In Memory of My Parents,
Ivan and Svitlana Danylenko

Contents

Acknowledgements viii
Abbreviations x
Introduction: Writing a Linguistic Biography of a Ukrainian Maverick xi

PART I THE BIBLE 1

CHAPTER 1 Exploring Psalmody 3
The Book of Psalms 3
Alexandrine Verse or Trochaic Foot? 6
Invoking Gavrila Deržavin 13
Church Slavonicisms 19
"Kulišisms" 21
Xarkiv Chimes In 27
The 1897 Poetic Crowning 32

CHAPTER 2 The Makings of the Rusian Bible 37
A *Pentatevx* Prolusion 37
Gearing Up for New Challenges 38
"Poison and Ruin for the Rusian People" 41
"The Labor Pangs of a Unified Ukrainian Literary Language" . . 43
Reception of the Translation 53
The Sloboda Bulwark 60
The Archangel *Havrylo* 65
Who Else Bears a Grudge? 90
The Creation of the New Biblical Style 95
Means of Archaization 96
Means of Vernacularization 102

CHAPTER 3 Galicia "Writes Back" 109
The West or the East? 109
Fostering the "Rusian Church Vernacular" 124
Any Palliative Solution? 131
Lost in Diacritics 139
To "Secularize" or "Synthesize"? 151

CHAPTER 4 Here Comes the Bible! 153
The Holy Writ Doesn't Burn 153
Tobit and Job 156

At the Crossroads of Poetry and Prose 172
Ivan Nečuj-Levyc´kyj Takes It Personally 176
The Pranks of Ivan Franko 193
Ivan Puljuj Makes His Riposte 196
How Should It Sound? 202
How to String Words?. 208
How to Choose Words? 214
How to Spell Words? 221
Ivan Nečuj-Levyc´kyj Is Shuffled Backstage 242
Interpreting Hebrew Poetry 249
The Book of Job 253
Lamentations. 261
The Song of Songs 265
The Versified Bible 270
Summary. 275

PART II SHAKESPEARE. 280

CHAPTER 5 "Oh, Shakespeare, Our Father, Native to All Peoples" 281
Ethics *Avant la Lettre*! 281
Bringing Forth the "Ukrainian Shakespeare" 289
The First (Over) Reaction 293
Kuliš's translation 299
The Language of the "Ukrainian Shakespeare" 300
On the Threshold of a New Secular High Style 311

CHAPTER 6 Expanding the Literary Canon of the "Ukrainian Shakespeare" 315
The First Step Is the Hardest?. 315
"*Huculia* Did Not Appear; Rather Shakespeare Was Merely Hidden". 320
Hamlet or *Hamljet*? That Is the Question 331
Hamlet in Peasant Leather Shoes 337
The Younger Generation Steps to the Fore 354
"We Are All Peasants Today" 359
One or Multiple Homesteads? 367

Conclusion: Detours Offered But Never Taken 374
Bibliography 386
Indices 427
Geographical and Personal Names 427
Subjects, Names of Periodicals, Titles of Literary Works and Translations 431
Word-Forms 438

Acknowledgements

The idea of writing this book came to me while I was embarking on a major project to write a history of modern literary Ukrainian during a stay at Harvard University in the spring of 2008. It became clear that the personality and literary work of Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819–1897) could hardly fit into a single chapter. But to write such a history without giving special credit to Kuliš, one of the founders and long-time leaders of the national movement in both Russian- and Austrian-ruled Ukraine in the nineteenth century, would be unrealistic.

As I amassed material about Kuliš and his language, it became apparent how little we know about him as a normalizer and a synthesizer of different traditions and styles in literary Ukrainian. My research persuaded me that his role in the formation of a new literary language seems to surpass in some ways that of Taras Ševčenko (1814–1861), another towering figure in the cultural landscape of Ukraine in the nineteenth century, and a man commonly viewed as the founder of modern literary Ukrainian. While Kuliš's contribution to the development of literary Ukrainian was no less significant—particularly in the diversification of stylistic devices—his vision of literary Ukrainian proved even more grandiose.

