed editions “Didactic Gospel” by Meletij Smotrytsky (DG 1616), “Didactic Gospel” by Kyrylo Stavrovetsky-Tranquillon (DG 1619), “Didactic Gospel” by Petro Mohyla (DG 1637) and the handwritten “Reshetyliv Didactic Gospel” by Simeon Tymofievych (DG 1670). The choice of the Didactic Gospels as research material is explained by the proximity of their context to the New Testament and, accordingly, by the representation of Christian values in them. The Didactic Gospels contain homiletic sermons on Gospel readings for every Sunday and major Church holidays. The genre of the Didactic Gospel has its origins in the Old Slavonic collection of sermons of the 9th century entitled “The Didactic Gospel”, which was compiled by Constantine of Preslav and contains translations of passages from the sermons of the Greek Church Fathers (for the characteristics of the East and South Slavic manuscripts of this written monument, see Krivko 2016). The prefaces to DG 1616 and DG 1637 state that they are based on a collection of sermons by Patriarch Callistus of Constantinople, although the question of the authorship of this monument remains open in the scientific community (Chuba 2006: 5). All Didactic Gospels of the 17th century display a fairly loose translation from the Greek original, with their authors often borrowing material from other works and adding their own reflections. Language features and structure of the 17th century Didactic Gospels have been studied by David Frick (1988), Marcello Garzaniti (1999), Halyna Chuba (2007, 2011, 2015), Lubov Oliynyk (2016), Larysa Dovga and Roman Kyselov (2018).

The predominant view in modern philosophical research is that “the essence of humility as understood within Christianity is a low self-estimate” (Dunnington 2019: 19). Humility in Christian ethics is defined as “a low opinion of
oneself” (Richards 1988: 253), “a certain kind of (low) self-assessment” (Statman 1992: 432), “low self-regard” (Care 1996: 235), “not overestimating one’s worth or accomplishments” (Flanagan 1990: 426). This view is based on the New Testament understanding of this virtue. In the Epistle to the Philippians, the main characteristic of “humility of mind” (ταπεινοφροσύνη) is ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας έαντῶν “estimate others better than himself” (Phil. 2:3). On the other hand, the interpretation of humility as ‘obedience to God’ follows from the theological perspective of low self-esteem as “appropriate because of the asymmetry between divinity and humanity, our smallness in comparison to God’s greatness” (Dunnington 2019: 19). Apart from the actual definition of humility as an ethical value, it can be fully characterized only in opposition to pride: “To have perfect virtuous humility is to lack the concern characteristic of the vices of pride” (Roberts, Wood 2020: 363).

The virtue of humility in the Greek language of the New Testament is denoted with the words ταπεινοφροσύνη and ταπεινώσις, derived from ταπεινός and ταπεινών. The word ταπεινοφροσύνη denotes “social virtue” in New Testament ethics (Dickson, Rosner 2004: 459–460) and means ‘humility of mind’, ‘humility before people’, ‘low opinion of oneself’. Instead, the word ταπεινώσις may denote both the virtue of ‘humility / submissiveness before God’ (see Luke 1:48) and the reference to ‘humble’, ‘abasement’ (see Acts 8:33, Phil. 3:21, James 1:10). The corresponding words ταπεινός and ταπεινών, as well as ταπεινώσις, are also used with positive and negative meanings, in the former case denoting virtue, and in the latter case indicating the humiliation of a person, their disadvantaged position, contempt and violence towards them (Levko 2018a: 285–288).

