JAMES M. FOSTER

SLAVIC IN NORTH AMERICA

An Exploratory Study into the Language
of Ukrainians in the USA.

SLAVICA CANADIANA

was adopted as an official publication of the Canadian Association of Slavists (CAS) ...

Slavica Canadiana will publish the Society's news, book reviews, bibliography, smaller articles and resumes of papers ...

The Annual Meeting of CAS recognizes with full appreciation the publishing activities of *Slavica Canadiana* (Slavistica, Winnipeg), *Etudes Slaves et Est-Europeennes* (Montreal), and the *Canadian Slavonic Papers* (Toronto) ... and commends them to all members of CAS.

Prof. Rudnyćkyj was heartily congratulated as Editor of *Slavica Canadiana* ... to his great success in initiating of Slavonic publication in Canada.

To date the following issues have been published:

Slavistica Canadiana 1950 — Winnipeg, 1950
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1951 — Winnipeg, 1952
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1952 — Winnipeg, 1953
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1953 — Winnipeg, 1954
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1954 — Winnipeg, 1955
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1955 — Winnipeg, 1956
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1956 — Winnipeg, 1957
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1957 — Winnipeg, 1958
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1958 — Winnipeg, 1959
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1959 — Winnipeg, 1960
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1960 — Winnipeg, 1961
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1961 — Winnipeg, 1962
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1962 — Winnipeg, 1963
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1963 — Winnipeg, 1964
Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1964 — in preparation

Order from:

UVAN

Box 3597, Sta. B., Winnipeg 4, Man., Canada

Дж. М. ФОСТЕР

ІЗ СТУДІЙ НАД МОВОЮ УКРАЇНЦІВ У США.

J. M. FOSTER

SLAVIC IN NORTH AMERICA

**An Exploratory Study into the Language
of Ukrainians in the USA.**

Introduction

Perhaps the only linguistic universal upon which all investigators agree — including psychologists, anthropologists and linguists — is that languages change through time. Yet this universal of language is probably least amenable to direct study. Linguistic change normally takes place so slowly that diachronic linguists must place heavy reliance on the study of written materials to determine the processes of loss and innovation in grammatical, lexical, morphological, and phonological patterns in a language at two or more points in time.

Certain factors, however, sometimes affect languages to speed up their normal rate of change, so that within one or two generations more change may come about than would normally occur in centuries. Both Bloomfield (1) and Weinreich (12) have discussed at length one such factor affecting languages: the process of linguistic acculturation, whereby one language, due to contact with another, absorbs features from the second language. A great deal of change occurred in the English language, for example, during the period of the Norman ascendency. And, as Bloomfield and Weinreich pointed out, in North America we have the examples of, and the opportunity to study, the acculturation of the languages of immigrant groups, some of which have been retained steadfastly in spite of the dominance of the English language.

The present study attempts to investigate systematically the speech of Ukrainian immigrants and their children who were born outside of Ukraine (in Germany, Austria, North America, etc.), but who have retained their native language. The investigation delves into two areas: 1) which speakers of Ukrainian have changed, or acculturated, their speech to

5

the greatest extent, and which speakers have changed little or not at all; and 2) which parts of the structure of Ukrainian have been most subject to change. Knowledge in these two areas may be extended not only to other East Slavic languages spoken by immigrants in North America, but also, to a lesser extent, perhaps, to immigrant languages in general.

The Ukrainian language spoken in North America is interesting for at least two reasons. Large numbers of Ukrainian speakers have migrated to this continent over the years, and have not only retained their language, but have taught it to their children. In the present study, we were able to interview informants who represented second, third, and even fourth generation Americans, and who were quite fluent in Ukrainian, although acculturated Ukrainian. Secondly, although Ukrainian is rather distantly related to English genetically, it differs widely from English on all linguistic levels. Thus any changes, or deviations from standard Ukrainian which we might find in acculturated Ukrainian, and which are in the direction of the structure of English (such as, perhaps, the loss of distinctive palatalization) can be attributed, with more certainty, to interference from English.

In the present study, 52 native speakers of Ukrainian were interviewed individually, each interview taking approximately 30 to 45 minutes. All subjects were also fluent in English, and 23 subjects were not born in Ukraine. The majority of subjects resided in Chicago, others represented Canada and eastern United States. Subjects ranged in age from eight to over sixty.

The method employed in this study was to select representative samples from each of the linguistic levels of Ukrainian and test the sample of Ukrainian speakers for loss or innovation on any level. An effort was made to avoid any sample items which might reflect dialect differences existing in Ukraine, for the aim of the study was to isolate only those patterns of variation due to acculturation with English.

