President’s Message

Ukraine inevitably dominates my remarks and this issue of the Newsletter once again. Since my last column, written in what now seems a distant and innocent past, the main question for Ukraine was how the protests in Kiev and a handful of other cities would resolve themselves. At the moment of this writing Russia has announced the annexation of Crimea, amassed troops near its border with Ukraine, and engaged in a campaign to destabilize eastern Ukraine and create a pretext, so it would seem, for an invasion. Events in Ukraine and Russia’s response to them have generated the most significant crisis in Europe since the Cold War. The outrageously implausible rationalizations for (indeed, gleeful celebrations of) Putin’s actions that have flooded Russia’s supine media are depressingly reminiscent of the Soviet era—to which one can add the further depressant of the realization that, unlike the Brezhnev era, when hardly anyone in Russia believed its press, most now evidently do.

Equally reminiscent of the Cold War has been the way western opinion has begun to divide itself into hawkish calls for action against the Putin government (for now in the form of economic and diplomatic measures) and appeals for understanding of Russia’s sense of vulnerability before an expanded NATO and what it sees as overweening U.S. influence in the world. Russia for its part seems abruptly to have shed all pretense of even trying to be part of “Europe” or the “international community;” its reflex calling to mind nothing so much as the hero of Mikhail Zoshchenko’s “Рассказ о человеке, которого вычистили из партии.” On learning of his exclusion the hero fumes, “Сколько лет я крепился и сдерживал порывы своей натуры. Вел себя порядочно. И не допускал никаких эксцессов...Сколько лет я портил себе кровь разными преградами. И то нельзя, и это не так, и жену не поколоти. Но теперь это кончилось, аминь.” My own sentiments are no doubt obvious but it is not my place in this column to lead AATSEEL to one or the other side of the barricades in the cultural war (and, for all I know, there may well be AATSEEL members who support Putin’s actions in Ukraine).

In all these unfortunate events one cannot escape a sense that our world has changed in some fundamental way, at the very least from what it has been since the early 1990s. Recent events in Ukraine may yet turn out to be but the far right swing of a Russian cultural-political pendulum whose opposing left swing was the chaos of the Yeltsin years—but which will eventually settle into
Advance your education and career through American Councils Fully-Funded Programs* for Teachers & Faculty:

- **SUMMER RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEACHERS PROGRAM** - Professional development in Moscow for pre- and in-service teachers of Russian language; K-12 teachers are especially encouraged to apply.

**Immersion Programs for Undergraduate & Graduate Students:**

- **ADVANCED RUSSIAN LANGUAGE & AREA STUDIES PROGRAM (RLASP)**
  Comprehensive Russian language and cultural immersion in Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Vladimir, Russia

- **Eurasian Regional Language Program (ERLP)**
  Language and cultural immersion in 10 Eurasian countries featuring more than 20 regional languages

- **Balkan Language Initiative** - Comprehensive language and cultural immersion in Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Macedonia, or Serbia

**Internships Abroad:**

- **Overseas Professional & Intercultural Training (OPIT) Program** - English language internships featuring nearly a dozen professional disciplines in more than 10 countries of Eurasia and the Balkans

**LEARN MORE**

Additional details on all American Councils programs (including fees, dates, and application deadlines) are available online.

**ONLINE**

🌐 www.acStudyAbroad.org

**QUESTIONS?**

✉️ outbound@americanCouncils.org

*Fellowship Funding for the Summer Russian Language Teachers Program is provided by the U.S. Dept. of Education (Fulbright-Hays).
a more benign equilibrium. Would that it were so, but at the moment of writing this seems an overly optimistic view. AATSEEL may find itself straddling this re-emergent European divide—a strange state of affairs, because when people of my generation entered the profession all the cultures and languages covered by AATSEEL lay on the other side of the Iron Curtain (and there was a certain exotic cachet in dealing with them). In the emergent European situation, some eleven countries whose language and culture place them in the AATSEEL tent are NATO members and generally seem to want to be a part of “Europe” (Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia). A nearly equal number are not (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belorussia, Georgia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Russia, Serbia, Ukraine).

Of most immediate concern to most AATSEEL members is the effect Russian policies will have on scholarly exchange in Russia and Ukraine (study in the westward-leaning countries listed above can be expected to continue undisturbed). It is too early to tell what the longer-term effects will be, but, fortunately, for now there seems to be no serious friction in situ and there may even be a modest increase in enrollments in programs in Russia.

It would be unseemly to celebrate the violent and tragic events in Ukraine as a factor leading to increased interest in Russian and Ukrainian studies. But if that does turn out to be one of the effects of Putin’s actions, at least we can welcome the renewed awareness among our students of how important eastern Europe is—and in fact has been, all along, since the dissolution of empires following World War I. Would that they came to this awareness by discovering Pushkin, Tolstoy, the Russian ballet, Capek, Seifert, Havel, Schulz, Mrozek, Szymborska, Krúdy—etc. But we can introduce them to those treasures once we get them in the classroom; and this country (since AATSEEL is constituted in the United States) needs more, not fewer, people who understand these places, their languages, their fears, their aspirations.

On another kind of realignment altogether, let me comment that AATSEEL’s recent decision not to feel obligated to schedule its annual conference in the same city and at the same time as the MLA was prompted by practical, not ideological, considerations. I believe our collective decision to separate will open up new possibilities for the organization to make itself more accessible and relevant to its members. Exactly how we do this will be worked out in the next few years, but we expect that the new arrangements will make the conference more convenient, affordable, and enjoyable for us all.

Thomas Seifrid
University of Southern California
AATSEEL President (2013-14)

“The Story of a Man who was Purged from the Party”: “For so many years I disciplined myself and kept my impulses in check. Behaved decently. Didn’t permit myself any excesses... For so many years I ruined my health with all sorts of limitations. This you can’t do, that you’re not doing the right way, and don’t beat your wife. But now all that has ended, Amen.”
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Russia’s New Normal
by Kevin M. F. Platt
University of Pennsylvania
AATSEEL President Elect (2015-2016)

These days, you take a certain risk when you write anything about the current situation in Russia that is to be published with more than a twenty-four hour delay. Like everyone else in our fields, I suspect, the first thing I do in the morning is to consult Facebook and my news sources of choice for new developments. Russia and its neighboring states are suddenly not the place they were just a few months ago. Everything is shifting and changing, it seems.

This accounts for my disorientation last week when I made a quick visit to St. Petersburg—but not because everything was actually different. The most disorienting realization of all was that everything was pretty much the same as always. Sure, there were many discussions of Ukraine and Crimea; the early-morning drunks outside the window did have a celebratory discussion of “krym nash”; and my cab driver was listening to a sensationalistic news report of conflict in Ukraine. Yet on the whole, the residents of the city were going about their business. Young people were walking along the canals. Academics were doing research and publishing papers. Buzzing crowds gathered in the bright, spring evenings at the new Mariinsky Theater. Everyone was eating koriushka. It seemed like events in Ukraine were farther away in St. Petersburg than they are in Philadelphia.

Since my return I’ve been trying to sort out the implications of this peculiar experience of an atmosphere of uneventfulness in St. Petersburg. In particular, my thoughts have been on the segment of Russian society I know best—the cosmopolitan and oppositionally-minded intelligentsia. Of course, certain people from these circles who broke ranks and came out in support of the Russian patriotic/military-aggressive fervor have realigned their social and professional circuits, but everyone else is doing business as usual. No one is whispering or looking over his or her shoulders. One explanation of this state of affairs—one that resonates with a recent article by Oleg Kashin in Slon (http://slon.ru/russia/rossiya_posle_ukrainy_ne_novaya_zhizn_a_staryaya-1094268.xhtml)—is that the current configuration of public space is in and of itself nothing new. For years, state-dominated media have presented their own image of the world, the general populace has either bought into it or checked out, and the oppositional minority has subsisted in a sort of minor nature-preserve zone in social life, in the media space, and in the political consciousness of Russia.

Yet is this right? Sure: perhaps the persistence of these familiar structures is a reassuring demonstration that things are not as bad as they seem—that there remains the possibility for an alternative politics and an alternative civic life in Russia that might eventually moderate the strident politics of the authorities and the majority. Yet it is also true that the spaces for other views of the world are steadily growing smaller, with recent encroachments on previously independent news sources like Lenta.ru and TV Rain. Perhaps, therefore, the lack of a sense of urgency among the dissenting intelligentsia in response to what may be a catastrophic transformation of Russia’s political life and geopolitical position should be seen as an expression of self-delusion or heroic stoicism (string quartet on the Titanic)—or of a fatalistic acceptance.

