10 The Russian language in Belarus and Ukraine

Jan Patrick Zeller and Dmitri Sitchinava

Introduction

In 1995, after a controversial referendum, Russian was added to Belarusian as a second nationwide official language ('state language') in Belarus. In Ukraine, Russian got the opportunity to maintain a regional official status only in 2012 due to the equally controversial language law adopted under Janukovyč. This was implemented in 9 out of 27 *oblasti* (regions), including Luhans'k, Donec'k and Crimea. In 13 regions, the necessary 10% mark of 'native speakers' of Russian was reached. In February 2018, the latter law was declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court of Ukraine. Opponents of enhancement of Russian in Ukraine fear that Russian would become *de facto* a second state language, thus becoming more detrimental to Ukrainian, and in the long run, displacing Ukrainian from most domains, as it is the case for Belarusian in Belarus. While in Belarus, Russian clearly dominates in the public sphere, in Ukraine, this varies for historical reasons—different duration of belonging to the Russian empire, and historical settlement migrations from region to region. The center (except big cities), and even more so the west, are dominated by Ukrainian, the south and east by Russian.

In the Soviet era, after a short period of Belarusification/Ukrainization during the so-called *korenizacija* '~nativization' in the 1920s and early 1930s, Russian became the dominant language in both Soviet Republics without which any career was impossible. Ukraine has been undergoing Ukrainization with varying intensity since independence was proclaimed in 1991; in Belarus, a short period of Belarusification took place only in the early 1990s. Overall, today Ukrainian has a much stronger position in Ukraine than Belarusian in Belarus. Nevertheless, also in Ukraine, Russian is widely used in everyday communication, media, and business communication. However, the decrease of its use in schooling or official contexts in independent Ukraine has led to a certain change of different functional styles of Russian, including scientific and legal discourse. Many otherwise Russian-speaking Ukrainians do not use Russian terminology for legal documents or when they discuss school subjects, inserting the corresponding

Ukrainian terms in their otherwise Russian speech (see below). The linguistic norm of Standard Russian is nowadays less taught to the Russian speakers in Ukraine, as they mainly attend Ukrainian-language secondary schools. In Belarus, the opposite is the case.

While Belarus still shares media space with Russia, with TV programs, books, and other media from Russia widely distributed and often even preferred to the Russian-language Belarusian media, in Ukraine, this sort of language contact has been more restricted, especially since the beginning of the Russian–Ukrainian conflict in 2014. These developments contribute (and will probably keep contributing even more) to the divergence of the Russian language in Ukraine (henceforth, U-Russian) from its dominant variety, as it is spoken in the Russian Federation (R-Russian), and the convergence of the Russian language in Belarus (B-Russian) with R-Russian.

Especially for Ukraine, it should be stressed that the language question is only of limited relevance for the majority of the population, despite the often postulated 'language conflict' (cf. Del Gaudio, Ivanova 2015: 15; Zeller et al. in press). Indeed, the language question is often described as subject to political manipulation (Ruda 2012). In daily life, it is not unusual to hear a conversation in which one interlocutor speaks Ukrainian, the other Russian, without this disturbing either one. However, many intellectuals and politicians do discuss the problem of the public and/or personal use of Russian in the current political contexts, and different solutions are proposed, ranging from abandoning Russian in favor of Ukrainian (that can be also a personal politically motivated choice), to the recognition of the Russian-language culture in Ukraine as an integral part of a wider Ukrainian culture without political implications with regard to the neighboring country.

In Belarus, on the other hand, Russian is the unmarked choice everywhere in public, and the use of Belarusian is clearly marked and often interpretable as a sign of certain political views. There exists a Belarusian-speaking minority community of language activists, mainly consisting of intellectuals in liberal fields. They disagree with the official non-intervention policy and seek to promote the Belarusian language and pass it on to the next generation.

Despite obvious differences in language policies and the status of Russian in both states, in some respect, the position of U-Russian and B-Russian is similar as both find themselves in competition with a closely related standard language as well as with widespread substandard forms of mixed speech: Belarusian–Russian mixed speech (BRMS) and Ukrainian–Russian mixed speech (URMS). In Belarus, this mixed speech is derogatorily referred to as 'trasjanka', literally a mixture of hay and straw, in Ukraine as 'suržyk', literally a mixture of different kinds of flour, for example of wheat and rye.

The distribution of Russian

Estimating the distribution of Russian in opposition to Ukrainian/Belarusian and other codes in Belarusian/Ukrainian society is not easy. Many surveys,

9780367183660C10.3D 110 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

including the official census, are inadequate, as they allow for no more than one option for response to the questions, e.g., when respondents have to name the language used at home, or their mother tongue, whereas most speakers to some degree make use of more than one of these codes in daily life. Moreover, surveys exclude the substandard forms of mixed speech. Quite often, declarations of the native language/mother tongue are projected onto preferred language use, whereas 'mother tongue' is interpreted by the respondents rather as 'the language of one's ethnos' than the actual L1.