My work on this project was particularly rewarding while visiting different places in Ukraine and beyond. Working at the libraries of Harvard and Cambridge (UK) Universities, the V. I. Vernads´kyj National Library of Ukraine, and the Černihiv State Literary-Memorial Museum of Myxajlo Kocjubyns´kyj (Ukraine), where the bulk of Kuliš's protographs are preserved, was more pleasure than business.

I would like to extend my gratitude to the staff of the Bible Society's Library housed at the Cambridge University Library for assistance in this research and kind permission to obtain copies of the following publications: *Jevanhèlïje Lukỳ* (Lviv, 1874) (*Luka-U*), *Evanhèlïe Lukì* (Lviv, 1874) (*Luka-L*), and *Pys´mo Svęte. Jevanhelije Ioana* (Lviv, 1881), call

numbers BSS 257 E74, BSS 257 E74.2, and BSS 257 E81 respectively. A special note of thanks is due to the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute for honoring me, in 2008, with a Eugene and Daymel Shklar Research Fellowship in Ukrainian Studies that allowed me to concentrate on this project during the spring semester. Research on this project would not be possible without the collegial and professional support of many people with whom I have met over the last eight years. I am particularly grateful to Pavlo Hrycenko, director of the Institute of Ukrainian Language, who shared with me his expertise and helped me gain access to many rare manuscripts and protographs of Kuliš; Ksenya Kiebuzinski, head of the Petro Jacyk Central and East European Resource Centre and coordinator of Slavic Resources at the University of Toronto Libraries, who offered advice on locating some hard-to-find publications in North America; Olha Aleksic, Petro Jacyk archivist and bibliographer at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute; and Oleh Kupčyns´kyj, the former president of the Ševčenko Scientific Society in Lviv. Research on this book was also generously supported by grants from the Dyson College at Pace University in 2009, 2011, and 2015.

Finally, I am indebted to many colleagues who made this book possible, including Jan Fellerer (Oxford University), Michael S. Flier (Harvard University), Ljudmyla Hnatenko (V. I. Vernads´kyj National Library of Ukraine), Vasyl´ Nimčuk (Institute of Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), Leonid Uškalov and Serhii Vakulenko (Kharkiv Pedagogical University), and Eleonora Solovej (T. H. Ševčenko Institute of Ukrainian Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine).

My special thanks go to Meghan Vicks and Eddie McCaffray for their help with the editing of the manuscript.

However, without the support and understanding of my wife, Iryna, this project could never have come to life.

Abbreviations

Languages and Dialects		Grammatical Terms	
Bojk.	Bojkian	acc.	accusative
ChSl.	Church Slavonic	coll.	collective
ESl.	East Slavic	dat.	dative
EUkr.	East Ukrainian	derog.	derogative
Fr.	French	dim.	diminutive
Gk.	Greek	du.	dual
Gr.	German	f.	feminine
Huc.	Hucul	fut.	future
It.	Italian	gen.	genitive
Lat.	Latin	imper.	imperative
Latv.	Latvian	infml.	informal
Lemk.	Lemkian	instr.	instrumental
Lith.	Lithuanian	loc.	locative
MHGr.	Middle High German	m.	masculine
MoUkr.	Modern Ukrainian	n.	neuter
MUkr.	Middle Ukrainian	nom.	nominative
NUkr.	North Ukrainian	pl.	plural
OChSl.	Old Church Slavonic	PrAP.	present active participle
ORu.	Old Rusian	pres.	present
ORum.	Old Rumanian	pret.	preterit
Pol.	Polish	sg.	singular
RChSl.	Russian Church Slavonic	voc.	vocative
Rum.	Rumanian		
Rus.	Russian	1	first person
SWUkr.	Southwest Ukrainian	2	second person
Transc.	Transcarpathian	3	third person
Ukr.	Ukrainian		
WUkr.	West Ukrainian		