6

The Test Items

On the phonological level, the Ukrainian language, according to D. Čiževsky (3), utilizes five main oppositions: 1) vowels versus consonants, 2) accented vowels versus unaccented, 3) voiceless consonants versus voiced, 4) hard consonants versus soft (palatalized), and 5) short consonants versus long. The latter two oppositions utilize two features foreign to English phonology[1], namely, palatalization and consonantal length. It might be expected that these two features would be especially prone to loss in acculturated Ukrainian speech as they would receive none of the support from English which the other phonological features common to both languages would have. To test this hypothesis, the minimal pairs for palatalization and length given by Čiževsky were included in the questionnaire:

length

1. *Zilja* (a proper name) : *zillja* (herbs)
2. *viča* (gen. sing. of *viče* 'public meeting' : *seredn'o-viččja* (Middle Ages)
3. *otočeni* (pass. part. nom. plur. of *otočyty* 'to surround' : (*v*)*otočenni* 'in the surroundings of'
4. *pana* (gen. sing. of *pan* 'lord, master' : *panna* 'miss'

palatalization

1. *sudy* nom. plur. of *sud* 'court' : *sjudy* 'here'
2. *rada* 'council' : *rjady* 'row'
3. *nis* 'nose' : *n'is* 'carried'
4. *synu* 'voc. of *syn* 'son' : *synju* accus. sing. fem. of *synij* 'blue'
5. *dzus* 'off' : *dzjus* 'a word without meaning'
6. *cap* 'goat' : *cjap* 'chuck'

After a pretest of ten subjects, a number of these items were dropped from the test. Items 1, 2, and 3 of length and items 5 and 6 of palatalization had to be dropped because one or the other of the pairs was completely unfamiliar to the subjects. (The method used was to ask each subject for the Ukrainian equivalent to the English word, and to continue eliciting responses until the proper one came up, or it seemed

7

reasonably certain that the subject did not know the word.) Item 4 of palatalization was also deleted because many subjects represented a dialect which does not palatalize the segment in question in the second member of the pair.

On the level of morpho-phonology, it was necessary to include items on inflection (case for nouns and conjugation for verbs), and derivation. In both categories, Ukrainian differs extensively from English. English inflects nouns only for number whereas Ukrainian nouns are inflected for seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, vocative, and locative) and for number. Verbs in Ukrainian are inflected for three persons, singular and plural, in the present tense, whereas English verbs mark only the 3rd person singular in the present tense. Past and future tenses (as well as the aspect systems) are inflected quite differently in Ukrainian where gender and tense markers are suffixed to the verb stem in the past tense, but these processes of inflection are taken up in the syntactic level of the test. As a test of whether any loss or innovation has taken place at the inflectional level, one noun and one verb, from productive classes, were included. These were elicited within sentence form, correct responses being as follows:

holub 'dove, pigeon'

singular	plural
N. *holub*	*holub-y*
G. *holub-a*	*holub-iw*
D. *holub-ovi*	*holub-am*
A. *holub-a*	*holub-y* or *-iw*
V. *holub-e*	*holub-y*
I. *holub-om*	*holub-amy*
L. *holub-ovi* or *-i*	*holub-ax*

hraty 'to play'

singular	plural
1st *hra-ju*	*hra-jemo*
2nd *hra-ješ*	*hra-jete*
3rd *hra-je*	*hra-jut'*

(Stress has not been marked in any items on the test and no attempt was made by the experimenter to judge subjects on "correct" stress because of the extensive dialect variation in

8

Ukrainian in this area.) The above paradigms enabled the experimenter to test the retention by the subjects of two segments (or phones) which are foreign to English. It was thought that some subjects, due to interference from English, might devoice the *h,* or not trill the *r,* and all subjects were scored on these points.

The Ukrainian language also differs widely from English in the matter of derivational word formation. G. Shevelov (3) estimates that Ukrainian utilizes a total of more than 175 suffixes and about 40 prefixes to derive new bound forms out of roots. Although English (Old English) at one time had this productive capacity, it has now lost most of it and relies heavily on its extensive vocabulary of borrowed words. As a test of the retention of the subjects of this productive word formation, each was asked the Ukrainian equivalent of the following sixteen words (taken from Shevelov) :

