

**ROSSIFICATION AND CREOLIZATION:
THE INFLUENCE OF EXTERNAL FACTORS ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE***

Peter Jaroslaw PIASECKYJ
orcid.org/0009-0000-1764-2921
Master of Science, Scientist
email: piaseckyj@gmail.com

Oleh RUDNYK
orcid.org/0009-0009-3978-5718
3rd year student of History Faculty
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
email: olehrudnyk@knu.ua

Annotation. *This work is primarily based on the personal scholarly project of P. J. Piaseckyj, a Ukrainian diaspora scholar from the USA. It was the project titled "Anglo Surzhyk," which was initiated on February 9, 2018 (and still ongoing), that provided the author with the further impetus to write this paper. The project itself is a study of the prevalence of Anglicisms in everyday, academic, cultural, and professional Ukrainian communication. It is based on articles from Ukrainian media published on the Internet and currently contains over 2,500 borrowings. The project is continuously updated and thus not available in print; an electronic copy may be requested directly from the author via email or by visiting its namesake Facebook page [2].*

The author began contemplating the Anglicization of the Ukrainian language as early as 1949, at the age of six, upon arriving in New York and hearing the Anglicized Ukrainian spoken by American Ukrainians (from the first and second waves of emigration). Mr. Piaseckyj himself is fully proficient in English and possesses a "keen sensibility toward our language." On the other hand, Oleh Rudnyk (who is also fully proficient in both mentioned languages) focuses this work on the linguistic purism movement, specifically its historical continuity and its relevance to societal needs within the context of contemporary Ukrainian national realities. This focus is grounded in the ideas and works of American researchers such as Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf, and Welsh scholar Rhianwen Daniel [23, 24, 25]. This work also serves as an appeal to the Ukrainian academic community to more urgently address the issue of protecting the Ukrainian language from the phenomenon of creolization in the current conditions of global advancement.

Ключові слова: *rossification, rossisms, anglicisms, empirical analysis, Ukrainian language, language policy, korenizatsiia, linguistics, surzhyk, creolization.*

Introduction. The influence of external linguistic interference stands as one of the most critical and pressing issues in contemporary *Ukrainian linguistics*, demanding complete attention. Historically,

the Ukrainian language was not permitted to develop organically, having been subjected to prolonged and systematic pressure that resulted in significant structural and lexical modifications. Specifically, the

* We chose the spelling *rossification*, *rossisms* not to confuse the ancient name for Ukraine which was *Rus'* (Русь) with *Russia* which in Russian is *Rossia* (Россия).

centuries-long policy of Rossification facilitated the permeation of countless *Rossisms* into the Ukrainian lexicon and led to the formation of a *creolized* language, often exemplified by *surzhyk* (a mixed Ukrainian Russian vernacular). In the twenty-first century, a strong influx of *Anglicisms* further compounds these challenges. Our observations indicate that these Anglicisms often enter the Ukrainian linguistic space not directly, but through the medium of the Russian language.

The Anglicisms featured in the “*Anglo Surzhyk*” project are selected using the scholarly method of personal observation for each borrowing which became established within the Ukrainian linguistic domain in present-day Ukraine. This approach mirrors the methodology employed in compiling the majority of the world’s dictionaries. Furthermore, in some instances, the sources cited are not strictly academic publications but rather works by esteemed scholars whose viewpoints cannot be disregarded (such as articles in blogs or on the broader internet). These sources delineate the political events that coalesce our linguistic work. It is worth noting that the field of study concerning *creolization in Ukraine* is not yet sufficiently formalized academically; thus, it is perfectly suited for active scholarly discussion within the newly emerging *electronic network information space* of the Internet, where academics instantaneously share digital articles, books, and publications.

The **aim** of this work is to analyze the historical preconditions and current manifestations of linguistic distortion—caused by Rossification and the influx of mediated Anglicisms—to fully comprehend this influx. We investigate the consequences of these phenomena for the development

of the lexical richness and word-formation capacity of the Ukrainian language. Concurrently, we advocate for the necessity of implementing effective measures for its protection. These conclusions are grounded in the empirical analysis of a corpus of words, gathered within the framework of the “*Anglo Surzhyk*” project [2], which attests to the Russian-mediated provenance of a considerable portion of these borrowings. Emphasis is placed on the essential role of *governmental involvement* in the defense and standardization of the Ukrainian language amid globalization and persistent external influence.

The *creolization* examined in our work stands at the core of our focus.

Creolization is the formation of new languages founded on the confluence of two or more languages (the concept first appeared in Ukrainian linguistic literature in the *nineteen-sixties*, borrowed from the French *créolisation*). Alas, this process represents the present reality in the development of the Ukrainian language. *Surzhyk* is a salient instance of a Russo-Ukrainian *creole*. The current influx of Anglicisms via the Russian language could presage further creolization, potentially leading to the forfeiture of national linguistic identity. [19]

The problem of the Ukrainian language's creolization was meticulously scrutinized by *Ivan Dziuba* (1931-2022) in his work *Internationalism or Russification?* composed in *nineteen sixty-five*, which became one of the most vital documents of the Ukrainian dissident movement. In his writing, Dziuba mounted a critique of the Soviet regime's language policy in Ukraine. He maintained that, in lieu of the proclaimed “*internationalism*” – intended to effect equality and mutual cultural

enrichment—a concealed *Rossification* of the Ukrainian people and a blending of the Ukrainian language with the Russian were, in fact, taking place. [4]

Ramifications of Language Policy and the Hegemony of Dominant Linguistic Influences. The consequences of a scornful language policy are manifold:

1. *Stifling of Word-Forming Development.* In the fields of science, engineering, jurisprudence, and other specialized domains, the Ukrainian language often lacked the scope to independently advance its formation of vocabulary, as these spheres were under the sway of empires. This brought about frequent borrowings or the want of established Ukrainian terms.

2. *Peculiarities and Dialects of Diverse Indigenous Ukrainian Territories.* The protracted separation and the influence of neighbouring languages within various Ukrainian lands engendered considerable dialectal distinctions and localized adoptions, which at times were perceived as departures from the linguistic standard.

3. *Forfeiture of a Portion of Lexical Wealth.* Due to a want of widespread usage in matters of state, schooling, and the public media, certain Ukrainian words and locutions may have fallen into disuse or been forgotten.

4. *Psychological Duress.* Generations of Ukrainians were reared in circumstances where the use of their native language could be dangerous, leading to a sense of dread, shame, a loss of personal dignity, and the renunciation of their language even in everyday life.

Lexical Richness of Ukrainian and English: A Comparative Overview, Word Count in English and Ukrainian. The *Ukrainian language* possesses remarkable lexical richness. The generally estimated

total number of words (according to the Institute of the Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), encompassing the complete lexical fund, including dialects and specialized jargon, is approximately 1 million words. This figure is a generalized conclusion reached by scholars by considering all possible sources of vocabulary, not solely the words recorded in prescriptive explanatory dictionaries.

