

<https://doi.org/10.33190/0027-2833-344-2025-5-007>

## THE WORLD SHOULD KNOW MORE ABOUT THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN WARTIME UKRAINE

[Review of the book: Kiss, Nadiya and Wingender, Monika (eds.): *Contested Language Diversity in Wartime Ukraine. National Minorities, Language Biographies, and Linguistic Landscape*. Hannover–Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2025. 408 pp. ISBN-10: 383821966X; ISBN-13: 978-3838219660.]

This volume is the outcome of the international project *Contested Language Diversity: Dealing with Minority Languages in Post-Soviet Ukraine and Russia*. The project was originally funded by the Volkswagen Foundation (2020–2023) as part of its funding program «Trilateral Partnerships — Cooperation Projects between Scholars and Scientists from Ukraine, Russia, and Germany» (p. 7), which was overseen by Monika Wingender from the University of Gießen. Following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, collaboration with all Russian participants was canceled. However, the Institute for Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, along with the Uzhhorod National University, and the Izmail State Humanitarian University continued their involvement in the program. Some contributors had already begun exploring «contested language diversity» in Ukraine prior to 24 February 2022 and updated their texts later. The project's guiding principle was so-called «methodological triangulation», i. e., «comparing and analyzing data from official language-related documents and language legislation, media texts, and language biography interviews (more than 100 interviews were conducted within the project)» (p. 7).

The volume comprises an introduction by Monika Wingender and Nadiy Kiss (pp. 7–12), six papers in «Section I: Influence of the War on Language Use and Attitudes» (pp. 15–162), and eight articles in «Section II: Indigenous People, National Minorities and Regional Perspectives» (pp. 165–408). In the introduction, the editors emphasize that «the language situation and language policy in Ukraine has experienced drastic changes» (p. 8). They summarize the most important developments of recent years, including the 2019 language law, the 2021 law «On Indigenous People» and the 2022 law «On National Minorities (Communities)» (the highly controversial education law could have been added, although it had already been issued in 2017). Section I focuses on the coexistence of Ukrainian and Russian in Ukraine, while Section II considers other languages. Some of the papers have been published in Ukrainian collective volumes or journals, as the authors duly indicate.

Цитування: Мозер М. The world should know more about the language situation in wartime Ukraine [Рец. на: Kiss, Nadiya and Wingender, Monika (eds.): *Contested Language Diversity in Wartime Ukraine. National Minorities, Language Biographies, and Linguistic Landscape*. Hannover–Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2025. 408 p.]. *Мовознавство*. 2025. № 5. С. 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.33190/0027-2833-344-2025-5-007>

Citation: Moser M. (2025). The world should know more about the language situation in wartime Ukraine [Review of the book: Kiss, Nadiya and Wingender, Monika (eds.): *Contested Language Diversity in Wartime Ukraine. National Minorities, Language Biographies, and Linguistic Landscape*. Hannover–Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2025. 408 p.]. *Movoznavstvo*, (5), 74–82. [In Ukrainian]. <https://doi.org/10.33190/0027-2833-344-2025-5-007>



Стаття опублікована за ліцензією CC BY-SA 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

Svitlana Sokolova's «Language Behavior of Ukrainians Against the Background of the Full-Scale War. Trends of Change» (pp. 15–36) focuses on the «language preferences and linguistic behavior» of internally displaced persons [furthermore: IDP] and «residents of the regions that host them (mainly western)» (p. 15). The analysis is based on a survey of 759 interviewees (including 257 internally displaced persons) conducted via Google Forms in May and June of 2022 (p. 18). While the author acknowledges that these data are not fully representative, they allow for an interesting comparison with the data from a more reliable 2017 survey. Sokolova confirms the radical shift in attitudes toward Russia and the Russian language. First and foremost, in 2022 almost none of the interviewees declared a Russian (national or ethnic) identity, «probably putting citizenship rather than ethnicity in the first place» (p. 21). More respondents than ever declared Ukrainian as their «native language» (рідна мова), even if Russian was the language they spoke as children.

