



# Recenzija

*A Review of Soviet Ukrainian  
Scholarly Publications*

Spring-Summer, 1977

Volume VII, No. 2

*Cambridge, Massachusetts*

[diasporiana.org.ua](http://diasporiana.org.ua)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Donald G. Ostrowski (Fall-Winter)  
Michael K. Bourke  
Tatianna Gajecky (Spring-Summer)

John Barnstead

Zack Deal

Natalia Pylypiuk

Faculty Advisor: Omeljan Pritsak  
Managing Editor: Brenda D. Sens

*RECENZIJA*, published by the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies, Harvard University, appears semi-annually, in the winter and summer. Rates: for libraries and institutions \$5.00 (one year); for private subscribers \$4.00 (one year); cost of a single issue \$3.00.

Address all correspondence, contributions, and subscriptions to:

*RECENZIJA*  
Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute  
1581-83 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

\* Cover design by Jacques Hnizdovsky

# RECENZIIJA

## A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications

Volume VII, No. 2

Spring-Summer 1977

### CONTENTS

<i>Movoznavstvo</i> [Linguistics].....Jaroslav Harchun	p. 1
<i>Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova</i> , vol. II: <i>Morfologija</i> [The Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language, vol. II: Morphology].....Michael K. Bourke	p. 9
<i>Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova</i> , vol. III: <i>Syntaksys</i> [The Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language, vol. III: Syntax].....John Barnstead	p. 19
"Recent Ukrainian Bibliological Publications: A Brief Sur- vey of Monographs and Archeographic Collections."..... .....Edward Kasinec	p. 29
Index to Volume VII.....	p. 39

ISSN 0034-1207

Published by the Committee on Ukrainian Studies,  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

*Movoznavstvo*, Vydavnyctvo "Naukova dumka," Kiev, 1976, Nos. 1-6, 96 pp. each, 2,800 circulation.

The journal *Movoznavstvo* is the scholarly-theoretical organ of the Literature, Language, and Art-criticism Section of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR. The journal began appearing on a regular basis in 1967. It comes out six times a year; its circulation in 1976 amounted to 2,800 copies.

In preparation for the appearance of the first issue of this journal, throughout 1966 the Soviet Ukrainian press informed the scholarly and teaching community of the Ukraine about the coming appearance of the journal, emphasizing the importance of the tasks facing this new scholarly publication. The first issue of the journal was programmatic. It formulated these tasks. The introductory article by I. K. Bilodid and O. S. Mel'nyčuk showed a great interest in questions of theoretical linguistics as well as the level of development of Ukrainian linguistics. The other articles of the first issue emphasized the need for Ukrainian scholars to implement as soon as possible the modern methods of linguistic research, primarily the methods of structural linguistics.

In addition to exclusively theoretical questions, the journal from its very inception concerned itself with pressing problems of the living language on the pedagogical level, and even established a dialog with its readers by sending out interesting and useful questionnaires. In view of the fact that many Ukrainian speakers were bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian, the journal adopted not only a descriptive, but also a prescriptive approach to the problems of the modern language.

The task of this article, however, is not to survey the journal throughout the decade of its existence. It will be more expedient to analyze the six issues from 1976 to see what the journal has achieved in ten years and what place it occupies among Slavic journals.

The articles in the journal are arranged and analyzed under the following categories: Editorials, Problems in the Modern Life of the Language, Historical Studies, Linguistic-Stylistic Devices of the Work of Art, Studies in Romance and Germanic Linguistics, Studies in Lexicology and Lexicography, Research in Onomastics, and Phraseological Studies.

The Editorials are generally publicistic in nature and may be arbitrarily included in linguistics under the designation "socio-linguistics."

These articles often amount to pseudo-scholarly attempts to motivate linguistic interest in extra-linguistic factors. One such example is the section entitled "Rišennja XXVz"jizdu KPRS--ižyttja!" (No. 2, pp. 3-21). There is only one substantive article in this series: V. V. Akulenko, "Spivvidnošennja nacional'noho ta internacional'noho v movi" (No. 1, pp. 3-12). In this article, Akulenko initiates a serious discussion with Joseph Greenberg and Roman Jakobson concerning their methods of studying linguistic universals.

Most of the articles in the journal fall into the category called "Problems in the Modern Life of the Language." The articles published in 1976 cover a wide range of problems and themes, which can be grouped in the following order: semasiology and semantics, phonetics, word formation, syntax, lexicology, stylistics, onomastics, toponymy and anthroponymy, dialectology, immigrant dialects and the language of the emigration, contrastive linguistics, automatization of linguistic research. The number of articles under these subheadings is far from uniform. For example, phonetics is represented by only one article, N. I. Toc'ka, "Do pytannja pro artykuljacijnu ta akustyčnu klasyfikaciju holosnyx ukrajins'koji movy" (No. 6, pp. 5-10). The article attempts to review the traditional classifications of Ukrainian vowels and to apply modern methods of generative phonology and the data of acoustic phonetics. The binary system of distinctive features is introduced on both the genetic and acoustical levels. Because this article is so short, however, it can only be considered a popularization. One article does not give a complete picture about the scope of the work being done by Ukrainian linguists on the problems of the phonetics of the living contemporary Ukrainian. Nor do we get any idea about the research on dialects on the phonetic level. The study of oral speech, it appears, is being carried on only to a very limited extent. Only one other article deals with the spoken language, N. L. Bosakivs'ka, "Dejaki osoblyvosti slovotvoru usnoho movlennja" (No. 3, pp. 40-44). This is too little when one considers that contemporary linguistics is abandoning more and more the tendency to be prescriptive and is actively turning to the living language as its most reliable source. The difficulties encountered by Ukrainian linguists in studying the spoken language can be explained by the widespread bilingualism and by massive interference from Russian in the spoken language on all grammatical levels. For this reason, *Movoznavstvo* tends to concern itself with theoretical, normative, or bookish language.

Morphology, except for the above-mentioned brief article on word-formation, is not represented at all. The article by O. I. Bilodid, "Dijeslovo u hramatyčnomu včenni O. O. Potebni" (No. 5, pp. 15-23), is merely a summation of the well-known themes of the eminent scholar and presents historical interest rather than new theory.

Questions of syntax are rather widely treated, but only one article treats the syntax of the spoken language, S. P. Bevzenko, "Pro dialektni vidminnosti ukrajins'koji movy na syntaksyčnomu rivni" (No. 3, pp. 46-49). It is noteworthy that the scholars do not use the methods of transformational syntax at all and that they are not aware of the results achieved by their western colleagues in this discipline. This greatly narrows the creative possibilities of Ukrainian scholars while lowering the general scholarly level of publications on this question.

In the series on semiotics and semantics, the leading articles are by O. O. Taranenko, "Analoghija jak javyščje leksyčnoji semantyky" (No. 1, pp. 24-31) and "Metaforyčni modeli u svitli prahmatyky" (No. 5, pp. 24-29). The author makes conclusions concerning the action of semantic analogy and how it differs from morphological analogy. His reflections on the metaphorization of the word are also interesting. He is familiar with the newest achievements in semantics by American scholars, although he is quite restrained in his use of specialized Western terminology of this field. His conclusions about metaphorical models have importance for stylistics and etymology as well.

The articles by O. T. Grjaznuxina, "Avtomatyzacija linhvistyčnyx doslidžen' u Spolučenyx Štatax Ameryky" (No. 6, pp. 40-46) and Ju. O. Žluktenko and V. N. Bablyk, "Kontrastyvna linhvistyka. Problemy i perspektyvy" (No. 4, pp. 8-15) have a purely informative character and merely attempt to stimulate the interest of the reader in the problems raised.

For lexicologists and dialectologists an important article is that of Ja. Ju. Vakaljuk, "Leksyka narodnoji medycyny ukrajins'kyx hovoriv Prykarpattja" (No. 2, pp. 46-52). The article by Ju. O. Žluktenko, "Ukrajins'ka imihrants'ka mova v movnij sytuaciji Kanady" (No. 6, pp. 11-20), belongs more to the publicistic genres than to the scholarly; however, the conclusions of the article are on the whole correct and objective, and give reason to expect valuable work from the author in cooperation with American and Canadian linguists.

Following a tradition established in its first year of publication, the journal gives a prominent place to the problem of onomastics. The pages

of the journal no longer contain the originally popular research-recommendations concerning the clarification of distorted Ukrainian geographic names and surnames.

Articles published in the "Historical Studies" treat general questions of the Ukrainian language, as well as certain individual problems. The article by S. S. Vysoc'kyj, "Azbuca z Sofijs'koho Soboru v Kyjevi ta dejaki pytannja pochodžennja kyrylyci" (No. 4, pp. 74-83) is very problematic. Although he has some interesting conjectures about the origin of certain Cyrillic characters, he at the same time tries to restore the unsubstantiated theory of a protocyrillic alphabet. He even claims that the letter "Ѡ" (old Ѡ) is not a combination of "ѡ" and "Ѡ" but of "ѡ" and "Ѡ."

Other articles in this subgroup contain very precise analyses of written monuments, such as *hramoty*, an herbal medical guide from the sixteenth century, etc. There are essays from the history of Ukrainian surnames and dendronyms, and of the different ways in which lexical borrowings are adapted. A. P. Hryščenko has a substantive article, "Dyferenciacija tverdyx i m'jakyx prykmetnykovyx osnov v ukrajins'kij movi" (No. 1, pp. 51-62), which presents exhaustive treatment of this important problem.

The small size of the journal (only ninety-six pages) does not allow more attention to be given to historical studies. One can also see a tendency to avoid or to minimize studies of religious texts, showing once more the extralinguistic motivation of linguistic interests. This catastrophically narrows the field of activity of historical linguistics. Reading these articles, one is not able to discern the boundaries between the Old Rus'ian and Old Ukrainian periods. This controversial break is passed over in silence, as are the documents of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries--historically, the period of Ukrainian autonomy within the borders of the Russian Empire.

The articles in this series testify to the existence of considerable interest among Ukrainian scientists in historical topics, and at the same time they show the fragmented and unsystematic character of studies along this line.