I began this essay by recognizing the difficulty of coming to conclusions in the medias res of a crisis. Therefore, I will end cautiously, by leaving my commentary hanging, in the form of a question, rather than articulating a definite opinion. Yet my worry is that the relative calm in Russia reflects nothing less than the total victory of the Putin doctrine—a stealth revolution that has taken the open society of Russia from one decade ago and transformed it—in a bloodless, slow-moving coup—into a dictatorship in which, by general agreement, resistance is useless.

Letter From The Editor

Dear AATSEEL Members,

I am delighted to present to you the current issue of the AATSEEL Newsletter, which illuminates various facets of engaging with Ukraine as both a scholar and teacher. Special thanks go to Vitaly Chernetsky, President of the American Association for Ukrainian Studies, for his guidance in curating content, as well as his article on the state of Ukrainian Studies as a field. Mayhill Fowler, Yuri Shevchuk, and Kevin M.F. Platt graciously accepted requests for contributions on short notice and produced thoughtful and poignant pieces to complement this issue’s theme. At this time, I would also like to thank Molly Thomasy Blasing for undertaking the, often thankless, task of preparing the “Member News” column for many years. Molly has passed this responsibility to Colleen Lucey (clucey@wisc.edu) of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

William Gunn
University of Southern California
AATSEEL Newsletter Editor
Ukrainian Literary and Cultural Studies: The State of the Field
by Vitaly Chernetsky
University of Kansas
President, American Association for Ukrainian Studies

The past quarter century has been transformative for the field of Ukrainian Studies both in the US and internationally. This time has been filled with turbulent transformations, hopes and frustrations. Twice in recent years, in the winter of 2004–2005 and now, from November 2013 to the time these lines are being written, Ukraine became one of the foci of worldwide attention. It has been a complex and formidable challenge for our academic field to balance timely reaction to these transformations with commitment to long-term commitments.

During the Soviet period, the field of Ukrainian Studies found itself in an even more precarious position than most other subsections of our field outside Russian. It was an uphill battle to convince our colleagues that studying what at the time was but one of the constituent republics of the USSR was a worthwhile endeavor, and that this endeavor necessitated attention to its national language and culture, including its literary tradition. Paradoxically, in this respect Western academia largely mimicked Soviet arrangements, as it was impossible to work in Ukrainian Studies at federal-level Soviet institutions: Институт славяноведения НАН Украины focused only on Slavic languages and cultures outside the USSR; thus Ukrainian, as well as Belarusian, were only considered as a small part of the blanket approach to литература народов СССР studied en masse, with specificities of national cultures reduced to an ornamental minimum. However, the situation was augmented by the presence of a sizable and determined Ukrainian diaspora abroad, especially in North America, and its tireless organizational and fundraising efforts that culminated in the founding of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI) in 1973 and endowing three chairs at Harvard University. Similar efforts on the Canadian side of the border led to the establishment of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS), based at the University of Alberta, in 1976. In general, it is hard to draw a clear boundary between Ukrainian Studies activities in the US and in Canada, not to mention Britain or Australia, although this essay focuses more on the US-based efforts. The establishment of the two institutes led to the formal legitimation of Ukrainian Studies within Slavic and to a slow but steady growth in the presence of Ukrainian within North American academia. In 1989, as the region we study was undergoing massive transformation, the International Association for Ukrainian Studies was founded at a conference in Herculaneum, near Naples, and the American Association for Ukrainian Studies was launched as a national affiliate of this international body. Both organizations initially developed in a robust and energetic fashion; however, this enthusiasm about growth and change had to reckon with the general crisis and precarious position of our broader field in the context of unstable enrollments and other struggles Slavic has had to face.

One of the complexities that was a source of both strength and weakness stemmed from both teaching and research positions, on the one hand, and student enrollments, on the other, dominated by the representatives of the diaspora. The Ukrainian diaspora in the West did an admirable, truly heroic job in safeguarding the treasures of national culture that were being ignored, and often aggressively destroyed, within the USSR, yet it devoted relatively little attention to bringing persons of non-Ukrainian background within the fold. One of the important changes of the post-Soviet era has been precisely the opening of the field to persons of other, highly diverse backgrounds. One of the most successful conduits into the field has been Peace Corps; after working in Ukraine, the volunteers often came back with impressive language skills, background knowledge, and strong interest in further studying Ukraine and its culture, politics, and society. Additionally, this new generation of students and scholars included many who were eager to challenge the disciplinary confines not only of Ukrainian, but also of Slavic Studies more broadly, bringing new energies and freshness to the field. One of the best examples of this kind has been the academic career of Rory Finnin, a Peace Corps alumnus and a US-born and trained specialist in Ukrainian literature whose personal background is non-Ukrainian and who has been the main driving force behind the remarkable growth of a new and vibrant Ukrainian program at Cambridge University.

Despite the continued recalcitrance and conservativeness of Ukrainian government bodies focused on education, research, and culture more broadly, new vibrant institutions have also emerged in Ukraine and have promoted bold intellectual innovation. Among the best known and most successful here are the new universities, Kyiv Mohyla Academy, the Ukrainian Catholic University, and the Ostroh Academy. Both Ostroh and Mohyla are the symbolically re-founded schools based on the ones that were originally launched in 1576 and 1632 respectively, emphasizing continuity with a previous renaissance of learning in Ukrainian lands. An intellectual venture of great importance is Krytyka, a monthly magazine similar in outlook and scope to The New York Review of Books. Launched in Kyiv with the support and backing of HURI and especially George Grabowicz, holder of the Dmytro Ćyževs’kyj Chair in Ukrainian Literature at Harvard, for whom it has been truly a labor of love, Krytyka also runs an excellent academic book series, and most recently it has launched an ambitious redesigned web portal, krytyka.com. HURI has also been instrumental in bringing guest scholars working in Ukrainian Studies from all over the world for research fellowships. In addition to Harvard, active fundraising efforts in Ukrainian Studies have been taking place at a number of other American schools, including Columbia, Penn State, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Washington. Several of them now have endowed chairs or visiting professorships in Ukrainian Studies. Additionally, the venerable diasporic learned societies, the Shevchenko Scientific Society in the US and the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences, are now actively seeking to reinvigorate their intellectual and public presence.

The best examples of innovative work in Ukrainian Studies in the US and worldwide come from the meeting and hybridization of these formerly discrete forces, emanating from Ukraine, from the universities in the West, and from the diasporic intellectual institutions. The field has also benefitted from the work of younger interdisciplinary scholars, who at times turned to it for purely pragmatic reasons, for instance as archival research in neighboring Russia was again becoming more difficult in recent years, yet ended up developing a passionate investment in, and dedication to Ukrainian Studies. This synergy is also reflected in publication venues: side by side with the book series run by HURI and its journal Harvard Ukraini- an Studies, new Ukrainian studies publications have been coming out at a relatively broad variety of academic presses and periodicals.

In his 2000 article in the volume The Learning and Teaching of Slavic Languages, Robert DeLossa outlined the many challenges facing Ukrainian language pedagogy in the West. Fortunately, the situation has radically improved since then, as new instructional materials have been developed and published in the West and in Ukraine, most notably the comprehensive two-year textbook Roznovljajmo! (Let’s Talk!), co-authored by DeLossa, Roman Koropeckyj, Robert Romanchuk, and Alaxandra Isaievych Mason, which won the 2007 AATSEEL Book Prize for Language Pedagogy, but also Alla Nedashkovskaja’s advanced-level textbook Ukrainian through Its Living Culture (2010) and most recently Yuri Shevchuk’s Beginner’s Ukrainian (2011). At the crossroads of linguistics and anthropology, Laada Bilaniuk’s Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correlation in Ukraine (2005), likewise an AATSEEL Book Prize Winner, serves as an excellent introduction to the country’s complex linguistic landscape.

Overall, the publications that have had the greatest resonance are marked by their interdisciplinarity and a comparativist reach across national boundaries. At the forefront of this trend one finds the work of cultural historians, among them Serhy Yekelchyk’s Stalin’s Empire of Memory (2004), several volumes by Serhii Plokhy and Timothy
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The past quarter century has been transformative for the field of Ukrainian Studies both in the US and internationally. This time has been filled with turbulent transformations, hopes and frustrations. Twice in recent years, in the winter of 2004–2005 and now, from November 2013 to the time when these lines are being written, Ukraine was filled with turbulent transformations, hopes and frustrations. Twice in recent years, in the winter of 2004–2005 and now, from November 2013 to the present. The situation was augmented by the presence of a sizable and determined Ukrainian diaspora abroad, especially in North America, and its tireless organizational and fundraising efforts that culminated in the founding of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI) in 1973 and endowing three Chairs at Harvard University. Similar efforts on the Canadian side of the border led to the establishment of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS), based at the University of Alberta, in 1976. In general, it is hard to draw a clear boundary between Ukrainian Studies activities in the US and in Canada, not to mention Britain or Australia, although this essay focuses more on the US-based efforts. The establishment of the two institutes led to the formal legitimation of Ukrainian Studies within Slavic and to a slow but steady growth in the presence of Ukrainian within North American academia. In 1989, as the region we study was undergoing massive transformation, the International Association for Ukrainian Studies was founded at a conference in Herculaneum, near Naples, and the American Association for Ukrainian Studies was launched as a national affiliate of this international body. Both organizations initially developed in a robust and energetic fashion; however, this enthusiasm about growth and change had to reckon with the general crisis and precarious position of our academic field to balance timely reaction to the general crisis and precarious position of our broader field in the context of unstable enrollments and other struggles Slavic has had to face.

