

Olena Hlazkova

“Language War” In Ukraine XIX - XXI: From a Dialect to the Status of National Language

Following the view on the modern language problem in Ukraine as a result of a long war, this paper focuses on the language question which constitutes the anti-imperial Ukrainian counter discourse starting from the middle XIX century up to the present day and explores the development of nationalistic ideas in their close relationship to the language.

Introduction

The middle of the XIX century witnessed the beginning of the Ukrainian intelligentsia's effort to change the dialect status of the Ukrainian language into a literary and cultural one. Language policy towards Ukraine in the Russian Empire and then the Soviet Union along with the impact this policy had on the current state of the language has been widely discussed among linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, political scientists and above all politicians not only in Ukraine but also all over the world.

After its independence proclamation Ukraine finds itself in the process of overcoming the impact of the previous centuries of anti-Ukrainian policies; the Ukrainian language even after the Soviet Union collapse is still in the state of competition with the Russian language. As Larysa Masenko points out in her article “Ukraine: A Country Of People Without Nationality”: “Even though Ukrainian has achieved the status of the state language, no concentrated effort has been made to establish itself as such, even though this is crucial

for uniting the country” (Masenko 2010). According to professors Shapoval and Azhniuk, “the current language situation in Ukraine is first of all a result of a long war against Ukrainian language, Ukrainian identity and Ukrainian statehood, which was launched by Russia after 1654” (Pas'ko 2004).

This research is focused on the language question which constitutes the anti-imperial Ukrainian counter discourse starting from the middle XIX century up to the present day and explore the development of nationalistic ideas in their close relationship to the language. The study is based on comparison of approaches used to define Ukrainian language and its role in nation- and state formation, which were expressed in the Russian Empire of the XIX century, Soviet times and in independent Ukraine.

The choice of the starting point in my research is justified by the fact that in the XIX century Ukrainian language became a politicized issue which led to Valuev's edict* and other restricting documents aimed at banning the language in print and preventing it from further development. The scope of this research includes a random choice of the texts of the representatives of the XIX century intelligentsia, who first started raising the question of the distinct nature of Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire and its right to be used as a literary and cultural means of communication and cultural development; the articles of the Soviet period which addressed the question of Ukrainian language within the Soviet Union, and those of modern writers, publicists and social researchers who express their concern with the status of the national language in

* On 18 July 1863 (Old Style), the Russian Minister of the Interior, Petr Aleksandrovich Valuev, sent out a circular that practically banned all Ukrainian-language literature directed at the common people (Johannes Remy, *The Valuev Circular and Censorship of Ukrainian Publications in the Russian Empire (1863-1876): Intention and Practice*).

Ukraine and the problems it faces now. These include the following texts from the XIX century, including “The orthography of the Little Russian Language” by Mykhailo Maksymovych (1842), “The foreword to *Kobzar*” by Taras Shevchenko (1847), “The afterword to *The Black Council*” by Panteleimon Kulish (1857), from the XX century Ivan Ohienko “Ukrainian language” (1930s) “Ukrainian language in the first half of the XX century 1900-1941” by Iurii Sheveliov (1987), and “Philosophy and culture – the consciousness of nation” by Oksana Zabuzhko (1996), from the XXI century “Who or what threatens the Ukrainian language?” by Andrii Horniatkevych (2000), “The destiny of language – the destiny of nation” by Volodymyr Pas'ko (2004).

Research Questions and Methods

Taking into consideration the development of Ukrainian under the language policy in the Russian Empire and then the Soviet Union linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, political scientists and above all politicians not only in Ukraine but all over the world have widely discussed the preservation and development of the Ukrainian language under this policy. The main focus of these studies is the state of the language in different historical periods (Remy 2007, Bilaniuk 2005, Grenoble 2003, Miller 2003). Another aspect of the “language debate” between the Russian and Ukrainian is explored in reference to the nation- and state-formation processes in Ukraine (Riabchuk 2000, Savoisk'a 2008, Zazulia-Ostriichuk 2006, Mirsky 1997, Wolczuk 2001).

Analyzing the current language situation in Ukraine the researchers address this issue from a nationalistic perspective. For instance, Tatiana Zhurzhenko focuses on the status and relations between the Russian and Ukrainian language after 10 years of

Ukrainian independence (Zhurzhenko 2002). In her article “Language Politics in Contemporary Ukraine: Nationalism and Identity Formation,” she underlines the politicization of the language issue in the country and close relations between the nation-formation and Ukrainian language protection from the influence of Russian. Moreover, she states that the language split in Ukraine is representative of political instability in the country, which manifests itself in a division between “pro-Russian oligarchy and the nationally conscious democratic pro-Western opposition” (Zhurzhenko 2002).

A famous Ukrainian writer and statesman Volodymyr Pas'ko, who underlines in his article the “triune nature of language, nation and state, expresses the modern understanding of the role that national language plays in Ukraine” (Pas'ko 2004).

I will trace the evolution of the language question raised by Ukrainian intelligentsia at the beginning of the nation formation till the times when language becomes understood as a constituent in Pas'ko's formula. Based on the close reading of the above-mentioned works I will explore the following research questions:

- how “language problem” relates to the nation/state creation at different stages of Ukrainian history between the XIX and XXI centuries
- development of arguments in the process of national language establishment since the XIX century
- construction of the national identity in Ukraine in the XXI century

This research does not focus on the imperial discourse, so no articles expressing Russian viewpoint on Ukrainian language and its cultural value will be included into analysis. The specific focus of my research is the evolution of Ukrainian intellectual thought concerning Ukrainian language from its dialect position up to the

status of national language.

The texts chosen for the present research are approached from perspective of postcolonial theory. According to Gandhi, “Postcolonialism can be seen as a theoretical resistance to a mystifying of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially, interrogating the colonial past. The process of returning to the colonial scene discloses a relationship of the reciprocal antagonism and desire between the colonizer and colonized” (Gandhi 1966). Taking into consideration the subjected position of Ukraine to the Russian Empire during several centuries and their current unequal relationship the implementation of postcolonial theory into the current analysis appears to be relevant. Using close reading and discourse analysis of the above texts, I will analyze and trace the evolution of Ukrainian scholarly thought dedicated to the issues of language and national identity in the period between the XIX and XXI centuries.