Introduction

Writing a Linguistic Biography of a Ukrainian Maverick

Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819–1897), a true Ukrainian maverick, is arguably one of the most controversial figures in the national revival of Ukraine. He is also a crucial early figure in the development of the modern understanding of Ukrainian literature and language. A prominent writer, historian, ethnographer, and translator, Kuliš came from an ancient, though impoverished, Cossack family in the Černihiv province in Russian-ruled (Dnieper) Ukraine. Certainly, the Cossack stereotype of an independent spirit with a large dose of stubbornness and a somewhat temperamental vitality could be applied to his personality (Luckyj 1983, 1). His emphasis on the development of a separate Ukrainian high culture, including a full-fledged literary language and a truly national literature, along with his support for the idea of political union with Russia, was heavily criticized by Ukrainian populists. Although his first historical novel, *Mixail Čarnyšenko, ili Malorossija vosem´desjat let nazad* (Mixail Čarnyšenko, or Little Russia Eighty Years Ago, 1843), was written in Russian, Kuliš became the first professional Ukrainian writer and journalist, as well as an innovative normalizer of written Ukrainian. Remaining a leading figure in the national Ukrainian movement, Kuliš debunked the myth of the Cossack past of Ukraine, expressed admiration for the Russian tsar Peter I and tsarina Catherine II, and made some humiliating remarks about the national bard and prophet Taras Ševčenko in his three-volume historiographic work, entitled *Istorija vossoedinenija Rusi* (The History of the Reunification of Rus´, 1874–1877).

In the years 1864–1867, Kuliš served in the Russian governmental office of spiritual affairs in Warsaw, where he blamed Polish nationalism for having caused the uprising of 1863–1864 that sought social reforms and independence for Poland. Yet as early as 1882 he authored a

reconciliatory pamphlet appealing to Ukrainian-Polish understanding, *Krašanka rusynam i poljakam na Velykden′ 1882 roku* (An Easter Egg for the Rusyns and the Poles for Easter 1882), that appeared in Lviv. In the same year, Kuliš even submitted his renunciation of Russian citizenship in order to remain in Austria-Hungary and found a printing house; however, government policies there changed his mind and he withdrew his renunciation. As a result, in April 1891, the writer was issued a new certificate of Russian citizenship, though only after he took an oath of allegiance (Luckyj 1983, 179; Naxlik 2007, 1:372).

Disillusioned with the populist movement in Austria-Hungary, Kuliš returned in 1882 to Russian-ruled Ukraine, where he lost no time in severing his relationships with organized Ukrainian community life. No Ukrainian intellectuals of Kuliš's time turned to Islam for answers to Ukrainian problems. An idealist Christian, he was the first modern Ukrainian poet to write several major poetic works on Islamic themes, for instance, "Mahomet i Xadyza" (Muhammad and Khadijah, 1883). Having settled on his farmstead (*xutir*) Motronivka, Kuliš worked on translations of the Bible and the works of William Shakespeare, George Gordon Byron, Wolfgang Johann von Goethe, and other European authors until his death in 1897. Even after his death, he remained an important force for national cultural awakening, demonstrating his unflagging devotion to his people who, in the end, recognized his unique legacy in literature and language.

There are two seminal dates—1983 and 2007—in the modern study of Kuliš's creative life and literary output. In 1983, George Luckyj published a pioneering book about the life and times of Kuliš. This English-language monograph was the first one to appear outside Ukraine, where, from the early 1930s onward, Kuliš had been perceived as inconsistent in action and a true egotist who came to reject some basic assumptions of the very Ukrainian movement he helped to found (Luckyj 1983, vii). This life of Kuliš, as Luckyj admitted, was incomplete, since it was retold in its principle phases without the detail to be expected in a full biography. In fact, the author could hardly produce a voluminous work because access to most of the archival material necessary for a study of such a caliber was proscribed at that time. Despite this major hindrance, the aforementioned book proved exemplary in

many aspects. Its author managed not only to outline major events in the life and times of Kuliš but also to put him in the wider context of Ukrainian intellectual history and of the dilemmas of national culture found throughout the world. Read at its final stage by Ralph Lindheim and George Y. Shevelov, Luckyj's book has, until recently, remained the only serious study of Kuliš and his role in the Ukrainian national revival available in the West.

