Nataliia Yasakova
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
Kyiv, Ukraine
n.yasakova@ukma.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6810-8080

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNSAID IN THE DICTIONARY: LEXICOGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE OF THE STATUS OF UKRAINIANS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Background. *The eleven-volume "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language", published in the Soviet Union, avoided mentioning certain words and meanings. Given the socio-political circumstances under which it was created, and the history of Soviet interference in the publication of Ukrainian dictionaries, the omission of certain words and phrases is to be considered in the context of the implementation of state policy towards Ukrainians as one of the USSR nations. A vivid example is the practice of lexicographical processing of names that reveal the fight of Ukrainians for their political independence.*

Contribution to the research field. *The novelty of this research lies in the fact that, using nouns denoting persons as an example, it discloses the practice of silencing in the Soviet dictionary of certain words intended to strengthen the influence of the authorities, and construct a Ukrainian identity which was suitable for the Russian-Soviet empire.*

Purpose. *The aim of the article from the perspective of post-colonial linguistics is to highlight the causes and consequences of the absence from the most comprehensive Ukrainian Soviet dictionary of nouns denoting persons, associated with the experience of resistance to Moscow authorities and the idea of creating a Ukrainian state.*

Methods. *The research is based on the principles of critical discourse-analysis by N. Fairclough, who emphasises the connection between language, authorities, and ideology. The analysis of the dictionary includes textual, discursive and socio-cultural dimensions.*

Causes and consequences of omissions in the dictionary have been interpreted from the perspective of the post-colonial approach, having taken into account the consequences of the creation of the dictionary as well as the practice of using omitted words in Ukrainian texts from different years. Data from the General Regional Annotated Corpus of the Ukrainian Language (GRAC) was used to establish the practice of word usage.

Results. *The dictionary does not contain names referring to members of nationalist organisations and armed groups, derived from the names of their leaders (banderivets, bulbivets, melnykivets[1]), names of military formations and political organisations (upivets and ounivets[2].) The dictionary also lacks the names mazepynets and bohdanivets[3], associated with Ivan Mazepa and Bohdan*

---

[1]   TN *banderivets / bulbivets / melnykivets* – **Banderite**.A follower of **Stepan Bandera**, one of the leaders of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) / A follower of **Taras Borovets**, nicknamed «Bulba-Borovets», the leader of the armed group called the **Polissian Sich**, one of the earliest Ukrainian resistance units during World War II / **Melnykites**. Followers of **Andrii Melnyk**, another leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (1940's). Source: https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CB%5CA%5CBanderaStepan.htm

https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CB%5CO%5CBorovetsTaras.htm

https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CM%5CE%5CMelnykAndrii.htm

[2]   TN *upivets / ounivets* – A member of the **UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army)**, a Ukrainian partisan army formed during World War II main goals were to fight for Ukrainian independence and resist both Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union / A member of the **OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists)**, a political organization created in 1929 to work for Ukrainian independence, often through underground activity. Source: https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CU%5CK%5CUkrainianInsurgentArmy.htm

https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CO%5CR%5COrganizationofUkrainianNationalists.htm

[3]   TN *mazepynets / bohdanivets* – A supporter of **Hetman Ivan Mazepa** (1640–1709), a Ukrainian leader, ruled the Cossack Hetmanate and in 1708 allied with Sweden's King Charles XII against Russia's Tsar Peter I, hoping to secure Ukraine's independence. After that, *mazepynets* was often used (esp. negatively by Russians) to mean a Ukrainian who supported independence from Russia / A soldier of the **Bohdan Khmelnytsky Regiment**, formed during World War I, created in 1917 in Kyiv, named after Bohdan Khmelnytsky (the 17th-century Cossack leader), and became one of the first military units of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Source: https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CM%5CA%5CMazepaIvan.htm

https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CH%5CKhmelnytskyBohdan.htm

Kmelnytsky, two historical figures, crucial to the formation of Ukrainian identity, as well as the terms derzhavnyk and samostiinyk[4], linked to the idea of the political independence of Ukraine, and being key components of the anti-imperial discourse. Most of these words were used in Soviet publications to condemn the actions of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists". All of these words appeared in works banned by the Moscow authorities that covered Ukraine's past or the activities of Ukrainians outside the USSR.

Discussion. *The eleven-volume "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" represents Ukrainians in accordance with the official ideology of the USSR. Its authors were unable to describe the past and the present of their nation in a full manner. As a result, epistemological gaps in the dictionary contributed to the construction of Ukrainian national identity, which was part of the Soviet imperial project.*

A critical study of Ukrainian dictionaries will make it possible to trace ideological changes and the construction of Ukrainian national identity during the colonial and post-colonial periods. Interpreting what was silenced in Soviet-era works will help to understand the specifics of the Ukrainian colonial experience and improve the scientific description of the Ukrainian language.

Keywords: dictionary, Ukrainian language, post-colonial linguistics, Soviet colonialism, discourse, noun, Ukrainian national identity.

1. Introduction

The eleven-volume **"Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language"**, which covered over one hundred thousand items, was a real cultural event for Ukraine. This work was the first academic explanatory dictionary in the history of Ukrainian lexicography. Until then, bilingual Russian-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Russian dictionaries, which pursued, first and foremost, a practical aim, had been most numerous. The heuristic value of the monolingual explanatory dictionary was undeniable, since not only was it a lexical treasury, but also a

---

[4] TN *derzhavnyk / samostiinyk* – From the word **«derzhava»** = 'state'. A person who believes in building and strengthening a **Ukrainian state** (government, institutions, laws). The word was often used for politicians or activists who thought the most important goal was to create and maintain a functioning Ukrainian state / From the word **«samostiinist»** = 'independence'. A person who insists on **full Ukrainian independence**, separate from any foreign rule (Polish, Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Soviet, etc.). The term was especially strong in the early 20th century. *Samostiinyky* often rejected autonomy or federal solutions and demanded a completely independent Ukraine.

tool of discovering the Ukrainian language and culture. In contrast to the users of the bilingual dictionaries, who were mostly a wide audience of both professionals and non-professionals, native Ukrainian speakers, as well as those who did not speak Ukrainian, the explanatory dictionary gained the audience of primarily field experts.

Exploring the connection between lexicography and cultural and linguistic independence, C. Uchechukwu noted the importance of the target audience of dictionaries. According to C. Uchechukwu's observations, "the movement towards cultural or political independence can contribute to a shift in the target audience of lexicographic works of a language" (Uchechukwu, 2011, p. 204). In case of the Igbo language, as with other African languages, there has been a notable shift from a European audience, a wide audience which includes those learning the language, as well as those who already speak it, to a narrower audience of native speakers (Uchechukwu, 2011, p. 209). For the Ukrainian language, whose native speakers lived in the Russian Empire and later in the USSR, the main task was to emerge from the shadow of the Russian language, which was possible by means of using bilingual dictionaries. Therefore, according to O. Taranenko, Russian-Ukrainian translation dictionaries were the main genre of Ukrainian lexicography for a long time (Taranenko, 2018, p. 5). At the same time, the development of Ukrainian lexicography can be traced through various periods when interest in bilingual dictionaries intensified, weakened, or when dictionaries changed their ideological focus.

At the beginning of the 20th century, "The Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language", edited by B. Hrinchenko (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909), played an important role in standardising the Ukrainian literary language. Since it was published in an empire, where the Russian language dominated, it was formally intended for Russian-speaking readers, and opened the Ukrainian world to a wide Russian-speaking audience. The dictionary provided Russian equivalents or definitions of registered Ukrainian words, accompanied by illustrative material. The Ukrainian audience became the primary consumers of the dictionary. It was highly praised by the Ukrainian public figures, and became the foundation for the creation of subsequent dictionaries, most of which were also bilingual.

