

Book Reviews

Mykola Pavliuk and Ivan Robchuk. *Ukrainski hovory Rumunii: Diialektni teksty*. Edmonton, Lviv, New York, and Toronto: Instytut ukrai-noznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka v Amerytsi, and Kanadskyi instytut ukrainskykh studii, 2003. xvi, 782 pp.

This large volume is a result of long collaboration between two linguists, both graduates of Kharkiv State University, Ivan Robchuk (Ion Robciuc) from the Iorgu Jordan Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy and Mykola Pavliuk (Nicolae Pavliuc) from the University of Toronto. As a graduate of Kharkiv State University, I anticipated in this book a solid description based on traditional methods, which are no longer in linguistic fashion but are still popular in Ukraine and Romania. Indeed, Pavliuk's and Robchuk's work demonstrates the merits of a long-standing descriptive tradition deeply rooted in the pioneering studies of Kost Mykhalchuk and his followers.

The volume under review can be juxtaposed with text collections of a similar caliber that appeared after the publication of Ivan Pankevych's groundbreaking work *Ukrainski hovory Pidkarpatskoi Rusy i sumezhnykh oblastei* (Prague, 1938). Although with different degrees of didactic and theoretical load, their appearance was to some extent triggered by the preparation of *Atlas ukrainskoi movy*, a project, which was launched after the Second World War. Unfortunately, because of the anti-Ukrainian language policies of Soviet Ukraine, which emphasized the greatness and leading character of Russian culture and language, the Ukrainian problematic was subject to severe censorship, which greatly hampered dialectal studies. After a prolonged silence, in 1977, the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published a collection of short dialectal texts, *Hovory ukrainskoi movy*, representing the bulk of Ukrainian dialects both in and outside Ukraine. Another collection, *Hovirky Chornobylskoi zony: Teksty*, appeared only in 1996. It contained more extensive and detailed texts recorded in eleven villages of Central Polissia. In the last few years several regional collections have been published.

Outside Ukraine the situation was dubious, although not uniform. In Poland dialectal studies have remained mostly beyond the Marxist-Leninist matrix, although some linguistic themes came under ideological constraints. One of them was Feliks Czyżewski and Stefan Warchoł's *Polskie i ukraińskie teksty gwarowe z terenu wschodniej Lubelszczyzny* (Lublin, 1998). This collection provides parallel Polish and Ukrainian texts, recorded in one and the same locality and sometimes from bilinguals, which may serve as reliable material for furthering our knowledge about languages in contact. Last but not least was the collection *Rozpovidi z Pidkarpattia* by Oldřich Leška, Růžena Šišková, and

Mykola Mušinka, published in 1998 under the auspices of the Slavic Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. The project was launched in the late 1950s and was delayed because of the political events of 1968. This collection of Ukrainian texts recorded in the Subcarpathian region of Eastern Slovakia is unique for a number of reasons. Suffice it to say that, in addition to the texts and a socio-linguistic commentary, the book has phonetic sketches of three dialects. Thoroughly prepared, these sketches are based on strict structural principles used by the Prague Linguistic School.

Pavliuk and Robchuk's book on Ukrainian dialects in Romania, which they have studied for more than three decades, can be regarded as a highly traditional and at the same time individual contribution with a dual agenda. While following largely the descriptive model presented in the first two books of *Ukrainskyi dialektolohichnyi zbirnyk* (Kyiv, 1928 and 1929), it aims to give, first, a general description of Ukrainian dialects spoken in the historical regions of Romania: Maramureș, Suceava, Banat, and Dobrogea and, secondly, a large body of texts recorded in thirty-two Ukrainian villages in the above territories between 1962 and 1965 (pp. 5, 9). This agenda is reflected in the structure of the volume: the book is divided into two distinct parts, preceded by a comprehensive introductory article by a leading specialist in the field, Pavlo Hrytsenko of the Institute of the Ukrainian Language (pp. i–xvi), and a brief opening section with an introduction (pp. 5–10), a phonetic-transcription table (pp. 11–14), and a list of abbreviations (pp. 15–16), and followed by a concluding section, consisting of a glossary of all dialectal words in the texts (pp. 633–718), a selected bibliography (calqued into Ukrainian curiously enough as *selektyvna bibliohrafia*) (pp. 719–24), a summary (pp. 725–48), a list of the villages and informants (pp. 749–51), and three dialectal maps (pp. pp. 752–6).