1. *žinka* 'woman'
2. *žinočyj* 'female (adj.)'
3. *žinoctvo,* 'womenfolk' or 'womanhood'
4. *pysaty* 'to write',
5. *pysar* 'clerk' or 'secretary'
6. *pysarčuk* 'young clerk' or 'assistant clerk'
7. *pys'mennyk* 'writer'
8. *pys'mennyj* 'literate'
9. *pan* 'lord, master'
10. *pans'kyj* 'lordlike (adj.)'
11. *pidpanok* 'lordling'
12. *panuvaty* 'to rule'
13. *zapanuvaty* 'to begin to rule'
14. *panuvannja* 'rule'
15. *pans'kist'* 'lordly behavior'
16. *pans'koho* 'gen. case of adj. lordlike'

After the pretest, it was found necessary to delete items 11 and 15 from the test, as none of the subjects responded correctly, although some subjects, after being told the two words, stated that they were familiar with the words from literature. This section turned out to be rather difficult for all subjects, but seemed to discriminate those who knew Ukrainian (perhaps literary Ukrainian) well, from those who knew it less so.

Another morpho-phonemic feature which is apparently much more extensive in Ukrainian than English is vowel alternation. The following four items, taken from Čiževsky (3), are a test of their retention:

1. *stil* : *stoly* (table, nom. sing. and plural)
2. *pleče* : *plič* (shoulder nom. sing. and gen. plural)
3. *otec'* : *otcja* (father nom. and gen.)
4. *zov* (call) : *zvemo* (we call)

After the pretest, items 2 and 4 were eliminated: the former alternation has a dialectical variant with no alternation (*plečej*), and the latter pair were unknown to most of the subjects.

The level of vocabulary, is relatively easy to test for loss or innovation. Lists of English words can be drawn up with the proper Ukrainian equivalents from a Ukrainian lexicon, the subjects being tested to discover if they respond with the proper Ukrainian word, or some variation from it, a loan word from English, perhaps.

From the study of historical linguistics, however, we know that not all words are equally susceptible to change, even under the accelerated condition of acculturation. From Swadesh's (11) theory of glottochronology, we posit that a "basic vocabulary" exists for all languages which is extremely resistant to change, roughly 19% morph replacement in a millenium according to Lees (7). To test whether this is indeed true, the first 25 words[2] from Hymes'(6) list of basic vocabulary were elicited from all subjects.

We also wanted to test other vocabulary items which were not of an obscure or abstract nature, due to the fact that children were to be tested as well as adults. A random sample from a dictionary would result in many uncommon items not representative of every-day Ukrainian speech. Instead, a random sample of 25 words from the vocabulary section of an elementary Ukrainian grammar book, Stechishin (10), was taken. As it turned out, the items were rather easy for adult Ukrainian speakers, but reasonably difficult for children.

Random Words from Grammar

1. historian — *istoryk*
2. lamp — *l'ampa*
3. mud — *boloto*
4. breakfast — *snidannja*
5. proverb — *prykazka*
   prypovidka
6. window — *vikno*
7. page — *storinka*
8. machine — *mašyna*
9. endless — *bezkonečnyj*
10. eyebrow — *brova*
11. famous — *slavnyj*
12. widow — *vdova*
13. mushroom — *hryb*
14. field — *pole*
15. church — *cerkva*
16. row — *rjada*
17. priest — *svjaščenyk*
    otec'
18. mail — *počta*
19. cheap — *tanyj*
    deševyj
20. king — *korol'*
21. quarrel — *svarka*
22. reason — *pryčyna*
23. quietly — *tyxo*
24. cotton — *vata*
    bavowna
25. farmer — *ril'nyk*
    xliborob

Basic Vocabulary

1. I — *ja*
2. thou — *ty*
3. we — *my*
4. this — *ce*
5. that — *to*
6. who — *xto*
7. what — *ščo*
8. not — *ne*
9. all — *vse*
10. many — *bahato*
11. one — *odyn*
12. two — *dva*
13. big — *velykyj*
14. long — *dowhyj*
15. woman — *žinka*
16. man — *čolovik*
17. person — *osoba*
    ljudyna
18. fish — *ryba*
19. bird — *ptax*
20. dog — *pes*
21. louse — *voš*
22. tree — *derevo*
23. seed — *zerno*
24. leaf — *lystok*
25. root — *korin'*

In measuring linguistic change on the syntactic level, it was thought best to make up a few sentences varying in grammatical complexity from simple to relatively difficult, and utilizing relatively simple words so that no subject would be hindered because he didn't know a word, even though perhaps he knew the grammatical processes necesary to form the sentence. The following five sentences were taken from Stechishin (10):

1. I can read. — *Ja možu čytaty.*
   " *vmiju* "
2. The neighbor's son is reading. — *Syn susida čytaje.*

11

3. She will be singing with her brother John. — *Vona bude spivaty z bratom Ivanom.*
4. I did not see one table. — *Ja ne bačyw (bačyla) (ni) odnoho stola*
5. There were many trees in the forest, but there were few windows in the house. — *V lisi bulo bahato derev, a v xati malo vikon.*

These five sentences represent some of the common grammatical processes utilized in Ukrainian, such as use of auxiliary verbs, tense and aspect, possessives, negativizations, adverbial agreements, etc. Admittedly, it is only a very small sample of the multitude of possible sentence constructions, but it was essential to keep the entire test within manageable limits of time in order to assure a good sample size of subjects.