In 2007, a two-volume study of the personal and creative life of Kuliš appeared in Ukraine. Its author, Jevhen Naxlik, offered a sweeping view of Kuliš as a national awakener, writer, and thinker whose contribution to the formation of a new nation and its culture, in the form of literature, language, philosophy, and historiography, was meticulously recorded and projected onto the Ukrainian cultural and literary landscape. In all respects, Naxlik's study will remain the most exhaustive for many years to come, likely until serious incursions are made into Kuliš's literary works and language. Luckily, in many ways, Naxlik traced possible vectors for future research and outlined new vistas for both Ukrainian literature and language, progressively revealing their national past and future through the lens of Kuliš's literary output.

The aforementioned monographs of 1983 and 2007 will, no doubt, serve as beacons in the study of Kuliš and his voluminous output, including his language, largely neglected after Hordyns´kyj's (1928) analysis of his translations of Shakespeare. In recent years, however, Kuliš's personality and his oeuvre have begun to receive increased interest from literary scholars, bibliographers, and historians (Grabowicz 1981, 1992; Fedoruk 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2004; Zelens´ka 2000; Hončaruk 2006), although his language program has faded into oblivion. As a rare exception, one should mention, however, an insightful—though brief—analysis of Kuliš's incorporation of Galician elements into his language standard offered by George Y. Shevelov in 1966 (Shevelov 1966, 37–77; Ševel´ov 1996, 24–67). Apart from Shevelov, a mere handful of twentieth-century scholars have discussed the role of Kuliš in the formation of literary Ukrainian—especially its biblical style (Ohijenko 1949, 220–221; Horbač 1988; Muromceva and Muromcev 1995; Dzjubyšyna-Mel´nyk 1998, 279).

A true breakthrough in the study of Kuliš's language happened after Ukraine had gained its independence in 1991. Viewed today as a prophetic figure in the modern Ukrainian revival and, in addition to Ševčenko, a major founder of new literary Ukrainian, his language has become a focus of scholarly interest. With rare exceptions (e.g., Matvijas 2008), however, most of the recent publications demonstrate a fragmentary approach toward Kuliš's language and offer, instead, somewhat sketchy appraisals of his literary output and linguistic idiosyncrasies. Deserving of attention, nevertheless, are a number of recent studies examining the writer's language and its stylistic diversity in both his original works and translations (Jermolenko 2010; Solohub 2010; Dolžykova 2010; Kumeda 2010). Remarkably, all the aforementioned studies appeared in a special issue of the Ukrainian journal *Kul´tura slova* (The Culture of Word), published on the occasion of the 190th anniversary of Kuliš's birth. Of utmost interest is a probing insight into the recesses of the linguistic personality of Kuliš offered by Dolžykova (2004). In addition to poetic devices, she also analyzed dialectal features of Kuliš's language as well as the stylistic resources of its vocabulary, reserving a special place for his translations.

It should be noted that in almost all of the works investigating the language of Kuliš (Tymošyk 2000a; Dolžykova 2001; Tkač and Moroz 2003; Moroz and Tkač 2006; Danylenko 2010a; Jurkowski 2001), his translations of the Bible are consistently compared with other biblical translations into modern Ukrainian. Although a full study of Kuliš's language, premised on a comprehensive analysis of both his original works and translations in the context of the formation of literary Ukrainian in the nineteenth century, is still in the offing, some authors have already proposed some models for future research that were partly implemented in this book (e.g., Dzjubyšyna-Mel´nyk 1998). Thus, as early as 1995, following in the footsteps of Shevelov, two linguists, Muromceva and Muromcev, wrote a comprehensive article on Kuliš as an "innovator" and "creator of the Ukrainian literary language." Having criticized a hackneyed treatment of Kuliš as an extreme archaizer of the Ukrainian language, the authors emphasized the twofold nature of his normalization efforts. On the one hand, Kuliš was deeply interested in the history of Ukrainian, especially in those periods that antedated the appearance of Ivan

Kotljarevs´kyj's *Enejida* (1798), which is commonly viewed as the beginning of new literary Ukrainian, and in the works of Kotljarevs´kyj's epigones. On the other hand, Kuliš constantly experimented with Ukrainian dialectal and vernacular elements. All in all, according to Muromceva and Muromcev (1995, 13), Kuliš saw the future of Ukrainian in synthesizing the older literary tradition(s) with the vernacular-based one, whence the introduction of Church Slavonic, bookish, and loan forms into his vernacular standard.