Focusing in my research on the process of national identity construction in relationship to the language issue I explore the presence of national ideas in the texts of Ukrainian intellectual elites in different periods of time and their gradual development. I believe this analysis will help to get a better understanding of the current language situation in Ukraine and trace the evolution of nationalistic thought in Ukraine expressed in the language debate.

In this study I follow the definition of counter discourse as the one that constructs power but also “undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it” (Foucault 1979). Thus, analyzing the texts dedicated to the language issue in Ukraine I consider them to be a counter discourse that 1) was created as an opposition to the dominant discourse of the Russian Empire, the

Soviet Union and the Russian Federation; and 2) aimed at giving an alternative definition of Ukrainian identity and nation.

Analysis

XIX Century

In 1842 the first Ukrainian linguist Mykhailo Maksymovych in his letter to Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko expressed his views on the Ukrainian writing. Based on a profound research of numerous written resources dated back to the Kievan Rus' time the researcher argued the unique nature of Little Russian language which emerged from its phonological peculiarities. He complains on the usage of phonological type of writing used by Ukrainian writers who adopted the Great Russian script in order to transmit the phonology of the Ukrainian language:

За останні роки досить багато було видано у нас, в Росії і в Австрії; але, на жаль, всі вони навмисне і довільно відрізняються щодо правопису, і тому всі вони, за своїм правописом, одна гірше другої. Але ні одна з них цією якістю не перевищила ще граматики Павловського, який почав вживати російської літери для малоруської мови так довільно, немовби до нього не було грамоти на нащій православній Українській Русі. (Tymoshenko 1959)

In the past several years a lot has been published here, in Russian and in Austria; but, unfortunately, all of them (publications) intentionally vary in orthography, and that is why the orthography of publications is bad in all of them. But none of those has yet excelled in its quality the grammar by Pavlous'kyi, who started using Russian letters in Malorusian

language so liberally, as if there had never been literacy in our orthodox Ukrainian Rus'. (hereinafter the translation is mine)

It is indicative that the author differentiates the Great Russia from “orthodox Ukrainian Rus’” in whose cultural heritage he sees the roots of Ukrainian language.

In his attempts to establish a distinct Ukrainian script Maksymovych argues that the Little Ukrainian language needs to be standardized and move from the simple “sound copying”:

[н]ашому малоруському правописові не треба, та й не можна вже бути простим, зовнішнім копіюванням звуків мови літерами. Він повинен обов'язково, крім історичної своєї стихії, більше або менше виражати собою внутрішні, етимологічні закони і властивості нашої мови. (Тymoshenko 1959)

Our Malorusian orthography need not and must not be just a simple graphic copy of language sounds. Along with its historical element it must express more or less the inner, etymological laws and peculiarities of our language.

Introducing a single script system for the Little Russian, according to the author, would make it possible to unite all its dialectical variety:

Без цього не може бути й правопису нашої мови, що повинен поширюватися на всі її видозміни, які існують в устах народу — від Карпатських гір до степів Задонських і берегів Кубані. (Тymoshenko 1959)

Without it (the single script) there can be no orthography of our language, which must spread to all of its variations that are spoken by the people – from the Carpathians to the steppes of

Zadonsk and shores of the Kuban.

Defending the necessity to elaborate the Ukrainian script, Maksymovych enumerates a number of phonological differences which differentiates the Little Russian language from the Great Russian, and as a result shows that the Great Russian script does not transmit all the variety of the Little Russian in its written form. He supports his arguments by historical documents, samples of Kievan Rus' writing and the graphic symbols used in them.

Though calling the Little Russian a distinct “language” and working on the establishing of its own distinct script, the linguist supported the idea of Slavic unity which also influenced his views on the Little Russian language:

Проте я думаю, що тільки за допомогою цього способу може бути встановлений правопис малоруської мови, який охоплюватиме всі його різновиди і при тому зближуватиме з правописом великоруської і деяких інших мов словенських, чого нашій мові зовсім не треба цуратися. (Tymoshenko 1959)

But I think, that only with the help of this method can we establish Malorusian orthography, which would embrace all the language varieties and at the same time bring it closer to Great Russian orthography and some other Slavic languages; something that our language should not avoid.

In the foreword to *Kobzar* published in 1847 Shevchenko also points at the differences existing between Russian and Ukrainian languages. Based on this language distinction the poet further establishes the ground to differentiate between the two Slavic nations. Taking into consideration the colonial status of Ukrainian

territories within the Russian Empire in the XIX century the author highlights the status of Ukrainian literature in the imperial culture. It is worth mentioning that Shevchenko is very critical in expressing his attitude to the Empire.

He raises the question of the “single Slavic literature” and points at inconsistency of the Russian Empire that at one hand promotes this unity of Slavic languages and literature, but on the other hand does not pay attention to the processes of language and literature development within other Slavic ethnic groups, Ukrainians in particular:

Кричать о братстві, а гризуться, мов скажені собаки. Кричать о единой славянской литературе, а не хотят і заглянуть, що робиться у слов'ян! (Shevchenko 2003)

*They shout brotherhood, and argy-bargy like those mad dogs.
They shout single Slavic literature, and do not even want to
peak at what is going on with Slavs!*

The cultural value of the literary works written in Ukrainian is not to be recognized by the Russian critics.

Shevchenko addresses the Ukrainian intelligentsia with an appeal to keep writing in Ukrainian based on that claim that Ukrainians and Moscovites are two different peoples with two different languages:

А на москалів не вважайте, нехай вони собі пишуть по-своєму, а ми по-своєму. У їх народ і слово, і у нас народ і слово. (Shevchenko 2003)

*Do not mind the Moscovites, let them write in their own
language, and we will be writing in ours. They have a people
and a word, and we have a people and a word.*

It is obvious that the Ukrainian poet sees Ukrainians as a distinct

people in the Russian Empire and as an argument for this distinction he uses the difference between the Russian and Ukrainian languages. Moreover, Shevchenko unlikely Maksymovych, is critical of the idea of Slavic unity, which in his opinion in reality was not based on equal rights of Slavic peoples to express themselves culturally.

