THE HOLY GOSPELS IN VERNACULAR UKRAINIAN
Antin Kobyljans'kyj (1874, 1877) vs. Pantelejmon Kuliš (1871)

Early Modern Translations

Among pre-modern translations of the Holy Scriptures in Ukraine, scholarly tradition has revered several works prepared in Ruthenian (see Danylenko 2006, 120-141). To name just a few of them, they are Francysk Skaryna's [Franciszek Skoryna] "Bivlija ruska" of 1516-1519, which was very popular in all the Ruthenian lands, and its Ukrainian copy of 1568 made by Vasyl' Žuhaj in Galicia[1], as well as numerous interpretive gospels, influenced by Protestantism which, however, never played an important role in Ruthenia (Petrov 1923, 63-67; Čepiha 2001, 15f.). Among the latter gospels, deserving attention are Vasilij Tjapinskij's [Vasil' Cjapinski] "Homilary Gospel" published in both Church Slavonic and Ruthenian and heavily modeled on the Antitrinitarian Symon Budny's Bible of 1572 and New Testament of 1574 (see Fleischmann 2006, 94-102), the Volhynian Arian Valentyn Nehalevs'kyj's [Niegaliewski] Ruthenian translation from the Polish Gospel in 1581, which the Calvinist Marcin Czechowić had published in Cracow in 1577. Religious texts like the Krexiv "Apostol" (1563-1572), with a plethora of Belarusian traits, were quite numerous in Ruthenia in the first third of the seventeenth century.

[1] It is commonly accepted that "Bivlija ruska" is premised on the third edition of the Czech Bible, "Biblij Czeská w Benátkach tisst'ená", of 1506. Unlike Vladimirov's (1989, 163) conclusion supported today by many Slavists, Celunova (1990) claimed that Skaryna did not make use of any Church Slavonic protograph, in particular that of Numbers. According to Celunova, possible parallels appear accidental, thus being caused by the author's consistency in utilizing Church Slavonic grammar and vocabulary in his translation from Czech. As far as Žuhaj's version is concerned, the translator copied several of Skaryna's biblical books, e.g., Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon, retaining most of their phonetic, morphological, and lexical features (Aničenka 1969, 136-141).

A separate place should be reserved for the Peresopnycja Gospel of 1556-1561, in which Archimandrite Hryhorij and amanuensis Myxailo Vasylijevyč made an attempt to combine Church Slavonic with the 'prostaja mova' (Ruthenian) rather than local vernacular (Danylenko 2008b), and Meletij Smotryc'kyj's "Homilary Gospel" (Vievis, 1616), which was a translation of the collection of sermons attributed to Patriarch Kallistos I. A slightly revised version of this gospel was prepared by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla (1597-1647) and reprinted under his supervision in 1637 in the Kyjiv Cave Monastery. This reprinting did not contain the name of Smotryc'kyj (ca. 1577-1633) as its first translator, possibly because of his conversion to the Uniate Church in the 1620s. Nevertheless, the role of Smotryc'kyj was most significant in disseminating an Orthodox collection of Gospel pericopes and sermons all over the Ruthenian lands (Frick 1987).

Subsequently, with an exception of didactic and moralistic texts, the tradition of translation of the Holy Scriptures became heavily undermined in Polish-ruled Ukraine, where Polish enjoyed an ever-growing socio-linguistic status until it became the written language of the entire Polish-Lithuanian state by 1699. The situation was especially precarious in the Hetmanate where the increasing influence of Russian was enhanced by a series of decrees issued in the 1720s by the Russian Synod and the Russian Emperor. In 1720 on the occasion of the publication of the "Menologion" (1718), with the Kyjiv Cave Monastery named in the title page as the stavropegial monastery of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Peter I signed an ukaz forbidding the Kyjiv and Černihiv presses from printing anything but the canonic Church books. Later decrees, issued by the Russian Synod in September 1721, January and December 1727, and March 1728, introduced further restrictions in the use of the Ukrainian recension in the Church (Žiteckij 1900, 5-8).

It becomes therefore clear why the number of anthologies comprising didactic articles, lives of saints and other popularizing religious texts, was significant in Polish-ruled and later Austrian-Hungarian Ukraine. Of linguistic interest is "Besědy paroxialnię" of 1789, published in Church Slavonic in the Počajiv monastery which in 1713 officially joined the Uniate church and became a center of the Basilian monastic order. That collection was originally a translation from Polish, a fact which made the publisher justify in his preface the choice of Slavonic instead of the 'prostaja mova' (Voznjak 1924, 104). There are other collections of sermons compiled in the local variety of the literary language (*jazyčije*) with a strong admixture of Polish (Nimčuk 2005, 24f.), for instance, a Ruthenian translation of the above collection of parochial sermons, "Nauky paroxialnię" (1794). Originally translated from Italian into Polish and then

Church Slavonic, these sermons were written in the 'prostўj, i pospolitўj jazўk″ Ruskij', that is, according to Voznjak (1924, 104), in the 'common and vernacular Ruthenian language'. Chronologically, the language of "Nauky paroxialnię" is reminiscent of Ruthenian as used in the late sixteenth–early seventeenth century with a lot of Polonisms, in particular in the syntax and lexicon (Danylenko 2008a, 89-91). The language of this collection, as well as of "Sěmę slova božię" (1772), also published in the Basilian monastery of Počajiv, is very close to the local vernacular found in manuscript sermons and various miscellanea, in particular those authored by the priests Ihnatij (1666) and Tesljovciv (17th c.) in Subcarpathia, and by Illja Jaremec'kyj-Bilaxevyč in Bukovyna (18th c.).

A new period of translation of the religious texts was heralded by the appearance of the collection of fifty-seven sermons for popular instruction, "Cerkovnўę besědў. na vsě neděly roka na poučenie narodnoe", 2 parts (Buda, 1831), prepared in Church Slavonic by the Subcarpathian priest-scholar Myxajlo Lučkaj (Pop) (1789-1843). Despite the fact that this collection was basically an original work, Lučkaj was the first to try to secularize Church Slavonic in Galicia and Subcarpathian Rus' with the help of primarily non-vernacular regional and non-native elements. Different though from the language program as cultivated at that time in Russian-ruled Ukraine, Lučkaj's language program looked, as I pointed out elsewhere (Danylenko 2009a), innovative in comparison with a continuum ranging from the vulgar tongue via lofty Slaveno-Rusyn to Great Russian in the works of most Rusyn and Galician priests-turned-national awakeners.

In Russian-ruled Ukraine, homiletic publications began appearing from the mid-nineteenth century onward with major breaks, however, caused by the anti-Ukrainian Valuev circular of 18 July 1863 and especially the Ems Edict of 18 May 1876[2]. Scanty as didactic collections were, their linguistic basis revealed differences from the language of analogous texts used in the Uniate Church and circulated in religious and secular journals in Galicia, Subcarpathia, and Bukovyna. Based largely on the southeastern dialect(s), 'Little Russian' homiletics was influenced by another tradition as manifest in the 'new' 'prostaja mova' practiced in Russian-ruled Ukraine in the late eighteenth century with the ratio of vernacular elements outbalancing the native bookish and the Slavonic elements. In general,

---

[2] Among the authors of various homiletic and didactic collections composed in 'Little Russian', one should mention Vasyl Hrečulevyč, Ivan Babčenko, and Stepan Opatovyč (Nimčuk 2005, 25). In 1881, an anonymous author (V. 1881, 896) asked rhetorically how the second printing of Opatovyč's "Opovidan'nja z sv. Pys'ma" (St. Peterburg, 1863) made its way into press in 1875 when the development of literary Ukrainian was already hindered.

the linguistic difference between the two territorial groups of homiletic texts lay not so much in the number and geography of new vernacular elements but in the redistribution (normalization) of these elements. In Russian-ruled Ukraine that process was triggered by changes in poetic and fictional genres, while in Galicia, Subcarpathia, and Bukovyna the identification of the 'jazŭk″ russkij' with the 'jazŭk″ slavenskij' lead to the emergence of a regional mixed language, a hybrid labeled 'jazyčije' (Danylenko 2008a, 84).