Belarus

For officially bilingual Belarus, it is assumed that Russian and Belarusian fulfill different functions: Russian is the language of actual use, while the function of Belarusian is symbolic and the identification with it is a sign of the identification with the Belarusian state and nation (Mečkovskaja 2002). In both dimensions, Russian has been winning ground not only before, but also since Belarusian independence. In the official census in 1999, 58.6% of 'ethnic' Belarusians, i.e., those who declare their 'nationality' as Belarusian (and not Russian, Ukrainian, Polish etc.) named Russian as the language 'normally spoken at home'. In 2009, it was already 69.8% (PN 1999, 2009/3: 355). When BRMS is included as an answer option, the figures for Russian and even more dramatically for Belarusian go down. In a survey in seven Belarusian towns and cities, less than 5% mentioned Belarusian as the usually used language (almost never 'pure', most often 'with some Russian words'); 54.6% indicated Russian (mostly 'with some Belarusian words'—43.4%, and fewer named 'standard-like'—11.2%); and 41.0% 'the/a mixed language' (Hentschel, Kittel 2011: 116). When it comes to the symbolic dimension of linguistic affiliation, i.e., the declaration of a mother tongue, Belarusian is in a better position. However, in the official figures, Belarusian recorded dramatic losses even here, in favor of Russian that increased from 14% in 1999 to 37% in 2009 for ethnic Belarusians (PN 2009/3: 318). Among young adults, Russian even dominates as the declared mother tongue (Zeller, Levikin 2016). Note that in the census of 2009, for the first time the term 'mother tongue/native language' was defined, namely as 'the language learned first in early childhood'. This was not done in the survey (ibid.), but people were asked additionally what the concept of mother tongue meant to them.

The numbers cited so far obscure that in Belarus, most speakers use more than one code in daily life (mostly Russian and BRMS), and sometimes even all three. As a tendency, the Belarusian case can be described as a diglossic situation between BRMS and Russian. Russian dominates in the public space; BRMS (and at a much lower level dialectal Belarusian) has its stronghold in communication with friends and especially in the family. However, many speakers use these codes side by side in each domain. BRMS is by no means used only by the uneducated, and by those who

cannot speak Russian properly. At the same time, Russian is spreading more and more into informal spheres among younger people (see Hentschel, Zeller 2012; Kittel et al. 2018).

Ukraine

For Ukraine, the figures in surveys hint at a less significant role of Russian in comparison to Belarus; Ukrainian is doing much better than Belarusian. In the 2001 census, 29.6% of respondents declared Russian as their mother tongue (VPN 2001). When asked about the language of daily use at home, in 2016, 32.2% of respondents stated that they mainly used Russian, 25.4% both Russian and Ukrainian (NANU 2016: 475). Respondents were not offered URMS as a possible answer. In a survey of 2014 conducted in 56 towns and cities of central Ukraine (including the regions of Xarkiv and Dnipropetrovs'k, but excluding the large cities of Kyjiv, Xarkiv and Dnipro), 62.6% of ethnic Ukrainians named Ukrainian as most used language, 14.4% Russian, and 23.0% URMS, yet 27.6% said that they often used Russian and only 13.7% stated they never used Russian (Hentschel, Zeller 2017). Like in Belarus, in the question about the native language/mother tongue, the figures are higher for Ukrainian (85.5%), and lower for Russian (8.0%) and URMS (5.2%). As with Belarusian in Belarus, many people mention Ukrainian as their native language, although they did not learn it as their first one and although it is not their mainly used one. This indicates that Ukrainian has a high symbolic value in Ukrainian society in opposition to sometimes controversial Russian and overtly stigmatized URMS.

The regional structure plays a big part in Ukraine. In most regions of the center, the most commonly used language is Ukrainian, ahead of URMS and Russian. URMS dominates in the regions of Sumy and Dnipropetrovs'k, and Russian is dominant in Xarkiv region. Statements on the knowledge of Ukrainian and on the mother tongue in the last Ukrainian census suggest that in the eastern regions of Luhan'sk and Donec'k, and in the south, Ukrainian is undoubtedly used even less, and Russian is even more dominant. Since similar to the Dnipropetrovs'k region both eastern regions represent an industrial landscape, an increase in URMS as a means of communication can be expected as well, albeit a more Russian-colored one (cf. Hentschel, Zeller 2017).

Linguistic features

The 'Belarusian natiolect' of Russian (Mixnevič 1985a) is widely accepted and people may even identify with it (Korjakov 2002). Liskovec (2005: 165f.) assumes that in the second half of the 20th century, a Belarusian accent in Russian represented the ideal positioning in Belarusian society. While the use of Russian would be associated with education and culture, the accent was an index for a person to be 'from the people', and signaled

9780367183660C10.3D 112 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

equality with accent-speaking superiors. Today, a Belarusian accent in Russian represents 'unmarked' speech in Belarus (Liskovec 2005: 107). Still, the prestige of R-Russian is higher in Belarus than in Ukraine (Ivanova 2013: 372). In Ukraine, at least before 2014, even folk discussions were held on which variety of Russian should become the official Russian variety in Ukraine. There were proponents for it to be an autochthonous variety (e.g. the Donec'k, Luhans'k or Crimea variety), arguing that R-Russian is 'unnatural for the Russian speakers in Ukraine' and that the characteristics of U-Russian 'should not be perceived as dialectal, provincial or "wrong"' (Dmitričenko 2008; cited in Del Gaudio, Ivanova 2015). Thus, there was a desire to attain 'future linguo-cultural independence from the Russian (Moscow) norm-setting center, on the one hand, and to avoid the obligation of using Ukrainian as a sole official language, on the other' (ibid.).

Soviet studies on Russian in Ukraine and Belarus were in the spirit of 'language culture' (*kul'tura reči*) and explicitly or implicitly aimed to avoid possible interference and deviations from perceived Russian standard (e.g., Ižakevič 1976). In the 1980s, studies were conducted which were more neutral, targeted problems in contact- and sociolinguistics, and at least partly were based on solid empirical foundation (Biryla, Suprun 1982; Mixnevič 1985b; Bondarko, Verbickaja 1987; Čertorižskaja 1988). One has to emphasize, however, that at present, comprehensive variational-linguistic investigations, which on the one hand deal with the usage frequency and the degree of stabilization of the B-Russian and U-Russian features, and on the other hand investigate language change, social differentiation, style variation, and social assessments of the variation in B-Russian and U-Russian, do not exist. There is a high degree of uncertainty regarding the distribution, frequency, and stability of most of the features discussed below.

