

**Michael S. Flier and Andrea Graziosi, editors. *The Battle for Ukrainian: A Comparative Perspective*.** Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, 2017. Distributed by Harvard UP. Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies. x, 626 pp. Map. Tables. End-of-chapter notes. Index. \$29.95, paper.

**T**he volume *The Battle for Ukrainian: A Comparative Perspective* is the first of its kind in presenting discussion and polemics on language from a variety of vantage points. The book centres mostly on Ukrainian, but it also brings other Slavic and non-Slavic languages into the debate. Some of the themes that the authors address include the status and social roles of language(s); language politics and legislation and their impacts on society; the repression of language(s) and reactions and outcomes; language as a vehicle of nation- and state-building; language as an important (or not) pillar in ethnic and national identity; language and its role in collective and individual identity; language as a tool of assimilation and adaptation; language as a weapon against external forces and influences; and language as a tool in political manipulations and state or national policies. The overall picture that the reader gets allows for a profound understanding of the Ukrainian language situation, but it also places Ukrainian on the map of other conflicting and contentious language situations around the globe.

In the introduction to the volume (1-24), the editors, Michael S. Flier and Andrea Graziosi, provide a detailed portrayal of the turbulent history of Ukrainian over centuries and the bumpy developments of Ukrainian as a literary language. The volume is structured into two main parts: part 1 (25-388) focuses on Ukrainian, and part 2 (389-610) provides a comparative perspective, placing Ukrainian within a wider language debate.

Part 1 of the volume logically begins with the historical perspective on the origins of Ukrainian and an analysis of the centuries-old common language structure that was ultimately recognized as a common language of those who believed themselves to have a shared heritage, culture, and ethnos with Ukrainians (Flier [27-42]). Historical investigations of the nineteenth century, particularly of the time of the Valuev Directive (1863) and the Ems Ukaz (1876), which were both detrimental to the Ukrainian language, re-examine the “battles for Ukrainian” during those stormy times (Flier; Flier and Graziosi; Johannes Remy [43-62]; and Andrii Danylenko [63-96]). Other subjects that are discussed include efforts undertaken by the Russian Empire against nation-building processes in Ukraine, challenges with the codification of Ukrainian, debates over the language standard, and difficulties in Ukrainian publishing (Remy and Danylenko).

In contrast with the problematic life of Ukrainian in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century, the distinct language-development trajectory of Ukrainian in Habsburg Galicia and Austria-Hungary is also traced (Michael A.

Moser and Jan Fellerer). Here, the reader discovers a lesser-known chapter in the history of the Ukrainian language: the status and codification efforts and educational policies that contributed to the progress of Ukrainian, also called Ruthenian, in Austrian Galicia between 1772 and 1867 (Moser [97-118]); the standardization efforts and debates regarding orthography and questions surrounding the status of Ukrainian in Austria-Hungary between 1905 and 1918; and the unstable status of the Ukrainian language in the Second Polish Republic in the late 1920s (Fellerer [119-42]).

Analyses of Soviet politics and its influences on the Ukrainian language situation in particular figure prominently in the first part of the volume (Michael G. Smith [143-66], Hennadii Yefimenko, Patrick Sériot, Yurii Shapoval, and Simone A. Bellezza). These analyses focus on the place of national languages, including Ukrainian, in the controlled and carefully orchestrated Soviet ideological and political opuses; the regime of forced bilingualism (not multilingualism); and the supremacy of the Russian language in the political mechanism of the Soviet ideological machine. The subjects presented deal with, among other things, the contradicting rhetoric of the 1920s and 1930s surrounding the Ukrainianization process and the politics of the fusion of nations and of languages (Yefimenko [167-94]); the striking discourse about language by prominent linguists of the time (Sériot [195-214]); and the resultant controversies surrounding the orthographies (Yefimenko, Sériot, and Shapoval). The “Stalinization” of the Ukrainian language in the 1930s, the educational policies under Khrushchev, and the Russification of the orthographies in the 1930s and 1940s continue the argument of the effect of the Soviet regime’s Russification policies on Ukrainian, pointing nevertheless to the strength of Ukrainian in withstanding those language repressions and destructions (Shapoval [215-46]). The period of the late 1950s and 1960s is presented within the context of the activities of the *shistdesiatnyky* and their contribution to cultural renovation, with language as one of the tools in that movement. The reader finds various examples of the denunciation by the *shistdesiatnyky* of Russification in literary works, open letters, publications of *samvydav*, and other underground publications (Bellezza [247-70]).