English Language The estimated total number of words in *English* is often considered to exceed 1 million words. This count includes a vast number of technical and scientific terms, as well as new words that emerge daily. [5]

Word Count in Major Dictionaries. *The number of words documented in dictionaries* is frequently cited as ranging from 250,000 to 600,000 for contemporary standard literary language.

More conservative figures are provided by dictionaries. The *Oxford English Dictionary* Second Edition (OED2) has approximately 291,500 main entries and treats over a half-million words in total (including main entries, combinations, and derivatives).

For instance, the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* contains approximately 250,000 words. In contrast, the eleven-volume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*, which was published between 1970 and 1980, comprised around 165,000 words.

The *Institute of the Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine* notes that various specialized Ukrainian dictionaries, such as the *Dictionary of Translations*, include an extensive compilation of 370,000 Ukrainian English and 620,000 Ukrainian Russian translational equivalents.

In conclusion The Ukrainian language faces challenges related to the influence of English as a language of international communication. This influence, regrettably, often occurs through Russian mediation, which further complicates the already difficult matter of Rossification. Nevertheless, in terms of word quantity, *Ukrainian does not fall far behind English*. Therefore, it is important to recognize that the *Ukrainian language does not lack words for use*; the sole issue for the average Ukrainian speaker is the necessity to *know and learn those words!*

Everyday Communication and Linguistic Dynamics in Ukraine. Linguists who monitor *everyday social communication in Ukraine* (3) assert that, on average, both men and women use approximately *16,000 words per day*.

It is worth noting that preliminary studies and publications have cited figures ranging from *8,000 to 10,000 words*. This estimate, for example, has been widely circulated in various publications and books on psychology, though it wasn't always underpinned by large-scale scientific research.

A contemporary challenge for the Ukrainian language is that a significant portion of Anglicisms (English loanwords) enters the language not directly, but *indirectly, via Russian mediation*, based on empirical analysis of collected data. Observations derived from analyzing a corpus of loanwords – though not a formal dictionary – contain over *2,500 collected Anglicisms* (and the subjective projections of P. J. Piaseckyj suggest this number could surpass 3,000 words). These words were gathered by the author over eight years of reviewing material from modern Ukrainian media [2].

This conclusion is supported by a

comparative analysis of Ukrainian and Russian Anglicisms using electronic translation software: if an Anglicism in Ukrainian corresponds exactly with its counterpart in Russian, it points toward a Russian source.

Approximately *20–30% of the currently used Ukrainian words are Anglicisms*, with the majority having appeared in the 20th and 21st centuries [2, 3].

The Concept of Creolization in Scholarship. The study of creolization as a phenomenon began to appear in Ukrainian academic research toward the end of the *20th century*, a time when scholars started to actively investigate interlingual and intercultural contacts. Conversely, in global scholarship, the concept of creolization is well-established and extensively studied.

Sociologists have employed the notion of “creolization” to evoke a sense of cultural fusion and the emergence of new global cultures. However, the term has often been insufficiently theorized and is typically used as a simple synonym for “mixing” or “hybridity.”

In the book *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory* [1], prominent scholars lend historical and theoretical precision to the concept of creolization. They achieve this by examining diverse notions and the specific circumstances under which these actions and overall developments take place.

Interestingly, upon reading linguistic works, one observes that even the researchers who study creolization fall under its “*spell*”, evidenced by the fact that Anglicisms are also found within their scholarly papers! [2] We also see, that Mykola Khvylovy uses Anglicisms in his pamphlets the same way as well. [8]

The Historical Pressure on the

Ukrainian Language. For centuries, the *Ukrainian language* endured immense pressure, driven by the policies of *Polonization, Russification, and Magyarization*. This historical trajectory led to the unfortunate severance of a significant portion of the Ukrainian intelligentsia – particularly in Left-Bank Ukraine, Soviet Ukraine, and even modern Ukraine before the 2019 language law's enactment [6], as well as in the western part of Ukraine from 1945 to 2019 – from the profound sources of its own linguistic tradition.

The resulting void facilitated the infiltration of foreign languages into the Ukrainian cultural sphere, an intrusion that was often, disturbingly, accepted as the “norm”. Furthermore, the persistent and ideologically driven imposition of *Russian* resulted in a substantial influx of *Rossisms*. Consequently, this also indirectly enabled the continued flow of *Anglicisms* into the Ukrainian linguistic space, a trend that persists to this day.

The Historical Persecution of the Ukrainian Language. The linguistic history of Ukraine is marked by over a hundred prohibitions and restrictions that severely hindered the natural development of the Ukrainian language. Among the most infamous historical documents illustrating this phenomenon are *the Valuev Circular (1863)* and *the Ems Ukaz (1876)*. These decrees, aimed at restricting the publishing, education, and public use of the Ukrainian language, served as instruments of systematic *Rossification*. Over time, this policy led to the loss of a significant portion of authentic Ukrainian vocabulary and the emergence of *Surzhyk* the Russian Ukrainian language mixture (*creole*).

The pressure of *Rossification* became especially intense during the forced

industrialization and collectivization of the Stalinist era. This resulted in the extensive *Rossification* of the Ukrainian peasantry and, consequently, the widespread prevalence of *Surzhyk*. This dynamic was exacerbated over decades, particularly within Ukrainian-speaking communities and settlements throughout the Soviet Union.

Vivid examples of this linguicide (мовомор) can be seen in regions like the Kuban and the Far East. In these areas, a substantial part of the Ukrainian-speaking population – such as in the Pymorskyi region, where 78.1% of settlers between 1883 and 1905 were Ukrainian – gradually lost their language and national identity. [7]

Cultural Resistance and the Tragedy of the Renaissance. The *Korenizatsiia* (indigenization or nativization) policy of the 1920's, and specifically *Ukrainization*, represented a brief and temporary retreat from the preceding course of *Rossification*.

Mykola Khvylovy and “Away from Moscow!” [8]. This renowned exclamation is attributed to Mykola Khvylovy (1893–1933), a writer and the chief ideologue of the Literary Discussion of 1925–1928. He didn't directly put forth the slogan “Away from Moscow!” in his polemical pamphlets, but Yuriy Lavrinenko mentioned him citing a piece from Stalin's “Collected Works” in his book “Executed Renaissance” that Khvylovy “called for Ukrainian leaders to turn away from Moscow as quick as possible” [8]. His core proposition was that Ukrainian culture should orient itself toward Europe rather than slavishly imitating Russia. This slogan that “belongs” to Khvylovy became a powerful symbol of the Ukrainian intelligentsia's resistance to Russian cultural domination.

The Executed Renaissance.

However, this cultural resistance was brutally interrupted by the onset of the Stalinist persecutions and terror, which became historically known as the “Executed Renaissance” (*Rozstriliane Vidrodzhennia*) [9]. During this period, a significant portion of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, who were diligently working on the standardization and development of the language, was systematically annihilated.