The series entitled "Linguistic and Stylistic Devices in the Work of Art" contains only three articles. By their nature, they border on linguistics and literary criticism. Some elements of structural analysis can be seen in the article by V. H. Pryšva, "Pryjomy slovesnoho komizmu v tvorax Ostapa Vyšni" (No. 1, pp. 69-72).

The journal's next category, "Studies in Romance and Germanic Linguistics



was represented by the same number of articles as the series on historical studies. This shows a striking disproportion in the fundamental interests of Ukrainian linguistics, when two such broad fields as Romance and Germanic linguistics, with all their numerous subdisciplines, can be grouped together and be so poorly represented. *Movoznavstvo* is for them too a necessary and authoritative platform.

The series "Studies in Lexicology and Lexicography" contained five articles during 1976. Three of these articles deal with the formation and systematization of modern scientific terminology. O. F. Pinčuk in "Dejaki metodolohični pytannja standartyzaciji terminoleksyky" (No. 6, pp. 47-52), makes the valid conclusion that the problem of standardizing a terminological vocabulary basically amounts to establishing correct and promising norms that have linguistic motivation. Pinčuk takes into account the problems encountered by North American and West European specialists in this area. At the same time, he is much too optimistic in assuming that it is possible to completely control the development of terminology, using the principles of "Marxist linguistics," which asserts the possibility of society exercising conscious and purposeful influence on language as a controllable object.

Another article on terminology is H. O. Krakovec'ka, "Pro leksyko-semantyčnu transformaciju v sferi terminolohiji" (No. 6, pp. 53-59), which examines the evolution and shifts in the meaning of items from the medical lexicon. F. A. Cytkina, "Do pytannja pro strukturu terminiv-slovospolučen'" (No. 6, pp. 58-64), presents for the first time in *Movoznavstvo* a logical and consistent analysis of the terminology and phraseology of mathematical logic, based on a comparison of the source language (English) with the target language (in this case, Russian). The practical goal of the article is to discover the most rational means of translating and to help evaluate this process from a linguistic point of view: To a great extent the author succeeds.

During 1976 the journal published only two articles in the category of "Research in Onomastics." One of them, E. S. Otin, "Toponimičnyj aspekt odnijeji podiji davnorus'koji istoriji" (No. 4, pp. 57-61), is, strictly speaking, a historical study that uses linguistic methods. It tries to establish the exact place of the battle between the Rus' and the Tartaro-Mongols in 1223.

The last category, "Phraseological Studies," was only represented by two articles in 1976. In addition to these scholarly categories, the journal also publishes biographical reports about prominent figures in

linguistics, using geographical and political factors for criteria when making the selection. Each issue regularly contains reviews and notes, as well as current news on the academic life of the Ukrainian SSR and the Soviet Union.

*Movoznavstvo* is the only linguistic periodical publication in the Ukraine that deals almost exclusively with specifically linguistic topics. Some articles are extralinguistic in nature, due to the ideological basis of Soviet scholarship. The appearance of the journal was a noteworthy event in the scholarly life of the Ukraine, and it remains an authoritative forum for the exchange of views among Ukrainian linguists.

For reasons beyond the control of Ukrainian linguists, as well as the editorial board, this journal has not become one of the leading Slavic journals of the world. From this point of view, the journal is still in its formative stage, even though ten years have passed since its founding, when its first issue gave us every reason to expect that its methodology would very quickly reach a level meeting the criteria of the international scholarly community.

In all fields of linguistic research one can see the authors' lack of knowledge concerning the present state of the art in other countries. In this regard, *Movoznavstvo* suffers even in comparison with similar Russian-language publications within the USSR. The qualitative defects of the journal is caused by some purely quantitative factors: 1) the lack of foreign publications in libraries of Ukraine, not only the most recent ones, but even fundamental ones; 2) the lack of effective day-to-day information about scholarly life beyond the borders of Eastern Europe (and sometimes even in neighboring socialist countries, e.g. Poland); 3) most importantly, the lack of person-to-person contacts with foreign scholars through the exchange of scholars or private travel.

The limited achievement of the contributors to the journal is also caused by certain psychological factors: 1) a prejudice towards modern trends in linguistics in America and Western Europe; 2) the influence of extralinguistic theories on the approach to problems which are relevant only to linguistics.

The frequent use of the term "Marxist linguistics" is an example of the terminological inconsistency, the confusion of concepts from different areas of scientific experience which inevitably leads to the formulation of erroneous methodological principles.

In the field of phonology, only the first steps have been made to

acquaint the readers with the methods of generative phonology. There are no articles on the study of phonetic variation in conversational speech, neither on the dialectal level, nor on the level of interdialectal contact, i.e. the transitional dialects of cities with a rapidly growing population. During the whole year of 1976, only one article made passing reference to acoustic studies. For several years there has been no treatment of prosody.

There are no structural studies of morphology, and almost no articles on word-formation from the viewpoint of transformational grammar, in spite of the fact that transformational grammar, at least for the present, provides the greatest possibilities for answering the most controversial questions of morphology and word-formation.

Research in the field of syntax is making no progress at all, due to disregard of transformational syntax. In keeping with traditional linguistics, the fields of syntax, morphology, and phonetics are still completely isolated from each other, and this makes it impossible to have progress toward comprehensive study of the language on a synchronic level. On a diachronic level, studies of the history of the language have a fragmented, unsystematic character.

Thanks to one scholar, studies of semantics look more promising. This is especially important since semantics still presents a serious problem for linguists. The articles in the journal do not give any hint of the presence of any authoritative and attractive linguistic school or creative individual, which might act as a stimulus for any future scholarly work.

On the whole, it must be admitted that, within the limits of their objective possibilities, the linguists writing in *Movoznavstvo* operate easily with a carefully elaborated terminology; they are consistent in their presentation of the particular topics and they are logical in their conclusions. This testifies to the great scholarly potential of Ukrainian linguists, and to the high standards of the editorial board in its selection of material to be included in the journal.

One physical drawback is the external format of the articles. *Movoznavstvo* does not number the paragraphs and this presents a considerable inconvenience for specialists.

Although we were not looking for errors in language, some were noticed: in the journal's subtitle *viddilennja literatury* is used instead of *viddil literatury*; Taranenko's article on metaphoric models has *armijs'kyj čyn* instead of *armijs'ke svannja*. But, in general, the level

of the language is very high. Of the total number of articles for 1976, ten use parallel linguistic examples from Ukrainian and Russian. Three articles deal exclusively with Russian-language materials.

Jaroslav Harchun  
Harvard University

*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, Vol. II: *Morfolohija*,  
General Editor: I. K. Bilodid; Responsible Editor: V. M.  
Rusanivs'kyj, Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka," 1969, 583 pp.,  
17,000 copies.

*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova: Morfolohija* [henceforth *Morfolohija*] is the second volume in a five-volume series dealing with modern standard Ukrainian. It is the first such Academy grammar by Ukrainian linguists, and as such it is a milestone in the Ukrainian grammatical tradition. Henning Andersen, in his review of Volume One has written: "The publication of the grammar...becomes an occasion for taking stock, for measuring the achievements of Ukrainian linguistics so far, and for defining the goals of the next generation of Ukrainian linguists."<sup>1</sup>

Before reviewing *Morfolohija*, it would be worthwhile to place it in historical context. One striking feature of Ukrainian has been its lack of established norms. From a certain point of view, the Ukrainian normative tradition has been retarded.<sup>2</sup> This is caused by historical and political conditions, complicated by interference from the Russian language and regionalism among Ukrainians themselves. Compared with Russian, Ukrainian has a high number of lexical, morphological, and even syntactic doublets. Thus, it is gratifying to see the publication of an Academy grammar. In order to have a viable standard language, norms need to be established.

*Morfolohija* represents the normative reference work for morphology. To properly appreciate it, one must compare it with the works on modern standard Russian. The first Academy grammar of Russian was published in 1952.<sup>3</sup> This grammar was normative and oriented towards reference, not

---

<sup>1</sup>Henning Andersen, "Review of *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*. *Vstup; Fonetyka*," *Recenzija: A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications*, Vol. III, No. 2 (1973), pp. 19-26.

<sup>2</sup>This is no reflection on Ukrainian linguists. Some, like Oleksander Potebnja, have done outstanding work on other languages, like Russian.

<sup>3</sup>*Grammatika russkogo jazyka*, Vol. I: *Fonetika i morfologija* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1952) [henceforth *Grammatika* 1952].

analysis. It thus emphasized data and not theory. It had a traditional theory of parts of speech. A second Academy grammar was published in 1970.<sup>4</sup> The morphology section of this book emphasized the advances in linguistic theory which had been made in the Soviet Union and in the West. In other words, it supplemented the data of *Grammatika 1952* with theory. Thus, in the Russian tradition one can see an evolution from a heavily normative, weakly theoretical approach to a more analytic one, cognizant of new developments.

*Morfolohija* is clearly intended to be the analog of *Grammatika 1952*, even though nineteen years separate the two works. Because the Ukrainian grammatical tradition has lagged behind the Russian one,<sup>5</sup> *Morfolohija* seems somewhat anachronistic. This, of course, is an unfair criticism. Different languages codify their norms at different periods in their history.

Ideally, any normative study of morphology should have the following scholarly goals: 1) to establish norms for the literary language; 2) to provide a theoretical framework for these norms; and 3) to cite other theories and major treatments of the issues raised. On a practical level, an Academy morphology should have optimum clarity of organization and ease of use, since it is a reference tool. We will first treat physical organization, then theory and analysis.

In organization and clarity of presentation, *Morfolohija* is inferior to *Grammatika 1952*. On a general level, *Morfolohija* has no index. Although *Grammatika 1952* also lacks an index, it makes up for this by a detailed, analytic table of contents. *Morfolohija* also lacks a general bibliography of works cited. This is ameliorated somewhat by a bibliography at the end of each chapter. However, these bibliographies are defective in what they fail to cite. Almost no western works are cited. The majority of works referred to are published before 1960, although *Morfolohija* was published in 1969. This means that it probably was being prepared in the early and mid 1960's, a time of great linguistic ferment. Unfortunately, only a very small portion of the references come from the period 1960-1965.

---

<sup>4</sup>*Grammatika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1970) [henceforth *Grammatika 1970*].

