

Translation of religious texts. This was a factor in the standardization of the two oldest Slavic literary languages—Church Slavonic and Czech. Church Slavonic was probably standardized in the form which is now considered canonic in the Ohrid school of St. Clement, the “first bishop of the Bulgarian tongue,” in the late ninth century. It was probably there that the central and western Macedonian *k* and *g* (Cyrillo-Methodian) and Moravian *c* and *z* were replaced by western Macedonian *št* and *žd*. The Czech literary language was standardized by the mid-fifteenth century, owing to continuous work on the translation of religious texts from the late thirteenth century (hymns, *vitae*, Scriptures, etc.), also preserving in part the traditions of the Moravian Church Slavonic literary language which had operated until the late eleventh century. In the geographically restricted Lower Lusatian (Sorabic) language, the publication of a translation of the New Testament in 1709, based on the dialect of Chošebuz (Cottbus), determined the Chošebuz base of standard Lower Lusatian.

Intervention of printers. This factor influenced Polish, whose standard was established in the early sixteenth century by (mostly German) printers in Cracow. They turned to producing and selling Polish books for profit and standardized spelling and printing in the process.

Imitation of an elegant secular language. It was the imitation of French by the Russian aristocracy (who thought in French and spoke in Russian) between roughly 1760 and 1825 that created the modern standard Russian language.

Influential publicistic works and journals. In Bulgaria, the educator Vasil Aprilov, who was from the eastern part of the country, initiated a discussion on the language standard in his circular letter of 1836. His book of 1847 demolished the extremist archaizers as well as settled, by offering a compromise, the controversy between vernacularists and traditionalists. In Slovenia, it was debate in the leading journals of the 1860s, primarily in J. Bleiweis's *Kmetijske in Rokodelske Novice*, that achieved an interdialectal compromise between Upper Carniola and Styria on the literary standard. For White Ruthenian it was through the Vilnius-based periodical *Niva* (1906–1915), which united practically everybody who wrote in that language, that a rough linguistic standard—a synthetic amalgam, most closely resembling the central dialects of the Minsk area—was achieved.

Influential writers. This is the case of Ukrainian, in which the creation of a new standard language, based on southeastern dialects, is attributed to the Romantic writers T. Ševčenko and P. Kuliš (roughly 1840–1860).

Contract. It was the “Literary Agreement” (*Književni dogovor*) signed in March 1850 in Vienna by two Serbian linguists and five Croatian intellectuals that created the Serbo-Croatian standard language, based on the neutral dialect of Hercegovina. A year later, and probably under the inspiration of the Serbo-Croatian contract, a similar agreement on the unification of different central Slovak literary languages was concluded by

Lutheran and Catholic leaders in Slovakia and was promulgated in a grammar of 1852, the preface of which was signed by three Lutherans and three Catholics.

Influential linguistic publications. A limited standard (in spelling, but not in morphology or phonetics) was established by K. Nitsch in 1911 for Kashubian, a literary language with a limited function (in regional belles-lettres).

Intervention of the state. More or less simultaneously, soon after 1945, authorities in two communist countries, Yugoslavia and East Germany, caused the final standardization of two small Slavic languages—Macedonian and Upper Lusatian (where a division between Catholic and Protestant literary languages had existed until World War II).

It is striking how late the role of the state appears in this summary (and the two cases where it does are both communist states). The political rebirth of Serbs and Bulgarians in the nineteenth century did not have any decisive influence on the establishment of their standard languages. In both cases the time of standardization either followed (Serbia) or preceded (Bulgaria) the restoration of political sovereignty, and the standard was not based on the dialects of the capitals of the sovereign entities (Belgrade, Sofia). Another striking fact is the limited role of linguists in establishing a standard language. Only in the atypical case of Kashubian and, partly, in the case of Serbo-Croatian can a major role be assigned to linguists. In other cases it was, rather, the clerical translators of sacred texts, foreign printers and booksellers, aristocrats, educators, journalists, belletrists, religious and political leaders (some of them also doubling as amateur linguists) who created the standard languages discussed in this book. In general, the book confirms what many consider axiomatic: that whereas spoken languages are products of uncontrollable and subconscious or unconscious evolution (and thus are “natural”), standard languages are products of conscious human decisions (and therefore are “artificial”).

Bohdan Struminsky
Harvard University

MODERN UKRAINIAN. By Assya Humesky. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980. 438 pp. \$8.00, paper.