Another perspective on the relationship between the Russian and Ukrainian languages in XIX century is proposed by Panteleimon Kulish in “The afterword to The Black Council”, which was published in 1857. In the afterword Kulish gives his reasons to write the novel in Ukrainian language. The author also provides an overview of the status of the Ukrainian language in the Russian Empire, pointing at the fact that the Ukrainian language is unknown in the Northern Russia and is not popular among the Southern Russians (Ukrainians):

[p]усский писатель нашего времени для изображения малороссийских преданий, нравов и обычаев обратился к языку, неизвестному в северной России и мало распространенному в читающей южнорусской публике. (Kulish 1989)

a contemporary Russian writer in order to depict Malorusian legends, manners and customs turned to a language, unknown in the Northern Russia and little spread among the reading Southern Russian audience.

Calling himself a Russian writer Kulish emphasizes his belonging to the Russian Empire, which embraced three Slavic ethnic groups of Great Russians, Little Russians and Bielorussians. Understanding that publication of his novel written in Ukrainian might be interpreted as a sign of “local patriotism” Kulish explains the true

reasons for this preference of unpopular Ukrainian over the prestigious Russian:

Вообразят, пожалуй, что я пишу под влиянием узкого местного патриотизма и что мною управляет желание образовать отдельную словесность, в ущерб словесности общерусской. Для меня были бы крайне обидны подобные заключения, и потому я решился предупредить их объяснением причин, заставивших меня избрать язык южнорусский для художественного воссоздания летописных наших преданий. (Kulish 1989)

They would imagine probably, that I am writing under the influence of the local narrow patriotism and that I am moved by a wish to form a separate literature to the detriment of all-Russian literature. Such conclusions would be utterly insulting for me, and this is why I decided to advise beforehand the reasons that made me choose the South Russian language for the artistic depiction of our chronicles.

One of the ideas presented by Kulish concerns the close relations between the two languages, which were established due to the geopolitical unification of the Northern, and Southern Russia. During the historical development the Great Russian language became a state and literature language of the Russian empire gradually forcing the Little Russian element out:

[и] тут приток севернорусского элемента в литературный язык сделался почти исключительным. В свою очередь, малороссияне отреклись от природного языка своего, и, вместе, с просвещением, разлившимся по империи из двух великих жерл,

Москвы и Петербурга, усвоили себе формы и дух языка севернорусского. (Kulish 1989)

and this is when the intake of the Northern Russian element into the literary language became almost exclusive. Malorusians, in their turn, repudiated their natural language, and along with the Enlightenment, which spread over the Empire from two great cities, Moscow and Petersburg, adopted the form and spirit of the Northern Russian language.

Supporting the Pan-Slavic movement of that time which focused on the unity of all three Slavic peoples in the Empire, Kulish does not recognize the right of the Ukrainian language (Little Russian) for a separate development. As it was mentioned above, the writer was concerned with a possible interpretation of his writing in Ukrainian as separatism. In this respect, he limits the Ukrainian literature value to a function of enriching the all-Russian culture. In his comments on the contribution to the development of all-Russian culture, made by the Ukrainian intelligentsia, Kulish mentions the names of Gogol' and Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko. However he touches only the surface of the issue and unlikely Shevchenko does not suggest a logical conclusion that Ukrainian culture, language, character, and scholar thought are not only distinct from the imperial ones but also deserve the right to be acknowledged as such. He dresses his speculations on the distinct Ukrainian character and its literature in a coat of brotherly love between the Great Russian nation and Ukrainians, points at mutual respect between the two and underlines his NOT-belonging to a “narrow local patriotism”:

малороссияне, призванные им (Гоголем) к сознанию своей национальности, им же самим устремлены к любовной связи ее с национальностью

севернорусскою, которой величие он почувствовал всей глубиной души своей и заставил нас также почувствовать. (Kulich 1989)

Malorusians, encouraged by Gogol' to recognize their own nationality, are directed by him to a liaison with the Northern Russian nationality, whose grandeur he felt with the entire depth of his soul and also made us feel it.

The latter, according to Kulish, aims at creation of a separate Ukrainian literature “to the prejudice of the Russian one.”

XX Century

The XX century views on Ukrainian language differ a lot from the XIX century modest claims about differences between the Ukrainian and Russian languages. The work “Ukrainian Language” by Ivan Ohienko written in the first half of the XX century gives a more profound argumentation in favour of the distinct nature of both the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainians as a separate people. The fact that most of Ohienko's work was banned in the Soviet Union proves that his ideas constituted a threat to the unity of Ukraine and Russia.

Speaking of the relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian language I. Ohienko quotes the results of historical, linguistic, and anthropological studies, which explicitly proved the weakness of the theory about the joint development of the two from a single proto-Russian language. The same sciences are said to prove the distinction between the Russians and Ukrainians:

за останні часи сильно розвинулася наука про людину, антропологія, і вона незбито доказала, що українці й росіяни — це два різні народи; див., наприклад, працю проф. Хв. Вовка: Студії з

української етнографії та антрополії. Прага, 1927 р. (Ohienko 1935)

in the recent times the science about a human, anthropology, has developed considerably, and it proved that Ukrainians and Russians are two separate peoples; i.e. work by Prof. Hv. Vovk: Studies on Ukrainian ethnography and anthropoly. Prague, 1927.

The author explicitly states that there has never been a “single Ruthenian language” and thus no reasons existed to consider Ukrainian language to be a dialect of the Russian:

Говорити про єдність давніх східних племен північних і південних не маємо жодних наукових підстав, — такої єдності ніколи не було, й ніколи не було якоїсь однієї спільної руської мови на Сході слов'янства. (Ohienko 1935)

There is no scientific reason to talk about the unity of the ancient Eastern tribes of the North and South – such a unity never existed, and there never was a single Ruthenian language at the beginning of Slavdom.

Acknowledging the fact of political unity under historical conditions Ohienko does not recognize the ethnic and, moreover, language “fusion”:

Так, Україна, що тоді звалася Русь, під своєю державою об'єднала в IX-X віках увесь слов'янський Схід, цебто народи український, російський та білоруський, але це було об'єднання виключно державне, політичне і в жодному разі не етнічне й не мовне. (Ohienko 1935)

So Ukraine, which was called Rus' at that time, united in the IX – X centuries all the Slavic East, Ukrainian, Russian and Byelorussia peoples, but this was a strictly state unity,

political, but not ethnic or linguistic.

