

An Uneven Contest between Ethnographism and Europeanism

Andrii Danylenko^{*}

The Ukrainian-language studies abroad that have been conducted by Ukrainian émigré scholars after the Second World War were conditioned by the development of linguistics in Ukraine. Postwar Ukrainian linguistic studies outside Ukraine, both in Europe and North America, were a direct continuation of the work of the linguists and writers of the Ukrainization period in Soviet Ukraine. To place Ukrainian diaspora's (mostly theoretical) contribution to linguistic studies in its proper context, we must take a brief look at the main trends in the development of linguistics in Ukraine in the 1920s and early 1930s. This will give us a new insight into the development of Ukrainian linguistic thinking in recent times.

The Origin of Ethnographism and Europeanism in Ukrainian-Language Studies

The impact of Kharkiv and Kyiv, particularly on the normalization of literary Ukrainian in the period of Ukrainization was so strong that even Galicia and other Ukrainian ethnic territories, which found themselves under Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Russia after the First World War, were exposed to the direct or indirect influence of the humanistic intelligentsia of Left-Bank Ukraine. Thus, the unity of the Ukrainian language and of its studies was largely preserved. Let us recall that Kyrylo Studynsky, Ilarion Svientsitsky, and Vasyl Simovych, who

^{*} I am grateful to the late Professor George Y. Shevelov for commenting on an earlier version of this paper.

represented Western (Polish-ruled) Ukraine, participated in the work of the orthographic commission in Kharkiv in 1928–29.

Because of limited contacts, some regional differences, reinforced by either Russian or Polish socio-historical and cultural domination, were preserved and affected Ukrainian-language studies. In the nineteenth century two research traditions had developed, one in Western and the other in Eastern Ukraine, and they continued into the twentieth century.¹ Ethnographic romanticism was represented by the professors of philology at Lviv University, Omelian Ohonovsky (1833–94) and Oleksander Kolessa (1862–1945), and at Chernivtsi University, Stepan Smal-Stotsky (1859–1938) and Omelian Kaluzhniatsky (1845–1914). Smal-Stotsky and Theodor Gartner championed this approach in their *Grammatik der ruthenischen (ukrainischen) Sprache* (A Grammar of the Ruthenian [Ukrainian] Language, 1913). Using the Neogrammarian method, they tried to show that Ukrainian originally differed from other (East) Slavic languages. Unfortunately, the book presented well-known phenomena in a rather mechanical way and did not offer any compelling evidence concerning the unique position of Ukrainian among the Slavic languages. The grammar was criticized by many Slavists for its insufficient historicism and its accidental generalizations based on inadequate empirical data.

This tendency was very different from the approach first outlined by Oleksander Potebnia (1835–91), professor of the Russian language and literature at Kharkiv University (1874–91). He transcended the eclecticism (Romantic-Neogrammarian combination) of his predecessors and in his synthesizing works on historical syntax opened up a new perspective of the evolution of the (East) Slavic languages. Potebnia and his followers specialized in general linguistics and comparative studies, including studies of the development of the Ukrainian language in the broadest (East) Slavic context. By contrast, devotees of ethnographism were not interested in comparative studies, only in the history of Ukrainian, its dialects and literary monuments.

The two traditions gave rise to two different groups among the linguists who worked in Soviet Ukraine from about 1917 to 1933 on normalizing standard Ukrainian. Although all of them propagated on the whole the “unspoiled” vernacular, the ethnographic group espoused

1. George Y. Shevelov, “Linguistics,” in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, ed. Danylo H. Struk (Toronto: University Toronto Press, 1993), 3: 126–7.

mostly the populist approach and brought literary Ukrainian closer to the vernacular. The main representatives of this extremely puristic or rather archaizing group were Ahatanhel Krymsky (1871–1942), Ievhen Tymchenko (1866–1948), Olena Kurylo (1890–1937) in her early writings, and Serhii Smerechynsky (1891–?), and outside Soviet Ukraine, Vasyl Simovych (1880–1944) in his *Na temy movy* (On the Subject of Language, 1924) and some later articles. The other, moderately puristic trend in Ukrainian linguistics may be called synthetic or European.² Scholars such as Oleksa Syniavsky (1887–1937), Mykola Sulyma (1892–?), Olena Kurylo in her later writings, and Vsevolod Hantsov (1892–1979), who belonged to this group, tried to synthesize native rural components with urban ones, thus following the European tradition in constructing the literary language.

