I. Rozprawy i analizy

Svitlana Martinek

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

ORCID: 0000–0003–3154–613X

e-mail: s.v.martinek@gmail.com

The opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)': what has changed during the Russian invasion of Ukraine?

Opozycja *svij* 'swój' – *czużyj* 'obcy': co zmieniło się podczas inwazji Rosji na Ukrainę?

Abstract: Since cognitive linguistics explores the conceptual structures of human consciousness through their language manifestations relying on empirical methods, it provides a new approach to the study of binary oppositions. Despite numerous studies of this phenomenon, many of the questions raised here have not been fully answered. As binary oppositions are not absolutely stable structures inherent to human consciousness, we need to study them within specific linguacultures and explore their modification over different periods of time.

This article presents an empirical study of the binary opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' in the minds of Ukrainian speakers based on the method of an associative experiment conducted in the period from 6 November 2022 to 29 February 2024. The data obtained were compared with the results of the experiments recorded in the Associative Thesaurus of the Ukrainian Language (UAS 2007).

The aim of the study is to analyse the binary opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' and changes in its content and evaluative characteristics in the minds of Ukrainian speakers as a result of the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Keywords: associative experiment; binary opposition; alienable and inalienable possession; possession cline; values

Introduction

It is difficult to establish when humanity started exploring binary op-
positions. At least, in Europe, they were repeatedly addressed in different
periods: by ancient philosophers, medieval alchemists or by psychologists,
linguists, and ethnologists in recent centuries.

On the one hand, the concept of opposition was used in their research
by many prominent linguists like Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1893), who
expressed the idea that the sum of oppositions experienced by a specific
unit plays a decisive role in its identification, or Ferdinand de Saussure,
who believed that "language is characterized as a system based entirely on
the opposition of its concrete units" (Saussure 1966: 107). These ideas had
a definite impact on the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the
1930s. In particular, the concept of opposition played a central role in the
phonological theory developed by Nikolai Trubetzkoy and Roman Jacobson
in the 1930s, where the concept of a phoneme derived from the phonological
opposition.

On the other hand, Carl Gustav Jung, who is deemed to be one of the most
influential psychologists in history, wrote about "certain well-defined themes
and formal elements, which repeated themselves in identical or analogous
form with the most varied individuals", among which he emphasized duality
(see Jung 2008 [1954]: 134).

These ideas greatly influenced Claude Lévi-Strauss (1968 [1958]), who
transferred binary oppositions into the sphere of ethnology and applied them
as a powerful tool in identifying and interpreting the fundamental structures
of human consciousness and culture.

However, later the method of binary opposition became the subject
to considerable criticism in the deconstruction approach suggested by the
philosopher Jacques Derrida. Imprimis, he remarked that "in a classical
philosophical opposition we are not dealing with the peaceful coexistence
of a vis-à-vis, but rather with a violent hierarchy. One of the two terms
governs the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), or has the upper hand"
(Derrida 1982b: 41). Therefore, Derrida (1982a: 329) introduced the concept
of deconstruction, which "does not consist in passing from one concept to
another, but in overturning and displacing a conceptual order, as well as
the nonconceptual order with which the conceptual order is articulated".

Comparing poststructuralists' views with those of their predecessors,
George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1999: 468) note:

> . . . the poststructuralists correctly perceived that conceptual systems have changed
> in important ways over time and vary in important ways across cultures. But they went

to the opposite extreme, assuming that any account of meaning that was not timeless and universal had to be arbitrary and ever subject to change. . . . they could not bring empirical studies of mind and language to bear critically on their own a priori philosophical assumptions.

Nevertheless, with the advent of two influential movements – post-structuralism in semiotics and generativism in linguistics – research and debates on the theory of opposition almost ceased (Danesi 2009: 12). Oddly enough, despite the theory of opposition being unlikely to contradict the basic principles of Cognitive Linguistics (CL), the proliferation of the latter has once again been relegated the study of oppositions to the periphery of research attention (ibid.).

Indeed, CL "appears to have given slightly more weight to identifying various forms of analogy at the expense of contrast, be it in its treatment of categorization, conceptual metaphor or blending" (Krawczak, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Grygiel 2022: 2). However, in the state-of-the-art research opposites are considered as "a primal organizing principle for the human mind which applies to language, perception and relational reasoning" (Branchini et al. 2021: 2). Langacker (2022: 15) argues that both contrast and analogy are fundamental capacities that both can be regarded as "aspects of comparison". In a similar fashion, Tabakowska (2022: 47) notes that "analogy and contrast can be seen as two sides of a single 'cognitive coin'".

However, it appears that it is CL that provides a new approach to the study of binary oppositions, since it begins with "an empirically responsible philosophy" and emphasizes the "embodied and imaginative nature of the mind" (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 468).

This paper presents an empirical investigation of the binary opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' in the minds of nowadays Ukrainian speakers. The contrast between *us (our)* and *them (their)* is considered as one of the most significant for humanity (see Bartmiński 2007: 39; Parakhon-skyy and Yavorska 2019, 146; Tolstaya 2004: 557–558). The investigation of this opposition is of a great interest in the era of globalization and multicul-turalism, on the one hand, and in the period of inter-religious clashes, tense ethno-social interactions, political conflicts, and wars, on the other. This is evidenced, especially, by its use in political discourse (see Chlebda 2007; Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2020: 267–283; Parakhonskyy and Yavorska 2019: 446–449; van Dijk 2006, and others).