<sup>5</sup>One can see this lag from a comparison of *Voprosy jazykoznanija* with *Movoznavstvo*, in date of founding, size, and level of development.

Granted, this volume was probably out of its authors' hands after 1967; nevertheless, it would have been possible to append the latest works on a given subject. An Academy grammar should list the important works on a given topic, even though these may not be presented in the given theory. Such major works as Roman Jakobson's article on Russian conjugation,<sup>6</sup> and others, both Soviet and non-Soviet, have been omitted from the references.<sup>7</sup>

The chapter division of *Morfolohija* follows the traditional division by parts of speech. There is a theoretical introduction to each chapter, which discusses the semantic and grammatical properties of the particular part of speech. After that, each morphological aspect of the part of speech is given: derivational morphology (word-formation), accentology, grammatical categories, and paradigmatics.

Because of poor organization, however, what results is a "shotgun" approach: all possible information (including some historical and syntactic facts) is thrown into each chapter. In terms of sections and paragraphs, the organization in *Grammatika* 1952 is more clear and effective.

The second consideration is that of theory. Although it is unfair to compare *Morfolohija* with *Grammatika* 1970, one would have expected that, given the benefit of almost two decades of linguistic experience, Ukrainian linguists would have been able to compile a volume with the reference orientation of *Grammatika* 1952, but at the same time introduce some of the theory that was circulating in the 1960s. Unfortunately, this was not done.

*Morfolohija* has a theoretical base that is twenty years behind the times. This theory is taxonomic, and views linguistic phenomena as static, and at a superficial level. Most attention is concentrated on listing superficial phenomena without relating them on a more abstract, generalized level. There is little distinction between the graphic form of a word and its actual morphophonemic structure (e.g., listing the ending of читают as чита-ють, instead of analyzing it as čytaj-ut', or even as читай-уть ).

---

<sup>6</sup>Roman Jakobson, "Russian Conjugation," *Word*, Vol. IV, No. 5 (1948), pp. 54-67.

<sup>7</sup>For example, Alexander Isačenko, *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*, Vol. I: *Formenlehre* (Halle, 1962), and S. K. Šaumjan, *Strukturnaja lingvistika* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1965).

More recently, however, language has come to be viewed as a process. Abstract underlying forms are posited, and these forms produce the eventual surface phenomena. This perspective allows greater depth of analysis and generalization. On the one hand, one can understand why *Morfolohija* keeps close to the data--it is the first attempt by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences to codify the norms for Ukrainian. On the other hand, a moderate degree of abstraction would help the author to classify and analyze the data itself, and might help the reader to understand it.<sup>8</sup> The problem is that an Academy grammar should have a balance between examples and rules. In general, all language learning follows these two principles: concrete patterns and abstract rules. Thus, after a certain amount of illustrative material, one should be able to generalize a rule. *Morfolohija* never does provide any abstract principles of word-formation or paradigmatics.

In addition to theoretical weakness, *Morfolohija* suffers from a less than comprehensive treatment of material. Its presentations are always sketchy. For example, *Grammatika* 1952 devotes fifty-one pages to noun suffixes (pp. 212-273), while *Morfolohija* has only fourteen pages (pp. 37-50) on this topic.<sup>9</sup> The treatment of individual suffixes is similar. *Grammatika* 1952 devotes three complete pages (pp. 214-217) to the suffix *-ec*. *Morfolohija* gives only seven lines (p. 40) to the Ukrainian equivalent *-ec'*.<sup>10</sup> In *Morfolohija*, the various meanings of this suffix are all lumped together, as are the examples, which are not explained. *Grammatika* 1952 breaks them down into four different categories, having different word-forming principles and meanings. Within each group, it discusses productivity, meaning, stress, morphophonemics, derivation, and irregularities. In a following section, it treats suffixes formed on the basis of *-ec*:

---

<sup>8</sup>An example of such moderate abstraction is Charles Townsend, *Russian Word-Formation* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968). The principles used by Townsend were known in the Soviet Union in the early 1960s.

<sup>9</sup>The two books are of equal length. *Morfolohija*, however, has a lot of filler material, like unnecessary citation of whole sentences to illustrate a purely mechanical problem in morphology. (For example, in the section dealing with the correlation of verb stems, they insert fourteen lines of quotes from *belles-lettres*.) *Morfolohija* also has space-filling, redundant charts listing the accentual patterns of nouns.

<sup>10</sup>The two suffixes are nearly equivalent, and so the comparison of space used is valid.



-lee, -ovee, -anee. These latter suffixes are ignored by *Morfolohija*, although they occur in Ukrainian.

The failure to organize material properly and the absence of theory can be seen in *Morfolohija*'s treatment of the grammatical categories of nouns. The grammatical category of number is obviously correlated with the semantic (i.e., lexical-grammatical) categories of collectivity, indivisibility, etc. Number is grammatical because it is expressed by endings. The others are not strictly grammatical, because they are not expressed by endings; nevertheless, they influence the appearance of number.<sup>11</sup> *Grammatika* 1952 treats this in the proper way. The grammatical position of number is discussed first. Then it treats the other categories as subsections. Nouns used only in the singular are subdivided into collective, abstract, and indivisible nouns. Those in the plural are also subdivided and analyzed. *Morfolohija*, however, reverses this, placing the "categories" of concrete/abstract, collectivity, and indivisibility before the category of number.

In the paradigmatics of nouns, *Morfolohija* provides all the charts for the -a nouns (feminines) at once, both hard and soft. These charts are followed by diffuse notes on the various forms of each case. *Grammatika* 1952 takes a clearer approach. It first lists only the hard paradigm, with notes to its endings. It then provides the soft paradigm, with its own set of notes. Thus, the paradigms, together with their exceptions and variants, are more easily found in *Grammatika* 1952 than in *Morfolohija*. Clearness of expression is crucial for a reference grammar.

The same deficiencies run throughout the book. For example, the adjective suffix -av- is common to both Ukrainian and Russian. *Morfolohija* treats it in nine lines (p. 201). *Grammatika* 1952 has thirty lines (p. 334). The whole entry in *Grammatika* 1952 is better organized, more informative, and more easily read. *Grammatika* 1952 analyzes the suffix in terms of the part of speech from which it is derived. *Morfolohija* does not. The suffix -av- makes adjectives from nouns and other adjectives. Its extension, -ljav-, makes adjectives from nouns and verbs. *Grammatika* 1952 adds another nine lines for this latter suffix. It also discusses the hardness or softness of the final stem consonant to which the suffix

---

<sup>11</sup>For example, collective nouns are not used in the plural. Nouns denoting an indivisible substance (e.g. bread) in the plural denote types (e.g. types of bread).

is added. *Morfolohija* does not.

An example of how strict adherence to surface forms prevents *Morfolohija* from arriving at generalizations is its treatment of mobile vowels in noun suffixes. For example, *Morfolohija* lists *-ok* and *-k-* as suffixes for nouns denoting instruments and concrete objects (the first being used with masculine nouns, and the second with feminine nouns). Unfortunately, *Morfolohija* misses the important fact that, whenever you have a zero ending ( $\emptyset$ ), it will trigger the appearance of an underlying mobile vowel. Here *Morfolohija* is confusing paradigmatics with word-formation. From this point of view, both the masculine and the feminine noun have the same underlying suffix: *-/k-*. That is, *tan/k-* (masc., "dance") and *vod/k-* (fem., "vodka") have the same structure, except for their declensional endings. A vocalic ending on these words prevents the appearance of a mobile vowel: *tanka* (gen. sg.) and *vodka* (nom. sg.). A zero ending ( $\emptyset$ ) will trigger the appearance of this mobile vowel: *tanok* (nom. sg.) and *vodok* (gen. pl.).

By having recourse to a somewhat more abstract form, one can capture significant generalizations about the morphological patterns of Ukrainian. This holds for the mobile vowels in adjectives and verbs as well.<sup>12</sup>

The defects of *Morfolohija*'s surface-oriented, static model of language are particularly obvious in its analysis of verb classes. It is necessary to establish verb classes because of the variation in the form of the stem between the infinitive and the present tense (*sudy-ty* vs. *sudž-u*, *kras-ty* vs. *krad-u*, *sta-ty* vs. *stan-u*). Because there is no level of abstraction beyond the grapheme, *Morfolohija* is forced to list all the different types of alternations, establishing twelve such classes, with numerous subclasses (pp. 311-317).

The resulting picture is somewhat distorted and confusing, but in some instances they simply make the wrong morphological analysis. For example, it is claimed (p. 312) that *puskaty* has the suffix  $\frac{a\emptyset}{ae}$ <sup>13</sup> in

---

<sup>12</sup>In verbs, a mobile vowel appears in prefixes before root clusters which have vowel-zero alternation: *vidirvaty* vs. *vidryvaty*, but *viddaty* vs. *viddavaty*. There is an interesting parallel between the occurrence of a mobile vowel before a zero ending ( $\emptyset$ ) in noun suffixes and in verb prefixes before a vowel-zero alternation: *vidibraty* vs. *vidbyraty* and *tanok* vs. *tanka*. This suggests that the vowel of *b-r* and the ending of masc. nom. sg. at some level are the same.

<sup>13</sup>The actual graphemes are used in order to illustrate the error

the present tense, but in -ає we are dealing with three different elements, a stem suffix -аj- a linking vowel -e- and a zero ending (while in -аю, the -у- is the ending, and there is no linking vowel).<sup>14</sup>

This confusion could be eliminated by analyzing the Ukrainian verb in terms of Roman Jakobson's one-stem analysis for the Russian verb, but *Morfolohija* does not even mention his work. Traditionally, the infinitive and the present tense form for each verb were memorized as a pair, without any principle to correlate them (*pysaty* vs. *pyšeu*). Such an approach ignored general morphological patterns and greatly complicated the teaching of Slavic verbs. It is linguistically more sound and pedagogically more effective to draw a connection between these two forms.<sup>15</sup> Jakobson devised a set of rules to establish a basic stem (not necessarily the present-tense stem or the infinitive stem) and to derive all other forms from it, including consonant changes (mutations). Such a system could have been modified to handle the Ukrainian data.<sup>16</sup>

---

of their use in *Morfolohija*.