Without going into detail, I would claim that these two approaches to linguistic phenomena were a continuation of two regional traditions that survived beyond the 1920s to the postwar period when a wave of Ukrainian émigré scholars reached the West. It is interesting that these scholars continued to work within one of these approaches, depending on his or her region of origin, although some of them used to base themselves on conflicting criteria, rooted partly in romanticism and ethnographism and eclectically combined with the Neogrammarian method.

Ethnographism versus Europeanism in Western Ukraine

Simovych (1880–1944) was the first representative of Western Ukraine to abandon his early ethnographic views and adopt a new “synthetic” view of the development of the Ukrainian language. During the Prague period in his life he became familiar with the latest achievements of the Prague Linguistic Circle, and upon returning to Lviv Simovych propagated its structuralism in Ukraine. On the basis of extensive historical material, he traced the development of the structure of Ukrainian Christian names. His ideas met with a rather hostile response. The philologists at the Shevchenko Scientific Society (NTSh) in Lviv, such as Vasyl Lev (1903–91), Kost Kysilevsky (1890–1974), and Jaroslav Rudnyckyj (1919–95), adhered to the spirit of Miklosich and Vondrák in their research. This was the first clash between the ethno-

2. George Y. Shevelov, *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900–1941): Its State and Status* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1989), 138–9.

graphic tradition, which predominated in Western Ukraine, and the synthetic (European) tradition, which predominated in Eastern Ukrainian. A second attempt at exploring linguistic phenomena from a structuralist point of view was made right after the war by a representative of the synthetic group from Kharkiv, George Y. Shevelov (1908–2002).³

Along with the NTSh in Lviv there were other centres of Ukrainian linguistics—the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw and the Ukrainian Free University in Vienna (from 1921 in Prague). The first published several works by Galician linguists in the “Romantic spirit” and supported Ivan Ohienko’s (1882–1972) and Roman Smal-Stotsky’s (1893–1969) research. Ohienko was a typical representative of ethnographic romanticism in Ukrainian linguistics. A prolific writer, he was particularly interested in popularizing the norms of literary Ukrainian. Generally speaking, he identified the standard language with the vernacular, as he did in *Chystota i pravylnist ukrainskoi movy* (The Purity and Correctness of the Ukrainian Language, 1925). His puristic and ethnographic views remained unchanged and are evident in his later publications in the history of Ukrainian, such as his *Istoriia ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* (History of the Ukrainian Literary Language, 1950). Taking the Ukrainian literary language in isolation, he claimed that its history was governed by an immanent tendency to narrow the gap between it and the vernacular. He assessed the contribution of particular writers to the development of the literary language by their closeness to the people, to the people’s traditions and language. This approach did not provide a realistic picture of the complex linguistic processes in Ukraine and the adjacent countries and failed to identify not only the external but also the internal causes of the emergence of a new standard Ukrainian language in the eighteenth century.

A similar ethnographic approach was favoured by Roman Smal-Stotsky in his early writings, especially in his first study of Ukrainian word formation *Abriß der ukrainischen Substantivbildung* (A Study of the Formation of Ukrainian Nouns, 1915). From pure description he went on to a systematic study of word formation in connection with semantics in his best-known book *Prymityvnyi slovotvir* (Primitive Word Formation, 1929). Although they were based on extensive studies of synchronic data, his works

3. Iurii Sherekh, *Narys suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* (Munich: Molode Zhyttia, 1951).

were ethnographically biased. He came under the influence of the German psychological school, particularly after he had joined the faculty of the Ukrainian Free University in 1923. The residual psychologism and the Neogrammarian method are evident in his main work, which presents the formation of Ukrainian interjections from the psychological viewpoint of Wundt and Marty.⁴ Smal-Stotsky developed an interesting theory of the derivation of interjections, which finally made it possible to treat them etymologically. Unfortunately, without a strictly structural approach, Smal-Stotsky's works do not fit well into the broad evolution of Slavic languages; consequently, they are scarcely known among non-Ukrainian linguists.