The Hypotheses

The hypotheses in this study fall into two categories: 1) those concerning the psychological-sociological factors affecting human beings, and 2) those concerning linguistic factors affecting languages.

Hypothesis 1. The amount of change or deviation from the standard as measured by the number of incorrect responses by each subject will be in the following direction:

a. *Group I*, those people who were born in Ukraine, and who did not migrate to this country until after reaching maturation (over 18), and who migrated recently (since the end of WWII) will show the least variation from the standard.

b. *Group II*, those people who have the same characteristics as the preceding except that they migrated to America at a much earlier date (before World War II) will show the next smallest amount of change.

c. *Group III*, those who were born in Ukraine, but who migrated before fully maturing should show the next largest amount of change. Further this group will be broken down into *IIIa*, those who left Ukraine after reaching adolescence (between 13 and 18) and those, Group *IIIb*, who left

12

before reaching adolescence—the former showing less change than the latter. This follows from Lenneberg (8) and Halle (4) who argue that the ability to learn to pronounce new speech sounds and to change one's grammar is a decreasing function of age and drops off markedly once adolescence is attained. Thus those who had attained adolescence in Ukraine would have formed their speech habits, while those who had not reached that critical period would be more susceptible to interference from English, and would have a greater ability to introduce English grammatical or phonological features into their Ukrainian speech.

d. And finally, those persons not born in Ukraine will show more change than any of the above groups: *Group IV*, those born in Germany or Austria during or immediately after WWII, should show less change than *Group V*, those born in North America, since the former will not have been exposed to English at such an early age as the latter, and will thus have had more time to form their Ukrainian speech habits before the begining of interference from English.

Hypothesis 2. Subjects who state on the questionnaire administered after the test, that they use Ukrainian more often than English, will show less change than their opposites on this point. This follows from the assumption that language patterns decay more rapidly from disuse than use.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis is almost a corrollary of the second, namely, those subjects who live in a Ukrainian speaking community will show less change than those who do not. This hypothesis and also the fourth and fifth are from Casagrande (2).

Hypothesis 4. Those subjects who listen to radio programs in Ukrainian will show less change than those who do not. The radio programs would tend to stress the standard language, and thus also tend to iron out dialect irregularities and retard acculturation to some extent, according to Casagrande.

Hypothesis 5. Those subjects who read newspapers and books and magazines in Ukrainian will show less change than those who do not; this for the same reasons as those of hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 6. We expect more deviation from standard Ukrainian on the list of random words selected from the grammar book, than on the basic vocabulary list; this from the theory of glottochronology mentioned before.

And finally, we want to explore which levels of the language will show the greatest amount of change. At present there is little systematic literature on the subject upon which to base any hypotheses.

Results

Hypothesis 1. Group I (N=8) made a mean number of mistakes of *2.0* on the total test (a possible 101 mistakes). Group II's (N=2) mean number of mistakes was *21.0;* Group IIIa (N=4) *2.0;* Group IIIb (N=15) *4.4;* Group IV (N=16) *10.6;* Group V (N=7) *18.9.*[3] Statistical tests of significance using *t* distributions were performed on the data with the following results: Group I significantly different from Group II at .01 confidence level[4]; Group I not significantly different from either IIIa or IIIb, but significantly different from IV at the .01 level, and from V at the same level. Group IIIb was significantly different from Group IV at the .01 level and from Groups II and V at the same level. Further, Group II was significantly different from Group IV at the .01 level, but Group IV was not so from Group V.

From the preceding tests of significance, it was apparent that the previous grouping of the subjects was not the most efficient. On reanalysis, Group I, IIIa and IIIb were combined into a new Group A, while Groups II and V were combined to form Group B, and Group IV remaining the same, but now called Group C. Group A's average no. of mistakes is *3.3* (N=27); Group B's mean is *19.3* (N=9); and Group C's mean is *10.6* (N=16). Each Group is significantly different from each other at the 01 level of confidence.