Furthermore, «half of the IDPs changed their language behavior and began to speak Ukrainian completely or at least more often» (p. 28) or rather claimed that this was the case. The author correctly comments, «It can be assumed that the percentage of Russian speakers in everyday life might be somewhat higher, since we offered the questionnaire only in Ukrainian, which convinced Russian speakers' might not want to answer» (p. 30). Moreover, the fact that prevalently Russian-speaking IDPs speak Ukrainian «more often» in western regions is undoubtedly supported by their new linguistic environment. Some critical readers may wonder what basis some of the interviewees used to assess their language as «Surzhyk» (p. 30). Was this category an option in the questionnaires, or did the respondents introduce it? What kind of surzhyk did they have in mind? While the author acknowledges the existence of language conflicts between IDPs and long-time residents, they conclude cautiously that the media tends to exaggerate these conflicts.

Olena Ruda explores «Language and War. Language-Related Discourse in Ukraine Since the Beginning of the Full-Scale Invasion» (pp. 37–67). Referring to a National Democratic Institute of Ukraine survey, she states that «84 percent of respondents have begun to communicate more in Ukrainian» (p. 40), or rather, claimed to have done so. The paper's tone is patriotic, which is understandable given the situation of war. Some statements should have been avoided. For example, is it true that a «vision» of the power of the Ukrainian language «is shared by the entire population that consists of different groups of speakers and lives in different regions of Ukraine and beyond its borders» (p. 42). The analysis focuses on social media. Though it lacks coherence at certain points, it offers interesting insights. Some conclusions are questionable (p. 58: «What unites Russian and Ukrainian speakers is a negative attitude to such a phenomenon of Ukrainian linguistic reality as 'surzhyk'», illustrated by one post). Ruda mentions the new word *Ukrained*, but does not explain its meaning.<sup>1</sup> She does not comment on the new expression «Jonsoniuk» (rather: *džonsonjuk*) either (p. 63) (it is a humorous reference to the British politician Boris Johnson, who has shown great solidarity with Ukraine). The intriguing new word *затрі́дні*, which refers to well-known Russian propaganda slogans, is explained as if it were a verb. In fact, it is a plural noun meaning 'unrealistic plans' (p. 64). The English translation of a Ukrainian

<sup>1</sup> <https://chytomo.com/en/ukrained-is-a-new-word-in-the-urban-dictionary/>

pun is misleading: «Do you not want peace with Russia? I want peace without Russia!» (p. 65); instead of [...] *I want a world without Russia* (the pun is based on the homonymy of the Russian word *мир*, which means both 'peace' and 'world').

Liudmyla Pidkuimukha's «Russia Must Be Opposed on All Fronts. How the Full-Scale War Has Changed Language Situation in the Ukrainian Business Environment» (pp. 69–89) is based on «interviews with business owners and CEOs and their posts on social media» (p. 69). The interviews were collected from online sources. In the introductory parts, Pidkuimukha summarizes the results of recent surveys. She defines *рідна мова* as «native language (first language)» (p. 72) without further explanation, though other studies in the volume clearly demonstrate that these concepts often do not align. Pidkuimukha could have related the increased use of Ukrainian in the business sphere even prior to the full-scale war to Ukrainian language legislation from the outset (p. 75). She does refer to the 2019 language law in the following chapter (p. 76). However, the law did not take effect in July 2022 (p. 76), but rather in May 2019 (a transitional period was foreseen for the implementation of some of the provisions). Some readers may wonder how the author selected her sources, but their relevance is obvious, as some of Ukraine's largest companies are involved. One might ask whether *файна мова* should be translated as «a cool language» without further comment (p. 77). Instantly, *теребені* is not usually explained as 'chatting' (p. 77), but as 'nonsense'. Finally, the meaning of «the pure Ukrainian lexical units» (p. 78) remains unclear.