Part I deals with the general characteristics of Ukrainian dialects in Romania (pp. 19–101). First, the authors try to construct a comprehensive classification of these dialects on the basis of their most salient phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features. While drawing on dialectal data available in other sources, they argue that the Maramureș, Suceava, and Banat dialects belong to the Southwestern group of the Transcarpathian, Hutsul, and Bukovinian dialects, while the steppe dialects of Dobrogea belong to the Southeastern group of Ukrainian dialects (pp. 21–6). In criticizing E. Vrabie's 1963 classification, Pavliuk and Robchuk also try to determine the dialect attribution of all Ukrainian villages and towns, thereby providing a complete list of Ukrainian dialects spoken in Romania (pp. 23–6).

In the chapter "Phonetic Peculiarities" (pp. 27–37), the authors elucidate representative phenomena at the phonetic level. Of particular interest in the vocalism are reflexes of the etymological [o] in the newly-closed syllables in the Hutsul dialects, which are the following: [ɨ], [ɨʲ], and [i] (p. 28). In some Transcarpathian dialects, however, the etymological [o] and [e] are represented by the sound [y̯], a labialized high front vowel similar to the German [ü] in München [ʔ – A. D.] (p. 29). Mostly on the basis of their studies in 1965 and 1971, Pavliuk and Robchuk claim that the above reflexes, in particular the diphthong [ɨʲ], shed light on the evolution of the etymological [o] in the Southwestern dialects. Correct as it may appear, the above assessment is incomplete, especially in view of the parallel evolution of another sound, [e]. Furthermore, since the evolution of [o] and [e] is known to have long remained in the focus of the debates about the compensatory lengthening and diphthongization of the etymological sounds [o] and [e], the authors could have briefly discussed competing views. It is therefore surprising

that Pavliuk and Robchuk, while liberally citing F.T. Zhylyko's studies, do not mention a single word from George Y. Shevelov's compendium, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg, 1979). The latter posited a twofold developmental scenario for the etymological [o]: (1) the evolution of *ü* without an intermediary stage in the Hutsul dialects, and (2) its evolution with an intermediary reflex on the road to *i* in some Central Transcarpathian dialects (pp. 600, 763). Had Pavliuk and Robchuk taken the above distinction into account, they could have produced a phonetic typology of the target Ukrainian dialects like that outlined by the authors of *Rozpovidi z Pidkarpattia* for the Subcarpathian region of Eastern Slovakia. Incidentally, a similar typology is more than obvious in the areal maps summarizing Ukrainian dialectal phenomena, especially in maps 1, 2, and 9, as discussed in *Atlas ukrainskoi movy*, vol. 3, *Slobozhanshchyna, Donechchyna, Nyzhnia Naddnyprianshchyna, Prychornomoria i sumizhni zemli* (Kyiv, 2001), p. 64ff.

Sections dealing with consonantal sounds are very informative, although their material is presented somewhat haphazardly (pp. 31–7). In addition, the authors make use of obsolete terminology, which leaves apparent gaps in the phonetic systems of the dialects under consideration. Thus, while mentioning the devoicing of the voiced consonants in the Dobrogea dialects, they speak about the so-called word-internal or word-final positions (p. 37). Yet, in order to give a full picture of the assimilative processes, it would be more fitting in this case to outline a system of morpheme boundaries with increasing or decreasing boundary strength, thereby diagnosing them in different dialects.

The chapter "The Phonological Structure" addresses a variety of vowel and consonant systems realized in Ukrainian dialects in Romania (pp. 39–56). The authors establish three principal vowel systems (stressed vocalisms). The most typical is a six-vowel system, which is found both in the literary language and in the bulk of Ukrainian dialects, including most of the Maramureş dialects. A seven-vowel system, with an additional /ɤ/ reflecting the corresponding Old Rus'ian sound, is observable in the Banat and some Maramureş dialects. An eight-vowel system, with an additional labialised /y/ in place of the etymological /o/ or /e/, is typical of some Banat dialects (pp. 39–40). Unfortunately, despite their schematic presentations, all vowel systems are marred by a rather confusing misprint. The problem is that the Ukrainian /ɤ/, which is characterized phonetically as a central front mid vowel, is opposed in all diagrams to a back rounded mid /o/, a pairing which does not exist in modern Ukrainian.