Thus, linguistic studies in Western Ukraine and at research centres headed by Western Ukrainians in Warsaw and Prague were basically ethnographic. Simovych was the only figure in Galicia who produced some pioneering studies based on the structuralist method. His studies of personal names and word formation, particularly the formation of adjectives, broke new ground in these areas and are less dated today than some of his inquiries in historical morphology and phonology⁵ or in the history of Old Church Slavonic. The latter was a consistently Neogrammarian study that made no new discoveries.⁶

Studies of Ukrainian in the Postwar Emigration

After the Second World War Ukrainian scholars abroad have brought about a significant change in Ukrainian linguistics. In contrast to Soviet Ukraine, where ideology continued to deform research, Ukrainian linguists in the West, particularly at the Free Ukrainian University in Munich, made many, although not always successful, attempts⁷ to apply both traditional and new approaches to language. Some areas of

4. See Roman Smal-Stotsky, *Prymityvnyi slovotvir* (Warsaw, 1929), 1–17.

5. George Y. Shevelov, "Vasyl' Simovych and His Work," introduction to Vasyl Simovych, *Ukrainian Linguistics*, comp. George Y. Shevelov (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1981), 1: 17f.

6. It came out in mimeograph form titled *Narys hramatyky starobolharskoi (starotserkovnoslovianskoi) movy* (Prague, 1926).

7. For statistics relating to the scholarly works of professors at the Ukrainian Free University from 1947 to 1980, see Dan B. Chopyk, "Movoznavstvo i slavisty Ukrainskoho vilnoho universytetu," in his mimeographed *Ukrainian Language: Phonemics, Morphophonemics* (Munich and Salt Lake City, 1995), 181–6. Unfortunately, the author did not offer a conceptual survey of the main contributions by Slavists affiliated with the Ukrainian Free University during this period.

linguistics were almost neglected abroad. For instance, after Ohiienko's *Istoriia ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* no synthetic work in the history of literary Ukrainian came out until Shevelov's *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache, 1798–1965: Ihre Entwicklung unter dem Einfluß der Dialekte* (The Literary Ukrainian Language, 1798–1965: Its Development under the Influence of the Dialects, 1966) appeared.

Vasyl Chaplenko's (1900–?) *Ukrainska literaturna mova (XVII st.–1917 r.)* (The Ukrainian Literary Language [17th Century–1917], 1955) dealt almost exclusively with the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century and, consequently, did not provide a comprehensive picture of the literary language. Moreover, the book covered the formation of modern literary Ukrainian from an ethnographic standpoint that extolled not so much the vernacular as the Eastern variant of the standard language and promulgated the idea of its monodialectal foundation.⁸ By dismissing Panteleimon Kulish's contribution to the formation of literary Ukrainian because of his “alienness to the puristic tendency”⁹ Chaplenko had prejudged the issue of the dialectal synthesis of literary Ukrainian.

Shevelov's book *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798–1965*, which was based largely on his monograph *Halychyna v formuvanni novoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* (Galicia in the Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language, 1949) and a series of articles covering various aspects of the problem, gave a much more synthetic and realistic treatment of the evolution of literary Ukrainian. While refuting the idea of the “Poltavan-Kyivan basis of the Ukrainian national language,”¹⁰ Shevelov maintained its bidialectal basis with a predominance of the eastern contribution. Furthermore, he challenged the populist treatment of literary Ukrainian, which prevailed not only in the ethnographic group of linguists in the 1920s but also later on in Soviet Ukraine. According to him, modern literary Ukrainian, which emerged in Ivan Kotliarevsky's time, was a continuation of earlier tradition rather than an innovation,¹¹

8. Vasyl Chaplenko, *Ukrainska literaturna mova XVII st.–1917 r.* (New York: Ukrainskyi tekhnichnyi instytut, 1955), 271f.