Muromceva and Muromcev (1995, 16) came to the conclusion that Kuliš was the first to advance the "intellectualization" of literary Ukrainian through "the introduction of a large amount of abstract words and the enrichment of semantics of known words." One of his major achievements was the borrowing of numerous "Europeanisms," which elevated the overall cultural level of his native language (ibid.). That was a pioneering conclusion, especially if compared with their predecessors' ideologically biased treatment of Kuliš's language (Pljušč 1971, 331).

Viewed as a staunch innovator, Kuliš was given credit by Rusanivs´kyj (2001, 233–234) for his work on the diversification of genres and styles in the new literary standard of Ukrainian. Kuliš's main source of inspiration was arguably folklore, although he also employed Church Slavonic forms, whose number constantly increased in his literary works. Yet the creation of special devices for a new biblical style was, as Rusanivs´kyj (ibid.) pointed out, one of the biggest achievements of this writer, who cooperated with Ivan Puljuj in his translation of the Bible. Unlike in the work of Muromceva and Muromcev, who discussed the Europeanizing trend in Kuliš's language and especially in his translations, Kuliš's rendition of the Holy Scriptures was merely touched upon by Rusanivs´kyj (who nevertheless praised its quality). Yet, as Rusanivs´kyj argued (ibid.), the most significant contribution of Kuliš to the formation of literary Ukrainian was his historical novel *Čorna rada* (The Black Council, 1857), inasmuch as Kuliš succeeded in introducing lexical elements capable of creating a true historical coloring into written Ukrainian.

In contrast, a negative opinion of Kuliš's translations, including of some plays of Shakespeare, was expressed by Macjuk (1996), who placed the language of the writer in the context of the vicissitudes of literary

Ukrainian in Galicia. Unabashedly, the author argued that the phonetic, morphological, derivational, lexical, and syntactic features of Kuliš's translations vulgarized the lofty language of Shakespeare (ibid., 122). According to Macjuk, the innovations of Kuliš were prone to endow words with "negative aesthetics"; this is why neither Church Slavonicisms, nor Ukrainianized Slavonic forms together with coined forms, could enrich the nominative resources of the "Galician-Rusian language" (ibid.). Moreover, Kuliš was blamed for developing a peculiar "language doctrine" that could hardly appeal to Galician Ukrainians. A synthesis of Old Rusian with vernacular Ukrainian in Kuliš's language appeared, as Macjuk surmised, to be in dissonance with the period of "Europeanization of Ukrainian translations" in Austria-Hungary. This is why Kuliš's translations ostensibly looked obsolete the very moment they went to press (ibid., 123).

The aforementioned judgment is quite remarkable. Tentatively, being of Galician stock may have influenced Macjuk's judgment, as she was clearly at odds with the opinion formulated by the Kharkiv-based linguists Muromceva and Murovcev. Natives of Sloboda Ukraine, they extolled, for their part, the role of Kuliš in preserving the old tradition of literary Ukrainian through the re-introduction of bookish and especially Church Slavonic forms. As I argued elsewhere (Danylenko 2008b), the mix of such forms may well have been quite natural in the speech of Dnieper Ukrainians. In fact, a century ago the transition from the Meletian version of Church Slavonic (from the name of Meletij Smotryc´kyj, one of the codifiers of the language) to Russian Slavonic in these lands seemed to have taken place smoothly due to the long tradition of bilingualism: Church Slavonic (*slavenorosskij iazyk"*) and Ruthenian (*prostaja mova*). For most Little Russians (Ukrainians) in the eighteenth century, this process might have appeared as a natural stage in the development of the *slavenorosskij iazyk"*, although with a number of non-Russian elements reduced to little more than symbolic presence. The same attitude toward Church Slavonic was still observed in Dnieper Ukraine in the mid-nineteenth century. Suffice it to recall here the consistent use of Slavonic forms by Taras Ševčenko (Shevelov 1966, 43). Kuliš used them perhaps on an even greater scale, since he was prepared to view some Russian borrowings as Slavonic proper, thus belonging to the high-style stock of

written Ukrainian as compared with its vernacular elements (Hnatjuk 2010). Needless to say, such a synthesis of Slavonic and vernacular elements could hardly satisfy the Galician populists in the second part of the nineteenth century, a stance uncritically transplanted by Macjuk into the linguistic paradigm maintained in today's Ukraine.

