



The Ukrainian Language in Argentina and Paraguay as an Identity Marker*

Украинский язык в Аргентине и Парагвае как маркер идентичности

Gleb P. Pilipenko

Institute for Slavic Studies
of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russia

Глеб Петрович Пилипенко

Институт славяноведения РАН
Москва, Россия

Abstract

This paper discusses the function of the Ukrainian language in Argentina and Paraguay. Although there are studies that focus on describing the historical and ethnographic features of the Ukrainian diaspora in this region, there are no studies devoted to the analysis of speech. I collected oral narratives during a field study of Slavic communities in the region in 2015, and this allowed me to draw conclusions about the processes occurring in informants' speech. I discovered that the Ukrainian language used by descendants of the first and second waves of migration, living in the province of Misiones in Argentina and in the department of Itapúa in Paraguay, retains the traits of the primary dialect system of the South-Western dialect group of Galicia (Halychyna). A large number of contact phenomena (borrowed lexemes, numerals, affirmative and negative particles, etc.) were recorded, as well as language strategies that typically accompany these phenomena. For example, reiteration strategy, metalinguistic comments, and hesitations in choosing suitable words were all present. The principle difficulty in the adoption of words borrowed from

* I would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments.

Spanish — particularly nouns — is gender affiliation. A characteristic common to all informants was the strategy of code-switching. An analysis of the functioning of toponyms revealed that place names preceded by prepositions remain indeclinable. Personal names remain an important identity marker for members of the Ukrainian diaspora and both Spanish and Ukrainian feature a distinction between onomastic spaces. The identity of speakers is also reflected in ethnonyms that have emerged in the new land of resettlement.

Keywords

Ukrainian language, bilingualism, Spanish language, code-switching, identity, toponyms, ethnonyms, personal names, narrative, field research, Argentina, Paraguay

Резюме

В статье рассматривается функционирование украинского языка в Аргентине и Парагвае. В отличие от работ, ориентирующихся на описание исторических и этнографических особенностей жизни украинской диаспоры в данном регионе, работ, посвященных анализу устной речи, практически не существует. В результате полевого исследования славянских диаспор, проведенного в 2015 году, был собран лингвистический материал, позволяющий сделать выводы о процессах, происходящих в речи информантов. Установлено, что украинский язык потомков первой и второй волны переселения, проживающих в провинции Мисьонес в Аргентине и в департаменте Итапуа в Парагвае, сохраняет черты первичной диалектной системы, говоров юго-западного наречия, распространенных в Галиции. Зафиксировано большое количество контактных феноменов (заимствованные лексемы, числительные, утвердительные и отрицательные частицы и т. д.), а также выявлены языковые стратегии, сопровождающие эти феномены, например стратегия повтора, метаязыкового комментария, колебание при выборе подходящего слова. Центральная проблема при освоении испаноязычных заимствований — выбор одного из трех грамматических родов. Особое место в нарративах информантов занимает стратегия кодового переключения. Рассмотрено также функционирование топонимов, в результате чего было установлено, что топонимы в сочетании с предлогами остаются без изменений. Личное имя является для представителей украинской диаспоры важным маркером идентичности, в испанском и украинском языках происходит разграничение ономастического пространства. Идентичность говорящих отражена также в этнонимах, возникших в новых условиях переселения.

Ключевые слова

украинский язык, билингвизм, испанский язык, переключение кода, идентичность, топонимы, личные имена, этнонимы, нарративы, полевое исследование, Аргентина, Парагвай

When we deal with the economic migration of Ukrainian peasants outside their ethnic area, it should be emphasized that this was directed both toward the West and the East. As a result of migration beginning at the end of the 19th century, Ukrainian settlements appeared in the Volga region, the Urals, in Western Siberia, Northern Kazakhstan, and in the Far East and Central Asia. All of these resettlements took place within one country; first it was the Russian Empire and later the USSR. As for western migration, most migrants went overseas. Destinations for Ukrainian migrants included the United States, Canada, Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay. A limited number of Ukrainians settled in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Croatia, which remained part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire until 1918, as did territories in western Ukraine.

The Ukrainian diaspora has resulted in the establishment of one of the largest Slavic communities in both Argentina and Brazil, the two largest countries of South America. A certain number of Ukrainians, as well as people of Ukrainian origin, also live in Paraguay and Uruguay. In this paper, the object of research is the Ukrainian language of the Ukrainian diaspora living in Argentina and Paraguay. These Spanish-speaking countries¹ have a much larger number of citizens of Ukrainian ethnic origin than does Uruguay, which has a significantly smaller population. If the Ukrainian language of the Brazilian diaspora has been investigated since the 1960s [Гримич 2010] and field studies are carried out nowadays [Сушинська 2010: 252], then linguists have paid insufficient attention to the situation of Spanish-speaking countries in the region. There is a very small number of studies devoted to the linguistic analysis of the Ukrainian language (in particular to the spoken language) in Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay. For example, in [Олійник 2011] the analyzed material is literature in Ukrainian, written in Argentina. Ryzvaniuk gives fragmentary information about the lexical processes in the Ukrainian language of Latin America (e. g. calques: dairy cow — *молочна корова* (sp. *vaca lechera*) instead of “*дійна корова*”) [Ризванюк 2004: 728]. Wintoniuk examines the discourse of migrants and their descendants about the use of the Ukrainian language in the province of Misiones, and the author argues that scholars don't pay enough attention to the language situation of migrants [Wintoniuk 2014]. Based on my observations, linguistic analysis of the oral speech of Ukrainians remains outside the field of view of researchers. The remoteness, and often the inaccessibility, of their places of resettlement complicate the logistics of expeditions and fieldwork-planning for researchers from Europe and North America. In addition, such linguistic expeditions require command of both Ukrainian and Spanish.² If only because of the proximity

¹ In Paraguay the Spanish language is co-official with Guaraní.

² In Argentina and Paraguay the most commonly used name for the Spanish language is *castellano*.

of the Slavic communities in South America, their speech is of extraordinary interest both in respect to the interaction of elements belonging to different language systems, as well as in respect to the overlapping of beliefs and ritual practices.

Scholars mainly concentrate their attention on the historical and ethnographic aspects of diaspora life. Strelko's research on the Slavic population of Latin America, published in 1980, is pioneering [Стрелко 1980]. The Ukrainians of Argentina and Paraguay became the object of study in the historical-ethnographic works of Sapelak [Сапеляк 2008, Сапеляк 2011]. Information about the Ukrainian diaspora in the countries of South America can be found in [Евтух и др. 2000], and in [Pomirko 2010]. Cipko and Lehr describe in detail the history of Ukrainian communities in Argentina and Paraguay. They pay attention to some of the ethnographic traits of everyday life³ and examine the formation of cultural, socio-political and religious organizations [Cipko, Lehr 2000; Cipko, Lehr 2006]. Cipko also provides a historical overview, devoted to the migration of the Ukrainians in Argentina [Cipko 2012]. Furthermore, he offers a synthesis of all the research on the Ukrainian diaspora in Argentina [Ціпко 2013], giving examples of ethnonyms which have been used to refer to the Ukrainian migrants, e. g. *rusos*, *polacos*, *austro-polacos*, *rutenos* [Ibid: 203]. Among the works in Spanish on this issue, I should mention books written by Vasylyk and Snihur [Vasylyk 2000; Snihur 1997].

Kuzhel, through the analysis of Ukrainian calendars, examines the cultural and educational lives of migrants of the 1920–1930s in Argentina and Brazil [Кужель 2008]. The data on the first wave of the Slavic colonization (Poles and Ukrainians) in the province of Misiones are presented in [Stemplowski 1985]. The Ukrainian migration of the 1990s in Argentina is discussed in particular in [Богданова, Погромський 2010].

For the purpose of collection of oral narratives of linguistic and cultural practices of the Slavic communities in South America, I carried out comprehensive field research in Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay from March to May 2015. During this time, I conducted semi-structured interviews with informants from Slovene, Croatian, Russian, Serbian and Ukrainian diasporas. The interest in Ukrainian linguistic enclaves has emerged from my field work among Ukrainian descendants in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina [Пилипенко 2016], as well as Kazakhstan. In addition, I have examined other minority groups, such as Slovenes living in Italy, and Hungarians, residing in

³ Cipko makes interesting ethnographic observations. For example, a stove that was always present in every Ukrainian traditional home, became unnecessary in the new territory in the conditions of hot climate and was placed outside the house. In addition, in Paraguay the so-called Polish carriage (*carro polaco*) is still actively used, and became an identity symbol of immigrants from Galicia [Lehr, Cipko 2006: 40–43].

