

life, participating in educational campaigns, the popularization of culture and social media. To enable this there had to be social facilities—nurseries, kindergartens, cafeterias, and laundries—releasing women from household duties in order to engage in public activities. Promotion of women from previously unprivileged classes encountered strong resistance from traditionally privileged groups “such as landowners, the bourgeoisie and the Catholic Church” (172). In order to become practical reality, rather than just a political catchphrase, emancipation of women required significant changes in public life.

Post-Stalinism, predicated by Nikita Khrushchev’s “Secret Speech” (March 1956), was particularly dramatic in Poland, leading to the notion of “revisionism” as a key tenet in Władysław Gomułka’s twelve-year leadership. This proposed a reinvigorated intellectual environment, restoring the “left” to the complexities that Stalinism had eliminated, and a workers’ impulse towards self-management and participation in direct democracy. The chapter by Bartłomiej Starnowski discusses Jacek Kuroń and Karol Modzelewski’s “Open Letter to the Party” (1966) as the leading manifesto of opposition to communist monopoly and advocacy of a social-democratic vision of economic recovery and a socially-supported state. The author acknowledges that this was a “definitely left-wing” (236) form of political resistance but concludes—with Modzelewski himself—that it soon became dated. He identifies this with a post-communist “ritual of penance” in which such a historical narrative was not deemed to be helpful any more.

The book’s final part is focused on the waning of Polish communism during its final decades. Anna Zawadzka traces the wilting of its idea to deprive the intelligentsia of elite status and to promote instead workers and the peasantry. Rather than achieving this “revolutionary project of shifting social relations” (314), she sees a slow return of the ethos of the old intelligentsia during and after the post-Stalinist “thaw.” This demonstrated a failure of the transformation of social structure which had been eagerly undertaken at the outset of the communist era. Its reinstatement was symbolic of old-rooted class distinctions, in which an elite of those with the “authority of the highbred” was restored.

Much of interest is proposed in this extensive volume, which draws attention to notions of continuing intellectual and perhaps practical importance. Given the mode of research—only one author of the thirteen uses archives—their findings cannot be deemed conclusive. A positive function of academic research is to raise further questions.

ANTHONY KEMP-WELCH
University of East Anglia

Ukrainian-English Collocation Dictionary. By Yuri I. Shevchuk. New York: Hippocrene Books, 2021. xxxvi, 970 pp. \$59.95, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.253

The publication of this *Ukrainian-English Collocation Dictionary* (further to be referenced as UECD) comprises a monumental event in Ukrainian lexicology. It is described as six dictionaries in one: translation, collocation, learner’s, thesaurus, phraseological, and encyclopedic. It hits the mark on each of those categories with copiously detailed entries, which exhibit the compiler’s in-depth knowledge of both Ukrainian and English. Yuri Shevchuk navigates back and forth seamlessly between the two languages and presents consistently suitable versions of Ukrainian words and phrases in English.

The minimalist cover design by Natasha Mikhalchuk, with an illustration by Lev Sloujitel, is inviting and appropriate for the dictionary. The letters “r” and “i” on it serve orthographically to differentiate the Ukrainian from the Russian alphabet. Unfortunately, the thin cardstock cover bends and curls after even light use. I would hope that in the future the publisher offer the choice of a hard cover as well as an electronic version. The paper is high quality and the type and printing eminently readable. The dictionary includes 200,000 word combinations, 80,000 examples of word usage, 8000 synonymic groups, and 1000 antonyms. Besides succinct translations of Ukrainian words into colloquial English, the compiler provides head words and derivative phrases and expressions using those head words with accompanying translations into English. This collocational aspect of the dictionary is particularly useful to learners of Ukrainian and their language instructors.

The compiler highlights the fact that his dictionary takes into account the intense Russification of Ukrainian that occurred during Soviet times. To a great degree the dictionary decolonizes Ukrainian from coercive Soviet influences and historical suppression. It represents what the Ukrainian language was meant to be had it developed under normal circumstances without Russification. The author is to be applauded for the consistency of his approach, though actual usage and the spelling of words in Ukraine may vary in media and literary sources from what appears at times in his dictionary. Shevchuk himself calls his methodology “prescriptive lexicography” rather than “descriptive.” He largely follows the Kharkiv orthography of 1928 rather than Russified spellings of Soviet times meant to bring Ukrainian closer to Russian.

Here are a few practical examples of how Shevchuk’s dictionary differs from two others of the most significant previous dictionaries, which both have been reprinted several times: the C.H. Andrusyshen and J.N. Krett *Ukrainian-English Dictionary* (1955; further referred to as UED); and the Ye.F. Popov and M.I. Balla *Comprehensive Ukrainian-English Dictionary* (2003; further referred to as CUED). The former was published in Canada and the latter in independent Ukraine.