The dissonance in the appraisal of Kuliš's language by Muromceva and Muromcev, on the one hand, and Macjuk, on the other, becomes ever more pronounced in the case of his translations. The two eastern Ukrainian linguists discuss the intellectualization of the language in Kuliš's translations, while the Galician scholar considers his translations vulgar and void of any European flavor. Such conflicting views of Kuliš's language are reminiscent of those expressed in Austria-Hungary and tsarist Russia after the appearance of his translation of the Bible: in its own day, it was chastised in Galicia and highly praised in Dnieper Ukraine!

In the nineteenth century, the representatives of the two parts of Ukraine were unanimous in acknowledging the importance of translations for the formation of new literary Ukrainian and the creation of a new literary tradition capable of introducing differentiation and new vitality. According to Grabowicz (1992, 234), the period from the early 1860s to the early 1890s, taken as a whole, contained a literature that was neither fully provincial nor yet fully national, whence the use of Russian in some writings produced in Dnieper Ukraine or of German (e.g., Jurij Osyp Fed´kovyč) and Polish (e.g., Ivan Franko) in Galicia (ibid.). Kuliš believed that, for Ukrainian to become a full-fledged literary and national language, one had to make it not only variegated dialectally (the horizontal dimension) but also historically (the vertical dimension). His ambitious language program was premised on the positivist model that was perceived by the romanticists in Dnieper Ukraine and the younger generation of Galician populists as artificial and vulgar. It is not an exaggeration to say that, in this respect, Kuliš was ahead of many of his contemporaries, including Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885), Jurij Osyp Fed´kovyč (1834–1888), Ivan Nečuj-Levyc´kyj (1838–1918), and even Ivan Franko (1856–1916), in emphasizing universal culture and literary values, the world, and attitudes of learning and Enlightenment. All this can explain Kuliš's receptiveness to literary influences and models, be

they Russian or European, as well as the range of his translations from the Bible to Shakespeare, and his fundamental concern for a rational and structured, not metaphysical and nativist, vision of Ukrainian culture, especially in his later views (Grabowicz 1992, 237; Danylenko 2009b, 2010b, 16–21).

In a sense, the transcendental values of the Bible and Shakespeare became exemplary in the language program of Kuliš, with the Bible being a source of the biblical high style and Shakespeare a source of the secular high style. In the eyes of Kuliš, the universalism of these works was likely to reveal their twofold nature. They could not only enlighten his compatriots but also help create a full-fledged literary language capable of faithfully rendering the intricacies of reasoning and feeling in Ukrainian. Using such a literary language as a learning tool, the Ukrainians would be able to appropriate elements of universal culture and literature through translations of classical works. According to Kuliš and his advocates, such translations were ultimately destined to become an integral part of Ukrainian culture. And indeed, they are still of paramount importance today when, as in Kuliš's time, it is necessary to demonstrate the identity of endangered culture and language (Luckyj 1983, 182).

This is why Kuliš's translations are not analyzed in this book from the point of view of their faithfulness or aesthetic quality. The book concentrates, instead, on his translations as language products that reflect the vagaries of the formation and codification of written Ukrainian in the nineteenth century. These products are of particular importance since, back in Kuliš's time, they would delineate the functional range of both biblical and secular varieties of the high style in new literary Ukrainian. In other words, questions of textual reliability and faithfulness, in particular how the latter is reflected in rhythm and meter in poetic translations, are addressed in this book only sporadically. The major emphasis in this book is placed, instead, on the systematic description of language forms and the level of their codification by Kuliš in his translations.