Serbia, Ukraine⁴ and Slovenia. Thus, having the experience of numerous comprehensive (dialectological, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic and ethnographic) field research experiences in Europe, I applied my skills of field work in new geographical, climatic and cultural conditions.

During my stay in South America I conducted interviews with interlocutors (Ukrainians and informants of Ukrainian origin) in the Argentine capital Buenos Aires and in the province of Buenos Aires (in particular, in Llavallol and Quilmes), as well as in the northeastern province of Misiones, which is considered to be a center of Ukrainian settlements in Argentina. The work was conducted in Apóstoles, Tres Capones, San José, and also in the administrative center of the province in the city of Posadas. Besides Argentina, the work with Ukrainian interlocutors was continued in neighboring Paraguay. There, I visited the department of Itapúa and its administrative center, the city of Encarnación, located on the opposite bank of the Paraná River, across from the Argentine province of Misiones. I focused on representatives of the older, middle and younger generations. Among the informants there were those whose competence in the Ukrainian language is quite reduced, and as such they were interviewed in Spanish. They are going through the process of language shift.⁵ The ongoing assimilation necessitates a detailed examination of the local Slavic speech that is of extraordinary interest to linguists. On the one hand, this speech reflects the status and peculiarities of dialects at the time of resettlement in new lands; on the other hand, it is exposed to the constant influence of surrounding languages, especially to the influence of Spanish. Twenty-five hours of audio recordings were analyzed for the purposes of the paper. When working with interlocutors, I selected a semi-structured interview method; the interviews were conducted on ethnographic and sociolinguistic topics, as well as the history of the resettlement.

In my opinion, Slavic migrant communities in South America represent a “preserve” of Slavic dialects in a Spanish-speaking environment. It is known that the population of Argentina was formed as a result of mass migration in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Analyzing the formation of the local Ukrainian diaspora, researchers indicate several migration waves: 1) 1897–1914, 2) 1920s–1939, 3) 1946–1950s, 4) the 1990s [Ціпко 2013: 203; Ярош 2012: 341].

The first wave refers to the period from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of twentieth century to the First World War. Migrants rushed to Latin American countries from the West Ukrainian lands, which were part

⁴ About the L2 use (Ukrainian language) among Transcarpathian Hungarians see, e. g. [Pilipenko 2014, Пилипенко 2014].

⁵ Hrymch notes that there is a “core” (active part of the Diaspora) and a “mantle” of the community where the identity cannot be realized or can even be ignored [Гримич 2012: 211].

of Austria-Hungary; the majority of migrants arrived from Galicia.⁶ Together with the Ukrainians from Galicia (Greek-Catholics by faith) migrated Poles [Lehr, Cipko 2000: 168; Prutsch, Stefanetti Kojrowicz 2003], whose descendants I also visited during my field work in Apóstoles.⁷ The role of the Greek Catholic Church in language maintenance must be emphasized, e. g. in Apóstoles, Basilian Fathers organized courses of catechesis for children [Ярош 2012: 342]. The inter-war period is characterized by the inflow of migrants from new lands: they come not only from Galicia but also from Volhynia, region that was joined with Poland, according to the results of the Riga peace Treaty of 1921.⁸ In the 1930s the migrants from Poland made up 58% of all immigrants in Argentina⁹ [Cipko 2012: 103]. Not only did the religious composition change (the Volhynia region is dominated by Orthodox believers), but also speakers of different dialects of Ukrainian language appeared (Volhynian dialects of the South-Western dialect group and dialects of Polissia of the Northern dialect group). Many immigrants became followers of neo-Protestant denominations (Baptists, Pentecostals). In the new lands, migrants were engaged in agricultural work, growing yerba mate, wheat, cotton and tobacco; in the cities they worked in factories and the refrigeration industry – *frigoríficos* [Ibid.: 105].

After the Second World War, migration was dominated by political motives in that immigrants came who did not agree with the policy of the Communist authorities. This migration wave was quite small in comparison with the previous ones. However, it was well-organized and cohesive, and as a result these immigrants occupied leading positions in migrant organizations [Ibid.: 113]. Unlike previous migration waves that had mostly economic reasons (mostly dominated by peasants), the post-war migration wave was dominated by people from the intelligentsia, priests, officials, teachers, etc.

The fourth migration wave started in the 1990s. During this period, Ukrainian citizens from almost all regions appeared in Argentina, including those from Eastern and Southern Ukraine who use Surzhyk in daily communication or speak Russian. As for organizational forms of diasporic life, Ukrainians are

⁶ Cipko argues that in the period before the First World War among the immigrants from the Russian Empire were Ukrainians who were part of the “Federation of Russian workers organization of South America” [Cipko 2012: 107].

⁷ My field work confirmed that Polish informants (the older generation) speak both Polish and Ukrainian language, cf. [Zubrzycki, Maffia 2003: 167–168].

⁸ At that time, Belarusians also migrated to Argentina from Western Belarusian lands that belonged to Poland (see [Шабельцев 2011]).

⁹ In the 1930s the Argentine government began to limit the inflow of migrants that resulted in resettlement in neighboring Paraguay [Шабельцев 2011: 4]. Among Ukrainians in Paraguay Orthodox believers dominate, because most of them came from Volhynia [Cipko, Lehr]. They settled in the vicinity of Encarnación, in the colonies Fram, Nueva Ucrania etc. Information about immigrants in Paraguay can be found in [Filipow Kolada 2014] and in [Сапеляк 2011].

united in several communities that occupy different ideological positions. These communities can be divided into those that defend Ukrainian autonomist aspirations (“Prosvita”, “Vidrodzhennia”) and those that have arisen in the post-war period as unions of compatriots, supported left-wing politics and maintained relations with the Soviet Union (e. g. the cultural and sports clubs “Dnipro”, “Vissarion Belinsky”, “Maxim Gorky” in the province of Buenos Aires).¹⁰ After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia began to support these organizations, despite the fact that there are not many Russians there — they mostly unite Ukrainians and Belarusians, as the descendants of pre-war migration as well as new migrants.¹¹ It should be noted that the ideological division is not mentioned in the work on this issue (except, e. g. [Шабельцев 2011: 10–12; Cipko 2012: 110, 112–114]).

Thus, the representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora are divided according to ideological positions, by religion (Greek Catholics, Orthodox of different jurisdictions, neo-Protestant communities), by the time of resettlement (there are migrants from the end of the nineteenth century, as well as those who migrated at the end of the twentieth century), and by linguistic features (maintaining/losing the Ukrainian language; the predominant use of Surzhyk or Russian). The main part of the Ukrainian diaspora in Argentina lives in Greater Buenos Aires and in the provinces of Misiones and Chaco in the North of the country.¹²

I established contact with Ukrainians originating from different areas (Galicia, Volhynia, regions of Eastern and Southern Ukraine), belonging to different denominations (Greek-Catholic, Orthodox, Pentecostal, Baptist), whose ancestors migrated to South America at the end of the nineteenth century as well as with representatives of the last migration wave. However, due

¹⁰ According to the testimony of my informants, members of the same family could participate in ideologically different organizations.

¹¹ Today, these organizations are united in the Federation of Cultural Institutions of Immigrants from Belarus, Russia and Ukraine (Federación de Instituciones Culturales de Inmigrantes Bielorrusos, Rusos y Ucrainianos, FICIBRU). In these clubs it is interesting to see the transformation of the identity of the participants. The clubs are officially Russian, Russian language courses are organized there (in some of them, for example, in the cultural and sports club “Dnipro” (Llavallol), the Belarusian language has been recently introduced). Most of the participants, however, are not ethnic Russians — they are descendants of Western Ukrainians and Belarusians of the pre-war migration wave. Inside, we can see the flags of three countries standing together (Belarus, Russia and Ukraine), and flags of the Soviet Union still hang in some clubs. The repertoire of these clubs consists of the folk elements of all three Eastern Slavic people. See in detail [Шабельцев 2011: 17].