Belarusian Russian

Deviations from R-Russian are frequent in B-Russian. Most of them result from the influence of Belarusian but are also present for speakers who did not grow up with dialectal Belarusian and/or BRMS as the language of first socialization.

Phonetics and phonology

Belarusian characteristics in B-Russian speech appear mainly on the phonetic-phonological level (see for example Sadoŭski 1982; Vygonnaja 1985). They include Belarusian *Tsekanje* and *Dzekanje*: affricates /ʦʲ/ and /ʣʲ/ instead of R-Russian /tʲ/ and /dʲ/, Belarusian *Jakanje* ([a] for unstressed /e, o, a /after palatalized consonants instead of R-Russian *Ikanje*, i.e. [i]-like sounds), an open [a] vs. R-Russian [ɐ, ʌ, ə] for unstressed /o, a /after non-palatalized consonants, fricative [ɣ] or [ɦ] for R-Russian /g/, non-palatalized [ʧ] instead of R-Russian palatalized /ʧʲ/, non-palatalized [r] instead of R-Russian /rʲ/,

9780367183660C10.3D 113 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

[u] and [w] for R-Russian /v/, [w] for R-Russian [u] in certain contexts. Yet, even more than 30 years after the studies cited above were conducted, it remains unclear how this variation differs socially and possibly regionally, and how it has developed. Hentschel and Zeller (2014) and Zeller (2015), who are primarily interested in BRMS, show that on the one hand even those utterances in family conversations that lexically and morphologically correspond to R-Russian are clearly affected by Belarusian on the phonic level. However, on the other hand, there is a clear grading of the phonic variables: *Tsekanje* and fricatives for R-Russian /g/ clearly outweigh not only for speakers who tend to use BRMS in family speech, but also for those speakers—primarily younger generations—who tend to speak Russian at structurally deeper linguistic levels (i.e., the morphological and lexical ones). But the use of the Belarusian fricative reduces significantly for the latter type of speakers. Non-palatalized [ʧ] and—even more pronounced—non-palatalized [r] also decrease for many speakers. For persons who are more inclined to use R-Russian, the corresponding R-Russian sounds already outweigh. R-Russian [v] predominates Belarusian [w] and [u] already in mixed utterances. Belarusian *Jakanje* is also on the decline, giving way to R-Russian *Ikanje* or 'intermediate' *Jekanje* (Zeller 2015). Moreover, younger speakers in particular tend to pronounce Russian words in Russian utterances closer to the R-Russian standard than Russian words in mixed utterances (Zeller 2015). This material is not representative in that it only includes individuals claiming to speak BRMS in their family. However, given the wide distribution of BRMS discussed above, the results apply to large parts of Belarusian society. Furthermore, it is very likely that although the grading of phonic interferences will apply to other speakers as well, for those using Russian as the dominant family language, the Belarusian interferences will decline even more. This might be an indication that B-Russian will further converge with R-Russian in the future.

Morphology

Belarusian influences on B-Russian inflectional morphology, i.e., the use of Belarusian endings, are rarely reported, if ever. This may be due to the non-acceptance of such influences and the corresponding classification of speech, containing such features, as 'trasjanka'.

Lexicon

At the lexical level, Belarusianisms like *divan* instead of *kovër* 'carpet', *miska* instead of *tarelka* 'plate' or *bogatyr'* instead of *bogač* 'rich man' have been reported in early surveys (cf. Bulyka, Krysin 1999, using data from the 1980s, and Woolhiser 2012). Recent research is still in its infancy (cf. Goritskaya 2018). Goritskaya and Suprunchuk (2018) show that a number of Belarusian words also occur in linguistically Russian

9780367183660C10.3D 114 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

blogs, but it is often hard to distinguish between stylistically neutrally used words, metalinguistic uses, and stylistic-functionally motivated uses. Examples include typical Belarusian realia (*dranik* 'potato pancake'), or concepts having symbolic significance for Belarusian society (*bul'ba* 'potato', *busel* 'stork', *vjoska* 'village' or, with reference to Belarusian, *mova* 'language', similar to *mova* in U-Russian with reference to Ukrainian); colloquial items (*maloj, malaja* 'the little one' (son or daughter), known also in U-Russian (see below), *busja* 'kiss; my dear') and words with no simple equivalent in R-Russian (like *šufljadka* 'drawer', also known in U-Russian, or *harhara* 'cumbersome thing', cited in Kustova, Savčuk 2013). Ryčkova and Stankevič (2014) cite also Belarusian ethnographical and religious terms used (with orthographical and/or morphological adaptation) in B-Russian newspaper texts (like *kaplica* 'chapel', *kirmaš* 'trade fair', *rušnik/ručnik* 'traditional towel'). Given the dominance of Russian in the administrative sphere, it is both symptomatic and understandable that there is no tendency to use Belarusian terms for legal and official institutions, documents, etc., contrary to the use of Ukrainian terms in Ukraine (Del Gaudio 2013: 353); cf. however, *deržava* 'state' that is less marked stylistically in B-Russian texts than in R-Russian ones under the influence of Belarusian *dzjaržava* (Kustova, Savčuk 2013). A similar shift in markedness is attested by these authors with regard to the word *palit'* 'burn' which is in R-Russian a marked synonym for *žeč'* but a more neutral term in B-Russian (cf. Belarusian *palic'*). Lexical Belarusisms belonging to other parts of speech than nouns are rare, but still do exist, like *zanadto* 'too much' or *pamjarkoŭny* '~tolerant/peaceful' (often quoted in Belarusian orthography within a Russian text).