One of the complexities that was a source of both strength and weakness stemmed from both teaching and research positions, on the one hand, and student enrollments, on the other, dominated by the representatives of the diaspora. The Ukrainian diaspora in the West did an admirable, truly heroic job in safeguarding the treasures of national culture that were being ignored, and often aggressively destroyed, within the USSR, yet it devoted relatively little attention to bringing persons of non-Ukrainian background within the fold. One of the important changes of the post-Soviet era has been precisely the opening of the field to persons of other, highly diverse backgrounds. One of the most successful conduits into the field has been Peace Corps; after working in Ukraine, the volunteers often came back with impressive language skills, background knowledge, and strong interest in further studying Ukraine and its culture, politics, and society. Additionally, this new generation of students and scholars included many who were eager to challenge the disciplinary confines not only of Ukrainian, but also of Slavic Studies more broadly, bringing new energies and freshness to the field. One of the best examples of this kind has been the academic career of Rory Finnin, a Peace Corps alumnus and a US-born and trained specialist in Ukrainian literature whose personal background is non-Ukrainian and who has been the main driving force behind the remarkable growth of a new and vibrant Ukrainian program at Cambridge University. Despite the continued recalcitrance and conservatism of Ukrainian government bodies focused on education, research, and culture more broadly, new vibrant institutions have also emerged in Ukraine and have promoted bold intellectual innovation. Among the best known and most successful here are the new universities, Kyiv Mohyla Academy, the Ukrainian Catholic University, and the Ostroh Academy. Both Ostroh and Mohyla are the symbolically re-founded schools based on the ones that were originally launched in 1576 and 1632 respectively, emphasizing continuity with a previous renaissance of learning in Ukrainian lands. An intellectual venture of great importance is Krytyka, a monthly magazine similar in outlook and scope to The New York Review of Books. Launched in Kyiv with the support and backing of HURI and especially George Grabowicz, holder of the Dmytro Čyžev’skyj Chair in Ukrainian Literature at Harvard, for whom it has been truly a labor of love, Krytyka also runs an excellent academic book series, and most recently it has launched an ambitious redesigned web portal, krytyka.com.

HURI has also been instrumental in bringing guest scholars working in Ukrainian Studies from all over the world for research fellowships. In addition to Harvard, active fundraising efforts in Ukrainian Studies have been taking place at a number of other American schools, including Columbia, Penn State, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Washington. Several of them now have endowed chairs or visiting professorships in Ukrainian Studies. Additionally, the venerable diasporic learned societies, the Shevchenko Scientific Society in the US and the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences, are now actively seeking to reinvigorate their intellectual and public presence. The best examples of innovative work in Ukrainian Studies in the US and worldwide come from the meeting and hybridization of these formerly discrete forces, emanating from Ukraine, from the universities in the West, and from the diasporic intellectual institutions. The field has also benefited from the work of younger interdisciplinary scholars, who at times turned to it for purely pragmatic reasons, for instance as archival research in neighboring Russia was again becoming more difficult in recent years, yet ended up developing a passionate investment in, and dedication to Ukrainian Studies. This synergy is also reflected in publication venues: side by side with the book series run by HURI and its journal Harvard Ukrainian Studies, new Ukrainian studies publications have been coming out at a relatively broad variety of academic presses and periodicals. In his 2000 article in the volume The Learning and Teaching of Slavic Languages, Robert DeLossa outlined the many challenges facing Ukrainian language pedagogues in the West. Fortunately, the situation has radically improved since then, as
new instructional materials have been developed and published in the West and in Ukraine, most notably the comprehensive two-year textbook Rozmovljajo! (Let’s Talk!), co-authored by DeLossa, Roman Koropeckyj, Robert Romanchuk, and Alexandra Isaievych Mason, which won the 2007 AATSEEL Book Prize for Language Pedagogy, but also Alla Nedashkivska’s advanced-level textbook Ukrainians through Its Living Culture (2010) and most recently Yuri Shevchuk’s Beginner’s Ukrainian (2011). At the crossroads of linguistics and anthropology, Laada Bilaniuk’s Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine (2005), likewise an AATSEEL Book Prize Winner, serves as an excellent introduction to the country’s complex linguistic landscape.

Overall, the publications that have had the greatest resonance are marked by their interdisciplinarity and a comparative reach across national boundaries. At the forefront of this trend one finds the work of cultural historians, among them Serhiy Yekelchyk’s Stalin’s Empire of Memory (2004), several volumes by Serhii Plokhy and Timothy Snyder, Catherine Wanner’s Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine (2008), William Risch’s The Ukrainian West: Culture and the Fate of Empire in Soviet Livy (2011), Serhiy Bilenko’s Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations (2012), or the articles and the forthcoming book by Joshua First on Ukrainian poetic cinema. Often, scholars highlight the contrast or the complex relationship between Ukrainian and Russian culture, as in Myroslav Skandrij’s Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times (2001), Vitaly Chernetsky’s Mapping Postcommunist Cultures: Russia and Ukraine in the Context of Globalization (2007), or Edyta Bojanowska’s Nikolai Gogol (2007), likewise an AATSEEL Book Prize Winner, serves as an excellent introduction to the country’s complex linguistic landscape.

Another remaining major problem is the relative paucity of available English-language translations of both Ukrainian literature and Ukrainian scholarship. On the former front there have been important advancements, with several presses large and small featuring at least a handful Ukrainian writers each (from AmazonCrossing, the publishing branch of the online retailer, to university presses and such independent publishers as the New York-based Spuyten Duyvil), and also the launch of a special periodical, Ukrainian Literature: A Journal of Translations, based at the University of Toronto; still even among the key canonical texts many remain unavailable in English. But with scholarly writing the situation is even more precarious, as many key texts both past and present remain unavailable, for instance the sophisticated and animated discussion of Dziga Vertov’s filmmaking in Ukrainian film press during Ukrainian period is still excluded from the canon of Vertov studies in the West; most of Solomiia Pavlychko’s or Tamara Hundorova’s writings, for example, still await for an English translator.

For all the dramatic challenges and setbacks, Ukraine and its culture do not cease to amaze us. During the past couple of months, as following the protests in Ukraine there have been giving many people in our field lots of sleepless nights, we still see in the resolve and determination of its growing and strengthening civil society, which matures against incredible odds and pressures, a sign of hope and the proof of continuing, increasing relevance of the discipline of Ukrainian Studies.

While Ukrainian state bodies have been missing in action on this front, others have picked up the slack in bringing Ukrainian writers and other prominent intellectuals to the US. In recent years, Columbia University’s Mark Andryczyk in cooperation with the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington has spearheaded a particularly successful program of this kind. As a result, we have been fortunate to have a stellar roster of contemporary Ukrainian writers as guests at US universities.

Significant challenges, however, still bedevil Ukrainian Studies in the US. While Ukraine, with its messy yet genuinely diverse politics, has served as a contrasting foil for the neighboring Russia and Belarus, broader interest in the US has been unstable, as reflected in everything from funding opportunities to undergraduate enrollments. Several study abroad programs have unfortunately folded; as the readers could see in the previous AATSEEL newsletter, only two programs in Ukraine run by US universities were listed: the ones at Arizona State and the University of Kansas. The complexities of Ukraine’s national identity project vis-à-vis the ethnic, religious and political diversity found on its territory past and present are not always taken into meaningful account. For instance, studies on the literature, culture, or history of individual cities and regions of Ukraine still sometimes ignore the Ukrainian context or uncritically reproduce prejudiced ethnic stereotypes about Ukrainians. Another remaining major problem is the relative paucity of available English-language translations of both Ukrainian literature and Ukrainian scholarship. On the former front there have been important advancements, with several presses large and small featuring at least a handful Ukrainian writers each (from AmazonCrossing, the publishing branch of the online retailer, to university presses and such independent publishers as the New York-based Spuyten Duyvil), and also the launch of a special periodical, Ukrainian Literature: A Journal of Translations, based at the University of Toronto; still even among the key canonical texts many remain unavailable in English. But with scholarly writing the situation is even more precarious, as many key texts both past and present remain unavailable, for instance the sophisticated and animated discussion of Dziga Vertov’s filmmaking in Ukrainian film press during Ukrainian period is still excluded from the canon of Vertov studies in the West; most of Solomiia Pavlychko’s or Tamara Hundorová’s writings, for example, still await for an English translator.