Hypothesis 2.[5] A total of 13 subjects stated they used Ukrainian more often than English, their mean no. of mistakes being *2.9;* the mean of those saying they spoke English more often than Ukrainian (N=31, the other S's stating they used both languages to an equal extent) being *11.4.* The scores are significantly different at the .01 level.

Hypothesis 3. The mean no. of mistakes for those S's (N=35) stating they lived in a Ukrainian speaking neighborhood was *7.5;* the mean for those living in a non-Ukrainian neighborhood (N=19) was *11.2.* These scores were not significantly different at the .05 level of confidence (although they were at .10 level) and thus the hypothesis that those living in a Ukrainian speaking neighborhood would score signicantly better than those who did not, was not supported.

Hypothesis 4. The mean no. of mistakes for those S's stating they regularly listened to Ukrainian broadcasts (N= 22) was *6.3;* the mean for those who did not listen to such programs (N=22) was *9.6.* These groups were not significantly different at the .05 level. (This may be explained by the fact that many of the S's who stated that they did regularly listen to the radio broadcasts, said that they did so only because a parent or some one else would turn the program on. The S's said that they "could not help but hear the programs", but did not pay particular attention to them.)

Hypothesis 5. The mean no. of mistakes on the total test for those subjects who stated that they regularly read books and newspapers in Ukrainian (N=31) was *5.9;* the mean score for those who stated that they did not read such material (N=15) was *13.9.* These scores were significantly different at the .01 confidence level.

Hypothesis 6. Subjects from Group A scored an average of *0.41* mistakes on the basic vocabulary list, *0.63* mistakes on the random list; Group C made an average *1.19* mistakes on the basic vocabulary, *3.50* on the random list; Group B scored an average *1.89* mistakes on the basic list, *6.11* on the random list. No tests of significance were performed on the data as the difference in scores for Group A and C is very

15

small, however even though we can draw no statistical inferences from the data, we can notice that for each group, the basic list showed less difficulty than the random list— this being especially true of Group B. Perhaps if the entire 200 word list from Hymes were used and an equally lengthy list of randomly selected words, rather than the small sample used here, the difference between scores for each group would be more pronounced and, perhaps, significant.

In looking at the errors each group made on each part of the test, we were surprised to find that every person tested, who was under the age of approximately thirty, pronounced the Ukrainian word for *nose* (nis) with a soft rather than the expected hard *n*, while those over this age retained this distinction.[6] This tendency was especially noticeable when testing parents and their children: the parents retaining the distinction of hard and soft *n* for the minimal pair, the children pronouncing both words with palatalized *n*. This result is contrary to prediction (we had predicted that palatalization would be lost by some, not innovated where it formerly had not been), but the change merely seems to extend the phonetic rule of Ukrainian which palatalizes consonants before high front *i*.

Except for this item, we find that palatalization has not been changed by the subjects in this test, except for one subject from Group B who palatalized the initial *s* in the word for *courts of justice* (sudy) where it should not have been. Furthermore, the item on consonant length brought even less variance with only one subject, from Group B, showing loss of length in the word for *miss* (panna).

The inflection of nouns presented a harder test for all subject groups, the cases which were most often missed being dative singular, vocative singular, genitive plural, and instrumental plural. There seemed to be no systematic set of errors which we might call innovations for these cases; instead, it appeared that they had merely been lost by some of the subjects. The conjugation section of the test showed almost no variance; only one person from Group B was unabel to proceed directly through the paradigm. It is not at all un-

16

reasonable that inflection of nouns should show more loss than conjugation of verbs considering the fact that any speaker of standard Ukrainian must learn many noun inflection paradigms, but only a few basic verb conjugation paradigms. No subject mispronounced the two phones (h and r) which were also tested in this section.

As commented upon earlier, the derivational word formation items were the most difficult items for all subjects, and showed the most pronounced progression of errors from Group A to Group C to Group B. The vowel alternations were missed by no persons from Groups A or C, but two subjects from Group B regularized the forms.

Mean no. of mistakes for each group on each section of the test.

	Phonology		Morpho-phonology			Vocabulary		Syntax
	Palatalization	Length	Inflection	Derivation	Alternations	Basic	Random	
no. of items on each section:								
	6	2	20	14	4	25	25	5
Group A	0.70	0.00	0.33	1.85	0.00	0.41	0.63	0.00
Group B	0.88	0.11	2.66	6.66	0.33	1.89	6.11	1.22
Group C	1.00	0.00	1.10	3.88	0.00	1.19	3.50	0.06

Group A = those born in Ukraine who migrated to North America after WW II, regardless of age at migration.

Group B = those born in North America, and those who migrated from Ukraine previous to WW II.