As binary oppositions should not be seen as stable and unchangeable structures of human consciousness, we should pay special attention to changes of connected cognitive domains in a certain linguaculture within a certain period. The purpose of this study therefore is to analyse the binary opposition

of *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' and changes in its content and evaluative characteristics in the minds of Ukrainian speakers as a result of the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Associative experiment: justification of the method

Initially, the majority of conclusions in CL were based mainly on the introspection of the investigator. Although it is undoubtedly a productive method (moreover, the application of any method cannot avoid a conscious or unconscious act of introspection), still CL necessarily involves empirical confirmation of the researcher's hypotheses. In recent decades, there has been an increasing tendency to use empirical methods borrowed from other cognitive sciences (see Talmy 2007). The main achievement of this stream is the combination of the powerful theoretical base of CL and corresponding empirical methods of analysis (cf. Heylen et al. 2008: 92).

This paper presents the investigation of the binary opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' based on the method of an associative experiment (AE). The traditional way to conduct such an experiment is to show or say a word (stimulus) to respondents, and then ask them to write or say what other word (response) comes first to their minds after receiving the stimulus. The time between the presentation of the stimulus and the appearance of the response is limited.

The experiment with Ukrainian native speakers was conducted by Marharyta Zhuykova and Olha Svidzynska between November 6, 2022 and February 29, 2024. There were 281 respondents of different ages, of which 147 were female and 134 were male. They provided associative responses to the stimuli *sviy* 'us (our)' and *chuzhyy* 'them (their)'. The analysis considered both the first and subsequent (second, third) reactions that were caused by suggested stimuli. The rationale for this decision was that those responses also revealed relevant, important conceptual content, as evidenced by the fact that they often coincided with the first responses of other respondents. The data obtained were compared to the results of the experiments recorded in the associative thesaurus of the Ukrainian language (UAS 2007).

The working hypothesis is that after the stimulus word is perceived, the corresponding fragments of a certain conceptual structure with its specific features and associated emotions and evaluations become fully or partially activated. Therefore, it can be assumed that the evoked responses reveal certain conceptual content in the speakers' minds (see Martinek 2002: 98–99).[1]

---

[1] Unfortunately, in the case of polysemy we are dealing with referential ambiguity when the investigator can only guess what exactly the respondent meant.

Traditionally, investigators pay maximum attention to the frequency of the resulting response. However, the analysis of data obtained using AE showed that it is also necessary to consider individual responses, since they often reveal significant features of a certain cultural concept.

All in all, the method of the AE allows us to examine the values currently shared by members of a particular discourse community, paying attention to gender, age, profession, etc. (cf. Martinek 2002: 98–99; Martinek, 2004: 497–498). Moreover, the resulting reactions make it possible to identify historical changes in conceptual structures in the minds of speakers if we compare the results obtained in different periods (cf. Martinek 2002: 107), as it will be shown in the examples below.

Opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' in the Slavonic semiotic system

Many prominent Slavists were engaged in research on the binary opposition *us (our) – them (their)* (Bartmiński 2007; Chlebda 2007; Khobzey 2008; Ivanov and Toporov 1965, 1974; Tolstoy 1987; Tolstaya 2004; Zhuykova 2007). It should be noted that this opposition is one of the oldest ones (see, for instance, about its role in the formation of the dual organization of primitive peoples and the origin of dualistic cosmogonies in Zolotarev 1964: 27–28, etc.).

To adequately assess the significance of the *us (our) – them (their)* contrast for humans, we should consider it in the whole system of oppositions. For instance, the old Slavonic semiotic system reconstructed by Ivanov and Toporov contains several basic oppositions, which create a particular symbolization of one main opposition, "differentiating the positive and the negative concerning community and a human being" (Ivanov and Toporov 1965: 63). As for the ancient Slavic semiotic system, the following basic semiotic oppositions were identified: moon – sun; night–day; darkness – light; black – red (white) ; us (our) – them (their) ; here/close – there/far; forest – house; left – right; female – male; younger – older; water – fire; lower – upper; earth – sky; water – earth; sea – land; death – life; illness – health; northern – southern; western – eastern; odd – even (see Ivanov and Toporov 1965).

The results of AE show which oppositions within this system interact with the opposites being analysed, confirming the relevance of these connections for modern speakers. Primarily, the correlative member of the binary opposition is one of the most frequent responses both for *sviy* 'us (our)' –

chuzhyy 'them (their)'(13.2%) and *chuzhyy* 'them (their)'– *sviy* 'us (our)' (9.3%).

Secondly, the responses evoked by the stimuli *sviy* and *chuzhyy* revealed the links with correlative members of other binary oppositions. The stimulus *sviy* caused the responses *dim* 'home, house' (10.7%), *cholovik* 'man; husband' (3.2%), *blyz'kyy* 'close' (2.8%), *svitlyy* 'light', *teplyy* 'warm' (0.4% each). The stimulus *chuzhyy* invoked, in its turn, reactions *cholovik* 'man, husband' (2.5%), *dalekyy* 'distant' (1.5%), *daleko* 'far' (0.7%), *dim* 'home, house' (1.4%), *kholod* 'cold', *lis* 'forest', *nich* 'night' (0.4% each). Furthermore, both stimuli caused evaluative reactions: *sviy* – *dobryy* 'good' (0.7%), *krashchyy chuzhoho* 'better than extraneous', *naykrashchyy* 'the best' (0.4% each); *chuzhyy* – *pohanyy* 'bad' (0.4%).

Thus, the opposition *sviy* – *chuzhyy* is linked to the following oppositions in Ukrainian speakers' minds: house – forest, close – far, man – woman, day – night, light – darkness, etc. and to the general axiological contradistinction GOOD – BAD (see Martinek 2008: 287).

