



Journal of Arts & Humanities

Contemporary Language Issues in Ukraine: Bilingualism or Russification¹

Iryna Zbyr²

ABSTRACT

The article aims to focus on the analysis of the contemporary language issues in Ukraine. A characteristic feature of contemporary language situation in Ukraine is a co-existence on its territory of two languages, Ukrainian and Russian, along with various forms of Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism. Narrowing down the spheres of use of the Ukrainian language and the strong interferential influence of Russian have led to the emergence of the hybrid of Ukrainian-Russian forms of the everyday language known as Surzhyk. The article discusses how language forms are connected with conceptualizations of national identity in contemporary Ukrainian language ideology. It especially focuses on Surzhyk a pejorative collective label for non-standard language varieties that dissolve the language boundary between Ukrainian and Russian standard languages. Although most attention in Ukrainian debates on language is directed towards the complex relations between two standard languages, Surzhyk is considered an important problem, not the least among those for whom it is a major threat to the survival of the Ukrainian language.

Key words: Bilingualism, language, linguicide, Russification, Surzhyk.

Available Online: 25th February, 2015.

MIR Centre for Socio-Economic Research, USA.

1.0 Introduction and research settings

Language policy in every country has its general and specific features which are closely connected with the country's historical development, culture, peculiarities of political system, etc. The language issue in

¹ This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2015.

² Professor, Department of Ukrainian Studies, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, South Korea. email: ivtorak@gmail.com.

Ukraine is nowadays an important component of a complex problem of national identity, since many people view the language as a foundation for this identity. That is why the given problem seems to be absolutely indispensable when the Ukrainians defend their own identity.

Contemporary language situation in Ukraine may be considered as a result of a long-term war against the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian identity and Ukrainian national statehood which Russia unleashed after 1654. Contemporary situation with the language in Ukraine has resulted from the unfinished assimilation process back in the Soviet times, i.e. turning a Ukrainian-language community into a Russian-language community. As a result, here unbalanced bilingualism reflects a post-colonial condition of the Ukrainian society.

A language is a symbol of nation's solidarity. It seems possible to build up Ukraine as an independent state only on the basis of historical background of the Ukrainian people, and thus it's the language which ensures normal functioning of the national organism in all its manifestations. The language reflects unity of the state. In the national state such notions as "a state", "a nation" and "a language" have the same meaning. All multi-ethnic empires dissolved because they did not have a common means of consolidation, i.e. the language. The language and self-awareness are the most important features of a nation. "Neither a name, nor religion and the blood of ancestors make a person a member of a certain people... A person belongs to the nation in whose language he or she thinks", wrote the author of a famous Russian explanatory dictionary Volodymyr Dal (*Potebnia, 1993*). However, in Ukraine many attempts are made to eliminate these criteria from the definition of nation.

Almost in every sphere of life language spread and language use do not correspond either to the ethnic balance of population (the Ukrainians and the Russians make 77.8% and 17.3% correspondingly), or to the number of citizens who consider the Ukrainian and Russian languages as their native ones (67.5% and 29.6%), or to objective language use in everyday life, since 68.6% of population at any rate use Ukrainian and 61% use Russian... On the whole, language rights of ethnic Russians as well as those who name Russian as their mother tongue and Russian-speaking citizens of Ukraine in general seem to be ensured to a much greater extent if compared to language rights of ethnic Ukrainians, those who name Ukrainian as their mother tongue and Ukrainian-speaking citizens of Ukraine. If we still admit that there is language discrimination in Ukraine, the statistics give more reasons to speak about the discrimination of Ukrainian-speaking rather than Russian-speaking citizens. In eastern and southern parts of Ukraine, where stereotypes about oppression against the Russian language in Ukraine prevail, it is the Ukrainian language that is on the verge of disappearing and requires adequate protection. However, on numerous examples the language balance testifies to the fact that the statement about compulsory Ukrainization of Southern and Eastern Ukraine does not stand up to criticism (*Medvediev, 2007*).