First Modern Vernacular Translations

The first comprehensive survey of modern vernacular translations of the New Testament (NT) was offered by Žytec'kyj (Žiteckij 1905). Notoriously oblivious of Galician contributions, he extolled instead translations made by *literati* from Dnieper Ukraine, Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819-1897) (in collaboration with Ivan Puljuj, 1845-1918) in 1871, Myxajlo Lobodovs'kyj (Loboda) (1874-1913) in 1903, and especially Pylyp Moračevs'kyj (1806-1879) in the early 1860s. Leaving aside inopportune Ukrainianization of the Biblical names like *Ysus″* for Jesus, *Zaxar″* for Zacharias, *Havrylo* for Gabriel, and some other minor shortcomings, Žytec'kyj (ib., 39) recognized Moračevs'kyj's translation as the most felicitous and true to the vernacular standard of that time. Indeed, Moračevs'kyj's language was largely premised on Southeast Ukrainian. Suffice it to mention here the original use of a counter-etymological labialized phoneme x^w in the form *xvarysei* 'Phar′-i-sees' (Mt 5:20) (Sreznevskij 1902, 093) instead of *f* still alien in Dnieper Ukrainian at that time. A similar *xv*-spelling, *porxvyru* (acc.) '[clothed] in purple' (Lk 16:19) is found in the translation of "The Rich Man and Lazarus" (Lk 16:19-31; see Žiteckij 1905, 59). Remarkably, while preparing Moračevs'kyj's translation toward a Synodal publication in 1907-1911, the Synodal commission whose editing, in general, was reasonable (Arpolenko 2003, 220), restored the letter *f* in loan forms like *faryseji* 'Phar′-i-sees' (HG, 20).

Since Žytec'kyj did not show much sympathy for Galicians and Rusyns, he did not incorporate into his study a single translation from Galicia, Subcarpathian Rus' or Bukovyna, while downplaying a translation made by Markijan Šaškevyč (1811-1843), a founding member of the literary group "Rus'ka trijcja" (Ruthenian Triad). The latter translated the "Gospel According to John" and fragments of the "Gospel According to Matthew" (chapters 1-5) in 1842, though the manuscript was published as late as 1912 by Myxajlo Voznjak (Šašk., 107-142) which may explain why

Žytec'kyj disregarded this work[3]. However, this translation deserves special attention from several points of view. First of all, in terms of priority, this is the first translation of the Holy Scriptures ever made in modern Ruthenian (Ukrainian), thus antedating the translations of Kuliš and Puljuj, Lobodovs'kyj (Loboda) and Moračevs'kyj. Second, the Gospel(s) were translated into local vernacular permeated with dialectal features that were in some cases deliberately suppressed by Šaškevyč, a native of the South Volhynian dialect of Brody (Horbač 1988, 47).

Indeed, the vernacular and, what is more significant, dialectal basis of Šaškevyč's translation is quite revealing. Thus, despite the fact that the author tried to omit the change *'a > 'e*, this phenomenon is sporadically attested in his translation, e.g., *щоб пожнєдаў єѣ* 'to lust after her' (Šašk., 111:167; see Horbač 1988, 47). On the other hand, he liberally utilized enclitic forms like *го* (acc.) (Šašk., 112:169), *му* (dat.) 'he', *ю* (acc.) 'she' (ib., 128:658), *мя* (acc.) 'I' (ib., 116:187), *тя* (acc.) 'you' (ib., 113:59). Šaškevyč employed the dative/locative singular of masculines and neuters in *-ovy/-evy*, e.g., *сынови своєму* (dat.) 'to his son' (ib., 116:150) and *в чоловѣкови* (loc.) 'in man' (ib., 114:96). One happens in Šaškevyč's translation on former perfect tense forms with auxiliaries treated in Southwest Ukrainian as (bound) enclitics of the type *чулисте* 'ye have heard' (ib., 111:155) and *я видѣў и свѣдчиў ємъ* '[And] I saw, and bare record' (ib., 113:39f.), as well as numerous active present participles of the type *плачуща* (f. sg.) 'weeping' (ib., 128:658) with a Church Slavonic suffix.

On closer inspection, the translation of Šaškevyč appears a peculiar blending of Church Slavonic and dialectal elements so that even statistically it is difficult to say which of them prevail. Tymošyk (2000b, 102f.), however, claimed that Church Slavonicisms are predominant in the translation of all the fragments. According to her, Šaškevyč tended to retain most morphological and syntactical patterns typical of the Church Slavonic text that allegedly served as a major reference for the translator. Feasible as this hypothesis appears, one can, in fact, discern whole constructions being transplanted by Šaškevyč in their entirety from the Church Slavonic *Vorlage* to his translation. To give a typical example, of interest is the following phrase *найшла ся мающая в животѣ от Духа святого* 'she was found with a child of the Holy Ghost' (Šašk., 108, 22) where, remarkably, the translator used the vernacular adjectival genitive ending *-ого* instead of Church Slavonic *-аго*.

---

[3] Together with his other works, excerpts (Mt 5:1-30 and Jn 4:1-54) from Šaškevyč's translation were published also in 1913 in vol. 3 (1) of the series "Rus'ka pys'mennist'" (along with the works of Jakiv Holovac'kyj) (L'viv, 1913). The orthography and the language, however, were considerably corrected so that it turned good-for-nothing from the linguistic point of view.

Clearly, Šaškevyč's translation contrasted not only with the amateurish work of Lobodovs'kyj but also with the vernacular-based translation of Moračevs'kyj singled out by Žytec'kyj as exemplary. Generally, from Vladimir Sreznevskij (1902) onward scholarly tradition has taken it for granted that Moračevs'kyj's translation, rather than the one prepared by Kuliš in collaboration with Puljuj, was close to the literary language as cultivated in Dnieper Ukraine since the times of the Xarkiv Romanticists (Nimčuk 2005, 29-30)[4]. That is why, perhaps, Horbač, a native of Galicia, abstained from discussing the language of Moračevs'kyj, while dwelling primarily on the translations made outside Russian-ruled Ukraine. It is therefore important to ascertain the place of Kuliš in the formation of a new confessional style and, by extension, of a new literary language[5]. It is even more expedient to investigate his language program as reconstructed in his first *scholarly translation* of the Holy Scriptures[6] in comparison

---

[4] Long before its publication in 1906-1911 (HG), his translation of the New Testament (NT) became critically acclaimed in Russian-ruled Ukraine. Moračevs'kyj completed his translation of the Gospels According to John and Mark as early as 1860, that is, before Kuliš initiated his work on the translation of the Holy Scriptures. As one can glean from Moračevs'kyj's language, heavily edited though before the publication of his translation (see Pšepjurs'ka-Ovčarenko 1988), he seemed to have a cardinally different vision of the lofty style in Ukrainian. It is not accidental that, at the outset of his work, Moračevs'kyj's translation was totally anchored in the Russian and Church Slavonic texts. Only later, the entire translation completed, Moračevs'kyj decided to compare his text with the Latin, French, German, and Polish translations of the NT. Remarkably, while editing the final draft of the translation, Moračevs'kyj jotted down in the margins parallel excerpts in several languages, albeit not a single example was provided in Hebrew or Greek (Sreznevskij 1902, 090-091). Conceivably, the major difference in the approaches chosen by Kuliš and Moračevs'kyj was linked to different perspectives in their creative work, the European centrism of the former and the 'homestead ethnographism' of the latter. It comes therefore as no surprise that Moračevs'kyj as a writer proved an incidental phenomenon in Ukrainian literature.

[5] Kuliš's language is premised basically on the eastern Polissian dialect. As compared with Moračevs'kyj whose native dialect was also located in northern Ukraine, Kuliš was more consistent in introducing some northern Ukrainian features into Southeast Ukrainian (Matvijas 2008).

[6] In the late 1860s, Kuliš's conception of the translation of the Holy Scriptures underwent a series of changes. At the outset, Kuliš deliberately intended to offer a free adaptation of the Bible into a *poetic framework*. Hence a particular, antiquated Biblical pen name, Pavlo Rataj, that is, 'ploughman'. Under this pseudonym in 1869, he published a poetic translation of "Pentatevx Musijevyj" (Pentateuch) as a supplement to the L'viv periodical "Pravda" (issues 1-24). In the same year, this translation was reprinted under a somewhat pretentious title, "Svjate Pys'mo, abo vsja Byblyja staroho y novoho Zavitu, rus'ko-ukrajins'koju movoju pereložena" (The Holy Scripture or, the Complete Bible of the Old and New Testaments, Translated into Rusian–Ukrainian Language) (Byblyja 1869), under the auspices of the editorial board of the Galician newspaper "Pravda" (Studyns'kyj 1930, xxiii-xxiv, xxvii-xxviii).

Having realized that for church use the Bible had to reflect strictly the canonical text, Kuliš might have embarked on the *scholarly translation* in the late 1860s. Both the

with translations made in compliance with a different literary tradition observed at that time in Austrian-Hungarian Ukraine. They are, first of all, translations made by Antonij (Antin) Kobyljans'kyj (1837-1910) and Šaškevyč. However, since Šaškevyč's translation of 1842 remained unknown to Kuliš, one should address translations of the Gospel According to Luke and the Gospel According to John made by Kobyljans'kyj in the 1870s as a reply to the appearance of Kuliš's translation of the Holy Gospels.