9. *Ibid.*, 125. Kulish is known for his liberal use of Polonisms and Slavonicisms in his later literary works.

10. *Poltavsko-kyivsky dialekt — osnova ukrainskoi natsionalnoi movy* (Kyiv: AN URSSR, 1954).

11. Iurii Shevelov, “Chernihivshchyna v formuvanni novoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi

although the tradition had suffered a number of interruptions before Kotliarevsky.

Panteleimon Kovaliv's (1898–1973) works are of particular interest for the history of the East Slavic languages. He wrote (with Mykola Hrunsky) *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi movy* (Essays in the History of the Ukrainian Language, 1941) and some works on the descriptive and historical morphology of Russian and Ukrainian before concentrating on the history of Ukrainian. His *Leksychnyi fond literaturnoi movy kyivskoho periodu, X–XIV st.* (The Lexical Fund of the Literary Language of the Kyivan Period, 10th–14th Centuries, 2 vols., 1962, 1964) is largely patterned on Krymsky and remains practically unknown among Slavists. He did not succeed in presenting the East Slavic lexical data in a developmental perspective and thereby failed to draw a convincing distinction between the East Slavic elements proper and Old Church Slavonic words. For instance, Kovaliv quite reasonably emphasized the correlation between the lexical elements of the Old Slavonic and the Old (Common) East Slavic¹² but refrained from any comprehensive differentiation of these elements depending on where the particular monuments might have been written. Hence, Kovaliv's attempt at exhaustiveness proved to be a failure.¹³ He did not take into account the nature of the written language used by the Orthodox Slavs of the time, which was basically Church Slavonic in its East Slavic recension. Nor did he distinguish persuasively between Church-Slavonic loan forms and indigenous ones. A preliminary delimitation of Old Ukrainian texts from the non-Ukrainian East Slavic ones, which Shevelov later undertook, would have provided the necessary data for questioning the old-standing theory of Common East Slavic in the eleventh to fourteenth centuries.

In his book *Vstup do istorii skhidnoslovianskykh mov* (Introduction to the History of East Slavic Languages), Kovaliv attempted to revise the

movy," in *Zbirnyk na poshanu Zenona Kuzeli*, vol. 169 of *Zapysky NTS* (Paris, 1962), 256.

12. Panteleimon Kovaliv, *Leksychnyi fond literaturnoi movy kyivskoho periodu, X–XIV st.* (New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1962), 1: vii–ix.

13. Among other failings of this book is the almost total lack of references to the recent work in the field, especially, in non-Slavic languages. For example, Kovaliv does not mention Linda Sadnik and Rudolf Aitzetmüller's *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslawischen Texten* (s'Gravenhage: Mouton, 1955), a dictionary that would have been helpful to him.

theory of Common (Old) Russian, which Aleksei Shakhmatov had first proposed. Unfortunately, the book did not attract much attention among Slavists. Its main flaws were its parochial methodology and almost a total lack of references to recent publications in the area. Shevelov's *Prehistory of Slavic* (1964), a pioneering contribution to the study of the history of Slavic, is only cursorily mentioned. All in all, Kovaliv's monograph was no more than a belated survey of the problems relating to the genesis of the present-day East Slavic languages.

Kovaliv's works differed essentially from those of Ukrainian émigré linguists, particularly the proponents of ethnographic romanticism. Although he used a limited bibliography and the rather scanty data available outside of Ukraine, Kovaliv was much more systematic and insightful than most of his compatriots. His *Slovianski fonemy: Pokhodzhennia i istorychnyi rozvytok* (Slavic Phonemes: Origin and Historical Development, 1965), for example, is an attempt at an all-encompassing study of Slavic phonemes from the developmental point of view. The attempt fails: lacking factual data, Kovaliv re-tells in his own terms what the Neogrammarian school had taught long ago. Nevertheless, considering its ambitious task, the book is valuable as an effort to present an overall picture of Slavic historical phonology.