<sup>14</sup>In a footnote (p. 312) the authors admit that -yю equals -uju in "phonetic transcription." They thus show a poor awareness of language levels. We are not dealing with static, isolated phonetic forms, but rather with phonetic changes at morpheme boundaries, i.e., morphophonemics.

<sup>15</sup>One example of the successful application of Jakobson's system to the teaching of Russian verbs is Alexander Lipson, *A Russian Course*, Vol. I, Pt. 2 (2nd prelim. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica Publishers, 1974).

<sup>16</sup>Jakobson's system consists in the principle that at morpheme boundaries certain changes occur when morphemes are added to other morphemes. Some boundaries are stable and show no changes. Such boundaries have the structure C + V and V + C (C = consonant and V = vowel). For example, when the infinitive morpheme is added to a verb stem ending in a vowel, nothing happens: *pyea + ty = pysaty* (V + C). Conversely, when a present-tense ending is added to a stem that ends in a consonant, no change occurs: *vad + u = vedu* (C + V).

The changes occur when two consonants (or two vowels) from two different morphemes come in contact:  $C_1 + C_2$  and  $V_1 + V_2$  ( $C_1$  = the final consonant of the stem;  $C_2$  = the initial consonant of the ending; likewise for  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ ). Such boundaries are unstable and changes occur at them. When two consonants come together,  $C_1$  drops or is modified (*stan + ty = staty*, *čytaj + ty = čytaty*, *krad + ty = krasty*; more complex examples of this are *tn + ty = tjtaty*, *kol + ty = koloty*). When two vowels come together,  $V_1$  drops and  $C_1$  often changes (mutates) (*pyea + u = pyšu*, *pyea + e = pyše*, *sudy + u = sudšu*, *sudy + at' = sud'at'*). This, however, does not happen if  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are both *y* (*sudy + yt' = sudyt'*).

With regard to verb classes, it should be pointed out that *Grammatika* 1952 devoted forty-five pages to them (pp. 533-578), while *Morfolohija* has only fourteen pages (pp. 311-325). Once again, the organization and the thoroughness of the material in *Grammatika* 1952 is far superior to that of *Morfolohija*. Although *Grammatika* 1952 does not use a one-stem system, it at least realizes that verbs with the alternation *-yvat'/-yvajut*, *-et'/-ejut* are subclasses of verbs with *-at'/-ajut*. *Morfolohija*, however, assigns analogous verbs to three separate classes (p. 312).

When presenting the verb classes, *Grammatika* 1952 lists them by productivity, which is only logical. *Morfolohija* mixes the non-productive classes with the productive ones. In *Grammatika* 1952, the section devoted to a particular verb class also contains all the information concerning stress, productivity, irregularities, from what parts of speech they are derived, how they are formed, as well as morphophonemic changes. *Morfolohija*, however, lists all the classes first, then it adds a series of comments to them, which are poorly organized, incomplete, and difficult to use. Little is said about the parts of speech from which the verb class is derived, or about the morphophonemic changes.

This uneven comparison may be continued. *Morfolohija* has a total of six pages on reflexive verbs (pp. 334-337, 399-400), in contrast to the eleven pages in *Grammatika* 1952 (pp. 415-426). Moreover, *Grammatika* 1952 classifies these verbs into eight different groups, with a lengthy discussion and many examples. *Morfolohija*'s treatment is confused and incomplete.

*Grammatika* 1952 has thirty-seven pages (pp. 578-605) on the question of prefixation and prefixation-suffixation in verbs (e.g. *na-pyty-aja*) while *Morfolohija* treats this topic in only eleven (pp. 339-444, 348-353), and even these few pages are tucked away in sections dealing with verbs that occur in an aspectual pair, and those that are only in one aspect. If one wanted to view prefixation as a separate problem, *Morfolohija* would not be convenient to use. In all cases, *Grammatika* 1952 has superior organization, more lucid explanations, and simply more information.

One of the crucial problems in Slavic morphology is the derivation of imperfective verbs from perfective ones. *Grammatika* 1952 gives it twenty-eight pages (pp. 427-455), while *Morfolohija* can spare only seven (pp. 317-319, 345-348). *Grammatika* 1952 lists the initial perfective

according to the separate verb classes discussed above. *Morfolohija* lumps several classes together as long as they all have the same imperfective suffix. This is in itself somewhat confusing, but *Morfolohija* even presents the process backwards.

For example, it is a known fact that the derivation of an aspectual pair goes from a prefixed perfective to a prefixed imperfective (e.g. *zamovyty* > *zamovljaty*). *Morfolohija*, however, distorts this process (p. 345) with a very poor statement of the relationship and does not show the direction of derivation. Moreover, the pairs are listed with the imperfective member first (*vyčytuvaty* - *vyčytaty*). Moreover, this section on aspectual pairs has an incomprehensible heading: "For prefixed imperfectives and verbs with related stems, the formation of the perfective form by means of corresponding stems and changing the accent is characteristic" (p. 345).

There is very little discussion of the morphophonemic complexities of the derivation of imperfective verbs. There is almost no analysis of the levels of derivation (except pp. 347-348), i.e., initial simplex imperfective (*čytaty*), prefixed perfective (*perēčytaty*), and derived imperfective (*perēčyty aty*).

The last chapter of *Morfolohija* treats the frequency of declensional and conjugational endings (including gerunds). Each separate morpheme is assigned a "function," and all the allomorphs are listed together with it: Function 1: nom. sg., fem., -a#, -y# (i.e., *škola, maty*).

The total number of "functions" is 134. Any given form will be listed under several functions (e.g., -o# can indicate neut. nom. sg., or an adverb, or neut. past tense). After this, the average frequency for the various functions is derived for various literary genres. Two conclusions are drawn: 1) one and the same suffix in a certain function has a different frequency depending on the style of speech; 2) two functions with the same form are characterized by a statistical disparity in one and the same text. These conclusions seem trivial and self-evident. Obviously, in narration the vocative will be used only rarely; in a play, however, it will have great frequency. Nevertheless, it is useful to have the endings quantified in this way.

Of greater seriousness is the failure to list a zero ending as an allomorph. For example, there are only two variant endings for masc. nom.

sg.: -o#, -a#. The only ending for the fem. gen. pl. is -ej#. No zero ending is given for the imperative. This is compounded by the listing of a totally wrong ending for the imperative: -j# (*vykon-j#*). This is actually part of the present-tense suffix -uj-, which alternates with the infinitive suffix -uva-. It is ironic that, the only time this work attempts a morphophonemic notation, the wrong analysis is made.

In sum, *Morfolohija* is a disappointment. Its organization, thoroughness, and level of analysis are considerably below the standards of any Academy of Sciences. It did codify norms, but the book is so badly structured that it is nearly impossible to locate necessary information. Ukrainian linguists should have used the traditional, but well-organized Russian model and the new linguistic theories that were available. They did not, however, and the next generation of Ukrainian linguists will have to correct the deficiencies of *Morfolohija* before they can take up new problems.

Michael K. Bourke  
Tufts University

*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, Vol. III: *Syntaksys*, General Editor: I. K. Bilodid; Responsible Editor: O. S. Mel'nyčuk, Kiev: Vydavnytvo "Naukova dumka," 1972, 19,000 copies.

The publication of the five-volume "Academy" grammar of Ukrainian was a landmark in the history of Ukrainian linguistics. The present volume [henceforth *Academy Syntax*] may be viewed as a kind of benchmark in the development of syntactic studies in Ukraine, and, since five years have passed since its appearance, it seems appropriate to evaluate it in light of previous syntactic handbooks and subsequent research. Until the publication of *Academy Syntax*, the most important reference work on Ukrainian syntax was that of Bulaxovs'kyj.<sup>1</sup> Since *Academy Syntax*, the most significant work has been that edited by Žovtoibrjux on phraseology and the simple sentence.<sup>2</sup>

Two technical comments should be made at this point. First, *Academy Syntax* has no index. Although Soviet publications within the last few years have been better indexed than previously, this trend has yet to make itself felt in Soviet Ukrainian syntax, where no major handbook has an index. This absence is somewhat compensated for by analytical tables of contents, but the books remain difficult to use for anyone not already familiar with them. Second, *Academy Syntax* contains only a scanty bibliography and no alphabetical list of works employed. This is perhaps a less important deficiency than the lack of an index, since comprehensive bibliographic coverage of the field already exists. (See the Appendix to this article.) However, reference to this coverage ought to be included in any general syntactic study. There is no excuse for using only minimal scholarly apparatus. Any reader who could make his way through the

---

<sup>1</sup>L. A. Bulaxovs'kyj (ed.), *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Vol. II: *Syntaksys* (1. Proste recennja, 2. Skladne recennja, 3. Punktuačija) (Kiev: Deržavne učbovo-pedahohične vydavnytvo "Radjans'ka škola," 1951) [Henceforth *Syntaksys* 1951].

<sup>2</sup>M. A. Žovtoibrjux (ed.), *Syntaksys slovospolučennja i prostoho rečennja* (syntaksyčoni katehoriiji i zv"jazky) (Kiev: Vydavnytvo "Naukova dumka," 1975) [Henceforth *Syntaksys* 1975].

complicated terminology of the theoretical portions of the book would hardly be frightened off by thorough footnoting and complete bibliography, especially if it were confined to the end of each chapter or to the end of the book.

The data base supplied by the *Academy Syntax* is considerably more limited than in *Syntakysy* 1951, which still remains indispensable for illustrative material and discussion of syntactic phenomena in the dialects. The scope of the two books may be indicated roughly by a comparison of the sections dealing with *osnačal'ni rečennja* (approximately equivalent to English relative clauses). *Academy Syntax* covers them in eleven pages (332-343), while *Syntakysy* 1951 requires twenty-four (183-207). Examples of anomalies given in *Academy Syntax* tend to be lifted bodily from *Syntakysy* 1951. Although this practice is common in less scholarly literature (e.g., high school textbooks), it should not be done in a work for specialists.<sup>3</sup>

As with previous handbooks, *Academy Syntax* strikes a curious balance between description and prescription. In contrast to *Syntakysy* 1951, it leaves historical background and development largely untouched. Dialect variation is also dealt with less extensively. Often *Academy Syntax* merely states the current official norms of usage for a particular construction, without indicating past controversies concerning it. This is the case with verbal forms in *-no* and *-to*, where the political struggles surrounding the use of these forms are passed over in silence (p. 251). Like other recent studies of this construction in Ukraine, *Academy Syntax* suffers from a lack of substantiating evidence.<sup>4</sup>

The best synchronic descriptive study remains that of Olena Kurylo.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>For example, the sentence *ne tak bylo u našoji Marusi, Naumovoji ta Nastynoji dočky, os' ščo ja rozkazuju...* migrates through at least four articles on relative clauses, although the construction it illustrates is found several times in Kvitka-Osnov'janenko. Other examples might easily be supplied.