Some words widespread (exclusively or predominantly) in B-Russian are not Belarusian borrowings proper, rather they belong to the local version of everyday urban speech and are formed according to the Russian derivational patterns, like *ssobojka* 'box lunch' (lit. 'with-oneself') or perhaps already obsolete *tridžik* '3G USB router'. Mečkovskaja (2005: 61) reports more frequent use of feminitives like *čempionka* 'champion (female)' or *prepodavatel'nica* 'teacher (female)'.

B-Russian used in public is according to Woolhiser (2012: 238) more conservative than R-Russian, as fewer recent borrowings from English are used. Another example of conservative speech behavior is the sticking to the Soviet-era term *milicija* 'police' as opposed to the change of the official name to *policija* in the Russian Federation. On the other hand, in B-Russian, the new official name of the country *Belarus'* is preferred to *Belorussija*, still widely used in R-Russian (Woolhiser 2012: 240; Goritskaya 2018).

Syntax and morphosyntax

The Russian language in Belarus exhibits some substrate influence of Belarusian, for example in the context of verbal periphrases (Sitchinava 2018). While in

9780367183660C10.3D 115 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

Standard Russian/R-Russian the preterite construction with the invariable particle *bylo* is limited by the canceled result meaning, in spoken urban B-Russian (including Internet forums), the pluperfect with inflected *byl*- is used sporadically to signal experience, temporal precedence, and other non-canonical meanings, not unlike the uses of the cognate *byŭ*-construction in Belarusian.

According to an unpublished corpus study of Hrodna region newspapers by Sitchinava, in Russian-language newspaper texts in Belarus syntactic variants (or other foci of variation) differing from those found in the R-Russian press discourse sometimes prevail. In modern R-Russian, e.g., the agreement pattern of *rjad* 'a variety of, a number of' is almost exclusively masculine, whereas in Belarus the variation between masculine, plural, and neuter agreement patterns of *rjad* continues to exist, not unlike in the Soviet press of the 1970s (cited by Graudina et al. 1976). On the other hand, in the B-Russian press of Hrodna region, such variants are definitely standardized as the invariable place names like *v Ivanovo* 'in Ivanovo', plural nominative choice with feminine adjectives like *dve požilye sestry* 'two elderly sisters', prepositional government *kontrol' za* 'control of', while in R-Russian the norm is less rigid and alternative variants like *v Ivanove, dve požilyx sestry* and *kontrol' nad* are also frequent.

Colloquial B-Russian also frequently shows different syntactic government patterns of some verbs, e.g., *ja s nego smejus'* 'I am laughing at/mocking him' (R-Russian normative variants *nad nim*/*iz-za nego* with different meanings) or *prijti so školy* 'to arrive from school' (R-Russian standard *iz školy; so školy* being also known in colloquial, especially regional speech), and the comparative construction with the preposition *za* as in *lučše za kogo* instead of *lučše kogo* (see Norman 2008; Goritskaya 2016).

Ukrainian Russian

Del Gaudio and Ivanova (2015) argue in favor of recognizing U-Russian as a separate variety, as it differs from R-Russian at all levels, not only on the phonetic-phonological and lexical ones, but also morphosyntactically. There are hardly any deviations at the written level (Del Gaudio 2011: 28). In spoken Russian, Ukrainian peculiarities are more obvious. As for Belarus, it should be emphasized that not all speakers show Ukrainian features in their speech, and among those who do, not all to the same extent. However, the direction of development seems to be different than that in Belarus: it is mainly older people who follow the Moscow norm and unlike the case of Belarus, the influences of Ukrainian are increasing, which is plausible, given the decline of Russian in society, and especially in education (ibid.: 31).

Phonetics and phonology

U-Russian has features that result from regular phonetic-phonological differences between Russian and Ukrainian. Mentioned here are primarily

9780367183660C10.3D 116 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

a fricative realization for R-Russian /g/, Ukrainian *Okanje* (differentiation of unstressed /o/ and /a/) vs. R-Russian *Akanje*, no devoicing of voiced obstruents in final position and before unvoiced obstruents or non-palatalized final bilabial consonants (Bondarko, Verbickaja 1987; Čertorižskaja 1988: 59–73; Del Gaudio 2011). Unclear is the status of R-Russian palatalized /ʧʲ/. According to Del Gaudio (2011), its U-Russian realization is predominantly non-palatalized (like in standard Ukrainian). But according to Bondarko and Verbickaja (1987: 100f.), it is 'inadequately' palatalized or palatalized. Zeller (2018) likewise reports almost exclusively palatalized pronunciation even in mixed speech, pointing to stigmatization of the Ukrainian pronunciation. On the suprasegmental level, there are some lexically determined differences in the word accent, for example stress on the first syllable in *ponjala* '(she) understood', *žila* '(she) lived' (Del Gaudio 2011: 33).

Corpus linguistic studies of family speech in central Ukraine focus on URMS and, correspondingly, mixed utterances, corpus studies on the co-existence of the codes, and the nature of the actually used Russian are still pending. Since Ukrainian is much more present in central Ukraine than Belarusian in Belarus, and since URMS is phonically much more 'Ukrainian' than BRMS is 'Russian', it can be assumed that the Russian code in central Ukraine is also strongly influenced phonically by Ukrainian. In big cities like Kyjiv, and in the south and east of the country, the situation is certainly different.

Morphology

Like for B-Russian, only few U-Russian features are reported for inflectional morphology, or only those that also exist in R-Russian varieties (for example, the variation between {-a} and {-y} in the nominative plural of lexemes like *traktor* 'tractor', Čertorižskaja 1988: 98–101), or they are attributed exclusively to people with low proficiency in Russian (for example, forms which like Ukrainian standard avoid stem alternation: *my xočem* instead of *my xotim* 'we want', *oni bežat* instead of *oni begut* 'they run', Taranenko 2010: 70). Again, this may be due to the non-acceptance of such influences and the corresponding classification of such speech as 'suržyk' (see below). Note, however, a characteristic of U-Russian speech imperative *ed'* 'go! (by transport)' whereas the verb *exat'* lacks such a form in Standard Russian (although it is one of the variants attested in colloquial speech in Russia). Čertorižskaja (1988) reports alternation of suffixes {-yva-} and {-uj-} in forms like *rasskazueš'* 'instead of *rasskazyvaeš'* (2.Sg. from *rasskazyvat'* 'to tell').