"Language policy does not presuppose the prohibition to speak another language, it means creating favorable conditions for development of the official language, for it to be able to perform its functions in all social spheres", thinks M. S. Briukhovets'kyi, the Honorary President of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (*Kalynovs'ka, 2008*). Language policy must not be left unattended. Being a creation of public mind, the language produces a powerful reciprocal impact on it. Thus, there is no country which would be indifferent to the fact which language is being spoken by its citizens. After all, the "contents" of this natural reservoir of information determines the level of spiritual development of a society, the hierarchy of its priorities and the culture of interpersonal, international and inter-ethnic relations (*Nahorna, 2005*).

Taking into consideration the development of Ukrainian under the language policy in the Russian Empire and then the Soviet Union linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, political scientists and above all politicians not only in Ukraine but all over the world have widely discussed the preservation and development of the Ukrainian language under this policy. The main focus of this article is the state of the language in different historical periods and the nation- and state-formation processes in Ukraine (*Bilaniuk, 1998, Taranenko, 1999, Pivtorak, 2001, Masenko, 2004*). Another aspect of the language discussion is explored in reference to surzhyk a linguistic phenomenon degenerated by

using of two languages (Antonenko-Davydovych, 1994, Serbenska, 1994, Andrukhovych, 2001, Medvediev, 2007). Analyzing the contemporary language situation in Ukraine the researchers address this issue from a nationalistic perspective.

For instance, a well-known Ukrainian sociolinguist Larysa Masenko focuses on the status and relations between the Russian and Ukrainian language after Ukrainian independence (Masenko, 2004). In her book *Language and Society: Postcolonial Dimension* she covers a variety of aspects of functioning and status of the Ukrainian language in the Ukrainian society. The main subjects of the author's investigation are bilingualism, language maintenance and language conflict in Ukraine. Along with that she also discusses the historical development of the Ukrainian language which serves as a useful historical basis for the whole book. There is a strong accent in the book on the postcolonial perspective on interpreting Ukrainian sociolinguistic phenomena. This approach is deeply rooted in the Ukrainian scholarly tradition (G. Shevelov, O. Horbach), free of Soviet ideological biases and prejudices.

Now surzhyk is used to denote the Russian-Ukrainian language mixture. The word has a negative connotation and opposes the language mixture with varieties of language perceived as pure, such as the standard variety. According to Serbenska (2004), current public discourse associates surzhyk with parochialism, lack of education, and a low culture.

Considering the works of famous linguists, we formulate tasks of this article:

- Consider the language issues in Ukraine based on the historical aspects of bilingualism and contemporary language legislation;
- Identify the question of bilingualism and Surzhyk as a phenomenon which was generated using of two languages;
- Characterize the main problems on the way of development of contemporary Ukrainian language and national identity.

2.0 The question of bilingualism in Ukraine

2.01 Bilingualism is a transitional policy towards total Russification

What is more, nowadays Russia is not always to blame for this. Over many years Ukrainian own *mankurts** have grown up and now influence the situation. Of course, the condition of language results from centuries-long Russian policy, but for the time being it is the presidents and prime ministers of Ukraine who are to blame for the lack of appropriate language policy in the country. Mobs of *moskals*** and *khokhols**** also shoulder the responsibility as they push politicians towards strengthening the status of Russian in conditions of its privilege.

It has to be mentioned that such inaction on the part of the Ukrainian Government and constant external influence from Russia has led to tragic condition of the language in Ukraine and even generated a new linguistic phenomenon, namely surzhyk (a range of mixed (macaronic) sociolects of the Ukrainian and Russian languages used in certain regions of Ukraine and adjacent lands.) in the east, south and centre of Ukraine. The surveys have showed that surzhyk is used by 2.5% of adult population in Western Ukraine and 21.7% adults in Eastern and Central Ukraine, the overall number being approximately 12% of the Ukrainians (see *Surzhyk, 2007*).

Why is Ukrainian in a better condition in Western Ukraine than in other regions of the country? It happens so because the scale of Polonization cannot be even compared with Russian linguistic. Lviv

*Mankurt is an Ukrainian person with an erased historical memory.

**Moskal is an ironic name for Russian citizens irrespective of their ethnic origin or the place of living among the Ukrainians.