This book may be viewed as a linguistic biography of Kuliš only in part. It is also concerned with a comparative study of a wide array of other Ukrainian authors who were engaged in translating the Bible and Shakespeare. Since this book deals primarily with the internal history of

new literary Ukrainian through the material of specific translation products, comparison with parallel translations in other neighboring (e.g., Bohemian, Polish, or Russian) cultures will be minimal. Only cases of direct cultural and ideological impact, especially in the case of some western European and Russian translations and their discussion in biblical studies, will be taken into consideration. A thorough study of the Ukrainian translations of the Bible and Shakespeare in their connections with the translations made into other, first of all Slavic languages, is yet to be written. In sum, the approach chosen in this book is hardly more than a springboard for the integral history of the new Ukrainian literary language one can only dream of today.

The choice of the Bible and Shakespeare by Kuliš was not random at all. Neither was it random in the case of this book. The language used by Kuliš is quintessentially exemplary and consistent with his vision of the role of Ukrainian and its codification, including of orthography, in the national movement. Overall, the language of Kuliš's translations is likely to reflect quandaries he faced in the process of creating a new type of literary Ukrainian that, in his plans, was likely to strengthen an affirmation of national identity and function as a strategy to ensure acculturation of the Ukrainian people. Needless to say, a study of the language of Kuliš's translations can hardly substitute for an exhaustive description of his contribution to the formation of literary Ukrainian in the nineteenth century. However, a perusal of the linguistic dimension both of Kuliš's scriptural and secular translations, supplemented by a discussion of the time and people engaged in their assessment, may prove crucial to tracing the contours of a full and complete picture of the development of literary Ukrainian from the mid-nineteenth century onward.

A special comment is due here about the terminological challenges faced by those who are interested in the history of literary Ukrainian. The history of literary languages, the Ukrainian language among them, is not a new discipline. Its study usually focuses on the written language in works of literature, including translations, less often in journalism, and quite rarely in other genres. Though due to different reasons, literary Ukrainian in both Austria-Hungary and tsarist Russia in the late nineteenth century was a standardized language in the making. That is, it was

a written language utilized in only a limited number of functional domains, particularly in Dnieper Ukraine. This is why, even for the written language used in Russian-ruled Ukraine, which theoretically was the standard language of the entire country, the designation of "standardized language" can be made only with great reservation. There was a certain norm of usage, but it was not codified, nor even exhaustively described, and there was no authority to prescribe it (Shevelov 1989, 18). In this book, therefore, a more traditional and less "prescriptive" term (i.e., "literary language") will be used in reference to a written language undergoing multiple changes dependent on subjective and objective (socio-political) factors (Danylenko 2015a, 230–237; Wingender 2013).

Additionally, a terminological distinction between "Rusian" and "Ruthenian" is maintained throughout this book. The Latin-based term "Ruthenian" is reserved for both the *rus´kyj jazyk"* (Rusian language) and the *prostaja mova* (plain language) employed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and, later, in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from the fourteenth through the seventeenth centuries (Danylenko 2006a). Leaving aside discussion of these terms in the context of the linguistic and cultural patrimony of pre-modern Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples, I will resort to the term *prostaja mova* in order to refer to the vernacular standard that antedated the appearance of a new vernacular-based literary language in the early nineteenth century in Dnieper Ukraine and, though with some reservations, in Austrian-ruled Ukraine (Danylenko 2008a, 2008b). Using this term will allow me to emphasize the genetic continuity of the vernacularizing tendency first observed in the *prostaja mova* and later fully developed in new literary Ukrainian as early as the eighteenth century (Danylenko 2008b, 66, 2011b, 245–246; Peredrijenko 1979).