Group C = those born in Germany or Austria during or immediately after WW II, and who then migrated to North America.

Mistakes on the vocabulary section of the test represented, in every case, loss of the standard Ukrainian term,

and gain of an English borrowing as those subjects who missed the Ukrainian words were always able to give one or more synonyms in English to the English stimulus words.

Finally, on the question of syntax, it can be seen from the diagram above that the only group that consistently made syntactic errors was Group B. The most common mistake was loss of the genitive case for possession in sentence two and for negation in sentence four, and again in sentence five for the words *trees* (derev) and windows (vikon) which are governed by the adverbs *few* (malo) and *many* (bahato), both of which require genitive case. It appeared that subjects had simply lost this case, especially in the plural; the most likely response replacing it being either the nominative or accusative case forms. A second, much less frequent error was loss of the locative case ending for *forest* (lisi) in sentence five. Other mistakes were unsystematic, for example, one subject representing Group B was unable to form past tenses.

Summary

Sample items were selected from the different linguistic levels (phonology, morphophonology, vocabulary and syntax) of standard Ukrainian, making up a 101 item test of retention of standard Ukrainian. The test was administered to 52 bilingual speakers of Ukrainian and English living in North America; the test items being elicited in English, responses in Ukrainian.

It was found that those persons who were born in the Ukraine, and who migrated to this continent during the post World War II period (regardless of their age at the time of migration) scored significantly higher on the over-all test of retention of standard Ukrainian than did those persons who were born in Germany and Austria during and immediately after WWII, and who then migrated. The latter group, however, scored significantly higher than the group which included American born subjects and those who migrated from the Ukraine previous to WWII.

18

Subjects who stated on a questionnaire administered after the test that they spoke Ukrainian more often than English scored significantly higher than those who said they spoke English more often than Ukrainian. Subjects who stated that they lived in a Ukrainian speaking neighborhood did not score significantly higher than those who stated that they did not live in such a neighborhood. Subjects who stated that they listened to Ukrainian radio broadcasts did not score significantly higher than those who said they did not, but those who stated that they read books and newspapers in Ukrainian did score significantly higher than those who stated that they did not. Each of the three subject groups scored higher on the list of "basic vocabulary" (taken from Hymes glotto-chronology list) than they did on a list of words picked at random from an elementary Ukrainian grammar book.

An analysis of the mistakes made by each group on each of the different sections of the test showed, in general, that palatalization and consonant length have been retained by all groups; noun inflection has suffered considerable loss, especially for the latter two groups; verb conjugation has suffered no loss; vowel alternations show little or no tendency toward regularization; vocabulary shows considerable loss for the latter two groups (who make greater use of English borrowings); and syntactic errors were only consistently made by the group representing American born S's and those who migrated previous to WW II.

NOTES

1. Although Halle and Chomsky (5) have demonstrated that English stress is predictable, it is certainly not obviously so, or completely so. Further, from Stankiewicz (9) we may assume that Ukrainian stress is, at least to some extent, also predictable, and might, upon a very deep analysis, such as Halle and Chomsky have done on English, be even more so. For this reason and also because of the extensive dialect variance in Ukrainian stress, we have not included any items sampling innovation or loss in this area.

2. In a previous study (unpublished) by the present writer, the entire 100 word list (diagnostic) from Hymes was elicited from two persons (who would represent Group IIIb in this paper). Both subjects showed no variation from standard Ukrainian.

3. It is apparent from the consideration of statistical sophistication that we have made the test too simple. All scores, from the highest to lowest, are at one end of the possible distribution of scores (1 to 101). In order to obtain a better distribution (a closer approximation to a normal curve) we would want to have made the test difficult enough so that the average subject would have made as many errors as correct responses, the other scores tapering off from the mean in both directions. However, the number of test items would have to have been at least doubled (because what we did include on the test was the minimum necessary to obtain some measure for each linguistic level), and therefore we would have been able to obtain fewer volunteer S's, because of the extra time involved in administering the test.

4. It is very remarkable that these two groups turned out to be significantly different at the .01 level since Group II contained only two subjects. This was due to the fact that there was very little variance in their scores even though they were from two different areas in the United States, had migrated from the Ukraine at different times (1922 and 1930), and were of completely different cultural and educational backgrounds (one a college professor, the other a housewife).

5. Since the following hypotheses were tested with the same S's as the first hypothesis, and since the S's cluster to some extent in some of the subsequent hypotheses (for example many of the S's who state that they regularly read books and newspapers in Ukrainian also state that they listen to Ukrainian radio broadcasts, etc.) we cannot claim to have supported the hypotheses independently, which would require a fresh sample of subjects for any of the overlapping hypotheses. However as the study is exploratory in nature, and not meant to be a final authority on any of the hypotheses, we may safely suspend some of the requirements necessary to sophisticated statistical analysis.