Few peculiarities have been reported on the level of morphological derivation and composition. Sometimes different verbal affixes occur: U-Rus: *vypravit'* vs. R-Rus. *ispravit'* 'to correct' (Del Gaudio, Ivanova 2015: 26). The Ukrainian designation of administrative units with the suffix {-ščin-} (e.g., the names of Russian regions *Rjazanščina, Tambovščina*) and the use of the morpheme {-rob}

(Rus. neologism *xlopkorob* 'cotton grower' modeled after Ukrainian *xliborob* 'grain grower') during the Soviet period (about 1950s–1960s) were transferred into the official Russian journalistic language throughout the USSR (cf. Taranenko 2007a, 2007b, 2010), as did the neologism *korabel* 'ship-builder', introduced in 1960 by a novelist Oleksandr Syzonenko from Mykolaiv after Ukrainian and Russian *korabel'nyj* 'belonging to ships' with an artificial model of derivation; the word *korabel* became widespread throughout standard Russian in 1960–1970s. Like in B-Russian, feminitives with the suffix {-k-} like *avtorka* 'female author' are better accepted in U-Russian than in R-Russian as they are more frequent in Ukrainian. Again, like in B-Russian, transfer of grammatical gender is reported (*sobaka* 'dog' as a masculine noun), as well as differences in the distribution of count nouns and pluralia tantum (Čertoržskaja 1988).

Lexicon

Less telling are the often reported lexical items for Ukrainian realia borrowed from Ukrainian: folk, culinary terms, articles of clothes, household objects, and others: *grivna* 'hryvnia, Ukrainian currency', *keptarik* 'Carpathian fur coat', *gorilka* 'horilka, Ukrainian alcohol', *getman* 'hetman, leader of the Cossacks', *xata* 'peasant house', *galuški* 'dumplings', *bandura* 'folk music instrument', or agricultural activities: *orat'* 'to plow', R-Rus. *paxat'*, *skorodit'* 'to harrow', R-Rus. *boronit'*. Many of them were also borrowed to R-Russian to render a Ukrainian *couleur locale* and do not belong to U-Russian as such (Taranenko 2010). According to Del Gaudio (2011) and Del Gaudio, Ivanova (2015), the use of Ukrainian items for legal, political, and administrative terms that are officially Ukrainian is rather stable (*zajava* instead of *zajavlenie* 'application'; *klopotannja* instead of *xodatajstvo* 'petition; application'; *posvidčennja* instead of *udostoverenie*, 'certificate' *svidoctvo* instead of *svidetel'stvo* 'certificate', *deržava* instead of *gosudarstvo* 'state', *rada* instead of *sovet* 'council', *idu na zbory* instead of *idu na sobranie* 'I am going to an (official) meeting'). In the Russian speech of Ukrainian schoolchildren and teachers of the Ukrainian-language schools, technical terms are used in Ukrainian, as *poxidna* 'derivative (in calculus)' instead of *proizvodnaja* or *teperišnij čas* 'present tense' instead of *nastojaščee vremja.* With reference to the Ukrainian language, *mova* instead of *jazyk* can be used (like in B-Russian with reference to Belarusian); other examples of concepts in daily life include *stavok* instead of *prud* 'pond', *burjak* instead of *svekla* 'beetroot', *napruga* instead of *naprjaženie* 'voltage', *kuljok* instead of *paket* 'package', *borg* instead of *dolg* 'debt'. Ukrainian words for relatives and other personal relations are said to often appear in U-Russian (*djad'ka* 'uncle', *tetka* 'aunt', *žinka* 'wife', *tato* and *bat'ko* 'father', *divčina* 'girl', *moj maloj* 'my child/younger brother', lit. 'my little one'; cf. Ozerova 2002), and also Ukrainian hypocoristic forms of women's names (*Marusja*, known also in R-Russian historically and marginally, *Nataločka* instead of R-Russian *Maša, Nataša*). Some function words are also reported: *sjudoj(u*) and

tudoj(u) 'this way', 'that way' with no fitting one-word equivalent in R-Russian; *ne možno* instead of *nel'zja* 'impossible' (Del Gaudio 2011), *nexaj* instead of *pust'* 'let it' (Nikolenko 2003), *šo, šoby* 'what, that' instead of *čto, čtoby, ta* (particle) instead of *da* (Taranenko 2010, cf. typical U-Rus. *ta da!* 'yes, of course!' with no direct equivalent in R-Russian). There are also Ukrainian colloquial items in Russian speech, including discourse particles (*žaxy!* instead of *užas!* 'terrible!', *trymajsja* instead of *deržis'!* 'hold on!, move on!'; *tak otož* instead of *vot imenno* 'you said it'). One can also find functional or semantic extensions of Russian words: *ili ty znaeš?* 'do you know?' after Ukrainian *čy ty znaeš* with *čy* polyfunctional between 'or' and question particle (Del Gaudio 2011).

U-Russian differs from R-Russian in its treatment of Western borrowings. More borrowings are used in written U-Russian than in R-Russian (even if the same words exist also in the Russian standard); see the corpus-based study of Švedova (2017). Some of such U-Russian Western borrowings, rare or unknown in R-Russian, occur in journalism or scientific discourse: *kogabitacija* '(political) cohabitation', *politikum* 'political sphere', *margines* 'margins, marginal sphere', *modernyj* 'belonging to the Modern period in history'.

