

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-5312-2025-102-08>

УДК: 81'373:81'255.4

**Oksana Dzera**

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Hryhoriy Kochur Department of Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv; e-mail: [oksana.dzera@lnu.edu.ua](mailto:oksana.dzera@lnu.edu.ua);

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3471-0724>;

GOOGLE SCHOLAR: <https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?hl=uk&user=1opWdFYAAAAJ>;

RESEARCH GATE: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Oksana-Dzera>

## DECODING DICTIONARIES: THE CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE OF ROKSOLANA ZORIVCHAK

The article explores the critical legacy of Roksolana Zorivchak in Ukrainian lexicography. It argues that dictionaries function not merely as linguistic tools but also as essential instruments of cultural memory and national identity. This problem gains particular relevance in the context of globalization and Russian aggression, when issues of language, culture, and identity become especially acute. The aim of the article is to highlight Zorivchak's role as a critic of Ukrainian lexicography and to assess the significance of her work for contemporary studies in metalexicography. The methodological foundation of the paper is based on the interdisciplinary approach encompassing Translation Studies, Metalexicography and Cultural Studies. The research combines historical and critical perspectives to trace the evolution of Ukrainian lexicography under varying sociopolitical conditions and applies methods of comparative analysis, discourse analysis and hermeneutic analysis. The main findings reveal that Prof. Zorivchak addressed a wide range of issues: from preserving national traditions in dictionary-making to introducing innovative approaches, especially in translation and terminological lexicography. Her critique exposes the manipulative potential of dictionaries in a totalitarian society while simultaneously emphasizing their role in restoring cultural continuity. Importantly, her legacy demonstrates how dictionaries can resist ideological pressure and serve as spaces for safeguarding linguistic diversity. Zorivchak's observations continue to resonate in today's scholarly debates, particularly in the context of decolonial approaches to Ukrainian studies. Thus, her contribution not only enriches Ukrainian lexicographic criticism but also provides a framework for understanding dictionaries as both scholarly and political instruments. The conclusions stress that revisiting Zorivchak's contributions opens new avenues for studying dictionaries as instruments of cultural resistance, identity preservation, and integration of Ukrainian lexicography into the global academic landscape.

**Key words:** *culture, dictionary, identity, lexicography, Ukraine, Roksolana Zorivchak.*

**In cites:** Dzera, O. (2025). Decoding dictionaries: the critical perspective of Roksolana Zorivchak. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series: Foreign Philology. Methods of Foreign Language Teaching*, (102), 66-73.  
<https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-5312-2025-102-08>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The article addresses the underestimated role of dictionaries in shaping cultural identity and preserving national language. Dictionaries are often considered merely linguistic instruments, while their cultural, historical, and ideological dimensions remain underexplored. In the context of globalization and Russian aggression, the issues of language, culture, and identity are especially acute for Ukraine.

The evolution of Ukrainian lexicography has long been shaped by historical, cultural, and political conditions. Scholars emphasize that the development of dictionaries in Ukraine cannot be separated from the pressures of Russification and ideological control, particularly during the Soviet period. As Mykhailo Panochko [3] notes, even in the 1970s – when an average of 20 new Ukrainian dictionaries appeared annually – lexicographic activity was conducted under significant constraints. Despite these challenges, landmark projects such as the multi-volume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* provided a foundation for subsequent research and helped preserve Ukrainian linguistic and cultural identity.

Recent scholarship has highlighted both the progress and unresolved challenges in the field. Studies by Iryna Blynova & Victoria Davydenko [11] and Nataliia Snizhko [8] elucidate the influence of digitalization and globalization on dictionary-making, noting the emergence of new types of dictionaries – encyclopedic, discursive-stylistic, and multimedia – that reflect the dynamism of contemporary language use. The integration of computer technologies has significantly expanded the accessibility and functionality of dictionaries [10].

At the same time, critical reflections on the ideological role of lexicography have gained prominence. Valentyna Savchyn [14] demonstrates how under Soviet totalitarianism, dictionaries often became instruments of linguistic manipulation: by shaping norms of the dominant language, censoring entries, and embedding ideological stereotypes, they functioned as tools of assimilation and control. This destructive practice sought to weaken Ukrainian linguistic autonomy while reinforcing communist values.

Alongside these perspectives, more practice-oriented research has emerged. Oleksandra Litviniak [13] explores the use of dictionaries in interpreting, emphasizing their role not only during assignments but also in the professional development of interpreters. Meanwhile, bibliographic work by Dmytro Pylypchuk *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language: 1596–2018* [5, p. 36–38] underscores the importance of viewing the totality of Ukrainian dictionaries as part of the nation's cultural legacy.

