

mostly of the Populist school. It does not include a single work by a Western scholar. Nor does it include any of the post-1917 Ukrainian historians active outside the USSR, either in the Western Ukraine prior to World War II or in the countries of Western Europe and North America before and after the war. It seems clear that this arbitrary selection was effected on political rather than scholarly grounds.

The final chapter, "The Ukrainian SSR in the International Arena," creates an impression of unreality. There we read that "the entrance of the Ukrainian SSR, in the capacity of a founding member, into the United Nations Organization amounted to its universal recognition as a subject in international law" (p. 573). But no explanation is given of the reason why this "subject in international law" has so far made no use of its constitutional right to entertain diplomatic relations with foreign countries. The discrepancy between appearance and reality is, perhaps, even more glaring in the comparatively harmless, nonpolitical area of international cultural relations. The book states that "Ukrainian scientists participate in international congresses, symposia, etc." (p. 583). The reviewer can, however, testify from personal observation that at the last two meetings of the International Congress of Historical Sciences (in Stockholm, 1960, and in Vienna, 1965) the Ukrainian SSR was "represented" by one or two inconspicuous members of the common Soviet delegation. This incongruity is not, of course, of the making of the encyclopedia's editors and contributors; rather, it expresses certain unresolved contradictions inherent in the very nature of the Ukrainian SSR.

In conclusion, *Ukrainskaia Sovetskaia Sotsialisticheskaia Respublika* may be consulted for reference purposes, and it will legitimately find its place on library shelves. But the prospective users ought to be warned that they are being offered a very lopsided and doctored image of the past and present of the Ukraine.

IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY
The American University

ROSIIS'KO-UKRAÏNS'KYI SLOVNYK. Akademiia nauk Ukraïns'koï RSR, Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni. 3 vols. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka," 1968. A-M: xxiii, 700 pp. 1 ruble, 83 kopeks. N-Pryiat': viii, 756 pp. 1 ruble, 87 kopeks. Pro-Ia: viii, 727 pp. 1 ruble, 82 kopeks.

I am fortunate not to be editor of the *Slavic Review*: the scruple about where to place this review is not mine. Should it be among the few linguistic topics (reputedly read by no one, except the proofreader) or among the host of reviews of current political history items (with the largest possible audience)?

The decision is not easy. The Soviet dictionaries of languages other than Russian in the USSR are not only, and sometimes not primarily, records of what words and idioms the language possesses, to be assessed by purely linguistic criteria, but are also tools for guiding the language in a desired direction by omitting certain words and expressions and promoting or introducing others. In countries where more than half the newspaper, radio, and television materials are translations from Russian, and Russian serves as the main means of communication with all the other nations of the USSR and, more often than not, with other nations and cultures, Russian-to-the-other-language dictionaries are especially effective. What appears in these is officially approved; what is not there is subject to doubt and suspicions.

The first comprehensive Russian-Ukrainian dictionary was conceived of in the twenties by the then unpurged Academy of Sciences. Of the four volumes that were planned three (in six parts) were published in 1924–33. The fourth is said to have been destroyed on the printing press, after it had all been set in type. In the thirties and forties a great purge of the standard Ukrainian language was carried out, especially of words that had come from the West through German and Polish; instead, thousands of Russian words were deliberately and systematically introduced into Ukrainian. In a recent survey of the postrevolutionary developments in standard Ukrainian, V. Illienko (*Ukraïns'ka mova i literatura v shkoli*, 1969, 4:19–24) states that modern Ukrainian was extraordinarily enriched by two sources: internal development and borrowings from Russian. Even a superficial glance shows that the borrowings from Russian he quotes are indeed borrowings from Russian; but what he cites as the results of internal development are, ninety-five times out of a hundred, loan translations from Russian. This state of affairs was fairly adequately summarized in the one-volume Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of 1948, often called by Soviet Ukrainian intellectuals the Russian-Russian dictionary. In spite of growing dissatisfaction and protests, especially vocal among Soviet Ukrainian writers, it was binding for twenty years.

The present three-volume dictionary is a response to these protests and implies the withdrawal of its ill-reputed predecessor. Its Ukrainian part is much richer: some banned words are back; some artificially introduced Russianisms are relegated to second place. The concessions, however, are moderate, and the dictionary nowhere breaks radically with that of 1948. A few examples will show this: Russian *apel'sin*: 1924 *pomarancha*; 1948 *apel'syn*, West Ukr. *pomarancha*; 1968 *apel'syn*, *pomarancha*. Russian *dıvan*: 1924 *dyvan*, *kanapa*; 1948 *dyvan*; 1968 *dyvan*, *kanapa*. Russian *kofe*: 1924 *kava*; 1948 *kofe*, *kava*; 1968 *kava*, *kofe*. Russian *kofeëk*; 1924 *kavochka*; 1948 *kofeïok*; 1968 *kavon'ka*, *kavochka*, *kofeïok*.