The phrase “Executed Renaissance” was popularized internationally in 1959 by *Yuriy Lavrinenko* (1905–1987), a prominent Ukrainian literary scholar, critic, publicist, and historian, and a key researcher of the era. He used it as the title for his anthology of Ukrainian poetry and prose from the time to denote the generation of Ukrainian artists who were destroyed by Stalinist terror in the 1930’s.

Archival documents from the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) and interrogation protocols bear witness to the way the communist (Russian) authorities dealt with the leading Ukrainian national strata, routinely accusing them of “bourgeois nationalism.” These materials are accessible in numerous historical collections and archives.

Standardization and Political Influence on Ukrainian Orthography. In 1933, the Soviet grammatical system for the Ukrainian language was formally adopted, an orthography frequently referred to as the “Stalinist Orthography”. [10] This nomenclature arises from its direct reflection of the Soviet regime’s contradictory policy of first promoting *Ukrainization* and then its subsequent reversal toward *Rossification*. The overarching aim of this linguistic revision was the systematic eradication

of distinctive national features within the language, a measure that constituted a key component of the Kremlin’s broader policy designed to suppress national identity.

This 1933 standard superseded the previous one: the *Kharkiv Orthography*, or *Skrypnyk’s Orthography*, which had been introduced in 1928. However, the Soviet authorities gradually phased out the earlier standard due to its perceived “nationalist” orientation and its maintenance of linguistic features deemed too distinct from Russian.

The Termination of Ukrainization and Its Aftermath. The *Korenizatsiia* policy proved to be relatively ephemeral. With the consolidation of power by Stalin and the commencement of mass suppression and terror in the 1930’s, the official course of supporting national cultures was decisively reversed. *Korenizatsiia* itself was subsequently denounced as “bourgeois nationalistic”.

This period was broadly characterized by the systematic liquidation of Ukrainian national institutions, including the *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church* (1930), and the wholesale destruction of the nation’s scholarly and political leadership. All nationally conscious Ukrainians, encompassing civil, political, cultural, and military figures, were subjected to brutal persecution or, as historical record attests, outright execution.

The liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) took place on January 28–29, 1930, within Kyiv’s Saint Sophia Cathedral, the oldest surviving architectural monument of Kyivan Rus’. This action was executed at the behest of the State Political Directorate (GPU), which had summoned an assembly of bishops and priests of the UAOC. The

meeting was deceptively proclaimed an “Extraordinary Council of the UAOC,” and its resulting resolution declared the Church’s “self-dissolution.” [11]

The policy of *korenizatsiia* (indigenization) was formally adopted at the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), held in April 1923. The resolution, entitled “On National Moments in Party and State Building,” declared: “The implementation of the policy of *korenizatsiia* in local Soviet, Party, and trade union apparatuses is one of the Party’s most important tasks.” This quote underscores the great significance the Party attached to involving local personnel and utilizing national languages within administrative and cultural institutions. The core tenets of this resolution laid the groundwork for the *korenizatsiia* policy. A direct translation of the resolution’s full text is not readily available in open Ukrainian-language sources, as the original document was drafted in Russian. However, its main stipulations concerning indigenization are discernible. [12]

The Destruction of Ukrainian Dictionaries. Multiple sources, including scholars of Ukrainian language and history, attest to the existence and subsequent deliberate destruction of Ukrainian dictionaries during the 1920’s and early 1930’s. [13] These linguistic works were compiled during the brief period of Ukrainization and were later repressed because of the Soviet regime’s suppression of the Ukrainian national will.

Repression and Cultural Destruction. Hundreds of thousands of people were either *executed by firing squad or sent to the GULAG*. As previously mentioned in this work, the policy of Ukrainization culminated in the Great Purges, which became known

as the “*Executed Renaissance*” (*Rozstriliane Vidrodzhennia*). [13]

Key Historical Accounts. Dmytro Doroshenko (1882–1951), a prominent Ukrainian historian, analyzed the processes of the Ukrainian national revival in his works. His book, *A History of Ukraine*, concisely outlined the stages and consequences of Ukrainization.

Serhiy Bilokin (1948–2023) likewise confirmed the destruction of Ukraine’s cultural and scientific achievements, including its dictionaries. His research documents the *repressions* against linguists and the removal and *destruction of their linguistic works*.

The Ukrainian linguist Yuriy Shevelov (1908–2002) addressed the “Executed Renaissance” (specifically within the field of linguistics) in his article, “*That’s How They Taught Us the Proper Pronunciations*,” which is part of his “*Triptych on the Work of Kyiv Linguists of the 1920’s*,” detailing the activities of Kyiv’s linguistic scholars during that decade.

In the 1920’s, the commission tasked with compiling the “*Russian Ukrainian Dictionary*,” under the leadership of Academicians Ahatanhel Krymsky (1871–1942) and Serhiy Yefremov (1876–1939), was officially titled the “*Commission for the Compilation of the Living Ukrainian Language*.” Subsequently, this dictionary was *banned in the 1930’s*, and its compilers were *repressed*, branded as “*Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists*”.

The *liquidation of the korenizatsiia policy* was fundamentally linked to Stalin’s perception of national movements as a *threat to the unity of the USSR* and a potential catalyst for the empire’s disintegration. This shift in policy revealed that, for the Soviet regime, *korenizatsiia* was merely a *tactical*

maneuver, not a genuine recognition of the rights of the national republics. Its ultimate suppression became a component of the broader consolidation of the dictatorial regime and *centralized control* under the full control of Stalin.

Thus, while *korenizatsiia* initially fostered the development of national languages and cultures, it was simultaneously an instrument used by Soviet power to solidify the Russian imperial existence. Its subsequent destruction, which was accompanied by immense *persecutions*, underscored the *hypocrisy of Soviet policy* and its readiness to sacrifice millions of people to preserve its imperial authority.

In 1933, the Soviet orthography for the Ukrainian language was formally adopted. It is frequently referred to as the “*Stalinist Orthography*” [10] because it reflected the shifting political goals of the Soviet regime: first, the tactical policy of “Ukrainization,” and subsequently, the imposed Rossification. This new orthography was engineered by Soviet authorities to systematically suppress the distinctive national features of the language, a measure that was part of the Kremlin's overall policy to crush national self-identity. It replaced the previous standard, the “*Kharkiv Orthography*”, which had been introduced in 1928 but was gradually eliminated by the Soviet government due to its perceived “*nationalist*” orientation.