The emergence in the 1920s of a significant number of Ukrainian dictionaries, intended for a wider audience, was connected with a national policy of the Bolsheviks. The demonstrative support of the non-Russian peoples was aimed at levelling their desire for political independence. According to T. Martin, at

that time the Bolsheviks were building a kind of Affirmative Action Empire, where nations did not resist the unitarian and centralised structure of the Soviet state. This state could hardly be considered a classic empire, since it had used a new strategy which made it impossible to perceive it as an empire. The state centre was not officially identified with Russia, but the hierarchy of state-building and colonial peoples remained. Russians had to suppress their own national interests, identifying themselves with the supranational Affirmative Action Empire (Martin, 2013, pp. 34–40). Dictionaries of this period were aimed at Ukrainians, as well as representatives of other nations who lived in Ukraine and needed special language training for skilled work in various fields. These were often bilingual dictionaries, written, however, in the Ukrainian language.

At the end of the 1920s, Ukrainisation was halted and the authors of many dictionaries were repressed. Their lexicographical works were banned because they revealed numerous differences between the Ukrainian and Russian languages, which did not correspond to the new national policy. The fate of the Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary, edited by A. Krymsky and S. Yefremov, is indicative. It first began to be published in 1924, but was never published in its entirety, and its materials were not taken into account in the compiling of other dictionaries during the Soviet era (for more details, see Pozdran, 2026). As S. Plokhy summed up, Stalin used the Great Famine (*TN* Holodomor) and the Great Terror to "transform an autonomous and often independent-minded republic into an ordinary province of the Soviet Union" (Plokhy, 2021, p. 334).

Although there were some differences in the bilingual translation dictionaries of the following decades, caused by Moscow tightening or loosening its grip through the use of repressive practices, they were aimed at the same audience. Those were translation dictionaries designed for the Ukrainian consumer, a citizen of the USSR, who was in constant contact with the Russian language, which was the language of the central authorities, the media, higher education, the army, and culture among other things. The aim of such dictionaries was to help Ukrainians feel more at home in a society dominated by the Russian language.

The creation of the monolingual explanatory dictionary signified the transition of Ukrainian lexicography to a new level, and marked an important step towards a more structured description of Ukrainian lexis without reference to Russian vocabulary. At the same time, the dictionary became a tool of Russian propaganda. Communist ideology was reflected in definitions of lexemes, the

choice of stylistic remarks, and usage examples. I. Renchka demonstrated this in her works, having analysed how the dictionary presented the names of political parties, movements and ideologies, artistic directions, as well as vocabulary related to religion and economics (Renchka, 2018a, 2018b).

The clear ideological bias of the Soviet dictionary was one of the reasons to compile a new explanatory dictionary in Independent Ukraine, with its authors declaring the underlying principles of its compilation in the preface. In particular, they noted the need to rid the dictionary of the vestiges of the totalitarian regime, conduct de-ideolisation of the lexicographical material, ensure lexicographical objectivity, expand the visual database by including works of the previously banned authors, and introduce material which reflected national and historical realities. It is worth noting that the authors identified "filling lexical gaps" as a separate task of their work – "incorporating into the lexical inventory commonly used vocabulary which was omitted from the eleven-volume "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" (Rusanivskyi et al., 2010, p. 8).

The Soviet dictionary, tasked with recording the lexical composition of the Ukrainian language as fully as possible, omitted certain lexical units and their meanings. Taking into consideration the socio-political circumstances under which this dictionary was created, as well as the history of Soviet interference in the publication of Ukrainian dictionaries, the omission of certain elements should be considered in the context of the implementation of state policy regarding Ukrainians as one of the nations of the USSR. A clear example of this would be the lexicographical practice of processing names associated with the struggle of Ukrainians for their independence.

2. Theoretical Background

The aim of the article from the perspective of post-colonial linguistics is to highlight the causes and consequences of the absence from the most comprehensive Ukrainian Soviet dictionary of nouns denoting persons associated with the experience of resistance to Moscow authorities and the idea of creating a Ukrainian state. Using as the basis the principles of critical discourse-analysis by N. Fairclough, who emphasises the connection between language, authorities, ideology, the article interprets the dictionary combining textual, discursive and socio-cultural dimensions. According to N. Fairclough, "Textual analysis can often give excellent insights about what is 'in' a text, but what is absent from a text is often just as significant from the perspective of socio-cultural analysis" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 5).

The social importance of dictionaries has resulted in their interpretation as indicators of certain ideologies in a significant number of studies (Demska, 2012; Alnizar, 2025; Włodarczyk-Stachurska, 2015; Moon, 2014). A multifaceted interpretation of dictionary articles, based on the principle of critical discourse analysis introduced by N. Fairclough, was realised, in particular, in the works of F. Alnizar, V. N. Mufidah, and Z. Yani. The researchers emphasise that "Lexicography is not merely about describing language but about shaping knowledge" (Alnizar, 2025, p. 133), and that dictionaries "function as cultural instruments that shape, preserve and institutionalise dominant knowledge systems" (Alnizar, 2025, p. 149).

In the case of the academic monolingual explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language, its unique influence can be clearly noted since for a long time it has been, and still remains, an authoritative source of information for anyone working with Ukrainian, including writers, editors, teachers, journalists, and scholars. The publication of the new twenty-volume monolingual explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language has not been finalised yet, while the more limited explanatory dictionaries, published in Independent Ukraine, cannot fully satisfy users, since they do not provide all the necessary information, and often tend to be abridged versions of this Soviet dictionary.

The need to consider Ukrainian dictionaries from a post-colonial perspective is not evident, since Ukraine was never a colony in a classical sense. Ukrainian dictionaries are not examples of colonial lexicographical works, in which authors-Europeans introduced the unknown exotic world to their compatriots, describing a foreign language through the lens of their own. Ukrainian lands were not separated from the centre of the Russian, and later Russian-Soviet, Empire by an ocean, and Ukrainian cultural tradition was not perceived by Russians as foreign; instead they sought to appropriate it rather than distance themselves from it. It was, clearly, this cultural closeness of the Slavic nations that led scholars not to regard Ukrainians as a colonised nation. For example, A. Bennigsen, speaking about colonialism in the Soviet Union, excluded the territories inhabited by Ukrainians and Belarusians from consideration, "professing the Orthodox religion and whose cultures and historical traditions are scarcely distinguishable from the Russian" (Bennigsen, 1969, p. 145). A. Bennigsen did not regard relations between Russians and many other nations of the Empire as colonial, with the Slavic nations being a case not even worth considering. According to the Ukrainian political scientist M. Riabczuk, "Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova represent an intermediate case

between rather standard colonialism in the Russo-Soviet Asia and Caucasus and a rather light neocolonial rule over Central and Eastern Europe. On the one hand, as a group, they did not enjoy even the limited sovereignty as did their western neighbors" (Riabczuk, 2013, p. 56). Thus, post-colonial analysis can be applied to these post-Soviet countries, provided that appropriate precautions are taken into account.

Y. Hrytsak argues that the post-colonial approach is not enough for interpretation of Ukrainian-Russian relations and it might be ineffective for understanding of the past and present of Ukraine in the global context. The renowned Ukrainian historian notes that Ukrainians possess a wide range of colonial experience, which cannot be reduced to the relations between the core, the periphery and the colony. According to Y. Hrystak, "Ukraine's two roles – as the core of the Russian and Soviet projects, on the one hand, and as the center of anti-imperial and anti-Soviet resistance, on the other – represent two opposite extremes in the varieties of Ukrainian colonial experiences" (Hrytsak, 2015, pp. 733–734).