Anastassia Onatii discusses «Totalitarian Echoes. Mapping the Influence on Ukrainian Language Textbooks» (pp. 91–117). Although Soviet propaganda undoubtedly has its peculiarities, it is not true that «the ideological influence on Ukrainian textbooks began in 1921» (p. 92): Textbooks are always impacted by ideologies, including earlier ones. Onatii briefly mentions some overt markers of Soviet ideology in Ukrainian textbooks before analyzing five Ukrainian textbooks from 1955, 1985, 1992, 2013, and 2018 for their use of place names. She rightly views these names as «covert linguistic instruments» (p. 94). As expected, more Ukrainian and fewer Russian toponyms were used in independent Ukraine than during the Soviet era. Interestingly, the author interprets this shift as «a specific conservative focus on Ukrainian realities» (p. 98). Few readers will understand why Onatii decided to regard the toponym *Caucasus* as non-Soviet, arguing that the mountain range «also extends into parts of northeastern Turkey and northern Iran» (p. 98). If that is the case, then why are the Carpathian Mountains considered a Ukrainian toponym? Fortunately, the author provides fragments of the textbooks in English translation and their original Ukrainian. However, she does not mention that many of the quotations are taken from well-known texts that were reprinted in the textbooks: For example, the first quotations are taken from a poem by Pavlo Tyčyna (p. 99). In the 1955 textbook, the «North Pole» is not a toponym, but rather the name of a drifting ice station. Most non-Ukrainian readers will not understand what BAM is (the Baikal–Amur Mainline, a railway line) (p. 103). Onatii's comment about the inadequate representation of Western Ukrainian toponyms in two Soviet textbooks raises doubts: «In contrast to the historical conditions of 1955, ideological reasons prevailed in 1985» (p. 105). The assertion that «Eastern Ukraine almost wholly disappeared» (p. 107) in the 1992 textbook is misleading, because earlier textbooks also rarely referenced East Ukrainian places, as demonstrated by Onatii's fine cartographic illustrations. More East Ukrainian toponyms reappear in the 2013 and 2018 textbooks. Therefore, the author's far-reaching conclusion is difficult to accept («The insufficient informational and humanitarian

national policy in these regions became one of the reasons for the widespread Russification over a prolonged period <...>»; p. 114).

In «Changes in Language and National Consciousness of Ukrainians in the Period of Russia's Full-Scale War in Ukraine» (pp. 119–139), Natalija Matvejeva summarizes the most important findings of recent language polls. She also introduces her readers to a survey she conducted in Ternopil in 2022 and compares it to an earlier survey she had conducted in Kyiv in 2017. The lengthy introduction is somewhat simplistic. Although one might agree that «everyone associates France with the French language» (p. 120) the author herself is certainly aware that the actual language situation in France is more complicated. This is true not only in France, but also in many other countries that are not necessarily associated with one language, and also in regard to many languages that are not necessarily associated with one state. Generally, Matvejeva's overview of recent language surveys is informative, but some of her comments are questionable. Her interpretation of the substantial in the ominous conception of *рідна мова* is convincing: «If earlier these respondents understood their native language as the language of their parents, i.e. the language they were spoken to since childhood (Russian), then nowadays they started to understand their native language as the language of their Motherland» (p. 125). Matveeva signals her awareness that a comparison of a survey of 300 students in de facto monolingual Ternopil in 2022–2023 with a survey of an unspecified group of students in bilingual Kyiv in 2017 is somehow strange (p. 131). In her poll, the notion «Surzhyk» also poses a problem (p. 131; see above). Matveeva apparently did not include the category as an option in her 2017 survey, but she did in 2022–2023. The author argues that «it is known that the prestige of a language means its authority in the international communication» (p. 132). However, the survey question explicitly addressed the prestige of Ukrainian and Russian in Ukraine (ibid.). The most interesting part of the Ternopil survey concerns the students' attitudes toward Russian-speaking Ukrainians, particularly those who are internally displaced (pp. 134–135).