The Relay Race of Russification: The Attempted Fusion of Ukrainian and Russian Languages, 1972-2019. The O. O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics, under the leadership of Ivan Bilodid (1906–1981) and Vitaliy Rusanivsky (1931–2007), was among the chief proponents of Russification within Ukraine's academic circles. Yet, the government paid no heed to the appeals of

conscientious Ukrainian forces concerning this deliberate affront to the Ukrainian language and our *national dignity*, a matter critically tied to linguistic identity. Thus, Bilodid and Rusanivsky, leveraging their positions, executed the mandate of the Soviet system, which aspired to forge a “single Soviet people” with a “single Soviet language”—which was, in effect, Russian. Their activities, though deceptively labeled as the “development” of the Ukrainian language, were in truth an instrument of Rossification, resulting in the distortion of the language and the shrinking of its functions in public life. [14]

Later, during the Soviet era, the policies of Volodymyr Shcherbytsky (1972–1989) relentlessly continued to displace Ukrainian from higher education, science, and state administration, reinforcing its relegation to the periphery. *He drove the final nail into the coffin of Ukrainian identity.*

Had the *Act of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine* – passed by the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR in 1991 – not come to pass, we would be in the same state as Belarus today. I (Piaseckyj) have been in America since 1949 and vividly recall a visit to Kyiv as a tourist in 1977. I did not hear a single Ukrainian word. I felt as if I were the *last Ukrainian*, like the last Mohican (native American tribe), and was overcome by a profound sadness! When I wished to purchase tickets for the “Raketa” hydrofoil to Kaniv, the Intourist agent demanded to know why I was going- there! I replied that the *Taras Shevchenko (1918-1861) the Father of the Ukrainian Nation*, famed throughout the world, was buried there. [15]

Subsequently, the tenure of Dmytro Tabachnyk (2010–2014) as Minister of Education saw policies aimed at

restructuring educational programs and amplifying the influence of the Russian language. This provoked significant public outrage and scholarly protest. [16]

His endeavors included the reduction of instructional hours for Ukrainian language and literature, attempts to abolish the subject of “*History of Ukraine*,” the rejection of a mandatory Ukrainian language examination for postgraduate admission, the promotion of the Russian language in education, and the rewriting of textbooks. These and other measures sparked widespread opposition from the public, academics, and students, who perceived them as a threat to Ukrainian identity and statehood.

In a subsequent development, President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelenskyi, signed a law in 2024 that officially designates English as one of the languages of international communication in Ukraine. *This move appears to suggest that the Ukrainian government is not prioritizing the Ukrainian language but rather focusing on English instead.* This occurs even though the key Ukrainian language law has been in existence for six years, having been enacted in 2019. [17]

To date, *ninety-three years have elapsed* since the liquidation of the Korenizatsiia (Indigenization) policy. It took the full-scale Russian invasion in 2022 for the Ukrainian government to finally recognize *that language* is not merely a means of communication, but also a potent factor in national unity, identity, and resistance to war. Consequently, the state policy aimed at strengthening respect for, and usage of the Ukrainian language is a critically important component of Ukraine's national security strategy. This policy is embodied in the law “On Ensuring the

Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language” [6], adopted in 2019. Incidentally, a similarity can be drawn between this Ukrainian law and the French Toubon Law [18] (enacted by the French government in 1994 to curb the excessive Anglicization of the French language), particularly regarding the objective of *protecting the purity of the language from the intrusion of foreign, assimilating cultural borrowings.*

Linguistic Purism As Anti-Colonial Resistance. The assertion that the movement for *linguistic purity functions not as a “chauvinistic, bourgeois-nationalist caprice”* of particular interested parties, but rather as an *anti-colonial (anti-imperialist) resistance movement* against cultural and, crucially, national (or ethnic) assimilation, is articulated by *Rhianwen Daniel*, a scholar from the Philosophy Department at Cardiff University (Wales, Great Britain), in her work titled “*Standardization and vitality: The role of linguistic purism in preventing extinction.*” [23]

Her scholarly work is structured into seven sections, the last of which serves as the conclusion and the first as the introduction. In the initial section, she underscores that amidst the context of *digital globalization* and the proliferation of English as the international *lingua franca*, particularly on the Internet, the communicative abilities of non-native speakers in their own languages are progressively deteriorating. She further notes that *21 European languages* are currently facing “digital extinction.”

Therefore, *Rhianwen Daniel* emphasizes that the *standardization of language* must proceed in tandem with the development of *linguistic technologies* (ranging from proprietary electronic dictionaries and speech development applications to voice

AI assistants and search engines). This is presented as a logical conclusion, given that we are currently living in the *digital age*. She also cites the *Académie Française* (French Academy) as an illustrative example. Since its founding in 1635, the Academy has anchored a movement for *linguistic purity* within its language policy. Its primary objective has consistently been to oversee, regulate, authorize, and engage in approving word-forming work in support of French state-building. Crucially, throughout this work, the author actively employs the *Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis* [24, 25].

This hypothesis asserts that language either *completely determines or partially influences* the speaker's mode of thought, worldview, and general cognition. The author actively validates this hypothesis-theory by detailing research experiences with various *minority languages*, positing language as the *vessel or driver of culture*. The argument suggests that every national culture worldwide possesses its unique characteristics precisely due to its specific language, which acts as a distinctive treasury of words carrying unique concepts or sets of ideas. These concepts, in turn, sequentially forge the distinct cultural output of a nation or ethnic community. A prime example supporting this claim is the phenomenon of *untranslatability* (or *untranslatables*), which denotes instances where a word from a foreign language is either impossible to translate entirely or requires a cumbersome multi-word circumlocution to convey its meaning (a point also noted by Rhianwen Daniel in her work).

Komorebi (木漏れ日) is a Japanese term that refers to the scattered or dappled sunlight that filters through the leaves of trees.

Furthermore, the author addresses the

variance in the grammatical gender of nouns (masculine, feminine, neuter) *and their prevalence across the world's languages, a distinction that inherently shapes the way a speaker of a particular language apprehends an object or entity*. For instance, the word for "dog" in Ukrainian is assigned a gender ('he' or 'she') based on the animal's sex, whereas the English equivalent remains the neutral pronoun 'it'.

The author further illuminates a point regarding the *Pirahã tribe* in the Brazilian state of Amazonas, citing the research of linguist *Daniel Everett*, which reveals peculiar linguistic features that impose distinct "*cognitive constraints*" upon its speakers. These limitations include, for example, an inability to differentiate certain colors, quantify using numbers or units of measurement, or express actions that occurred in the more remote past.

These phenomena and their subsequent study invariably challenge the conventional assumption that *language functions solely as a mere instrument of communication*; instead, they posit that language directly influences the genesis of human thought and the apprehension of the ambient world. Consequently, an impoverished vocabulary, whether personal or inherent to the language itself necessarily yields an equally *circumscribed intellectual output* for the speaker.

The Natural Basis of Language Purity.

Concerning the movement advocating for *language purity*, Rianven recalls its genesis during the *Enlightenment and Renaissance*. The scholars of the Italian *Accademia della Crusca*, established in 1582, undertook the task of purging Latin of the numerous lexical borrowings accrued throughout the Middle Ages. This effort established a *definitive precedent* for the lexical, grammatical, and

syntactical renewal of language, serving as an influential model for the subsequent formation of Western European national languages from regional vernaculars. It warrants mention that languages have continuously evolved throughout the modern and contemporary periods, thus perpetuating the adoption of this original standardization paradigm.

It is by drawing upon these foundational tenets that she asserts the movement for language purity is an *organic*, rather than a reactionary or chauvinistic, phenomenon, fundamentally because it *safeguards the authenticity of the language that is constitutive of national culture*.