Together, these studies illustrate that Ukrainian lexicography is both a site of struggle and innovation: historically marked by external pressures and ideological interference, yet increasingly characterized

by resilience, technological advancement, and a renewed emphasis on cultural identity.

Though a number of recent works in Ukrainian linguistics have examined dictionary-making, the contribution of Professor Roksolana Zorivchak as a critic of Ukrainian lexicography has not been systematically studied.

The study aims to analyze the critical legacy of Prof. Roksolana Zorivchak, her assessments of Ukrainian dictionaries of both the Soviet and independent periods, and her understanding of lexicography as a factor of resistance and nation-preservation.

Dictionaries constitute one of the most significant repositories of knowledge regarding the world, or more broadly, “a guide to the mind and world of a people” [12, p. 22], a cognitive map to past and present communities of speakers. More specifically, they serve as a representation of a particular culture, language, and collective identity. They operate as a dynamic record of a specific language during a defined period of its historical development.

Historically, dictionaries were created primarily to address the demands of language instruction and acquisition, to enhance communication via translation, to establish linguistic standards, and to serve as authoritative informational resources, among other functions. Nonetheless, their paramount importance lies in their contribution to language preservation and revitalization, as well as the affirmation of national identity and linguistic rights.

These dimensions have been largely overlooked by linguists, who typically perceive dictionaries as mere linguistic instruments rather than cultural artifacts, thereby limiting their analysis to the practical implications of lexicographical endeavors and the methodologies employed in their creation. In reality, the historical, political, and social environments have exerted a profound influence on the trajectories of both dictionaries and their compilers, who frequently became victims of authoritarian regimes or experienced significant disregard from authorities in the post-totalitarian state.

## 2. ROKSOLANA ZORIVCHAK AS A CRITIC OF UKRAINIAN LEXICOGRAPHY

The object of the study is Ukrainian lexicography as a cultural and linguistic phenomenon. The subject of the study is the critical activity of Prof. Roksolana Zorivchak devoted to the analysis of dictionaries.

Material of the study is drawn from reviews and articles by Prof. Zorivchak, collected in the monograph *Bolyty bolem slova nashoho*, namely her reviews of translation, terminological and phraseological dictionaries, as well as texts tracing the history of Ukrainian lexicography.

The methodological framework of this study rests on an interdisciplinary approach at the crossroads of Translation Studies, Metalexicography,

and Cultural Studies. The research combines historical and critical perspectives to trace the evolution of Ukrainian lexicography under varying sociopolitical conditions and to foreground Professor Roksolana Zorivchak's contribution as a lexicographic critic. A comparative analysis of key lexicographic projects in Ukraine and abroad is carried out to identify the interplay of linguistic, ideological, and cultural factors shaping dictionary-making. The hermeneutic method is employed to interpret Zorivchak's theoretical reflections and critical reviews, situating them within broader scholarly debates about the role of dictionaries in preserving national identity. Elements of discourse analysis are applied to reveal how lexicographic commentary encodes ideological positions, particularly in the Soviet and post-Soviet contexts. Finally, a descriptive and analytical synthesis integrates these findings, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation of Zorivchak's intellectual legacy and its relevance for contemporary Ukrainian lexicography.

The relevance of this study is determined by the need to reassess the role of dictionaries not only as linguistic reference tools but also as instruments of cultural resistance and identity preservation. In the context of Ukraine's struggle against centuries of Russification and the ongoing Russian aggression, the critical evaluation of lexicographic practices acquires both scholarly and societal importance. Dictionaries have historically functioned as sites of ideological influence, shaping perceptions of language norms and national culture. Therefore, examining Roksolana Zorivchak's contribution as a lexicographic critic highlights the ways in which Ukrainian scholarship has sought to defend and revitalize its linguistic heritage under conditions of political pressure. Her legacy remains highly relevant today, as the challenges of globalization, digitalization, and decolonization demand a reconsideration of the cultural functions of dictionaries in shaping Ukraine's place within the global academic and cultural landscape.

## 2.1. Historical perspective: lexicography under suppression

Prof. Roksolana Zorivchak was among the few who comprehended the revitalizing and maintaining function of dictionary compiling at the dawn of Ukraine's independence. "One of the key conditions for a fully-fledged nation is the availability of a large number of multidisciplinary, high-quality dictionaries"<sup>1</sup> [1, p. 202]. In her review of the *Ukrainian-Russian-English-German Explanatory and Translation Dictionary of the Market Economy Terms* (2001, ed. by Prof. Taras Kyiak), Roksolana Zorivchak contemplates the tragic circumstances of Ukrainian history preventing the professional development of dictionary compiling. The author highlights a short period of Renaissance

fostered by the indigenization policy of the early Soviet period. It stipulated the activity of the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language (1921-1930) formed in a bid to carry out research into terminology and compile terminological dictionaries. According to Zorivchak, the Institute collected the lexical card index comprising over 2 million units and released 16 dictionaries in the fields of chemistry, geology, mathematics, anatomy, zoology, botany, communal economy and military affairs etc., out of 34 that were in progress. Lev Poliuha [6, p.147] provides even more staggering figure – 24 dictionaries out of 40 planned.

Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to be sure of the exact number of dictionaries released because the seemingly favourable Ukrainization processes were interrupted in the early 1930s, with the onset of extensive and violent repression directed towards writers, scholars, translators, and various factions of the intellectuals. In the year 1930, the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language faced condemnation as an embodiment of nationalism, leading to its dissolution and subsequent replacement by the Institute of Linguistics within the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. The authors of terminological dictionaries were charged with the introduction of terms that were markedly dissimilar to their corresponding Russian counterparts, employing what were deemed unnatural and artificial neologisms, thereby attempting to forcibly distinguish the Ukrainian language from the Russian language. The terminological dictionaries were denounced as detrimental and subversive to state interests, resulting in the withdrawal of their copies from circulation and their widespread destruction. The dictionary-compilers were condemned as "enemy elements" embracing "a bourgeois-nationalistic ideology" [7, p. 146] and subjected to punitive measures. In 1929, Hryhoriy Kholodnyi, the head of the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language, was arrested and sentenced to eight years of incarceration, eventually facing execution in Solovki in 1938.

## 2.2. Dictionary-compiling in independent Ukraine and contemporary challenges

Despite her high appreciation of the reviewed dictionary *Ukrainian-Russian-English-German Explanatory and Translation Dictionary of the Market Economy Terms*, Prof. Zorivchak conveys her discontent regarding the broadly diminished scholarly caliber of terminological dictionaries published in Ukraine in the 1990s–early 2000s. Unfortunately, her recommendation to reinstate the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language remains unheeded [1, p. 203].

*Explanatory and Translation Dictionary of the Market Economy Terms* is praised primarily for thoroughly elaborated scientific principles and tendency to either combine transcription with descriptive explication or, when feasible, eschew transcription in favor of a transparent Ukrainian word or phrase.

<sup>1</sup> All translations of quotations from Ukrainian into English are done by the author of this article.

### 2.3. Prof. Zorivchak as a guardian of the linguistic culture

In several articles and essays, Prof. Roksolana Zorivchak has positioned herself as a vigilant guardian of the Ukrainian language, acutely aware of the potentially destructive effects of excessive linguistic globalization. For her, maintaining a high linguistic standard requires a robust sense of proportion and caution against overusing or misusing borrowings. Her works include incisive discussions on topics such as *On the Sense of Proportion in Using Borrowed Words* [14, p. 29-30], *On the Overload of Foreign Words* [1, p. 28], and *Did the Neighbor Really Enter Through the "Office Doors"?* [1, p. 43-44]. These are just a few of the compelling headlines from the chapter "Lexical and Grammatical Peculiarities" in her book *Bolity bolem slova nashoho [To Ache with the Pain of Our Word]*.

In the article *The Biggest Lexical Card Index of the Ukrainian Language is Inaccessible for Us* [1, p. 171-173], Prof. Zorivchak pays tribute to Academician Ahatanhel Krymskyi, a Ukrainian linguist, orientalist, historian, writer, and translator. His best-known contribution to lexicography is the *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary* (1924-1933), edited by him and Serhii Yefremov. The dictionary was intended as a four-volume work, though only three volumes were published. Its primary goal, as stated in the foreword, was to showcase the richness of the Ukrainian language by extensively documenting its lexical treasures, including numerous synonyms, derivatives, and idiomatic expressions [2, p. I].

The dictionary's completion coincided with the onset of Soviet Russification policies. The work was condemned for its so-called "bourgeois nationalist" character and alleged "artificial" separation of Ukrainian from Russian. The first three volumes were banned, withdrawn from circulation, and the unpublished fourth volume was destroyed. This suppression reflects the ideological manipulations of the era, as the dictionary offered a rare, undistorted view of Ukrainian linguistic identity before Soviet intervention.

Roksolana Zorivchak highlights Ahatanhel Krymskyi's pivotal role as Scholarly Secretary of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, where he established and led the Permanent Committee for Compiling the Dictionary of the Living Ukrainian Language. This committee initiated the creation of the Lexical Card Index of the Ukrainian Language – a project that endured despite the oppressive totalitarian regime. Over time, the index grew into a treasure trove of linguistic data, eventually forming the foundation for landmark works such as the 11-volume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (CYM, 1970-1980) and the 2-volume *Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (1993). By 1998, the index contained an astonishing 8 million cards. However, that same year, its repository in the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine was rented out to a Chinese restaurant, relegating the index to an attic where it languished for nearly a decade. In

a 2005 article, Prof. Zorivchak publicly appealed for its preservation, restoration and accessibility to the researchers [1, p. 173].