In our opinion, the colonial experience of Ukrainians provides grounds for using the post-colonial approach for studying the past and the present functioning of the Ukrainian language, as well as for the interpretation of linguistic works about it. The peculiarity of the colonial experience shared by Ukrainians necessitates the critical use of the post-colonial research tools, while adjusting them accordingly to the peculiarities of the Ukrainian situation. As A. Matusiak has aptly noted, Ukrainians "in the imperial project of the "Russian world" have always been the peripheral shell of the imperial centre" (Matusiak, 2020, p. 223). Studies of the Ukrainian language from the post-colonial perspective ought to include the ambivalent status of Ukrainians in the Russian and Soviet empires, and the multiplicity of their colonial experiences. Ignoring and inadequately processing colonial traumas in Ukrainian linguistics will result in a distorted perception of language processes, and a misunderstanding of the factors and trends of language development.

One of the directions of post-colonial research of the Ukrainian language is the deconstruction of the dominant discourse, expressed by linguistic works, in particular lexicographical ones. In this regard, it is particularly important to trace which fragments of Ukrainian experience related to national identity are not represented in the most authoritative dictionary of the Ukrainian language from the Soviet period.

3. Data

The study analyses the text of the eleven-volume "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" (Bilodid et al., 1970–1980), published by the leading scientific publishing house of the Ukrainian SSR, "Naukova Dumka" (TN "Scientific Thought") between 1970 and 1980. To establish the practice of word usage in Ukrainian texts from different years, data from the General Regional Annotated Corpus of the Ukrainian Language (Heneralnyi rehionalno anotovanyi korpus ukrainskoi movy / HRAC-18) has been used.

4. The Incompleteness of the Ukrainian Academic Dictionary in Relation to Soviet Identity Construction

4.1. Conditions for the Creation of the Dictionary and its Source Base

A multifunctional view of text involves studying the discursive practices it is embedded in, in particular, examining the processes of text production, distribution and consumption. The Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language was created by a team of lexicographers at the O. O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, a state institution whose activities were constantly subject to ideological pressure, particularly noticeable in the humanities. Work on the dictionary began in the second half of the 1950s, when Stalin's repressive practices were still well remembered and their consequences were acutely felt at both the institutional and personal levels. The Encyclopedia of Ukrainian History notes that "the intensified struggle against 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism' led to the elimination of almost all Ukrainian studies institutions of the academy in the early 1930s, and periodicals and serial publications in the humanities ceased to exist" (Shpak & Yurkova, 2010, p. 249). During the 1930s, many employees of the Academy of Sciences were repressed and lost their jobs. In his 1959 work "The Generation of the 1920s in Ukrainian Linguistics", Y. Shevelov stated, "The 1920s generation of linguistics was exterminated ruthlessly and senselessly. They were accused of nationalism and sabotage "on the language front". A tiny handful of those left survived only physically. Severed from live scientific contacts, and often from teaching at universities, they were spiritually crashed, forever intimidated, without any opportunity to work on the topics dear to their hearts and without possibility to publish their scientific works, they merely vegetated during the decades that followed" (Sheveliov, 2002, p. 24). In particular, most

of the authors of the aforementioned academic Russian-Ukrainian dictionary was repressed: V. Gantsov, H. Holoskevich, S. Yefremov, A. Krymsky, and A. Nikovsky. Y. Shevelov states the decline of Ukrainian linguistics, which only partially recovered in the mid-1950s, although it did not reach the level of the 1920s, as it was under significant Russian influence (Shevelov, 2002, p. 25). Thus, the dictionary was created under conditions of total state control and ideological pressure, which changed according to the political situation in the USSR, but never ceased. Evidently, the traumatic experience of previous generations of Ukrainian linguists also impacted the research guidelines, way of thinking, and lexicographical practice of linguists.

The Soviet authorities directly interfered in the work of lexicographers. V. Vynnyk, one of the authors of the dictionary, who worked in the Department of Lexicology and Lexicography at the Institute of Linguistics from 1963 to 1988, in his article "How the eleven-volume academic explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language was created", mentions the practice of removing materials from the lexical card index of the Institute of Linguistics in the 1930s. In particular, "ideologically harmful» words and illustrations were removed, selected from folk art, Ukrainian translations of the Bible, works by writers regarded as «bourgeois-nationalist", repressed writers and public figures (Vynnyk, 2012, p. 19). V. Vynnyk notes the later impact of Communist Party ideologists on the formation of the source base of the dictionary, in particular the ban on the use of works written by Ukrainians outside the Ukrainian SSR. The lexicographer sees the main flaw of the dictionary to be its disregard for the functioning of the language outside Soviet Ukraine, in the diaspora, where millions of Ukrainians lived (Vynnyk, 2012, p. 25).

The circumstances under which the dictionary was created influenced the shaping of its source base, which, consequently, was reflected in the comprehensiveness of the lexical inventory, the content of definitions, and the nature of the visual material. The preface to the dictionary, which characterises its scope and structure and is included in the first volume, lacks information about the ideological restrictions regarding the recording of vocabulary in the lexical inventory or interpretations of certain definitions. On the contrary, the editorial team of the dictionary highlights the enormous volume of lexical material, collected from various 18th–20th century sources. The user experiences descriptions of Ukrainian vocabulary it their full comprehensiveness, although due to official prohibitions, lexicographists were unable to process a significant number of texts from the early the 20th century, when the Ukrainian

movement assumed a political character, as well as texts written by Ukrainians who did not live in the USSR and did not support communist ideology.

The authors' ideological bias is evidenced by the general statement that the dictionary "reflects the state and development of the modern Ukrainian language vocabulary, whose true flourishing became possible only after the Great October Socialist Revolution thanks to a successful implementation of Lenin's national policy" (Bilodid et al., 1970–1980, v.1, p. VI). This statement in the preface to the dictionary, on the one hand, emphasises Ukraine's dependence on the politics of the imperial centre, and, on the other hand, stresses its positive nature. The ruling ideology is presented as conducive to national development. Even though Ukraine had to obey Moscow's decisions, its power is not depicted as domineering foreign power, but rather the ruling ideology represented as its own. The structure of the list of used sources is noteworthy in this regard. It is headed by a section entitled "Political Literature", which includes works by Lenin, Karl Marx, and Friedrich Engels, as well as various documents and materials regarding the activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. All these sources are united not only by their political orientation, but also by the fact that they are translations from Russian. In spite of this, they are not included in the category "Translated Literature". This category includes 15 translations of works of fiction by Russian authors (almost half of which are works by M. Gorky), two collections of literary-critical articles by Russian authors, and only five translations from other languages. Ideologically important translations from Russian are listed in the dictionary first among Ukrainian sources, before the list of Ukrainian works of fiction, therefore making them closer and normalising them for Ukrainian readers. Ideological literature is not marked as translated, because in that case the ideology itself may be perceived as foreign.

The source base of the dictionary covers only those texts that did not contradict the Soviet view of history and contemporary life of Ukrainians within the Ukrainian SSR. The dictionary's list of sources does not include many literary and opinion journalism texts published in the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, documents regarding Ukrainian statehood of 1917–1921, works by Ukrainian writers and figures of the Ukrainian movement, periodicals published abroad, as well as works by Ukrainian Soviet public figures who had been repressed and banned in the USSR. The part of Ukrainian experience that was ideologically alien to the Soviet authorities remained invisible to the dictionary user.