The Threat of Anglicisms and Institutional Silence. *Regrettably, Professor Yuriy Shevchuk* [19] (Columbia University, New York, USA), in his 2024 article “*The Untranslatability of Anglicisms and Russification: Why Are Ukraine’s Specialized Institutions Silent?*”, *underscores that “the unfettered stream of Anglicisms threatens to transform the Ukrainian language, in the very near future, into yet another variant of Surzhyk – this time, Ukrainian-English”*. He also draws attention to the *dearth of operational institutions* responsible for regulating linguistic norms and literary standards, specifically mentioning the Institute of the Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Orthography Commission. Nevertheless, despite these evident challenges, the *consistent implementation of language law remains the cornerstone for the continued development of Ukrainian and the reinforcement of Ukrainian statehood*.

Leading scholars and linguists. *Professor Roman Serbyn* [20] (Université du Québec, Montreal, Canada) observes that the Ukrainian language “*has found itself*

under a novel menace – that of English”, which, he posits, “*is channeled through the Russian sieve, essentially resulting in supplementary Russification*” [20].

Taras Bereza [21] a philologist, translator, and lexicographer—is a scholar actively engaged in academic and publicistic work dedicated to the issue of linguistic borrowing. He advocates for the *identification of authentic Ukrainian equivalents* for foreign terms, particularly within the technical, scientific, and business domains. He contends: “People are unaware that the language is diminishing, that its vocabulary is contracting. Ukrainian is being relegated to a purely “domestic” register. It ceases to be the sophisticated language and become merely a means of mutual understanding between individuals. However, the communicative function is only its most rudimentary role.”

Iryna Farion [22] – a Deputy of the VII Convocation of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and a Doctor of Philology – made a significant contribution to contemporary Ukrainian linguistics with her work, “*Anglicisms and Anti-Anglicisms: 100 Word Histories in a Sociocontext*” [22]. This book systematically addresses the issue of the *excessive adoption of Anglicisms*, emphasizing the imperative to preserve linguistic distinctiveness. Farion advances intriguing perspectives, asserting that *the trajectory of borrowing is inherently unnatural to the Ukrainian language*. While most linguists advocate for the *judicious determination and deliberate adoption of foreign words*, rather than their outright prohibition, there is a preliminary need for scholars to contemplate and agree upon what constitutes a “*judicious determination*” and a “*natural order*”. Furthermore, she stresses the ultimate necessity of *destalinizing*

Ukrainian orthography. Consequently, the *Ministry of Language* is requisite to *reconcile these extant contradictions*.

The Establishment of a Ministry for Linguistic Purity. To preserve the purity of the Ukrainian language, a comprehensive approach is proposed, encompassing both governmental and civic measures. The defense of the language transcends mere linguistic concern, representing a *national imperative* that forms the foundation of *cultural and state identity*. To effectively counter the challenges associated with external linguistic influences and maintain Ukrainian's integrity, a multifaceted strategy involving both state and public initiatives is necessary.

Following the precedent set by France, where language policy is robustly supported by a range of institutions, Ukraine must establish analogous state bodies. The *Toubon Law (Loi Toubon)*, enacted on August 4, 1994, and named for its initiator, then-Minister of Culture Jacques Toubon [18], bears similarities to Ukraine's *2019 Language Law* [6].

Such a proposed *Ministry of Language Purity* could operate under the patronage of the President or the Prime Minister, and would be vested with the authority to:

1. *Develop and implement legislative regulation* governing the use of loanwords, particularly within governmental affairs, educational curricula, and mass media.

2. *Achieve the complete destalinization of Ukrainian orthography* [20, 22].

Conclusions. The cumulative effect of centuries of Rossification, coupled with the *percolation of Anglicisms mediated through the Russian language*, poses a considerable threat to the evolution of modern Ukrainian. This pervasive process risks the language's *creolization* and the potential *erosion of*

its distinct identity. Notwithstanding the substantial lexical richness of the Ukrainian vocabulary, there exists an *urgent necessity for proactive measures* aimed at linguistic protection and norming.

The establishment of a specialized state ministry, such as a *Ministry for Language Purity* – modeled after the French system – is a pivotal step to ensuring the oversight of linguistic standards, the development of specialized terminology, and the preservation of Ukrainian's uniqueness amid global challenges. Furthermore, it is essential to *recover and republish dictionaries dating from the 1920's* from archives, universities, libraries, private collections, and even the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU). Ultimately, the defense of the language is not merely a linguistic pursuit but a *national priority* that underpins *cultural and state identity*.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

- 1.1 Stewart, C. *Creolization*. Routledge, 2016.
- 1.2 Bickerton, D. *Bastard Tongues*. Hill and Wang, 2008.
2. Пясецький, П. Я. Facebook. Англо Суржик. URL: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/396484080822034> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
3. Mehl, M.R., Vazire, S., Ramirez-Esparza, N., Slatcher, R.B., Pennebaker, J.W. Are Women Really More Talkative Than Men? *Science*. 2007. № 317 (5834). P. 82–82. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1139940>
- 4.1 Дзюба, І. Інтернаціоналізм чи русифікація? Мюнхен, 1968. 263 с. URL: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/ideologiya/256-dzyuba-i-internatsionalizm-chi-rusifikatsiya/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 5.1. Philip Babcock Gove, Merriam-Webster. Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language: unabridged. Springfield, Mass., 2002.

5.2. Oxford English dictionary. Oxford, England.

5.3. Вільний тлумачний словник. Новітній онлайнний словник української мови (2013–2018). URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20231229175220/https://sum.in.ua/vkazivnyk/vits> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

5.4. Словник української мови / ред. І. К. Білодід; АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства. Київ, 1970–1980.

5.5. Онлайн-бібліотека найкорисніших словників української мови «Горох». URL: <https://goroh.pp.ua/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

6.1. Про забезпечення функціонування української мови як державної: Закон України від 25.04.2019, № 2704-VIII: станом на 16.01.2026. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2704-19#Text> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

6.2. Драчук, С. 20 найбільших новацій Українського правопису 2019 року. *Радіо Свобода*. 2019. 29 червня. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/30025623.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

6.3. Кириченко, І. М. 70 років проросійському українському правопису. *Збруч*. 2016. 8 грудня. URL: <https://zbruc.eu/node/59718> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

7.1. Население Кубанской области по данным вторых экземпляров листов переписи 1897 г. / ред. Л. В. Македонов; Екатеринодарский отдел. Санкт-Петербург, 1905. URL: <https://www.prlib.ru/item/350961> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

7.2. Масенко, Л. Українське Азовське море: україномовний простір – запорука цілісності держави. *Радіо Свобода*. 2018. 9 вересня. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/29480076.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

7.3. Попок, А. А. Далекосхідні поселення українців. *Енциклопедія історії України*. Т. 2: Г-Д / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ, 2004. 688 с. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Dalekoskhidni_poselennya (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