Taras Tkachuk discusses «Moral Values of the Ukrainian-Speaking and Russian-Speaking Students in Bilingual Settings» (pp. 141–162), based on a survey of 944 students (ages from 15 to 18) conducted in the Vinnytsja region. Of those students, 881 were Vinnytsia city residents, and the rest were residents of small towns in the region. The timeframe of the survey is unclear. It spanned from 2011 or 2014 to an unspecified date before the full-scale Russian invasion (p. 141). The author himself regards any differences regarding moral values such as «safety», «power», «achievement», etc. as «insignificant» (ibid.). Some readers may doubt the success of this attempt to reveal a «correlation between a speaker's moral values and language choice in bilingual settings» (p. 142). Furthermore, it would have been helpful to know in which language(s) the questionnaires were written. Nevertheless, the article presents interesting findings about the coexistence of Ukrainian and Russian in the Vinnytsia region before February 2022.

The second section opens with «Crimean Tatars in the Context of War, Displacement and Forced Migration. Language Policy and Behavior» (pp. 165–200), co-authored by Nadiya Kiss and Ivanna Car. The article provides a good overview of this important topic «based on the analysis of legislation, media texts, and a detailed analysis of 11 linguistic biographies of Crimean Tatars» (p. 165). Particular attention is paid to the impact of the Russian wars of 2014 and 2022 on the Crimean Tatars and their languages. However, information on several achievements provides too few references: the free online course «Qırım: Crimea is Us»,

the introduction of a Crimean Tatar language course at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, the «Strategy for the Development of the Crimean Tatar Language for 2022–2032», the «National Commission for the Crimean Tatar Language» (established in January 2023), and «the National Corpus of the Crimean Tatar Language», the announcement of the interdisciplinary program *Crimean Studies* at Kyiv Mohyla Academy<sup>2</sup>). Unfortunately, there is no mention of the Center of Crimean Tatar Language and Literature, which has existed at Kyiv's Taras Shevchenko University since 2016.<sup>3</sup> The authors emphasize that, in their conversations with respondents, they were able «to notice the peculiarities of their pronunciation, code-switching and other linguistic aspects that cannot be identified through questionnaires» (p. 170). Hopefully, this will also apply to Crimean Tatar in future interviews. One of the transcripts states that an inserted Crimean Tatar sentence «may not be completely correct, as the interviewer did not speak Crimean Tatar» (p. 180). This is, of course, far from ideal. Due attention is paid to the 2021 law *On Indigenous People* (pp. 172–173) and the 2022 law *On National Minorities (Communities)*. Regarding the situation prior to 2021–2022, monitoring documents on the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages might have been a good additional source. As with most contributions, fragments from language biographies are unfortunately only available in English translation (though not all of the translations appear to be reliable; see «decaternalization» on page 186). The remark, «Pay attention to the switching of codes in the informant's speech» (p. 181) remains unclear. Perhaps bold print was occasionally used to indicate Russian fragments in some cases, but in others, it apparently just highlights elements considered especially relevant. Table 1, «Changes in linguistic consciousness and linguistic behavior of Crimean Tatars caused by the war» (p. 184), is intended to generalize information from the language biographies, but it raises many questions. The authors themselves are aware that «since the study is not quantitative, we cannot state how widespread this awakening of national and language awareness is in the Crimean Tatar community» (p. 196). Further initiatives could possibly be coordinated with the «National Commission for the Crimean Tatar Language».