<sup>4</sup>This is especially true of F. P. Smahlenko, "Pro bezosobovi rečennja z slovamy na *-no*, *-to* u prysudku," *Praci Odes'koho deržavnoho universytetu, Serija filolohičnyx nauk*, Vyp. II (1961), pp. 85-88. V. M. Rusaniv's'kyj, "Dijeprykmetnyky j slova dijeprykmetnykovoho pochodzennja," *Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v skoli*, No. 8 (1968), pp. 28-36, is normative.

<sup>5</sup>"Pro ukrajins'ki bezpidmetovi konstrukciji z prysudkovyvy dijepryslivnykamy na *-no*, *-to*," *Zbirnyk Sekciji hrmatyky ukrajins'koji movy Ukrajin's'koji akademiji nauk*, Vol. I (1930), pp. 1-39.



However, in spite of her abundant examples, Kurylo too was interested in establishing norms for the literary language, and her classification of the constructions according to the presence or absence of a direct object (among other factors) is clearly faulty. Another scholar, I. Z. Petlyčnyj, projects contemporary norms onto data which do not support them.<sup>6</sup> A comprehensive statistical study of the phenomenon in terms of dialect distribution and paraphrasability by other constructions would be welcome.

Many interesting syntactic phenomena are simply not treated in *Academy Syntax*. Sometimes these phenomena are dependent on contexts wider than the single sentence. For example, no distinction is made between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.<sup>7</sup> (In Ukrainian this distinction is at least partially discourse-conditioned.) Other phenomena are not recognized as presenting any problems (e.g. the conjoinability of relative clauses with independent clauses,<sup>8</sup> the factors determining use

---

<sup>6</sup>"Bezособovi rečennja na -no, -to v movi xudožn'oji prozy I. Franka," *Pytannja ukrajins'koho movoznavstva*, Kn. 4 (1960), pp. 21-37. Petlyčnyj concludes that *bulo* was used by Franko with -no and -to forms to indicate past tense, thus refuting the more conservative "nationalist" norm, which holds that forms in -no, -to are inherently past tense and that therefore the use of *bulo* would be redundant. A careful examination of the data, however, shows that Franko uses *bulo* not to express simple past tense, but only to express an action occurring in the past prior to a second action, i.e., he uses *bulo* to express the Ukrainian pluperfect with -no, -to forms, just as he would use *buv* + L-participle. Franko's use of the pluperfect is erratic: he may fail to use it in places where it would logically be expected, but he never uses it where it is logically impossible. Such a pattern of usage may be expected if we consider the pluperfect to be marked for anteriority of action, with the simple past unmarked in this regard. Consider, for example, the following passage, where the *bulo* form may be interpreted with equal logic as simple past or pluperfect: *Mov važki doščovi žmari, vysjat' nad dušuju pani Olimpiji spohady jiji medovyx mišjaciv, prožytyx z hrařom. Sceny, aljozy, rozpuka... Vony vertajut' domiv, hrař hrobit', ščo prodat' ostannje selo, jake jomu lyšylosja z joho rodovyx majetkiv--oci sami Torky, v kotryx sudženo bulo pani Olimpiji prožyty reštu viku...*

<sup>7</sup>The distinction is made in Russian, and has been applied to Ukrainian recently by T. N. Akimova in "Strukturno-smyslovye typy pridatočnyx opredelitel'nyx v sovremennyx vostočnoslavjanskix jazykax," *Slavičtiské studie* (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akademie vied, 1969), pp. 101-116.

<sup>8</sup>I.e., sentences such as *Ce--nu, pravdu skazaty. --Antosyni čerevyky, z jakyx vona davno vyrosła j davno jiz ne nosyt'*, the literal translation of which is ungrammatical in English: "These, to tell the truth, are

of copular *je*, the interaction of lexical subcategorization of verbs with rules governing the use of *-sja*,<sup>9</sup> etc.). This is in part due to the limitations of the theoretical grammar model currently used in most Soviet Ukrainian syntax.

This model is basically taxonomic, discussing the interrelations of synonymous grammatical constructions only occasionally and only on the most superficial level. For example, the possibility of deriving gerundial phrases from adverbial ones, or participial phrases from relative clauses is ignored, and the nature of their synonymy is never adequately defined. Specialized studies on participles and gerunds tend to be concerned primarily with morphological peculiarities and stylistic norms of usage.<sup>10</sup> A recent encouraging exception is an excellent article by H. P. Olijnyk, which questions traditional methods of determining detached constructions and provides a typology of detached gerundial clauses.<sup>11</sup>

*Academy Syntax* at least attempts to provide an integrated theory of language, something lacking in previous work. According to the model presented in *Academy Syntax* language contains two basic sign units (*znakovi odynyci*): the word and the sentence. Morphology is the study of the word; syntax is the study of the sentence, which is viewed as having two sets of characteristics: internal and external. The internal factors of the sentence are the syntactic relations between its lexical or phraseological components; the external factors determine its relation to reality, and

---

Antosja's shoes, which she outgrew long ago and hasn't worn them for a long time." These constructions are discussed in my dissertation, *Aspects of Relativization in Contemporary Standard Ukrainian* [in preparation].

<sup>9</sup>This problem is discussed in M. O. Pryshlak, "A Study of the Lexical Specification of the Ukrainian Verbal Stem *dad-* and Related Problems Concerning *-sja* and Reflexivization" (unpublished paper, Seminar in Slavic Syntax, Harvard University, 1976).

<sup>10</sup>As, for example, E. Holoborod'ko, "Vyvčennja dijepryslivnyka v školax z rosijs'koju movoju vykladannja," *Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi*, No. 10 (1976), pp. 78-83.

<sup>11</sup>"Pro strukturni osoblyvosti rečen' z vidokremlyenyj dijepryslivnykovyj konstrukcijamy," *Movoznavstvo*, No. 1 (1977), pp. 21-24.

are reflected primarily in two syntactic categories: modality and tense.

Discussion of case in *Academy Syntax*, as in all of the handbooks, is limited to indication of the basic semantic characteristics and combinatorial possibilities within the *slovospolučennja* (word combination). Case is determined semantically rather than configurationally, and the source of morphological units is not discussed.

The *Academy Syntax* treatment of modality represents an advance over that of *Syntaksys* 1951, where discussion of the category is scattered among the sections "Typy rečen'" (pp. 19-21) and "Pidmet i prysudok" (pp. 21-52). In *Academy Syntax*, modality is viewed as a set of semantic oppositions, which are objects of syntactic investigation only insofar as they are expressed by concrete grammatical forms. (The vocative function is excluded as a modal element.) The oppositions are generally ternary, and in many cases seem arbitrary or inconsistent. "Irreality" is first paired with "potentiality," but then appears in opposition to "potentiality" and later even in combination with "reality" in the oxymoronic phrase "real-irreal" which characterizes the modalities of stimulus and interrogation, because "the action is thought of as simultaneously real and irreal!" (p. 121) Jakobson's approach to these categories in the Russian verb seems far more promising than this mishmash, and should have at least been mentioned as a possible alternative.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, the *Academy Syntax* treatment of modality is an attempt to deal with a linguistic problem analytically rather than intuitively or by fiat, and as such is to be commended. *Syntaksys* 1975 treats the problem more effectively, adapting Bondarko and Bulanin's system<sup>13</sup> for the Russian verb to Ukrainian. This system, although it also contains many inconsistencies, is better developed than the *Academy Syntax* scheme, and shows more awareness of Western work.

*Syntaksys* 1951, 1975, and the *Academy Syntax* all share the same approach to tense. The system consists of three basic tenses: past, present, and future, which are most clearly differentiated in sentences having a predicate expressed by a verbal form in the indicative mood, or

---

<sup>12</sup>*Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb* (Harvard University: Russian Language Project, Department of Slavic Languages, 1957).

<sup>13</sup>A. V. Bondarko and L. L. Bulanin, *Russkij glagol* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo "Prosvescenie," 1967).

else no verbal form at all. If the time meaning represented by the sentence does not correspond to the tense expressed by the form of the sentence, the terms relative or indirect tense are used. Instances of direct and indirect tense are then described in more or less arbitrary order. The interrelationship of aspect, tense, and mood are left practically untouched, and no consistent distinction between form and meaning is made. A contrastive study of Ukrainian and Russian aspect would be especially useful, and the numerous translations of Russian into Ukrainian and vice versa would be a good source of data for it. Aspect and tense usage in some of the nineteenth century authors, particularly Marko Vovčok, would also serve as topics for articles. The principle of markedness still seems the most hopeful tool for analyzing these problems.

One of the areas where Soviet Ukrainian syntax treats problems largely neglected in the West is the concept of *slovošpolučennja*, the equivalent of Russian *slovoščetanie*. This is defined by *Academy Syntax* as "a group of words, bound together by the syntactic ties inherent in the given language, and used as lexical-syntactic material in the formation of sentences" (p. 37). The *slovošpolučennja* may be roughly compared to any subtree of a phrase marker in an Aspects-type generative grammar. Ukrainian and Russian investigations of the syntactic bonds within the *slovošpolučennja/slovoščetanie* might well serve to explicate the concept of dominance in generative grammar, which is generally assumed to be intuitively obvious or is left as an undefined prime.