7.4. Зелений клин – Закаїтщина українська. *Historical Rehab of Ukraine-Ruthenia*. 2015. 5 квітня. URL: <https://historyukrainian.blogspot.com/2015/04/blog-post.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

8.1. Хвильовий, М. Думки проти течії: памфлети. Харків, 1926. 123 с. URL: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Khvylovyyi/Dumky_protu_techii_pamfleti/ (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

8.2. Сталин, И. В. Сочинения. Москва, 1947. Т. 8. URL: <https://traumlibrary.ru/page/stalin-pss18-08.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

8.3. Лавріненко, Ю. Розстріляне відродження. Париж–Мюнхен, 1959. С. 396–397. URL: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/miscellaneous/7991-rozstrilyane-vidrozhennya-antologiya-1917-1933/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

9. Лавріненко, Ю. Розстріляне відродження. Париж–Мюнхен, 1959. 980 с. URL: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/miscellaneous/7991-rozstrilyane-vidrozhennya-antologiya-1917-1933/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

10.1. Німчук, В. Про сучасну українську тлумачну лексикографію. Російсько-українські словники. URL: <https://r2u.org.ua/node/270> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

10.2. Радіонов, В. Правопис: правда, домисли та безсоромна брехня. *Культурна референтура ОУН*. 2018. 16 жовтня. URL: <https://kroun.info/iz-pershih-vust/pravopis-pravda-domisli-ta-bezsoromna-brehnya/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

10.3. Як у сталінські часи знищували український правопис. *Gazeta.ua*. 2017. 5 серпня. URL: https://gazeta.ua/articles/istoriya-movi/_ak-u-stalinski-chasi-znischuvai-ukrayinskij-pravopis/786653 (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

10.4. Кириченко, І. М. 70 років проросійському українському правопису. *Збруч*. 2016. 8 грудня. URL: <https://zbruc.eu/node/59718> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

10.5. Фаріон, І. Чому і досі пишемо

- по-сталінському? (з нагоди 90-ліття правопописної конференції у Харкові). *Українська правда*. 2017. 26 травня. URL: https://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/59284b53ce09b/#google_vignette (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 10.6. Фаріон, І. Правопис 20–30-х рр. XX ст. у політичних персонах. *Українська правда*. 2018. 5 вересня. URL: <https://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/5b90339de8dde/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
11. Зінкевич, О., Воронин, О. Мартирологія українських церков. Торонто–Балтимор, 1987. Т. 1: Українська Православна Церква: документи, матеріали, християнський самвидав України. 1207 с. URL: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/8020-martirologiya-ukrayinskih-tserkov-t-ukrayinska-pravoslavna-tserkva-dokumentimateriali-hristiyanskiy-samvidav-ukrayini/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
12. Сталин, И. В. Сочинения. Москва, 1947. Т. 5. URL: <https://books.yandex.ru/books/НбIАрCvd> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 13.1. Масенко, Л. Українське Азовське море: україномовний простір – запорука цілісності держави. *Радіо Свобода*. 2018. 9 вересня. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/29480076.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 13.2. Білокінь, С. Масовий терор як засіб державного управління в СРСР 1917–1941 рр.: джерелознавче дослідження. 2-ге вид. Київ, 2017. 768 с. URL: <https://files.znu.edu.ua/files/Bibliobooks/Inshi58/0042614.pdf> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 13.3. Шевельов, Ю. Триптих про призначення України. 2-ге вид. Харків, 2017. 96 с.
- 14.1. Shevelov, G. Y. Bilodid, Ivan. Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine. URL: <https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CB%5C1%5CBilodidIvan.htm> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 14.2. Гриценко, П. Ю. Русанівський Віталій Макарович. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Rusanivskyj_V_M (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 14.3. Українська мова у XX сторіччі: історія лінгвоциду / ред. Л. Масенко. Київ, 2005. URL: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Masenko_Larysa/Ukrainska_mova_u_XX_st_Istoria_linhvotsydu/ (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
15. Латиш, Ю. Володимир Шербицький: людина та її епоха. Спільне. 2017. 10 серпня. URL: <https://commons.com.ua/uk/volodimirscherbickij/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
16. Коваленко, Н. Правда про війну від Дмитра Табачника: радянська історія замість української? *Радіо Свобода*. 2013. 9 травня. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/24980940.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
17. Мосорко, А. Зеленський підписав закон про застосування англійської мови в Україні. *Українська правда*. 2024. 26 червня. URL: <https://life.pravda.com.ua/society/zelenskiy-pidpisav-zakon-pro-zastosuvannya-anglijskoji-movi-v-ukrajini-302342/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 18.1. Alphabet Linguistics. ‘Loi Toubon’ Understanding French Language Regulations > *Alphabet Linguistics*. 2017. URL: <https://www.alphabet-linguistics.com/loi-toubon-understanding-french-language-regulations/>
- 18.2. Mémoire du Sénat. La loi ‘Toubon’: quand la langue demeure une affaire d’État en France. 2019. URL: <https://archives.senat.fr/en-2025-le-senat-fete-ses-150-ans/la-loi-toubon-quand-la-langue-demeure-une-affaire-detat-en-france.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 18.3. Марусик, Т. Мовне законодавство і мовні відносини у Франції: погляд крізь віки–2. *ZN,UA*. 2011. 2 вересня. URL: https://zn.ua/ukr/internal/movne_zakonodavstvo_i_movni_vidnosini_u_frantsiyi_poglyad_kriz_viki-2.html (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).
- 18.4. Belluzzi, M. Cultural Protection as a Rationale for Legislation: The French Language Law of 1994 and the European Trend Toward Integration in the Face of Increasing U.S. Influence. *Penn State international law review*. 1995. № 14 (1). P. 127–152.

19. Шевчук, Ю. Непереклад англіцизмів і зросійщення. Чому не чути профільних інституцій України? *Радіо Свобода*. 2024. 28 січня. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/ukrayinska-mova-anhlitsyzmy/32793406.html> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

20. Сербин, Р. «Шовкова» русифікація української діаспори. За яку спадщину? Київ, 2002. URL: <http://ukrlife.org/main/evshan/serbyn10.htm> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

21. Васьків, О. У битві за мову ми програємо двом монстрам – словникар. *Gazeta.ua*. 2020. 26 березня. URL: https://gazeta.ua/articles/sogodennya/_u-bitvi-zamovu-mi-prograyemo-dvom-monstram-slovnikar/957245 (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

22.1. Фаріон, І., Помилуйко-Недашківська, Г., Бордовська, А. Англізми і протианглізми: 100 історій слів у соціокультурному контексті. Львів, 2023. URL: <https://svichado.com/anglizmi-i-protianglizmi> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

22.2. Фаріон, І. Рецензія на монографію «Англізми і протианглізми: 100 історій слів у соціокультурному контексті». *Українська правда*. 2024. 19 травня. URL: <https://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/6649edf57098f/> (дата звернення: 07.02.2026).