***Khokhol is a derogatory name for the Ukrainians that is often used by the Russians in everyday life.

and other cities of Western Ukraine housed a Ukrainian printing works that published Ukrainian books, there was the Ukrainian Language Society *Prosvita*, and Ukrainian children went to Ukrainian schools, etc. Why in some cities, for instance, Odessa, people predominantly speak Russian, while in the villages of that region they speak Ukrainian? The reason for this was the fact that most often the Russians migrated to cities where industry and infrastructure were developing.

Supporters for bilingualism very often resort to supposedly analogous examples, in particular the experience of Belgium, Luxemburg, Switzerland and Canada. Contrary to Unitarian Ukraine, Belgium and Luxemburg are federations where the Belgian or Luxembourgian languages do not exist; there has never been any language expansion towards the titular nation, since there is none. Moreover, Switzerland is a confederation of countries where there is no Swiss nation or language. Canada is a country of an emigrant type where no Canadian language has ever existed (see [Masenko, 2007](#)).

In case of bilingualism two languages compete on the whole territory of the country, and as a result one of the languages gradually weakens and disappears. Linguists have proved that two languages cannot be functionally equivalent on the same territory. For this reason bilingualism does not usually last long. In fact, it turns out to be a transitional stage (an intermediate link) to monolingualism where one of the languages is displaced. This seems to be quite obvious for those who artfully promote such supposedly peaceful bilingualism. It goes without saying that the humiliated, oppressed for centuries and bloodless Ukrainian language that has only started to rise to its feet could prove to be uncompetitive in the situation of active attacks from aggressive Russian-speaking people.

2.02 The historical aspect of bilingualism and language legislation in Ukraine

In order to address such a complex issue as a condition of language and bilingualism, one has to look into the roots of this question and refer to facts. The facts and history reveal the problem of language discrimination of the Ukrainians:

- 1654, Pereiaslav Council made Ukraine a part of Russia on the rights of autonomy (however, these rights had been violated for a long time).
- 1709, Peter I issues a decree on prohibiting books to be published in Ukrainian.
- 1763, Catherine II issues a decree on prohibiting Ukrainian-language teaching in Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.
- 1764, Catherine II annihilated Ukrainian hetmanate and along with that she closed up Ukrainian educational and cultural establishments, removed all Ukrainian-speaking officials from office.
- 1811, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was closed up.
- 1847, Kyrylo and Methodius Society was utterly annihilated and outstanding Ukrainian poets and writers were arrested, namely T. Shevchenko, P. Kulish, M. Kostomarov et alia.
- 1863, the Valuyev Circular was issued to prohibit publishing textbooks, mass literature and religious books in Ukrainian. Only belles-lettres books could be published in Ukrainian.
- 1876, the Ems Decree by Alexander II was aimed at displacing the Ukrainian language from the sphere of culture and limiting its use to everyday life.
- 1910, 1911, 1914, the Russian Government closed up the *Prosvita* Society in Kyiv, Chernihiv and Katerynoslav (now – Dnipropetrovsk).
- 1919, after Ukraine was conquered by Bolsheviks the nationally-conscious part of the population was massacred and all Ukrainian literary, dramatic and oral works were prohibited.
- 1922–1934, there was a wave of repressions against a unique and vivid phenomenon of Ukrainian and world culture, namely *kobzarstvo* (i.e. the culture of the blind professional itinerant folk singers, known as the *kobzars*.)
- 1929–1991, representatives of Ukrainian intellectuals, clergy and well-off countrymen were arrested. Ukraine became intensely inhabited by the Russians (their number increased fourfold). (see [Pivtorak, 2001](#))

Ukrainian language legislation dates back to the times of Ukrainian National Republic.

On March, 1918 the Central Council adopted a Bill on languages which clearly established that “all the inscriptions and outdoor signs... have to be written in the official Ukrainian language... Ukrainian is also the language of paperwork...”.

On October 28, 1989 the Bill on languages in the Ukrainian SSR established the official status of Ukrainian in Ukraine. On July 16, 1990 the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine determined: “The Ukrainian SSR ensures national and cultural renaissance of the Ukrainian nation, its historical conscience and traditions... as well as using the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social life”. On February 12, 1991 the Council of Ministers of Ukraine affirmed the State development plan for the Ukrainian language and other national languages in the Ukrainian SSR by 2000, but not even a half of it has been implemented. On June 28, 1996 article 10 of the Constitution of Ukraine declared: “Ukrainian is an official state language of Ukraine. The state ensures versatile development and use of the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social life on the territory of Ukraine”. (see Yushchuk, 2008).