4.2. Omissions at the Level of Dictionary Entries

The most noticeable result of ideological control exerted over the creation of the dictionary was the incompleteness of its lexical inventory. Among the words describing important aspects of life of Ukrainians in the multinational Russian, and later Soviet Empire, which are not mentioned in the dictionary, are lexical units referring to the followers of different branches of the Ukrainian movement. It had been actively developing starting from the mid-19th century, giving rise to its own national discourse, opposed to the imperial one, which is represented in many texts. It includes numerous nouns denoting persons which appeared in different periods and were associated with different historical events, personalities, as well as different views regarding the development of the Ukrainian project. The authors of the dictionary might not have been aware of some of these words due to the prohibition of many texts, while other words had already made history by the time the dictionary was compiled. However, there were also words that were quite relevant and known to a wide circle of Ukrainian speakers.

4.2.1. Words Associated with the Names of the Ukrainian Movement Figures and Names of Organisations

The lexical inventory of the dictionary does not include a significant number of names referring to the members of nationalistic organisations, armed groups, and derived from the names of their leaders, e.g. *banderivets, bulbivets, melnykivets.* However, these words were used in Soviet printed media and fiction – (1), (2), (3):

(1)   *Vsi ukrainski natsionalisty:* **melnykivtsi, banderivtsi i bulbivtsi** *organizuvaly bandy, shcho nikoly ne vystupaly proty nimtsiv, ale zavzhdy proty chervonoi armii i chervonykh partyzan* (Ukrainskyi dobrovolets, 1944, HRAK-18).
All Ukrainian nationalists: **melnykivtsi, banderivtsi,** *and* **bulbivtsi**[5] *organised gangs that never opposed Germans, but were always against the Red Army and Red Partisans* (Ukrainian volunteer, 1944, HRAK-18).

(2)   *Viduchyly my* **bulbivtsiv** *ta* **banderivtsiv** *napadaty na partyzaniv* (A. Shyian, 1944, HRAK-18).
We've weaned **bulbivtsi** *and* **banderivtsi** *from attacking partisans* (A. Shyian, 1944, HRAK-18).

(3)   *Odnoho razu o 1-i hodyni vnochi* **banderivtsi** *napaly na nashu khatu i khotily zabyty mene* (Vilne zhyttia, 1945, HRAK-18).

---

    [5] TN *melnykivtsi, banderivtsi,* and *bulbivtsi* – plural forms of *melnykivets, banderivets, bulbivets.*

Once, around 1a.m. **banderivtsi** *broke into our house and wanted to kill me* (Vilne Zhyttia 'Free Life', 1945, HRAK-18).

Propaganda used these words in order to portray Ukrainians fighting against Soviet rule as traitors and criminals that pose a threat to the lives and wellbeing of honest people. The name *banderivets* was used most often. L. Masenko points to the wide use of this word after the Second World War as a way to discriminate against Ukrainian patriots. Initially, the word *banderivets* referred to a follower of S. Bandera, however, later it started to be used to refer to any "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist". L. Masenko highlights that the word *banderivets* carried an extremely negative evaluative connotation in the totalitarian discourse, and the propaganda tried intensively to promote the image of violent criminals called *banderivtsi.* The renowned Ukrainian linguist recalls, in particular, the negative portrayal of *banderivtsi* in the works of Y. Melnychuk, which was used in the eleven-volume "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" to illustrate the adverb *dochasno* (TN *prematurely*) (Masenko, 2017, pp. 88–91). The paradoxical situation when a word is available in the dictionary as part of an illustration, but not included in the lexical inventory can be attributed to text censorship at the editing or publishing stage. The censor, obviously, had removed the dictionary entry related to the word *banderivets,* but failed to notice it in one of the illustrations.

The word *banderivets* and its derivatives emerged many years later in an additional volume of the "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language", which was published in 2017 and was ideologically a very different edition. It recorded several meanings of the word *banderivets*, stating the possibility of both positive and negative assessments depending on the beliefs of the author of the statement: "*Banderivtsi* (singular: *banderivets (m), banderivka (f)*). 1. *Historically* Members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, led by Stepan Bandera. 2. *figurative, colloquial, positive or negative*. Conscious Ukrainians" (Hrytsenko et al., 2017, v. 1, p. 43).

The interpretation of the words *banderivets, bulbivets,* and *melnykivets* would have required mentioning the names of the leaders of the Ukrainian Movement, S. Bandera, A. Melnyk, and T. Bulba-Borovets, in the Soviet dictionary. Even if their actions were viewed negatively, this would have meant emphasising the experience of armed resistance to Soviet rule. Moreover, the same words were used with a neutral or positive connotation by foreign Ukrainian sources that opposed the Soviet empire, – (4), (5), (6):

(4)   *Yakykh by zakhodiv bolshevyky ne vzhyvaly, to pravda pro nas, **banderivtsiv**, pravda pro vyzvolnu borotbu ukrainskoho narodu zavzhdy sobi promostyt shliakh do sovietskykh narodnikh mas* (P. Fedun-Poltava,1948, HRAK-18).
      *Regardless of the measures the Bolsheviks took, it's all true about us, **banderivtsi**, the truth about the Ukrainian Liberation Struggle will always find a way to the Soviet masses* (P. Fedun-Poltava, 1948, HRAK-18).
(5)   *Usi dermanski khloptsi, usi do odnoho, u **banderivtsiakh**, u **melnykivtsiakh**, u **bulbivtsiakh**...* (U. Samchuk, 1958, HRAK-18).
      *All the lads from Derman'[6], absolutely all of them are now **banderivtsi, melnykivtsi, bulbivtsi…*** (U. Samchuk, 1958, HRAK-18).
(6)   *V tabori ch. 11 uviazneno velyku kilkist molodykh ukraintsiv, yaki nazyvaiut sebe **banderivtsiamy*** (A. Mykulyn, 1958, HRAK-18).
      *"A great number of young Ukrainians who call themselves **banderivtsi** are imprisoned in camp p. 11"* (A. Mykulyn, 1958, HRAK-18).

Thus, the absence from the dictionary of such words as *banderivets, bulbivets, melnykivets* contributed to the silencing of information about the past and part of the present life of the Ukrainian nation.

The words *upivets* and *ounivets* were just as "dangerous". They referred to members of the military formations of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UIA), which was associated with the national liberation movement during the Second World War and in the post-war period, and participants of the political movement of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), which aimed to build an independent Ukrainian state. The word *upivets* was most likely not used in the public Soviet discourse, while the word *ounivets* was used in printed media, fiction and reference books. It is noteworthy that it was also used in the multi-volume encyclopedia "The History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR", which received the USSR State Prize. In the volumes describing the Soviet view of the history of western Ukraine, the word *ounivets* is one of the instruments of official propaganda – (7), (8):

(7)   *Ta **ounivtsiam** ne vdalosia domohtysia zdiisnennia svoiei pidloi mety* (Istoriia mist i sil Ukrainskoi RSR, Chernivetska oblast, 1969, HRAK-18).
      ***Ounivtsi**, however, failed to achieve their mean aim* (The History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR, Chernitsi region, 1969, HRAK-18).
(8)   *Sela y mista staly svidkamy naistrakhitlyvishykh zlochyniv okupantiv i **ounivtsiv*** (Istoriia mist i sil Ukrainskoi RSR, Ivano-Frankivska oblast, 1971, HRAK-18).
      *Villages and towns witnessed the most hideous crimes committed by occupiers and **ounivtsi*** (The History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR, Ivano-Frankivsk region, 1971, HRAK-18).

---

6   TN *Derman'* – a village in the Rivne region in the western part of Ukraine.

Thus, although the term *ounivets* was used by Soviet historical science and propaganda, it was ignored by the academic dictionary of the Ukrainian language.