In my random checking nowhere did I find the Russianisms of the Stalin period dropped; at best they are assigned second place and/or supplied with slightly disqualifying usage labels.

In matters of lexicographical finesse such as the stylistic characterization of words, the breakdown of word meanings, inflectional peculiarities, and the like, the new dictionary is better than both preceding Academy dictionaries. The level of Soviet lexicography is generally high (barring certain idiosyncrasies such as the exclusion of church terminology, slang, and obscene words) and so essentially is that of this dictionary. For those, however, who work creatively with Ukrainian, such as writers, translators, editors, linguists, and particularly etymologists and stylistic analysts, the first Academy dictionary of 1924–33, at least within the letters A to P, is not superseded. It gives a greater wealth of synonymy and phraseology, it draws attention to less current and less hackneyed words and idioms. This is, for example, its entry for Russian *glupyi*: “*nerozumnyi*, *durnyi*, *durnoholovyi*, *bezholovyi*, *durnoverkhyi*, *na rozum nebahatyi*; (*opisatel'no*) – *zelenyi*, *makotsvitnyi*. *Glup kak probka* – *durnyi iak pen'*, *iak stupa*; *sovershenno glupyi* – *durnisin'kyi*. *On ne glup* – *ne tsviashkom u timia bytyi*.” Only words and idioms given here in italics are found in the new dictionary (although it adds two idioms not in the old one: “*durnyi azh svityt'sia*,” “*durnyi iak chip*”).

It is regrettable indeed that while many efforts of American linguists are spent in attempts at tackling verily Alexandrian subtleties and esotericisms, the gigantic linguistic experiment on restructuring and redirecting scores of languages carried out in the Soviet Union remains virtually unheeded. It is true, one must

admit, that the walls of the laboratory where the experiment is being conducted are not of glass.

GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV
Columbia University

INFORMATION HUNGARY. *Ferenc Erdei*, editor-in-chief. Countries of the World Information Series, vol. 2. Oxford, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig: Pergamon Press, 1968. xiv, 1,144 pp. £12 10s.

This is the second volume in the new Countries of the World Information Series of the Pergamon Press. The editor is vice-president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; the contributors are all prominent Hungarian scholars, literati, and public officials. A lengthy, indeed bulky, reference book, it is divided into eleven major sections covering such topics as the country's geography, history, governmental apparatus, economy, health, education, science, literature, the fine arts, and international activities. It contains maps (historical and "atlas" maps) and beautiful illustrations of Hungarian paintings and folk art. The extensive and valuable statistical data is current to 1967; the subject and name indexes were compiled with care. The quality of printing and paper is extravagant.

Much of the information is presented here for the first time in English. Much of the interpretation reflects official viewpoints. In short, this is an extraordinarily rich though tasteful Hungarian goulash a bit overspiced with red paprika.

CHARLES GATI
Union College

BIBLIOGRAPHIE D'ÉTUDES BALKANIQUES, 1966. Edited by *N. Todorov*, *K. Georgiev*, and *V. Traikov*. Sofia: Académie Bulgare des Sciences, Institut d'Études Balkaniques, 1968. 347 pp. Paper.

The present bibliography is the result of wishes expressed at the First International Congress of Balkan Studies in 1966 that an effort be undertaken by Balkan scholars and bibliographers to provide information frequently and speedily on work in the field of Balkan and Southeast European studies. The task fell to the Bulgarians, hosts of the first congress, who have established for the purpose a center for bibliography and documentation in the Institute of Balkan Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The center's bibliographic work is under the direction of Veselin Traikov, well known for his *Bulgaria v chuzhdata literatura, 1954-1963*, *Bulgarska khudozhestvena literatura na chuzhdi ezitsi, 1823-1962*, and other compilations.

The scope of the bibliography, to appear annually beginning with 1966, is a tangle between the disciplines in the purview of the parent Association Internationale des Études du Sud-Est Européen (history, linguistics, literature, ethnography, folklore, law, philosophy, and art) and the categories of the international decimal classification system used to organize the entries. The compilers have, furthermore, excluded certain segments of Balkan history (antiquity, the Byzantine period, the years between the two world wars), on the grounds that they are covered elsewhere, and have adopted the chronological limits roughly from the