Bohdan Azhniuk's «Ethnolinguistic Demarcation of Public Space in the Linguistic Landscape of Transcarpathia, Ukraine» (pp. 201–244) is a seminal work. Focusing on the cities of Berehove (which has a high proportion of Hungarian inhabitants) and Užhorod (the region's capital), Azhniuk provides a convincing in-depth analysis with rich illustrations. Azhniuk demonstrates how Russian military aggression in Ukraine has become visible in the linguistic landscape. Moreover, he competently comments on various issues related to language policy, which is another field of his expertise. Interestingly, on one of his photographs, the Ukrainian names of the dentists appear in the order surname + initial of the given name + initial of the patronym. In contrast, the Hungarian names appear as surnames followed by the full given name, without the patronym (p. 217). On p. 218, we see a bilingual private announcement from Berehove. It demonstrates that its author was probably not Hungarian, or was at least not fully familiar with standard Hungarian (*nyul hus* for *nyúlhús*, meaning 'white meat'). Azhniuk's ob-

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.ukma-edu-ua.translate.google.com/eng/index.php/research/centres/crimean-studies-center-of-kyiv-mohyla-academy?\\_x\\_tr\\_sl=en&\\_x\\_tr\\_tl=de&\\_x\\_tr\\_hl=de&\\_x\\_tr\\_pto=sc](https://www.ukma-edu-ua.translate.google.com/eng/index.php/research/centres/crimean-studies-center-of-kyiv-mohyla-academy?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=de&_x_tr_hl=de&_x_tr_pto=sc)

<sup>3</sup> <https://philology.knu.ua/struktura-if/tsentry/tsentr-krymskotatarskoyi-mov-lit/>

servations on the presence of local dialects in the linguistic landscape of Transcarpathia are of utmost interest. His interpretation that the relevant inscriptions (most of which are humorous) are not textual evidence of the Rusyn language movement is convincing: None of them adhere to the rules suggested in recent Rusyn language standardization attempts. Some dialect words should have been translated because even speakers of Ukrainian will not understand them (most of these words are loans from Hungarian). Interestingly, none of the inscriptions render the Hungarian name of Užhorod correctly (they all use «Ungvar» instead of *Ungvár*). Azhniuk aptly comments on the presence of English and Italian in the linguistic landscape of Transcarpathia. Some of these signs are clearly intended to appear fancy, while others are aimed at foreign visitors. A fascinating example of people's creativity is a maternity clothing store called «to be», which sounds similar to Ukrainian *моби* 'you' (dat. sg.). A neighboring clothing store is called *sobi* 'yourself' (dat. sg.) (p. 230). The name of the boutique *Milan* (p. 234) is interesting because it is not standard Italian (*Milano*), but rather an English name or a nod to the city's local dialect. As Azhniuk convincingly argues, most Russian inscriptions are remnants of the past.

In «Language Situation of National Minorities in Transcarpathia. Socio-Communicative Elements of Design and Linguistic Landscape» (pp. 245–272), Lesia Hychko focuses on what she prefers to label as «the communication design of urban space» (p. 246). The article presents interesting materials, including a local medium that uses the Latin alphabet for Ukrainian (pp. 261–262) and (not necessarily Transcarpathian) attempts to create a «more Ukrainian» version of the Cyrillic alphabet (pp. 263–264). Most readers will quickly realize that the author is a design specialist rather than a linguist. Most postcards from mid-war Subcarpathian Rus' do not have «Slovak» (p. 248), but Czech components. The language biography fragments that Hychko collected shed light on Ukrainian-Hungarian and Ukrainian-Romanian language conflicts. Most interviewees confirm that the media tends to exaggerate the tension.

Halyna Shumytska contributes «Autobiographical Narrative of Linguistic Personality Formation in a Multilingual Border Region. Documentation Based on In-Depth Interviews» (pp. 273–297). Overall, the text is interesting, but it contains too many tautologies. In this contribution, we learn more about the 25 in-depth interviews recorded by the Užhorod team that were also relevant to Hychko. The interviews were presumably conducted in Ukrainian, which excluded some ethnic Hungarians from the outset. Did the Romanian woman from Užhorod really say, «In 1990 we switched to Latin» (p. 280), or did she refer to *латиниця*, i. e., the Latin script? Some sentences are not fully understandable (p. 287: «in the periods when this territory [the Transcarpathian region] was subordinated to different states simultaneously, there could be radically opposing linguistic and political aspirations that persist to this day»). Statements exaggerating the exceptional status of Transcarpathia and its multilingualism would have required commentary. Not everyone in the region speaks all the languages involved. As in other regions, it is primarily the minority language speakers who tend to know the most languages.