Today, the Institute of the Ukrainian Language at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine is transforming this invaluable resource into the Electronic Lexical Card Index (ELCI). This innovative, dynamic linguistic database serves as a modern lexicographic tool, enabling the collection, organization, and multi-parameter description of lexical material. The ELCI is envisioned as the cornerstone for developing a new generation of dictionaries, spanning general explanatory works, specialized glossaries, and industry-specific terminologies, thereby ensuring the continued evolution and preservation of the Ukrainian language.

Reflecting on the challenges facing Ukrainian lexicography, Roksolana Zorivchak [1, p. 204-205] lamented the absence of comprehensive Ukrainian thesauruses capable of capturing the intricate network of coordinative and subordinate relationships among linguistic units. Sadly, she did not live to witness the landmark 2021 publication of Oleksa Synychenko's *Thesaurus of the Ukrainian Language: Nature*, which marked a significant step toward addressing this gap.

Roksolana Zorivchak's review *On the Language of the Ukrainian Military* begins with the statement: "Ukrainians around the globe deem it important how and in what language the Ukrainian military speak. Without the Ukrainian literary language of our military, there is no Army, Armed Forces of Ukraine and, hence, the Ukrainian State" [1, p. 214]. In the article, the scholar analyses the *Concise English-Ukrainian Dictionary of American Military Slangisms* and *Glossary Of Ukrainian Military Slangisms* (2002) compiled by colonel Victor Balabin whom she calls a "highly qualified professional, a daring researcher-patriot" [1, p. 215].

The review *A Valuable Asset of Shevchenkiana* [1, p. 215-218] examines the monumental work *A Concordance to the Poetic Works of Taras Shevchenko*, a four-volume dictionary published in 2001 and edited by O. Il'nyts'kyi and Yu. Havrysh. This dictionary meticulously indexes the entire corpus of Shevchenko's poetic works, providing a comprehensive record of the location and textual context for every occurrence of each word in both his Ukrainian and Russian-language poetry, totaling 18,401 word forms. As the most detailed lexical analysis of any Ukrainian author's body of work to date, it serves as an invaluable resource for linguistic and literary studies. Each headword is listed alphabetically, accompanied by the total number of its occurrences in the text. Though it is not mentioned in the review, *The Concordance* may be used as a valuable tool for translators of Shevchenko's verse. Vera Rich, a distinguished translator, admitted that *The Concordance* had helped her identify the key words of *The Kobzar* and preserve them undiversified by synonyms.

Several of Zorivchak's articles focus on Ukrainian paremiography and phraseography, including *On the*

*Treasures of Ukrainian Phraseography* [1, p. 198–200], *On the Collection of Ukrainian Proverbs, Sayings, and Riddles* [1, p. 200–202], and *Drawing from Lukash's Well* [1, p. 211–213].

In particular, she examines the 2003 reprinted edition of *Halytski prypovidky i zahadky zibrani Hryhoriem Ilkevychem* [*Halychyna Proverbs and Riddles Collected by Hryhoriy Ilkevych*] (1841), shedding light on the activity of this unjustly forgotten folklorist, ethnographer, and pedagogue. Zorivchak explores Ilkevych's contributions and draws connections between his collection and Ivan Franko's monumental three-volume work, *Halytsko-Rus'ki narodni prypovisky* [*Folk Proverbs of Halychyna-Rus'*] (1901–1910), highlighting the continuity and significance of their efforts in preserving and studying Ukrainian folklore. Zorivchak [1, p. 199, 201] asserts that Franko's collection is among the finest phraseological resources globally, significantly advancing the field of contrastive phraseology. Each Ukrainian phraseological unit is enriched with equivalents from other Slavic languages as well as German, English, Spanish, Italian, Greek, and Armenian, offering a comprehensive cross-linguistic perspective and revealing the universal nature of human expression through language.

Zorivchak [1, p. 199–200] goes on to analyse Ukrainian Soviet phraseography of the “Thaw” period, namely *Phraseological Dictionary* by Natalia Batiuk (1966) and *The Dictionary of Ukrainian idioms* by Udovychenko (1968), as well as the two-volume *Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* published in independent Ukraine in 1993 and its revised one-volume edition *Dictionary of Phraseological Units of the Ukrainian Language* (2003).