The words *upivets* and *ounivets* were used in texts by Ukrainians in the western diaspora who approved of the activities of the OUN and UIA – (9), (10), (11):

(9) *Stvoriuvannia demoralizatsii i rozbyttia sered prybulykh z Kraiu **upivtsiv**, vyklykannia sered nykh dvokratnoho rozkolu* (S. Bandera, 1949, HRAK-18).
*Sowing discord and demoralisation among the **upivtsi** who arrived from the Lands, causing a double split among them* (S. Bandera, 1949, HRAK-18).

(10) ***Upivtsi** niiakykh vtrat ne maly, khoch bulo yikh vsoho dva roi* (U. Samchuk, 1958, HRAK-18).
***Upivtsi** suffered zero losses, even though there were only two swarms of them* (U. Samchuk, 1958, HRAK-18).

(11) *Tak v "osobomu otdieli" dovidalys, pyshut avtory knyzhky, pro te, shcho v polku diialy **ounivtsi*** (Visti kombatanta, 1971, HRAK-18).
*That is how the "special department" found out, according to the authors of the book, about **ounivtsi** who acted in the regiment"* (Visti Kombatanta "Combatant News")[7], 1971, HRAK-18).

The importance of the OUN and UIA for anti-Soviet Ukrainian discourse, as well as the reluctance to provide full names of Ukrainian nationalist organisations in the definitions, even in an imperial context, could be the reasons for the absence of the words *upivets* and *ounivets* in the dictionary inventory.

The dictionary included no mention of the terms *mazepynets* and *bohdanivets* associated with the historical figures of Ivan Mazepa and Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who were important for the formation of the Ukrainian idea. This was, possibly, caused by limited sources used, or because the words were related to the development of the idea of Ukrainian statehood, as well as the events of 1917–1921, when Ukrainians fought against Russians in an attempt to create their own state. In the dictionary, this period is represented primarily by the terms *petliurivets*, *petliurivskyi*, and "*petliurivshchyna*". They are connected with the name of Symon Petliura, a Ukrainian public figure and military leader, whom the dictionary called "one of the leaders of the petty-bourgeois nationalist party" (Bilodid, 1970–1980, v. 6, p. 344).

Given that many Ukrainian texts in the USSR were banned, lexicographers might not have been aware of the use of the words *mazepynets* and *bohdaniv-*

---

[7] *TN Visti Kombatanta (Eng."Combatant News")* – a scientific, historical, and socio-political journal that was first published in 1961 in the United States.

ets in the Kyiv press at the beginning of the 20th century, or that *bohdanivtsi* were the soldiers of the 1st Ukrainian Regiment (named after B.Khmelnytsky), who fought against the Bolshevik army, in particular defending Poltava and Kyiv. Even the examples of the primary meanings of the use of the word *mazepynets*, which referred to distant historical events, might not have been discovered by linguists due to the tendentiousness in the presentation of the history of the Russian Empire during the Soviet period. Initially, *mazepinets* referred to the supporters of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, who in 1709 concluded a military alliance against Moscow with the Swedish King Charles XII. Later, in the Russian Empire, the word *mazepynets* began to be used to negatively describe supporters of autonomy and political independence for Ukraine. The use of the word *mazepynets* in Ukrainian texts evidences that it was regarded as reflecting the coloniser's view of the colonised, labeling them as traitors.

(12)   *Prozyvaly yikh zradnykamy, separatystamy,* **mazepyntsiamy** *za se* (M. Hrushevskyi, 1912, HRAK-18).
       They were called traitors, separatists, **mazepyntsi** (M. Hrushevsky, 1912, HRAK-18).

(13)   *Dosyt bude pryhadaty, shcho vzhe v nashi chasy, na pochatku 20-ho stolittia, ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh buv okhreshchenyi yoho vorohamy imenem "mazepynstva", a prykhylnykiv tsoho rukhu nazyvano "**mazepyntsiamy**"* (D. Doroshenko, 1933, HRAK-18).
       *It would be enough to remember that in our times, at the beginning of the 20th century, the Ukrainian Liberation Movement was nicknamed by its enemies "mazepynstvo", and its followers were labelled '**mazepyntsi**'* (D. Doroshenko, 1933, HRAK-18).

It is noteworthy that after the disappearance of colonial restrictions, when Ukraine became an independent state, the words *mazepynets*, *petliurivets*, and *banderivets* began to be actively used in public domain to demonstrate the attitude towards Ukrainians in the Russian Empire – (14), (15), (16):

(14)   *U rizni chasy ukraintsiv nazyvaly "**mazepyntsiamy**", potim "**petliurivtsiamy**", a teper "**banderivtsiamy**"* (Ukraina moloda, 2010, HRAK-18).
       *At different times, Ukrainians were called "**mazepyntsi**", then "**petliurivtsi**", and now "**banderivtsi**"* (Ukraina Moloda 'Young Ukraine'[8], 2010, HRAK-18).

(15)   *I zavzhdy bortsiv za tsi idealy rosiiski okupanty oholoshuvaly bandytamy, prykleiuvaly yim prynyzlyvi klychky typu* **mazepyntsi, petliurivtsi, banderivtsi**... (Den, 2014, HRAK-18).

---

[8]   TN Ukraina Moloda 'Young Ukraine' is a daily Ukrainian-language newspaper based in Kyiv.

*The fighters for these ideals were always declared criminals by Russian occupiers, and were given humiliating nicknames like **mazepyntsi, petliurivtsi, banderivtsi…*** (Den 'Day'[9], 2014, HRAK-18).

(16)   *U diiachiv ukrainskoho vyzvolnoho rukhu zavzhdy buly imena: spochatku vony buly **mazepyntsiamy**, todi vony staly **petliurivtsiamy**, a vzhe potim **banderivtsiamy*** (NV, 2022, HRAK-18).

*The leaders of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement always had names: initially they were **mazepyntsi**, then they became **petliurivtsi**, and only later **banderivtsi**.* (NV 'The New Voice of Ukraine'[10], 2022, HRAK-18).

The words *banderivets*, *bulbivets*, *melnykivets*, *upivets*, *ounivets*, *mazepynets*, and *bohdanivets* attest to the existence of Ukraine's armed resistance to imperial coercion. Their consistent coverage in the dictionary could have destroyed the image of Ukrainians living happily in a multinational state and would have recorded names that at different times were used to negatively assess and condemn Ukrainians for their aspiration for political independence. The absence of such words in the most authoritative dictionary contributed to the normalisation of the colonial situation and was natural for a text that represented imperial discourse. Words associated with the names of well-known public figures of the Ukrainian movement and Ukrainian organisations referred to the counter-discourse which had been constructed using prohibited works.

4.2.2. Nouns Denoting Persons Associated
with the Idea of Ukraine's Political Independence

The active development of the Ukrainian Movement at the end of the 19th-beginning of the 20th century, as well as the realisation of prospects and tasks of the Ukrainian project, required putting new senses into words. During this period, the works of Ukrainian public figures emphasised the nouns denoting persons that attested to the influence of the idea of Ukraine's political independence. The word *derzhavnyk,* which was initially used to refer to a public figure, obtained a new meaning – 'a supporter of Ukrainian statehood'. The first meaning was recorded at the beginning of the 20th century in Hrinchenko's dictionary. The use of the word in both meanings can be observed in a considerable number of Ukrainian texts of that period, as well as later, mainly in works published outside the Ukrainian SSR – (17), (18), (19), (20):

---

[9] Den (Eng. *Day*) – a newspaper.
[10] *The New Voice of Ukraine* or simply as the *New Voice (NV)* is a Ukrainian, English and Russian language digital newspaper based in Ukraine.

(17)   *Ot teper nimetski **derzhavnyky** vidibraly vid Frantsii Alzas i Lotarynhiiu, ne pytaiuchy yii liudei i yavno proty yikh voli* (M. Drahomanov, 1913, HRAK-18).