In U-Russian, in connection with *Ukraine*, the preposition *v* 'in' is preferred which is the usual preposition in R-Russian with state names, except for Ukraine, where R-Russian uses *na* 'on'. The use of *na* is often interpreted and sometimes meant as a questioning of Ukraine's right to be an independent state of its own right (cf. Taranenko 2010: 67–69).

Syntax and morphosyntax

According to Del Gaudio, Ivanova (2013), relatively constant in spoken U-Russian is the use of the preposition *za* instead of Russian *o* or *po* with certain verbs (*dumat' za* + acc. instead of *dumat' o* + prep. 'to think of somebody'; *skučat' za* + instr. instead of *skučat' po* + dat. 'to miss somebody') and certain other governmental patterns, for example *smejat'sja s* + gen. vs. *smejat'sja nad* + instr. 'to laugh at/mock somebody', not unlike in B-Russian, see above; *daj mne varenika* 'give me a dumpling' (genitive or accusative animate) instead of *daj mne varenik* (accusative inanimate). When two variants are possible in R-Russian, the variant that has a Ukrainian equivalent is preferred: *stradajut ot bolezni Al'cgejmera* 'have (lit. suffer from) Alzheimer disease' instead of *stradajut boleznju* (cf. Ukrainian: *straždajut' vid xvoroby*). More general than the behavior of individual verbs seems to be the use of *s* instead of *iz* 'from' (*prijti s* + gen. 'come from' vs. *prijti iz* + gen.) and of *do* instead of *k* 'to' (*idti do* + gen. 'go to smb.' vs. *idti k* + dat.).

Trasjanka and suržyk

Although forms of Belarusian/Ukrainian–Russian mixed speech certainly have appeared on the territory of today's Belarus and Ukraine before, as

a mass phenomenon, these forms of mixed speech emerged in the course of urbanization and rural–urban migration in the 20th century due to the social dominance of Russian in towns and cities as a result of the convergence of autochthonous Belarusian and Ukrainian dialects with standard Russian (cf. Taranenko 2014). They were passed on to the next generations, who are well versed in standard Russian. These forms show traits of stabilization and are used in spite of overt stigmatization (cf. Hentschel 2017; Kittel et al. 2018). As for BRMS, the following hierarchy of Russian impact holds: discourse markers > lexical stems > pronominal stems/functional words > inflectional endings with lexical words > inflectional endings with pronouns > phonic elements (Hentschel 2014), but the different distribution of Belarusian and Russian variants on one and the same linguistic level hints at the existence of a supra-regional uses of BRMS (Hentschel 2013). Investigations of authentic language material in Belarus show that especially, but not exclusively, younger speakers are able to switch between BRMS and Russian, in some cases also Belarusian (Hentschel, Zeller 2012). The self-assessments of language use in Ukraine indicate that the same is true for URMS and Ukrainian/Russian: In certain contexts, people use UMRS/BRMS although they are able to use standard language. This clearly hints at a hidden ('covert') positive prestige, contrary to the overt negative prestige that these forms of mixed speech usually carry. Only for the first speaker generation, it may be true that mixed speech is an 'intended' Russian. For many speakers in both countries, mixed speech without functional differentiation of Russian and Ukrainian/Belarusian elements is/was the code of first linguistic socialization. The subsequent acquisition of Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian has for the most part to be conceived as the acquisition of mechanisms of suppression of contextually inappropriate elements from the acquired overall repertoire of linguistic possibilities (ibid.).

For most scholars, the distinctive feature of 'trasjanka/suržyk' in comparison to the 'natiolects' of Russian is the existence of Russian influence not only on the phonic level. Whether this corresponds to the 'emic' differentiation may be doubted. 'Trasjanka' and 'suržyk' are folk categories which in the minds of the speakers are in principle separate from Russian and Ukrainian, although these categories often diffuse (cf. Bilaniuk 2005).

To what extent a 'neo-suržyk' (on the basis of Russian, converging with Ukrainian) has emerged in the course of Ukrainization since independence was proclaimed in Ukraine (and to a much lesser extent a 'neo-trasjanka' has developed in Belarus in the early 1990s), and to what extent Russian features in Belarusian have been promoted within the contemporary circles of the new Belarusian-speaking language activists is still unexplored.

Bibliography

Bilaniuk, L. (2005) *Contested tongues. Language politics and cultural correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Biryla, M.V.; Suprun, A.Ja. (ed.) (1982) *Pytanni bilinhvizmu i ŭzaemadzejannja moŭ*. Minsk: Navuka i tėxnika.

Bondarko, L.V.; Verbickaja, L.A. (eds.) (1987) *Interferencija zvukovyx sistem*. Leningrad: Leningrad University.

Bulyko, A.N.; Krysin, L.P. (eds.) (1999) *Tipologija dvujazycija i mnogojazycija v Belarusi*. Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka.

Čertoritžskaja, T.K. (ed.) (1988) *Ukrainsko-russkoe dvujazyčie. Sociolingvističeskij aspekt*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.

Del Gaudio, S. (2011) O variativnosti russkogo jazyka na Ukraine. *Izvestija Rossijskoi akademii nauk. Serija literatury i jazyka*, 70(2), 28–36.

_____ (2013) Russian as a non-dominant variety in Post-Soviet states: A comparison. In Muhr, R. et al. (ed.) *Exploring linguistic standards in non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages.* Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 343–362.

Del Gaudio, S.; Ivanova, O. (2013). Variation in a non-dominant variety of Russian in Ukraine: Extralinguistic and intralinguistic perspectives. In Businger, M.; Oberholzer, S. (eds.) *Travaux du 19éme CLIL*. Geneve: Département de Linguistique de l'Université de Genève, 1–19.