## 2.4. Translation, lexicography and resistance

*Dictionary of Phraseological Units of the Ukrainian Language* (2003) is particularly noteworthy for sourcing examples not only from original Ukrainian texts but also from translations, including Mykola Lukash's renditions of Burns and Boccaccio, Borys Ten's translation of Homer, and Stepan Masliak's translation of Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk*. Of special interest is Prof. Zorivchak's review of *Phraseology of Translations by Mykola Lukash* (2002), a dictionary entering idioms used in Lukash's translations.

Lukash's idiomatic expressions stand out for their richness, as he drew from all strata of the Ukrainian language, embodying his principle of linguistic revitalization: “to shovel the language treasures acquired by our predecessors, put them into circulation, transfer them from the liabilities to the asset” [4, p. 412–413]. By transcending the linguo-ideological constraints of his era, Lukash breathed new life into many overlooked Ukrainian words, reclaiming them from the suppressive effects of Russian linguocide and enriching the Ukrainian lexicon with his pioneering approach.

In her review, Zorivchak emphasizes the rich synonymic variety of Lukash's works, which reflects

the well-developed Ukrainian synonymy capable of expressing the subtlest expressive and evaluative overtones. *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary* (1924–1933) edited by Krymskyi was condemned primarily for its extended Ukrainian synonymic rows as equivalents to one Russian counterpart. These synonymic strings were cut to a minimum in further (1937, 1948) publications of the *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary*. The major change, however, as Valentyna Savchyn [14, p. 122–124] observes, was a marked tendency towards restricting the Ukrainian part of the dictionary and substituting native words with Russian ones. More often than not, a Russian word was given preference and topped the list of counterparts, in this way acquiring the status of the nearest equivalent to the headword.

Prof. Zorivchak [1, p. 195–196] analyses the two-volume academic *Dictionary of Synonyms of the Ukrainian Language* (1999) which contains 9200 synonymic rows with profuse illustrations from classical works, folklore, and even translations and devotes a separate review [1, p. 197–198] to the second edition of *Dictionary of Synonyms* (2000) compiled by Sviatoslav Karavanskyi, an indefatigable fighter with the Soviet regime and a long-term prisoner of Soviet camps. Roksolana Zorivchak also references his book *The Search for the Ukrainian Word, or the Fight for the National “I”* (2001). The latter is presented as a dialogue about the Ukrainian language, discussing its terminological systems, derivational processes, and lexicographic achievements. However, Zorivchak strongly critiques Karavanskyi's labeling of Soviet-era Ukrainian linguists as “colonial linguists” or “linguists of the colonial school”. As a staunch anti-Soviet activist, Karavanskyi struggled to comprehend the nuanced resistance strategies employed by those who advanced Ukrainian linguistics while outwardly conforming to totalitarian pressures.

Roksolana Zorivchak held reservations about post-colonial studies, which, as she believed, unjustly categorized her and her colleagues as “colonial scholars”. In particular, at international congresses and conferences, she engaged in heated debates with Marko Pavlyshyn, an Australian scholar of Ukrainian descent and a pioneer in applying post-colonial theory to post-Soviet Ukrainian literature.

Despite her skepticism toward post-colonialism, Zorivchak was among the first to interpret the history of Ukrainian translation through the lens of resistance, a view resonant with post-colonial theory. She argued that literary translation was essential to national self-awareness and opposed Soviet oppression simply by existing. “Translation played a significant role in the history of national resistance and national renaissance – a role that has not yet been fully recognized” [1, p. 233].

In contrast, Maksym Strikha, in his seminal book *Ukrainian Literary Translation: Between Literature and Nation-Building* (2006) and its revised edition (2020), advocates for adopting post-colonial approaches to

study Ukrainian translation history. He underscores the absence of systematic analysis in this context: “Virtually no attempt has been made to systematically analyze the history of Ukrainian literary translation from the perspective of postcolonial methods, which are widespread globally. For Ukrainian translation, which evolved throughout the modern era in a colonial (or, at best, postcolonial) context, such an approach could prove extremely fruitful... This must become part of a comprehensive future study of Ukrainian translation history, especially now that the ‘nation-building’ era of Ukrainian translation has ended” [9, p. 25].

Zorivchak firmly disagrees, emphasizing in her 2005 work: “Some argue that after Ukraine gained independence, literary translation’s role has diminished, and the nation-building era of Ukrainian translation is over. I categorically disagree. Under new circumstances, translation must remain at the forefront of preserving culture, mentality, and language” [1, p. 247].

One can add to this discussion that a shift in translation’s role does not necessarily entail its declining relevance. The centripetal focus of nation-building is transitioning into a centrifugal international perspective, where translation introduces Ukraine’s distinctiveness to the global cultural arena. The Ukrainian translations of the independence era, with all their strengths and shortcomings, stand as a testament to the nation’s readability and self-narration on the international stage.