The first part of the volume ends with discussions of post-independence Ukraine (Dominique Arel, Volodymyr Kulyk, Laada Bilaniuk, and Bohdan Azhniuk). Topics include language politics, policies and legislation, and language rights, which are further related to the concepts of the status and social roles of languages and language attitudes and ideologies in Ukraine. Arel focuses on language status and state loyalty in his account of the impact of war on Ukrainian language politics and the resultant reconfigurations and changes (271-308). Azhniuk provides a detailed account of the debates and controversies surrounding the history and implementation of the Kivalov-

Kolesnichenko regional language law of 2012 (365-88). Both Kulyk and Bilaniuk analyze language practices in contemporary Ukraine and the visible transformations that are taking place. Kulyk draws links between the language practices of people and the language policies of the state by analyzing peoples' practices and language attitudes on both the national and regional levels from 2006 to 2014 (309-42). Bilaniuk studies practices in popular culture and media in post-Maidan Ukraine, connecting them to the pluralism of language ideologies in present-day Ukraine (343-64).

The second part of the volume includes a set of articles that place the Ukrainian language situation, directly or indirectly, within a comparative network of relevant studies. Although the studies here concentrate on languages other than Ukrainian, their focuses certainly contribute to the reader's augmented view and understanding of the Ukrainian language situation. Graziosi offers a comparative look at multinational states and the linguistic challenges that such environments create, drawing parallels between the multinational and multilingual India and the former Soviet Union (527-62). Tomasz Kamusella redefines the concepts of nation, language, and state, using the central European space to show examples of existing ethnolinguistic nation-states (415-52).

Many of the articles in the second part also address the struggles of languages for status, role, place, and function within a society or a particular community. For example, Jussi Kurunmäki and Ilkka Liikanen discuss Finnish in relation to Swedish in Finland in the context of the Russian Empire (473-94). Zvi Gitelman traces the history of Yiddish and Hebrew, including in the Soviet Union and taking into account the state manufacture of Jewishness in the USSR, but concludes overall that in the course of history, language has not been critical to Jewish identity (495-512). And Robert D. Greenberg focuses on the language and identity debate and language ideologies with respect to languages of the former Yugoslavia—Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin (513-26).

Some of the authors, in addition to discussing language status, analyze language policies, state legislations, educational policies, and codification efforts, all of which influence the specific path that language life takes within a particular society. Tony Crowley discusses Irish (391-414); Anita Peti-Stantić addresses Croatian, Serbian, and Slovene (453-72); Martin Ehala examines Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, and Russian in the Baltic states (563-86); and François Charbonneau explores the topic of English and French in Canada (587-610).

Some of these authors also raise and problematize the question of minority languages, language-status shifts, and even reversals in language status (Crowley; Kurunmäki and Liikanen; Gitelman; Ehala; and Charbonneau). As noted above, all of the research angles presented in the

second part of the volume are pertinent to discussions and debates regarding the Ukrainian language situation, which continues to offer researchers a great terrain for intellectual explorations and “battles.”

In sum, the editors should be applauded for compiling such a capacious volume that combines a wealth of research not only into the Ukrainian language situation, diachronically and synchronically, but also placing the case of Ukrainian into a much wider conversation about languages of the world and situations of language conflict, debate, and controversy. The volume is a very welcome contribution to Ukrainian studies, Ukrainian linguistics, and areas of the intersection of linguistics, politics, and the history of Ukraine and other imperial and post-imperial contexts.

Alla Nedashkivska  
*University of Alberta*