The Labor Pangs of a Unified Ukrainian: Kuliš's Translation

In 1869, after the publication of the "Book of Psalms" and "Pentatevx Musijevyj" (Pentateuch), Kuliš contacted, through Natal' Vaxnjanin (1841-1908), the then editor of the periodical "Pravda", Edward Millard, a representative of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Vienna, about a possible publication of the translation of the New Testament under the auspices of the Society. Millard passed over Kuliš's translation to some Galician and Bukovynian *literati* and scholars, including the Russophiles Ivan Naumovyč, Antin Petruševyč, and Ivan Branik from Černivci, who all heavily criticized the language of Kuliš (Studyns'kyj 1930, xxxiif.). Kuliš, however, asked Millard to get in touch with Franz Miklosich (1813-1891) as a possible reviewer of his translation of the NT. Puljuj (1905, 23) later recalled that Miklosich rejected his translation as a mere paraphrase rather than a close translation of the Greek original, and the Bible Society decided not to buy Kuliš's translation of the (Studyns'kyj 1930, xxviif.).

Somewhat disappointed but not entirely disillusioned, Kuliš decided to continue his work on the translation. Assisted by Puljuj, who had just completed his theological and philosophical studies at the University of Vienna, Kuliš began translating the NT in accordance with the strict rules set up by the Bible Society. Both culturally and linguistically, this was a challenging cooperation since the two translators represented different local varieties of literary Ukrainian. While compromising on certain linguistic means, they were persistently searching for a verbal medium able to satisfy all Ukrainians. Having failed eventually to make an agreement with the Bible Society, their translation of the four Holy Gospels came out of press in 1871, though anonymously and under separate covers, "Jevanhelyja po sv. Matfejevi" (Mt), "Jevanhelyja po sv. Markovi" (Mk), "Je-

---

poetic adaptation and *scholarly translation* of the Bible never ceased to interest him. In the 1890s, he was intensely working on his second translation of the Old Testament, the so-called *ustyxotvorena Byblija* (The Versified Bible) (UB). For the Ukrainian literary tradition, that was a new type of translation synthesizing two approaches divorced artificially.

vanhelyja po sv. Luci" (Lk), and "Jevanhelyja po sv. Ioanovi" (Jn) (Levyc-
kij 1888, 154).

Only nine years later, in 1880, the whole text of the NT, "Svjate pys'-
mo novoho Zavitu" (The Holy Scripture of the New Testament), went to
press in the Ševčenko Scientific Society in L'viv with the names of the
two translators (Levyckij 1888, 352). However, a true breakthrough in the
'Ukrainianization' of the NT took place in 1885 when Millard approached
Puljuj with a proposal to buy the rest of the printed copies of the 1880
edition. Shortly after that, he made it clear that the British and Foreign
Bible Society would be ready to buy the copyright of the Ukrainian edi-
tion of the NT. As a result, in 1887 and 1893, the NT, entitled "S'vjate
Pys'mo Novoho Zavitu movoju rus'ko-ukrajins'koju pereklaly vkupi P.A.
Kuliš y dr. Y. Puljuj" (K-P), appeared in its entirety as a publication of
the Bible Society in Vienna.

Despite certain shortcomings in the translation that went through sev-
eral stages in its preparation, the publication of the NT in Ukrainian be-
came a perennial event. The leading role of Kuliš who initiated the pro-
ject and edited the whole text of the NT can hardly be overestimated.
Moreover, vis-à-vis the stylistic and dialectal variance in the language of
the translation, completed by the representatives of two different literary
traditions, this translation may be aptly called, to use the words of Horbač
(1988, 51), "the labor pangs of a unified Ukrainian literary language". In
fact, that was the first successful experience in harmonizing linguistic pro-
grams of the two parts of Ukraine. However, the publication of the NT
did not satisfy neither conservative clerics, headed by Myxajlo Maly-
novs'kyj, the all-powerful Eparchial Consultor in the Lviv Archdiocese,
nor the liberal intelligentsia in Austrian-ruled Galicia. The translation was
denounced, in particular, by a long-time nemesis of Kuliš, Ivan Franko
(1856-1916), whose ideological and political views were notoriously dis-
cordant with Kuliš's programmatic idea of 'farmstead Ukraine'. However,
particularly unappeasable was the criticism of Melyton Bučyns'kyj (1847-
1903) who argued that in the translation 'phonetics [phonetic orthogra-
phy] is introduced, older forms are neglected, and murky places are con-
sciously retained [by the translators]: word is translated for word, without
caring for the meaning' (Studyns'kyj 1930, xxxiii). Clearly, that was a
regionally-biased criticism contrasting with a highly positive opinion
expressed by an anonymous reviewer in "Vestnik Evropy", according to
whom, Kuliš's work was 'one of the most vernacular, that is, commonly
intelligible translations of the Holy Scriptures' (V. 1881, 897-898)[7].

---

[7] Interestingly enough, Studyns'kyj (1930, vxxxi) assumed that the positive review in
"Vestnik Èvtopy" was authored by Volodymyr Navroc'kyj, a native of Galicia.

Generally speaking, the negative reaction of Ukrainians of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire was not surprising. First of all, the Greek Catholic church hierarchy was by default hostile to any vernacular translation of the Holy Scriptures. Instead of blessing the publication of a vernacular translation, they would rather see it immediately destroyed, as was unabashedly recommended by Malynovs'kyj in 1870 with regard to Puljuj's revised manuscript of "Molytvoslov‴" (A Prayerbook) (see Puljuj 1871, 3). One should also bear in mind that Ukrainians in Galicia, Subcarpathia, and Bukovyna were accustomed to the idea of *one* literary language, based on Church Slavonic, though with various degrees of admixtures (Danylenko 2008a, 109-111). In other words, the bulk of Galician speakers, primarily Russophiles, might not have been yet ready at that time to see the Holy Scriptures translated into vernacular, let alone demonstrating Central Dnieper features along with some apparent Galician elements. As far as the Ukrainophile critics are concerned, they could have been disoriented by an extensive inclusion of bookish and Church Slavonic forms in Kuliš's translation, thus allegedly appearing in dissonance with its overall vernacular make-up.

The Ukrainophiles Write Back: Kobyljans'kyj's Translation

Leaning though on different ideological premises, representatives of both the Russophile and Ukrainophile groups intended to counterbalance the impact of Kuliš's work by offering their own exemplary translations. Thus, the Russophile translators installed several fragments from the Bible in the journal "Nauka" published by Ivan Naumovyč in Kolomyja (see Levyckij 1888, 182, 198f.). The Ukrainophile Kobyljans'kyj, on the other hand, translated two Gospels, i.e., the "Gospel According to Luke" which appeared in 1874 in two separate editions, one in Cyrillic script (Luka-U) and the other in Roman script (Luka-L), and finally the "Gospel According to John" also published originally in two script versions in the late 1870s[8]. A native of Bukovyna[9], Kobyljans'kyj's translation seemed to

---

[8] The translation of the "Gospel According to Luke" (both its Cyrillic- and Latin-based versions) is cited in the comprehensive bibliography of Levyckij (1888, 211). Yet he omitted the translation of the "Gospel According to John" that appeared in two versions somewhat later, in 1877. Premised on the "Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture" (London, 1903-1911), Horbač (1988, 30, fn 5) wrote that the former Gospel was reprinted several times in 1874-1876. A sample of the Latin-based edition of the "Gospel According to Luke" of 1874 is found in "The Gospel in Many Tongues" first published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1954 (Gospel, 170). In this study, I am using the first two editions of the "Gospel According to Luke" (Luka-U and Luka-L) and the last Cyrillic-based edition of the "Gospel According to John" (Ioan) which appeared in 1881.

fit into the trend initiated by Šaškevyč and elaborated much later by
Oleksander Bačyn'skij (1844-1933) whose translation of the NT with the
parallel Church Slavonic text appeared in 1903 (Haluščynskyj 1925, 318).
Kobyljnas'kyj's work, however, stands out from the contemporary local
(Slaveno-Rusyn) literary mainstream in Galicia. Suffice it to say that,
according to Horbač (1988, 48), Kobyljans'kyj's dependency upon the
local 'Pokuttja-Dniester-Hucul' dialect (see Kobyljans'kyj 1928), was
much more conspicuous in comparison with Šaškevyč and his followers.

    Kobyljans'kyj's translations appeared in two parallel editions, utilizing
Cyrillic- and Latin-based scripts. Simovyč (1981, 117f.) placed the latter
script in the context of other attempts at creating Ukrainian *latinica* with
the help of Slavic orthographic devices only (Franz Miklosich, Josef Jire-
ček, Teodot Halip, and partly Myxajlo Drahomanov). There seem to be
several reasons behind Kobyljans'kyj's early efforts in introducing his own
system of Latin-based characters. At first sight, his system might be a be-
lated sequel to the orthographic debates initiated in the 1830s by Josyf
Lozyns'kyj (see Lesjuk 2004)[10]. Quite in the spirit of Lozyns'kyj's pro-
posal to use Roman letters to render local vernacular, Kobyljans'kyj could
opt for *latinica* as a counterbalance against conventional etymological or-
thography employed by the Russophiles. In this case, however, his intent
to prepare a parallel edition in Cyrillic script remains murky. One can
hypothesize that he simply wished to retain the dignity of the Holy Gos-
pel, translated though in vernacular, with the help of Cyrillic script. Inci-
dentally, a similar explanation holds true for the publication of Kuliš's
translation of Gospel Books in 1887 and 1893 with the use of Cyrillic
script under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Only
the edition of 1880, sponsored by the Ševčenko Scientific Society, utilized
a typical civil script.