For all the dramatic challenges and setbacks, Ukraine and its culture do not cease to amaze us. During the past couple of months, as following the protests in Ukraine there have been giving many people in our field lots of sleepless nights, we still see in the resolve and determination of its growing and strengthening civil society, which matures against incredible odds and pressures, a sign of hope and the proof of continuing, increasing relevance of the discipline of Ukrainian Studies.
Questioning Ukraine
by Mayhill C. Fowler
Stetson University

Whenever I tell people that I study Ukraine and that I speak Ukrainian, they always ask if I am of Ukrainian descent. I am not, but I have spent some of my most formative years studying Ukraine: its histories, its languages, and its cultures.

As a graduate student, I spent hours sitting in archives poring over theater budgets and Politburo memandora, bonded over Crimean wine with fellow scholars from North America and Europe, and although I made several local friends, all of them were, like me, scholars of culture in Ukraine. I came to Ukraine to acquire the information necessary to write my dissertation and secure employment in the West. I had no impact on Ukraine itself, and Ukraine and I existed in parallel worlds.

There are not many opportunities to engage more deeply with the post-Soviet world as a young scholar. The Fulbright offers opportunities to teach abroad, but only for established professors who already have the requisite teaching experience and expertise to win the grant. Some graduate students begin their encounter with the former Soviet Union through post-college work, at an investment bank, teaching English, or as a Peace Corps volunteer. There are, however, few opportunities to engage as a postdoctoral scholar in the field of higher education. When I had nowhere to go after completing my Ph.D. I was lucky enough—thanks to the Herculean efforts of my advisor and several colleagues—to return to Ukraine not as a student, but as a teacher.

I taught cultural history to advanced undergraduate and MA students for a semester at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, and it was through this experience that I became more a part of Ukraine.

I joined the kollektiv at the Center for Urban History in East Central Europe, where I had a desk, printer access, and a host of new colleagues to chat with over morning coffee, afternoon cake, and beers on Fridays. I participated in the Center’s exhibition Home: A Century of Change by translating the Ukrainian text into English and providing my voice for the English-language guided tour. Most importantly, I taught at the nearby Ukrainian Catholic University and struggled with engaging students in cultural history, that is, how people understand the world as they do. Far from an experienced professor, I was teaching my own course for the first time, in an unfamiliar academic culture, in an improvisatory mix of Ukrainian and English.

Hopefully I was able to teach my students something about the political and economic structures shaping worldview, but what my students taught me was invaluable. I experienced a fundamental reality of the post-Soviet higher educational world: the lack of questioning. The Soviet Union may have collapsed in 1991, but its built environment and mental frameworks—university buildings, academic infrastructures, and categories of thought—largely remain. Even at a post-Soviet institution like Lviv’s Ukrainian Catholic University, the Soviet legacy runs deep.

Let me offer three examples.

First, disciplinary categories remain fixed. As a specialist on theater, I always found myself alone at the Party archives. Why, my Ukrainian colleagues queried, was I wasting my time reading Politburo memoranda? The assumption was that I should be looking at set designs and scripts at the archive of literature and art. As a scholar of theater I was firmly in teatroznavstvo (Ukr.) or teatrovedenie (Russ.), which are particular Soviet-era disciplines akin to traditional dramaturgy in the United States that served to create cadres for theatrical criticism and the venerable position of the glavlit, the literary director at Soviet theaters. Teatrozavtsy and teatrovedy read in theater archives and write reviews; they do not go to Party archives and analyze budgets. I built my entire course, by contrast, on the idea that the arts result from particular economic and political structures, and this challenged my students’ understanding of what they were supposed to be learning in a history classroom.

Second, students are less comfortable with the contingency of geography. Because I view Ukraine as a multi-ethnic space, our discussions included Jews, Poles, and Russians, as well as Ukrainians. More importantly, we examined how people came to understand what constituted “Ukrainian” culture (or “Jewish,” “Russian,” “imperial,” or “local” cultures, for that matter). In other words, I assigned my students not Taras Shevchenko, but Sholem Aleichem. In Poland many young scholars have turned to Jewish Studies as a way of understanding Poland; some young scholars in Ukraine have taken up Yiddish, Hebrew and topics that include non-Ukrainians in the history of their country.

Third, the relationship between professor and student remains hierarchical. This manifests itself in unexpected ways; in the classroom, it meant taking notes only when I would specifically request they do so, and students never noted their peers’ comments. More generally, this hierarchy complicates the writing of recommendation letters. Students from Ukraine need competitive letters if they are to win fellowships outside the country, but post-Soviet professors are unfamiliar with this genre. Moreover, writing such letters implies that students may surpass their professor, in ideas, in travel, or in academic success, and therefore challenge the hierarchy.

Of course, identifying another culture’s categories should not mean that we do not question our own. Scholars often assume a “Ukrainianist” studies folk dancing and/or World War II nationalists. In fact, scholars focusing on Ukraine generally know at least four languages, study at least two empires, and understand the provincialism that comes from focusing exclusively on an imperial center. One of the challenges facing “Ukrainian Studies” is to re-conceptualize the field beyond Ukrainians, but one of the challenges of the Slavic field writ large is to re-categorize “Ukrainian Studies” not as a group of fringe ethics, but as an especially fertile field of study.

The post-Soviet infrastructure of higher education, in its material, bureaucratic, and mental framework, remains in Ukraine, but the young generation may challenge it. My one foray into cultural history may not have changed my students’ thinking, but it is my students who are currently engaged in the urgent struggle to re-think the category of “Ukraine.”
Challenges of Teaching Ukrainian as a Foreign Language
by Yuri Shevchuk
Lecturer of Ukrainian
Columbia University

Teaching Ukrainian as foreign language in a North American university entails a number of challenges that are both daunting and exciting. The current state of the field is very much a consequence of the fact that for centuries the Ukrainian language has been on the receiving end of massive, relentless, and very effective Russification. As the linguist Yuri Sheveliov famously noted, in addition to external pressure aimed at limiting the sphere of its usage, the Russifiers resorted to a novelty that other colonialists, the British, French or Spanish, did not think of using in their respective colonies. The Soviet-era Russifiers directly interfered in the Ukrainian language system itself, so as to make its phonology, morphology, lexis, syntax and even the language picture of the world closer to Russian. They codified the imposed changes in the Stalinist orthography literary Ukrainian circa 1933 that is yet to be discarded as profoundly anti-scientific.

Every instructor of Ukrainian in a North American university is inevitably faced with at least three major problems created by the legacy of Russian colonialism: 1) the continued reliance of the majority of language teaching publications coming out today on the old Soviet orthography; 2) the progressive replacement of literary Ukrainian in its colloquial variety by surzhyk, the macaronic mixture of Ukrainian and Russian as a result of continuing Russification; 3) the peculiar state of Ukrainian language methodology as manifested in textbooks, dictionaries, and other teaching aids that lags far behind the current needs.

The emergence of independent Ukraine solved the dilemma of which Ukrainian to teach: the one spoken in the western diaspora or the one in use on the Ukrainian cultural mainland. Predictably and justifiably the dilemma has been resolved in favor of the latter. Yet this solution in turn poses the questions, which orthography to use, the Soviet one, or its predecessor, the so-called Kharkivskiy pravopys (Kharkiv orthography), or some third option, a compromise between the two. The strongest argument in favor of the Soviet orthography is that it has been practiced for some eight decades including the twenty-three years of Ukraine’s independence. It, however, is fundamentally anti-scientific, a set of norms fabricated so as undermine Ukrainian as an original language with its own logic and make it sound as an impoverished pale copy of the great Russian tongue. The Kharkiv orthography reflects the inherent character of Ukrainian, reinforces its uniqueness. Until 1991, it was used exceptionally by the western diaspora, and since 1991 sporadically by a rather limited, if growing, number of publications (Krytyka) and media outlets (STB TV Channel) in Ukraine, however prestigious.