¹² Bohdanova and Pohroms'kyi give the following figures: in Argentina there are 300,000 Ukrainians, 150,000 of them live in the capital region, 75,000 reside in the province of Misiones, 33,000 live in the province of Chaco, as well as in Córdoba, Mendoza, Formosa [Богданова, Погромський 2010: 84]. It is very difficult to collect data on ethnicity, because the census in Argentina does not inquire about it.

to the limited size of my paper I shall only analyze the language features of the representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora living in the provinces of Misiones (Argentina) and Itapúa (Paraguay). I shall concentrate only on Ukrainians who migrated from Galicia and, accordingly, who are Greek Catholics by faith, and who arrived in South America during the first or second migration wave¹³. It should be said that Ukrainian is spoken only by the older generation, while among young people, proficiency is minimal [Wintoniuk 2014: 4]. This situation emerged mainly due to the reduction of language functions (often conscious) in a family environment that was a result of the language policy of the government, which attempted to limit the various types of polyphony [Ibid: 1].

The interlocutors described the reasons why their ancestors were forced to migrate to the other side of the world:

- [1] *Jíchaly u Parahváj | bo tútka u Parahváju wže buw jádén | pojíchav z Ukrajíny | skazáw šo tútka je dúže baháto zeml'í | tóto tudý bulý l'isy | zém'l'i | a na Ukrajín'i brakuválo zém'l'i*¹⁴ (The people went to Paraguay | because here in Paraguay there was already one man | he went from Ukraine | he said that there was a lot of land | and Ukraine did not have enough land).

Here we see an example of what was often given as an argument for migration — the scarcity of land forced people to seek other places. The interlocutor also speaks about how information about the new lands spread: they heard mostly from their countrymen who had already visited those places. Informants told me that they arrived in the jungle by chance. Hrymych cites two “etiological legends” (term of the author) about the arrival of Ukrainians in Misiones, from which it follows that the migrants found themselves there by chance. In one case, they were not allowed entry into the US so they went to Argentina instead. In another case, because of fever in Brazil, where they were originally headed, they were redirected to Argentina [Гримич 2012].

In the speech of interlocutors, features of the primary linguistic system were recorded — namely, the features of the South-Western dialect group, localized in Galicia¹⁵ (cf. a set of features for Naddnistrrian dialect in [Гриценко 2004a]). In the vowel system, the unstressed *o* is replaced by *u* or *o^u*, including in borrowed words: *i pujídem na Ukrajínu* (we shall go to Ukraine); *pukázyvaly támka, de pochóvan'i tak'í, de tak'í muhýly, muhýly* (they showed where they are buried, where are graves, the graves); *pryv'ís futyhráf'iji* (he brought photos). In the stressed position the vowel *y* is pronounced as *e* or *y^e*, the unstressed

¹³ The field work among Ukrainians from Volhynia was carried out in October 2017 in Oberá (Argentina) and Encarnación (Paraguay).

¹⁴ The examples are given in phonetic transcription.

¹⁵ My informants mentioned the settlements, from where their ancestors migrated, located in the area of distribution of this dialect.

vowels *y* and *e* are pronounced as *y^e* and *e^v*, respectively: *a tam putóm pujíde m'ij sen* (and then my son will go there) (instead of *syn*); *johó táto róby^e w Kyjiv'i* (his dad works in Kyiv). In the position after palatalized consonants *a* (reflex of **ę* or **a*) is changed to *e*: *dúže d'ěkujemo* (we thank you very much). As for the system of consonants, a characteristic feature of the speech of informants is the strong palatalization of sibilants *s*, *z*, *c*: *monastério s''v'atóho vasyľ'ija ve-lykoho* (the monastery of St. Basil the Great); *a uródyny s''v'atkújut takóš?* (do they also celebrate birthdays?); *buw otec''* (it was a father). Palatalized *t'* and *d'* are replaced by *k'* and *g'*, respectively *i tak pučáləs' naše žýk'e*¹⁶ (and so began our life). The sounds *ə* or *u* are pronounced in the masculine forms of the past tense (including in stressed syllables): *šu v'in kazáw* (that he said); *šo pryjžúw* (that he came). Almost everywhere, non-palatalized pronunciation occurs in the third-person plural ending of verbs in the present tense: *voný jíduť, voný jíduť tak sámó u Fránc'iju* (they go, they go also in France). The most common ending for the first-person plural verbs in the present tense is *-m* instead of *-mo*: *ščó músym v'itpov'idáty* (that we must answer). Among morphological features, the formation of the past tense with an auxiliary verb (e. g. in the first-person plural) is also of note. These forms are used in parallel with the forms without an auxiliary verb in the past tense: *tepér wže smo pozbyrály, bo perejšów čas pásky, ws''o búlo i je, čy ws''o [my] zabúly* (now we have already collected, because Easter has passed, everything was and is, or we forgot all). The particle *naj* in the imperative mood of the third person is often used: *naj voná jíde* (let her go). The reduplicated forms of demonstrative pronouns are recorded in the speech of informants: *tót'i múry, tóto ws''o tak'í* (these walls, they are all such); *tóto wže p'játe šoste pokol'ín'a* (this is already the fifth-sixth generation); *podaruwáw tóto, i pryjíchaly do dómu* (he gave it as a present and came home). In declination, the use of the ending *-ow* for the singular instrumental of female nouns, feminine adjectives and pronouns that have in the nominative singular *-a* is one of the most typical features: *še m'ij švág'er, to čolów'ika brat, s svójow ž'ínkow* (and also my brother-in-law, husband's brother, with his wife). As for syntactic features, the separation from the verb of the reflexive particle *s'a* (*s'i*) in sentences that is typical of the South-Western Ukrainian dialect group must be mentioned: *v jak'im to m'íst'i my búly šo my tak dujíchaly, ja wže zabúla jak to s'a nazyváje, i tudý, a tútka vudá* (we were in some city, where we came, I already forgot the name, and then, and there was the water). In the speech of informants, many of these features compete with other forms that are common in the literary language; even in the idiolect of one speaker we can find different forms.

Below I shall discuss the functioning of the Ukrainian language in contact situations and the identity of speakers that is manifested through narratives

¹⁶ Cf. in Ukrainian *náše žytt'á*.

and language use. As for the link between language and identity, I agree with Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, who argue that linguistic behavior is “*series of acts of identity in which people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social role*” [Le Page, Tabouret-Keller 1985: 14].

A notable feature of language, functioning in a foreign environment, is the use of personal names. Name is an identity marker and, in the situation of self-presentation, signals ethnic identity on the opposition line “own-alien”¹⁷ [Рылов 2010: 16; Eslami-Rasekh, Ahmadvand 2015: 5–6; Джон, Хаваза 2016: 63]. Matveev discusses the combination of the “own” and “alien” in the personal name, and also indicates the specific function of the name in contact situations which consist of overcoming language boundaries, time frames and territorial borders [Матвеев 2004: 13]. Scholars have introduced the concept of anthroponymical identity. In particular, they investigate how representatives of one’s own and other cultures perceive a name and its bearer [Гараруля 2012: 45]. In Spanish-speaking countries – in official communications, in documents, etc. – the informants use the Spanish versions of their names¹⁸, while in the family domain only Ukrainian names are used, as we can see also from narratives:

- [2] *Voná dúže mojá dočká cht’ila támka znáty | a m’ij syn tepérka káže | mámu | my jidem s **Pavló**m | tam objižžájimo káže drúhy e | e | deržávy i pujidem na Ukrajinu | a ja kážu **Petró** naj júde **Mar’ija** z vámy | ja kážu | naj vona júde.* (She really my daughter wanted to know | and my son now says | mom | we will go with **Pavlo** | we will visit he says other | uh | uh | countries and we will go to Ukraine | and I say | **Petro** let **Marija** go with you | I say | let her go).
- [3] *Ento ella dirá que **Pedro** tira | que mi hijo*¹⁹ (And then she will say that **Pedro** throws | that my son).

¹⁷ The opposition “own-alien” is one of the main semantic oppositions in traditional culture [Белова 2009: 581].