    As an alternative explanation, Horbač (1988, 48) suggested that Koby-
ljans'kyj created his own *latinica* for the Rusyns living in Bukovyna and

---

[9] There is scanty information about Kobyljans'kyj available today, save for an obitua-
ry authored by Tyt Revakovyč in 1910. In particular, Kobyljans'kyj was praised for two
pamphlets aimed against 'the literary dictator' Bohdan Didyc'kyj, a Russophile who edit-
ed the journal "Slovo" in the local 'jazyčije' (Revakovyč 1910, 166f.). Kobyljans'kyj
compiled the said pamphlets in Latin script: "Slovo na slovo do Redaktora 'Slova'" (Čer-
nivci, 1861), supplemented with the author's and Osyp (Jurij) Fed'kovyč's poems exem-
plifying regional vernacular, and "Holos na holos dlia Halyčyny" (Černivci, 1861), with
an addendum of several poems written by the author (Levyckij 1888, 2, 11).

[10] In reply to his major opponents, Markijan Šaškevyč and Josyf Levyc'kyj, Lozyns'kyj
adduced the following argument – in order to make Rusian (Ruthenian) a literary lan-
guage, the Rusyns need a grammar to be based on the vernacular pronunciation. The
latter, however, can be aptly rendered by Latin letters only (Makovej 1903, 83). Koby-
ljans'kyj who liberally used diacritics in his translations of the NT, seemed to have en-
dorsed Lozyns'kyj's reasoning.

North America, or for the Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants who commonly used the Hungarian variant of the Latin alphabet in their overseas publications. All in all, Kobyljans'kyj's *latinica* was premised on the elements borrowed from various western Slavic and even Rumanian orthographic systems, a mix dubbed subsequently 'Latin Czech' (Revakovyč 1910, 166) and 'Czech-Croatian-Polish-Rumanian' phonetic script (Horbač 1988, 48). In the parallel edition, the translator slightly modified Cyrillic script with an eye to rendering vernacular pronunciation without infringing on the etymological principle of the Church Slavonic spelling. That sort of compromise reveals itself in the following parallel excerpts:

Luka-U

5. Б   в за чăсõв Ìрода королă
I   деï с̦вiăченик на iмнiă
Захарïас, з днèвного рiăд ˋ
Авìевого; i жiнка iегò з донiòк
Аàронових, а iмнiè iеì Єлiсавета.
(1)

Luka-L

5. Buv za čăsõv Ìroda korolă Iudeï şviăčenyk na imniè Zacharїas, z dnèvnoho riădù Avìevoho; i žinka iehò z donìòk Aàronovych, a imniè ieì Elisaveta. (1)

5. There was in the days of Her´-od, the King of Ju-dae´-a, a certain priest named Za-cha-ri´-as, of the course of Ab-i´-a: and his wife was of the daughters of Aa´-ron, and her name was E-lis´-a-beth (Lk 1)[11].

In his Latin-based orthography, Kobyljans'kyj routinely employed a caron (*háček*) to render the fricatives *š, ž*, and the affricate *č*, e.g., *ščo* 'that' and *Bože* (n.sg.) 'relating to God' (Luka-L, 8:11, 12). In the Cyrillic version (Luka-U), the translator dropped the back *jer*, an innovation first proposed in the 1837 almanac "Rusalka Dněstrovaja" (The Nymph of the Dniester). Most representative in this version is a sizable number of diacritics borrowed from different Latin-based scripts and used in combination with cyrillic letters.

Thus, in addition to traditional Church Slavonic accents, Kobyljans'kyj introduced from Rumanian a breve and a tilde. Hence *ă* with a breve is a character denoting a mid central vowel, commonly a reflex of the old *ę* as attested in some Dniester, Sjan, and Hucul dialects (AUM, 2, map 41), cf. *ciă* (Luka-U) = *sie* (Luka-L, 1:3) as compared with a stressed reflex in *взiă-ло* (Luka-U) = *vziălo* (n. sg. past) 'take' (Luka-L, 1:1). In cases like *кŏнцă* (Luka-U, 1:3) the *ŏ* letter with a breve stands for a narrow reflex of the etymological *o* (AUM, 2, map 53; MoUkr. *кінця*), while the *ã* letter with a tilde renders a narrow reflex in the environment after a palatalized consonant. Modeled on the Polish and Rumanian orthography, a tail placed at the bottom of the latter *н,* denoted palatalization of the corrsponding

---

[11] Throughout the paper, all English translations are provided from the Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible (Thomas Nelson Bibles, 1977).

consonant, cf. *ſ* or *ŋ* in the Latin-based version. In *ĺos* 'lot' (Luka-L, 1:9), the tail happens to denote a Polish clear *l*. Kobyljans'kyj regularly marked assimilative palatalization, for example, in *ṣviǎtỳm* (m.instr.) 'holy' (Luka-L, 1:15) as attested today in some Dniester dialects (AUM, 2, map 77).

While rendering assimilative palatalization, Kobyljans'kyj seemed to follow the phonetic principle even more consistently than the system of the *želexivka* designed by Jevhen Želexivs'kyj in his "Malorus'ko-nimec'-kyj slovar'" (Little Russian-German Dictionary, 1884-1886). It is therefore not surprising that Kobyljans'kyj preferred denoting 'jotated' vowels with the help of two symbols like *i   /iu* or *u* (with palatalization of the preceding consonant marked by a tail) for *ю*, *ia/ia* for *я*, *iǎ/iǎ* or *ie* for *ѧ*, *ie/ie* for *є*. Conceivably, Kobyljans'kyj's system can be placed within the confines of 'the most radical phonetics' as propagated by Kuliš in the early 1880s for the Ukrainian orthography (Barvins'kyj 2004, 201) in contrast to the orthography used in his translation of the NT in 1871.

In all other matters orthographic, Kobyljans'kyj remained very close to the etymological spelling. He offered, in fact, its slightly modernized version that did not undergo substantial revision in subsequent publications of his translations, especially that of the "Gospel According to John" (Ioan, 1881). In the latter translation, Kobyljans'kyj's spelling proved more conservative as compared with his previous experimenting with different orthographic systems. On the one hand, he dropped using the tail below consonants to render both assimilative and positional palatalization, e.g., *свѧтыни* (loc.) 'temple' or *житьє* 'life' (Ioan, 11:56, 1:4), keeping, however, the front *jer* (soft sign). Neither did he use any longer a breve to mark a narrow reflex of the etymological *o*, introducing instead a circumflex (used in some contemporary publications) for its both stressed and unstressed reflexes, e.g., *плôдъ* 'fruit', *нôч* (instr.) 'night', and *ôдповѣли* (pl. past) 'reply' (Ioan, 4:36, 7:50, 9:20). A similar reflex is marked in some analogous forms like *зôправды* 'verily' (ib., 3:5), with an *ô* from a preposition ending etymologically in a back *jer*. He dropped also a breve above *a* (*ǎ*), reintroducing instead the old Cyrillic letter *ѧ*, for instance, in the reflexive particle *сѧ* (Ioan, 1:3).

Unlike his 1874 publications of Luka-L and Luka-U, in the 1881 translation Kobyljans'kyj began using the *jat'*, though sometimes he was obviously struggling with his native dialectal phonetics, cf. *з Галілеï* (Luka-U) = *z Galileï* 'from Gal'-i-lee' (Luka-L, 2:4) next to *до Галілеѣ* and *до Галілеï* 'to Gal'-i-lee' (Ioan, 1:44, 4:3). Reflexes of the former *jat'* and similar sounds tended to be consistently marked by the *jat'* as in the Polish borrowing *кобѣта* 'woman' (ib., 4:25) or dialectal forms of the type *горѣ* 'upwards' and *долѣвъ* 'downwards' (ib., 1:52). Generally, Kobyljans'kyj happened to use the letter *jat'* in those cases where he previously

employed the letter *i* or *ê*, both rendering narrow reflexes: *до міста* 'unto a city', *на дворі* 'outside' (loc.), *чоловік* 'man', *долів* 'downwards' (Luka-U, 1:26, 10, 2:25, 51) as compared with *чоловѣкъ* 'man', *хлѣбъ* 'bread', *долѣвъ* 'downwards' (Ioan, 1:9, 44, 52). One comes, however, across the character *ê* instead of *ѣ* in words that might have been conceived of by Kobyljans'kyj as vernacular clichés 'not deserving' any *jat'*, whence *о нêмъ* (loc.) 'about him', *жêнко* (voc.) 'wife', as well as *камêнныхъ* (gen.) 'of stone' (ib., 1:48, 2:5, 6) with an *ê* in place of the 'new' *jat'*. Still, as if emphasizing confessional significance of the translation, Kobyljans'kyj reinstated the front and back *jers* and *jery*, e.g., *близько* 'close', *водовъ* (f.instr.) 'water', *котрый* 'who' (ib., 11:55, 1:26, 27). Interestingly, Kuliš did not use these letters in the classical 1857-1862 period of *kulišivka* (Simovyč 1937).