An introductory textbook cannot be all things to all students, and therefore when evaluating such a work one must take into account its intended goals and audience. A. Humesky's *Modern Ukrainian* takes a traditional four skills approach (reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension). It is intended for use with an instructor and is aimed at students interested in acquiring a knowledge of the Ukrainian literary standard in use outside of

the USSR. The author makes frequent reference to regional and stylistic variants and the Soviet Ukrainian literary standard, however, and thus the student interested in Soviet Ukrainian can also profit from the book.

The work contains twenty-one lessons consisting of an unnumbered lesson on the phonological and graphic systems and twenty numbered lessons covering the traditional morphological topics with notes on syntactic and semantic features. There are five appendices, a grammatical index, and Ukrainian-English/English-Ukrainian vocabulary indices comprising approximately 1,500 main entries. An accompanying set of tapes can be obtained from the Slavic Department of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

The introduction to the sound and writing systems conveys all the necessary information and gives common expressions and appropriate vocabulary for memorization. Unfortunately, this section is marred by minor inconsistencies and typographical errors not listed in the errata sheet. Thus, for example, the list of hard consonants (7-8) does not indicate that *p* is unaspirated, and no example is given after the description of *t*; *k* is the only voiceless stop with both a description and an example. Although the non-aspiration of all voiceless stops is indicated in a note following the list (8), consistency in the initial presentation would be better for the student. While the omission of *y* from the list of the six vowels of Ukrainian (10) or the printing of *y* instead of *я* in the list of vowel letters following an apostrophe after a labial (18) are inconveniences which the instructor can easily catch and point out to students, nonetheless the instructor must be constantly alert, as the book contains many such errors.

The twenty numbered lessons have a consistent organization: a series of dialogues or readings with English translations followed by a vocabulary and explanatory notes, the formal grammar lesson, and a set of thirteen to twenty-six exercises. One unfortunate feature of the organization is that it does not follow the intended order of presentation (XIII). Thus the instructor is expected to present the different dialogues of the lesson on different days with appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and exercises. This places a considerable burden on the teacher, since the order of presentation of grammatical information does not follow the order of the dialogues and the vocabulary list is cumulative for each lesson rather than by dialogue. On the positive side, the exercises are varied and explicitly coordinated with the different sections of the grammar lesson.

The order of presenting grammatical information is traditional, but the manner of presentation needs improvement. Greater use should have been made of clearly labeled tables. Thus, for example, the table of present tense conjugation (p. 57) is badly mislabeled, and, in the case of the first conjugation, uses different verbs to illustrate different persons. Although the tables on the following pages are clearer, there is no such clarification after the presentation of the compound imperfective future in *-m-* (p. 104). After a statement of the rule of formation, a list of four infinitives, each followed by two different personal forms in no particular

order, is given. As the appendices lack any conjugation tables, this absence of coherent illustrative paradigms places a considerable burden on the student.

The treatment of declensional types confuses the labeling of gender and declension. Thus the grammatical explanation (pp. 54-56) uses the terms *feminine declension* (*a*-type and *c*-type) and *masculine-neuter declension*. Hence the masculine noun *Микола* belongs to the feminine declension (*a*-type). The treatment of declensional types is better in Appendix 4 (pp. 380-383), although no masculine examples are given for the *a*-declension (not "type"). Even here, however, neuter *n/t*-stems (e.g., *ім'я, дівчá*) are treated with the so-called masculine-neuter declension rather than with the so-called *c*-declension, where they belong. The author should have used the traditional numerical labels (*first, second, third declension*) thus keeping the concept of paradigmatic classes based on endings (declension) distinct from the concept of gender.

There is a wealth, perhaps even a plethora, of cultural and stylistic information given in the explanatory notes. Thus, for example, the explanation of *борщ* (p. 161) includes the information that: ". . . one cook book [*sic*] lists 22 varieties, including one which is called 'Polish.'" This is no problem for the student, provided the instructor distinguishes essential and ancillary information.

Despite its shortcomings, *Modern Ukrainian* is a valuable contribution to the teaching of Ukrainian, and with proper guidance any student can acquire from it a broad and sound understanding of both the language and the culture.

Victor A. Friedman
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

THE POET AS MYTHMAKER: A STUDY OF SYMBOLIC MEANING IN TARAS ŠEVČENKO. By *George G. Grabowicz*. Monograph Series. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. x, 170 pp. \$12.50. Distributed by Harvard University Press.

In Ukrainian history no personality is more intensely revered in the printed word than Taras Ševčenko. A two-volume bibliography, covering the period between 1839 and 1959, contains almost ten thousand entries, written primarily in Ukrainian and Russian and, with a few exceptions, published either in imperial Russia or the Soviet Union. Another ten thousand bibliographic items appeared in a supplementary volume