Compared to Shevelov's work on Slavic historical phonology, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, Kovaliv's effort looks amateurish. Shevelov devised his own "integrated comparative method"¹⁴ based on a conception of language as a structure with intrinsic laws of functioning and evolution. This method enabled him to overcome most of the drawbacks of the Neogrammarian comparative method, establish a relative chronology, and identify the motive forces of Slavic sound changes. Furthermore, he questioned the traditional division of the Slavic languages into the Eastern, Western, and Southern groups, and proposed that the development of separate Slavic languages could have resulted not merely from preservation or differentiation, but also from historically conditioned regroupings. This hypothesis was a real breakthrough in the treatment of

14. George Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1964), 6. For an assessment of that method in comparison with other methods of linguistic reconstruction, see, e.g., Henrik Birnbaum, "Some Terminological and Substantive Issues in Slavic Historical Linguistics (Reflections on the Periodization of the Slavic Ancestral Language and the Labeling of its Chronological Divisions)," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 35–6 (1987): 302–4.

the history of Slavic,¹⁵ which has been conventionally conceived as a process of (dialectal) differentiation. It also provided a new vantage point from which to tackle the problem of Common Old Russian.

This problem was widely discussed in the 1920s. Hantsov, Kurylo, and Ivan Zilynsky (1879–1952) attempted to explain the genesis of Ukrainian and its dialects from Common Old Russian. Following in the footsteps of his predecessors, Shevelov offered a completely new approach to the alleged formation of the East Slavic languages from the hypothetical common Russian language. He argued that to explain the rise of present-day Ukrainian, Russian, and Belarusian we must start out not with a (common) East Slavic language nor with the three present-day languages, but rather with a certain configuration of dialectal groups that changed in the course of east European history.¹⁶ This proposal was inspired largely by Hantsov's idea.¹⁷ Pointing to the diphthong- or monophthong-like reflexes of the etymological *o*, *e* in the newly closed syllables (cf. North Ukrainian *piech* and South Ukrainian *pich* 'stove; oven'), Hantsov assumed that there were four, not three, as Shakhmatov claimed, prehistoric dialectal groups in eastern Europe—the Southern and Northern Ukrainian dialects and the northern and eastern Russian dialects. Shevelov modified this scheme postulating five dialectal groups among the East Slavs: the Novgorod-Tver, Polatsk-Smolensk, Murom-Riazan, Kyiv-Polissia, and Galicia-Podillia unities.¹⁸ He showed that the two major dialectal units, the Kyiv-Polissia and Galicia-Podillia groups, evolved since about the seventh century into the current Ukrainian language.

Oleksa Horbach (Horbatsch) (1918–97), who published extensively on the history of Ukrainian, Polish, and other Slavic languages, was a devoted advocate of the traditional Neogrammarian method. He was interested mainly in purely descriptive research and concentrated on argots in Church-Slavonic, Ukrainian, and Polish texts from the sixteenth

15. For a discussion of Shevelov's adaptation of the theory of "punctuated equilibrium" to historical linguistics, see Robert A. Orr, "Evolutionary Biology and Historical Linguistics," *Diachronica* 16, no. 1 (1999): 127–8.

16. George Y. Shevelov, *Problems in the Formation of Belorussian* (New York: The Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953), v ff.

17. Vsevolod Hantsov, "Diialektolohichna kliasyfikatsiia ukrainskykh hovoriv," *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu UVAN* 4 (1924): 141.

18. See *Problems in the Formation* and especially his magnum opus *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag, 1979).

to the nineteenth century. His most important contributions here are his studies of Meletii Smotrytsky's grammar and Pamva Berynda's lexicon. He also published meticulous descriptions of Ukrainian dialects—especially those in Romania and Slovakia—which are based on the traditional, largely out-dated approach and do not advance our understanding of the development of Ukrainian dialects in the broader context of the adjacent Slavic and non-Slavic languages.