In Church Slavonic and Old Ukrainian monuments of the 16th century – namely, in the Apostle by Francisk Skaryna (A 1525), the Peresopnytsia Gospel (PG), the Lviv Apostle (A 1574) and the Ostroh Bible (OB) – the New Testament “lexicon of humility” is conveyed by the words сміреномудріє / сміреномудрії ‘humility’, ‘humility of mind’, ‘humble attitude’, смірнє / смірнєї ‘humility’, смир(н)ий / смірень ‘humble’, ‘low’, ‘unarrogant’ and сміряті / смірятти ‘to make humble’, ‘to humble’. Some old Ukrainian monuments of the 16th century, particularly the Krekhiv Apostle, show the expansion of the “lexicon of humility” through the use of the words покора ‘humility’, ‘meekness’, ‘submiss’ and покорний ‘humble’, ‘meek’, ‘submissive’ as equivalents of the Church Slavonic сміреніє / смірнієї and смир(н)ий / смірень (Ohijenko 1930: 94–95). Lexicographical works of this period, such as Лєдіконъ славеноросскїй альбо Именъ плькованіе (A Slavonic-Ruthenian Lexicon, or An Explanation of Proper Names) by Pamvo Berynda and Синонимъ славеноросскаѧ (Slavonic-Ruthenian Synonyms), as well as the majority of the Didactic Gospels demonstrate consistent use of these words and their derivatives in the Old Ukrainian language of the 16th and 17th centuries (Nimchuk 1961: 117–118; Nimchuk 1964: 144).

Pride in the New Testament is denoted with the word υπερηφανία ‘pride’, ‘arro-
Linguistic Means of the Evaluation of Humility and Pride in the 17th Century Didactic Gospels

Sermons for the Sunday of the Pharisee and the Publican in the 17th-century Didactic Gospels clearly demonstrate the axiological opposition of humility and pride as virtue and vice, typically representing it by means of the cognitive metaphor of spatial orientation (up and down).

According to the frequency of the words denoting humility and pride, the selected Didactic Gospels can be divided into two groups: 1) those with the predominant use of Old Ukrainian words покора and пыха, as well as their derivatives and synonyms (DG 1616, DG 1637, DG 1670); 2) those with the predominant use of the Church Slavonic смирение and горд(ъ)денья, as well as their derivatives and synonyms (DG 1619). In particular, the “Didactic Gospel” byKyrylo Stavrovetsky-Tranquillon features a wide range of derivatives from смирений and горд(ъ)дный, e.g. смиренный, смирени, смиритися, горд(ъ)дный, горд(ъ)делый / гряделый, гордо, гор(ъ)денья / гряденья, гор(ъ)достъ, гордитися. Regarding the “pride lexicon”, it occasionally features the words пыха and надыматися, e.g. фарисей в пыху подънесъся – ‘the Pharisee has risen in arrogance’, всуе надымалъся гордненью – ‘has been puffed up with pride in vain’ (DG 1619). The “Reshetlyiv Didactic Gospel” is notable for its parallel use of the Church Slavonic and Old Ukrainian equivalents, i.e. glosses, or the use of two synonyms, i.e. пыха або горд(ъ)достъ – ‘arrogance, or pride’, покора: смирени: тоє(стъ) пониженье наба(р)бшъ самого себе – ‘meekness, or humility, that is hu-
miliation of oneself’, зухвалны(й) або высокомысльны(й) ‘impudent, or haughty’, пыха або надуто(сть) ‘arrogance, or self-inflation’ (DG 1670). Contrariwise, DG 1616 and DG 1637 totally avoid the use of сміренны(й) and гор(ъ)дый, as well as their derivatives and other Church Slavonic words, while consistently using покора and пыха and other Old Ukrainian synonyms.