_____ (2015) A variety in formation? Morphosyntactic variation in Ukrainian-Russian speech and press. In Muhr, R.; Marley, D. (eds.) *Pluricentric languages. New perspectives in theory and description*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 169–193.

Dmitričenko, E. (2008) Oficial'nym variantom russkogo jazyka v Ukraine dolžen byt' donbasskij dialekt. *UNIAN Informacionnoe agentstvo*. unian.net/common/127421-ofitsialnyim-variantom-russkogo-yazyika-v-ukraine-doljen-byit-donbasskiy-dialekt.html.

Goritskaya, O. (2016) Nacional'nye osobennosti upravlenija: semantika i pragmatika. Paper presented at RusConstr 2016, St. Petersburg: Institute of Lingusitic Studies.

_____ (2018) In search of identity: A corpus-based study of lexical variation in Belarusian Russian. In Muhr, R.; Meisnitzer, B. (eds.) *Pluricentric languages and non-dominant varieties worldwide: New pluricentric languages—Old problems.* Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 219–232.

Goritskaya, O.; Suprunchuk, M. (2018) Frequency dictionary of Belarusian borrowings in the Belarusian variety of the Russian language. Paper presented at *SlaviCorp*, Prague: Charles University, 24–26.09.

Graudina, L.; Ickovič, V.; Katlinskaja, L. (1976) *Grammatičeskaja pravil'nost' russkoj reči*. Moskva: Nauka.

Hentschel, G. (2013) Zwischen Variabilität und Regularität, "Chaos" und Usus: Zu Lautung und Lexik der weißrussisch-russischen gemischten Rede. In Hentschel, G. (ed.) *Variation und Stabilität in Kontaktvarietäten: Beobachtungen zu gemischten Formen der Rede in Weißrussland, der Ukraine und Schlesien*. Oldenburg: BIS, 63–99.

_____ (2014) Belarusian and Russian in the mixed speech of Belarus. In Besters-Dilger, J.; Dermarkar, C.; Pfänder, St.; Rabus, A. (eds.) *Congruence in contact-induced language change. Language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 93–121.

_____ (2017) Eleven questions and answers about Belarusian-Russian mixed speech ("Trasyanka"). *Russian Linguistics*, 41(1), 17–42.

_____ (2018) Die weißrussische,Trasjanka' und der ukrainische, Suržyk': grundlegende quantitativ-qualitative soziolinguistische Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede. In Kempgen, S.; Wingender, M.; Udolph, L. (eds.) *Deutsche Beiträge zum 16. Internationalen Slavistenkongress Belgrad 2018*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 127–138.

9780367183660C10.3D 121 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

Hentschel, G.; Kittel, B. (2011) Weißrussische Dreisprachigkeit? Zur sprachlichen Situation in Weißrussland auf der Basis von Urteilen von Weißrussen über die Verbreitung “ihrer Sprachen” im Lande. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, 67, 107–135.

Hentschel, G.; Zeller, J.P. (2012) Gemischte Rede, gemischter Diskurs, Sprechertypen: Weißrussisch, Russisch und gemischte Rede in der Kommunikation weißrussischer Familien. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, 70, 127–155.

Hentschel, G.; Zeller, J.P. (2014) Belarusians’ pronunciation: Belarusian or Russian? Evidence from Belarusian-Russian mixed speech. *Russian Linguistics*, 38, 229–255.

Hentschel, G.; Zeller, J.P. (2017) Aspekte der Sprachverwendung in zentralen Regionen der Ukraine. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, 79, 37–60.

Ivanova, O. (2013) Post-Soviet bilingualism(s) and the pluricentricity of Russian. In Muhr, R.; Amorós Negre, C.; Fernández Juncal, C. (eds.) *Exploring linguistic standards in non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages/Explorando estándares lingüísticos en variedades no dominantes de lenguas pluricéntricas*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 363–376.

Ižakevič, G.P. (ed.) (1976) *Kul’tura russkoj reči na Ukraine*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

Kittel, B.; Lindner, D.; Brüggemann, M.; Zeller, J.P.; Hentschel, G. (in press) *Sprachkontakt—Sprachmischung—Sprachwahl—Sprachwechsel. Eine sprachsoziologische Untersuchung der weißrussisch-russisch gemischten Rede “Trasjanka” in Weißrussland*. Berlin: Lang.

Korjakov, Ju.B. (2002) Jazykovaja situacija v Belorussii. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 2, 109–127.

Kustova, G.I.; Savčuk, S.O. (2013) Izučenie leksiko-semantičeskoj i sociokul’turnoj specifiki russkoj reči na territorii Respubliki Belarus’ (na materiale tekstov SMI). In Zakharov, V.P. (ed.) *Trudy meždunarodnoj konferencii Korpusnaja lingvistika-2013*. Sankt-Peterburg: SPbGU, 344–352.

Liskovec, I.V. (2005) *Russkij i belorusskij jazyki v Minske: problemy bilingvizma i otnošenija k jazyku*. Diss., Evropejskij Universitet v Sankt-Peterburge.

Mečkovskaja, N.B. (2002) Jazyk v roli ideologii: nacional’no-simvoličeskie funkcii jazyka v belorusskoj jazykovoj situacii. In Gutschmidt, K. (ed.) *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Standardisierung slavischer Schriftsprachen in der Gegenwart*. Dresden: Thelem, 124–141.

_____ (2005) Postsovetskij russkij jazyk: Novye cherty v sociolingvističeskom statuse. *Russian Linguistics*, 29, 49–70.

Mixnevič, A.E. (1985a). Osnovnye aspekty problemy. In Mixnevič, A.E. (ed.) ibid., 3–12.