In part twelve of this article Ohienko goes further, criticizing the politics of “single unity between the Ruthenian dialects” introduced by the Russian Empire and supported by the Soviet Union. He also gives a reason for introduction and sustaining this politics by the Russian scholars:

Те, що державна назва Русь перейшла з України також і на північ, а також те, що спочатку, в X-XII віках усі східні племена були в одній державі, та що з 1654 р. українці підпали під московську політичну владу, це поставило російських учених на ложну путь, ніби народи український і російський — це один і той народ, а мова їх спільна, чи власне українська мова — це наріччя мови російської. І ось це почали російські учені боронити в своїх наукових працях, але робили це з чисто політичних поглядів: коли признати українцям окремішність їхньої мови, то, виходить, і народ окремий, а це вже накидає думки і про окремішність державну. (Ohienko 1935)

The facts that the state's name Rus' spread from Ukraine also to the North, and that at the beginning, in the X – XII centuries, all Eastern tribes were under one state, and that since 1654 Ukrainians were under the Moscow's political power mislead Russian scholars in the way that two peoples – Ukrainian and Russian – are one people, and they share a single language, or to be more specific, that Ukrainian language is a Russian dialect. And that is what Russian scholars started defending in their research, but they were doing this from a political perspective: if to admit that Ukrainians have their own separate language, it means that they are a separate people, which logically brings up thoughts about a separate state.

Stating that the “language issue” received political colouring Ohienko establishes a connection between the acknowledgement of the Ukrainian as a separate language and a necessity to recognize the Ukrainians as a separate people.

Broad study on the status and condition of the Ukrainian language was conducted by Iurii Sheveliov during 1900-1941. Exploring the politics of the Soviet Union towards the Ukrainian language the author pictures the attitude of the ruling administration towards the language and the people of the Ukrainian Republic. One of the issues discussed by Sheveliov is the process of Ukrainization launched by the Soviet government in 1923. According to the author such an unexpected decision was dictated by the international politics of the USSR. Trying to represent the Communist system in the most favourable light the Soviet government started focusing on its “colonies” and their cultural development. As the researcher notices in his work:

[ц]ю політику справді важко узгіднити з рештою комуністичної програми, для якої національні питання мають лише тактичний інтерес. (Sheveliov 1987)

indeed, it is difficult to conform this policy with the rest of the Communist program, which considers national issues only tactically.

Thus, the process of “ukrainization” was only a tactics aimed at sustaining control over the Ukrainian republic and its nationalistic movement.

According to Sheveliov before the politically approved “ukrainization” the agricultural sector of the Ukrainian republic had been the major sphere where Ukrainian was widely used. In description of the relationship between the two languages a

comparison between the highly developed Russian-speaking city and the Ukrainian-speaking village with its lower culture had been used. However, the “ukrainization” changed this opposition between the higher Russian and the lower Ukrainian cultures, establishing the equal grounds for development of the both:

Змінилося саме вмотивування українізації. Спершу це була потреба пристосуватися до селянства ... [Т]епер таку поставу рішуче відкидають, оскільки вона, мовляв, ховає в собі натяк на нижчий ступінь розвитку української культури й мови і передбачає їхнє зникання при змаганні з буцімто вищою культурою й мовою російською. (Sheveliov 1987)

The very motivation of ukrainization changed. First, it was a necessity to adapt to the rural population... Now such attitude is strongly rejected, because it supposedly points at a lower level of development for Ukrainian culture and language and implies their fading in competition with allegedly higher Russian culture and language.

The author further gives the main reason of “ukrainization” which concerned the “de-russification” of the large cities and industrial centres in the Ukrainian republic:

[Н]айістотніше завдання українізації явно полягало в дерусифікації великих міст і промислових центрів України. (Sheveliov 1987)

the main task of ukrainization was clearly the de-russification of the large cities and industrial centres of Ukraine.

However, discussing the influence this politics had on the Ukrainian language and the attitude towards it the author points

out its complex consequences. As an imposed and controlled policy “ukrainization” received an ambiguous evaluation in the Ukrainian society:

Вплив політики українізації на становище української мови і ставлення до неї був складний і не раз унутрішньо суперечливий. [У]країнізація викликала прихильність і підтримку одних прошарків населення та стороже вичікування других. (Sheveliov 1987)

The influence of the ukrainization policy on the state of Ukrainian language and the attitude towards it was complicated and internally contradictory. Ukrainization received a certain disposition of some layers of society and caused a cautious waiting of others.

Along with the increase of media and literature publications in Ukrainian, introduction of the Ukrainian language into the school and university curriculum, and general raise of interest in Ukrainian culture, the negative attitude towards “ukrainization” policy continued growing based on its forced and mandatory character. At the same time, the government constantly controlled this stimulation. Any initiative in this sphere going beyond the allowed limits was recognized as a dangerous nationalism:

[р]адянська влада сприймала хворобливо-підозріло всяку не контрольовану нею ініціативу на полі українізації. (Sheveliov 1987)

the Soviets suspiciously perceived any uncontrolled initiative related to ukrainization.

Among the main reasons of this policy failure Sheveliov names the lack of social basis, which would support the Ukrainian intelligentsia

in the process of raising and developing Ukrainian culture and language:

Міцної соціальної основи українізація під собою не мала. Фактично вона спиралася тільки на українську інтелігенцію комуністичної орієнтації, дуже тонкий прошарок суспільства. (Sheveliov 1987)

Ukrainization did not have strong social basis. In fact only Ukrainian intelligentsia of the communist orientation supported it, which was a very thin layer of society.

It is worth mentioning that the sphere of the Soviet influence and intrusion into the Ukrainian language issue was not only limited by the overall control of the social usage of the language and artificial support of its prestige. The politicization of this issue touched the language itself:

радянська система встановлює контроль над структурою української мови: забороняє певні слова, синтаксичні конструкції, граматичні форми, правописні та ортоепічні правила, а натомість пропагує інші, ближчі до російських, або й живцем перенесені з російської мови. (Sheveliov 1987)

the Soviet system establishes control over the structure of Ukrainian language: it prohibits certain words, syntactic constructions, grammar forms, orthographic and orthoepic rules, promoting instead others, closer to Russian, or even completely transferred from Russian language.

In the afterword to this research Sheveliov states that such an explicit oppression of the language was not favourable for its development or for the development of nation itself. Moreover, the

relationship between the Russians and the Ukrainians are identified as that of a “dominant” and “oppressed” nations:

Така залежність від мови панівної нації була великим гальмом для нормального розвитку мови української, та, зрештою, не тільки й самої мови. Тут маємо справу ще з одним виявом неповности української мови в першій половині ХХ століття. (Sheveliov 1987)

Such a dependence on the language of the dominant nation considerably slowed down natural development of Ukrainian language, and not only the language alone. Here we also deal with incompleteness of Ukrainian language in the first half of the XX century.