The possessive pronoun *sviy* 'us (our)'

The study of this opposition involves several issues that need to be addressed, above all, the notion of POSSESSION. Solly Zuckerman (1999a,b) asserts that human social behaviour has biological underpinnings, particularly when it comes to possession, which also has biological roots. However, we cannot talk about the purely biological nature of this concept, as it is intricately linked to cultural, historical, and social factors. That is why Hansjakob Seiler states that the domain of POSSESSION "can be defined as bio-cultural" (Seiler 1983: 4–5).

Moreover, we should pay attention to the fact that the term *possession* is rather ambiguous. As Lyons notes, in everyday usage it is more or less equivalent to the term *ownership* (Lyons 1977: 722; cf. Aikhenvald 2013: 2). Indeed, in the Ukrainian language we find the confirmation of this fact. Firstly, the words *sviy* 'us (our)' and *vlasnyy* 'own' are considered synonymous in Ukrainian (PSSUM 2008: 57). Secondly, although the combination of words *sviy vlasnyy (*approximately 'someone's own') is often perceived as tautological, it can be considered as a semantic reduplication used to emphasize possessivity. The close connection between these concepts has led to the emergence of the following responses to the stimulus *sviy*: *vlasnyy* 'own' (1.9%), *vlasnist'* 'property' (1.1%), and also *osobystyy* 'personal' and *pryvatnyy* 'private' (0.4% each).

Furthermore, Lyons (1977: 722) claims that "it is only a minority of what are traditionally called possessive constructions that have anything to do with property or possession'. Let us start with two main traditionally distinguished types of possession. These are alienable possession, when the entity possessed can be separated from its owner, and inalienable possession, when it cannot be, first noted by Lucien Lévy-Bruhl (1914: 97–98). As a rule, relations of inalienable affiliation form a closed group, while relations of alienated affiliation are potentially open. However, a significant number of languages do not distinguish between alienable and inalienable belonging. Additionally, the categorization of objects as alienable or inalienable varies from language to language. For this reason, some authors (Nichols and Bickel 2013) consider this classification to be primarily lexical. Conversely, Heine suggests that such vagueness is associated with the course of linguistic evolution: "rather than being a semantically defined category, inalienability is more likely to constitute a morphosyntactic or morphophonological entity, one that owes its existence to the fact that certain nouns happened to be left out when a new pattern for marking attributive possession arose" (Heine 1997b: 182; see also Chappell and McGregor 1996).

Usually, researchers include kinship terms, names of body parts, physical and mental states such as STRENGTH and FEAR, as well as relational spatial concepts like TOP, BOTTOM, and INTERIOR, as well as inherent parts of other items like BRANCH and HANDLE, into the category of inalienable possession (see Heine 1997a: 85). However, determining the type of possession in the Ukrainian language based solely on linguistic markers is almost impossible. This is especially true for stimulus-response pairs with the possessive pronoun *sviy* 'us (our)'. Therefore, in this case we can talk about semantic criteria at most.

Some of the responses received can be seen as prototypical examples of inalienable possession. Specifically, this includes reactions that denote kinship or family ties (see Table 1, row 1). However, the distinction between inalienable and alienable possession in Ukrainian appears quite fuzzy. Consider, for example, responses that reveal other types of relationships among people (Table 1, row 2). Given that these relationships may change over time or be interrupted, they are unlikely to be deemed as good examples of inalienable possession.

It is noteworthy that there is a significant increase in the number of reactions indicating family ties (Table 1, row 1). This rise could be attributed to the diverse age range of respondents: the 2022–2024 experiment included participants aged from 18 to 81 years, while the 2002–2005 experiment involved individuals ranging from 16 to 60 years. However, it is also notable

Table 1. Social links between individuals and/or groups revealed by responses to the stimulus *sviy*

2002–2005	2022–2024
1 *mama* 'mom' 0.5%	*bat'ko* 'father' 0.4%
rid 'family, kin' 0.5%	*brat* 'brother' 1.4%
ridnyy 'native, natal' 6.8%	*bratan* 'bro' 0.4%
rodyna 'family' 0.9%	*dytyna* 'child' 0.4%
rodych 'kinsman' 0.9%	*zhinka* 'woman, wife' 0.4%
svoyak 'brother-in-law' 0.9%	*onuk Mykhaylo* 'grandson Mykhailo' 0.4%
cholovik 'man, husband' 2.3%	*ridnyy* 'native, natal' 8.5%
	ridnya 'kin, relatives' 0.4%
	rodyna 'family $_N$' 2.5%
	rodynnyy 'family $_{Adj}$' 0.4%
	rodych 'kinsman' 5.3%
	syn 'son' 2.1%
	sim'ya 'family' 0.7%
	rodychi 'kinsmen' 0.4%
	cholovik 'man, husband' 3.2%
2 *druh* 'friend' 2.3%	*chlen komandy* 'team member' 0.4%
khlopets' 'boy' 0.9%	*druh* 'friend' 4.3%
lyudyna 'person' 0.5%	*druzi* 'friends' 0.4%
tovarysh comrade, friend' 0.5%	*kokhanyy* 'beloved$_{Adj}$; beloved one $_{SubstN}$' 0.4%
znakomyy	*lyubyy* 'beloved; beloved one$_{SubstN}$' 0.4%
'acquaintance $_{Adj/SubstN}$' 0.5%	*lyudyna* 'person' 1.1%
	mylyy 'darling; cute' 0.4%
	pryyatel' 'buddy' 0.4%
	tovarysh 'comrade, friend' 1.4%
	znayomyy 'acquaintance$_{Adj}$; acquaintance$_{SubstN}$' 1.1%

that there is a considerable rise in the number of reactions indicating personal or friendly relationships (Table 1, row 2). Hence, it can be concluded that the importance of all forms of human relationships has significantly increased recently.