23. Daniel, R. Standardization and vitality. *Language problems & language planning*. 2023. № 47 (2). P. 182–207. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.00105.dan>

24. Edward Sapir. Language: an introduction to the study of speech. Editorial: Cambridge, 2014.

25. Whorf, B. L., Carroll, J. B., Levinson, S. C., Lee, P. Language, thought, and reality. Cambridge, Mass.; London, 2012.

REFERENCES

1.1. Stewart, C. (2016). *Creolization*. London: Routledge. [in Eng.]

1.2. Bickerton, D. (2008). *Bastard Tongues*. New York: Hill and Wang. [in Eng.]

2. Pyasetsky, P. Y. *Anglo Surzhyk, Facebook Group*. [online] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/396484080822034> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

3. Mehl, M.R., Vazire, S., Ramirez-Esparza, N., Slatcher, R.B. and Pennebaker, J.W. (2007) 'Are Women Really More Talkative Than Men?', *Science*, 317(5834), pp.82–82. [online] Available at: doi:10.1126/science.1139940 [in Eng.]

4.1. Dziuba, I. (1968). *Internationalism or Russification?* Munich. [online] Available at: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/ideologiya/256-dzyuba-i-internatsionalizm-chi-rusifikatsiya/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

5.1. Gove, P. B., Merriam-Webster, I. (2002). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster. [in Eng.]

5.2. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in Eng.]

5.3. *Free Explanatory Dictionary. The Latest Online Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*. (2013-2018). [online] Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20231229175220/https://sum.in.ua/vkazivnyk/vits> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

5.4. Bilodid, I., ed. (1970-1980). *Ukrainian Language Dictionary*. Kyiv. [in Ukr.]

5.5. *Horokh Online Library of Ukrainian Dictionaries*. [online] Available at: <https://goroh.pp.ua/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

6.1. On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language, Law No. 2704-VIII, 25 April. (2019). *Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine*. [online] Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2704-19#Text> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

6.2. Drachuk, S. (2019). 20 Biggest Innovations of the 2019 Ukrainian Orthography. June 29. [online] *Radio Svoboda*. Available at: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/30025623.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

6.3. Kyrychenko, I. (2016). 70 Years of Pro-Russian Ukrainian Orthography. December 8. [online] *Zbruc*. Available at: <https://zbruc.eu/node/59718> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

7.1. Makedonov, L., ed. (1905). Population of the Kuban Region According to the 1897 Census. St. Petersburg. [online] Available at:

- <https://www.prlib.ru/item/350961> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Rus.]
- 7.2. Masenko, L. (2018). Ukrainian Azov Sea: Ukrainian-Language Space – Key to State Integrity. September 9. [online] *Radio Svoboda*. Available at: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/29480076.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 7.3. Popok, A. (2004). Far Eastern Settlements of Ukrainians. *Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine*, Vol. 2: H-D. Kyiv. [online] Available at: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Dalekoskhidni_poselennya [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 7.4. Green Wedge – Ukrainian Zakitaishchyna. (2015). *Historical Rehab of Ukraine-Ruthenia*, 5 April. [online] Available at: <https://historyukrainian.blogspot.com/2015/04/blog-post.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 8.1. Khvylovyi, M. (1926). *Thoughts Against the Current: Pamphlets*. Kharkiv. [online] Available at: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Khvylovyi/Dumky_proty_techii_pamflety/ [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 8.2. Stalin, I. (1947). *Collected Works*, Vol. 8. Moscow. [online] Available at: <https://traumlibrary.ru/page/stalin-pss18-08.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Rus.]
- 8.3. Lavrinenko, Y. (1959). *Executed Renaissance*. Paris-Munich: Instytut Literacki. [online] Available at: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/miscellaneous/7991-rozstrilyane-vidrozhennya-antologiya-1917-1933/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
9. Lavrinenko, Yu. (1959). *Executed Renaissance*. Paris-Munich: Instytut Literacki. [online]. Available at: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/miscellaneous/7991-rozstrilyane-vidrozhennya-antologiya-1917-1933/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.1. Nimchuk, V. On Modern Ukrainian Explanatory Lexicography. *Russian-Ukrainian Dictionaries*. [online] Available at: <https://r2u.org.ua/node/270> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.2. Radionov, V. (2018). *Orthography: Truth, Conjecture, and Shameless Lies, Cultural Referentura of OUN. 16 October*. [online] Available at: <https://kroun.info/iz-pershiv-vust/pravopis-pravda-domisli-ta-bezSOROMNA-breHnya/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.3. How Ukrainian Orthography Was Destroyed in Stalin's Era. (2017). August 5. [online] *Gazeta.ua*. Available at: https://gazeta.ua/articles/istoriya-movi/_ak-u-stalinski-chasi-znischuvali-ukrayinskij-pravopis/786653 [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.4. Kyrychenko, I.M. (2016). 70 Years of Pro-Russian Ukrainian Orthography, December 8. [online] *Zbruc*. Available at: <https://zbruc.eu/node/59718> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.5. Farion, I. (2017). Why Do We Still Write Stalin-Era Orthography? May 26. [online] *Ukrainska Pravda*. Available at: https://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/59284b53ce09b/#google_vignette [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 10.6. Farion, I. (2018). Orthography of the 1920-30s in Political Figures. September 9. [online] *Ukrayinska Pravda*. Available at: <https://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/5b90339de8dde/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
11. Zinkevych, O., Voronin, O. (1987). *Martyrology of Ukrainian Churches*. Vol. 1. Toronto-Baltimore. Available at: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/8020-martirologiya-ukrayinskih-tserkov-t-ukrayinska-pravoslavna-tserkva-dokument-materiali-hristiyanskiy-samvidav-ukrayini/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
12. Stalin, I. (1947). *Collected Works*. Vol. 5. Moscow. Available at: <https://books.yandex.ru/books/HbIApCvd> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Rus.]
- 13.1. Masenko, L. (2018). Ukrainian Azov Sea: Ukrainian-Language Space – Key to State Integrity. September 9. [online] *Radio Svoboda*. Available at: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/29480076.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]
- 13.2. Bilokin, S. (2017). *Mass Terror as a Tool of State Governance in the USSR 1917-1941: A Source Study*, 2nd ed. Kyiv. [online] Available at: <https://files.znu.edu.ua/files/Bibliobooks/>

Inshi58/0042614.pdf [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

13.3. Shevelov, Yu. (2017). *Triptych on the Destiny of Ukraine*. 2nd ed. Kharkiv. ISBN 978-966-2562-43-9. [in Ukr.]

14.1. Shevelov, H. *Bilodid, Ivan Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Available at: <https://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CB%5CI%5CBilodidIvan.htm> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Eng.]