Another representative of the modern Ukrainian intelligentsia – Oksana Zabuzhko, reconsidered the above-mentioned relationship between the language and the nation in Ukraine after its independence. In her article “Philosophy and culture – the consciousness of nation” she explains this relation between the two from philosophical perspective. Considering the language “tragedy” of the XIX – XX centuries the main reason for the current situation in Ukraine, which the author characterizes as lacking “the cultural consciousness”, Zabuzhko states that “russification” of Ukraine in the stated period of time resulted in “russification” of mentality:

[у]країнська інтелектуальна традиція, змінивши русло в мові, потекла в російську культуру, де й спричинила правдивий розквіт, тимчасом як мовомислительні обрії української нації zostались іще на два покоління на рівні хутірського мікрокосму: українці "не мали чим" думати про себе. (Zabuzhko 1996)

Ukrainian intellectual tradition, changing its course in language, flowed into the Russian culture, where it caused a

real heyday, meanwhile the thought in language development of Ukrainian nation remained at the level of farmer's microcosm: Ukrainians did not have any means to think about themselves.

Describing the influence the Russian language dominance had on Ukrainian nation O. Zabuzhko ascribes to the language another function through which the nation conceptualizes itself, develops vocabulary to characterize itself. The backwardness of Ukrainian intellectual thought is thus dependent on the language situation:

[в] добу, коли решта модерних націй стрімко нарощували свій інтелектуальний потенціал через розріст національних філософських шкіл, українці зайняті були головно героїчним витяганням учорашньої народної говірки на горішній поверх понятійного дискурсу. (Zabuzhko 1996)

in the time, when the rest of the modern nations were rapidly growing their intellectual potential through the spread of national philosophical schools, Ukrainians were mainly occupied with the heroic "pulling" of the yesterday's subdialect to the level of conceptual discourse.

As a result, the modern Ukrainian culture lacks a well developed school of academic philosophy:

[в] новітній українській культурі добротної україномовної академічної філософської школи, яку нормально мають перейти і література, і критика, і гуманітарна наука, — так і не склалося.

in the modern Ukrainian culture there is no well established Ukrainian-language academic philosophical school, which normally would embrace literature, critics and humanitarian sciences.

The Ukrainian nation still finds itself in the process of formation,

which due to the imperial language policy was not able to develop a decent national intellectual thought.

XXI century

After the independence declaration Ukrainian received the status of the state language. However, the Ukrainian intellectuals still discuss the language issue and point at the problems it faces nowadays in an independent post-communist country. One of the language debates was started between a Ukrainian historian, professor Petro Tolochko and a Ukrainian philologist Andrii Horniatkevych. In the response to Tolochko's publication under the title "Who or what threatens the Ukrainian language", Horniatkevych writes a similarly-named response in 2004. Among the main disputable points Horniatkevych addresses the historical development of the Ukrainian language, its linguistic peculiarities, and the status of the Ukrainian language in diaspora and Ukraine.

Connecting existence of the nation with its language the author underlines the cultural and national value of the latter:

Мовознавці щораз відкривають нові мови, отже, годі аксіоматично казати, що є більше народів, ніж мов, можливо, що є саме навпаки. Коли б ці народи чи народності втратили свої мови й перейшли на інші, вони, до великої міри, перестали б існувати, а їхні культурні надбання пропали б або перейшли до інших. (Horniatkevych 2004)

Linguists keep discovering new languages, so there is no need in repeating axiomatically that there are more peoples than languages, which is quite opposite. If those nations or ethnic groups happened to lose their languages and adopted new ones, they would stop their existence in a certain manner, and their cultural accomplishments would be lost or adopted by others.

Touching on the bilingual situation in Ukraine the author of the article focuses on the status of Ukrainian as a state language. Being under the protection of law and the state the language becomes a natural attribute of every citizen in the country. This statement is given as a natural, common-sense truth, which confirms the relationship between the people and the language that is reinforced through the institution of state:

Може, й так, але скільки емігрантів до Ізраїля вивчає іврит у літньому а то й похилому віці, бо вони прекрасно розуміють, що це державна мова, і якщо вони поселилися в тій державі, треба й володіти її мовою. (Horniatkevych 2004)

It may be true, but how many emigrants who came to Israel study Hebrew in an older age, because they clearly understand, that it is the state language, and if they settled in that country, they have to speak its language.

Discussing the linguistic aspects of the language Hornitkevych once again underlines the distinct nature of all Slavic languages and rejects the argument about the single proto-Russian language. It is representative, however, that in the XXI century this traditional imperial argument still exists in academical spheres and needs to be addressed.

At the same time, ideas expressed by Horniatkevych give alternative, progressive perspective on the language role and status. In respect to Ukrainian the author several times mentions the difficulties the Ukrainian language faced during several centuries of its development. One may conclude based on his article that the modern period of language development characterizes by the process of revisiting its historical forms and the re-introduction of the genuinely Ukrainian but somehow “forgotten” (or prohibited) forms

and letters into the language. Understanding Ukrainian as not only a separate, but above all a state language of a separate independent country the author raises the question of the state's responsibility to protect and preserve its language:

[з]аконодавство України гарантує українській мові статус державної — правда, але дійсність виглядає куди інакше. Мушу, на жаль, погодитися з тими, які закидають державним органам, що ті замало роблять для збереження й закріплення статусу української мови як державної. У таких обставинах турбуватися насамперед статусом російської мови в Україні — хоч і великодушно, але під цю пору таки суперечить інтересам державної мови. Це, на мою думку, було б нічим іншим, як відновленням панівного статусу російської мови імперських часів, а такий крок обмежив би українську до сфер родини, частини побуту та літератури й мистецтва. (Horniatkevych 2004)

It is true that the legislation of Ukraine guarantees the official status of Ukrainian as the state language, however the reality is somewhat different. Unfortunately, I have to agree with the critics of the government authorities, who are said to do hardly anything to solidify the official status of Ukrainian language as the state one. Under such circumstances to be worried about the status of the Russian language in Ukraine may be noble-minded, but it conflicts with the interest of the state language. In my opinion, it would lead to nothing else but restoration of the dominant status of Russian language of the imperial times, and such an undertaking would limit Ukrainian language to the private sphere of usage and partially literature and art.