The other portion of the reactions signifies mental activities or cognitive traits: *rozum* 'mind' (1.8%), *rozdum* 'reflection, thought', *kharakter* 'character, temper' or *shlyakh* 'way; (someone's) life, activity, way of being' (0.4% each).

A relatively small subset of reactions reveals part-whole relationships: *holova* 'head', mozok 'brain' (both these responses are polysemous and can also mean 'mind, consciousness, mental abilities') and *tilo* 'body' (0.4% each).

In this regard, the reactions *prostir* 'space' (0.7%) and *kordon* 'border' (0.4%) are also particularly remarkable, as they support Konrad Lorenz's observation (1966: 125) concerning the significance of maintaining personal

space and the necessary distance between individuals: "We may conceive the space, whose radius is represented by the individual distance, as a very small, movable territory, since the behaviour mechanisms ensuring its maintenance are fundamentally the same as those which effect the demarcation of territory". Such personal space is the region surrounding people, which they consider psychologically their own. Most people value their personal space and feel discomfort, anger, or anxiety when someone violates this space. However, it seems to be quite difficult to give a univocal answer to the question of whether personal space is inalienable property.

Another example of such fuzzy boarders can be reactions signifying emotional states (for instance, *spokiy* 'calmness, peace of mind' 0.4%) or different preferences (such as *muzykal'nyy hurt* 'music band' 0.4%) that may change over time and, as temporary characteristics, are not a prototypical case of the inalienable possession.

Some of the obtained responses reveal property relations where the possessee is the property of the possessor, and therefore correspond most closely to the notion of ownership: *dim* 'home' (10.7%); *budynok* 'house' (1.4%), *hamanets'* 'wallet' (1.1%); *mahazyn* 'shop', *mayetok* 'estate', *odyah* 'clothes', *telefon* 'phone' (0.7%) each; *avtomobil'* 'car', *horod* 'vegetable garden', *khlib* 'bread', *kin'* 'horse', *kovbasa* 'sausage', *market* 'market', *mashyna* 'car', *mayno* 'property', *nizh* 'knife', *noutbuk* 'laptop', *planshet* 'tablet', *ryukzak* 'backpack' (0.4% each). These reactions appear to exemplify various types of alienable possession.

The meaning of the response *khlib* 'bread' (0.4%) is somewhat ambiguous, since it can also be part of the proverb expression *Ity (pity) na sviy khlib (svoho khliba shukaty)* – literally 'to go for one's bread (to look for one's bread)', that is, to start living on one's own earnings (SUM 1970–1980, vol. 11: 78).

Also, the boundaries (already quite fluid) between these types of possession may not coincide in different languages. As Heine (1997a: 85) observes, "languages differ considerably with regard to where the boundary is traced between inalienably and alienably possessed items". Moreover, in some languages, one entity can be both alienably and inalienably possessed (see Chappell and McGregor 1996).

In general, it is quite challenging to determine whether something is alienably or inalienably possessed relying solely on semantic criteria in the absence of linguistic markers. In particular, possession in the cases of violation or destruction (be it someone's family ties, temporary emotional or mental states, someone's personal space, etc.), is difficult to interpret unambiguously as either alienable or inalienable. In this regard, Tasaku Tsunoda (1996: 565)

claims that distinction between inalienable and alienable possession "is not clear-cut but is a matter of degree," which he terms *possession cline.*

The revealed attitude and evaluation towards *sviy* 'us (our)' are mostly positive: *dobryy* 'good', *dovira* 'trust' (0.7%), *krashchyy chuzhoho* 'better than someone else('s)', *naykrashchyy* 'the best' (0.4% each) (see also the responses above that are mostly polysemous words, like *blyzkyy*, which means 'being near in time, space' and 'being in a direct family relationship with someone' (SUM 1970–1980, vol. 1: 198).

Chuzhyy 'them (their)': What has changed?

In studies on possessivity, more attention is usually paid to linguistic means which directly express the concept of belonging. Therefore, the adjective *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' is often overlooked. Only a few studies have specifically addressed this member of the analysed opposition (see Chlebda, 2007, 2017, 2018; Grzegorczykowa 2008; Gawarkiewicz 2023). Apparently, this can be explained by the asymmetric nature of this opposition, where the central place "belongs to the member *sviy* 'us (our)', which is the starting (or, in other terms, unmarked) one, while the concept of *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' can be described using negation as *ne-sviy* 'not us (our)', but not vice versa" (Parakhonskyy and Yavorska 2019: 146).

In general, the stimuli *sviy* 'us (our)'and *chuzhyy* 'them (their)' evoke responses which reveal similar cognitive domains, although the number of respondents who gave corresponding responses varies. For instance, the number of reactions indicating different types of property in response to the stimulus *chuzhyy* substantially decreases (compare with similar responses to the stimulus *sviy* above): *dim* 'home' (1.4%); *kit* 'cat' and *pes* 'dog' (1.1% each); *odyah* 'clothes' (0.7%); *budynok* 'house', *dvir* 'yard', *horod* 'vegetable garden', *mayno* 'property', *persyk* 'peach, peach-tree', *vlasnist'* 'ownership, property' (0.4% each). Against this background, the two-component response *litak vorozhyy* 'aircraft of enemy' (0.4%) to the stimulus *chuzhyy* deserves special attention. In this case, it implies not only belonging to someone else but also the danger this warplane poses by threatening human lives.