Horbach's studies in the history of the Ukrainian language do not shed much light on the linguistic processes in the East Slavic territories. His views on the origin and development of Ukrainian are based on outdated philological assumptions, defended by Stepan Smal-Stotsky. He does not even mention the studies by Hantsov and especially Kurylo, who in the early 1930s was the most innovative thinker in the field. His claim that the *Izborniki* of Sviatoslav of 1073 (sic!) and 1076 are reliable sources for the history of the Ukrainian vernacular,¹⁹ is based on too hasty an identification of the literary tradition of Kyivan Rus' with the contemporary spoken language. That language can hardly be found in the 1073 *Izbornik*, which faithfully reproduces the Church-Slavonic (Bulgarian) original and contains only occasional slips into the copyist's mother tongue. Interestingly enough, another devoted Neogrammarian, Nikolai Durnovo,²⁰ proved long before Horbach that the few local features that are recoverable from the text of the 1073 *Izbornik* are basically East Slavic.

In his works dealing with the genesis and history of the Ukrainian language, Horbach also demonstrated a somewhat outdated approach towards the periodization of literary Ukrainian. Although scrupulously elaborated, the author's periodization is premised on the Neogrammarian understanding of the history of language. Thus, contrary to Shevelov, who as a follower of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's and Ferdinand de Saussure's structural tradition, distinguished between internal and external factors in the history of language, Horbach confuses the above factors in his periodization of literary Ukrainian.²¹ By varying the internal and

19. Oleksa Horbach, "Henezha ukrainskoi movy ta ii stanovyshe sered inshykh slovianskykh mov," in his *Istoriia ukrainskoi movy: Zibrani statti* ([Munich: Mauersberger], 1993), 5.

20. See Nikolai Durnovo, "Russkie rukopisi XI i XII vv. kak pamiatniki staroslavianskago iazyka," *Ju noslovenski filolog* 4 (1924): 78.

21. Oleksa Horbach, "Zasady periodyzatsii istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy i etapy

external criteria of linguistic development he arrives at disorienting statements such as the following: the “Ukrainian literary language [sic!]” dates back to the Proto-Indo-European period, while the beginning of the Old Ukrainian period coincides with the Christianization of Kyivan Rus'.²² All in all, unlike Kurylo and Hantsov,²³ Horbach overlooked the necessity of singling out a pivotal criterion for the periodization of the history of Ukrainian.

In his theoretical writings Horbach did not overcome the limitations of the Neogrammarian tradition. Although some of his ideas are original, some of his generalizations are unfounded and subjective. His philological and dialectological studies are rich in facts but, like the works of other Ukrainian émigré scholars, weak on theory.

Bohdan Strumiński (1930–98), who was interested in onomastics, dialectology, and etymology, showed a strong interest in genetic and historical problems, although his early forays into the history of onomastic phenomena were not always successful and are largely irrelevant. But his last book, dealing with multifarious linguistic problems of the “beginnings of Rus',” was a significant contribution not only to traditional Normanist theory, which is at best questionable, but also to onomastic and etymological studies.²⁴ Besides some excessive theoretical generalizations,²⁵ Strumiński had many insights into the history of Ukrainian and other East Slavic languages. In this regard his work is quite different from Rudnyckyj's etymological studies, which are chaotic and mostly outdated.

Let me complete this survey of the major tendencies in Ukrainian-language studies abroad with a review of the achievements of émigré

ii rozvytku,” in *Druhyi mizhnarodnyi konhres ukrainistiv (Lviv, 22–28 serpnia 1993 r.): Dopovid i povidomlennia. Movoznavstvo* (Lviv: Mizhnarodna asotsiatsia ukrainistiv, 1993): 7–12.

22. *Ibid.*, 8.

23. Olena Kurylo, *Sproba poiasnyty protses zminy e, o v novykh zakrytykh skladakh u Pivdennii hrupi ukrainskykh diialektiv* (Kyiv: UVAN, 1928); Hantsov, “Diialektolohichna kliasyfikatsiia ukrainskykh hovoriv,” 87–8.

24. Bohdan Strumiński, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus': Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)* (Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996).