Pointing at the current state of thing in Ukraine Horniatkevych explicitly indicates the existing language problem. The concern of the country and politicians with the status of the Russian language

(language of an ethnic minority on the territory of Ukraine) is expanded at the expense of the state language, which now finds itself in a defensive position within the very territory of its own country. The inequality between the two is further highlighted by the uneven attention to the status of the Ukrainian language in the Russian Federation. Functioning within the Ukrainian ethnic community on the territory of the neighbouring country there have never been attempts to establish the Ukrainian as the second state language. This controversy is presented as a political issue, the feature which characterized the “language issue” since the XIX century.

Another representative of the modern Ukrainian intelligentsia – Volodymyr Pas'ko – outlines the current language situation in the country in his article “The destiny of the language – the destiny of the nation”. The very title is representative of the internal connection between the people and their language. Assessing the historical struggle of Ukrainians for their independence the author underlines the language problems the people had to overcome for several centuries. Giving the statistics on the bilingual communication in Ukraine in the XXI century Pas'ko explains it as a natural consequence of the previous anti-Ukrainian policy of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union:

[в]ласне українці складають 77,8% від всього нашого народу, а етнічні росіяни – 17,3%, тобто співвідношення – як 4,5 до 1, українців – щонайменше вчетверо більше. Рідною українську мову вважають 67,5% населення, тобто навіть не всі етнічні українці, російську ж визнали за рідну 29,6% нашої людности, в т. ч. 14,8% українців. Неможливо знехтувати той факт, що причиною цього протиприродного дисбалансу стало тривале, протягом століть примусове зросійщення нашого народу. Особливої інтенсивности ці процеси – денаціоналізації й зросійщення українців як

«соціалістичної нації» – набули в 1960-80-ті роки ХХ ст., цього не заперечують навіть затяті українофоби. (Pas'ko 2004)

Ukrainians constitute 77,8 per cent of all our people, and ethnic Russians – 17,3 per cent, which is the proportion of 4,5 to 1, where Ukrainians are at least 4 times more numerous. Ukrainian language is considered to be native language by 67,5 per cent of population, which does not include all the ethnic Ukrainians, while Russian was recognized by 29,6 per cent, including 14,8 per cent of Ukrainians. It is impossible to overlook the fact that the reason for such an unnatural imbalance has been a centuries long, compulsory russification of our people. The processes of denationalization and russification of Ukrainians as a “Socialist nation” became especially intensive during the 1960-80s, the fact which has never been negated even by Ukrainophobes.

This quote also presents the discrepancy between the Ukrainian as an official state language and a native language of one distinct ethnic group. It appears that the acquisition of the official status did not solve the problem of the language usage, as during the period of obligatory “russification” a considerable percentage of ethnic Ukrainians adopted Russian as their native language.

In the discussion of the problems the Ukrainian language faces Pas'ko names a number of unfavourable factors. First of all, the insufficient material support of the national language given by the state. In the sphere of mass media and literature publishing the Ukrainian segment is considerably smaller than that of the Russian:

Серед зареєстрованих друкованих ЗМІ пропорція прямо зворотна мовно-демографічній: на одне українське видання – чотири російськомовних або із так званими «паралельними випусками»,

коли українською – лише заголовок та вихідні дані редакції. Хоч як це парадоксально, але на вітчизняному газетному ринку склалася ситуація, коли на сто українців припадає близько 50 примірників газет рідною мовою, а на сто росіян, які проживають в Україні – майже 400 примірників, або у вісім разів більше”; “Катастрофічною для всього українського й українства загалом виглядає ситуація в телерадіопросторі, який майже повністю окупований російськомовними програмами. (Pas'ko)

The number of registered press media is directly proportioned to the linguistic demographics: for one Ukrainian publication there are four in Russian language, or what is known as “parallel edition”, when only the headings and the information about the publishing house are given in Ukrainian. Though it seems to be a paradox, but the national press market witnesses a situation, when for 100 Ukrainians there are 50 copies of newspapers published in their native language, and for 100 Russians living on the territory of Ukraine – almost 400 copies, which is 8 times more; The whole situation is catastrophic to everything Ukrainian in television media as well, which is almost entirely occupied by Russian programs.

Similar discrepancy between the national language usage and the Russian is found in education, where the number of text books written in Ukrainian is several times less than the educational materials published in the Russian Federation. The author characterizes such an imbalance between the representation of the two languages in the cultural and educational spheres of the Ukrainian society as a “disaster”.

Judging the statistics and the actual status of the Ukrainian language in the country, Pas'ko concludes that the language has not

yet become a state language in its full right:

Отже, розгляд мовної ситуації в нашій країні, навіть побіжний, переконливо свідчить, що державна українська мова за 15 років від прийняття Закону України «Про мови в Українській РСР» державною фактично так і не стала. Необхідних заходів з ліквідації наслідків примусового зросійщення українського народу протягом попередньої третини тисячоліття вжито не було. Вимоги патріотично свідомої громадськості фактично проігнорувало чиновництво практично в усіх галузях і на всіх рівнях владної вертикалі. Необхідних умов для всебічного розвитку і функціонування української мови в усіх сферах суспільного життя в Україні, як того вимагає чинне законодавство, створено не було. (Pas'ko 2004)

In this respect, even superficial consideration of the language situation in our country provides strong evidence that during the 15 years since adoption of the Law of Ukraine “On the languages in Ukrainian SSR” Ukrainian did not become the state language. No necessary measures have been taken to relieve the consequences of the obligatory russification of Ukrainian people during the last third of the millennium. The demands of the patriotically conscious public have been ignored by the officials practically in all spheres and on all levels of power vertical. No necessary conditions were created for an all-round development and application of Ukrainian language in all spheres of the public life in Ukraine, as is required by current law.