Furthermore, the responses elicited by the stimulus *chuzhyy* also reveal the cognitive domain of family relationships; however, compared to similar responses evoked by stimulus *sviy*, this domain is significantly less salient. These include ambiguous reactions such as *cholovik* 'man', 'husband' (2.5%), *neridnyy* 'non-relative' (1.4%), and *ne ridnyy* 'not a native' (0.4%).

Overall, the cognitive domain of social and interpersonal connections still remains important for Ukrainian speakers, as evidenced by a substantial

number of responses indicating different types of human relationships. Moreover, it is this group of reactions that is undergoing the most significant changes caused by the Russian-Ukrainian war. Let us compare the responses evoked by the stimulus *chuzhyy* in the AEs conducted in 2002–2005 (see UAS 2007, vol. 1: 339) and in 2023–2024 (Table 2).

Table 2. Social relations between individuals and/or groups revealed by the responses to stimulus *chuzhyy*

2002–2005	2023–2024
cholovik 'man, husband' 0.9%	*cholovik* 'man, husband' 2.5%
voroh 'enemy' 2.2%, *druh* 'friend', *izhoy* 'outcast', *nedruh* 'enemy, foe' – 0.4% each	*voroh* 'enemy' 13.1%, *ahresor* 'aggressor', *druh* 'friend' – 0.4% each
inozemets' 'foreigner' 0.9%	*inozemets'* 'foreigner' 2.1%, *inozemnyy* 'foreign' 0.4%
moskal' 'unofficial name of Russian' 0.4%	*moskal'* 'unofficial name of Russian' 25% and *moskali* 'unofficial name of Russians' – 0.4% each
Rosiya 'Russia' 0.4%	*Rosiya* 'Russia' 0.7% and *rosiya*[2] 'Russia' 0.4%, *katsapstan*[3] 'a derogatory colloquial name for Russia' – 0.4% each
	ork 'orc'[4], *rashist*[5] 'Russian soldier participating in the invasion of Ukraine; supporter of Putin's regime', *rosiys'kyy soldat* 'Russian soldier', *soldat* 'soldier' – 0.4% each
–	*susid* 'neighbour' 1.1%

---

[2] On September 20, 2023, the National Commission for State Language Standards (Національна комісія зі стандартів державної мови) reported that the spelling of the names "russian federation", "russia", "moscow", "moscovia", "tsardom of russia", "russian empire", "state duma of the russian federation" ", etc. with a lowercase letter cannot be qualified as a deviation from the norms of the Ukrainian language in the non-official texts. https://mova.gov.ua/news/napysannia-nazv-rosiiska-federatsiia 11.03.2024

[3] *Katsapstan* – the name given to Russia, a derivative from Ukrainian nickname *katsap* for Russians. Maciuszak (2008: 120) explains the origin of the word *katsap* as follows: Ukr. and Pol. *kacap* 'Russian; fool' < Ukr. *kak cap* '(having beard) like a he-goat'. The second element *-stan* comes from the Persian word *st$\bar{a}$n*, meaning 'country, place', which can be traced back to IE *$st(h)\bar{a}$ 'to stand' with addition of the suffixal *-n-* (ESUM, vol. 5: 395).

[4] Before the Russian invasion on February 24, 2022, the name *orc* was widely used among the military, volunteers, some media, and residents of Donbas. The use of the word *ork* 'orc' on February 25, 2022, on the official Facebook page of The Ukrainian Ground Forces made this name common. It started to be actively used in the mass media, as well as by civilians. The reason for such a transfer was the disorganization, brutality, and inhumanity of the occupiers. https://web.archive.org/web/20220317233636/ https://www.stb.ua/ua/2022/03/15/hto-taki-orky-i-chomu-vony-vtorglysya-do-ukrayiny/ 11.03.2024

[5] *Rashist* – (neologism, Ukraine, derogatory) blend of *Rasha* 'Russia' (derogatory) + *fashist* 'fascist'.

Thus, the two foundational principles of Slavic ethnolinguistics, as formulated by Tolstaya (2015: 24), namely the pan-Slavic community and the unity of language and culture, have not found support in empirical data. On the contrary, the data obtained both from the years of 2002–2005 and more recent ones reveal the existence of antagonism between the peoples of Ukraine and Russia, this opposition currently intensifying due to the ongoing war. The emergence of the reaction *susid*[6] 'neighbour', which was not documented before (see Table 2) is also noteworthy.

As Nikita Tolstoy (1988: 128) previously noted, already in its early historical period "the structure of Slavic and ethnic language identity was quite complex and heterogeneous in different Slavic lands. It had not only local features, but also changed historically, as evidenced by numerous linguistic, literary and historical cultural memorials". In this regard, Bartmiński (2017: 11–12) also expresses the opinion that "a pan-Slavic community proved to be an unrealistic and unattainable ideal, or – to be more precise – a relative category, limited to a certain historical, linguistic, and cultural context". Moreover, each specific culture has its own ingrained system of key moral values and stereotypes (see Bartmiński and Grzeszczak 2014), so the importance of comparative research in understanding these values is obvious.