6. Three subjects, who were in their early twenties, seemed to have soft and hard *n* for *nis* (nose) in free variation—however in rapid speech it appeared that they consistently softened the segment. Further, two subjects who were over age thirty *had* soft *n* in this word but from other evidence it can be assumed that they represent a dialect group (in Ukraine) which does soften this segment in this word.

REFERENCES

1. Bloomfield, Leonard. **Language**, New York, 1933.
2. Casagrande, J. B. Comanche Linguistic Acculturation III, **International Journal of American Linguistics**, Vol. **XXI**, no. 1, January, 1955.
3. Čiževsky, D. and Shevelov, G. The Modern Ukrainian Literary Language, **Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia**, V. Kubijovyč, editor. University of Toronto Press, 1963.
4. Halle, Morris. Phonology in a Generative Grammar, **Word 18**, 54-72, 1962.
5. Halle, Morris and Chomsky, N. Forthcoming. **The Sound Pattern of English.**
6. Hymes, D. H. Lexicostatistics So Far, **Current Anthropology**, Vol. 1, January 1960.
7. Lees, R. B. The Basis of Glotto-chronology, **Language 29**, 113-27.
8. Lenneberg, E. H. Language, Evolution, and Purposive Behavior, **Culture in History: Essays in Honor of Paul Radin**, S. Diamond, editor. Columbia University Press, 1960.
9. Stankiewicz, E., Stress alternations in the Ukrainian substantive declension: Types and role, **Annals**, Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., **8**, 1960.
10. Stechishin, J. W. **Ukrainian Grammar**, Winnipeg, 1958.
11. Swadesh, Morris. Lexico-statistic dating of prehistoric ethnic contacts, with special reference to North American Indians and Eskimos, **Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 96**, 452-63, 1952.
12. Weinreich, Uriel. **Languages in Contact**, The Hague, 1963. (Originally published as Number 1 in the series "Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York" (New York, 1953).

ONOMASTICA

A topo- and anthroponymic series edited twice a year.

Editor-in-Chief: *J. B. Rudnyćkyj*

To date the following issues have been published:

ONOMASTICA I: *The term and Name "Ukraine"* by
J. B. Rudnyćkyj, 132 p. Winnipeg, 1951. Price $2.00.

ONOMASTICA II: *Canadian Place Names of Ukrainian
Origin* by J. B. Rudnyćkyj, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1952,
third edition 1957. Price $2.00.

ONOMASTICA III: *The names "Galicia" and "Volynia"*
by J. B. Rudnyćkyj, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1952. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA IV: *The Name "Ukraine" in South-Car-
pathia* by B. Barvinśkyj, 16 p. Winnipeg, 1952.
Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA V: *L'origine du nom des Ruthenes* par
B. O. Unbegaun, 13 p. Winnipeg, 1953. Prix $0.50.

ONOMASTICA VI: *Contribution to the Methods in Ono-
mastics* by G. M. Lucyk, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1958.
Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA VII: *Canadian Toponymy and the Cul-
tural Stratification of Canada* by W. Kirkconnell,
16 p. Winnipeg, 1954. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA VIII: *Guagninus' Toponymy of* 1611 by
O. Kupraneć, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1954. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA IX: *Ukrainian Topo- and Anthroponymy
in the Inter. Bot. Terminology* by M. Borovśkyj,
Winnipeg, 1955. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA X: *The Term and Name "Canada"* by
I. Velyhorśkyj. Winnipeg, 1955. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XI: *Studies in Onomastics I: Canadian Slavic Namelore* by J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Winnipeg, 1956. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XII: *Indian, Pseudo-Indian Place Names in the Canadian West* by Cyril Meredith Jones. Winnipeg, 1956. 24 p. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XIII: *Sur quelques noms de lieu d'origine ukrainienne en Roumanie* par Petar Skok, Winnipeg 1957. 16 p. Prix $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XIV: *Contribution to Onomastics* by Ivan Franko. Winnipeg. 1957. Price $2.00.

ONOMASTICA XV: *Studies in Onomastics II: Toponymy* by J. B. Rudnyćkyj. Winnipeg 1958. Price $2.00.