¹⁸ In Spain during Franco’s rule it was ordered to give Spanish names to children, and foreigners had to give the translation of their names into Spanish: Yuri (Jorge), John (Juan) [Рылов 2010: 31]. In Argentina, the political regimes in the twentieth century advocated the unity of the nation that resulted in the promotion of the nationalist agenda reflected, in particular, in the law of name (Ley del nombre) № 18.248, according to which (art. 3) foreign names could not be registered, except in the case of their “castilianization” [Casale O’Ryan 2014: 76]. In addition, until the 1940s in media and book publications the “castilianization” of foreign names was common practice [González 2000: 35]. The law № 18.248 is available online www.gob.gba.gov.ar/portal/documentos/ley18248.pdf (12.01.2017). The “castilianization” encompassed not only the personal names but also the toponyms. The Ukrainians in Paraguay founded colonies *Тарасівка, Богданівка, Нова Україна, Нова Волинь*, but later they had to give Spanish names to their settlements, e. g. *Nueva Ucrania* [Сірко, Lehr 2006: 34]. Bans on the use of other languages began at school. I found evidence that the use of any language other than Spanish resulted in physical punishment [Snihur 1997: 154].

¹⁹ The informant speaks about the Ukrainian custom, when the family members throw up a spoon of kutia (traditional cereal dish) for the New Year [Валенцова 2004: 71].

- [4] *Bo ja kážu | **Petró** káže meni | mámu | ja káže | pujídu znow na Ukrájínu* (Because I say | **Petro** says to me | mom | he says | I'll go again to Ukraine).

These utterances were produced by one informant. The interview takes place in the presence of an accompanying person, who doesn't speak Ukrainian, so sometimes the interlocutor switches to Spanish in order to be understood by all guests. In example 2 she mentions the names of her children in Ukrainian: *Pavló, Mar'ýja, Petró*, despite the fact that there are Spanish equivalents for these names. In this case, scholars would argue that different onomastic spaces exist [Кошман 2010: 100]. Rylov notes that the naming of one and the same person depends on the circumstances of communication and on the personality of the communicants [Рылов 2010: 13]. Sobolev points out that in Balkan region the informants have a multiple choice of self-presentation [Соболев 2013: 66-67]. The phonetic features of names, stemming from one root, and the frequency of choosing names in certain traditions, may be very different [Джон, Хаваза 2016: 63]. In the above utterances the informant consistently delineates the domains of language use and chooses a Ukrainian or Spanish equivalent of a name: in Ukrainian utterances we find only Ukrainian names [4, 5] (*Petró*), whereas in Spanish utterances [3] we see the Spanish equivalent of the same personal name (*Pedro*). In a bilingual situation, in families where the Ukrainian language is maintained, Ukrainian names are used, but they are designated only for one's "own" family members and representatives of the Ukrainian community, while Spanish names are used in contacts with the outside Spanish-speaking world.²⁰ Thus, in terms of the example of personal name use, it is possible to note the opposition of the family domain to other spheres of life.²¹ According to the testimonies of my informants, among the young generation international names are becoming more common and Ukrainian names are forgotten:²²

- [5] *I Petró | tóto še **našy nómbry** | a jich d'ity wže n'e | jich d'ity wže je Miránda | to je wže Ródžer | i Kármen | Áleks | como en Estados' Unidos*²³ (And Petro | these are all our names | and their children are not | their children they have Miranda | this is Roger | and Carmen | Alex | as in the US).

²⁰ In this context, the interesting observation of Koshman should be mentioned. Analyzing the use of the Ukrainian anthroponyms in Russian text, he comes to the following conclusion: when the Ukrainian anthroponym is replaced by the Russian equivalent, personal names lose part of the linguistic information, the linguistic affiliation of the anthroponym is erased, and the noun model becomes impermeable [Кошман 2010: 102].

²¹ The differentiation between onomastic spaces is evident in the testimonies of Belarusians. One informant in the study of Shabeltsaŭ, Vasilij Afanasievich Romanov, remembering about school years, says that the teacher wrote in his diary: "*Basilio! Quereres poder!*" ("*Basilio! Want is can!*"), using his name in Spanish form [Шабельцаў 2009: 204].

²² Probably, this process is associated with the assimilation and occurs in parallel with the language shift.

²³ Using an apostrophe ('), I mark in Spanish utterances the weakened pronunciation of *s* or its disappearance that is typical of Latin American Spanish varieties (see [Нарумов 2001a: 460]).

The opposition between the concepts of “we” – “they”, “own” – “alien” emerges not only in the sphere of anthroponyms, but also in the functioning of ethnonyms. The approach of considering the ethnonyms within the framework of discourse analysis is accepted by linguists (see, e. g. [Сироткина 2008: 37]). Among Ukrainians in Argentina and Paraguay, the most frequent phrase of this type is *naš'i l'údy* (*našy l'úde, naše l'úde*),²⁴ concerning the identity of the speaker/participant in the communicative situation. By using this label, the speaker means both local Ukrainians and Ukrainians from other countries or regions (the reference to the ethnic component is embedded in the personal pronoun *naš*).²⁵ I believe that this phrase refers to endonyms, because it is used only by Ukrainians in order to designate this ethnic group. *Naš'i l'údy* can be said without translation in Spanish by the fourth or fifth generation of Ukrainians, otherwise don't speak Ukrainian any more. It implies not only affiliation to the local community, to those who maintain the language, but also to the descendants of the first and second migration waves, who preserve relevant identity attributes (e. g. they are parishioners of the Greek-Catholic Church (*iglesia católica ucraniana*), they participate in cultural activities,²⁶ they retain traditions and customs brought by their ancestors (e. g. they decorate the traditional basket for consecration at Easter – *kóšyč*)). Below we can see examples of the phrase *naš'i l'údy* used in Ukrainian and Spanish sentences:

- | | |
|---|---|
| [6] M. A <i>naš'i l'údy</i> <i>si</i> (laughter) <i>nosotros</i>
 <i>para nosotros</i> <i>nuestra gente</i> . | M. A <i>naš'i l'údy</i> yes (laughter) we
for us our people. |
| G. A <i>quién se refiere?</i> | G. Who is referred to? |
| M. A <i>los ucranianos</i> A to <i>naš'i l'údy!</i> | M. To Ukrainians A to <i>naš'i l'údy!</i> |
| G. <i>Los polacos?</i> | G. And to Poles? |
| H. No. | H. No. |
| M. No <i>los ucranianos</i> . | M. No Ukrainians. |
| G. <i>Como presentar?</i> | G. Like presentation? |
| M. <i>Si</i> <i>naš'i l'údy</i> <i>č'i n'e?</i> (laughter) <i>si</i>
 <i>naš'i l'údy</i> <i>que son ucranianos'</i> no
<i>polaco eso no</i> . | M. Yes to <i>naš'i l'údy</i> <i>č'i n'e?</i>
(laughter) yes <i>naš'i l'údy</i> that
they are Ukrainians no Poles no. |

In excerpt 6 the phrase *naš'i l'údy* appears in Spanish discourse. The conversation is held in Spanish, which is justified in this case because the two informants, both the descendants of Ukrainians, are unable to speak Ukrainian –

²⁴ The personal pronoun “our” in this phrase is not unique in Slavic ethnic context, and may refer to the language, ethnicity, type of behavior, etc. cf., по-нашенски [Сироткина 2008: 43]; *naš j'ozik, po n'aše, našat'a vera* [Соболев 2013: 63-64].

²⁵ In particular, during the field work the informants spoke about me, when they introduced me to other members of the community: *v'in (je) z našych l'údy* (he is from our people).

²⁶ One of the main events of the year in the province of Misiones is held in September in Oberá, “Festival of the immigrant” (Fiesta del Inmigrante), where each community participates in the procession, fairs, organizes workshops on folk culture, etc.

their competence in the Ukrainian language is reduced (the interlocutors remember only a few words and hardly understand simple spoken phrases). The purpose of this conversation was to find out the features of the use of *náš'i l'údy*. The informants firmly reject that Poles can be members of this identity group and can be designated in this way.²⁷ M. makes it clear that she knows the meaning by giving the Spanish translation (*nuestra gente*). Further, she illustrates the example in Ukrainian: *A to náš'i l'údy!* It is used as a positive marker in the opposition of “own-alien” in relation to new acquaintances (it is significant that at this moment M. switches to Ukrainian). The same phrase is pronounced in the last remark of M. with some modification: she adds *č'i n'e?* We need to pay attention to the fact that *náš'i l'údy* was recorded only in the plural, without any other option. If the interlocutors want to emphasize that they are talking about only one person belonging to this group or excluded from it, the descriptive construction is used: *v'in (voná) je (ne je) z náš'ych l'údy/l'údej/l'ude*.