In this respect it is worth mentioning that Ukrainian vocalism is characterized by a unique combination of oppositions, not realized in other East Slavic dialects. In some of the Ukrainian dialects in Romania, for example, the above seven-vowel system is marked by two distinctive features, to wit, "front vs. back" at the front mid level, with an opposition between /ɤ/ and /ɤ/, and "unrounding vs. rounding" for high back vowels, with an opposition between /y/ and /ɤ/. For the Banat eight-vowel system, one can cite other oppositions. Leaving aside /ɤ/, which, contrary to Pavliuk and Robchuk, is level with /ɤ/, there are two distinctive oppositions in rounding vs. unrounding, for example, *kýt* 'cat' vs. *kut* 'angel' for back high vowels and *mýst* 'bridge' vs. *mist* (lit. *misto*) 'place' for front high vowels (p. 41). (See also L.E. Kalnyn, "Osobennosti vostochnoslavianskogo dialektного kontinuumа v svete sovremennoi lingvogeografii," in *Slavianskoe iazyko-*

znanie: XII Mezhdunarodnyi sezd slavistov, Krakov, 1998. Doklady rossiiskoi delegatsii, ed. O.N. Trubachev [Moscow, 1998], 345–6.)

Speaking about consonantal phonemes, Pavliuk and Robchuk follow conventional opinion that the Ukrainian consonantal system is characterized, particularly in Ukrainian dialects in Romania, by distinctive voicing and palatalization (p. 45). However, I strongly believe that this typology is far from complete and does not adequately reflect the phonemic peculiarities of the consonantal inventory in these dialects. Obstruent voicing properties, in particular voicing sandhi, in Ukrainian, as discussed by Henning Andersen and Michael Flier, confirm the opposition between distinctive protensity in Southwestern Ukrainian and distinctive voicing in Southeastern Ukrainian. In this context, it would be instructive to compare the phonemic system in the steppe dialects of Dobrogea, which are said to belong to Southeastern Ukrainian, with the phonemic system of the rest of Ukrainian dialects in Romania, which belong to Southwestern Ukrainian.

A tentative contrast between distinctive voicing and distinctive protensity in Ukrainian dialects in Romania may be useful in analyzing different inventories of consonants and their neutralization properties, as discussed, for example, by Jan Ziżyński in his *Opis fonetyczny języka ukraińskiego* (Kraków, 1932), which, by the way, is not mentioned in Pavliuk and Robchuk's book. As a result, their thesis about a "lesser degree of the functional identity of the voiced and voiceless consonants in the steppe dialects of Dobrogea" in view of their strong voicing properties in the word-final position (pp. 53–4) may be put in other terms. Thus, contrary to the Transcarpathian, Hutsul, and Bukovinian dialects, the steppe dialects as exemplified by Pavliuk and Robchuk present, in fact, evidence of phonemic protensity, or traces of it, with no neutralization of this feature before a morpheme boundary, for example, *duzhka* [žk] 'handle.'

In the chapter "Morphological Peculiarities" (pp. 57–75), the authors discuss both archaic and innovative phenomena, which are abundantly represented in the nominal morphology and verbal paradigm. Suffice it to note in the Hutsul and Bukovinian dialects the influence of the first conjugation on the ending of the third person plural form in the second conjugation, hence *bizhút*' (3 pl. pres.) 'to run' next to *kr'ichút*' (3 pl. pres.) 'to yell.' Of interest is also a parallel use of two main verbal endings, for example, *vár'út* (3 pl. pres.) / *var'é* (3 sg. pres.) 'to cook' (p. 72). Similar parallelism is found in 3 sg. pres. in the steppe dialects. Although prevailing, forms without the final *-t*' are sometimes paralleled in the *t'*-forms: for example, *nóse'* next to *nósyt'* (3 sg. pres.) 'to carry about' (p. 71).