The two institutions vested with the authority to codify the Ukrainian literary standard and resolve such contentious issues, the Institute of Ukrainian language and the Institute of Linguistics, both part of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, have been effectively dominated by the holdouts of the old Soviet scientific establishment and therefore silent on this urgent matter. In the situation when the old orthography is unsustainable, both scientifically or morally, while the scientific literary standard is yet to be officially adopted, instructors of Ukrainian, authors of Ukrainian-as-foreign-language textbooks are left to decide for themselves. In Ukraine such decisions have been primarily in favor of the Soviet-era standard. They were made not so much on scientific merits but under the pressure from the Ministry of Education. In North America the Kharkiv orthography has traditionally been adhered to for a very pragmatic reason—to be easier on the Ukrainian language learner. The Kharkiv orthography is much more streamlined and relatively freer from historically motivated normative irregularities and exceptions that have beset modern literary Russian standard and that after 1933 “reform” were implanted into Ukrainian. For example, in transcription of foreign proper names, Latin H always corresponds to Ukrainian Г, and G to Г, as in Harvard – Гарвард, Helsinki – Гельсинки, and hegemony – гегемонія. This simple rule is absent from Russian, cf. Russ. Гарвард, but Хельсинки, гегемонія. This rule was scrapped in Ukrainian in 1933. By Kharkiv orthography, all foreign-borrowed neuter nouns, ending in ~о preceded by a consonant, decline as all other neuter nouns, e.g., метро – Воні встрілилися біля зупинки метро. They met near the subway station. In the modern Russian and Soviet Ukrainian orthography, this group of nouns constitutes an exception and do not decline, cf. Russ. Они встрілилися у остановки метро, and Soviet Ukr. Воні зступили біля зупинки метро. For language learners this is one more unnecessary exception to the rule. There are many more such Russian-borrowed normative aberrations in the Soviet-era Ukrainian orthography. Another serious challenge for Ukrainian language instructor arises from the fact that after the Soviet collapse, Russification not only never stopped but took new highly effective forms. One of them is the imposed Russian-Ukrainian bilingualism (IRUB). IRUB is an artificial and pervasive pairing of the Ukrainian speech with Russian in the media, newscasts, popular talk shows, interviews, etc. As a result the use of literary Ukrainian is shrinking in such strategic communicative spheres as radio, television, printed press, film, colloquial speech, business, science and technology, the Internet. A serious practical consequence of this policy is that both instructor and her student are hard-pressed to find Ukrainian speech samples, uncontaminated by Russian, that can be used as models of standard Ukrainian. It had become increasingly hard to find modern films, websites, radio and TV programs that are in Ukrainian only. The problem does not exist for instructors of Russian, Polish, Czech, Serbian or other Slavic languages. The IRUB creates an impression that Ukrainian in Ukraine is always used alongside Russian and never alone; it demotivates pragmatically-oriented learners and re-orients them toward Russian.

Until relatively recently no specialists were trained as instructors of Ukrainian as foreign/second language. In North American universities, Ukrainian is, with very few exceptions, taught by the faculty whose primary expertise is either literature, the Russian language, linguistics or sociolinguistics, but not Ukrainian as foreign language. Teaching Ukrainian is all too often perceived as anything but a long-term career prospect, worth a serious sustained investment of intellectual effort. Predictably such an attitude rarely translates into the publication of textbooks, dictionaries, and other much needed teaching materials, conference panels on the current issues of teaching Ukrainian as foreign language, and other activities directed at the development of Ukrainian language scholarship and methodology. Little wonder that instructors of Ukrainian today have to contend with insufficient number of usable textbooks for all levels: elementary, intermediate, advanced and superior. The already published resources are either outdated or have serious flaws that make them practically unusable. The current state of Ukrainian-as-second language methodology is best illustrated by the treatment of word stress in different textbooks. It is common knowledge in the field that the highly mobile word stress presents a serious challenge for learners of Ukrainian and even its native speakers. In order to minimize this challenge, it has been a consistent practice in North America to mark the word stress in all textbooks for all levels. This is also the case for similar language aids published in the Soviet Union. This methodologically justified and pragmatically indispensable approach is now being disposed of in a great number of Ukrainian-language-as-second textbooks published in Ukraine and elsewhere since 1991. This methodologically indefensible treatment of word stress has now made its way into North America and should be a matter of serious concern for those working in the field.

Another singularly crippling handicap of the current state of the Ukrainian-language-as-second methodology is the gaping absence of a Ukrainian dictionary meant specifically for the English-speaking learners of Ukrainian. The translation dictionaries, Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian published in Ukraine are all meant for Ukrainian-speakers learning English. They offer no morphological or syntagmatic description of words and prove to be of limited use for those who learn Ukrainian as opposed to translate into and from it. The only exception to the rule is the Ukrainian-English Dictionary by C. H. Andrusyshen, University of Saskatchewan, 1955, which is outdated. These are but a few of a much greater number of challenges faced by the instructor of Ukrainian as a foreign language today. Each of them makes the
work in the field a truly exciting and rewarding pursuit and everyone, who undertakes that pursuit, a pioneer.

1 This is true of Yar Slavutych Conversational Ukrainian, 1959, G. Duravetz Ukrainian. Conversational and Grammatical, 1973, Assya Hametsky Modern Ukrainian, 1980, Robert de Lossa et. al. Let’s Talk, 2005, Yuri Shevchuk Beginner’s Ukrainian, 2011, to name but a few.
3 Oleksandra Antoniv, Liubov Pauchok Ukrainian for Foreigners, Kyiv, Inkos Publishers, 2012. This textbook completely ignores word stress and therefore is unusable. Strange as it is, it has been recommended for use by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. The same approach is used in Albena Stamenova, Raina Kamberova Ukrainian for Bulgarians, Sofia, 2008.
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Q: What is the difference between тот же, такой же, одинаковый: У меня такие же туфли! У меня те же самые туфли! У нас одинаковые туфли.

A: This is the issue of 'sameness', which in Russian is very complex because we have six ways of saying 'the same' and they are not interchangeable; we should add один, один и тот же and тот самый.

There are two very important points for understanding the differences:

- Is there one item compared to itself at two different moments in time or two items?
- Are we comparing two things to one another or comparing one item to another?

In other words, are the two items under consideration equal or does one serve as a base for comparison? In the case of one item, are we comparing two manifestations of the same item to one another or comparing one manifestation to the previous one?

Now let us look at the six options one by one. First we will examine the case of two separate items:

1. Viewed at the same time — одинаковые — two alike objects. For example, one looks at Liz Taylor and Gina Lollobrigida and sees two identical dresses:

   Позавчера в Большом Кремлевском на приеме был конфуз: Лиз Тейлор и Лолобриджида явились в одинаковых платьях от Дiorа, как будто купленных в одной секции ГУМа. [Василий Катанян. Прикосновение к идолам (1998)]

   Similarly one could say: У нас с сестрой одинаковые туфли.

2. Viewed separately, one is compared to the other — такой же — just like the other one. In the following example, women wanted a dress just like the actress Gurchenko had:

   С подобной же просьбой ко мне обращались женщины, чтобы сшить себе такое платье, как у меня в фильме, или чтобы я выслала свое: «Мне так хочется такое же платье, я очень похожа на вас! » [Людмила Гурченко. Аплодисменты (1994-2003)]

   So one could see a pair of shoes on someone else and say: У меня такие же туфли есть. — 'I have a pair of shoes just like those.'

   Now let us take a look at the case of one item, which has many more options.

3. Один — means a shared item: жить в одной квартире, работать в одном институте, учиться в одном классе, ходить в одну школу etc.

   Я уже приметил парочку евших из одной тарелки. [Владимир Маканин. Неадекватен // «Новый Мир», 2002]

   — Потому что парню — десять, и что это за дело — в одной кровати с матерью спать! [Дина Рубина. Белая голубка Кордовы (2008-2009)]

   And in case of shoes it would be на двоих одни туфли. Not too common these days in real life, but a subplot in a number of films.

   The only problem with один is that the item should be shared in time as well, so we cannot say: *Достоевский и Бродский жили в одном городе.

4. Тот же / тот же самый — one item seen at two different points in time, one compared to the other:

   Она была одета в то же платье, только шляпу сняла…. Будто десяти лет не прошло… [Андрей Битов. Вкус (1960-1999)]

   In this case the same woman (та же женщина) was wearing the same dress ten years later.

   Тот же самый has the element of surprise; the message is that one would be expecting some change. For example, at the end of Chapter 30 we find the following example:

   Через несколько мгновений на пороге показалась Машурина — в том же самом платье, в каком мы ее видели в начале первой главы. [И. С. Тургенев. Новь (1877)]

   One might have expected a different dress. Or take the next very telling example, where Nekrasov expresses his surprise by saying надо же and by using тот же самый:
И надо же, чтоб в том же самом доме, где жил Яся, в 17-й квартире жила та самая Мира Соловейчик, к тому же имеющая какое-то отношение к литературе. [Виктор Некрасов. Саперлипопет (1983)]

Similarly with shoes, она была сегодня в тех же туфлях, что и в прошлый раз.

5. Тот самый has a similar meaning to the previous one but a completely different function: it serves as a reminder, and the time span between two appearances of the item is usually substantial.