Analyzing the “language issue” Pas'ko claims that the absence of any actions aimed at the improvement of the current situation in Ukraine threatens not only the Ukrainian language itself but the existence of the Ukrainians as a nation:

Отож, найважливішим, найважчим і найбільш загрозливим наслідком нинішньої «мовної політики» місцевого зросійщеного або національно байдужого чиновництва, наслідком, який може зробити мало актуальними всі інші міркування і висновки, є те, що в незалежній Україні серед власне українського народу виростає і безперешкодно поширюється, як бур'ян в занедбаному полі, новий його різновид – людей, які є українцями генетично й географічно, але не духовно, українців за походженням, однак з незрозуміло якою мовою і культурою. (Pas'ko 2004)

So the most important, the most difficult and the most threatening consequence of the current “language policy” of the local russified or nationally indifferent officials, the consequence which may deprive other speculations and conclusions of any value, is the fact that in the independent Ukraine among Ukrainian people a new type of people is evolving and spreading like weeds in the neglected field, - people who are Ukrainians genetically and geographically, but not spiritually, Ukrainians by origin, but with unknown language and culture.

Along with the ineffective language politics in Ukraine as a major reason for language problem to exist author names an imposed opinion, that the Russian language needs to be protected. However, as a result of defending the language of minority which de facto dominates almost in every sphere of social life in Ukraine, the national language of the country and its development does not receive attention and support from the state. Moreover, the prestige of the national language has decreased dramatically over the years of independence.

In the article Pas'ko characterizes the problem as a change in the

Russian politics aimed at preserving its influence on the territory of the former “subject”:

Стає цілком очевидним, що на нинішньому етапі розвитку Української держави має місце перехід імперсько-шовіністичних елементів від стійкого спротиву до шаленого наступу на українську мову і на українську культуру загалом. (Pas'ko 2004)

It becomes obvious that the present stage of development of Ukrainian state witnesses the transitional period when imperial chauvinistic elements move from a stable opposition to a furious attack on Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture in general.

Transfer of the language issues into the sphere of politics leads to the misuse of this topic by various political forces. In defence of the Ukrainian language prestige Pas'ko supports the capability of the language to fulfil its functions in every sphere of social life under the condition it is given this possibility:

Так що наша мова і спроможна, і придатна, якщо її не гнобити й не гнітати, звісно, як це робилося в Російській імперії і Советському Союзі протягом понад трьохсот років. (Pas'ko 2004)

And so our language is capable and suitable, if it is not vexed and oppressed as it was done in the Russian Empire and the USSR for more than 300 years.

The necessity to take effort in order to finally establish Ukrainian as a national state language in its full right is also dictated by the understanding of the language as an intrinsic definer of the nation:

Не може бути українського народу без української мови, як не може бути незалежної держави на ім'я Україна з народом, який би називався инакше, ніж український, і розмовляв

мовою іншою, ніж українська. Бо такий народ і така держава повинні тоді називатися инакше. (Pas'ko 2004)

There can be no Ukrainian people without Ukrainian language, as there can be no independence country named Ukraine with the people which could be called other than Ukrainian, and spoke any other language, than Ukrainian. Because such nation and such country should be them called differently.

This close relation between the language and nation, the language and state causes the current state of affairs in bilingual Ukraine:

Цілком очевидно, що саме в цьому, в політичному значенні мови як найважливішого чинника націєтворення і державотворення, полягає головна причина і шаленого тиску на українську мову, і політичних спекуляцій довкола її місця й ролі в реальному житті нашого суспільства. (Pas'ko 2004)

It is obvious, that the main reason of both fierce pressure and political speculations on the place and role of Ukrainian language in the real life of our society lies in the this very political meaning of the language as the most important factor of nation building and nation formation.

Discussion

The analyzed articles propose the variety of opinions on the language topic and its specific situation in Ukraine. The XIX century Ukrainian intellectual thought combines two opposite viewpoints on the Ukrainian language and its functions in the society. The pan-Slavic idea of nation and language unity between the Northern and Southern Slavs found its reflection in the linguistic work of Maksymovych on the orthography of the Ukrainian language. A bit

different perspective on this unity was expressed in the foreword to the Ukrainian novel of Penteleimon Kulish. While Maksymovych explicitly stated that the Ukrainian and Russian languages were different in nature and origin, he viewed the development of the Ukrainian in close relationship to other Slavic languages. Moreover, the author did not consider it to be a drawback, but a benefit for the Ukrainian language in the first place. For Kulish, the Slavic unity was associated with the single language for all Slavs – Russian. In this respect his writing in Ukrainian, which was believed to be just a dialect of Russian, needed to be explained, so that the author was not blamed for supporting “narrow local nationalism.”

Shevchenko became the representative of a totally opposite position in the language debate. The poet went further in his claims about differences between the two languages and claimed the two people – the Great Russians and Malorussians – to be different in their nature. His criticism of the imperial politics was radical in comparison to other cautious expressions of distinction between the two peoples and their languages. However, recognition of the Ukrainians as a separate Slavic people did not develop into the idea of their possible independence separate from the Russian Empire.

The XX century intellectual thought started revisiting the language relationship in the imperial Russia. Ohienko in his work continued the ideas expressed in the article of Maksymovych. However, Ohienko not only supported the claim about the differences between the Ukrainian and Russian languages using the scientific approach, but also defined the imperial ideology of Slavic unity as a false one. He further gave the explanation for the introduction of the language policy in the Russian Empire. Recognition of the separate language would logically lead to a necessary recognition of the separate nation.

Sheveliov in his research on the Ukrainian language continued the general tradition of addressing the imperial past and evaluating its influence on the language situation in the Soviet Union. Describing the process of “ukrainization” the author highlighted its unnatural character which led to the failure of this program. The governmental attempt to control language of a separate republic only reinforced the subordinate position of the Ukrainians within the USSR. According to Sheveliov the consequences were negative not only to the language development itself, but also to the Ukrainian nation.

The analysis of the works written by the contemporary representatives of intellectual thought in Ukraine helped to reveal the current language situation in the country. The article by Horniatkevych is indicative of the existing debate on the status of the Russian language in Ukraine. Being a state language whose status is guaranteed by the constitution Ukrainian finds itself in a defensive position. It results in a negative assessment of the bilingual situation in the country in the works by Horniatkevych, Pas'ko and Zabuzhko. At the same time, all three authors point at the relation between the language and the nation. In this respect the insecure position of the national language in Ukraine caused by several centuries of imperial rule leads to what Zabuzhko calls “an underdeveloped cultural and national consciousness” of the Ukrainians.

Conclusion

The articles chosen for this study enabled a closer look at the language issue in Ukraine at different stages of the country's history. The XIX century intellectual thought already viewed Ukrainian as a separate language. However, this language distinction was further

developed into the distinction between the Great Russians and Malorussians as different peoples only in the work of Shevchenko. Unlikely moderate Maksymovych and Kulish, the Ukrainian poet did not support the idea of Slavic unity under the rule of Moscovy.