Some Hutsul, Transcarpathian, and Bukovinian dialects exhibit a robust clitic system. In addition to the standard preterite in *-lʹs*, *-la*, and *-lo*, the authors bring attention to the perfect for 1 sg. and 2 sg., which is derived from the past participle and the corresponding present auxiliary of 'to be.' In the Hutsul dialects, the clitic auxiliaries can float as in Polish, that is, they need not immediately follow the verb, for example, *dé-s khodýý?* (2 sg.) 'where have you been?' (p. 72). The same cliticization, rather than suffixation, is typical of the future tense, with the future clitic from an old future auxiliary *jati* 'to take,' for example, *mu robyty* 'I shall work' (p. 73). Interestingly, in some Bukovinian dialects the authors single out another analytic future tense, which, they claim, is derived from the infinitive and the future clitic form of the verb *máti*, for example, *maju mas'týti* 'I have to smear.' The authors are quick, however, to take this future for a borrowing from the Romanian verb *avea* 'to have' used as a clitic auxiliary in the future tense, for example,

am să lucrez 'I have to work' (pp. 73–4). There seems to be no compelling evidence for the borrowing of this analytic form into Ukrainian. Although this analytic future tense is a shared Balkan property, there were also prerequisites in the internal development of the Ukrainian language (see my "The East Slavic 'habere': Revising a Developmental Scenario," in *Proceedings of the 13th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 9–19, 2001*, ed. L. Jones Bley and M.E. Huld [Washington, D.C., 2002], 110–16.) However, even if borrowed, the Romanians might have functioned in this case as mediators, as they did in the transference of *k'* and *g'* (in place of *t'* and *d'*) or of the extension of the affricate *dž* under the influence of the West Bulgarian dialects (Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, pp. 773–4).

The chapter "Syntactic Peculiarities" (pp. 76–84) is objectively less informative, since, as the authors point out, the Ukrainian dialects in Romania do not share as many syntactic as phonetic and morphological peculiarities (p. 76). Nevertheless, some syntactic peculiarities are very representative, especially the distribution of the predicative cases in different dialects. It is worthwhile mentioning a predominant use of the predicative nominative case (cf. *vin je profesor* 'he is a professor'), which, although not specified by the authors, is more typical of the steppe dialects. Most arresting in this regard is the accusative case used in the predicate with the preposition *za* in some Bukovinian dialects, for example, *brat staŷ za traktor'ista* (acc. sg.) 'the brother became a tractor driver' (p. 78). The latter prepositional construction may be treated as a separate, parallel development of the predicative cases in Ukrainian, which is known to show a strong preference for the nominative case in the predicate.

Another interesting construction is the instrumental case used with the preposition *z* (*ys, is*) 'with' in the Transcarpathian dialects of Maramureş, for example, *rubáje khli'ib iz nozhóm* 'he is cutting bread with a knife' (p. 83). The authors are inclined to regard this construction as a borrowing from Romanian. The above assumption is quite plausible, since Romanian, in fact, knows the above prepositional construction. This syntactic pattern, however, is also shared by other Indo-European languages. Thus the Ukrainian dialects demonstrate a common morphosyntactic feature.

The final chapter addresses lexical peculiarities (pp. 85–101). The authors offer a well-researched classification of the dialectal lexicon. First, they distinguish between non-contrasting differences (mainly "ethnographic dialectisms") like the well-known form *gl'ag/kl'ag/gl'eg/kl'eg* 'they ferment,' and contrasting differences of the type *tsvýntar*' (Hutsul and Bukovinian dialects) and *hrobký* (steppe dialects) 'cemetery' (pp. 85–9). Among the latter differences, the authors single out so-called semantic dialectisms, which have similar sound forms but different meanings. However, one can hardly take *budyty* 'to smoke (meat)' for a semantic dialectism as proposed by Pavliuk and Robchuk (p. 89). Compared with the underlying *vudyty*, the lexeme *budyty* (incidentally, not attested in the book's glossary of dialectal words) seems to demonstrate a case of sound shift, *v ~ b*, within a series of labials (Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, p. 741). Although it is difficult to uncover whether the phonetic or the semantic factor was decisive in the instance of *budyty* (< *vudyty*), the above shift looks quite plausible and may be treated tentatively as affective.