Vasyl Sharkan explores «Media Discussions on the Functioning of Minority Languages in Transcarpathia» (pp. 299–323). He includes Polish, even though it is not widespread in Transcarpathia and is not mentioned in the region's language overview (p. 301). As the author himself explains (p. 305), the increased «interest in Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak and Polish languages» (p. 299) following Russia's full-scale invasion was clearly not due to an interest in minority languages,

but rather due to the prospect of seeking refuge in neighboring countries. The most interesting part of this paper is Sharkan's analysis of the media coverage of the political debates between Hungary and Ukraine regarding language issues. Hungarian names are not always rendered correctly. Regarding the «turul» scandal in Mukachevo, it would have been appropriate to cite Bohdan Azhniuk's essay, in which he provides a detailed explanation of the situation prior to 2022 (pp. 214–215).<sup>4</sup>

Ivanna Car's article, «Language Adaptation of Ethnic Russians in the West of Ukraine» (pp. 325–346), draws upon the language biographies of just three individuals from Velyn, a village in the Lviv region. Of course, the three individuals had to learn the Ukrainian language of their new home. Two of the women have essentially adopted Ukrainian as their primary language, but the man, who moved to Velyn at age 48, has not. Some statements are irritating; see, e. g., p. 334: «when talking about her adaptation to the Polish-speaking environment [while working abroad], Olha unconsciously and uncontrollably began to use some Polish words (*dobrze, bardzo*, etc.)» (see also p. 340). Why is the author so confident that this was an «unconscious and uncontrollable» process? In some cases, readers would probably prefer to hear from the respondents themselves rather than read the author's judgmental descriptions. The author's assessments of the respondents' language competence would have been more compelling if they had been supported by examples (p. 338–340). The findings of this study are rather audacious in light of the limited number of respondents.

Andriy Kolesnykov and Maryna Delyusto contribute «From the Observations of Dynamics of Language Situation in the Multilingual Area Between the Dniester and the Danube Rivers» (pp. 347–383), which deals with «the dynamics of the language situation» in southern Besarabia (p. 347). The essay is often redundant and makes many subjective generalizations. Some fragments are rather vague. Allegedly, «the Turkic and German ethnolinguistic components» (p. 348) had dominated in the region since the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, although German migrants did not arrive until the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The periodization raises doubts. The authors distinguish the years from 1991 to 2000 as the «post-Soviet period» and the years from 2001–2022 as the «pre-war period». However, the 2014 annexation of Crimea particularly impacted the entire Black Sea region. The authors are certainly well-acquainted with the language situation in the region from their own experience. In any case, it is impossible that between 1991 and 2000, the Ukrainian language «*de facto* does not yet exist in the region» (p. 354). The authors themselves describe their existence in some detail later on (p. 355). The initial identification of the Lipovans' idiom with the Russian standard language is not convincing (*ibid.*). A clarification is provided later (p. 360). Curiously, the authors claim that, between 1991 and 2000, «the area is characterized by internationalism» (p. 356). Presumably, this was an inaccurate translation of *міжнаціональність*. The classification of various languages as «strong» or «weak» or «average» is not always convincing. Support for minority languages from abroad is primarily viewed as an external threat (pp. 364–365). The 2019

<sup>4</sup> «An important development in the semiotic demarcation of space was the erection in 2008, in Mukachevo, the second largest city of Transcarpathia, of the twenty five meters high monument to turul — a mythical bird of pray which, in the 9th and 10th centuries, used to be the symbol of the Hungarian Árpád dynasty (Tin'). It is still one of the key symbols of Hungarian identity and there are numerous monuments to turul throughout Hungary.» In October 2022, the statue was removed.