*So now German **derzhavnyky** have taken Alsace and Lorraine from France without asking its people and clearly against their will.* (M. Drahomanov, 1913, HRAK-18).

(18)   *I ukrainski **derzhavnyky**, i komunisty, i bili ta chervoni rosiiany opysuiut sebe yak hrupu, shcho proishla cherez vazhki strasti i ponesla velyki zhertvy …* (M. Kulish, 1929, HRAK-18).

*Ukrainian **derzhavnyky**, and communists, and white and red Russians describe themselves as a group that endured hardships and suffered great losses…* (M. Kulish, 1929, HRAK-18).

(19)   *I Somko, i Bohun, i Doroshenko, yak velyki ukrainski **derzhavnyky** zaznaly porazok, bo ne zrushyly narodnykh mas* (Ia. Stetsko, 1951, HRAK-18).

*Somko, and Bohun, and Doroshenko, being truly great Ukrainian **derzhavnyky**, all lost, because they failed to stir the masses* (Y. Stetsko, 1951, HRAK-18).

(20)   *Vin – virnyi i poslidovnyi ukrainskyi **derzhavnyk*** (Visti kombatanta, 1970, HRAK-18).

*He is a loyal and consistent Ukrainian **derzhavnyk*** (Visti Kombatanta 'Combatant News', 1970, HRAK-18).

The importance of the word *derzhavnyk* in constructing a national counter-discourse is stressed by the fact that it became part of the names of Ukrainian political organisations, therefore gaining an official status. The Ukrainian Union of Farmers-Derzhavnyky (UUFD), and later the Union of Hetmans-Derzhavnyky, (UHD) were monarchist in orientation and operated abroad, where they distributed their publications for an extended period of time, including during the preparation and publication of the dictionary. The UHD, which had branches in all countries of the Ukrainian diaspora, was perceived by the Moscow authorities as hostile, because it aimed to restore Ukrainian statehood (Ostashko, 2012).

In Soviet Ukrainian sources, the word *derzhavnyk* was not commonly used, although it was associated with Ukrainian anti-imperial discourse, so the academic dictionary ignored both the practice of using the word *derzhavnyk* in both meanings and the experience of its lexicographical fixation. Although the dictionary edited by B. Hrinchenko is mentioned in the Preface as one of the sources, its materials were used selectively. In total, about 25,000 words from B. Hrinchenko's dictionary were not included in the eleven-volume explanatory monolingual dictionary (Hnatiuk, 2014, p. 16). According to V. Vynnyk, "From the early 1930s, the dictionary edited by B. Hrinchenko was effectively banned as "bourgeois-nationalist" and unavailable to the general public" (Vynnyk, 2013, pp. 20–21). In 1958, while preparations for an academic dictionary

of the Ukrainian language were underway, Hrinchenko's work was republished, but initially the Institute of Linguistics intended to censor the publication: "A group was established in the dictionary department tasked with putting together lists of words that were to be removed from the lexical inventory and illustrative material that was also to be removed when the dictionary was republished" (Vynnyk, 2013, p. 21). Later, it was decided to publish the dictionary without omissions, but with a preface containing a warning to users.

Since the 1990s, when Ukraine became an independent state, the word *derzhavnyk* has been actively used in the media, educational and scientific literature, and in the Verkhovna Rada – (21), (22), (23):

(21) *Yak i Lypynskyi, Dontsov — perekonanyi **derzhavnyk**; yak i Lypynskyi, vin – prykhylnyk elitarnoi derzhavy* (M. Popovych, 1998, HRAK-18).
*Just like Lypynsky, Donstov is a convinced **derzhavnyk**, just like Lypynsky, he is a supporter of an elitist state* (M. Popovich, 1998, HRAK-18)*.*

(22) *My znaiemo, shcho tsia liudyna ye **derzhavnykom**, ye patriotom i vona vestyme nas u pravylnomu napriami* (Iz stenohram Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy, 1998, HRAK-18).
*We know that this person is a **derzhavnyk**, a patriot, and will lead us in the right direction* (From the transcript of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 1998, HRAK-18).

(23) *Ale my ne pidnialy Franka, a vin ye svitovym heniiem, naibilshym ukrainskym **derzhavnykom*** (Vysokyi zamok, 2009, HRAK-18).
*But we did not elevate Franko, although he is a world genius and Ukraine's greatest **derzhavnyk*** (Vysokyi Zamok, 'High Castle', 2009, HRAK-18).
In political debates and journalism, the term began to be used to name "a politician who cares about the interests of the state" (24), (25):

(24) *Yakshcho za tsiu spravu vizmutsia naukovtsi y **derzhavnyky**, a ne prodazhni polityky hroshovykh mishkiv, sprava ukrainizatsii Ukrainy nabere konstruktyvnoho i lehitymnoho kharakteru* (Den, 2016, HRAK-18).
*If scientists and **derzhavnyky** take on this cause, rather than corrupt politicians with deep pockets, the process of Ukrainisation will assume a constructive and legitimate character* (Den', 2016, HRAK-18).

(25) *Zaishlo bahato novykh oblych, ale malo **derzhavnykiv*** (NV, 2019, HRAK-18).
*Many new faces have emerged, but few **derzhavnyky** among them* (NV, 2019, HRAK-18).

The lexical inventory dictionary also does not include the word *samostiinyk*, whose use is closely linked to the political processes of the early 20th century. In texts from this period, it occasionally referred to supporters of political independence in different countries, but in most cases, it referred to the Ukrainian context. The word *samostiinyk* was primarily associated with the idea of Ukrainian independence. Importantly, it referred not only to supporters

of the idea, but also to those who actively implemented it, members of relevant political parties and movements, and concerned not only the past, but also the present life of Ukrainians.

(26)   *Sohodnia chuiu, shcho ya y my vsi nikoly ne buly y ne mozhemo buty samostiinykamy, bo samostiinytstvo tse vykliuchno sotsiialistychna prykmeta* (V. Lypynskyi, 1926, HRAK-18).
Today, I hear that I and all of us have never been and cannot be samostiinyky, because independence is an exclusively socialist trait (V. Lypynsky, 1926, HRAK-18).

(27)   *M. Mikhnovskoho pidderzhav dr. Ivan Lutsenko ta inshi samostiinyky* (P. Mirchuk, 1953, HRAK-18).
M. Mikhnovsky was supported by Dr. Ivan Lutsenko and other samostiinyky (P. Mirchuk, 1953, HRAK-18).

(28)   *Ta tse, dorohyi mii, zhovto-blakytnyi prapor ukrainskoi kontrrevoliutsii, prapor samostiinykiv!* (Ia. Rudnytskyi, 1966, HRAK-18).
But this, my dear, is the yellow and blue flag of the Ukrainian counterrevolution, the flag of samostiinyky! (Y. Rudnytsky, 1966, HRAK-18)

The word *samostiinyk* was used as part of the name of one of the Ukrainian parties associated with the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 – the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Samostiinyky (UPSS), and was also used in the names of periodicals (Boiko, 2019). In 1918, the UPSS published a weekly magazine, called "Samostiinyk", and in the 1950s, a weekly, and later a monthly, magazine called "Ukrainian Samostiinyk", associated with the OUN, was published in Munich. The words *samostiinyk* and *derzhavnyk* also became part of the official name of the part of the OUN led by S. Bandera. From 1943, it used the name OUN *Samostiuniky Derzhavnyky* (OUNSD).

The word *samostiinyk* also appeared in the works of Ukrainian Soviet writers and in opinion journalism, where the activities of supporters of Ukrainian independence were portrayed as bourgeois-nationalist and counterrevolutionary – (29), (30), (31):

(29)   *Vykryky, samostiinyky ne daiut yomu hovoryty* (O. Korniichuk, 1933, HRAK-18).
Shouts, samostiinyky won't let him speak (O. Korniichuk, 1933, HRAK-18).