*Academy Syntax*, like all the handbooks, retains basic subdivision of the sentence into the traditional subject + predicate. Recent transformational work has shown the difficulties of this approach,<sup>14</sup> and one feels a great deal of uncertainty because of this in the treatment of sentences containing infinitives (pp. 254-257). Consigning infinitival sentences to a separate category masks the similarities between them and sentences with other types of syntactic centers. Since conjoining arguments

---

<sup>14</sup>See, among others, Catherine V. Chvany, *On the Syntax of BE-Sentences in Russian* (Cambridge: Slavica Publishers, 1975), pp. 15-19, 22-29; Edward L. Keenan and Bernard Comrie, "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar," *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1977), pp. 75, 80.

are no longer as convincing as they once were as evidence for the underlying structure of infinitival sentences, we need to find new tools of analysis. Many of the sentence categories traditionally considered single-centered are perhaps more usefully analyzed as having an underlying bipartite structure. Also, it is difficult to see a structural difference between *Holosiv nečuty* and *Znadvoru ničoho ne čuty*, yet they are assigned to different sentence types.

An especially valuable part of *Academy Syntax* is its discussion of the intonational contours of conjunctionless complex sentences (pp. 409-428), since intonation was almost completely ignored in *Syntaksys* 1951. The recent discussions of the interrelationships of intonation, word order, and theme-rhyme in Soviet Ukrainian linguistic literature are welcome.<sup>15</sup>

*Academy Syntax* has no statistical data on the distribution of various syntactic constructions in time and space, their relative frequency in various styles, and the differing functional load they may bear in the dialects. This is disappointing but hardly surprising, since the importance of such information is even now only sporadically realized. Ideally one would create a "syntax bank," containing all this information as well as information on the syntactic systems of individual authors, recorded in a form which would make it easy to correlate facts from widely separated areas. Only then will it be possible to conduct syntactic investigations on a more comprehensive scale.

Syntactic handbooks serve several purposes: they establish norms of usage for the literary language; they systematize previous work; and they provide a view of what remains for further research. *Academy Syntax* meets these goals, but only minimally. Although literary norms are

---

<sup>15</sup>See for example A. J. Bahmut, *Intonacija jak movnyj zasib vyražennja dumky* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1975). Some conclusions in the book are drawn on the basis of insufficient data (e.g., A. J. Bahmut, in "Intonacija jak zasib vyražennja informatyvnoho centra v skladnovidrjadnomu rečenni," pp. 35-38, is clearly mistaken when he claims that the pauses which separate a relative clause from a main clause depend on the position of the subordinate clause with respect to the main clause, rather than on the distinction restrictive versus non-restrictive; he also ignores factors such as speed of delivery and wider context). Nevertheless, a great deal of useful information is provided.

established, many difficult problems are left untouched, and not enough attention is paid to dialect anomalies. Moreover, it does not fully meet the other two goals. Western theory and work are largely neglected. Areas for further research are not always clearly defined--often due to an inadequate theory and data base. Perhaps the greatest service of *Academy Syntax* is that it raises issues of theory and methodology. Their further discussion will eventually result in a more refined theory and more thorough treatment of data.

John Barnstead  
Dalhousie University

## APPENDIX

Work done on Ukrainian syntax in the Soviet Union from 1918 to 1967:

1. Hol'denberh, L. I. and Korolevyč, N. F., eds. *Ukrajins'ka mova: bibliohrafičnyj pokazovyk (1918-1961 rr.)*. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademiji nauk Ukrajins'koji RSR, 1963.

[Historical syntax (pp. 46-59); contemporary syntax (pp. 85-96). Dialectical syntax must be sought among articles on other areas of grammar within the general category "Okremi dialekty j hovirky" (pp. 135-167). Entries in each of the sections mentioned are in alphabetical order by author. A spot-check of the general author index at the end of the book shows it to be quite unreliable, e.g., none of the four pages listed for M. Laduxin contain any mention of him.]

2. Korolevyč, N. F. and Šarana, F. K. *Slov'jans'ka filolohija na Ukrajinі (1958-1962 rr.)*. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademiji nauk Ukrajins'koji RSR, 1963.

[This bibliography covers only works published within Ukraine. Although contemporary syntax has its own separate listing (pp. 42-48), historical syntax must be sought among other articles in the sections "Istorija ukrajins'koji movy" (pp. 22-36) and "Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy" (pp. 73-76); dialectal syntax is scattered throughout "Dialektolohija ta linvoehohrafija" (pp. 55-73). Entries are alphabetical by author within each section; the author index seems reliable.]

3. Korolevyč, N. F., Beljajeva, L. V., Hol'denberh, L. I., and Šarana, F. K. *Slov'jans'ka filolohija na Ukrajinі (1963-1967 rr.)*. C. I. *Movoznavstvo. Pol'klorystyka*. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka," 1968.

[Similar in structure and scope to (2). Contemporary syntax (pp. 84-95); historical syntax in "Istorija ukrajins'koji movy" (pp. 60-71) and "Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy" (pp. 154-158); dialectal syntax in "Dialektolohija, linvoehohrafija" (pp. 115-137).]

4. Bahmut, J. A., responsible editor. *Movoznavstvo na Ukrajinі za p'jätidesjat rokov*. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukovo dumka," 1967.

[Articles on synchronic syntax are discussed in "Doslidžennja fonetyky i hramatyky ukrajins'koji movy" by M. A. Žovtobryx (pp. 35-78); diachronic syntax is included in "Doslidžennja z istoryčnoji fonetyky, hramatyky i leksykoloohiji" by M. M. Peščak (pp. 145-161). Author index provided.]

5. Bilodid, I. K., responsible editor. *Doslidžennja z movoznavstva v Urajins'kij RSR za sorok rokiv*. Kiev: Vydavnyctvo Akademiji nauk Ukrajins'koji RSR, 1957.

[No index. Primarily useful for L. I. Hol'denberh's index to *Movoznavstvo* for 1934-1957 (pp. 293-309).]

Current Soviet work on Ukrainian syntax:

6. *Novaja sovetskaja literatura po jazykoznaniju: bibliografičeskij bjulleten'*. Moscow: Institut naucnoj informacii po obščestvennym naukam AN SSSR.

[Issued monthly since 1954.]

Useful general linguistic bibliographies covering Ukrainian syntax (generally in less detail):

7. Stankiewicz, Edward and Worth, Dean S. *A Bibliography of Slavic Linguistics*. Volume II. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

[Important for its references to materials published by Naukove tovarystvo im. Ševčenka. Page and volume references are often unreliable. Synchronic syntax (pp. 419-423); diachronic syntax (pp. 434-436); dialectal syntax interfiled with other articles in "Dialectology" (pp. 455-469).]

8. *Rocznik Slawistyczny*. Cracow, 1908-present.

9. *MLA International Bibliography*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

[Scanty coverage before 1967.]

10. *Bibliographie linguistique*. Utrecht-Antwerp: Permanent International Committee of Linguists.



11. *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*. London: The Modern Humanities Research Association.

[Annotated.]

## Recent Ukrainian Bibliological Publications:

### A Brief Survey of Monographs and Archeographic Collections\*

The number of publications in the social sciences and the humanities originating in Ukraine during the last three years is lamentably small. This bleak picture is occasionally brightened by the appearance of an important reference tool, or an arcane, but solid work in the ancillary historical disciplines of paleography, archivistics, or historical metrology. Another bright spot is the field of bibliology. Bibliological studies have great importance for many areas of Ukrainian humanistic scholarship. The books printed at a given juncture in history reflect not only that period's intellectual interests, but also its economic and technical standards. Moreover, libraries, and the published reference tools to these collections, are the laboratory for the social scientist and humanist. Thus, any information concerning the holdings of Soviet Ukrainian libraries should be of great interest to Ukrainian scholars in the West.

---

\*The books being surveyed are the following:

A. P. Daragan and M. Ja. Kaganova (comps.), *Prižiznennyye izdaniya proiavedeniĭ V. I. Lenina v fondax CNB AN USSR: bibliografičeskij ukazatel'* (Kiev: Izdatel'stvo "Naukova dumka," 1975) [78 pp., 1500 copies];

L. I. Gol'denberg and N. I. Maloletova (comps.), *Informacionno-bibliografičeskaja periodika zarubežnyx stran v fondax Bibliotek AN USSR: annotirovannyj ukazatel'* (Kiev: Izdatel'stvo "Naukova dumka," 1975) [201 pp., 1100 copies];

M. P. Humenjuk et al. (eds.), *Knyha i znannja: tematyčnyj sbirnyk naukovyx prac'* (L'viv, 1974);

S. K. Hutjans'kyj, A. A. Kohut, and M. P. Rud (eds.), *50 rokiv Central'noji naukovoji biblioteki AN URSR. Materialy jubilejnoji konferenciji* (Kiev: Vydavnytvo "Naukova dumka," 1974) [93 pp., 500 copies];

Ja. Zapasko, *Mystec'ka spadščyna Ivana Fedorova* (L'viv: Vydavnyče ob'jednannja "Vyšča škola," 1974) [219 pp., 25,000 copies];

Ja. D. Isajevyč et al. (comps.), *Persodrukar Ivan Fedorov ta joho poslidovnyky na Ukrajinі (XV-perša polovyna XVII st.): sbirnyk dokumentiv* (Kiev: Vydavnytvo "Naukova dumka," 1975) [341 pp., 3,900 copies];

*Fedorovskie čtenija: sbornik naučnyx trudov* (Moscow: 1973);

*Bukvar Ivana Fedorova* (Kiev: Vydavnytvo xudožn'oji literatury "Dnipro," 1975) [95 pp., 15,000 copies];

H. N. Lohvyn, *Z hlybyn* (Kiev: Vydavnytvo xudožn'oji literatury "Dnipro," 1974) [188 pp., 6,000 copies];

R. M. Maštalič et al., *Rozvytok polihrafiĭ na Ukrajinі* (L'viv: Vydavnyče ob'jednannja "Vyšča škola," 1974) [186 pp.];

In this review, we will briefly examine bibliological publications that have been recently catalogued for the Ukrainian collections of the Harvard University Library. Before treating each publication in detail, it might be useful to make some general remarks concerning certain characteristics common to all these publications. The first striking feature of all the items is the important role of *partiinost'*, even in the somewhat esoteric field of bibliography. For example, the name of Lenin figures explicitly in one of the titles. Another constant companion in Soviet Ukrainian bibliography, as in other types of publications in Soviet Ukraine, is the theme of the beneficent role of Russian culture in the history of the Ukrainian book. To some degree, this explains the cult of Ivan Fedorovyč, a Muscovite cleric who was probably responsible for printing the first extant book on Ukrainian ethnic territory. This Ukrainian (and Russian) *peršodrukar* is the subject of four of the works under review, some of which represent a positive "fallout" from the jubilee year (1974). *Partiinost'* is even manifested in the periodization of the history of printing in Ukraine, in the listing of reference publications according to their provenance (e.g., "capitalist" versus "socialist" countries), and in the frequent failure to recognize the achievements of regimes which were "bourgeoise," "reactionary-monarchist," or rigorously Orthodox. One striking example can be found in *50 rokiv Central'noji naukovoji biblioteky AN URSSR*, a memorial miscellany devoted to the fiftieth anniversary of the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Kiev. According to one speaker at the symposium on September 29, 1969, this library was founded in February-May 1919. The reader is left to assume that both the concept of a national library and its implementation were the work of the newly-established Soviet Ukrainian regime. This, however, is not the case. In his well-known history of the Hetmanate, Dmytro Dorošenko states that the plan for the creation of a National Library had already been laid in the summer of 1918.