orthographic rules are not convincingly characterized as a «rejection of the peculiarities of the South-Eastern Ukrainian dialects» (p. 367). Overall, the article does offer some interesting observations, particularly concerning the local linguistic landscape (pp. 368–370). References to alleged language assessments based solely on hearsay are less convincing (e. g., p. 371). Many of the statements read as if they were from an op-ed piece. Only some of them are confirmed by the interview respondents, most of whom were young women of Gagauz origin. Given the fact that speakers of Russian understand it only with great difficulty, it is hard to believe that «the Russian Lipovan dialect is associated with an invader» (p. 379). On the other hand, Russian is their native language only in the most relative sense.

Finally, Svitlana Nemyrovska describes the «Perception of the Ukrainian Language Amongst National Minority Representatives in Chernihiv» (pp. 385–408). Her nine particularly interesting language biographies were collected in the summer and fall of 2021, i. e., before the full-scale aggression. In her introduction, the author briefly describes the events of the first months of the war when Chernihiv was temporarily occupied by the Russian army. After providing an overview of Chernihiv's history, she reports on the respondents, who «identified themselves with Jewish [2 persons], Polish, Azerbaijani, Chuvash, Belarussian [sic, along with *Belarusian*; 2 persons], and Russian [2 persons] nationalities» (p. 390). Curiously, the Azerbaijani person «called himself *Ukrainian Highlander* (UKR: *український горець*), trying to emphasize his ties with Ukraine» (p. 390). The youngest respondent was born in 1989, the oldest in 1946. Eight out of nine «consider[ed] Russian to be their mother tongue» (p. 391), two «communicate[d] in Ukrainian as their main language on a daily basis» (ibid.). Three persons «answered the interviewer's questions in Ukrainian», and two more occasionally switched to Ukrainian (ibid.). Nemyrovska's article clearly reveals the importance of preserving the original language of interviews, as many significant nuances are lost in translation.

In technical terms, the volume as a whole is edited quite carefully, though some details were overlooked. The bibliographies are an exception. Ukrainian-language publications are transliterated inconsistently and exhibit many errors. Their transliteration also follows different rules. In some cases, Ukrainian-language publications are followed by a translation. Sometimes Ukrainian titles are capitalized, as is often done in English. Some articles are overly redundant. Clearly, many contributions would have benefited greatly from further editing by a native English speaker. In any case, the volume is an important contribution to the study of the Ukrainian language during wartime. For future work with language biographies, new steps seem desirable: First, the selection criteria for respondents must be explained. Second, all language biographies should be made available in their entirety and in the original language, at least online (audio versions would be even better). Without access to the full interviews, readers may assume that the excerpts are often used arbitrarily. Third, studies of minority languages should include researchers who are familiar with these languages.

#### **Michael MOSER**

Institut für Slawistik, Universität Wien  
Spitalgasse 2-4, Hof 3, A-1090 Wien, Austria  
E-Mail: michael.moser@univie.ac.at  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3693-1291>

**Міхаель МОЗЕР**

Інститут славістики Віденського університету  
Шпітальгассе 2-4, Гоф 4, А-1090 Відень, Австрія  
Електронна пошта: michael.moser@univie.ac.at  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3693-1291>

**СВІТ ПОВИНЕН БІЛЬШЕ ЗНАТИ ПРО МОВНУ СИТУАЦІЮ В УКРАЇНІ  
ПІД ЧАС ВІЙНИ**

[Рец. на: Kiss, Nadiya and Wingender, Monika (eds.): Contested Language Diversity in Wartime Ukraine. National Minorities, Language Biographies, and Linguistic Landscape. Hannover–Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2025. 408 pp.].

Дата надходження до редакції: 12.09.2025

Дата надходження після доопрацювання: 15.09.2025

Дата затвердження редакцією: 17.09.2025

Received: 12.09.2025

Received in revised form: 15.09.2025

Accepted: 17.09.2025