14.2. Hrytsenko, P. *Rusanivsky, Vitalii Makarovych*. [online] Available at: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Rusanivskyj_V_M [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

14.3. Masenko, L., ed. (2005). *Ukrainian Language in the 20th Century: History of Linguicide*. Kyiv. [online] Available at: https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Masenko_Larysa/Ukrainska_mova_u_XX_st_Istoria_linhvotsydu/ [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

15. Latysh, Yu. (2017). *Volodymyr Shcherbytsky: The Man and His Era*. 10 August. [online] *Spilne*. Available at: <https://commons.com.ua/uk/volodimir-sherbickij/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

16. Kovalenko, N. (2013) The Truth About War from Dmytro Tabachnyk: Soviet History Instead of Ukrainian. May, 9. [online] *Radio Svoboda*. Available at: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/24980940.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

17. Mosorko, A. (2024). Zelenskyi Signed Law on Using English in Ukraine. June 26. [online] *Ukrainska Pravda*. Available at: <https://life.pravda.com.ua/society/zelenskiy-pidpisav-zakon-pro-zastosuvannya-angliyskoji-movi-v-ukrajini-302342/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

18.1. “Loi Toubon”: Understanding French Language Regulations. (2017). [online] *Alphabet Linguistics*. Available at: <https://www.alphabet-linguistics.com/loi-toubon-understanding-french-language-regulations/> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Eng.]

18.2. “La loi “Toubon”: quand la langue demeure une affaire d’État en France. (2019) [online] *Mémoire du Sénat*. Available at:

<https://archives.senat.fr/en-2025-le-senat-fetes-ses-150-ans/la-loi-toubon-quand-la-langue-demeure-une-affaire-detat-en-france.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Fra.]

18.3. Marusyk, T. (2011). Language Legislation and Language Relations in France: A View Through the Centuries. September 2. [online] *ZN.ua*. Available at: https://zn.ua/ukr/internal/movne_zakonodavstvo_i_movni_vidnosini_u_frantsiyi_poglyad_kriz_viki-2.html [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

18.4. Belluzzi, M. (1995). Cultural Protection as a Rationale for Legislation: The French Language Law of 1994 and the European Trend Toward Integration in the Face of Increasing U.S. Influence. *Penn State International Law Review*, 14(1), pp.127–152. [in Eng.]

19. Shevchuk, Yu. (2024). Untranslated Anglicisms and Russification: Why Ukrainian Professional Institutions Remain Silent. January 28. [online] *Radio Svoboda*. Available at: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/ukrayinska-mova-anhlitsyzmy/32793406.html> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

20. Serbin, R. (2002). “Silk” Russification of the Ukrainian Diaspora. For Which Heritage? Kyiv. Available at: <http://ukrlife.org/main/evshan/serbyn10.htm> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

21. Vaskiv, O. (2020). In the Battle for Language, We Lose to Two Monsters – Lexicographer. March 26. [online] *Gazeta.ua*. Available at: https://gazeta.ua/articles/sogodennya/_ubitvi-za-movu-mi-prograyemo-dvom-monstram-slovnikar/957245 [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

22.1. Farion, I., Pomylyuko-Nedashkivska, H., Bordovska, A. (2023). *Anglicisms and Anti-Anglicisms: 100 Word Stories in Social Context*. Lviv. ISBN 978-966-938-717-2. Available at: <https://svichado.com/anglizmi-i-proti-anglizmi> [Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

22.2. Farion, I. (2024). *Review of the Monograph “Anglicisms and Anti-Anglicisms: 100 Word Stories in Social Context.”* May, 19. [online] *Ukrainska Pravda*. Available at: <https://blogs.>

pravda.com.ua/authors/farion/6649edf57098f/
[Accessed 7 Feb. 2026]. [in Ukr.]

23. Daniel, R. (2023). Standardization and Vitality. *Language Problems & Language Planning*. No. 47(2), pp. 182–207. [online] Available at: doi:10.1075/lplp.00105.dan [in Eng.]

24. Sapir, E. (2014). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in Eng.]

25. Whorf, B., Carroll, J., Levinson, S., Lee, P. (2012). *Language, Thought, and Reality*. Cambridge, MA; London. [in Eng.]

Резюме

РОСИФІКАЦІЯ ТА КРЕОЛІЗАЦІЯ: ВПЛИВ ЗОВНІШНІХ ЧИННИКІВ НА РОЗВИТОК УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Петро Ярослав ПЯСЕЦЬКИЙ
orcid.org/0009-0000-1764-2921
магістр наук, науковець
email: piaseckyj@gmail.com

Олег РУДНИК
orcid.org/0009-0009-3978-5718
студент 3 курсу історичного факультету
КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка
email: olehrudnyk@knu.ua

Актуальність. Робота базується в основному на особистому науковому проекті українського діаспорянина-науковця зі США П. Я. Піасецького. Саме проект «Англо Суржик», початий 9 лютого 2018 р. (є незавершеним досі), дав автору поштовх до написання цієї праці. Дослідження поширеності англіцизмів в українському повсякденному, науковому, культурному та професійному мовленні, ґрунтуючись на статтях українських ЗМІ, оприлюднених в Інтернеті, на цей час містить уже понад 2500 запозичень. Проект постійно оновлюється, тому не є друкованим. Автор почав застановлятися над питанням англіфікації української мови ще у віці 6 років (1949), коли приїхав до Нью-Йорка та почув українську англіфіковану мову з уст американських українців (першої та другої хвиль еміграції). Сам П. Піасецький прекрасно володіє англійською та має «тонке відчуття до нашої мови». З другого боку, Олег Рудник у дослідженні зосереджує увагу на русі за чистоту мови (linguistic purism), зокрема у змісті його історичної тяглості та відповідності суспільним потребам щодо сьогодишньої української дійсності, ґрунтуючись на доробках західних дослідників, таких як Едвард Сепір, Бенджамін Лі Ворф та Ріанвен Деніел. Ця праця також несе характер відозви до українських наукових кіл для стрімкішого порушення питання про захист української мови від явища креолізації в сучасних умовах глобалізаційного поступу.

Метою дослідження є аналіз історичних передумов та сучасних проявів мовно-

го викривлення, спричиненого росифікацією та напливом опосередкованих англїцизмів, щоб зрозуміти цей поступ.

Висновки. Вплив багатовікової росифікації, а також опосередкованих англїцизмів, що проникають через російську мову, є значною загрозою для розвитку сучасної української мови. Цей процес призводить до її креолїзації та можливої втрати самобутності. Попри значне лексичне багатство українського словника існує нагальна потреба в активних заходах для захисту та унормування мови. Створення спеціалізованого державного міністерства, такого як Міністерство чистоти державної мови, за прикладом Франції, є ключовим кроком для забезпечення контролю за мовними нормами, розвитку термінології та збереження унікальності української мови в умовах глобалїзаційних викликів. Є потреба віднайти в архївах, університетах, бібліотеках, особисто в громаді та Службі безпеки України (СБУ) словники з 1920-х років і перевидати їх. Захист мови – це не лише мовне, а й національне питання, що є основою культурної та державної тотожності.

Ключові слова: росифікація, росизми, англїцизми, англїзми, емпіричний аналіз, українська мова, мовна політика, мовознавство, суржик, креолїзація.

Отримано редакцією / Received: 13.02.26

Прорецензовано / Revised: 23.02.26

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 26.02.26