Not all the works under review are of equal value. The publications

---

O. Ovdijenko, *Knyžkove mystectvo na Ukrajinі (1917-1974)* (L'viv: Vydavnyce ob"jednannja "Vysča škola," 1974) [21 pp. + (63 ll.), 5,000 copies].

Several of these works (Daragan and Kaganova; Gol'denberg and Maloletova; Humenjuk; Hutjans'kyj; Zapasko; and Ovdijenko) are reviewed by Mr. Kasinec in greater detail and separately in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (forthcoming).

by Isajevyč and by Zapasko are enduring pieces of scholarship, and will remain fundamental reference works for years to come. The other works are merely useful, either because they bring together previously scattered information or, on a more elementary level, because they contain illustrative and iconographic material. Some of the works are occasionally revealing of Soviet Ukrainian librarianship. For example, *50 rokiv* mentions the number of items looted from the Academy collection by the Nazis (705,000 items!), explicates the intricacies of current Soviet book deposit regulations, and lists the Academy of Sciences Library's holdings of Western reference serials.

The works under review fall into two broad categories: 1) works dealing with the holdings of specific library collections in Ukraine; 2) works dealing with the history of book printing and book culture in Ukraine. Let us deal with each type of publication in turn.

In the introduction to Daragan and Kaganova, *Prizhiznennye izdanija*, S. K. Hutjans'kyi, Director of the Academy Library, provides a history of the various publishing houses of Leniniana. This is followed by a list of 231 individual publications by Lenin that are found in the Academy collections. Twenty-four items date from the period 1898-1909, while the remaining 207 works date from 1917 to Lenin's death in 1924. The small number of pre-revolutionary imprints in the collection perhaps results from the fact that the Kievan repositories on which the Academy Library is based were not regarded as depository collections for proscribed literature. This well-printed book contains four indices: 1) the cities in which Leniniana was published; 2) a list of corrigenda; 3) a title index; and 4) a listing of individual titles in Lenin's collected works.

A work closely related to the above is Gol'denberg and Maloletova, *Informacionno-bibliografičeskaja periodika*, which deals with reference aids held by the Academy Library. Gol'denberg and Maloletova understand "informational-bibliographical" publications to be national bibliographies, abstract journals, bibliographical annuals, current-awareness publications, and informational publications which appear every two or three years. The greater portion of their listing (pp. 5-158) contains 390 general and subject periodicals arranged according to the Soviet system of classification. According to this system, national bibliographical publications of the "socialist" camp are listed together. Within each subsection, Cyrillic publications are given first. Western language publications follow,

with translations into Russian. Each of the periodical entries contains a short description and a statement of holdings. The work concludes with an index of titles (pp. 159-172) and an appendix (pp. 173-199). The shelf marks (call numbers) are not given consistently, and the holdings seem to be incomplete for many publications.

While the Academy Library in Kiev is clearly the largest collection in Ukraine, the filial in L'viv also contains many important volumes, which were nationalized from Galician-Ukrainian collections. The third publication, Humenjuk et al., *Knyha i znannja*, is a miscellany. It contains several worthwhile articles dealing with the collections of the Library in L'viv. R. M. Bihans'kyj discusses the 420 volumes of Belorussica donated to the Academy Library in 1969 by the family of I. S. Svencic'kyj, giving a history of this collection, a discussion of Svencic'kyj's work on Belorussia, his relationship with Belorussian scholars, and a survey of this collection, organized under nine rubrics. M. A. Val'o deals with the Library's holdings of Russian Academy publications. This overview is structured under four rubrics: 1) serial publications of a general and academic nature; 2) miscellanies and monographs; 3) bibliographical publications; and 4) historiographical works on the Academy. Val'o also treats in passing Leniniana and Communist Party publications about the Russian Academy. Another valuable article is R. S. Karabatov's essay on the Greek holdings of the L'viv Rare Book Division.

O. P. Kušč contributes two essays. The first deals with the more than 150 works of Anton Chekhov that have been translated in Western Ukraine since 1889, as well as those in the original language and in Polish. Kušč's second essay deals with the question of translating Alexander Blok into Ukrainian, concentrating on the fragments of "The Twelve" published in *Nova kul'tura*, No. 5, 1923, as well as the separate edition by Vasyli' Bobyns'kyj held in the L'viv Regional Archives. Kušč notes that this copy contains an interpellation protesting the activity of the press representative, Moxnjux, who had confiscated a line in this poem. In addition to this copy, two others exist in the L'viv Academy Library.

In a short essay, Humenjuk himself treats "bibliography" (in the broadest sense of "reviews") in the four liberal L'viv periodicals: *Druh* (1874-1877), *Svit* (1881-1882), *Narod* (1890-1895), and *Žyttje i Slovo* (1894-1897). In a related essay, Je. Je. Kravčenko surveys the archives of

M. Pavlyk with a view to elucidating the points of controversy between this socialist and the "bourgeois-nationalists." In particular, Kravčenko deals with Pavlyk's general social philosophy, his attacks on the Uniate Church, and his propagation of the works of Marx and Engels. Je. M. Stasjuk gives a survey of the various primers published in Russia and Ukraine from the sixteenth century to the Soviet period. In another short essay, A. P. Tarapata describes the collection and available services in the Marxist-Leninist Division of the Library. Finally, V. V. Masotas' contributes a lengthy essay on his book, *Komunistyčena Partija Zaričnoji Ukrajinny: bibliografičnyj pokazčyk za 1919-1969* (L'viv: 1969).

The golden anniversary of the Academy of Sciences' Library is commemorated in Hutjans'kyj, Kohut, and Rud, *50 rokiv*. In the first article, Hutjans'kyj (Director) recounts the library's efforts to carry out Lenin's library mandates; S. V. Sorokovs'ka (Chief Bibliographer) deals with the collections of rare Leniniana; P. A. Sotnyčenko (Collection Development Officer) provides an overview of the types of collections in the library; L. A. Zjuba (Public Services Librarian) reviews the ways in which the library has adjusted its administrative structure to serve its highly variegated public; and F. Z. Symčenko (Rare Books Librarian) contributes a useful review of the bibliological work of those associated with the library. In addition to dealing with the broad principles and modes of Soviet literature collection building, M. Kahanova treats the various methods of acquiring current Soviet publications through paid and free "obligatory" copy, purchase, and gifts and exchanges. K. D. Bakulin (Foreign Publications Division) discusses the means by which foreign publications are acquired (mostly through international exchange). In the lengthy final essay, O. P. Daragan treats the catalogues, card files, reference department, and reference archives of the library.

The remaining books belong to the second classification--works dealing with the history of book printing in Ukraine.

*Zapasko, Myster'ka spadščyna*, is an excellent study of Ivan Fedorovyč's types and ornaments. Although only thirteen books are known to have come from Fedorovyč's press, they contain a great variety of decorative material and initials, all of which are reproduced here in the size of the originals, as are examples of his six Greek and Cyrillic types. The work is divided into three broad sections: 1) an introductory text (pp. 6-85); 2) indices to the specific kinds of type and ornamentation in Fedorovyč's works

(pp. 87-151) and to portions of the various works reproduced (pp. 153-157); and 3) an album of reproductions (pp. 159-220). The introduction provides an historiographical review of the various studies of Fedorovyč's career. The next section presents a brief survey of each of the thirteen Fedorovyč publications, including physical description, printing, locations, and graphic elements. This is followed by a study of the three basic type faces used by Fedorovyč (the "Moscow," "Ostrih," and "Greek"), as well as the more than five hundred ornaments. Zapasko thus deals with 185 lines of ligatures (*v"jaz'*), 16 figure ornamentations (frontispieces, heraldic marks, printers' signs and marks, title frames, page engravings), 254 ornamental ornaments (80 blocks of headpieces in 5 stylistic groups, 20 tail pieces, and 154 initials in 4 stylistic groups), and finally miscellaneous ornaments, including running titles, frames, and cast metal motifs.

The two concluding sections of the book deal with the five identifiable graphists: Fedorovyč himself, Petro Tymofijovyč Mstyslavец', Hryn' Ivanovyč, Lavrentij Pylypovyč, and "WS" (Wendel Scharfenberg?). Zapasko notes that seventy-nine of Fedorovyč's original blocks were used on more than eighty-two posthumous titles published in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Zapasko's study compares well with those that have been done for Fedorovyč's western European contemporaries. However, readers who do not know Slavic must work with inferior English summaries and captions. This situation is somewhat ameliorated by French and German summaries.

There are many archeographic collections dealing with the Old Russian and Ukrainian book; however, most of these collections have been poorly or tendentiously edited, and virtually all have been difficult to obtain. A notable exception to this is Isajevyč, *Perěodrukar Ivan Fedorov*. Isajevyč is Zapasko's younger colleague.

This publication is divided into several parts: 1) an introduction (pp. 5-13); 2) the collection of 137 documents; and 3) an appendix, consisting of: notes, lists of typographies and typographers, a glossary of archaic terms, a conversion table for Slavonic numbers, a bibliography and abbreviations, an index of personal and geographical names, and a resume in English and in Russian.