### 2.5. Navigating Ukrainian usage

The chapter “Lexical and Grammatical Peculiarities” in Zorivchak’s book is designed as a practical guide, resembling a popular usage dictionary. It addresses issues of problematic meaning, stylistic appropriateness, and correct grammar in a way that is accessible to a general audience. Sadly, the need for such resources in Ukrainian remains pressing, with the only comprehensive conventional dictionary of usage being *The Dictionary of Difficulties of the Ukrainian Language* by D. Hrynchyshun and A. Kapeliushnyi, published back in 1989. This earlier work, covering 15,000 entries, tackled challenges in orthography, orthoepy, syntax, and more but has not been adequately followed up in subsequent decades.

Prof. Zorivchak’s work delves into nuanced distinctions between paronyms (e.g., *особа* vs. *особистість*, *дипломант* vs. *дипломат*), partial synonyms (*майдан* vs. *площа*, *зараз* vs. *тепер*), and inappropriate borrowings from English, Russian, or Polish (*подавляющий* vs. *переважний*, *на зразок* vs. *на кшталт*). She also critiques grammatical misuse, with topics such as *Let Us Preserve Our Vocative Case!* [1, p. 97] and *On Nominative Sentences* [1, p. 104–105]. Her overarching aim, outlined in the introductory article *On Speech Culture*, is to foster linguistic sensitivity and excellence. Citing Maksym Rytskyi’s poignant observation, “Reading dictionaries is not as strange and

weird as it may seem,” she makes her guide not only educational but engaging, illustrating principles with examples from media and everyday life [1, p. 15].

Prof. Zorivchak’s “*Lexical and Grammatical Peculiarities*” upholds a longstanding Ukrainian tradition of popular usage guidebooks. It aligns with the legacy of Borys Antonenko-Davydovych’s seminal *How We Speak* (1970), a bestseller in its time. Despite ideological restrictions that curtailed its second print run, Antonenko-Davydovych’s work has remained a cornerstone of Ukrainian language guidance. Similarly, Iryna Farion’s last book *Anglicisms and Anti-Anglicisms. 100 stories of words in the sociocontext* (2024) carries forward this tradition, highlighting the ongoing challenge of linguistic purity amid globalization.

One of Prof. Zorivchak’s most striking insights, from her introductory article, is particularly resonant in today’s context: “A high level of speech culture often demands the rejection of one’s favorite expressions if they are inappropriate<sup>2</sup>. This rejection requires setting aside personal preferences and ambitions for the sake of the Native Word, which belongs to the whole nation” [1, p. 15]. This ethos of self-discipline and collective responsibility underscores the cultural and national significance of language in preserving Ukrainian identity.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

This analysis only scratches the surface of Professor Roksolana Zorivchak’s immense contributions to Ukrainian lexicography and her profound insights into its historical evolution. Her work embodies a lifetime of dedication to the study, critique, and promotion of Ukrainian linguistic and lexicographic heritage. Prof. Zorivchak’s endeavors encompass a comprehensive critique of nearly all significant dictionaries published in independent Ukraine, as well as those produced during the Soviet period and earlier. Her scholarship weaves a nuanced narrative that highlights both the achievements and challenges of Ukrainian lexicography.

Prof. Zorivchak’s scholarship provides not only a critical evaluation of existing works but also a vision for the future of Ukrainian lexicography. Her insistence on the importance of lexicographic and translational efforts in shaping national identity ensures that her contributions will resonate far beyond her time, continuing to inspire scholars, linguists, and cultural historians for generations to come.

The study demonstrates that:

1. Prof. Roksolana Zorivchak perceived dictionaries as cultural artifacts shaping national identity.
2. Her critical legacy revealed the destructive role of Soviet linguistic policies and the need for high-quality lexicographic works in independent Ukraine.
3. She defended the Ukrainian language against both colonial suppression and the risks of globalization.

<sup>2</sup> In present circumstances, it seems relevant to add – the rejection of the language of the aggressor.

The article calls for rethinking lexicography as a tool of cultural resistance. Practical significance lies in encouraging further research into Ukrainian dictionaries as linguistic and socio-political phenomena.

The perspective of research includes a systematic analysis of Ukrainian lexicography through the lens of the decolonial approach, tracing its role in consolidating national identity and representing Ukraine in the world.