The change of the political status of the Ukrainian lands within the Soviet Union marked another period of language debate addressed by Sheveliov. Living in a republic that belonged to the unity of equals Ukrainian intelligentsia continued their struggle for development of their native language, which under certain international circumstances managed to result in an official program of “ukrainization”. However, the government of the Soviet Union established a strict control over this language campaign and Ukrainian-speaking population aimed at preserving the dependent position of the latter.

The XIX and XX century language policy has been re-addressed and re-evaluated in the works of Ukrainian writers, publicists, and philosophers already after the declaration of independence in Ukraine. The authors whose articles were included into the current analysis coincide in revealing the negative influences of the imperial policy on different spheres of social life in Ukraine. One of the common ideas found in the writings of Pas'ko, Zabuzhko, and Horniatkevych deals with the relationship the authors establish between the language and its status and the Ukrainians as a nation. The actual bilingual situation in the country is considered to be representative of the ongoing nation-formation.

As we can see starting from pointing at the language differences between the two Slavic peoples in the XIX century the intellectual thought of Ukraine managed to preserve this idea of language distinction and connect it to the notion of “nation” in the XXI. After 1991 the “language – nation” formula receives another component -

“state”, whose main function is to preserve and protect the national language. Having finished a long way of evolution from a dialect to the state language Ukrainian is still overcoming the damage caused by the imperial policies. In respect to the nation-formation this issue preserves its political value till nowadays.

Works Cited

- Bilaniuk, Laada. *Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine*. USA: Cornell University Press, 2005. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power, Truth, Strategy*. UK: Routledge, 1979. Print.
- Fowkes, Ben. *Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict in the Post-communist World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. Print.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: a Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966. Print.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. *Language Policy in the Soviet Union*. Spolsky, Bernard & Shohamy, Elana. USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003. Print.
- Horniatkevich, Andrii. "Shcho abo Khto Spravdi Zagrozhuie Ukrain'skii Movi." *Suchasnist'*. *Izbornyk*. n.pag. Web. March 28, 2011.
- Ivanyshyn, Vasyl' and Radevych-Vynnyts'kyi, Iaroslav. *Mova i Natsiia*. Drogobych: Vidrodzhennia, 1994. Print.
- Kononenko, Petro. "Teoriia Natsional'noi Idei." n.pag. Web. April 1, 2011.
- Kulish, Panteleimon. *Chorna Rada. Khronika 1663 roku*. Goncharuk M.L. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989. Print
- Lyzanchuk, Vasyl'. *Tvorimo Razom Ukrainu!* Krups'kyi I.V., Masenko L.T., Ponomariv O.D. L'viv: Pais, 2009. Print.
- Maksimovich, Mihail. "O Pravopisanii Malorossiiskogo Iazyka." *Izbornyk*. n.pag. Web. March 25, 2011.
- Masenko, Larysa. "Ukraine: a Country of People Without Nationality." *Atlantic Council*. n.pag. Web. March 17, 2011.

- Miller, Alexei. *Ukrainian Question: Russian Nationalism in the 19th Century*. Budapest New York: Central European University Press, 2003. Print.
- Mirsky, Georgiy. *On Ruins of Empire: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Former Soviet Union*. USA: Greenwood press, 1997. Print.
- Ohienko, Ivan. "Istoriia Ukrain's'koi Literaturnoi Movy." *Izbornyk*. n.pag. Web. March 20, 2011.
- Pas'ko, Volodymyr. "Dolia Movy – Dolia Natsii." *Nezalezhnyi Kul'turologichnyi Chasopys*. 2004. n.pag. Web. March 28, 2011.
- Radchuk, Vitalii. "Dvomovnyi Ianus Ukrainy." *Biblioteka Imeni Marii Fisher-Slyzh*. n. pag. Web. March 30, 2011.
- Remy, Johannes. "The Valuev Circular and Censorship of Ukrainian Publications in the Russian Empire: Intentions and Practices." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 49, 1/2 (Mar-Jun 2007): 87-110. Print.
- Savois'ka, Svitlana. "Movno-separatysts'ki Tendentsii u Politychnomu Prostoru Ukrainy." [Separatist Linguistic Tendencies in the Political Sphere of Ukraine] *Political Management* 2 (2008): 76-88. Print.
- Seveliov, Iurii. *Ukrain's'ka Mova v Pershii Polovyni XX Stolittia. Stan i Status*. [The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the 20th Century. State and Status] USA: Suchasnist', 1987. Print.
- Shevchenko, Taras. "Peredmova do Druhoho Vydannia "Kobzaria" [The Foreword to the Second Edition of "Kobsar"]. *Hrestomatiia Materialiv z Istorii Ukrain's'koi Literaturnoi Movy*. Tymoshenko P. D. Part 1. Kyiv: Radians'ka Shkola, 1959. 222-229. Print.
- Shkandrij, Myroslav. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001. Print.
- Snyder, Timothy. *Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003. Print.
- Subtel'nyi, Orest. *Istoriia Ukrainy*. n.pag. Web. March 3, 2011.
- Wolczuk, Kataryna. *Moulding of Ukraine: The Constitutional Politics of State Formation*. Hungary: Central European University Press, 2001. Print.

- Zabuzhko, Oksana. "Filosofiia i Kul'turna Prytomnist' Natsii." *Khroniky vid Fortinbrasa (Vybrana Eseiistyka)*. n.page. Web. April 1, 2011.
- Zazulya-Ostriychuk, Olha. "Identity Construction: National Rebirth or Identity Crisis?" *New Perspective on Contemporary Ukraine: Politics, History, Culture*. March 16-19, 2006: 1-29. Print.
- Zhurzhenko, Tatiana. "Language Politics" in Contemporary Ukraine: Nationalism and Identity Formation." *Questionable Returns*. A. Bove. IWM Junior Visiting Fellows Conferences, Vol. 12. Vienna: n.p., 2002. 1-24. Print.

Olena Hlaskova is a PhD student in Slavic languages and literature at the Department Modern Languages and Culture Studies, University of Alberta. Her research interests include feminist literary criticism, women's studies, modern feminist movements, migration, Slavic linguistics and language question in post-Soviet countries, and Spanish literature.

Contact: hlaskova@ualberta.ca