The documents gathered by Isajevyč relate to the period 1573-1648, and have been taken from all the known repositories, among them the Central State Historical Archives in L'viv and Kíev, the Central State Archives

of Old Acts in Moscow, the Central State Historical Archives in Minsk, and the Archives of the Leningrad Section of the Academy of Sciences' Institute of History. Isajevyč's documentary approach to the history of Ukrainian printing is a legitimate one, since books from some of the printing houses have not survived, nor in fact have documents from the great Ukrainian printing house of the Kiev monastery of the Caves. The majority of documents reproduced here have been taken from the magistral and city judicial books.

The next work, *Fedorovskie čtenija*, is the most recent Fedorovyč miscellany. Many of its contributors worked on the above-mentioned two volumes of Fedorovyčiana. This collection is the seventh in a series of *Fedorov Readings*, the first of which took place in 1933. While the first *Readings* concentrated on the narrow issue of Ivan Fedorovyč, the subsequent symposia (1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1964, 1973) were broadened in scope to include questions (and book exhibits) of modern Russian and Soviet book printing in general.

Zapasko has contributed an essay which deals with the important influence of the local Ukrainian artistic tradition on Fedorovyč's publications. E. L. Nemirovskij reviews the stages in the source-study and historiography of Fedorovyč. Isajevyč presents a useful characterization of the printing activities of Myxajlo Slizka in L'viv (1638-1667). Other essays include an article by O. M. Macjuk discussing new archival documents found in Minsk and relating to the career of S. Sobol' (1635-1645). M. B. Vydašenko gives a brief history of the Univ monastery (presently Mižhir'ja, Peremyšl' Region, L'viv Oblast') during the period of its greatest printing activity (1646-1770). The longest piece in the collection is an essay by A. A. Guseva concerning the continuity in the use of the Fedorovyč ornamentation and type of Ukrainian printers to 1650.

In addition to writing interpretative essays and collecting documents, Soviet Ukrainian scholars have also been active in publishing facsimiles of Fedorovyč's work. An example of this is the *Bukvar Ivana Fedorova*--facsimile edition of the famous *Primer* (*bukvar* or *hramatyka*) (1574) of Fedorovyč. This *Primer* was first brought to the attention of the scholarly world by Roman Jakobson, and published by him in the *Harvard Library Bulletin* in an article jointly authored with the late W. Jackson. In addition to the actual facsimile, the work contains a fourteen-page biography of Fedorovyč, as well as a linguistic analysis of the *Primer* by



V. Nimčuk. The work, however, contains two factual errors. The Ostrih Bible was not published in 1681 (p. 85), but a century earlier. Further, William Jackson was not a philologist, but a descriptive bibliographer, as evidenced by his *Records of a Bibliographer* (Harvard University Press: 1967).

While Fedorovyč unquestionably played an important role in the development of Ukrainian printing, it is gratifying to see that recent Soviet Ukrainian scholarship has not ignored other important periods in the history of Ukrainian book publishing. The volume *Z hlybyn* by the prolific art historian H. N. Lohvyn (1910- ) gives a broad history of the Ukrainian manuscript miniature from the tenth century to 1800, and deals heavily with the socio-political background of the manuscript book. This work contains eighty-four color illustrations of the miniatures, of which nearly one half are from Leningrad, Moscow, and foreign repositories. Lohvyn writes in an easy style, conveying an impressive amount of information on such topics as the number of manuscripts in Old Rus' as well as generalizations on the physical characteristics of old Ukrainian miniatures. Relying on the research of B. Sapunov, Lohvyn posits that there was an impressive number (80,000) of manuscripts extant in Old Rus' before the Mongol invasion (pp. 33-34).

The last two books under discussion deal with the modern Ukrainian book. Maštaliř, *Rozvytok polihrafiji na Ukrajinı*, purports to be a general history of the Ukrainian printing industry; nevertheless, only a small portion of this volume deals with the pre-Revolutionary period. Its authors divide the history of the Ukrainian printing industry into three parts: 1) the pre-Soviet period (pp. 8-68); 2) the Soviet period (pp. 70-164); and 3) future perspectives for the printing industry (pp. 166-185). The pre-Revolutionary period, in turn, is subdivided into: the seventeenth century, which saw a swift development in the manufacturing industry in Ukraine; the eighteenth century, which witnessed a decline; and the mid-nineteenth century, a period when capitalist relations began to be formed. Within each of these chronological divisions, the history of printing houses and the legislation affecting them is first presented; this is followed by the houses' "internal" history (physical plants, conditions of the workers, strikes, etc.). Both the development of printing techniques and the socio-political background of the printing industry are extensively covered. The greater part of the work deals with

events in Eastern Ukraine.

While it is unquestionably useful to have all of this information concentrated in one place, this work is essentially derivative and based on well-known published sources. Unfortunately, these sources are not always used correctly. For example, Borys Hrinčenko is identified (p. 47) as the publisher of *Černigovskij listok*, but this publication expired before he was even born.

The final work under review, Ovdijenko, *Knyžkove mystectvo*, deals with one narrow aspect of the Soviet publishing industry, namely, book graphics. Ovdijenko's book presents an encyclopedic recitation of the more than one hundred graphists of the Soviet period. While Ovdijenko does mention such organizations as AXČU, APMU, OSMU, OMMU (all in Kiev), and the K. Kostandi Society in Odessa, his introduction is highly politicized and contains little on the question of publishing, education for the graphic artist, or societies of graphists. This book is further weakened by carping on two familiar themes: 1) the efforts of Soviet graphics to overcome "formalism" and "constructivism" (*proletku'lt*) and to adapt the legacy of nineteenth-century Russian and Ukrainian artists to "socialist realism" and 2) the positive influence of Russian artists on Ukrainian graphics.

Edward Kasinec  
Harvard University

Index to Volume VII

Books Reviewed (Listed by Author or Title)

*Movoznavstvo* [Linguistics] (Jaroslav Harchun)

No. 2, p. 1

V. M. Ničyk, ed., *Vid Vyšens'koho do Skovorody (Z istoriji filozofs'koji dumky na Ukrajinі XVI-XVIII st.)* [From Vysens'kyj to Skovoroda: From the History of Philosophical Thought in Ukraine of the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries] (Taras D. Zakydalsky)

No. 1, p. 50

V. V. Panašenko, *Paleohrafija ukrajins'koho skoropysu druhoji polovyny XVII st. (Na materialax Livoberežnoji Ukrajinjy)* [The Paleography of Ukrainian Cursive of the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century: Based Upon Materials of Left-Bank Ukraine] (Edward Kasinec)

No. 1, p. 34

*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, vol. II: *Morfoložia* [The Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language, vol. II: Morphology] (Michael K. Bourke)

No. 2, p. 9

*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, vol. III: *Syntaksys* [The Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language, vol. III: Syntax] (John Barnstead)

No. 2, p. 19

S. A. Vysockij, *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj XI-XIV vv.* [Old Rus'ian Graffiti of Kiev's St. Sophia from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century] (Bohdan O. Strumins'kyj)

No. 1, p. 14

S. A. Vysockij, *Srednevekove nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj (Po materialam graffiti XI-XVII vv.)* [Medieval Inscriptions of Kiev's St. Sophia: According to Materials of Eleventh to Seventeenth Century Graffiti] (Bohdan O. Strumins'kyj)

No. 1, p. 14

## Reviewers and Authors

- Barnstead, John. (*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, Vol. III: *Syntaksys*)  
No. 2, p. 19
- Bourke, Michael K. (*Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*, vol. II: *Morfologia*)  
No. 2, p. 9
- Harchun, Jaroslav. (*Movoznavstvo*)  
No. 2, p. 1
- Kaiser, Daniel H., "In Search of Old Kiev: A Review of the Literature,"  
No. 1, p. 1
- Kasinec, Edward. (V. V. Panašenko, *Paleohrafiĭa ukrajins'koho skoropysu druhoji polovyny XVII st.: Na materialax Ljuberežnoji Ukraĭiny*)  
No. 1, p. 34
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Recent Ukrainian Bibliological Publications: A Brief Survey of Monographs and Archeographic Collections."  
No. 2, p. 29
- Strumins'kyj, Bohdan O. (S. A. Vysockij, *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievekoj XI-XIV vv.*; S. A. Vysockij, *Srednevekove nadpisi Sofii Kievekoj: Po materialam graffiti XI-XVII vv.*)  
No. 1, p. 14
- Zakydalsky, Taras D. (V. M. Ničyk, ed., *Vid Vyšens'koho do Skovorody: Z istoriji filosofov'koho dumky na Ukraĭini XVI-XVIII st.*)  
No. 1, p. 50

## Indices

- Index to Volume VI  
No. 1, p. 60
- Index to Volume VII  
No. 2, p. 39

	Ukrainian		Russian	
	<u>R</u>	<u>LC</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>LC</u>
А	a	a	a	a
Б	b	b	b	b
В	v	v	v	v
Г	h	h	g	g
Ґ	g	g	-	-
Д	d	d	d	d
Е	e	e	e	e
Є	je	iē	-	-
Ж	ž	zh	ž	zh
З	z	z	z	z
И	y	y	i	i
І	i	i	ī	ī
Ї	ji	ī	-	-
Й	j	ī	j	ī
К	k	k	k	k
Л	l	l	l	l
М	m	m	m	m
Н	n	n	n	n
О	o	o	o	o
П	p	p	p	p
Р	r	r	r	r
С	s	s	s	s
Т	t	t	t	t
У	u	u	u	u
Ф	f	f	f	f
Х	x	kh	x	kh
Ц	c	ts	c	ts
Ч	č	ch	č	ch
Ш	š	sh	š	sh
Щ	šč	shch	šč	shch
Ю	ju	iū	ju	iū
Я	ja	iā	ja	iā
Ь	'	'	'	'
,	"	"	"	"

The following letters will be transliterated as follows:

Ukrainian	Russian
Ъ	"
Ы	ŷ
Э	è
Ё	ë
Ê	ê
Ô	ô
Ў	ũ
Ѣ	î
Ѧ	t
Ѩ	ÿ
Ј	ĵ

R Recenzija

LC Library of Congress

Prepared by A. Hornjatkevyc