In the sermons for the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee, the evaluation of humility and pride in their axiological opposition is represented by means of evaluative adjectives (лѣпший ‘better’, добрый ‘good’ – злый ‘evil’, шкодливый ‘harmful’), antonymous verbs (збирати ‘to gather – роспорошуати ‘to scatter’), comparative and antithetical constructions, e.g.: Як теды величе злає єсть реч высокомысльності и пыха, такъ ве-
лище добрых речи єсть покора ‘Meekness is as much a good thing as self-conceit and arrogance is a bad one’ (DG 1637); На(д) высокомысльності и пыхоу нѣчого шкодлившого не єсть, а на(д) хлюбу и порожную славу нѣчого заразлившого ‘There is nothing more harmful than self-conceit and arrogance, and there is nothing more contagious than arrogance and vanity’ (DG 1616); Неровно прето лѣпша єсть реч, кгды с(я) грѣшный обачаетъ, и до покоры приходитъ ‘It is much better when a sinner repents and comes to meekness’ (DG 1616); На(д) всѣ грѣхи и злости, бо(л)шѣй грѣхи и т¶ка злость єсть пыха ‘Above all other sins and evils, the biggest sin and the greatest evil is arrogance’ (DG 1616); Пыха до вшелъ въ пропасть дховного єсть перешкодою ‘Arrogance is an obstacle for any spiritual progress’ (DG 1637); хлюба и надутость ‘arrogance and self-inflation’ in DG 1670); Нѣсть бо злъйша єк(о) пыха ‘No greater evil than arrogance’ (DG 1619); Барзо велики(й) упадо(к) не ты(л)ко телесны(й), але и дйевны(й) пыха человъкъобъ приносить ‘The arrogance of men causes not only the physical harm but also the spiritual one’ (DG 1670); Високое о содъ розуме(н) є в шкоди(тъ) ‘Self-conceit is harmful’ (DG 1616); Штоко(к) въ пыхи ошищаетъ(в), а пыха всѣ цноти ве(гъ)дє ‘Meekness cleans all sins, while arrogance destroys all virtues’ (DG 1637).

The evaluation of humility and pride in the New Testament is also expressed by means of evaluative adjectives, e.g. πονηρός ‘bad’, ‘evil’, which is semantically equivalent to the Old Ukrainian злъй ‘evil’ and шкодливъ ‘harmful’: нѣв дè каувчає въ таїй зало(ї)її(ї) імъ, паса каувча(ї)її тову(тъ) пахъра єстин “But now you boast in your arrogance. All such boasting is evil” (James 4:16).

Predicate phrases associated with the words for humility in the Didactic Gospels either have a meliorative semantics or convey down-up movement, while predicates combined with the words for pride have the opposite meaning, including reduction, deprivation, and up-down movement: A покора въ Покуптъ и въ Спо-въдъ оусправедливстветъ, до збаве(н) приводитъ, и близкъ Бога становитъ ‘Meekness in repentance and confession makes one just, brings him to salvation and places him close to God’ (DG 1637); Пыха до пропасти зводи(тъ) члъка, а по-
The positive evaluation of humility and the respective negative evaluation of pride in Didactic Gospels are also represented by means of phrases with the modality of necessity or purpose. In particular, the function of predicates is performed by imperatives and verbs with the semantics of order, encouragement, necessity, etc.: “Абы тою приповѣстю всѣхъ насъ научилъ пыхою взгоржати, а в покорѣ кохатис’ ‘For him to teach us with this sermon to despise arrogance and to love meekness’ (DG 1637); ‘Роскохаймос в покорѣ, … зненави(д)мо пыху ‘Let us love meekness and hate arrogance’ (DG 1616).

Similar constructions, which convey the call for humility and renunciation of pride, are present in the Apostolic Epistles, thus revealing the imminence of this evaluation of virtue and vice in Christian ethics: “πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε “all of you be submissive to one another, and be clothed with humility” (1 Pet. 5:5); “μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντα ἑαυτῶν “Let nothing be done through selfish ambition or conceit, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than himself” (Phil. 2:3).

The evaluation of humility and pride in the sermons on the Publican and the Pharisee in each Didactic Gospel: “πας ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ύψωθήσεται ‘And whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted’ (Matt. 23:12; Luke 14:11, 18:14). Remarkably, in DG 1616, DG 1637 and DG 1670 ταπεινῶν in this quote is rendered not with the Church Slavonic смирати, as in DG 1619, but with the Old Ukrainian equiv-
Pharisee is constructed through the modeling of God’s actions towards the bearers of virtue or vice, with predicates conveying positive or negative connotations, respectively: Бога душеубийство тою заразою хоромуших опускаетъ, … потумыла(ть) высокомышливых людей хлобу ‘God humbles those sick with this soul-destroying illness … and brings down the arrogance of haughty people’ (DG 1616); Нечистъ есть пред(д) Господъ демь всакъ гордосердный ‘Everyone with an arrogant heart is filth in the eyes of God’ (DG 1637; высокосе(р)дный ‘one with a haughty heart’ in DG 1670); Мерзены(й) и брыдкы(й) есть пред Бого(м) вшел якы(й) зухвалны(й) человек(к), пышны(й) або надуты(й) ‘Every impudent, arrogant or self-inflated person is disgusting and loathsome for God’ (DG 1670).