Without a doubt, the observed increase in reactions pointing to Russians indicates long-term changes in this stereotype in the minds of the members of Ukrainian linguaculture. Not only the direct participants of military operations but also civilian population suffer from psychological wounds and post-traumatic stress disorders during the ongoing war (see one of the first studies of a large-scale set of psychological data collected from civilian population of Ukraine during the ongoing Russian invasion in Zasiekina, Zasiekin, and Kuperman 2023).

Reactions reflecting shifts in emotional attitudes towards *chuzhyy* further confirm this observation. For example, in 2002–2005 the reactions to the stimulus *chuzhyy* showed its ambivalent characteristics: *bayduzhyy* 'indifferent', *izhoy* 'outcast', *khyzhyy* 'predatory', *nedobryy* 'not good, unkind', *nelyud* 'non-human, cruel person', *nizhnyy* 'tender', *povazhnyy* 'respectable', *samotniy* 'lonely', *sumnyy* 'sad', *vidstoronenyy* 'aloof', *vorozhyy* 'hostile',

---

[6] The reaction of a *susid* 'neighbour' to the stimulus *chuzhyy* may be related to the descriptive name of Russia as *pivnichnyy susid* 'northern neighbour'. Consider these examples: ". . . every year on February 20, we remember those who were the first to die so that Ukraine does not disappear from the world map, so that the northern neighbour does not absorb it" (http://www.cppktr.edu.ua/?p=5752) or "the northern neighbour, which invaded Ukraine with a war, did not wait, trying to capture and destroy as many territories of our state as possible" (https://armyinform.com.ua/2024/03/23/nogu-zafiksuvaly-zvychajnym-shurupovertom-teroboronovecz-maksym-rozpoviv-pro-boyi-v-bahmuti-i-poranennya/).

yak sviy 'as our, as us' – 0.4% each. On the contrary, in 2022–2024 the reactions emphasize its negative features: *bayduzhyy* 'indifferent', *hrubyy* 'rough, coarse', *nebezpechnyy* 'dangerous', *nedobryy* 'not good, unkind', *nepryvitnyy* 'unfriendly', *samotniy* 'lonely', *tsikavyy* 'curious; interesting', *vorozhyy* 'hostile', *zhulik* 'rogue', *zlyy* 'evil'– 0.4% each.

There is a growing awareness of it as something different, even strange, not conforming to accepted norms. Let us compare the single response *inshyy* 'another, different' 0.9%, obtained in 2002–2005, with the responses *inshyy* 'different' 1.1%, *dyvnyy* 'strange', *ne takyy* 'not like that', *nezakonnyy* 'illegal', *nezhoda* 'disagreement' - 0.4% each, obtained in 2022–2024. The system of prohibitions and restrictions concerning *chuzhyy* still works; however, there is a reaction indicating the removal of some moral constraints concerning it:

2002–2005	2022–2024
ne khodyt' 'does not walk', *pkhaty nis u chuzhi spravy* 'poke your nose into other people's affairs' – 0.4% each	*idy het'* 'go away', *mozhna chmyryty* '(you) may bully', *neprokhanyy* 'uninvited', *zaborona* 'prohibition' – 0.4% each

The feelings caused by *chuzhyy* also become more negative and even painful:

2002–2005	2022–2024
antypatiya 'antipathy', *bil'* 'pain', *boyazn'* 'fear', *nedovira* 'mistrust', *nevpevnenist'* 'uncertainty' – 0.4% each	*strakh* 'fear' 1.1%, *bil'* 'pain', *nedovira* 'mistrust' – 0.7% each; *ne pryyemnyy* and *nepryyemnyy* 'unpleasant', *zhakh* 'horror' – 0.4% each

If before *chuzhyy* required caution, now it poses a clear danger and threat:

2002–2005	2022–2024
oberezhnist' 'caution', *omana* 'delusion', *osterihatys'* 'beware', *ostoroha* 'caution' – 0.4% each	*nebezpeka* 'danger' 0.7%, *uvaha* 'attention', *zahroza* 'threat' 0.4%

Conclusion

Members of the opposition *sviy – chuzhyy* can cover a wide variety of possessive relations: between part and whole, physical and mental states of the subject, family members, any type of property, etc. These relations are traditionally divided into alienable and inalienable types of possession.

However, in the absence of clear grammatical markers, the boundary between these subcategories is often blurred, with transitional cases. Aikhenvald (2019: 7) notes: "A range of relationships – linked to possession – may be subsumed under the umbrella of a more general 'associative' construction".

Since both the possessive pronoun *sviy* and the adjective *chuzhyy* can denote very different kinds of possessee, they function as typical shifters, as Otto Jespersen (2007 [1922]: 123) points out (see also Jacobson 1971 [1957]).

Furthermore, binary oppositions should not be regarded as stable and unchanging structures of human consciousness. Rather, attention should be paid to the changes they undergo over time in a particular linguaculture. Aikhenwald (2019: 8) argues that "[m]eanings encoded within possessive structures often reflect the relationships within a society, and change if the society changes."

The analysis of the AE results reveals the content and evaluative characteristics of members of the binary opposition *sviy* 'us (our)' – *chuzhyy* 'they (their)' in the minds of Ukrainian speakers as a result of Russia's invasion. The reactions obtained via the experiment make it possible to identify changes in the minds of the speakers, as well as the emotions that accompany them. It is obvious that the stress and emotional trauma experienced during the war have a major impact on the value system of members of a given culture. In particular, there is a significant increase in the number of reactions that reveal family relationships, personal or friendly ties. Thus, the results of the experiment show that the importance of all types of human relationships increases markedly during the war period.

