
Larysa Masenko is well known as a pioneer of modern Ukrainian sociolinguistics and as one of the leading experts in the field of Ukrainian language policy. This recent monograph on the language of Soviet totalitarianism is somewhat closely related to an important collection of materials that she published together with Viktor Kubaichuk and Orysia Dems’ka-Kul’chyts’ka more than a decade ago (*Ukrains’ka mova u XX storichchi: Istoriia linhvotsydu; Dokumenty i materialy* [The Ukrainian Language in the Twentieth Century: The History of a Linguicide; Documents and Materials]). At the same time, Masenko’s new book adds to the ideas found in George Y. Shevelov’s classic study *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900-1941): Its State and Status*.

The book under review, after a brief introduction (5-8), offers three chapters. Chapter 1 is called “Dyskurs oshukanstva” (“The Discourse of Betrayal” [9-48]). Chapter 2 is named “Dyskurs nenavysti” (“The Discourse of Hatred” [49-162]). And chapter 3 is entitled “Protsesy sotsial’noi ta natsional’noi unifikatsii v SRSR” (“The Processes of Social and National Unification in the USSR” [163-224]). An afterword (225-32) sums up the results.

In chapter 1, Masenko discusses the essence of Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish “newspeak” (“novomova” [e.g., 10]), illustrating the terms with interesting materials from the Ukrainian and Russian contexts. Chapter 2 is somewhat more innovative in that it offers, *inter alia*, a careful study of the word *kurkul* (“kulak”) and other negative epithets and slogans—the word *fashyst* (“fascist”) and the like—that were used during the Soviet period. Another interesting aspect of chapter 2 is Masenko’s quite convincing argument that the discourse of hatred during the Soviet period was closely related to Soviet criminal jargon. Chapter 3 focuses on the history of Soviet state terror, and it describes how the policy of “indigenization” (“korenizatsiia” [e.g., 187]) was followed by the oppression of the nationalities and languages. A more lengthy and in-depth discussion of the history of the Ukrainian language of the second half of the twentieth century would have made the book even more innovative and valuable.

Generally, experts will not find many new insights in this monograph, but they will appreciate the interesting and sovereign discussion of important topics and some intriguing illustrating examples. My only criticism pertains to the outline of the Stalinist terror that followed the brief episode of “indigenization”: the reader of this book will not understand that the Stalinists unleashed their open war against Ukrainianization as early as
1929—during the trial against the so-called Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (Spilka vyzvolennia Ukrainy, or SVU)—not only in 1933.

Masenko’s book is written in a clear style and has very few typographic errors. Overall, this book is a solid overview that can be recommended to anyone interested in the history of the Ukrainian language during the Soviet period.
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