This pattern of evaluation of humility and pride where God is positioned as the evaluator is common in the New Testament, e.g.: διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν ... καὶ ὕψωσεν ταπεινούς ‘He has scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts ... and exalted the lowly’ (Luke 1:51–52). In the sermon for the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee in DG 1616 and DG 1637 another biblical quote with similar modelling of God’s actions is rendered with the use of Church Slavonic смиренный and гордый instead of the Old Ukrainian покорный and пышний: Ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν – Гдь бо гордымъ противится, а смѣреннымъ даетъ блгдтомъ (James 4:6, 1 Pet. 5:5). Contrariwise, the loose rendering of this quote in DG 1670 features Old Ukrainian equivalents with Church Slavonic glosses: Пышному або го(р)дому чоловѣку Гдь Бо(г) зъпротивлює(тъ)сѧ, а смѣренному або покорному лас(с)ку свою не ты(л)ко дочасную, але и вѣчную освѣчає(тъ), показує(тъ) ‘God resists the proud, or arrogant, but gives grace to the meek, or the humble – grace which is not only temporary but eternal’. DG 1616 and DG 1637 contain accurate renditions of biblical quotes into Old Ukrainian (“prosta mova”) from the Ostroh Bible of 1581 (Dovga, Kiselov 2018: 106), while DG 1670 features their paraphrases, which are very close to DG 1616 and DG 1637.

Therefore, the sermons for the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee represent humility as an indisputable value in opposition to pride. The material analyzed above demonstrates the variability of linguistic means for the representation of humility and pride in the 17th century Didactic Gospels. It also testifies to the presence of both Church Slavonic and Old Ukrainian vocabulary in this genre and points to the intensive formation of Ukrainian ethical lexicon in this era.

CONCLUSIONS

Having analyzed the use of the “lexicon of humility and pride” in the Ukrainian written sources of the early modern period, we came to the conclusion that the 17th century Didactic Gospels feature a broad range of “prosta mova” vo-
vocabulary for humility and pride as one of the key axiological oppositions in Christian ethics.

In the sermons for the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee the frequency of the use of покора and пыха (as well as the Church Slavonic смирениѥ / смирениѥ и гордыѥѧ / гордость), with their derivatives and semantic equivalents included, is quite dissimilar. The “lexicon of pride” shows a much greater sophistication and variability of lexical items that are widely represented in the texts. The words for humility and pride in the Didactic Gospels show a clear semantic correlation with the New Testament “lexicon of humility and pride”. Furthermore, the linguistic constructions they use to express the axiological evaluation of these traits bear close resemblance to the Greek New Testament.

The axiological opposition of humility and pride is represented in the 17th century Didactic Gospels with the conceptual metaphor of spatial orientation (up and down), whereby humility and pride, first occupying the position of down and up respectively, are reversed in the eschatological and soteriological perspective. The axiological opposition of the virtue of humility and the vice of pride in the analyzed sermons is mostly verbalized by evaluative adjectives; verbs with a meliorative / pejorative meaning; comparative and antithetical constructions; predicates with the meaning of necessity, purpose, order, encouragement; synonymous and compositional repetitions of axiological statements.

Further research in this area could focus on the diachronic study of the formation of Ukrainian ethical values and the comparative study of the axiological paradigm in the Ukrainian language in the context of socio-humanitarian challenges of today.
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