If national minorities are concerned, it has to be mentioned that all the international legal documents demand that apart from fluency in their native language, the national minorities should also be fluent in the language of their country of residence. However, a shameful Bill on state language policy, adopted on July 3, 2012, determines that Ukrainian remains an official language but considerably widens the use of regional languages if the number of speakers of these languages exceeds or sometimes even does not reach 10% from the total number of inhabitants in a certain region. It gave all the grounds not only to develop bilingualism in certain regions of Ukraine, but also to limit the use of Ukrainian in all spheres of social life and to promote the Russian language in most regions of Ukraine (see *Zakon Ukrainy*). Fortunately, the given bill was annulled on February 23, 2014.

2.03 Surzhyk as a “child” of bilingualism

Surzhyk (literally it means a mixture of rye and wheat, barley and oats, etc.) is a language which artificially combines elements from different languages observing no literary norms. It is mainly used to speak about Ukrainian vernacular which is littered with unmotivated Russian loans (as a result of Ukrainian and Russian mutual interference). Surzhyk is a reduced language which lacks national coloring, beauty and expressiveness (see Rusanivs'kyi & Taranenko, 2000).

Here are typical expressions of Surzhyk:

- “Russian words” use instead of normative Ukrainian equivalents: *даже* (навіть), *да* (так), *нет* (ні), *када* (коли), *не нада* (не потрібно), *січас* (зараз), *чуть-чуть* (трішки), *конешно* (звичайно, звісно), *наверно* (мабуть), *язик* (мова);
- “Ukrainian” forms of Russian verbs – *унаслідував* (успадкував), *получав* (отримував), *отключив* (вимкнув);
- “Ukrainian” form of Russian numerals – *перший/ перва* (перший/ перша), *вторий/ втора* (другий/ друга);
- mixing Ukrainian and Russian forms of pronouns – *хто-то* (хтось), *шо-то* (щось), *як-то* (якось), *кой-шо* (щось), *кой-які* (якісь);
- use of prepositions and cases according to the Russian model – *по вулицям* замість *по вулицях*, *на російській мові* замість *російською мовою*;
- formation of superlative degree of adjectives and adverbs on the model of the Russian language – *самий головний* (найголовніший), *саме важне* (найважливіше);
- words and expressions calked from Russian – *міроприємство* (захід), *прийняти участь* (взяти участь), *до цих пір* (досі), *факт на лице* (незаперечний факт);

- active use of sound “ie” in position after consonant – *архітектор* (архітектор), *студент* (студент), *лекція* (лекція), *тема* (тема) (see *Surzhyk*)*.

The definition of *Surzhyk* given by the standard Ukrainian dictionary underlines the importance of language contact and code mixing: “Elements of two or more languages, artificially united, not abiding by the norms of the standard language; a non-pure language”. (*Slovnyk Ukrains’koi movy, 1978*). There is general agreement among Ukrainian linguists on this point: what differentiates *Surzhyk* from other non-standard language varieties in Ukraine (slang, criminal jargon, territorial dialects) is the fact that it oversteps the Ukrainian-Russian language boundary.

Surzhyk would hardly have become the concern it is for Ukrainian language activists if Ukrainian and Russian were not conceptualized as comprising separate language systems. Not surprisingly, an emphasis on the need for clear-cut boundaries between the two languages has been apparent among Ukrainian language activists in contemporary Ukraine. One Ukrainian linguist argues that in a bilingual situation it is the ability to differentiate between the two languages that decide the level of culturedness and education of an individual speaker (*Trub, 2000*). In *AntySurzhyk*, the linguist Oleksandra Serbens’ka writes: “*AntySurzhyk* aims to help Ukrainians understand the laws of the separate existence of two languages Ukrainian and Russian” (*Serbens’ka, 1994*). The norm-breaking function of *Surzhyk* is one of the reasons behind the negative attitudes towards it that prevail in Ukrainian nationalist language ideology.