On the other hand, reactions to *chuzhyy* reveal a much more negative attitude. The resulting emotions become more negative and even painful. If earlier the attitude towards *chuzhyy* was ambivalent, now it appears as a clear threat or menace.

Thus, the results of the associative experiment help to identify changes in the minds of Ukrainians during the Russia-Ukraine war, which apparently lead to profound changes in the value system.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2013. Possession and ownership: a cross-linguistic perspective. In *Possession and Ownership. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Eds. Aleksandra I. Aikhenvald, Robert M. W. Dixon. 1–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2019. Expressing 'possession': Motivation, meanings, and forms. In *Possession in Languages of Europe and North and Central Asia*. Eds. Lars Johanson, Lidia Federica Mazzitelli, Irina Nevskaya. 7–25. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2007. Opozycja swój / obcy a problem językowego obrazu świata. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 19: 35–59.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2017. Ethnolinguistics in the Year 2016. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 28: 9–31. DOI: 10.17951/et.2016.28.7

Bartmiński, Jerzy, Monika Grzeszczak. 2014. Jak rekonstruować kanon wartości narodowych i europejskich? *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 26: 21–44.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan. 1893. *Próba teorii alternacyj fonetycznych*. Kraków: Akad. Umiejętności.

Branchini, Erika, Elena Capitani, Roberto Burro, Ugo Savardi, Ivana Bianchi. 2021. Opposites in reasoning processes: Do we use them more than we think, but less than we could? *Frontiers in Psychology* 12: 715696. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.715696

Chappell, Hilary, William McGregor. 1996. Prolegomena to a theory of inalienability. In *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body-part Terms and the Part-whole Relation*. 3–30. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chlebda, Wojciech. 2007. Kiedy swój staje się obcym. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 19: 89–98.

Chlebda, Wojciech. 2017. Jak (w Polsce) zostać innym? In *Obcy/Inny – analiza przypadków*. Eds. Małgorzata Karwatowska, Robert Litwiński, Adam Siwiec. 13–25. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Chlebda, Wojciech. 2018. Rozumienie obcego i innego w perspektywie wybranych dyscyplin naukowych. In *OBCY, INNY – propozycje aplikacji pojęciowych*. Eds. Małgorzata Karwatowska, Robert Litwiński, Adam Siwiec. 29–35. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Danesi, Marcel. 2009. Opposition theory and the interconnectedness of language, culture, and cognition. *Sign Systems Studies* 37(1/2): 1141.

Derrida, Jacques. 1982a. *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1982b. *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gawarkiewicz, Roman. 2023. Nie-swój w językowym obrazie świata polskich studentów. Refleksja językoznawcza. *Horyzonty Wychowania: Oswajanie obcości*. 22(61): 47–56. DOI: 10.35765/hw.2023.2261.06

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 2008. Od wspólnoty do obcości. Rozwój znaczeniowy polskiego przymiotnika *obcy* na tle słowiańskim. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 20: 39–50.

Heine, Bernd. 1997a. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd. 1997b. *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heylen, Kris, José Tummers, Dirk Geeraerts. 2008. Methodological issues in corpus-based Cognitive Linguistics. In *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*. Eds. Gitte Kristiansen, René Dirven. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 91–128. DOI: 10.1515/9783110199154.2.91

Ivanov, Vyacheslav Vs., Vladimir N. Toporov. 1965. *Slavyanskiye yazykovyye modeliruyushchiye semyoticheskiye sistemy: Drevniy period*. Moskva: Nauka.

Ivanov, Vyacheslav Vs., Vladimir N. Toporov. 1974. *Issledovaniya v oblasti slavyanskikh drevnostey: Leksicheskiye i frazeologicheskiye voprosy rekonstruktsii tekstov*. Moskva: Nauka.

Jakobson, Roman. 1971 [1957]. Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In *Selected Writings II*. 130–147. The Hague: Mouton.

Jespersen, Otto. 2007 [1922]. *Language: Its Nature and Development.* Routledge.

Jung, Carl Gustav. 2008 [1954]. On the nature of the psyche. In *Collected Works of C.G. Jung: Structure & Dynamics of the Psyche.* Vol. 8. Ed. Gerhard Adler. Transl. Richard Francis Carrington Hull. 159–234. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Khobzey, Natalya. 2008. Opozytsiya sviy – chuzhyy u movnomu prostori L'vova. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 20: 297–309.

Krawczak, Karolina, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marcin Grygiel. 2022. Introduction. Analogy and contrast in language: Theoretical and empirical insights from Cognitive Linguistics. In: *Analogy and Contrast in Language: Perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics* Eds. Karolina Krawczak, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marcin Grygiel. 1–12. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hcp.73.00kra

Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, Ronald. 2022. What could be more fundamental? In *Analogy and Contrast in Language: Perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics.* Eds. Karolina Krawczak, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marcin Grygiel. 15–45. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hcp.73.01lan

Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien. 1914. L'expression de la possession dans les langues mélanésiennes. *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 19(2): 96–104.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1968. *Structural Anthropology.* New York: Basic Books.

Lorenz, Konrad. 1966. *On Aggression.* London: Methuen.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics.* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maciuszak, Kinga. 2008. The Persian suffix -(e)stān 'the land of'. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 13: 119–140.

Martinek, Svitlana. 2002. The role of an associative experiment in revealing of conceptual structures. In *Cognitive Linguistics Today.* Eds. Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Patrick James Melia. 97–108. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.

Martinek, Svitlana. 2004. The role of the associative experiment in the profiling of concepts. In *Imagery in Language. Festschrift in Honour of Professor Ronald W. Langacker.* Eds. Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Alina Kwiatkowska. 489–498. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Pub Inc.