Беру открытку, глядя на нее. Ксюша! Она сфотографирована в профиль. На ней то самое платье, в котором она погибла. [Геннадий Алексеев. Зеленые берега (1983-1984)]

Умер Павел — старший брат Ирины. Тот самый, который избил Володьку. [Токарева Виктория. Своя правда // «Новый Мир», 2002]

Уже много лет спустя, глядя на человека, она про себя говорила: “Это тот самый, который принес мне тогда половину булки.” [И. Грекова. Под фонарем (1963)]

In Turgenev's "Asya", in chapter four the heroine throws a branch of geranium from a window. At the very end of the story, in chapter twenty-two, the narrator says:

Осужденный на одиночество бессемейного бобыля, доживаю я скучные годы, но я храню, как святыню, ее записочки и высохший цветок гераниума, тот самый цветок, который она некогда бросила мне из окна. (Тургенев. Ася)

6. Один и тот же

This one is tricky for speakers of English. It refers to one item and two events discussed simultaneously none of which were discussed prior to this. If we look at the example from Tugenev's "Новь" above, the dress is first mentioned in chapter one, as the author says later, and here is this mention:

Возле стола сидела женщина лет тридцати, простоволосая, в черном шерстяном платье, и курила папироску. (Тургенев. Новь)

In order to use тот же, тот же самый and тот самый there should be a previous mention of the item in question. In order to use один и тот же there should not have been a previous mention of the item:

Вы уже сами, наверно, заметили, что никто не хочет ходить в одном и том же платье, а норовит каждый раз надевать на себя что-нибудь новое, оригинальное. [Николай Носов. Незнайка в Солнечном городе (1958)]

Дважды войти в одну и ту же реку он действительно не может, не может дважды совершить одно и то же движение, одинаково произнести одно и то же слово. [В. П. Зинченко. Теоретический мир психологии (2003) // «Вопросы психологии», 2003.10.21]

It is particularly difficult when один и тот же modifies the subject:

Один и тот же текст может вступать в разные отношения с его разными уровневыми структурами. [Ю. М. Лотман. Семиотика культуры и понятие текста (1981)]

Одна и та же песня последовательно исполнялась сначала отцем, затем матерью, сестре, брату, подругам — всем, кто по правилам свадебной игры должен принимать участие в обряде. [Свадьба тюменских старожилов // «Народное творчество», 2004]

There is one perennial problem with expressing sameness in Russian: even after studying the subject, many students continue to believe that самый means ‘the same’, which it never does. Самый outside of тот же самый means ‘very’ if it is not part of a superlative:

— Не тяжёлая, самый раз будет, — заверил фельдшер и взглянул в сторону Русакова, который выразительно поглядел на него, но смолчал. [Василь Быков. Болото (2001)] — ‘Not heavy, it will be just right,’ assured the medic and looked at Rusakov, who expressively looked at him, but remained silent.’
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GoldenDict: A Dictionary Lookup Program for Language Learners
Ferit Kılıçkaya (Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey)
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Dictionaries prove to be of great help and guidance to language learners in their efforts not only to learn words but also use them appropriately in the target language. Therefore, teachers and learners of any language attach great importance to the use of dictionaries in their long but enjoyable journey of teaching and learning. It was not long ago that language learners carried thick dictionaries in print with them; however, the technological advances have also changed the way we use dictionaries. This change first started with the introduction of electronic pocket dictionaries followed by dictionaries provided on CDs/DVDs. Today, there are websites with dictionaries in print and/or on CD/DVD (Collins Dictionaries, Oxford Learners Dictionaries, Merriam-Webster, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Macmillan Dictionaries, and Cambridge Dictionaries – just a few examples) that can be accessed using new technological devices such as tablets and smartphones as well as the versions that can be installed on these devices.

It can be stated that language learners mostly opt for electronic dictionaries (online and/or the ones that can be installed on tables and smartphones). The recent research on the use of electronic/online dictionaries indicates that many language learners use online dictionaries in and outside the classroom (Jin & Deifell, 2013) and that teachers as well as students have developed positive attitudes towards using electronic dictionaries, with a preference for electronic dictionaries over print ones (Dashtestani, 2013). An article recently published by Nesi (2014) provides a brief but informative overview of the studies conducted on language learners’ use of dictionaries.

In the current column, I will briefly introduce GoldenDict, a dictionary lookup program for language learners.

GoldenDict

GoldenDict, a dictionary lookup program, enables language learners to use several dictionary files (to cite some of them: Babylon .BGL files, ABBYY Lingvo .dsl source files, and StarDict .ifo/.dict/.idx/.syn dictionaries) together with the support for Wikipedia and online dictionaries through URL patterns.

When you visit ‘http://www.goldendict.org’, the homepage will appear, introducing the main features of this program. You need to click on the ‘Download’ button at the top of the page, which will lead to the page offering you several options to select from. On the next page, click on the installer that will meet your needs. For example, 32-bit Windows En-Ru-En installer (78 MB) has two dictionaries (Apresyan En-Ru and Smirnitskiy Ru-En) and English word pronunciations.

When the download is finished, click on the installer and install GoldenDict. When you run the program, the following interface will welcome you.

When you have downloaded the 32-bit Windows En-Ru-En installer (78 MB), you will have two dictionaries (Apresyan En-Ru and Smirnitskiy Ru-En) and can try the program. However, if you have downloaded the first installer, you will have no dictionary content. For the dictionary content, you might start with WordNet 3.0, which has a clear license and has been specially formatted for GoldenDict. Alternatively, you may check the ‘Dictionaries’ page that provides third-party dictionaries that work with the program. I suggest you try FREE Babylon (.bgl) dictionaries for the dictionary content and/or purchase PREMIUM dictionaries (Please make sure that you have checked copyright issues regarding the use of these dictionary files in GoldenDict).

When you are finished downloading the dictionary files, you will need to copy or move to the folder where you have installed GoldenDict (e.g. C:\Program Files\GoldenDict\content). However, these files are not automatically added to GoldenDict; we need to add these files to the program. On the main window, there is an ‘Edit’ button. Click on ‘Edit’ and select ‘Dictionaries’.

The following window will appear. On this window, we will add the path(s) to search for dictionary files and then click on the ‘Rescan now’ button so that GoldenDict can index these files. Whenever we need to use new dictionary files, we will follow the same steps.
Below is the search result for the word 'obituary' using the dictionary file WordNet® 3.0 (En-En).

However, as previous studies indicate such as Dashtestani (2013), most language learners use a variety of online dictionaries while looking up the words in the target language. **GoldenDict** has a very practical and amazing feature for these learners. You can query online dictionaries from one single interface.

In order to query online dictionaries, we need to enter URLs. I will add the website of 'Macmillan Dictionary' as an example. First of all, we need to find out how this online dictionary works. In order to find out this, I enter the word 'obituary' in the search box on this website and then check the URL that provides the meaning of this word. The URL appears as 'http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/american/obituary'. Then, replace the value or word 'obituary' with the expression %GDWORD%, which will **GoldenDict** will use to search for the words entered in 'Look up:' on the main window. The URL that we will use in **GoldenDict** is 'http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/american/%GDWORD%'.

On the main window, click on 'Edit', select 'Dictionaries', and then click on the tab 'Websites'. First, click on the 'Add' button and enter a name such as 'Macmillan'. Then, paste the URL into the address field and do not forget to click once on the small box next to 'Name' to activate this website.

Below is the search result for the word 'obituary' using the Macmillan Online Dictionary website through **GoldenDict**.

Another research result is provided below for the word 'obituary', using the website 'Jukuu', an online database of sample sentences.
We may need to prevent advertisements loaded with other websites. In order to do this, on the main window, click on 'Edit', select 'Preferences', and then click on the tab 'Network'. Click once on the small box next to 'Disallow loading content from other sites (hides most advertisements)'.

Evaluation

*GoldenDict* is a great program for language learners interested in using several dictionary files, as well as popular online dictionary websites to look up words. It is also worth noting that a mobile version of GoldenDict is available for Android Devices at http://goldendict.mobi/.

Resources

**Online Dictionaries**
- http://www.collinsdictionary.com/
- http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/
- http://www.merriam-webster.com/
- http://www.ldoceonline.com/
- http://www.macmillandictionary.com/
- http://dictionary.cambridge.org/

**Online Database of Sample Sentences**
http://www.jukuu.com/

**Dictionary Files**
- http://downloads.sourceforge.net/goldendict/WordNet3.0_1.0.zip
- http://www.babylon.com/free-dictionaries/
- https://store.babylon.com/category/1/7/1/0/1/dictionary
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Long Beach, CA 90840-1601

Mary Neuburger
Professor, Department of History
University of Texas at Austin
128 Inner Campus Dr., Stop B7000, GAR 1.104
Austin, TX 78712-1739
Domestic Summer Language Programs

Editor: Kathleen Evans-Romaine (Arizona State University)

AATSEEL compiles information on U.S.-based summer programs in Slavic, East European, and Eurasian languages and cultures. These listings include only Slavic, East European, and Eurasian offerings. Many of the programs listed offer additional languages. See individual program sites for details. The information below was provided in October 2013 and is subject to change. Please contact programs directly for details and updates. Program directors; send updates for future Newsletters to cli@asu.edu.