25. See my review of Strumiński's *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'* in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 21, nos. 1–2 (1994 [1998]): 197–200; and George D. Knysh's review of the book in *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 54, nos. 1–2 (1998): 11–15.

linguists in the field of lexicography. Since Ukrainization, this discipline has reflected the transition of the Ukrainian language from everyday and literary use to all the uses of a national language in a modern society. Both ethnographic and synthetic (European) research traditions have influenced dictionary making, especially after the revival of lexicography in the 1920s. The first volume of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences' *Rosiisko-ukrainskyi slovnyk*, compiled under the direction of Krymsky, Iefremov, et al. (3 vols., 6 fasc., A–P), was excessively puristic and essentially different from the subsequent volumes, which were compiled largely in the synthetic spirit. It has retained its practical and standardizing value for the modern literary language.

Work in Western Ukraine enriched Ukrainian lexicography with several Ukrainian-Polish and Polish-Ukrainian dictionaries, particular those by Svientsitsky and Kysilevsky (1920) and Ievhen Hrytsak (1931). In the 1930s several technical, terminological, and practical dictionaries were published in Germany under the auspices of the Dictionary Division of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin. The division's main achievement was Zenon Kuzelia and Jaroslav Rudnyckyj's *Ukrainisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1943), which contained about 100,000 entries, including idioms, phrases, and modern terms.²⁶

As for English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English dictionaries, the best is the *Ukrainian-English Dictionary* compiled by Constantine H. Andrusyshen and James N. Krett (first published in 1955). It remains the most comprehensive work on Ukrainian compiled to date inside or outside Ukraine.²⁷ From the scientific viewpoint, however, it is not an original work but is based mostly on Borys Hrinchenko's dictionary and previous publications in the field. Nevertheless, without it Ukrainian studies outside Ukraine would not have progressed as rapidly as they did during the following two decades.²⁸ Indeed, so far among publications of its kind it is second to none in practical importance. Maria, Wolodymyr, and Alla Dejko's *A Ukrainian-English /English-Ukrainian Dictionary for Popular Use*, published in Australia in 1979, is only a compilation of two main lexicographic sources—Hryhorii Holoskevych's

26. *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), 1: 443–4.

27. Victor O. Buyniak, "Constantine Henry Andrusyshen: The First Canadian-Born Slavist," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 16, nos. 1–2 (1991): 216.

28. *Ibid.*

Pravopysnyi slovnyk (Orthographic Dictionary, 1914) for the Ukrainian language and *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* for the English language. It was designed for use by the average bilingual speaker. Along with other similar publications,²⁹ it helped maintain the use of Ukrainian in the immigrant community.

The most significant contribution to Ukrainian lexicography in the West was Ievhen Onatsky's (1894–1979) *Vocabulario ucraino-italiano* (Rome, 1941; 2d ed. 1977) and *Vocabulario italiano-ucraino* (Rome, 1977). In keeping with the moderately puristic trend in Ukrainian linguistics, Onatsky used lexical material from the Southwestern, Northern, and Southeastern Ukrainian dialects in proper proportions. His approach to normalizing the standard language with the help of dictionaries may be compared to some extent with the synthetic vision of literary Ukrainian that was propagated by Kulish in the nineteenth century. According to the latter, literary Ukrainian should be based on a polydialectal synthesis with various admixtures of languages such as Church Slavonic and Old Polish.

Historical and etymological dictionaries were virtually neglected abroad.³⁰ The only etymological dictionary was compiled by Jaroslav Rudnycky—*An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (2 vols. in 22 fascicles, 1962–82). It was a pioneering effort in several respects: it was the first etymological dictionary of Ukrainian to encompass a vast quantity of historical, dialectal, and slang data; the first etymological dictionary of a Slavic language to be published basically in English; and the first etymological dictionary to be published in Canada. Still, “Rudnycky's merits are mostly in his intentions and general design, his failings—in his execution.”³¹

29. See, for example, Wasyl Niniowsky's *Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian Dictionary* (Edmonton: Ukrainian Book Store, 1985), a carefully prepared dictionary for elementary, junior, and senior high school as compared with the wholly dilettantish *Ukrainian-English / English-Ukrainian Dictionary* compiled by Leonid Hrabovsky (New York: Hippocrene Books, 1991). For an assessment of the latter, see Robert De Lossa's review in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 16, nos. 1/2 (1992): 199–200.