ONOMASTICA XVI: *The French Element In Newfoundland Place Names* by E. R. Seary. Winnipeg 1958. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XVII: *Mexico — The Name* by G. Tibon. Winnipeg 1959. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XVIII: *Les noms de famille ukrainiens* par E. Borschak. Winnipeg 1959. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XIX: *Place Names in Nova Scotia* by R. MacG. Dawson. Winnipeg 1960. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XX: *Topo- and Anthroponymic Materials from Western Ukraine* by O. Ochrym, Winnipeg, 1960. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XXI: *The Origin of the Name "Slav"* by J. B. Rudnyćkyj. Winnipeg, 1961. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XXII: *A Classified Dictionary of Slavic Surname Changes in Canada* by R. B. Klymasz. Winnipeg, 1961. Price $2.00.

ONOMASTICA XXIII—XXIV: *Geographic Names of Boikovia* by J. B. Rudnyćkyj. Winnipeg, 1962. Price $3.00.

ONOMASTICA XXV: The names *"Rusychi" and "Ruso-vychi"* by S. Hordynsky. Winnipeg, 1963. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XXVI: *The Spanish Toponyms of the British Columbia Coast.* Winnipeg 1963. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XXVII: *Topo- and Anthroponymic Materials from Halychyna.* Winnipeg, 1964. Price $1.00.

ONOMASTICA XXVIII: *La provenance du nom Bulgar.* Winnipeg 1964. Price $1.00.

Further issues in preparation.

Obtainable at:
UVAN, Box 3597, Sta. B., Winnipeg, Canada.

SLAVISTICA

A series relating to Slavic languages, literatures, cultures, ethnography, archeology etc., with special attention to the problems of Eastern Slavic world. Published by UVAN in Winnipeg, Canada.

Appears three times a year:

No. 25. V. Swoboda: *The "Slavonice" Part of the Oxford Heptaglot Lexicon.* A Ukrainian-Latin Vocabulary of the 1st Half of the 17th Century (in Ukrainian, English, and Latin), Winnipeg, 1956.

No. 26. M. I. Mandryka: *A Phase of Bulgarian-Ukrainian Literary Relations.* Shevchenko's Influence on Bulgarian Poetry (in Ukrainian and Bulgarian), Winnipeg, 1956.

No. 27. J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: *Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1955.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1957.

No. 28. A. Franko-Kluchko: *Ivan Franko's Manuscripts in Canada* (in Ukrainian), Winnipeg, 1957.

No. 29. P. Kovaliv: *Adjectival Participles in the Slavic Languages* (in English), Winnipeg, 1957.

No. 30. J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: *Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1956.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1957.

No. 31. W. Kirkconnell: *The Place of Slavic Studies in Canada* (in English), Winnipeg, 1958.

No. 32. J. M. Kirschbaum: *L. Štur and his place in the Slavic world* (in English), Winnipeg-Cleveland, 1958.

No. 33. J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: *Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1957.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1958.

No. 34. Clarence A. Manning: *English Tenses and Slavic Aspects* (in English). Winnipeg, 1959.

No. 35. J. B. Rudnyćkyj: *Burns and Shevchenko* (in Ukrainian). Winnipeg, 1959.

No. 36. J. B. Rudnyćkyj: *Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1958.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1959.

No. 37—38. Anna Stearns: *New Canadians of Slavic Origin* (in English). Winnipeg, 1960.

No. 39. J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: *Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1959.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1960.

No. 40. V. J. Kaye — Kysilevs'kyj: *Ukraine, Russia and other Slavic countries in English literature, lectures between 1912—1936* (in English), Winnipeg, 1961.

No. 41. W. K. Matthews: *Taras Shevchenko, the man, the symbol,* Winnipeg, 1961.

No. 42. J. B. Rudnyćkyj: *Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1960.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1961.

No. 43. J. M. Kirschbaum: *Jan Šafarik,* Winnipeg, 1962.

No. 44. J. B. Rudnyckyj: *Etymological Formula,* Winnipeg, 1962.

No. 45. J. B. Rudnyckyj: *Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1961.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1962.

No. 46—47. S. Hordynsky: *The Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign and Ukrainian Folk Poetry,* Winnipeg, 1963.

No. 48. J. B. Rudnyckyj: *Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1962.* (Multilingual). Winnipeg, 1963.

No. 49. W. Jaszczun: *Phonetic, Morphological and Lexical Peculiarities of the Shnyriv Dialect.* Winnipeg - Pittsburgh, 1964.

No. 50. V. O. Buyniak: *The Galician - Volhynian Chronicle.* Winnipeg - Saskatoon, 1964.

No. 51. *Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1963.* (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1964.

Price: $1.00 per copy.

Obtainable at:

UVAN

Box 3597, Sta. B.   Winnipeg 4, Man., Canada