Behind the ostentatiously religious façade of the Cyrillic-based edition of 1881, one encounters some representative dialectal features. Thus, in addition to *ô* as in *радôсть* 'joy' (Ioan, 3:29), the circumflex was placed by Kobyljans'kyj above *u* (*û*) and *ы* (*ы̂*), though exclusively in the prefix (*ы̂-*). The former character was sounded as a high-mid front vowel reflex of *i* or *y* (see AUM, 2, map 22) which, in turn, might be of different origin, e.g., *родженû* (pl.) 'born', *ôвцû* pl. 'sheep', *своû* (pl.) 'my' (Ioan, 1:13, 2:25, 1:11), *божницû* (gen.) 'synagogue' (ib., 9:22) next to *нû* 'no' (ib., 1:21) as opposed to *межи* 'among' (ib., 1:14). For instance, the form *нû* is a reflex of the old *нѣ* that in modern Ukrainian, including Kobyljans'kyj's native dialect, took over the function of the old *ни* 'no' as opposed to 'yes' (Shevelov 1979, 662f.). For this reason, *нû* (< *нѣ*) is also attested in negative pronouns like *нûхто* 'nobody' (Ioan, 1:18). In the prefix *ы̂-*, however, one deals with a narrow reflex *i* (< *y*) as found in the Sjan and especially Hucul dialects (AUM, 2, map 18) which also know the *i*-reflex in place of the etymological *o* in the newly closed syllables (Shevelov 1979, 666; Pan'kevyč 1938, 66, 74f.), cf. *ôдповѣвъ* (m. sg. past) 'reply', *жидôвска* (f.) 'Jewish' (Ioan, 1:21, 2:13) alongside *вы̂тарчитъ* (3 sg. fut.) 'be enough' with a dialectally representative ending -*тъ*, *вы̂знавъ* (m. sg. past) 'admit' (ib., 1:20, 6:7), as compared with etymological spellings *ты* 'you', *сынови* (dat.) 'you' (ib., 4, 5; 4, 19).

Overall, in Kobyljans'kyj's phonetics, one can speak about a reversal from a solid dialectal basis of the language of Luka-U/Luka-L of 1874 to a slightly moderate vernacular and dialectal language of Ioan of 1881, with its orthography showing a bias toward the Church Slavonic tradition. As far as Kuliš's translation of the NT is concerned, a more balanced approach is evidenced in both orthography and phonetics (Danylenko 2009b). First of all, Cyrillic script of the 1887 edition (K-P) aside, Kuliš's orthography is void of almost all outdated Slavonic letters, with the exception of *ѧ*, thus, unlike Kobyljans'kyj's translation of 1881, looking more

democratic. Viewed, however, from a broader perspective, Kuliš's spelling system appears more conservative as compared with a more 'democratic' (phonetic) approach, applied by the translator in his poetic paraphrases of some Biblical books in the 1860s. In the case of the 1868 autograph of the Book of Job (Yov), there are, however, in the text numerous features that are shared in his translation of the NT. Among them, I will mention the use of *i* referring to the corresponding sound irrespective of its origin like *тіло* 'body', *свій* 'someone's own' (Yov, 19r, 7r) next to *він* 'he', *всі* 'all' (K-P, Lk 2:10, 21), the old letter *є* rendering jotation of *e* at the beginning of a word and, in other environments, palatalization of the preceding consonant, e.g., *єдиний* 'common', *маєш* (2 sg. pres.) 'have' (Yov, 14v) next to *Єлизавета* 'Elizabeth', *витаннє* 'greeting' (K-P, Lk 1:41).

Though less 'phonetically ostentatious' in comparison with the 1861-1862 *kulišivka*, Kuliš resorted in Yov to such orthographic devices that did not make their way into his translation of the NT, for instance, rendering assimilative changes at the morpheme boundary like *боіцця* (3 sg. pres.) 'be afraid' and *подивисся* (2 sg. fut.) 'look' (Yov, 4r, 16r). Neither did such assimilation make its way into the orthography of Kobyljans'kyj's translation of 1874. In Kuliš's translation of the NT, one finds numerous features representing different dialectal areals. To begin with the alternation *u-* : *v-* in congruence with the principles of euphony, this change is typical primarily of Southeast Ukrainian and literary Ukrainian as cultivated in Russian-ruled Ukraine in the second half of the nineteenth century, e.g., *и ввесь дім* 'and [his] whole house' next to *повиганав усіх* 'he drove them all out' (K-P, Jn 4:53, 2:15). Among western Ukrainian forms, deserving attention is *него* (gen.) 'he' (ib., Jn 3:3), cf. *без него* 'without him' in Kobyljans'kyj (Ioan, 1:3). Kuliš used both the form *від* which, according to Ivan Nečuj-Levyc'kyj (1838-1918), epitomized allegedly the spread of Galician defective norms in Dnieper Ukraine (Nečuj-Levic'kyj 1907, 19), and its Central Dnieper equivalent *од* 'from', e.g., *родиться од води* '[a man] be born of water' next to *роджене від духа* '[which] is born of the Spirit' (K-P, Jn 3:5, 6). Overall, Kuliš would use dialectisms from different regions or choose primarily cross-dialectal forms, cf. *кьерничина* with the dialectal lowering of the *ir*-reflex as opposed to a parallel form widely spread in North and Southeast Ukrainian, *криниця* 'well' (K-P, Jn 4:6; AUM, 2, map 71).

Kobyljans'kyj's forms, in contrast, are largely southwestern Ukrainian. In morphology, it is worthwhile mentioning neuters of the type *весѣлье* 'marriage', *житье* 'life', *повстанье* 'resurrection' (Ioan, 1:4, 2:1, 5:29), also *имнье* next to an archaic-dialectal blending *имнѧ* (ib., 1:12, 6; Kobyljan-s'kyj 1928, 39); a liberal use of active participles, e.g., *стоѧчій и слухаючій* 'which standeth and heareth', *маючій* 'that hath the bride', *творѧчій* (ib.,

3:29), with vernacular suffixes *-ач-* and *-юч-*, and *оучинивший* 'he that made' and *зказавший* 'which said' (ib., 5:11, 12), influenced by the local literary tradition; masculine and neuter dative forms in *-ovy/-evy* where *y* < *ĭ* like *голосови* 'voice' and *сынови* 'son' (ib., 3:29, 5:22) and some other forms as compared with newer (southeastern Ukrainian) datives *синові* and *отцеві* 'father' in Kuliš (K-P, Jn 4:5, 21) where *i* < *ѣ* (Bevzenko 1978, 95). The latter also employed neuters in *-(j)e*, partly influenced by the old literary tradition and therefore criticized by Nečuj-Levyc'kyj (Nečuj-Levic'kyj 1907, 21-22), e.g., *житте* 'life' and *свідченне* 'record' (K-P, Jn 1:4, 19). Most interesting is Kuliš's sporadic use of active participles. Thus, in Chapter 1 of the "Gospel According to John", Kuliš employed only four present active participle forms, pertaining directly to the narrative about Christ, though only one of them is used with a Church Slavonic suffix, i.e., *градущий* '[he] that comes' (ib., Jn 1:15). Past active participles are also very scanty. There are only two forms in the translation of the said chapter – *злинувший* 'descending' and *пославший* '[he] that sent' (ib., Jn 1:32, 33).

While Kuliš was open to multidialectal borrowings with an eye to diversifying his language, Kobyljans'kyj remained largely focused on obvious regionalisms, attested also more often than not in Šaškevyč's translation. It is worthwhile mentioning reduplicated demonstratives, inherited from the Old Ukrainian period, like *осесе* 'this', *тото*, *отото* 'that' (Ioan, 1:19, 28, 2:16; Luka-U, 1:18, 20) and so on (Pan'kevyč 1938, 277-282; Bevzenko 1978, 133), the abundance of clitic forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns occurring sporadically in parallel use with the corresponding full forms, e.g., *каже му* next to *каже ему* 'saith unto him' (Ioan, 1:44, 47) or *го питали* next to *питали его* 'asked him' (ib., 1:19, 21). Another most representative regional feature is the use of numerous feminine instrumentals of the type *з нев* 'with her', *неплоднов* 'barren' (Luka-U, 1:58, 36), *лѣчбовъ* 'number' (Ioan, 6:10) and other forms which were no exceptions in contemporary literary texts in Austrian-Hungarian Ukraine (Macjuk 2001, 272-273).