(30)   *– Chuie moia dusha, shcho tsei samostiinyk naklyche bidu i na svoiu, i na tvoiu holovu* (M. Stelmakh, 1961, HRAK-18). *– My soul senses that this samostiinyk will bring trouble upon both himself and you* (M. Stelmakh, 1961, HRAK-18).

(31)   *I vse tse chynyly natsionalistychni "provodyri" vzhe pislia toho, yak Hitler odverto napliuvav na yikhni marennia pro "vidrodzhennia samostiinoi Ukrainy", navit postriliav ta povishav kilkokh osoblyvo zapalnykh ukrainskykh "samostiinykiv"* (Perets, 1980, HRAK-18).

*And all this was done by nationalist "leaders" after Hitler had openly spat on their delusions of "reviving an independent Ukraine" and even shot and hanged several particularly ardent Ukrainian "**samostiinyky**"* ('Perets', 'Pepper'[11], 1980, HRAK-18).

In spite of this, the dictionary did not follow Soviet propaganda, choosing instead to remain silent. However, the dictionary inventory includes the word *zhovtoblakytnyk* (yellow-blue), used by Soviet propaganda, along with the terms *mazepynets petliurivets*, and *banderivets*, to condemn and discredit the actions of supporters of Ukrainian independence – (32), (33):

(32)   *Ostannia nadiia **zhovtoblakytnykiv** lusnula pid nimetskym chobotom, nache nadutyi svyniachyi mikhur* (Ia. Halan, 1943, HRAK-18).
*The last hope of **zhovtoblakytnyky** burst under the German boot like an inflated pig's bladder* (Y. Halan, 1943, HRAK-18).

(33)   *Os iz yakoho dzherela berut vodu, shchob prymusyty krutytysia koleso antyradianskoho mlyna, i **zhovtoblakytnyky**, i patentovani suchasni "radianolohy"* (Komunist Ukrainy, 1973, HRAK-18).
*That's the source from which they draw water to turn the wheel of the anti-Soviet mill, both the **zhovtoblakytnyky** and the patented modern "sovietologists"* (Communist of Ukraine, 1973, HRAK-18).

The dictionary presented the word *zhovtoblakytnyk* as a derogatory term for a "representative of the Ukrainian national bourgeois revolution" (Bilodid et al., 1970–1980). v. 2, p. 541). In contrast to the words *derzhavnyk* and *samostiynik*, the word *zhovtoblakytnyk* was not coined within the Ukrainian movement. It was a derogatory term that appeared within the Soviet imperial discourse and stopped to be used in texts published after Ukraine's declaration of independence.

4.3. Socio-Historical Factors and Consequences of Vocabulary Gaps for the Construction of Ukrainian Identity

For the USSR, ideological censorship of any publications was common practice.

There were words that could have been excluded from the dictionary or removed from it in the process of scientific or literary editing, as well as during technical preparation for publication. Government control was exercised at all stages of work on the dictionary, and at each stage a decision could have been made not to draw attention to certain words. In a totalitarian state, different

---

[11] TN Perets', 'Pepper' is a Ukrainian satirical and humorous illustrated magazine.

words were classified as "dangerous". Important for the interpretation of the dictionary from a post-colonial perspective was the establishment of the fact that words related to the national memory of the colonised, the experience of anti-colonial struggle and the creation of their own state, the assessment of imperial expansion and domination, the development and dissemination of ideas about liberation from foreign rule, and the need for their own state were removed.

The analysis of the lexicographical description of nouns denoting persons in the Ukrainian language dictionary published in the USSR demonstrates selectivity in the formation of the lexical inventory. It omits the words that deny the authenticity of Moscow's dominance, its voluntary acceptance by Ukrainians, and the absence of imperial pressure. Nouns denoting persons associated with the names of the Ukrainian Movement leaders and the names of organisations that fought for the Ukrainian state brought to the attention of language speakers historical and contemporary facts of resistance to Moscow's rule, demonstrating the subjectivity of Ukrainians and their aspiration to have their own state. These words showed the Ukrainians' perception Ukrainians themselves had of Soviet power as foreign and recorded their long experience of armed resistance to Moscow.

Due to the incompleteness of the information presented about the nation's past, the dictionary became one of the instruments for constructing a version of Ukrainian national identity that was convenient for the Moscow authorities to subjugate. Given the dictionary's function, its authority in society, and the distribution of this edition to all scientific and educational institutions and libraries of the Ukrainian SSR, the spread of a censored view of the past was directed at the majority of Ukrainian speakers. In the USSR, the state controlled not only all publishing houses, but also the sale of all books, "ensuring that the information important to it was read and absorbed by as many people as possible" (Kyrydon, 2024, p. 28). Different reference books, textbooks, and manuals offered a similar selectivity in their portrayal of the past. In particular, the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia, published in 1959–1965 in 17 volumes in Ukrainian, and later republished in 1974–1985 not only in Ukrainian but also in Russian, did not contain articles about the UIA, S. Bandera, T. Bulba-Borovets, A. Melnyk, and other figures of the Ukrainian Movement, although S. Bandera and A. Melnyk were mentioned in the article on the OUN.

The Dictionary of the Ukrainian language, created under Soviet control, ignored the existence of Ukrainian anti-imperial discourse, represented in texts from both the pre-Soviet past and the Soviet period, published both in Ukraine and abroad. Meanwhile, as M. Ryabchuk noted, the rise of the Ukrainian national project was possible due to the decisive rejection of colonial "normality", and then, accordingly, the national identity was molded within its discursive framework (Ryabchuk, 2019, p. 116). The desire to establish an independent state was reflected at the linguistic level in the specific terms *derzhavnyk* and *samostiynik,* which were actively used in Ukrainian anti-imperial discourse. The censorship of these words concealed from users of the Soviet dictionary a certain way of thinking about Ukraine's past, present and future, offering only an imperial perspective.

By exercising complete control over the media, scientific and educational discourse, the authorities supported discursive practices that affirmed the dominance of the imperial narrative about the historical unity of Ukraine and Russia, and therefore the authenticity of their membership in the USSR. The fact that Russians were considered pioneers in implementing communist ideology was a strong argument in favour of their civilisational superiority. Formal recognition of the distinctiveness of the Ukrainian people and culture through the creation of the Ukrainian SSR, which was entirely controlled from Moscow, was presented as the ultimate level of self-realisation for Ukrainians. The unavailability in the USSR of Ukrainian texts that represented a non-imperial vision of Ukraine, especially foreign ones, state control over all stages of work on the dictionary, and the cruelty inherent in the Soviet regime in persecuting dissenters led to the incompleteness of the dictionary, which its authors did not always realise and readers might not have noticed.

When using the Ukrainian Soviet dictionary nowadays, it is important to take into consideration the fact that it was created by a subjugated nation under the control of the imperial centre, and thus its data does not always reflect the real state of affairs. In our opinion, in this case, it is worth considering the opinion of Ch. Spivak, expressed in the now classic work of post-colonial studies, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" "When we come to the concomitant question of the consciousness of the subaltern, the notion of what the work *cannot* say becomes important" (Spivak, 1994, p. 82). In a text as special as the Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, created under the conditions of the Russian-Soviet empire, the unsaid requires special attention from researchers.