To this phrase are opposed ethnonyms that refer to non-Ukrainians. I recorded the following words: *ind'jány*, *čórny(j)*, *(h)išpány*.²⁸ Here are examples of the use of these terms:

- [7] *I znály orhan'izuváty v'įjsku | a ind'jány | znály de vudá* (And they were able to organize the army | and the Indians | knew where was the water).
- [8] *Voný ws'i išpány | déjak'i z náš'ych je tut | šo prychód'at | šo ródyč'i pusylájut | alé dúže málo | fs'o išpány* (They are all *išpány* | there are some of our people here | who come | that parents send | but very few | they are all *išpány*).
- [9] *No | yo soy chorni como ellos' dicen* (laughter) || *chorni es' negro | negro les' llaman* || *ucranianos decían chorni | cabello [negro]* (No | I'm *chorni* as they say (laughter) || *chorni* is black | they call them black || the Ukrainians said *chorni* | [black] hair).
- [10] *No čorny | no | ne хот'іly* (No *čorny* | no | they didn't want).

The migrants in the new land were faced with the autochthonous inhabitants of those places: the Guaraní Indians, and also with the métis – descendants of mixed marriages of Europeans and Indians who spoke Spanish. All of them differed from the Slavic population of the West Ukrainian lands in appearance and anthropological traits. In addition, in the province of Misiones, Ukrainian settlers had contacts with immigrants from Europe and Asia (Scandinavians,

²⁷ In the province of Misiones in some localities the Poles live together with the Ukrainians (e. g. in Apóstoles, Azara).

²⁸ The opposition based on ethnicity and reflected in the ethnic names is a universal category that is present, for example, in migrant communities of Siberia, in particular, in the Middle Irtysh region, where immigrants from Ukrainian provinces of the Russian Empire are called *chochly* (хохлы), and the peasants from Belarusian lands are called *litva* (литва) or *vitiabshany* (вitiesшаны) [Новоселова 2004].

Germans, Japanese, Arabs, etc.). As Shabel'tsev points out, “*the descendants of the first European settlers are different in mentality and in phenotypic characteristics from the locals*” [Шабельцев 2011: 16]. The local population, which significantly differs in anthropological characteristics from Ukrainians, has been often designated with the ethnophaulism *čorny(j)*. Based on my observations, it is still widely used in the speech of informants, often with a negative connotation. The basis for the nomination is the dark colour of skin and hair of Indians. In example 9 the informant, a representative of the *métis*, who has frequent contacts with the Ukrainian community, says about himself with a smile that he is *chorni*. He does not know Ukrainian, but he is familiar with this word – in his utterance he even translates it in Spanish (*chorni es' negro*). Ukrainians of the third and fourth generations were also present for this conversation. The informant opposes himself to other interlocutors, when he says that “they”, Ukrainians, use this word (*como ellos' dicen*), and then his utterance ends with laughter that corresponds to the relaxed tone of the conversation. Commenting on this word, he points to his black hair. The context of example 10 is: the informant speaks about the Ukrainian weddings of the first half of the twentieth century and mentions that parents wanted their children to marry only Ukrainians and Poles and not *chorni*. Here a negative attitude toward ethnic neighbors is evident, as well as moral imperatives (e. g. not to mix with them).²⁹ The word (*h*)*išpány* refers to all who speak Spanish; in example 8 (*h*)*išpány* are opposed to those who still maintain active language competence and can speak Ukrainian.

Below I shall discuss the functioning of foreign-language tokens in the speech of Ukrainians in Argentina and Paraguay. Geographic names do not decline and remain in their original form:

[11] *W Río Gránde máje b'il'se ukrajín- | e-e | tych | ital'ijc''iw | a w Sánta Katarína n'ímc''iw wže | a w Paraná to wže je ws''il'ák'i | ukrájinc''i | pol'áky | japónc''i | ws''i* (In Río Grande there are more Ukrain- | uh | these | Italians | in Santa Catarina there are already more Germans | and in Paraná there are all sorts of people | Ukrainians | Poles | Japanese | all). .

[12] *Nu tut | e | e | w Apóstoles tut b'il'se | e | katól'iky* (Well here | uh | in Apóstoles | there are more | uh | Catholics).

[13] *Tepér ne znáju | jak to búde | buw otéc'' e-e | šo pryjižúw z Bwénos Ájres | tu pumér tomú m'ís''ac'* (Now I don't know | what will happen | there was a priest who came from Buenos Aires | he died a month ago).

²⁹ Cf. the testimony of Belarusians from Paraguay: “*The immigrants did not try to mix with indigenous Paraguayans: if the parents knew that she had fallen in love with «black», they could say, «Get out of the house!»*” [Шабельцев 2011: 29].

Toponyms that are not connected with local realia can be declined (for example, the toponyms referring to the autochthonous ethnic territory, e. g. the well-known place names). Spanish masculine nouns almost always and feminine nouns in most cases remain indeclinable. In excerpt 11 the feminine nouns in the singular locative do not decline (*w Santa Katarína*; *w Paraná*), in example 13 the masculine noun is used without the genitive ending (*z Bwénos Áj-res*), in example 12 the masculine noun in the locative remains indeclinable (*w Apóstoles*). In my opinion, the determining factor here may be the influence of Spanish, from which the toponyms are borrowed in L1, because Spanish does not have case endings for nouns. Being constantly exposed to the influence of Spanish and living in a Spanish-speaking environment, the informants simply borrowed the prepositional structure of the Spanish language in Ukrainian (*en Santa Catarina* = *w Santa Katarina*, *de Buenos Aires* = *z Bwenos Ajres*, *en Apóstoles* = *w Apostoles*). In my opinion, it is a kind of structural calque. Examples of a similar structure (the lack of declination of the borrowed noun after the preposition) have also been recorded in the speech of Ukrainians of the fourth emigration wave in Canada, e. g.: *ja pryjikhala v September* [Chumak-Horbatsch, Garg 2006: 21]. When determining a potential declination, uncertainty about the plurality of nouns creates additional problems. If in the Ukrainian literary language the name of the Argentine capital is perceived as a masculine singular noun (*працювати у Буенос-Айреси*_{SG.LOC.M.} (to work in Buenos Aires), *пеpeixати до Буенос-Айреса*_{SG.GEN.M.} (to move to Buenos Aires)), in Spanish this word is used in the plural (from Spanish *buenos aires* – good winds). Exactly the same situation occurs with the city Apóstoles, in Spanish this toponym is in the plural (*apóstoles* – apostles).³⁰

- [14] D. *W četvér čy w séredu?* D. On Thursday or on Wednesday?
 A. *W četver | wže l'iták | en Foz.* A. On Thursday | they already have
 the plane | in Foz.
 G. *A-a-a! | Foz du Iguasú!* G. Ah! | Foz do Iguacu!
 D. *Čérez Argentýnu.* D. Through Argentina.
 G. *Čérez Bwénos Ájres?* G. Via Buenos Aires?
 A. *Bwénos Ájres | voný jítuť na Foz du Iguasú | jim léchše | pot'ím čéres Foz du Iguasú.* A. Buenos Aires | they go to Foz do Iguacu | it is easier for them | then via Foz do Iguacu.
- [15] *My jízdyly na Ukrájinu na | šo my jízdyly na po | wže pu vud'í | po Mar Negro | tudý my lyšýly s'a na svójam sel'í* (We went to Ukraine | we went by | by water | by the Black sea | and then we remained in our village).

³⁰ Exactly the same strategy concerning the use of toponyms I noted in an interview with Belarusian repatriates from Argentina to the USSR in [Шабельцаў 2009: 213]: "Other communities in Dock Sud, our «Jakub Kolas» in Valentin Alsina, in Caseros (this is a suburb, far from the city center)."

In example 14 A. says that her friends will fly from the airport of Foz do Iguacu, which is located in Brazil, to Buenos Aires. The locative construction is transposed into the Ukrainian language from Spanish: instead of the preposition *u* we find its Spanish equivalent *en* (*en Foz*). In the further cues of A. Ukrainian prepositions are consistently used with the same toponym: *na Foz du Iguasú*; *čéres Foz du Iguasú*. In the first cue of A. short-term code-switching occurs,³¹ because the previous segments of utterances are clearly attributed as belonging to the Ukrainian language system. A. implements the strategy described above: the transposition of Spanish prepositional constructions with toponyms. But this strategy is incomplete, because she doesn't translate in her L1. In this case, the explicit morpheme for locative meaning is not used.