Deserving special attention are dialectal erstwhile perfect forms with clitic auxiliaries (Pan'kevyč 1938, 313f.; Kobyljans'kyj 1928, 59-60), whence their spelling as solid or separate words, e.g., *šukàlysmo* '[we] have sought', *šukàlyste* 'ye sought' (Luka-L, 2:48, 49) next to *абы смо дали* 'that we may give' (Ioan, 1:22), or *приобрілас* 'has found' (Luka-U, 1:30) next to *не вірив іес* 'thou believest not' (ib., 1:20) and *с чув* 'though hast been instructed', literally 'you (have) heard' (ib., 1:4). Kuliš tried to avoid such dialectal forms despite the fact that they were well attested in Middle Ukrainian (Bevzenko 1978, 325f.), including the clitic reflexive particle, and even codified in contemporary regional grammars (Macjuk 2001,

304). Only sporadically did he resort to old perfects in order to archaicize Christ's or his disciples' language, e.g., *сказала єси* '[Je´-sus said unto her] Thou hast [well] said' (K-P, Jn 4:17).

Remarkably, in syntax, there are no major differences between Kobyljans'kyj's and Kuliš's translations, both largely leaning on archaic (Church Slavonic) patterns, though dialectal constructions do occur in Kobyljans'-kyj, e.g., *верн8ли ж сіᴕ тих сімдесіᴕт, з радостев* (Luka-U, 10:17), with the genitive subject of the Polish type, next to *і вернулись сімдесять назад з радощами* 'and the seventy returned again with joy' in Kuliš (K-P, Lk 10:17). Thus, both translators used passive constructions where the agent-salient participant was marked by a preposition *від* (*од*), denounced later by Nečyj-Levyc'kyj as Galician-Podolian, and *через* which were also commonplace in the translation of Šaškevyč, e.g., *ôдъ Бога роджеnû* (Ioan, 1:13) alongside *від Бога родилисᴕ* 'born of God' (K-P, Jn 1:13) or syntactically synonymous *право б8ло дане черезъ Мойсеᴕ* (Ioan, 1:17) next to Kuliš's equivalent *закон через Мойсеᴕ даний був* '[For] the law was given by Mo´-ses' (K-P, Jn 1:17). I did not find in Kobyljans'kyj impersonal constructions with the forms in *-no* and *-to* and the accusative direct object. Kuliš, however, employed them intermittently inasmuch as he could consider them too vernacular for the lofty narrative of the translation, e.g., *запрошено ж Исуса, и учеників іого* (K-P, Jn 2:2) as compared with *запрошеный же б8въ Іис8съ и оученики его* 'and both Je´-sus was called, and his disciples' in Kobyljans'kyj's translation (Ioan 2:2). Unlike Kobyljans'kyj who, in relative clauses, liberally employed *котрый* 'which' in compliance with the Polish literary tradition. In his translation of chapter 1 of the "Gospel According to John", Kuliš made use of the native *що* 'that, which' fourteen times, and of *котрий* only twice.

Vocabulary, to be sure, is most useful for the assessment of linguistic programs of Kuliš and Kobyljans'kyj who, incidentally, knew each other, purportedly by correspondence, and seemed to share most of the Ukrai-nophile views[12]. To begin with, unlike Šaškevyč's translation (see Tymo-šyk 2000b), there is a paucity of Church Slavonicisms in Kobyljans'kyj's vocabulary. Leaving aside church terminology, I can adduce just a handful of Church Slavonic forms, e.g., *аминь* 'verily' (Ioan, 3:3; see Biblija, 557v), paralleled by various vernacular derivatives like *зôправды* (ib.,

---

[12] There is a unique evidence of interpersonal relationship between Kuliš and Kobyljans'kyj. In a letter of May 9, 1861, that was not, however, mailed, Kuliš wrote to Kobyljans'kyj about his admiration for Jurij Fed'kovyč's poems published by Kobyljans'kyj in his "Slovo na slovo" (Kuliš 1899; see fn 9). Extolling Fed'kovyč's language different from the *jazyčije* used by some Galician poets, Kuliš expressed pessimism about Kobyljans'kyj's Latin-based script. According to him, such a script was likely to scare off potential readership in Dnieper Ukraine. It is time for us, he concluded, to write in the same fashion' (ib., 4).

Іоан, 5:19), *на правду* (ib., 6:26), *по правдѣ* (ib., 6:32), *правдиво* (ib., 6:53), or a bookish equivalent *истинно* (ib., 6:10), commonly attested in Kuliš; *пустынѧ* 'desert' (ib., 6:31; Biblija, 556v) which is paralleled by *пуща* (ib., Іоan, 1:23), most likely under Polish interference; *єднородный* 'only begotten [Son]' (ibid., 3:16) as compared with Church Slavonic *єдинородный* (Biblija, 556v). I can add here personal and geographical names used, as a rule, in their Church Slavonic forms like *Іоарданъ* (Jor´-dan) and *Іоанъ* (John).

Kobyljans'kyj's translations are replete with vernacular and dialectal elements: *всѧчино* (n. sg.) 'all' (Іоan, 1:3), *ôдки* 'whence' and *ôдси* 'hence' (ib., 1:49, 2:16), *заки* 'before, till' (ib., 5:7), *борше* 'faster' (ib., 6:21), *хороба* 'disease' (ib., 5:4), *голота* '[a great] multitude' (ib., 6:2), *бесѣда* 'words [of eternal life]' (ib., 6:68; Luka-U, 2:50), *гармѣдеръ* 'murmuring' (Іоan, 7:12), *варводѣти* 'murmur' (ib., 6:52; see Žel., 1: 56), *вадити сѧ* 'strive among themselves' (Іоan, 6:52; see Žel., 1: 53), *напудити сѧ* 'become afraid' (Іо-an, 6:19), *хлопакъ* 'lad' (ib., 6:9), and the like. Polish borrowings are typi-cally long appropriated forms in the local variant of Ukrainian such as *кревна* (Luka-U, 1:36) next to *родичка* 'cousin' in Kuliš (K-P, Lk 1:36), *моцар* (Luka-U, 1:52) next to *потужний* 'mighty' in Kuliš (K-P, Lk 1:52), *офіра* (Luka-U, 2:24) next to *жертва* 'sacrifice' in Kuliš (K-P, Lk 2:24), *выкурованый* (Іоan, 5:10; see Žel., 1: 77) next to *сцілений* in Kuliš (K-P, Jn 5:10; see Hrinč., 1: 725), *не въстарчитъ* (Іоan, 6:7) next to *не стане* 'is not sufficient' in Kuliš (K-P, Jn 6:7), *лȣдка* (Іоan, 6:24) next to *човен* 'ship(ping)' in Kuliš (K-P, Jn 6:24), *королевство Боже* (Іоan, 3:3) next to *царство Боже* in Kuliš (K-P, Jn 3:3), finally *ufàv* (m. sg. past) 'trust' (Luka-L, 11:22) next to *вповав* in Kuliš (K-P, Lk 11:22). A list of such pairs may be expanded. It becomes clear that Kuliš was consistently loyal to the recommendation he had given to Puljuj, while working together on the translation of the NT, — in most cases, "one had better resort to Church Slavonic rather than to Polish" since "Old Bulgarian tradition, if there is no indigenous form, is more appropriate for Ukrainian" (Studyn-s'kyj 1930, xxvii, 9, 12).

In Kuliš's translation Church Slavonic forms intermingle with vernac-ular and dialectal elements. In contrast to Kobyljans'kyj (and Šaškevyč), such variegated elements, according to Kuliš, could serve as a verbal me-dium able to unite linguistically all Ukrainians. It is useful to compare the following parallel excerpts from Kobyljans'kyj's and Kuliš's translations[13]:

---

[13] Haluščynskyj (1925, 317) believed that Kobyljans'kyj's translations, influenced by German Protestantism, were made from the Greek original. Indeed, having obtained his theological education in L'viv and Černivci, Kobyljans'kyj served several years as a preacher of 'The Free German Religious Community' (Revakovyč 1910, 171). However, a cursory comparison of the translations made by Kobyljans'kyj and Kuliš prompts me to

Kobyljans'kyj's translation [Ioan, Iv, 4]	Kuliš's translation [K–P, Iv. 4]
11. Каже ємᲈ кобѣта: Пане, анû чер-пала немаєшъ, а стᲈднѧ є глᲈбока; ôд-ки одже маешъ водᲈ живᲈ?	11. Ка́же іому́ жі́нка: Добро́дію, и черпака́ не ма́єш, и коло́дазь глибо́кий; звідкіла ж ма́єш во́ду живу́?
13. Ôдповѣвъ Іисᲈсъ и каже ôй пючій воды сеû єû прагнᲈти бᲈде зновъ.	13. Озва́всь Ису́с и рече́ ій: Всѧкий, хто пьє во́ду сю забажа́є знов. (К-Р, Ів. 4)
15. Каже до него женщина: Пане, дай ми такоû воды, щобымъ не прагнᲈла, анû не ходила сюды зачерати. (Ioan, 4)	15. Ка́же до не́го жі́нка: Добро́дію, дай мені́ сіеї воду́, щоб жа́ждувала, ані ходи́ла сюди́ че́рпати.