30. This is also true of terminological dictionaries. Anatol Vovk compiled several rather amateurish dictionaries such as his posthumously published *Anhliisko-ukrainskyi slovnyk vybranoi leksyky* (New York and Lviv: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1998).

31. See George Y. Shevelov's extensive review of the first six parts of the dictionary in *Language* 44, no. 4 (1968): 856–75.

Besides excerpting words haphazardly from various sources, Rudnyckyj left some essential problems unsolved. First, he failed to delimit Ukrainian from non-Ukrainian Eastern Slavic texts of the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries. Secondly, besides using the label “Old Eastern Slavic” for all sorts of Church Slavonic and indigenous components, he introduced “Middle Ukrainian” and “Old Ukrainian,” which constantly overlap in his entries. But his main weakness was the method of reconstructing words. His reconstructions were usually limited to roots, and the few reconstructions of whole words were anachronistic and far-fetched. All this allowed Shevelov to reasonably state that Rudnyckyj’s approach to Indo-European was conservative, one would say pre-Kuryłowiczian and pre-Benvenistean.³² Suffice it to mention Rudnyckyj’s cool reaction to the structural method as propagated by Simovych in Lviv before the Second World War. A devout disciple of the Neogrammarian tradition, Rudnyckyj, like the ethnographic purists in the 1920s, treated Ukrainian in isolation from other languages. This tendency eventually culminated in Pavlo Shtepa’s dictionary of indigenous substitutes for loan words in Ukrainian.

Conclusion

The evidence I have presented here shows that the tradition of historical and ethnographic romanticism has predominated in Ukrainian-language studies outside Ukraine. It is not surprising that Ukrainian linguists in Soviet Ukraine at the time of Ukrainization, then in Polish-ruled Ukraine, and subsequently in the West embraced this tradition. Almost all researchers of national languages embraced it at the time their languages were undergoing a renaissance and expanding their functions and lexical inventory. This was true of Czech, Bulgarian, and Romanian. The Ukrainian case is different only in that the renaissance of the language has been artificially prolonged abroad by the émigré scholars, especially from Western Ukraine. The populist approach both to the language and to Ukrainian-language studies has been entrenched in the emigration. European structuralism, particularly that of the Prague school, has left only a weak impression in Kovaliv’s, Rudnyckyj’s, and Horbach’s work. Émigré linguists who have tried to apply some new methods in their work have produced works devoid of any originality. This holds

32. *Ibid.*, 862.

true of Dan B. Chopyk's studies, which give a synchronic description of Ukrainian, especially its ikavism.³³ Compared with the works of American structuralists, such as Henning Andersen, Christina Y. Bethin, and Michael S. Flier, on Ukrainian, Chopyk's contribution, although also formalistic in spirit, is hardly innovative. I agree that Strumiński's "legacy should increasingly be viewed as that of fine philologist rather than of a conjectural historian."³⁴ Thus, the only towering figure among Ukrainian émigré linguists was Shevelov. His synchronic and diachronic studies of (East) Slavic languages, especially of Ukrainian, are truly impressive in method and result.³⁵ A consistent, yet innovative follower of Potebnia, Kurylo, Hantsov, and Simovych, Shevelov not only situated the Ukrainian language in a broader context, but also substantially expanded the methodological basis for future scholarship in most linguistic domains.

33. See Dan B. Chopyk, "Computer-Assisted Tallying and the Present State of *o, e: i* Alternations in Ukrainian Nouns (Inflectional-Level Analysis)," in his *Ukrainian Language*, 106–16. This article was first published in *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 15, nos. 39–40 (1981–3): 49–59.

34. Knysh's review of *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, 115.

35. See my article "George Y. Shevelov as a Linguist," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, 2000, no. 2: 199–211.