Another interlocutor in example 15 uses the Spanish form of a geographical name. As follows from the conversation with him, he received education in Spanish; therefore, geography was also taught in Spanish. At the time of the interview the informant described his trip to Ukraine and didn't remember the Ukrainian equivalent for *Mar negro* (Black sea). In this excerpt we see borrowing rather than code-switching, because it is a single concept without any additional grammatical indices (as we have seen in the second cue (A.) of example 14 with the preposition *en*). It is significant that this borrowing remains indeclinable. The use of words from L2 for denoting even well-known concepts and objects is quite common in bilingual situations [Chumak-Horbatsch, Garg 2006: 21].

In this section I shall analyze other borrowed elements that are not personal or geographical names. Here we should pay attention to the status of these items: whether it is a situational code-switching occurring within a single word or if they belong to L1 system. I agree with Budzhak-Jones, who investigated the speech of Ukrainians in English-speaking environments. According to Budzhak-Jones words from L2 in L1 are borrowed and don't belong to the code-switching practice when occurring within a single word [Budzhak-Jones 1998]. Here are examples of this point:

[16] *Támka tak káže | s'p'ivájut | a káže fs'ak'i | **filmas'jón** pryv'ís | futyhráf'iji | fájno*
(There he says | they sing | he says different [songs] | he brought film | photos | it's good).

[17] *Tam káže wden' ves'il'a | káže | až uvéčir | to jim schódly | inákše **kostúmbre** | o to také*
(He says there the wedding | he says | is in the afternoon | and it lasts until the evening | and they went there | there are different customs | so).

[18] *I po mív'i | po brazyl'ij- | my kážem brazyl'j's'ka móva | wp'iznajút s kotróji **estádu** ty je | čy Paraná | čy Santa Katarína | čy Río Gránde* (And by language | Braz- | we say

³¹ The code-switching is defined as the "exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" [Gumperz 1982: 59].

Brazilian language | they recognize from what state are you from | from Paraná | or Santa Catarina | or Rio Grande).

[19] *My v Odésu jízdyly | to my jízdyly na Ukrájinu tak sámó z **ekskurs'jónu** | to my jíchaly | pryjíchaly do Kýjiva | z'v'icy jíchala dúže velýka **ekskurs'jón** | my pryjíchaly da Kýjiva | a s Kýjiva my pujíchaly | e-e-e | **ómnibusamy** pujíchaly do Odésy* (We went to Odessa | we went to Ukraine also with a guided excursion | and we went | we came to Kyiv | and from there departed a big excursion | we came to Kyiv | and from Kyiv we went | uh | by buses we went to Odessa).

[20] *Pójzdom móžna jíchaty do L'vóva | a v'id L'vóva móže braty sób'i túdy vóny móžut' bráty sób'i | e-e-e | čy táks'i | čy **ómnibus** malén'kyj šoby voný jíchaly na náše seló* (By train you can go to Lviv | and from Lviv you can take and then they can take | uh uh uh | a taxi | or a small bus to go to our village).

In these examples, we can observe different degrees of adaptation of borrowed lexical items from L2 to L1. However, it is not possible to understand to which class the noun belongs. Based on phonetics, it is clear that the Spanish word is calqued (as demonstrated, e. g. the stress in words ending in *-ción*: *filmas'jón*, *ekskurs'jón*, or in *ómnibus*). In example 17 the informant declines the word *kostumbre* (sp. *costumbre* – custom) to agree with the word *inákše*. It is possible to explain such choice in various ways: the informant could be orienting based on the end vowel in a Spanish word, and then setting the parallelism based upon this index: *inákš-e kostúmb-r-e*. Alternatively, he could be perceiving the word as a neuter noun, of the same type as the word *mope*, for example. An interesting contact item is also observed in excerpt 18, where the informant speaks about the variants of the Portuguese language in Brazil and uses a borrowed term for the administrative-territorial division of Brazil *estado* (state)³². Here the speaker agrees based on a dependent word in the feminine gender, although in both Spanish and Portuguese the word *estado* is masculine: *s kotróji_{GEN.SG.F.} **estádu** ty je*. In addition, there is no formal base for the agreement in feminine gender, as the word ends in *-o* [u], which is characteristic of masculine nouns. The noun itself does not change, and it is not provided with the grammatical indexes, and as such it is probably in an intermediate phase of adaptation. Budzhak-Jones notes that in 42 % of cases the English inanimate nouns ending in a consonant behave in Ukrainian speech as feminine words, e. g.: *a trolley jšla* (original orthography is retained) [Budzhak-Jones 1998: 10–11].

A more advanced degree of adaptation is shown in example 19: *ómnibusamy* *pujíchaly do Odésy*, in which the borrowed lexeme *omnibus* is declined with the instrumental plural ending *-amy*. This word is characterized by the absence of palatalization of *n* before *i*, its phonetic form is copied. It is

³² In Brazilian Portuguese this word is pronounced as [estadu].

noteworthy that this word is preceded by a pause and the hesitation of the informant (*e-e-e*), as if the informant were not sure about which following word would be suitable for the Ukrainian utterance. This hesitation, in my opinion, marks the following word as borrowed and indicates its “alien” nature.³³

In the following examples, some strategies are employed by the interlocutors, who emphasize “problem” words, which could be, in their opinion, unclear to the researcher. The main strategy is reiteration, when the lexeme is translated into Ukrainian:

[21] *Vy jakú **matériju** wčyté v un’iversytét’i? | **prédmet**?* (What subject do you study at University? | a subject?)

[22] *Sálta | tam je náš’i séstry | a jízdyly na **kataráty**? | na **vodospát**?* (Salta | there are our sisters there | did you already go to the waterfalls? | to the waterfalls?).

In excerpt 21 the conversation is about the researcher’s activities. The interlocutors ask me about my field of interest. The “problem” word is *materia* (subject in Spanish), and after a little pause the informant chooses a suitable Ukrainian lexeme, *prédmet*, understanding that *materia* may have been unclear to the researcher. This strategy is often adopted in the bilingual communities and has been noted by many scholars (see, e. g. [Gumperz 1982: 78–79; Petrović 2009: 147–148; Laihonon 2008: 684]). This strategy is also used in example 22. Asking the researcher about the National Park Iguazú (*Parque Nacional Iguazú*) the informant used the borrowed Spanish word *kataráty*. Then she immediately offered the Ukrainian word (*vodospát*). It is significant that both words were integrated into the Ukrainian language system, *kataraty* has a plural ending *-y*, typical of plural masculine and feminine nouns of the hard subgroup (sp. *catarata*). The word *matérija* has the accusative singular and agrees with an dependent word: *vy jakú_{ACC.F.SG.} **matériju**_{ACC.F.SG.} wčyté*.

The “problem” with the words emphasized in the narratives is their interpretation and explanation (metalinguistic commentary).

[23] *My wže **jubilado** | jak to kazáty? | še ne májem takóji rob- | takóji jak to kazáty? | zan’át’a take³⁴* (We are already retired | how to say it? | we do not have such a work | such | how to say it? | such an activity).

³³ The hesitations in the informant’s speech in bilingual situations and pauses are discussed, in particular, in [Myers 2006: 339]. Their role in the bilingual utterances of the informants is also considered by Laihonon [Laihonon 2008: 686].

³⁴ Cf. the metalinguistic commentary from the Ukrainian-English bilinguals (the original orthography is retained): *Toj ukrajinec’ vyviv nas znajete do takoho do elevatera, znajete elevatory velyki sce v sudi znajete tak* (The Ukrainian man led us out to such an elevator, you know, big elevators, especially in the court house, you know, yes) [Budzhak-Jones 1998: 9].

The informant resorts to this strategy when she cannot find a suitable equivalent in her L1. In this case [23] she did not remember the word *пенсіонер*, which is probably unknown to the informant since it belongs to the social domain. All terms in this domain are typically borrowed from Spanish. Feeling the “alien” character of the lexeme in the Ukrainian sentence, the informant chooses an explanation strategy. She twice inserts a question, *jak to kazáty?* that can be explained as self-repair in the presence of the researcher, because she doesn't know the right word.³⁵

Autocorrection can be applied not only to lexical items, but also to prosodic phenomena, such as the position of stress in a word:

[24] *Alé z Ukrajiný pryvésty soróčku výšý^etu čy z Brazyl'ji doró- doróho dóroho* (But it is very expensive to bring from Ukraine the embroidered shirt).