A recurring theme in nationalist writings on *Surzhyk* is that language contact resulting in mutual exchange of language elements is a natural phenomenon as long as the norms of the different languages are upheld and the exchange does not jeopardize the uniqueness of the contacting languages. If on the other hand the independence of the languages is threatened by the exchange and mixed language forms take root in the language, language contact is considered harmful. Serbens’ka puts this in the following way:

“The development of contacting languages, among them Ukrainian and Russian, has without question its own laws. When an individual brings words and combinations of words from another language into his language use without ruining the grammatical structure and phonetic distinguishing features of Ukrainian, keeping its beauty intact, using its inexhaustible lexical and phraseological richness, the process is natural and does not call for any objections. However, by arbitrarily mixing words from the Ukrainian and Russian languages, by declining them and uniting them according to the Russian pattern, by building phrases in defiance of the models of the native language, the carrier of the language non-deliberately becomes “half-lingual” (*Serbens’ka, 1994*).

After having referred to cases of interaction between Ukrainian and Russian, the well-known writer and linguist Borys Antonenko-Davydovych takes a similar position:

“Such cases of interaction are completely natural and unavoidable under the conditions of communication of nations and cannot lead to any objections, if certain words and combinations of words are transferred not artificially or incorrectly, but emerge from the demands of life itself, settling down on the firm ground of another nation. It is not good when a person with a poor mastering of Ukrainian or Russian, or of them both, mixes both languages, confuses their words, declines the words of one of the languages according to the grammatical demands of the other one” (*Antonenko-Davydovych, 1994*).

* The translation is given in the Appendix.

In other words, language contact is natural whenever it does not, as does surzhyk, dissolve the boundaries between the languages involved. O. Serbens'ka claims that Surzhyk is seen as mixing the heritage from the past with foreign elements:

"Nowadays the word surzhyk is also used in its broader sense as a name for a person's deteriorating and poor spiritual world, a person's detachment from its origins, as a name for a mixture of remnants of the past and native elements with foreign ones that neutralizes the personality, national and lingual conscience. This mixture of Russian and Ukrainian is spoken by a part of Ukrainian citizens, though it is a well-known fact that using a mixture of two languages belongs to the most alarming pedagogical phenomena. The fractured language makes people less intelligent, their thinking becomes primitive. In fact, the language expresses not only thoughts. It also stimulates conscience, puts it under control and shapes it. Surzhyk in Ukraine is dangerous and detrimental, since it sponges on the language that has been formed over the centuries, and threatens to change it ..." (Serbens'ka, 1994).

According to Bilaniuk, language ideology is a key to understanding Surzhyk in contemporary Ukraine. She explained that the study of language ideology goes beyond objective linguistic facts to consider what people believe about language and how they judge others' language use. The definition of surzhyk in Ukraine today is therefore determined by the pervasive discourse of linguistic purism. (see Bilaniuk, 1997, 1998).

Yurii Andrukhovych once called Surzhyk "an incestuous child of bilingualism" (Andrukhovych, 2001). Therefore, this is a newborn baby who survives and lives on its own. Although it seems to have grown up, there still remained childlike and unshaped forms of language and thinking which are doomed for eternal wretched existence in this age- and intellect-dependent status, as far natural self-development is the wrong road for it. This is a frozen hybrid which is an organic part of ethno-lingual structure of Ukraine. Meanwhile, numerous linguo-philosophical and culturological researches into this presence appear to be rather well-grounded, since the state is doomed for bilingualism.

3.0 Conclusion

It turns out to be quite obvious that contemporary situation with languages in Ukraine is an artificial and unfair result of centuries-long linguicide by Russia, and the above-mentioned facts and figures serve as a perfect proof for this statement.

The Russian language prevails in all spheres except for education which together with circumstances of the previous paragraph cause problems for the titular nation for which intensified Russification is compared to rubbing salt into the wound. The language environment of Russian-speaking people seems more comfortable than that of Ukrainian speakers.

Along with that, politicians use language issues as convenient small coins. The Russified Ukrainians are irritated by attempts the Ukrainians make to pay due attention to protecting and developing their language. Following the principle *self above all* Russian-speaking Ukrainians want to eventually ensure the official status of Russian which de facto already prevails over the Ukrainian-speaking environment.