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING MULTIPLE EAST-EUROPEAN/EURASIAN LANGUAGES:

**Arizona State University**

Languages: Albanian, Armenian, BCS, Macedonian, Polish, Russian, Tatar, Turkish, Ukrainian, Uzbek

Locations: Tempe AZ, Ankara, Kazan, Kiev, Samarqand, Sarajevo, St. Petersburg, Tirana, Yerevan

Dates: Vary by location and level

Credits: 8–13 (160–220 hours of instruction)

Tuition/Fees: $960

Funding: Melikian Scholars Awards

Website: [http://cli.asu.edu](http://cli.asu.edu)

Contact: cli@asu.edu; 480-965-4188

**Indiana University**

Languages: Arabic, Georgian, Hungarian, Mongolian, Persian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Swahili, Tatar, Turkish, Urdu, Uzbek, Yiddish

Locations: Bloomington, Indiana

Dates: 9 Jun – 1 Aug [All Arabic and Level 1 Russian: 2 Jun – 1 Aug]

Credits: 3-10

Tuition/Fees: (est) $1,600 - $4,500

Funding: Ugrad funding: FLAS, Project GO for ROTC cadets and midshipmen in good standing

Grad funding: FLAS

Website: [http://www.indiana.edu/~swseel/](http://www.indiana.edu/~swseel/)

Contact: swseel@indiana.edu; 812-855-2889

**University of Kansas**

Languages: Ukrainian

Locations: Lviv, Ukraine

Dates: June 1- July 18, 2014 (tentative)

Credits: 6

Tuition/Fees: Approximately $4,900 (including excursion costs)

Room/Board: Approximately $1,650

Funding: Ugrad funding: FLAS (www.flas.ku.edu)

Grad funding: FLAS (www.flas.ku.edu)

Website: [http://ku.studioabroad.com/?go=Ukraine](http://ku.studioabroad.com/?go=Ukraine)

Contact: Justine Hamilton justine@ku.edu, 785-864-3742

---

**CESSI (University of Wisconsin, Madison)**

Languages: Kazakh, Tajik, Uyghur, Uzbek (other Central Eurasian languages with sufficient demand)

Locations: Madison WI

Dates: June 16-August 8, 2014

Credits: 8

Tuition/Fees: UW tuition ($3,800 program fee)

Funding: Melikian Scholars Awards

Ugrad funding: FLAS

Grad funding: FLAS

Website: [http://www.creeca.wisc.edu/cessi/](http://www.creeca.wisc.edu/cessi/)

Contact: cessi@creeca.wisc.edu; 608-262-3379

**University of Kansas**

Languages: Croatian

Locations: Zadar, Croatia

Dates: May 25- July 5, 2014

Credits: 6

Tuition/Fees: Approximately $5,400 (including excursion costs)
Room/Board: Approximately $2,000

Funding:
- Ugrad funding: FLAS (www.flas.ku.edu)
- Grad funding: FLAS (www.flas.ku.edu)

Website: http://ku.studioabroad.com/?go=Croatia
Contact: Justine Hamilton justine@ku.edu 785-864-3742

UCLA

Languages: Russian, Romanian, Serbian-Croatian
Locations: Los Angeles
Dates: June 24 - August 2/ August 16
Credits: 12
Tuition/Fees: $271/unit for UC undergrad. students and $339/unit for UC grad and visiting students
Website: http://www.summer.ucla.edu/fees/fees.htm
Contact: lisalee@humnet.ucla.edu ; 310-825-3856

University of Pittsburgh

Program: Slavic, East European and Near-Eastern Summer Language Institute
Languages: Arabic, BCS, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Persian, Polish, Russian, Slovak, Turkish, Ukrainian
Locations: Pittsburg, Moscow, Prague, Montenegro, Krakow, Debrecen, Bratislava
Dates: June 9 – July 18, or August 1, or August 15
Credits: 6–10
Tuition/Fees: $4,056–$8,060
Funding: Grad funding: Tuition Scholarships, FLAS, Project Go (ROTC, Russian), stipends
Grad funding: Tuition Scholarships, FLAS, stipends
Website: http://www.slavic.pitt.edu/sli/
Contact: slavic@pitt.edu; 412-624-5906

BALSSI (University of Pittsburgh)

Languages: Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian
Locations: Pittsburg
Dates: June 9 – July 18
Credits: 6
Tuition/Fees: $4,056
Funding: Ugrad funding: REES and SLI Tuition Scholarships, FLAS
Grad funding: REES and SLI Tuition Scholarships, FLAS
Website: http://www.slavic.pitt.edu/sli/
Contact: slavic@pitt.edu; 412-624-5906

University of Washington

Languages: Russian
Location: Seattle, WA
Dates: June 23 – Aug 23
Credits: 15
Tuition/Fees: $8,264–$9,187
Website: http://depts.washington.edu/slavweb/academics/summer-language-intensives/
Contact: slavicll@uw.edu; 206-543-6848

Beloit College

Languages: Russian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, ESL
Location: Beloit, Wisconsin
Dates: June 14-August 8, 2014
Credits: 12
Funding: Ugrad funding: Director’s Scholarship
Grad funding: Director’s Scholarship
Website: http://www.beloit.edu/cls/
Contact: cls@beloit.edu; 608-363-2373

Bryn Mawr College

Languages: Russian
Location: Bryn Mawr, PA
Dates: Jun 4 – July 30, 2014
Credits: 4-8
Funding: Ugrad funding: need based
Grad funding: need based
Website: http://www.brynmawr.edu/russian/rli.htm
Contact: rli@brynmawr.edu; 610-526-5187

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING RUSSIAN:
Georgia Institute of Technology
Languages: Russian
Location: Moscow
Dates: May 19-July 15, 2014
Credits: 9
Tuition/Fees: In-state tuition, fees, and $4800 program fee. Homestay (accommodation, breakfasts and dinners all included in program fee).
Funding: Ugrad: Scholarships for ROTC cadets through Project GO
Website: http://www.modlangs.gatech.edu/lbat/russia
Contact: sgoldberg@gatech.edu; 404-894-9251

Middlebury College
Languages: Russian
Location: Middlebury, VT
Dates: June 20 – Aug 15 (8-week intensive language program)
July 1 – Aug 15 (6-week graduate program)
Credits: 12 semester hours, undergrad level (8-week program)
9 semester hours, grad level (6-week grad program)
Tuition/Fees: $10,505 (8-week program; includes housing and meals)
$8,095 (6-week grad program; includes housing and meals)
Funding: Need-based financial aid; also, merit-based scholarships such as the Kathryn Davis Fellowship for Peace
Website: http://www.middlebury.edu/ls/russian
Contact: schoolofrussian@middlebury.edu; (802) 443-2006

Monterey Institute for International Studies
Languages: Russian
Location: Monterey, CA
Dates: June 16 – August 8, 2014, application deadline: April 28
Credits: up to 8
Tuition/Fees: $3,950, MIIS application fee $50
Housing & Meals: not included
Funding: Ugrad funding: financial aid
Grad funding: scholarships
Website: go.miiis.edu/silp
Contact: languages@miiis.edu; 831-647-4115

University of Michigan
Languages: Russian
Location: Ann Arbor, MI
Dates: May 6–June 24, June 26–August 15
Credits: 8 per class
Tuition/Fees: $2,800–$3,200
Website: http://lsa.umich.edu/sli
Contact: Slavic@umich.edu 734-764-5355

North Carolina State University
Languages: Elementary Russian 101/102
Location: Raleigh, NC
Dates: Elementary: May 14 – June 25
Credits: 8 credits per session, 2 sessions
Tuition/Fees: resident: $1,950, non-resident $6,000.
Room/Board: Not included
Funding: Ugrad funding: Project GO (ROTC only)
Website: http://gold.chass.ncsu.edu
Contact: Shanna Ratashak, Project GO-NCSU, seratash@ncsu.edu, 919-513-0119

University of Virginia
Languages: Russian, Arabic, Chinese
Location: Charlottesville, VA
Dates: June 15 to August 8
Credits: 12 (Russian), 8 (Arabic, Chinese)
Tuition/Fees: Ugrad $4,407 (in state) $14,570 (out of state)
Grad: $4,959 (in state) $9,698 (out of state)
Housing: $25 (single) and $33 (double)
Website: http://www.virginia.edu/summer/SLI/index.html
Contact: Shanna Ratashak, Project GO-NCSU, uvasli@virginia.edu; 434-243-2241
Member News

AATSEEL enjoys keeping its members informed about important events and professional milestones. If you or an AATSEEL member you know has recently defended a dissertation, been hired, received a promotion or retired, please send the member’s name, accomplishment and affiliation to Colleen Lucey (clucey@wisc.edu).