11. The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from when then hast thou that living water? 13. Je´-sus answered and said unto her. Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again. 15. The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw. (Jn 4)

Orthographic innovations aside, Kobyljans'kyj's language is riddled with regional forms like *кобѣта* and *женщина* 'woman' along with *Пан* 'Sir', *ôдки* 'whence', and long naturalized Polish borrowings *стᲈднѧ* 'well' and *прагнᲈти* 'thirst' (Tymč., 2, 209, 373), as well as the derivative *черпало* 'scoop' with a dialectally productive suffix *-lo* (Verxratskyj 1899, 51) next to *зачерати* 'draw' (see Žel., 1, 281), the participial form *пючій* 'drinking', influenced by both Polish and Church Slavonic literary traditions, as well as the use of a clitic auxilary in *щобымъ*. Though vernacular at its core (cf. *Исус*), the excerpt from Kuliš contains an old aorist form *рече* (3 sg.) which, introduced by him in the late 1860s, was unfairly chastised by Franko (1910, 176; cf. Danylenko 2009c). Moreover, Kuliš makes use of a western Ukrainian form, *жаждувати* 'quench one's thirst' (Žel., 1, 216).

The innovative use of the obsolete aorist form *рече́* with the ultimate stressing in the present tense meaning 'says' was not incidental. Kuliš utilized Church Slavonicisms in order to emphasize, if needed contextually, the Biblical narrative. To name just a few Church Slavonicisms, the following are quite representative form the morphonological and lexical points of view: *благодать* 'grace' (K-P, Jn 1:14), *грѧдущий* '[he] that cometh' (ib., 1:15), *єси* '[thou] art' (ib., 1:19), *глаголати* 'say' (ib., 1:15), a nominal form, *недостоєн* (m. sg.) 'not worthy' (ib., 1:27), and the like. Statistically, such forms are not numerous, hardly exceeding fourteen percent (Tymošyk 2000a, 244). What is important, however, is not their number but their fusion with other elements in the make-up of the translation. In this respect, Kuliš's language is a true conglomerate of various elements, including the above-mentioned 'Galician-Podolian' *від* 'from' or

claim that the former author might have been intimately familiar with Kuliš's text. That comes as no surprise since Kobyljans'kyj designed his translations as a reply to Kuliš's translation of the NT of 1871.

него 'him', Church Slavonicisms like *воскреснути* 'rise' (K-P, Mk 16: 9), Russianisms of the type *трепет* 'trembling' (ib., 16:8; see Hrinč., 2, 791) and *болесть* 'disease' (K-P, Jn 5:4), Polonisms like *змаганнє* 'question' (ib., Jn 3:25; see Shevelov 1966, 138) next to *с8перечка* in Kobyljans'kyj (Ioan, 3:25), and, finally, vernacular forms of primarily southeastern Ukrainian provenance like *баритися* 'tarry' (K-P, Lk 1:21) as opposed to a western Ukrainian parralel form *(за)бавити сă* in Kobyljanskyj (Luka-U, 1:21; see Tymč., 1, 39, 43).

Vernacularizing or Synthesizing?

Overall, Kobyljans'kyj's translations heralded a new round in the formation of the local variety of literary language aimed at bridging a rift between the educated clergy and common parishioners in Galicia, Subcarpathain Rus', and Bukovyna. Tentatively, his literary output can be juxtaposed with Šaškevyč's translation which was largely premised on Church Slavonic literary norms, open already to vernacular and especially dialectal elements (Horbač 1988, 47). In his intention to explicate and enlighten in an intelligible manner, Kobyljans'kyj seemed to follow the same regional literary tradition, cultivated already in the eighteenth-century Basilian monastery of Počajiv. The major statistical difference lay in his introducing of a plethora of dialectal and non-native forms into the confessional text. This is why, despite an apparent minimum of Church Slavonicisms, the language of Kobyljans'kyj can be placed along the same functional spectrum and, accordingly, conceived as a kind of 'Church Slavonic-turned-vernacular', and his translation of the NT as the first Ukrainian dialectal translation (Nimčuk 2001, 383). Clearly, there was a radical difference between Kobyljans'kyj's language and the language program of the creators of the Peresopnycja Gospel who tried to combine Church Slavonic with the 'prostaja mova' rather than with the local vulgar tongue.

In contrast to Kobyljans'kyj, Kuliš opted for a diametrically opposite approach. Based on the southeastern Ukrainian vernacular as opposed to the Russian recension of Church Slavonic ushered in by the Russian Synod decrees in the 1720s, Kuliš strived for a synthesis of the intrinsically low-style vernacular with elements picked from other territorial and functional registers, including Church Slavonic, Russian, Polish, and Galician expressions. It is therefore not surprising that, while working on the translation of the NT with Ivan Puljuj, Kuliš was routinely consulting the Church Slavonic, Russian, Polish, Serbian, German, Latin, English, and French versions of the Holy Scriptures (Studyns'kyj 1930, xxviii-xxix).

Kuliš proposed a new confessional style and, by extension, a new literary language. His vista differed not only from the program of the Galician

populists, including Kobyljans'kyj, but also from those *literati* in Russian-ruled Ukraine, who translated the Holy Scriptures, in particular Oleksander Navroc'kyj (1823-1892), Volodymyr Aleksandrov (1825-1894), as well as Myxajlo Lobodovs'kyj with Pylyp Moračevs'kyj. Sandwiched between the populist program evolved from the Church Slavonic tradition in Galicia and the 'homestead ethnographism' of some of his compatriots in Russian-ruled Ukraine, Kuliš proved highly versatile in the translation of the NT. Had his programmatic views been accepted as guiding principles, the formation of a new Ukrainian literary language would have taken, to be sure, a different detour.

Literature

Aničenka, Ŭ.V. 1969. *Belaruska-ŭkrainskija pis'mova-moŭnyja suvjazi.* Minsk.

Arpolenko, H. 2003. P. Moračevs'kyj i peršyj povnyj pereklad Sv. Jevanhelija novoukrajins'koju movoju. *Volyn'-Žytomyrščyna* 10. Žytomyr, 212-220.

AUM – *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy,* vol. 2: *Volyn', Naddnistrjanščyna, Zakarpattja i sumižni zemli.* Kyjiv 1988.

Barvins'kyj, O. 2004. *Spomyny z moho žyttja,* parts 1-2. New York, Kyjiv.

Bevzenko, S.P. (ed.). 1978. *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy. Morfolohija.* Kyjiv.

Biblija – *Bíblija ily knýgy Sveščénnago pysanię vétxago y nóvago zavěta.* St. Petersburg 1862.

Byblyja 1869 – [Kuliš, P., trans.] 1869. *Svjate Pys'mo abo vsja Byblyja Staroho y Novoho Zavitu rus'ko-ukrajins'koju movoju pereložena.* L'viv.

Celunova, E.A. 1990. O cerkovnoslavjanskom protografe Biblii Franciska Skoriny (na materiale Knigi Čisla). *Slavia* 59 (3), 244-250.

Čepiha, I.P. 2001. Peresopnyc'ke Jevanhelije – unikal'na pamjatka ukrajins'koji movy. In: Nimčuk, V.V. (ed.). *Peresopnyc'ke Jevanhelije 1556-1561. Doslidžennja. Transliterovanyj tekst. Slovopokažčyk.* Kyjiv, 13-54.

Danylenko, A. 2006. *Slavica et Islamica. Ukrainian in context.* München.

— 2008a. The formation of New Standard Ukrainian: from the history of an undeclared contest between Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine in the 18th century'. *Die Welt der Slaven* 53 (1), 82-115.

— 2008b. The new Ukrainian standard language (1798) – between tradition and innovation. In: Bethin, Ch.Y. (ed.), *American Contributions to the 14th Congress of Slavists in Ohrid, Macedonia, 2008,* vol. 1: Linguistics. Bloomington/IN, 59-74.

— 2009a. Myxajlo Lučkaj – a dissident forerunner of literary Rusyn? *The Slavonic and East European Review* 87 (2), 201-226.