In order to make the language processes in Ukraine develop according to consolidation logics, avoiding confrontations, we need a well-planned system of supportive measures for the Ukrainian language which nowadays turns out to be objectively weaker notwithstanding its official status. On the basis of in-depth analysis of language situation in the most Russified regions there should be offered systematic ways to cut the distance from the contemporary state of language functioning and declared legal status of Ukrainian as a state language. Systematicity cannot be a synonym to apathy and

indecisiveness. The language situation has to be influenced drastically and simultaneously in all spheres of social life, namely education, information, culture and army.

It is extremely important that Ukraine should choose its own language policy represented by legislative bodies without any external pressure. Reducing the use of Russian and widening the area where Ukrainian and English is used has to be organized simultaneously; and this will weaken Russia's political and ideological pressure on Ukraine. By no means should one aim to displace the Russian language from Ukraine. Needs for economic, political and cultural interchange will stimulate Ukrainians to be fluent in Russian. National spiritual sovereignty does not require isolation. Needless to say, that any discrimination measures concerning Russian culture will lead to growing social tension and, therefore, become a factor weakening national unity (see Nahorna, 2005).

In order to avoid such a course of events and eradicate certain potential risks of the impact that external factors have on politicization of language issues, it seems appropriate to take a number of measures, namely to revise the legal framework of language policy; to develop additional measures for southern, eastern and central regions of Ukraine in order to support the Ukrainian language; to actively promote the Ukrainian language in all spheres of life and on the whole territory of Ukraine; to control the support for lesser-used languages and to revise a list of languages which come within the purview of the Bill of Ukraine "On Ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages". It is also necessary to strengthen and develop networks in minority languages according to the needs which have been declared by these minorities; to establish joint committees with neighboring countries on issues of language and cultural as well historical heritage in order to carry on active communication on the given problems (see Zaremba & Rymarenko, 2008).

High national self-conscience and a high level of resistance to political, cultural and language expansion of neighboring countries is a key to preserving Ukrainian identity. Only having applied a complex of well-planned, effective, administrative and educational measures we will be able to affirm the statehood of the Ukrainian language and to build really independent and democratic Ukraine.

References

- Andrukhovych, Y. (2001). "Orim svii perelih... i siimo slovo...". *Urok ukrains'koi*, 7, 2–4.
- Antonenko-Davydovych, B. (1994). *Yak my hovorymo*. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim „KM Akademia”.
- Bilaniuk, L. (1997). Speaking of Surzhyk: Ideologies and mixed languages. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 21(1/2), 93-117.
- Bilaniuk, L. (1998). *The politics of language and identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine*. (PhD Dissertation). University of Michigan, USA.
- Kalynovs'ka, O. (2008). *Movna sytuatsiia v sferi osvity*. In Juliane Besters-Dilger, (Ed.), *Movna polityka ta movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini. Analiz i rekomendatsii* (pp. 196–233). Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim „KM Akademia”.
- Masenko, L. (2004). *Mova i suspil'stvo: Postkolonial'nyi vymir*. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim „KM Akademia”.
- Masenko, L. (2007). *Dvomovnist' – instrument rozkolu Ukrainy*. Retrieved from the *Ukraina Moloda*, 119 website: <http://www.umoloda.kiev.ua/number/1022/174/36912/>
- Medvediev, O. (2007). *V bilshosti sfer hromads'koho zhyttia dominuie rosiis'ka mova*. Retrieved from the V. Lypyns'kyi Research Center website: <http://www.lrc.org.ua/projects/mova-ua-medvedev.html>
- Nahorna, L. (2005). *Politychna mova i movna polityka: Diapason mozhlyvostei politychnoi linhvistyky*. Kyiv: Svitohliad.
- Pivtorak, H. (2001). *Pokhodzhennia ukrainsiv, rosiian, bilorusiv ta yikhnikh mov*. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim „KM Akademia”.
- Potebnia, A. (1993). *Mysl' i yazyk*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Rusanivs'kyi, V. & Taranenko, O. (2000). *Ukrains'ka mova: Entsyklopediia*. Kyiv: Ukrains'ka Entsyklopediia.