[25] *To naša sestrá pomal'uvála || ikony | ikóny || nawčýla s'a dobre u Rým'i* (This painted our sister || icons | icons || she studied in Rome).

In both cases, the informant's hesitation is noticeable, as it is manifested in pauses and unfinished words that have a “problem” stress position. In example 24 there are three attempts to choose the stress position in the adverb *doro*ho. The first variant is unfinished, the second one is pronounced with the stress on the second syllable and the third one corresponds to the Ukrainian literary pronunciation, with the stress on the first syllable. In example 25 the plural noun *ikony* is mentioned twice – the first time it is pronounced with the stress on the first syllable and then after autocorrection it is stressed in accordance with the orthoepic rules of Ukrainian literary language. The stress on the first syllable can be explained as the result of Spanish language influence (cf. *el ícono*). However, the informant likely hesitates due to the fact that in Spanish the word *el icono* with the stress on the second syllable also exists.³⁶ It is obvious that these phenomena have emerged due to contact with the Spanish language and due to the isolation and distance of Ukrainian language speakers from the main area of its use. Explanation, metalinguistic commentary, and translation are characteristic of an interview in which the interviewees need to assert their own identity and to sustain a conversation in their L1, despite the fact that he or she does not have a satisfactory command of Ukrainian.

Almost always the affirmative and negative particles (*sí*, *no*) are also borrowed from the L2. Here are some examples:

³⁵ Laihonen also noted the same strategy in his studies [Laihonen 2008: 686].

³⁶ It is noteworthy that in the dialects of the Ukrainian language, in particular, in the Naddnistrian, there is a paroxytonic stress; in addition, there is a double accentuation of verbs [Гриценко 2004: 388].

- [26] D. *To jísty s škarlúpoju.*
G. *Ne [tréba] očýstyty?*
D. **No.**
- [27] S1. *Tam [rozmovl'ájut'] t'il'ky po ukrajíns'ky.*
G. *T'il'ky po ukrajíns'ky?*
D. **Śí.**
M2. *Séstra náša zv'ýcy | z Mis'jónes.*
G. *Z Mis'jones?*
M1. **Śí | z Mis'jónes | śí.**
- D. You should eat it with peels.
G. Don't I need to clean it?
D. No.
- S1. There they speak only Ukrainian.
G. Only Ukrainian?
D. Yes.
M2. Our sister is from there | from Misiones.
G. From Misiones?
M1. Yes | from Misiones | yes.

It is obvious that the Ukrainian affirmative and negative particles were displaced by their Spanish equivalents, and are firmly rooted in the informant's speech. In excerpt 27 (the cue of M1), we see that the borrowed affirmative particle can frame the main idea of the utterance.

Code-switching seems to be more widespread among those who have limited L1 competence and who are unable to use the language in different contexts [Thomas 1982: 218]. Auer suggests that code-switching “*presupposes liberty of the individual speaker, it is a contextualization device which can be used in creative ways by participants*” [Auer 1999: 329]. In this paper I shall concentrate only on a few traits that are characteristic of the informants' speech. Code-switching occurs whenever numerals are used in conversation, no matter whether the interlocutors are mentioning dates, counting objects, or speaking about amounts of money. The following two excerpts illustrate the functioning of numerals in the speech of the Ukrainian diaspora:³⁷

- [28] G. *V jakómu róc'i ce buló?*
S1. **Cuarenta y cinco** | *týs'ača déwjat'sot sórok p'játoho róku | bo nás'i | m'ij prád'it pryjíchaw z d'it'mý z Ukrajíny | máma mámyna mála déwjat' l'it.*
- [29] G. *A jak'í hróš'i w Parahvaju | ja šče ne báčyw.*
D. *Peso.*
S2. *Guaraní.*
S1. *To tys'ač'í | to na tys'ač'í | m'il'jóny | najb'il'sa | k'il'ko pes'ów **cuantos**' pesos' na sto tys'ač'.*
D. **Doscientos' y ochenta pesos'.**
- G. In what year was this?
S1. In 45 | in 1945 | because our | my great grandfather came with children from Ukraine | my grandmother was nine years old.
- G. What is the currency of Paraguay | I have not seen yet.
D. *Peso.*
S2. *Guaraní.*
S1. There are thousands | thousands | millions | the biggest banknote | how many pesos for hundred thousand?
D. Two hundred eighty pesos.

³⁷ The borrowing of numerals is not something extraordinary in contact situations. For instance, in the Istro-Romanian language in Croatia, numerals over 8 are borrowed from Slavic dialects of Istria [Hapymob 20016: 662–663].

S2. **No, trescientos’.**

S1. *K’íl’ko pés’iw vǎš’ich?*

D. **Dościentos y ochenta pesos’.**

S2. No | three hundred.

S1. How many of your pesos?

D. Two hundred eighty pesos.

In excerpt 28, when asked about the year, the informant answers in Spanish, then gives a more detailed explanation in Ukrainian. However, the first reaction to the question is given in Spanish. Here, we see a combination of code-switching strategy with reiteration. The interlocutor, in giving the translation, signals that she is familiar with numerals in L1. In the next example [29], a conversation about the currency of Paraguay and its exchange rate to the Argentine peso, no translation of numerals in L1 is provided. S1 asks the other interlocutors to help him, because he doesn't know what the exchange rate is of the Paraguayan Guaraní to the Argentine peso. When asking, he uses the strategy of translation. However, this strategy occurs in the opposite direction from before, as the segment in L1 (the quantitative word and the numeral) occurs first, then the question is duplicated in L2 with almost no pause (*k’ilkó pes’iw cuantos’ pesos’*). This likely happens because the informants used to talk about these topics in Spanish, and it is not easy to sustain the conversation exclusively in Ukrainian (cf. [Głuszkowski 2015: 167]).³⁸ In the same cue, S1 switches again to L1 (*cuantos’ pesos’ na sto tys’ač*). D. and S2 answer this question almost simultaneously, but their data do not match. Both informants give the answer in Spanish. Then S1 is forced to repeat the question again, in Ukrainian, thereby interrupting the Spanish discourse and receives the right answer from D. in Spanish.

The following example [30] is typologically similar to the previous one, except in regard to code-switching. Here we also observe conversation with cues in different languages within one sentence:

[30] M1. *Ty znáješ šo tam s’p’iváty?*

M2. **Qué apellido voná máje?**

M1. *Bójko.*

G. *Bójko | ukrajíns’ke | teš.*

M1. Do you know what we will sing there?

M2. What is her surname?

M1. Bójko

G. Bójko | also Ukrainian.

In this conversation, M2 poses a question, the first part of which is in L2 and the second part of which is in L1. This is a classic case of code-switching within a sentence: *qué*_{ESP.-what} *apellido*_{ESP.-surname} *voná*_{UKR.-she} *máje*_{UKR.-to have}. Before this question the previous cues of other participants also contain code-switching, hence, this strategy does not differ from the general tendencies in the speech of informants. The interlocutors don't notice this practice, which confirms the usual character of such verbal behavior.

³⁸ Wintoniuk states that the majority of Ukrainians in Misiones use their L1 with a reduced set of words [Wintoniuk 2014: 4].

In summary, analyzing the speech of descendants of the first and second immigrant waves from Galicia to Argentina and Paraguay, I have come to the conclusion that their Ukrainian language retains the traits of the original South-Western dialects of Ukrainian. Informants manifest their identity on the opposition level “own-alien” in onomastics, in the use of Ukrainian personal names that function in the family domain. Furthermore, they manifest their identity through the membership to the group of “*our people*” as opposed to “*čorny*”, “*(h)išpany*”, etc. The speech of the Ukrainians is full of contact phenomena: unadapted lexemes for toponyms, different degrees of adaptation of foreign items, the use of borrowed affirmative and negative particles, the strategies of reiteration and translation, the metalinguistic commentary during the semi-structured interview that marks “problem” words, and finally the strategy of code-switching (in particular, the use of Spanish numerals). All analyzed features were gathered during field research through interviews. The collected narratives are of great value from the point of view of linguistics, because the speakers are going through the process of language shift.

Literature

Белова 2009

Белова О. В., “Свой-чужой,” in: *Славянские древности*, 4, Москва, 2009, 581–582.

Богданова, Погромський 2010

Богданова Т. Є., Погромський В. О., “Українська етнічна спільнота в Аргентині наприкінці ХХ – на початку ХХІ століття,” *Історичний архів*, 4, 2010, 82–86.