_____ (ed.) (1985b) *Russkij jazyk v Belorussii*. Minsk: Nauka i technika.

Muhr, R. (ed.) (2012). *Non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages. Getting the picture. In memory of Michael Clyne*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.

NANU. (2016) Nacional’na Akademija nauk Ukrajiny. Instytut sociolohiji. *Ukrajins’ke suspil’stvo: monitorynh social’nych zmin. Dodatok: tablyci monitorynhovoho opytuvannja “Ukrajins’ke suspil’stvo—2016”*. i-soc.com.ua/assets/files/monitoring/dodatki2016.pdf.

Nikolenko, N.I. (2003) O specifike russkogo jazyka sredstv massovoj informacii Ukrainy. *Kul’tura narodov Pričernomor’ja*, 37, 300–304.

Norman, B. (2008) Russkij jazyk v Belarusi segodnja. *Die Welt der Slaven*, LIII, 289–300.

Ozerova, N.G. (2002) Ukrainizmy v russkoj gazetnoj reči na rubeže tysjačeletij. *Russkij jazyk i literatura v učebnych zavedenijach*, 5, 2–4.

PN. (1999) Nacional’nyj Statističeskij Komitet Respubliki Belarus’. *Perepis’ naselenija 1999 g*. belstat.gov.by/informatsiya-dlya-respondenta/perepis-naseleniya/perepis-naseleniya-1999-goda.

9780367183660C10.3D 122 [108–122] 19.5.2019 4:13AM

_____ (2009) Nacional'nyj Statističeskij Komitet Respubliki Belarus'. *Perepis' naselenija 2009. T. III: Nacional'nyj sostav naselenija Respubliki Belarus'*. Minsk. belstat.gov.by/homep/ru/perepic/2009/itogi1.php, accessed 08/12/2018.

Ruda, O.G. (2012) *Movne pytannja jak ob"jekt manipuljatyvnyx stratehij u sučasnomu ukrajins'komu polityčnomu dyskursi*. Kyiv: Instytut ukrajins'koji movy NAN Ukrajiny.

Ryčkova, L.V.; Stankevič, A.Ju. (2014) Mnogocelevoj lingvističeskij korpus regional'nyx SMI. *Informacionno-kommunikacionnye texnologii v lingvistike, lingvodidaktike i mežkul'turnoj kommunikacii*, 6, 488–497.

Sadoŭski, P.V. (1982) Z'javy fanetyčnaj intėrferėncyi va ŭmovax belaruska-ruskaha bilinhvizmu. In Biryla, M.V.; Suprun, A.Ja. (red.) *Pytanni bilinhvizmu i ŭzaemadzejannja moŭ*. Minsk: Navuka i tėchnika, 176–228.

Sitchinava, D.V. (2018) Contact-induced pluperfect-type forms in Belarus. Paper presented at the workshop "Grammar of non-standard varieties in the East of the Circum-Baltic area", University of Tartu, 1–3.02.

Švedova, M.O. (2017) Korpusni metody doslidžennja rehional'nyx vidminnostej u mežax odnijeji movy (na materiali rehional'nyx korpusiv ukrajins'koji ta rosijs'koji mov). *Visnyk Charkovs'koho nacional'noho universitetu. Seria "Filolohija"*, 77, 33–38.

Taranenko, O.O. (2007a) Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'ki movni kontakty. In Rusanivs'kyj, V.M.; Taranenko, O.O. (eds.) *Ukrajins'ka mova: Encyklopedija*. 3rd ed. Kyjiv: Ukrains'kaja Encyklopedia, 770–773.

_____ (2007b) Ukrainian and Russian in contact: Attraction and estrangement. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 183, 119–140.

_____ (2010) Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'ki movni kontakty na sučasnomu etapi: prytjahuvannja I vidštovxuvannja. I. Vplyvy, interferencija, zapozyčennja. *Movoznavstvo*, 2010(2–3), 55–82.

_____ (2014) Ukrainisch-russischer Suržyk: Status, Bewertungen, Tendenzen, Prognosen. In Hentschel, G.; Taranenko, O.; Zaprudski, S. (eds.) *Trasjanka und Suržyk —gemischte weißrussisch-russische und ukrainisch-russische Rede*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 265–287.

VPN. (2001) Deržavnyj komitet statystyky Ukrajiny (2003–2004) *Vseukrajin'skyj perepys naselennja '2001*. http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/, accessed 04/12/2018.

Vygonnaja, L.T. (1985) Fonetičeskie osobennosti russkoj reči v Belorussii. In Mixnevič (ed.) ibid, 121–159.

Woolhiser, C. (2012) "Belarusian Russian": Sociolinguistic status and discursive representations. In Muhr (ed.), ibid, 227–262.

Zeller, J.P. (2015) *Phonische Variation in der weißrussischen „Trasjanka". Sprachwandel und Sprachwechsel im weißrussisch-russischen Sprachkontakt*. Oldenburg: BIS.

_____ (2018) Zum ukrainisch-russischen Sprachkontakt: Phonische Variation im ukrainischen 'Suržyk' im Vergleich mit der weißrussischen 'Trasjanka'. In Kempgen, S.; Wingender, M.; Udolph, L. (eds.) *Deutsche Beiträge zum 16. Internationalen Slavistenkongress Belgrad 2018*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 365–374.

Zeller, J.P.; Levikin, D. (2016) Die Muttersprachen junger Weißrussen. Ihr symbolischer Gehalt und ihr Zusammenhang mit sozialen Faktoren und dem Sprachgebrauch in der Familie. *Wiener Slawistisches Jahrbuch (Neue Folge)*, 4, 114–144.

Zeller, J.P.; Taranenko, O.; Hentschel, G. (in press). Language and religion in central Ukraine. *Journal of the Sociology of Language*, forthcoming.