- Serbns'ka, O. & other eds. (1994). *Antysyrhuk*. Lviv: Svit.
- Slovnnyk Ukrayins'koyi movy (1978). Kyiv: Naukova Dumka.
- Surzhyk (2007). Retrieved from the Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surzhyk>
- Taranenko, O. (1999). *Movna sytuatsiia i movna polityka chasiv "perebudovy" i derzhavnoi nezalezhnosti Ukrainy (kinets' 80-ies–90-s)*. In S. Yermolenko (Ed.), *Ukrains'ka mova (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich, pp. 35–66)*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski. Instytut Filologii Polskiej.
- Trub, V. (2000). *Yavishche "surzhyku" yak forma prostorichchia v sytuatsii dvomovnosti*. *Movoznavstvo* 1, 46–58.
- Yushchuk, I. (2008). *Ukrains'ka mova*. Pidruchnyk. Kyiv, Lybid'.
- Zakon Ukrainy "Pro zasady derzhavnoi movnoi polityky" (2012). Retrieved from the Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy website <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5029-17>
- Zaremba, O. & Rymarenko, S. (2008). *Rol' zovnishnikh chynnykiv u polityzatsii movnykh problem*. In O. Maiboroda (Ed.), *Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini: mizh konfliktom i konsensusom (pp. 258–280)*. Kyiv: I. F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

Appendix: Table

Surzhyk	Russian	Ukrainian	English (translation)
даже [dazhe]	даже [dazhe]	навіть [navit']	even
да [da]	да [da]	так [tak]	yes
нет [niet]	нет [net]	ні [ni]	no
когда [kada]	когда [kagda]	коли [koly]	when
не надо [nie nada]	не надо [ne nado]	не потрібно [ne potribno]	no need
сичас [sichas]	сейчас [seichas]	зараз [zaraz]	now
чуть-чуть [chut'-chut']	чуть-чуть [chut'-chut']	трішки [trishky]	a little
конечно [konieshno]	конечно [kanechno]	звичайно [zvychaino]	of course
наверно [navierno]	наверно [naverno]	мабуть [mabut']	maybe
язык [yazyk]	язык [yazyk]	мова [mova]	language
унаслідував [unasliduvav]	унаследовал [unasledoval]	успадкував [uspadkuvav]	inherited
получав [poluchav]	получил [paluchil]	отримав [otrymav]	received
отключив [otkliuchyv]	отключил [otkliuchil]	вимкнув [vymknuv]	turned off
перший / перва [pershyi / perva]	первый / первая [pervyi / pervaia]	перший / перша [pershyi / persha]	first
второй / втора [vtoryi / vtora]	второй / вторая [vtoroi / vtoraia]	другий / друга [druhyi / druha]	second
кто-то [khto-to]	кто-то [kto-to]	хтось [khtos']	anyone
шо-то [sho-to]	что-то [chto-to]	щось [shchos']	anything
як-то [yak-to]	как-то [kak-to]	якось [yakos']	once
кой-шо [koi-sho]	кое-что [koe-chto]	щось [shchos']	anything
кой-які [koi-yaki]	какие-то [kakie-to]	якісь [yakis']	some kind of
по вулицям [po vulytsiam]	по улицам [po ulitsam]	по вулицях [po vulytsiakh]	on streets
на російській мові [na rosiis'kii]	на русском языке [na russkom yazyke]	російською мовою [rosiis'koiu movoiu]	in Russian language
самий головний [samyi holovnyi]	самый главный [samyi glavnyi]	найголовніший [naiholovnishyi]	the most important
саме важне [same vazhne]	самое важное [samoe vazhnoe]	найважливіше [naivazhlyvishe]	the most important

міроприємство [miropryuemstvo]	мероприятіє [meropriyatie]	захід [zakhid]	event
прийняти участь [priyniaty uchast']	приняти участь [priniat' uchastie]	взяти участь [vziaty uchast']	to take part
до цих пір [do tsykh pir]	до сих пор [do sikh por]	досі [dosi]	still
факт на лице [fakt na lytse]	факт на лице [fakt na litso]	незаперечний факт [nezaperechnyi fakt]	undeniable fact
архітектор [arkhitektori]	архітектор [arkhitektori]	архітектор [arkhitektori]	architect
студент [student]	студент [student]	студент [student]	student
лекція [liektsiya]	лекція [lektsiya]	лекція [lektsiya]	lecture
тема [tiema]	тема [tema]	тема [tema]	theme