Speaking about borrowings, the authors claim that loanwords from Romanian are most numerous in the bulk of Ukrainian dialects in Romania. Nonetheless, certain dialects might have been more influenced by other languages, for example, the Hutsul and

Bukovinian dialects by German, the steppe dialects by Russian and Bulgarian (pp. 100–1). There are also borrowings, which were not brought directly by Romanians. One of the most interesting examples is *grazhd/a*, which is cited by Pavliuk and Robchuk as a loanword into the Hutsul dialects from Romanian. Although the Hutsul form *grazhdá* ‘fenced complex of house, sheds and barns’ has as its immediate source Rumanian *grajd* ‘stable,’ it shows all the features of Bulgarian phonology, which is likely to have been mediated by the Wallachians. The above example reflects, to be sure, a rather complicated way of borrowing, which was not even discussed in Dmytro Sheludko’s “Rumänische Elemente im Ukrainischen,” *Balkan-Archiv* (Leipzig, 1926), 2: 113–46, and Emil Vrabie’s “Influența limbii Române asupra limbii ucrainene,” *Romanoslavica* 14: *Lingvistică* (1967): 109–98. Oddly enough, these classic works are not found in the bibliography of the book under review.

The most valuable part of the book is certainly its collection of dialectal texts. Clearly recorded and meticulously presented, they will serve as a reliable source of information for Slavists interested in the structure of Ukrainian dialects in Romania, as well as in the traditions and customs of Ukrainians who have long lived in direct touch with Romanians. A bird’s-eye view of some aspects of Ukrainian culture and way of thinking can be gained from the texts, ranging over various themes. Depending on the age of a particular informant, an eager reader can dig out precious information about military service, the name “Hútsul,” animals, woods, birds, flood, the planting season, work in Belgium, and so on (pp. 182–94). Readers who are not accustomed to the transcription system used in texts of this sort will find it difficult to decipher these texts. The authors refer readers to the transcription used in *Prohrama dlia zbyrannia materialiv do Dialektolohichnoho atlasa ukrainskoi movy*, 2d ed. (Kyiv, 1949), pp. 94–101, and provide only “ancillary characters and diacritics” to render some “sounds and phonetic nuances” in the target dialects (pp. 11–14). But anyone who does not have the 1949 edition of *Prohrama* at hand, will give up reading these texts. In any case, the texts would have been more accessible, had the authors provided all the necessary characters in the form of diagrams, which are found, for example, in Czyżewski and Warchoń’s collection of Polish and Ukrainian dialectal texts on pp. xliv–xlvi. Also, the exemplification of language data in these texts is not complete. Apart from basic characters and diacritics, which are customary in dialectal records, it would have been instructive to have offered additional “suprasegmental characters” like long/short pauses, or explanatory marks to refer to atypical forms or other “supratextual data.”

The book under review is a very welcome publication in Ukrainian linguistics. This is why my criticisms of the theoretical part, which seems somewhat outdated and off-hand in its apparatus and methodology, are restrained by the authors’ stated *modus operandi* and, what is more serious in this case, by some limitations imposed by the Communist regimes in both Ukraine and Romania. Yet, apart from minor quibbles, which do not spoil the positive overall impression of the book, its main drawback lies in the lost opportunities. True, Ukrainian dialects in Romania have long been neglected by official linguistics. It has been therefore difficult for students, who were sometimes banned from scholarly activities, to maintain a traditional descriptive level, to say nothing of introducing a mainstream linguistic fashion. It is no surprise therefore that Pavliuk and Robchuk strayed from the path that they were expected to take at the outset of their research. Thus, while offering a classification of Ukrainian dialects in Romania, Pavliuk and Robchuk were

most likely aware of an intrinsic “historical-geographical” difference between the two groups of Ukrainian dialects as represented in the villages of Maramureș, Suceava, and Banat (Southwestern Ukrainian), on the one hand, and in the villages of Doborogea (Southeastern Ukrainian), on the other. However, the authors failed to transform the above “historical-geographical” difference into the “linguistic” typology. (The latter has been recently *grosso modo* outlined in part 3 of volume 3 of *Atlas ukrainskoi movy*, the last volume, which is not even mentioned in Pavliuk and Robchuk’s book.) Otherwise, instead of a pell-mell presentation of phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical features observable in the target dialects, the authors would have succeeded in distinguishing two distinct language types as realized in the two groups of Ukrainian dialects in Romania. This typology would have helped the reader to perceive more deeply the linguistic features of the Ukrainian dialects in Romania.

In spite of the criticisms above, Pavliuk and Robchuk’s volume is a long-awaited contribution in a series of studies of Ukrainian dialects outside Ukraine, which is worth having in your library.

Andrii Danylenko
Pace University (NYC)