Martinek, Swietłana. 2008. Opozycja swój/obcy w świadomości współczesnych rodzimych użytkowników języka i kultury ukraińskiej. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 20: 281–296.

Nichols, Johanna, Balthasar Bickel. 2013. Possessive classification. In *WALS Online.* Eds. Matthew S. Dryer, Martin Haspelmath. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7385533

Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2020. *Definiowanie i profilowanie pojęć w (etno)lingwistyce.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Parakhonskyy, Borys, Halyna Yavorska. 2019. *Ontolohiya viyny i myru: bezpeka, stratehiya, smysl.* Kyjiv: NISD.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1966 [1916]. *Course in General Linguistics.* Eds. Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye. Transl. Wade Baskin. New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Seiler, Hansjakob. 1983. *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language.* Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag.

Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2022. Diagrammatic iconicity and rendering time in a narrative text: Analogies and contrasts. In *Analogy and Contrast in Language:*

Perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics. Eds. Karolina Krawczak, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marcin Grygiel. 15–45. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hcp.73.02tab

Talmy, Leonard. 2007. Foreword. In *Methods in Cognitive Linguistics*. Eds. Monica Gonzalez-Marquez, Irene Mittelberg, Seana Coulson, Michael J. Spivey. XI–XXI. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tolstaya, Svetlana. 2004. Oppozitsii semanticheskyje. In *Slavyanskiye drevnosti: Etnolingvisticheskiy slovar'*. Ed. N. I. Tolstoy. Vol. 3. 557–558. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Tolstaya, Svetlana. 2015. *Obraz mira v tekste i rituale*. Moskva: Russkiy fond sodeystviya obrazovaniyu i nauke.

Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1987. O prirode svyazey binarnykh protivopostavleniy tipa pravyy-levyy, muzhskoy–zhenskiy. In *Yazyki kul'tury i problemy perevodimosti*. 169–183. Moskva: Nauka.

Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1988. *Istoriya i struktura slavyanskikh yazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1996. The possession cline in Japanese and other languages. In *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-Whole Relation*. Eds. Hilary Chappell, William McGregor. 565–630. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110822137.565

van Dijk, Teun. 2006. Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society* 17: 359–383.

Zasiekina, Larysa, Serhii Zasiekin, Victor Kuperman. 2023. Post-traumatic stress disorder and moral injury among Ukrainian civilians during the ongoing war. *Journal of Community Health* 48: 784–792. DOI: 10.1007/s10900–023–01225–5

Zhuykova, Marharyta. 2007. Slavyanskiy koren' pust- v kontekste kontseptual'noy oppozitsii "svoy–chuzhoy". *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 19: 211–224.

Zolotarev, Aleksandr M. 1964. *Rodovoy stroy i pervobytnaya mifologiya*. Moskva: Nauka.

Zuckerman, Solly. 1999a. Biological basis of the sense of property. In *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*. 403–422. Routledge.

Zuckerman, Solly. 1999b. The biological background of human social behaviour. In *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*. 423–434. Routledge.

Sources

ESUM – *Etymolohichnyy slovnyk ukrayins'koy movy*. Vols. 1–7. Ed. Oleksandr S. Mel'nychuk. Contributors: R. V. Boldyryev, V. T. Kolomijets', T. B. Lukinova, O. S. Mel'nychuk, V. H. Sklyarenko, I. A. Stoyanov, A. M. Šamota. Vol. 5, 1982. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

PSSUM 2000 – *Praktychnyy slovnyk synonimiv ukrains'koy movy*. Svyatoslav Karavanskyy. Kyiv: Ukrains'ka knyha.

SUM 1970–1980 – *Slovnyk ukrains'koy movy*. Vols. 1–11. Ed. Ivan Bilodid. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

UAS 2007 – Martinek, Svitlana. 2007. *Ukrayins'kiy asotsiatyvnyy slovnyk*. Vols. 1–2. Vol. 1: *Vid stymulu do reaktsii*. L'viv: Vydavnychyy tsentr LNU imeni Ivana Franka.

Streszczenie: Lingwistyka kognitywna bada pojęciowe struktury ludzkiej świadomości poprzez ich przejawy językowe, a więc zapewnia nowe podejście do badań opozycji binarnych. Pomimo licznych badań na ten temat, wiele postawionych tu pytań dotyczących opozycji swój–obcy nie doczekało się pełnej analizy. Opozycje binarne nie są całkowicie stabilnymi strukturami nieodłącznie związanymi z ludzką świadomością, musimy je badać w obrębie określonych kultur językowych i uwzględniając modyfikacje w różnych okresach czasu. W artykule przedstawiono empiryczne badanie binarnej opozycji *svij* 'swój' – *czużyj* 'obcy' w świadomości osób mówiących po ukraińsku w oparciu o metodę eksperymentu skojarzeniowego przeprowadzonego w okresie od 6 listopada 2022 r. do 29 lutego 2024. Uzyskane dane porównano z wynikami eksperymentów zapisanymi w *Asocjacyjnym słowniku języka ukraińskiego* (2007). Celem pracy jest analiza binarnej opozycji *svij* 'swój' – *czużyj* 'obcy'oraz zmian w jej treści i cechach wartościujących, które zaszły w świadomości osób ukraińskojęzycznych w trakcie wojny rosyjsko-ukraińskiej.

Słowa kluczowe: eksperyment skojarzeniowy; opozycja binarna; posiadanie zbywalne i niezbywalne; skala posiadania; wartości