5. Conclusions

The publication of a dictionary is a kind of ideological act, since its text is determined by certain social factors, and ultimately, influences society. The eleven-volume Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language contains important information about the Ukrainian language and culture; however, it portrays Ukrainians in compliance with the official ideology of the USSR. The authors of the Soviet Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language were unable to fully cover the past and present of their nation. This was influenced by the state's total control over the creation and publication of the dictionary, as well as the traumatic experience of Ukrainians living in a Soviet totalitarian state. Consequently, the dictionary became an instrument of authoritarian control and a form of colonising activity, performed by the colonised themselves.

The words disclosing the experience of armed and political struggle of Ukrainians against Moscow's rule and capturing important aspects of Ukrainian anti-imperial discourse remained invisible to dictionary users. Due to the ban on processing texts written by Ukrainians outside the USSR, the dictionary offered a false view of the Ukrainian nation. The epistemological gaps in the dictionary contributed to the construction of Ukrainian national identity as part of the Soviet imperial project.

A critical study of Ukrainian Soviet dictionaries, as well as dictionaries published later in independent Ukraine, will make it possible to trace changes in ideological orientations reflected in lexicographical practice, and analyse the role of dictionaries in constructing the national identity of Ukrainians in the colonial and post-colonial periods. Interpreting what remained unsaid in dictionaries, as well as in linguistic works and language teaching works of the Soviet period will help to understand the peculiarities of the colonial experience of Ukrainians and improve the scientific description of the Ukrainian language.

Sources

Bilodid I. K. (Ed.). (1970–1980). *Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy: v 11 t.* Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

Heneralnyi rehionalno anotovanyi korpus ukrainskoi movy (HRAK-18), M. Shvedova, R. fon Valdenfels, S. Yaryhin, A. Rysin, V. Starko, T. Nikolaienko, A. Lukashevskyi ta in. Kyiv, Lviv, Yena, 2017–2025 [in Ukrainian]. https://uacorpus.org.

Hrinchenko, B. (Ed.). (1907–1909). *Slovar ukrainskoi movy. 1–4.* http://history.org.ua/LiberUA/SlUkrM_1907/SlUkrM_1907.pdf.

Hrytsenko, P. Yu. (Ed.). (2017). *Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy v 11 tomakh. Dodatkovyi tom. Knyha 1.* Vydavnychyi dim Dmytra Buraho [in Ukrainian].

Rusanivskyi, V. M. (Ed). (2010). *Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy. U 20 t. Tom 1. A-B.* Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

References

Alnizar, F., Mufidah, V. N., Yani, Z. (2025). Framing faith and language: a critical discourse analysis of socio-religious etymologies in indonesian lexicography. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 28* (1), 128–152.

Bennigsen, A. (1969). Colonization and Decolonization in the Soviet Union. *Journal of Contemporary History, 4* (1)*,* 141–51.

Boiko, O. D. (2019). Ukrainska partiia sotsialistiv-samostiinykiv. In A. V. Smolii (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy. Ukraina – Ukraintsi* (Book 2, pp. 627–628). Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

Demska, O. (2012). Ideolohiia i slovnyk. *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist, 21,* 276–281 [in Ukrainian].

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language.* Longman.

Hnatiuk, I. (2014). "Slovar ukrainskoi movy" za redaktsiieiu Borysa Hrinchenka v otsintsi ukrainskykh movoznavtsiv. *Leksykohrafichnyi biuleten, 23,* 7–17 [in Ukrainian].

Hrytsak, Y. (2015). The Postcolonial Is Not Enough. *Slavic Review*, *74* (4), 732–737.

Kołodziejczyk, D., & Şandru, C. (2012). Introduction: On colonialism, communism and east-central Europe – some reflections. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 48* (2), 113–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2012.658242.

Kyrydon, A. (2024). Universalna entsyklopediia yak kulturnyi kod ta identytet natsii. In A. Kyrydon (Ed.), *Ukrainska entsyklopedystyka v umovakh vyklykiv i zahroz natsionalnii identychnosti* (pp. 18–42). Derzhavna naukova ustanova "Entsyklopedychne vydavnytstvo" [in Ukrainian].

Martin, T. (2013). *Imperiia natsionalnoho vyrivniuvannia: natsii ta natsionalizm u Radianskomu Soiuzi (1923–1939 roky).* Krytyka [in Ukrainian].

Masenko, L. (2017). *Mova radianskoho totalitaryzmu.* KLIO [in Ukrainian].

Matusiak, A. (2020). *Vyity z movchannia. Dekolonialni zmahannia ukrainskoi kultury ta literatury XXI stolittia z posttotalitarnoiu travmoiu.* LA "Piramida" [in Ukrainian].

Moon, R. (2014). Meanings, Ideologies, and Learners' Dictionaries. Proceedings of the XVI EURALEX International Congress: The User in Focus, 85–105. https://euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex2014/euralex_2014_004_p_85.pdf.

Ostashko, T. S. (2012). Soiuz hetmantsiv-derzhavnykiv. In A. V. Smolii (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* (Vol. 9, p. 735). Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

Plokhii, S. (2021). *Brama Yevropy.* Knyzhkovyi klub "Klub Simeinoho Dozvillia" [in Ukrainian].

Pozdran, Yu. V. (2016). "Rosiisko-ukrainskyi slovnyk" za redaktsiieiu A. Yu. Krymskoho ta S. O. Yefremova yak dzherelo perekladnykh slovnykiv XX–XXI st.: ofitsiinyi status ta

leksykohrafichna krytyka. *Aktualni problemy filolohii ta perekladoznavstva, 10,* 281–287 [in Ukrainian].

Renchka, I. (2018a). *Leksykon totalitaryzmu.* KLIO [in Ukrainian].

Renchka, I. (2018b). Zminy v semantytsi leksychnykh odynyts ekonomichnoi sfery v suchasnii ukrainskii tlumachnii leksykohrafii. *Mova: klasychne – moderne – postmoderne, 4,* 111–128 [in Ukrainian].

Riabchuk, M. (2019). *Dolannia ambivalentnosti. Dykhotomiia ukrainskoi natsionalnoi identychnosti.* IPiEND im. I. F. Kurasa [in Ukrainian].

Riabczuk, M. (2013). Colonialism in another way. On the applicability of postcolonial methodology for the study of postcommunist Europe. *Porównania*, *13*, 47–59.

Shevelov, Yu. (2002). Pokolinnia dvadtsiatykh rokiv v ukrainskomu movoznavstvi. In Yu. Shevelov, *Portrety ukrainskykh movoznavtsiv* (pp. 8–30). KM Akademiia [in Ukrainian].

Shpak, A. P., & Yurkova, A. V. (2010). Natsionalna akademiia nauk Ukrainy. In A. V. Smolii (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* (Vol. 7, pp. 244–262). Naukova dumka.

Spivak, G. C. (1994). Can the Subaltern Speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 66–111). Routledge.

Taranenko, O. (2018). Slovnyky ukrainskoi movy v diialnosti Akademii nauk Ukrainy. *Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, 4,* 5–14 [in Ukrainian].

Uchechukwu, Ch. (2011). Foreign culture lexicography and beyond: Perspectives from the history of Igbo lexicography. In E. A. Anchimbe & S. A. Mforteh (Eds.), *Postcolonial linguistic voices: identity choices and representations* (pp. 201–212). De Gruyter Mouton.

Vynnyk, V. O. (2012). Yak stvoriuvavsia akademichnyi tlumachnyi "Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy" v 11-ty tomakh. In I. S. Hnatiuk (Ed.), *Ukrainska i slovianska tlumachna i perekladna leksykohrafiia: Leonidovi Sydorovychu Palamarchukovi* (pp. 16–27). KMM [in Ukrainian].

Włodarczyk-Stachurska, A. (2015) Dictionaries and ideologies: some remarks of the EFL lexicography. *Journal of Education Culture and* Society, *1*, 26–39.