— 2009b. 'Pyšy, jak movyš…', abo čomu Pantelejmon Kuliš ne stav tvorcem sučasnoho ukrajins'koho pravopysu. In: Hrycenko, P.Ju. (ed.), *Ukrajins'kyj dialektolohičnyj zbirnyk* 4. Kyjiv (forthcoming).

— 2009c. Xaj dufaje Srul' na pana: do istoriji stosunkiv I. Franka z P. Kulišem. In: Lysyčenko, L.A. et al. (eds.). *Filolohični studiji.* Xarkiv, 354-363.

Fleischmann, S. 2006. *Szymon Budny. Ein theologisches Portrait des polnisch-weißrussischen Humanisten und Unitariers (ca. 1530-1593).* Köln, Weimar, Wien.

Franko, I. 1910. *Narys istoriji ukrajins'ko-rus'koji literatury.* L'viv.

Frick, D. 1987. Meletij Smotryc'kyj's Ruthenian *Homilary Gospel* of 1616. In: *The Jevanhelije učytelnoje of Meletij Smotryc'kyj.* With an introduction by David A. Frick. Cambridge/MA, ix-xvi.

Gospel – *The Gospel in many tongues. Specimens of 826 languages in which The British and Foreign Society has published or circulated some portion of The Word of God.* London 1954.

Haluščynskyj, T. 1925. De ucrainis S. Scripturae versionibus. *Bohoslovija* (Lviv) 3 (1-4), 218-225, 309-319.

HG – [Moračevs'kyj, P., trans.] *Hospoda našoho Iysusa Xrysta Svjate Jevanhelije vid Matfeja, slavjans'koju j ukrajins'koju movoju*, 4th ed. Moscow 1907.

Horbač, O. 1988. Movostyl' novitnix perekladiv Sv. Pys'ma na ukrajins'ku narodnju movu 19-20 vv. *Ukrajins'kyj Vil'nyj Universytet. Naukovi zapysky* 13. München, 29-98.

Hrinč. – Hrinčenko, B. 1924. *Slovar' ukrajins'koji movy. Ukrainsko-russkij slovar'*, 2 vols. Berlin.

Ioan – [Kobyljans'kyj, A., trans.] 1881. *Pys'mo Svęte. Jevanhelije Ioana*. L'viv.

Kobyljans'kyj, B. 1928. Hucul's'kyj hovir i joho vidnošennja do hovoru Pokuttja. *Ukrajins'kyj dijalektolohičnyj zbirnyk* 1, 1-92.

K–P – *Svęte pys'mo Novoho Zavitu. Movoju rus'ko-ukrajins'koju pereklaly vkupi P. A. Kuliš y Dr. Y. Puljuj*. Lviv 1887.

[Kuliš, P.] 1899. Pis'mo P. A. Kuliša v Bukovinu, 1861 goda. *Kievskaja starina* 2, 3-4.

Lesjuk, M. 2004. Počatok azbučnoji vijny v Halyčyni. *Šaškevyčiana. Zbirnyk naukovyx prac'* 5-6. L'viv, Winnipeg, 41-56.

Levyckij, I. Em. 1888. *Halycko-ruskaja bybliohrafija XIX-ho stolětija* […]. 1801-1886, vol. 1. L'vov.

Luka-L – [Kobyljans'kyj, A., trans.] 1874. *Evanhèlĭe Lukì*. L'viv.

Luka-U – [Kobyljans'kyj, A., trans.] 1874. *Jevanhèlije Lukỳ*. L'viv.

Macjuk, H. 2001. *Preskryptyvne movoznavstvo v Halyčyni (perša polovyna XIX st.)*. L'viv.

Makovej, O. 1903. Try halyc'ki hramatyky. Dodatky. *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Ševčenka* 84, 59-96.

Matvijas, I. H. 2008. Dialektna osnova movy v tvorax Pantelejmona Kuliša. *Ukrajins'ka mova* 1, 95-99.

Nečuj-Levic'kyj [Nečuj-Levyc'kyj], I. 1907. Sjohočasna časopysna mova na Ukrajini. *Ukraina*, vol. 1, Jan., 1-49, Feb., 183-237, Mar., 280-331.

Nimčuk, V.V. 2001. Ukrajins'ki dialektni pereklady Sv. Pys'ma. In: *Ukrajins'ke i slovjans'ke movoznavstvo* 4. Užhorod, 383-389.

— 2005. *Ukrajins'ki pereklady Svjatoho Pys'ma*. In: Moser, M. (ed.). *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache*. Wien, 15-64.

Pan'kevyč, I. 1938. *Ukrajins'ki hovory Pidkarpats'koji Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej*. Praha.

Petrov, A. 1923. Otzvuk reformacii v russkom Zakarpat'i XVI v. *Mémoires de la Société Royale des Sciences de Bohême. Classe des lettres* 1921-1922, 1-125.

Pšepjurs'ka-Ovčarenko, M.M. 1988. Mova perekladu Novoho Zavitu P. Moračevs'koho. *Ukrajins'kyj Vil'nyj Universytet. Naukovi zapysky* 13. München, 203-248.

Puljuj, I. 1871. *Lyst bez koperty jako odpoviď Vpr. Krylošanynu Malynovs'komu na referat molytovnyka*. Wien.

— 1905. *Novi i pereminni z'vizdy*, 3rd ed. Wien.

Revakovyč, T. 1910. Antin Kobyljans'kyj. Kil'ka zhadok. *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Ševčenka* 94, 166-173.

Shevelov, G.Y. 1966. *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798-1965*. Wiesbaden.

— 1979. *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg.

Simovyč, V. 1937. Kuliševa mova j 'Kulišivka'. *Žyttja i znannja* 2, 58-59.

— 1981. *Ukrajins'ke movoznavstvo*. Ottawa.

Sreznevskij, V.I. 1902. Oxrannaja opis' rukopisnogo otdelenija biblioteki Imperatorskoj akademii nauk. *Izvestija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 16 (4), 089-094; 17 (5), 079-087; 1903, 18 (3), 01-019.

Studyns'kyj, K. (ed.). 1930. *P.O. Kuliš (Materijaly i rozvidky)*, part 2. L'viv (*Zbirnyk filolohičnoji sekciji Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka* 22/2).

Šašk. – [Z jevanhelija sv. Mateja. Pereklad jevanhelija sv. Ivana]. In: Voznjak, M. (ed.). 1912. *Pysannja Markijana Šaškevyča*. L'viv (*Naukove tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, Zbirnyk filjologičnoji sekciji* 14), 107-142.

Tymč. – Tymčenko, Je. 2003. *Materialy do slovnyka pysemnoji ta knyžnoji ukrajins'koji movy XV-XVIII st.*, parts 1-2, ed. by Nimčuk, V. V., H. I. Lysa. Kyjiv, New York.

Tymošyk, H. 2000a. Staroslov'janizmy u teksti perekladu Sv. Pys'ma P. Kuliša ta I. Puljuja. *Problemy slovjanoznavstva* 51. Lviv, 243-244.

— 2000b. Iz sposterežen' nad movnymy osoblyvostjamy perekladiv Sv. Pys'ma. *Šaškevyčiana. Zbirnyk naukovyx prac'* 3-4. L'viv, Winnipeg, 100-107.

UB – [Kuliš, P.]. *Ustyxotvorena Byblyja: Knyha Nastan'nja S'vitu, Častyna Perva Knyhy Moyseëvoi Pervoi*, Repository at the Myxajlo Kocjubyns'kyj Museum in Černihiv (Ukraine), No. A-4540.

V. 1881. [Review of] Svjate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu. Movoju rus'ko-ukrains'koju pereklaly vkupi P.A. Kuliš y dr. Y. Puljuj. Lviv. 1880. *Vestnik Evropy* 87 (1/2), 895-898.

Verxratskyj, I. 1899. Znadoby dlja piznannja uhorsko-ruskyx hovoriv. *Zapysky Naukovo-ho Tovarystva imeni Ševčenka* 27, 1-68; 28, 69-94; 29, 95-200; 30, 201-276.

Vladimirov, P.V. 1989. *Doktor Francisk Skorina. Ego perevody, pečatnye izdanija i jazyk.* Facsimile reprint of 1888. München (*Specimina Philologiae Slavicae* 85).

Voznjak, M. 1924. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 3: *Viky XVI-XVII*, part 2. L'viv.

Yov – [Kuliš, P.] 1868. *Yov.* Manuscript repository at the Institute of the Ukrainian Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Fond 22/166.

Žel. – Želexovskyj, Je. 1886. *Ruthenisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1-2. Lemberg.

Žiteckij, P. 1900. *Eneida Kotljarevskogo i drevnejšij spisok eë v svjazi s obzorom malorusskoj literatury XVIII veka.* Kiev.

— 1905. O perevodax evangelija na malorusskij jazyk. *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 10 (3/4), 1-65.

Pace University, New York   Andrii Danylenko
(adanylenko@pace.edu)