## REFERENCES

1. Zorivchak, R. (2005). *Bolity bolem slova nashoho... [To Ache with the Pain of Our Word...]*. Lviv: Ivan Franko Lviv Univ. Publ. (In Ukrainian)
2. Krymskyi, A. (Ed.). (1924). *Rosyys'ko-Ukrayins'kyi Akademichnyi Slovnyk [Russian-Ukrainian Academic Dictionary]. Vol.1 (A – Zh)*. Kyiv: Chervonyi Shliakh. (In Ukrainian)
3. Panochko, M. (2021). Rozvytok ukrayins'koyi leksykohrafiyi v 70-kh rokakh XX st. [The Development of Ukrainian Lexicography in the 70s of the twentieth century]. *Academichni studiyi. Seriya "Humanitarni nauky"*, 4, 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.52726/as.humanities/2021.4.4> (In Ukrainian)
4. Perepadya, A. (1966). Desyata muza. Intervyu z Anatolem Perepadeyu [The tenth muse. Interview with Anatol' Perepadya]. *Ukrayina: Nauka i kul'tura*, 408–413. (In Ukrainian)
5. Pylypchuk, D. (2020). *Slovnyky ukrayins'koyi movy: 1596-2018: bibliohr. pokazhchyk: [nauk. vyd.] [Dictionaries of the Ukrainian language: 1596-2018]: bibliographic index: [scientific edition] [comp. & author of the preface Dmytro Pylypchuk]*. Kyiv: Prosvita. (In Ukrainian)
6. Poliuha, L. (2003). Rol' ukrayins'koyi leksykohrafiyi v utverdzheni natsional'noyi samobutnosti [The Role of Ukrainian Lexicography in the Affirmation of National Identity]. *Visnyk Lvivs'koho universytetu. Seria zhurnalistyky*, 23, 144–152. (In Ukrainian)
7. Rezoliutsiya, 1934. (2005). Rezoliutsia Komisii NKO dlia perevirky roboty na movnomu fronti v pytanniakh terminolohii [The Resolution of the Commission of the People's Commissariat of Education calling for the check on the work on the linguistic front in regard to terminology]. In L. Masenko (Ed.), *Ukrainska mova u XX storichchi: Istoriya linhvotsydu; Dokumenty i materialy* [The Ukrainian Language in the 20th c.: The History of Linguicide; Documents and Materials]. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiya", 143–148.
8. Snizhko, N. (2022). Kontsepty nainovishykh tлумachnykh slovnykiv Ukrayins'koyi movy [Concepts of Newest Explanatory Dictionaries of the Ukrainian Language]. *Ukrayins'ka Mova: naukovu-teoretychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian Language: scientific and theoretical journal]*, 3(83), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrmova2022.03.003> (In Ukrainian)
9. Strikha, M. (2020). *Ukrayins'kyj pereklad i perekladachi: mizh literaturoyu i naysiyetvorennyam [Ukrainian translation and translators: between literature and nation-building]*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (In Ukrainian)
10. Shevchenko, L. & Syzonov, D. (2020). Stan i perspektyvy dyskursyvno-stylistychnoyi leksykohrafiyi: ohliad problemy [The State and Prospects of Discursive Stylistic Lexicography: An Overview]. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej [Studies in Polish and Slavonic Philology]*, 55, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.1966> (In Ukrainian)
11. Blynova, I. & Davydenko, V. (2021). Contemporary Ukrainian Lexicography: Status, Trends, and Development Trends. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 21, 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.21.01>
12. Frawley, W., Hill, C., K. & Munro, P. (2002). Making a Dictionary: Ten Issues. In W. Frawley & al (Eds.), *Making Dictionaries: Preserving Indigenous Languages of the Americas*. Perkeley: University of California Press, 1–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijl/17.1.91>
13. Litvinyak O. (2019). Interpreters and Dictionaries. In D. Osuchowska and L. Harmon (Eds.), *Contents, Use, Usability. Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15991>
14. Savchyn, V. (2019). Dictionary in the Totalitarian Society: Ukrainian Lexicography in the 20th century. In D. Osuchowska and L. Harmon (Eds.), *Contents, Use, Usability. Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15991>

The article was received by the editors 25.08.2025

The article is recommended for printing 17.10.2025

Published 30.12.2025

**Дзера Оксана Василівна** – доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри перекладознавства і контрастивної лінгвістики імені Григорія Кочура, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка; e-mail: oksana.dzera@lnu.edu.ua; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3471-0724>; GOOGLE SCHOLAR: <https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?hl=uk&user=1opWdFYAAAAJ>; RESEARCH GATE: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Oksana-Dzera>