For the nineteenth century, the learned form "Ruthenian" is used in those contexts which deal with results of regional language mixing (commonly labeled *jazyčije*), including bookish elements extant from the Middle Ukrainian period, as used in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Bukovyna. In these lands in the early eighteenth century, the Greek Catholic clergy who found themselves the only defenders of a separate Ruthenian regional identity advanced the idea of one literary language, based on Church Slavonic, though with a wide range of admixtures

(Danylenko 2008a, 111, 2009a, 225–226). No wonder, then, that the official name of the Ukrainian language in Austria-Hungary was "Ruthenian" (Gr. *Ruthenisch*). One implication of the name "Ruthenian" was a certain degree of non-identification of Austrian Ukrainians with Russian Ukrainians. In the literary language this provided some authorization for the preservation of local linguistic peculiarities and for the development of a regional variety of Ukrainian within Austria (Shevelov 1989, 24). Instead of the learned form "Ruthenian," the indigenous term "Rusian" is used in all possible ethno-linguistic and socio-political contexts, covering the regional (western Ukrainian) language and their speakers viewed in the pan-Ukrainian perspective. The use of this designation makes it also possible to distinguish the Rusians, i.e., the Galician Ukrainians, from the Rusyns, or the local population of Ukrainian origin in Transcarpathia and Bukovyna (Danylenko 2009a, 2009d).

Terminologically, another special case is "Little Russian," occurring in scholarly literature sometimes in conjunction with such terms as Hetmanate (Cossack Ukraine) and Sloboda Ukraine (Plokhy 2006, 329–333). The term "Cossack Ukraine" is employed in this book in reference to the population of the Hetmanate, who were often called "Little Russians" in official documents from the seventeenth century onward. Along similar lines, their language was referred to as "Little Russian," in opposition to "Great Russian," used by Russian speakers in Muscovy and, subsequently, in the Russian Empire. It should be recalled, however, that Ukrainian metropolitan Jov Borec´kyj (†1631) seems to have established the tradition of viewing the Little Russians and the Great Russians as brothers who together constitute a family. Only later did Muscovite Rus´, rooted in its dynastic and patrimonial way of thinking, accept such a vision of unity (ibid., 290–291), which subsequently became reflected in the opposition of Great Russian and Little Russian as describing, in particular, the socio-linguistic distribution of the Russian and Ukrainian languages as used in the Russian Empire.

Interestingly, still honored by the populists in nineteenth-century Ukraine, this distinction was also endorsed by Kuliš at the beginning of his literary career. Somewhat later, however, he came up with another opposition, Old Rusian (*staroruščyna*) versus New Rusian (*novoruščyna*),

that is, literary Ukrainian whose tradition is traced back to the period of Kyivan Rus′ versus literary Russian, a newly created language with a younger (Muscovite) tradition (Kuliš 1914). Accordingly, in harmony with Kuliš's conception, the term "Old Rusian" is employed, in this book, to label the language and culture of Kyivan Rus′ (Shevelov 1979, 55–77). As far as the name "Ukrainian" is concerned, it is used throughout the text as an umbrella term *avant la lettre*, overlapping semantically with the modern understanding of this romantic concept wholly embraced by Kuliš in his conception of new literary Ukrainian.

As this book will show, the language of Kuliš is a unique aggregate of various elements belonging to different style registers and periods in the history of Ukrainian. In addition to bookish (Ruthenian) and Church Slavonic elements, as well as numerous borrowings, Kuliš's language is comprised of both vernacular and dialectal forms and constructions. In our book, the term "vernacular" is reserved for the description of colloquial (plain) phenomena in general, thus largely referring to urban speech patterns of the cultivated class (intelligentsia). All things "dialectal" are generally viewed in the light of dialectal geography, thus dealing primarily with products of rural speech patterns.

Finally, a word on textual sources and linguistic examples is warranted at this point. In a work of this nature, representation of some textual sources is determined by linguistic precision and typographic style. Major quotations appear as a rule in their original spelling. The modernized orthography is reproduced only as rendered in the source being quoted. In the interest of space, some short titles, especially in translations of biblical books, include elisions that are not indicated. In the case of direct correspondences, all English quotations from the Bible are supplied from the Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible (Thomas Nelson Bibles, 1977). Unless noted, all other translations accompanied by grammatical annotation are my own, including examples excerpted from Kuliš's translations of both the Bible and Shakespeare. Direct correspondences in the latter case are provided from *The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. A New Text Edited With Introduction and Notes By William Allan Neilson and Charles Jarvis Hill* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970). If no direct equivalent of a Ukrainian form is found in the English original,