The AATSEEL Newsletter would like to recognize the following members for their recent professional success:

Elizabeth Blake (Saint Louis University) announces the publication of her monograph, *Dostoevsky and the Catholic Underground*, with Northwestern University Press. In February 2014 Angela Brintlinger (Ohio State University) presented her inaugural lecture “It’s About Genre” to celebrate her promotion to full professor. Dr. Brintlinger also writes with news that she received a Faculty Workshop/Conference Grant from the Mershon Center for International Security Studies at Ohio State University. In Autumn 2014 she will organize a workshop with Dr. Firiiza Melvila (Cambridge University) and Dr. Jennifer Siegel (Ohio State History Department) related to their project, “Winning and Losing the Great Game: Literature, Art, and Diplomacy between Russia and Iran.”

Ellen Elias-Bursac (Independent Scholar and Translator) announces that her translation of David Albahari’s novel *Globetrotter* will come out with Yale University Press in August 2014.

Anna Frajlich-Zajac (Columbia University) writes with news of several professional accomplishments. She is the recipient of honorary diplomas from Foundation Judaica in Krakow, Poland and from The Polish People’s University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Dr. Frajlich-Zajac announces that her book of poetry *Łódź jest i jest przystanią* (Szczecin: FORMA, 2013) has been warmly received by literary critics and featured in both *World Literature Today* and the Polish magazine *Nowe Książki*. She also wishes to announce the publication of “Daty dedykacji” in *Obecność: Wspomnienia o Czesławie Miłoszu*, Ed. Anna Romaniuk (Warsaw: PWN, 2013); “The Ghost of Shakespeare in the Poetry of Szymborska” in *Szekspiromania, księga dedykowana pamięci Andrzeja Żurowskiego*, Ed. Anna Cetera (Warsaw: University of Warsaw Press, 2013); and Ross Ulberg’s translation of her poems in *Modern Poetry in Translation* (2013).

Professional highlights from Alla Kourova (University of Central Florida) include an in-house grant for “Picturing Russia,” and several awards, including a College Award in Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching as well as a University Excellence Award in Teaching. Dr. Kourova also announces the publication of her book, *Using cross-cultural projects in teaching foreign languages: A research-based approach to design and implementation* (Smolensk: Universum Press, 2013) as well as the following articles: “The integration of the Bologna process in Russia” (*Florida Foreign Language Journal*, 2013); “Connecting classrooms: Russian language teaching project at UCF” (*Journal of the American Council of Teachers of Russian*, 2013); and two pieces co-authored with D.T. Modianos: “Inter-cultural awareness and its role in enriching students’ communicative competence” (*The International HETL Review Special Issue*, 2013); and “Cross-cultural projects in the in-service teachers training programs” in *Philosophy of Education: History and Present Time* (Penza: Penza State University Press, 2013).

Kevin McKenna (University of Vermont) has recently been honored with a festschrift volume of essays edited by international paremiology authority, Professor Wolfgang Mieder, and published by Peter Lang International Folkloristics (ISBN-13: 978-1433119514). Titled *Russkie poslovitsy: Russian Proverbs in Literature, Politics, and Pedagogy—Festschrift for Kevin J. McKenna in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, this essay volume features a sampling of 14 of McKenna’s published articles over the past two decades and gathered them into one volume. The essays are divided into three groups—literature, politics, and pedagogy. The first six essays are dedicated to the literary use and function of proverbs in a wide range of works. The next five articles deal with the use of Russian proverbs in *Pravda* headlines and the final three essays in the section on pedagogy look at the role of proverbs in Russian language curriculum.


Gavriel Shapiro (Cornell University) announces the publication of his book *The Tender Friendship and the Charm of Perfect Accord: Nabokov and His Father* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2014).

Valeria Sobol (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign) has been awarded a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Stipend for her book project: *The Haunted Empire: The Russian Literary Gothic and the Imperial Uncanny*, 1793-1844.

Mara Sukholutskaya (East Central University, Ada, Oklahoma) was awarded an Honorary Doctorate in Linguistics and International Communication this year from two cooperating universities—the M.P. Dragomanov National Pedagogical University (Kiev, Ukraine) and the Ukrainian-American Liberal Arts Institute at the Wisconsin International University (USA)-Ukraine (WIIU).

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Ian Wilson, is pleased to announce that Frederick White (Utah Valley University) has been appointed as the new Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs—Engaged Learning. His responsibilities will include the Office for Engaged Learning, the Center for Global and Intercultural Engagement, the Capitol Reef Field Station, Internships Services, Academic Service Learning, Undergraduate Research, the Office of Sponsored Programs, the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence, the Innovation Center, the Office of Academic Research Support, and the Institutional Review Board.

Olga Yokoyama (University of California, Los Angeles) was awarded a Distinguished Professorship from UCLA in 2012 and an Honorary Doctorate from Tyumen State University, Russia in 2013. Dr. Yokoyama also received a Transdisciplinary Seed Grant for the project “Hemispheric contribution to syntactic and pragmatic control of shifts in point of view” from UCLA. In addition to these professional milestones, she wishes to announce...
the publication of “Modeling the shifting face of the discourse mediator,” in Divided Languages? Diglossia, Translation and the Rise of Modernity in Japan, China, and the Slavic World eds. Árokay, J. Gvozdanović and D. Miyajima (New York, 2014) and that her book Russian Peasant Letters: Texts and Contexts, is now available in Russian under the title: Pis’ma russkix krest’ian. Teksty i konteksty (Moscow, 2014).
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In Memoriam Karl Kramer

The Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures at the University of Washington grieves the passing of Professor Emeritus Karl Kramer on February 19, 2014 at age 80. Karl was a Seattle native who earned his B.A. (English, 1955), M.A. (Comparative Literature, 1957), and Ph.D. (Comparative Literature, 1964) all at the University of Washington. As a participant in one of the first – and, in those days of the Cold War, extremely rare – academic exchanges in the former Soviet Union, Karl attended Moscow State University as a doctoral candidate in 1959-1960. He went on to teach at Northwestern University (1961-1965) and the University of Michigan (1965-1970) before coming back to the UW in 1970, where he taught jointly in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Department of Comparative Literature until his retirement in 1999. He chaired the Slavic Department between 1988 and 1998. A world-renowned Chekhov scholar, Karl taught a wide variety of courses during the nearly thirty years he spent at the UW. He also became actively involved – mainly as a translator and consultant – in a number of theatrical productions of Chekhov’s plays staged by local directors and actors in the Seattle area, especially those connected with Intiman Theatre, and participated for many years in a group bringing discussions of theater and plays to Washington State prisons. Loved by his colleagues and students, Karl and his generosity of spirit, nobleness of character and dry, self-deprecating sense of humor will be greatly missed. He is survived by his wife Doreen, daughter Jennifer, and two grandchildren. A memorial service is planned for April 5, 2014 on the UW-Seattle campus.
Recent Publications

Carmen Finashina (Northwestern University)
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Critical Languages Song Project

Advanced one-semester courseware in Russian culture and language through the prism of song tailored to the needs of fourth-year language students.

Materials are presented in a specially designed computer interface to support advanced learners.

Courseware is offered free of charge to faculty and their students at U.S. universities.

Visit: clsp.gatech.edu

Language • Culture • Context • Conflict • Song

Discover

a new location for tailored Study Abroad programs in Russian Language, Baltic and post-Soviet Area Studies

Daugavpils
the most Russian city in the European Union

Daugavpils, the second largest city of Latvia, is a unique Russian linguistic enclave within the European Union and a perfect place to study the Russian language and regional issues.

Daugavpils offers total immersion in modern Russian language, rich history, and contemporary life of a multicultural East European city:

• 96% of the population speaking Russian as their native or primary language of communication;
• Personal safety with European living standards and medical care;
• Customized academic and intensive programs in the Russian language, literature, as well as in Baltic, Jewish, post-Soviet studies;
• Convenient location for weekend study trips to Russia, Belarus and all Baltic States;
• Daugavpils University provides European ECTS academic transcripts accepted by most U.S. universities.

No visa required for students and scholars from the United States and Canada.

Learn Russian

The Department of Russian and Slavic Linguistics at Daugavpils University has a long tradition of research and teaching the Russian language and literature to international students, teachers, philologists and linguists.

Find more at www.du.lv/en

For more information about the “Learn Russian in the EU”, please contact us at info@learnrussianineu.com

Follow us at www.LearnRussianInEU.com and facebook.com/LearnRussianInEU
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