To give a sense of the relative scope of the three dictionaries, I will compare definitions of three words in them: the verb “здавати” and the nouns “тупик” and “справа.” The Andrusyshen UED provides four single-word definitions of the verb “здавати” and six examples of usage for a total of ten lines. The Balla CUED has twenty-one lines, five different numbered definitions, and eleven examples of usage. The collocation dictionary, which uses a smaller typeface than both of the other two dictionaries, consists of over seventy lines and thirty examples of usage. Thus, the sheer volume of information provided in Shevchuk’s UECD dictionary indicates its extraordinary value as a research tool. The compiler provides accents for all the words in his definitions, which makes it especially useful to learners of Ukrainian.

The noun “тупик” does not appear in the Andrusyshen UED dictionary. Balla’s CUED dictionary provides just a single definition of the word: “dead end siding,” which is a term used in railroading. Shevchuk’s UECD dictionary provides the literal meaning of “dead end, cul-de-sac, blind alley” as well as the figurative meaning of “impasse, dead end, deadlock.” It also provides six examples of usage as well as an indication of the plural form “тупики.”

For the word “справа,” the Andrusyshen UED provides twenty-six lines in its definitions, the Balla CUED approximately sixty, and Shevchuk’s UECD over 200 lines. The sheer abundance and quality of information in Shevchuk’s entries should make his dictionary a primary source that translators and learners should go to in seeking translations of Ukrainian words and expressions. Shevchuk’s collocation dictionary, the first of its kind for any Slavic language, should also serve as a useful template for future compilers of similarly constructed dictionaries for the Slavic

world. Shevchuk's UECD in sum is a remarkable contribution to Ukrainian lexicology that will have a meaningful impact for decades to come.

MICHAEL M. NAYDAN
The Pennsylvania State University

Making Ukraine Soviet: Literature and Cultural Politics under Lenin and Stalin.

By Olena Palko. Library of Modern Russia. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020. xiv, 266 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Maps. \$115.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.254

The historiography of western and post-Soviet Ukrainians has generally taken a dim view of the early Soviet period. This includes the utopic mid-1920s, the heyday of state-sponsored Ukrainization, which promoted Ukrainian language and culture while promising to reverse the oppressive legacies of Russian chauvinism and imperialism. Leading Bolsheviks believed that this approach would win Ukrainians over to the socialist cause, hopefully preempting a resurgence of "separatist" Ukrainian nationalism, which the Red Army struggled to defeat between 1918 and 1921. The prevalent narrative among Ukrainian researchers holds that Soviet Ukraine experienced an extraordinary literary and artistic renaissance in the 1920s, but that this renaissance was "executed" by the *siloviki* following the rise of Iosif Stalin, the suppression of Ukrainization's most avid supporters, and the return to Russification as state policy. Viewing the 1920s through the lens of the famine-genocide of 1932–33, which killed millions in Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian historians tend to condemn the entire Soviet project, from start to finish, as violently Ukrainophobic. Even Ukrainization, half implemented then discarded, worked insidiously to secure the Muscovite monopoly on high culture, science, and power. The Ukrainians who aligned themselves with the Soviet state and the Communist Party either had to betray something vital about their national identity or face persecution, whereas an authentic Ukrainian culture and politics could only be anti-Soviet. State-sanctioned Soviet Ukrainian culture could only be a colonial parody of Ukraine's national genius.

In *Making Ukraine Soviet: Literature and Politics under Lenin and Stalin*, Olena Palko offers a far more nuanced account of the intersection of interwar Ukrainian culture and Soviet power. Instead of treating the Communist Party's abandonment of Ukrainization as a foregone conclusion, baked into the veiled Russian imperialism of Bolshevik ideology, Palko emphasizes the agency and originality of the authentically Ukrainian and anticolonial, yet pro-Soviet, writers of the 1920s. The reorientation of our perspective that this book urges is a sorely needed corrective to Moscow-centric diffusionism and neocolonial stereotypes about Ukraine more generally, which are rife across the disciplines in Slavic Studies. Palko centers Ukrainian actors, ideas, and texts on both sides of the conflict between "Soviet Ukrainian culture and Soviet culture created in the Ukrainian language" (4)—between an autonomous and uniquely Ukrainian version of Sovietness, on the one hand, and a centralized all-Soviet ethos translated into the local idiom, on the other. Palko uncovers Sovietization and Ukrainization as bitterly contested processes that were internal to and proceeded from Ukrainian life, not mere impositions from outside. She argues convincingly that the unified Soviet Ukrainian literary canon, which emerged after the 1930s, was in fact the result of an amalgamation of these competing projects.

Combining biography, literary analysis, and a close reading of the era's polemics, Palko analyzes two renowned Ukrainian writers—the prosaist Mykola Khvyly'ovy