## РОЗКОДОВУЮЧИ СЛОВНИКИ: КРИТИЧНА ПЕРСПЕКТИВА РОКСОЛАНИ ЗОРІВЧАК

Статтю присвячено осмисленню критичної спадщини Роксолани Зорівчак у сфері української лексикографії. У дослідженні підкреслюється, що словники виступають не лише інструментами фіксації мови, а й важливими чинниками культурної пам'яті та національної ідентичності. Проблема набуває особливої актуальності в умовах глобалізаційних викликів і російської агресії, коли питання мови, культури й ідентичності стають надзвичайно гострими. Мета статті полягає у висвітленні ролі Роксолани Зорівчак як критика української лексикографії та у виявленні значення її праць для сучасних студій у галузі металексикографії. Методологічну основу дослідження визначає міждисциплінарний підхід, що синтезує напрацювання перекладознавства, металексикографії та культурології. Дослідження поєднує історичну і критичну перспективи з використанням методів порівняльного аналізу, дискурс-аналізу та герменевтичного аналізу. Основні результати полягають у тому, що дослідження проф. Зорівчак охоплюють широкий спектр проблем: від збереження національних традицій у словникарстві до впровадження новітніх підходів, зокрема при підготовці перекладних і термінологічних словників. Її критика виявляє маніпулятивний потенціал словників у тоталітарному суспільстві й водночас показує перспективи їх розвитку як засобу відновлення культурної тяглості. Важливо, що спадщина Зорівчак демонструє здатність словників протистояти ідеологічному тиску та служити простором збереження мовного різноманіття. Її спостереження і сьогодні не втрачають актуальності, особливо в контексті деколоніального підходу до українських студій. Таким чином, її внесок не лише збагачує українську лексикографічну критику, а й пропонує рамку для розуміння словників як наукових і водночас політичних інструментів. У висновках наголошується, що звернення до спадщини Зорівчак відкриває нові перспективи для осмислення словників як засобів культурного спротиву, збереження ідентичності та інтеграції української лексикографії у світовий науковий контекст.

**Ключові слова:** ідентичність, культура, лексикографія, словник, Україна, Роксолана Зорівчак.

### СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Зорівчак, Р. (2005). *Боліти боєм слова нашого....* Львів: Видавництво Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка.
2. Кримський, А. (Ред.). (1924). *Російсько-український академічний словник. Том 1 (А – Ж)*. Київ: Червоний шлях.
3. Паночко, М. (2021). Розвиток української лексикографії в 70-х роках ХХ століття. *Академічні студії. Серія "Гуманітарні науки"*, 4, 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.52726/as.humanities/2021.4.4>
4. Перепада, А. (1966). Десята муза. Інтерв'ю з Анатолем Перепадею. *Україна: Наука і культура*, 408–413.
5. Пилипчук, Д. (2020). *Словники української мови: 1596-2018: бібліографічний покажчик: [наук. вид.]* [упорядн. і автор передмови Дмитро Пилипчук]. Київ: Просвіта.
6. Полюга, Л. (2003). Роль української лексикографії і утвердженні національної самобутності. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія журналістики*, 23, 144–152.
7. Резолюція, 1934. (2005). Резолюція Комісії НКО для перевірки роботи на мовному фронті в питаннях термінології. Л. Маценко (Ред.). *Українська мова у ХХ сторіччі: Історія лінгвоциду; Документи і матеріали*. Київ: Видавничий дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 143–148.
8. Сніжко, Н. (2022). Концепти найновіших тлумачних словників української мови. *Українська мова: науково-теоретичний журнал*, 3(83), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrmova2022.03.003>
9. Стріха, М. (2020). *Український переклад і перекладачі: між літературою і націєтворенням*. Київ: Дух і Літера.
10. Шевченко, Л. & Сизонов, Д. (2020). Стан і перспективи дискурсивно-стилістичної лексикографії: огляд проблеми. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 55, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.1966>
11. Blynova, I. & Davydenko, V. (2021). Contemporary Ukrainian Lexicography: Status, Trends, and Development Trends. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 21, 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.21.01>
12. Frawley, W., Hill, C., K. & Munro, P. (2002). Making a Dictionary: Ten Issues. In W. Frawley & al (Eds.), *Making Dictionaries: Preserving Indigenous Languages of the Americas*. Perkeley: University of California Press, 1–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijl/17.1.91>
13. Litvinyak, O. (2019). Interpreters and Dictionaries. In D. Osuchowska and L. Harmon (Eds.), *Contents, Use, Usability. Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 75–84 <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15991>
14. Savchyn, V. (2019). Dictionary in the Totalitarian Society: Ukrainian Lexicography in the 20th century. In D. Osuchowska and L. Harmon (Eds.), *Contents, Use, Usability. Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin : Peter Lang, 119–136 <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15991>

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.08.2025

Стаття рекомендована до друку 17.10.2025

Опубліковано 30.12.2025