Валенцова 2004

Валенцова М. М., “Кутья,” in: *Славянские древности*, 3, Москва, 2004, 69–71.

Гарагуля 2012

Гарагуля С. И., “К вопросу об антропонимической идентичности (на материале английских личных имен),” *Вопросы ономастики*, 2 (13), 2013, 43–52.

Гримич 2010

Гримич М., “Мовна ідентичність українців Бразилії: історія досліджень,” *Українознавство*, 4, 2010, 62–63.

——— 2012

Гримич М., “Заснування української спільноти в Аргентині: історіографічний аналіз,” in: *Збірник наукових праць Національного науково-дослідного інституту українознавства та всесвітньої історії*, ХХІХ, Київ, 2012, 41–68.

Гриценко 2004

Гриценко П. Ю., “Надністрянський говір,” in: В. М. Русанівський, О. О. Тараненко, М. П. Зяблюк, ред., *Українська мова. Енциклопедія*, Київ, 2004, 387–388.

Джон, Хаваза 2016

Джон А. А., Хаваза Ф. Н., “Изменения в антропонимии дунган (хуэйцзу) как маркер идентичности,” in: *Китай: история и современность: материалы IX международной научно-практической конференции. Екатеринбург, 21–23 октября 2015 г.*, Екатеринбург, 2016, 63–70.

- Евтух, Каминский, Ковальчук, Трощинский 2000
Евтух В. Б., Каминский Е. Е., Ковальчук Е. А., Трощинский В. П., “Украинцы в дальнем зарубежье,” in: Н. С. Полищук, А. П. Пономарев, ред., *Украинцы*, Москва, 2000, 81–95.
- Кошман 2010
Кошман И. М., “Украинский антропоним в русском тексте,” in: *Компаративні дослідження слов'янських мов і літератур*, 11, Київ, 2010, 100–104.
- Кужель 2008
Кужель Л., “Українські календарі (1914–1939) в Аргентині і Бразилії як джерело інформації про західноукраїнську книгу,” in: *Записки Львівської національної наукової бібліотеки України імені В. Стефаника*, 11, 2008, 73–95.
- Матвеев 2004
Матвеев А. К., “Апология имени,” *Вопросы ономастики*, 1, 2004, 7–13.
- Нарумов 2001a
Нарумов Б. П., “Испанский язык,” in: *Романские языки*, Москва, 2001, 411–462.
- 2001b
Нарумов Б. П., “Исторорумынский язык/диалект,” in: *Романские языки*, Москва, 2001, 656–671.
- Новоселова 2004
Новоселова А. А., *Украинцы в Среднем Прииртышье: идентификация и самоидентификация в конце XIX – XX вв. (по полевым этнографическим материалам)* (<http://ethnography.omsksreg.ru/>; последнее обращение: 01.08.2018).
- Олійник 2011
Олійник І. О., “Іспанізми в українській мові діаспори Аргентини (на матеріалі художніх творів),” в: *Науковий вісник Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство*, 5 (ч.1), 2011, 55–60.
- Пилипенко 2014
Пилипенко Г. П., “Второязычная речь закарпатских венгров: социолингвистический и структурный аспект,” in: *Українсько-угорські міжновні контакти: минуле і сучасність. Az ukrán-magyar nyelvi kapcsolatok múltja és jelene*, Ужгород, 2014, 246–265.
- 2016
Пилипенко Г. П., “Украинский остров в Боснии и Герцеговине: полевое исследование языка и культуры,” *Лицеум*, XXII, 17, 2016, 89–98.
- Ризванюк 2004
Ризванюк С. О., “Українська мова в Латинській Америці,” in: В. М. Русанівський, О. О. Тараненко, М. П. Зяблюк, ред., *Українська мова. Енциклопедія*, Київ, 2004, 728–729.
- Рылов 2010
Рылов Ю. А., “Системные и дискурсивные свойства испанских антропонимов,” in: Ю. А. Рылов, В. В. Корнева, Н. В. Шеминова, К. В. Лопатина, Е. В. Варнава, *Системные и дискурсивные свойства испанских антропонимов*, Воронеж, 2010, 5–104.
- Сапеляк 2008
Сапеляк О., *Українська спільнота в Аргентині: історико-етнологічний аспект*, Львів, 2008.
- 2011
Сапеляк О., *Парагвайці українського походження: церковно-громадське життя*, Львів, 2011.
- Сироткина 2008
Сироткина Т. А., “Этнонимы как речевые маркеры категории этничности (на материале этнонимии Пермского края),” *Вопросы ономастики*, 6, 2008, 37–46.
- Соболев 2013

- Соболев А.Н., “Общие наблюдения над лексикой и фразеологией,” in: А. А. Соболев, А. А. Новик, ред., *Голо Бордо (Gollobordë). Из материалов балканской экспедиции РАН и СПбГУ 2008–2010 гг.*, Санкт-Петербург, München, 2013, 60–70.
- Сушинська 2010
Сушинська І., “Українська мова у бразилійській діаспорі: стан і статус,” *Лінгвістичні студії*, 20, 2010, 250–253.
- Стрелко 1980
Стрелко А. А., *Славянское население в странах Латинской Америки*, Киев, 1980.
- Ціпко 2013
Ціпко С., “Історія досліджень про українців Аргентини,” *Мовознавство*, 1, 2013, 203–205.
- Шабельцаў 2009
Шабельцаў С., *Беларусы ў Аргенціне: грамадская дзейнасць і рээміграцыя ў СССР (1930–1960-я гг.)*. Зборнік дакументаў ўспамінаў, Мінск, 2009.
- Шабельцев 2011
Шабельцев С., *Иммигранты-чакаро из II Речи Посполитой в Аргентине и Парагвае. Воспоминания белорусов и украинцев*, Минск, 2011.
- Ярош 2012
Ярош О., “Вивчення рідної мови в умовах української діаспори в Аргентині,” in: *Українська мова у світі: збірник матеріалів Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (89 листопада 2012 року)*, Львів, 2012, 341–347.
- Auer 1999
Auer P., “From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech,” *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3, 4, December 1999, 309–332.
- Budzhak-Jones 1998
Budzhak-Jones S., “Developing diagnostics: Word-internal code-switching versus borrowing,” *Cahiers linguistiques d’Ottawa*, 26, 1998, 1–14.
- Casale O’Ryan 2014
Casale O’Ryan M., *The Making of Jorge Luis Borges as an Argentine Cultural Icon*, London, 2014.
- Chumak-Horbatsch, Garg 2006
Chumak-Horbatsch R., Garg S., “‘Mmmmm... I Like English!’ Linguistic Behaviors of Ukrainian-English Bilingual Children,” *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 10, 2, 2006, 3–25.
- Cipko, Lehr 2000
Cipko S., Lehr J. C., “Contested identities: Competing articulations of the national heritage of pioneer settlers in Misiones, Argentina,” in: *Prairie Perspectives: Geographical Essays*, 3, Winnipeg, 2000, 165–180.
- 2006
Cipko S., Lehr J. C., “Ukrainian settlement in Paraguay,” *Prairie Perspectives*, 9, 1, 2006, 31–46.
- Cipko 2012
Cipko S., “The Ukrainian Experience in Argentina, 1897–1950: An Historical Overview,” *Studia Migracyjne—Przegląd Polonijny*, 38, 4 (146), 2012, 103–116.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Ahmadvand 2015
Eslami-Rasekh A., Ahmadvand M., “Name-giving variations in Kurdistan Province of Iran: An ethnic identity marker categorized,” *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18, 2, 2015, 5–22.
- Filipow Kolada 2014
Filipow Kolada B., *Historia de la Iglesia ucraniana greco católica en el Paraguay*, Encarnación, 2014.
- Głuszkowski 2015
Głuszkowski M., “Uwagi teoretyczne na temat zmiany kodu w monologach starowierców

- mieszkających w Polsce," *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, 39, 2015, 159–173.
- González 2000
González H., *Historia crítica de la sociología argentina: los raros, los clásicos, los científicos, los discrepantes*, Buenos Aires, 2000.
- Gumperz 1982
Gumperz J. J., "Conversational Codeswitching," in: J. J. Gumperz, ed., *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, 1982, 55–99.
- Laihonen 2008
Laihonen P., "Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12, 5, 2008, 668–693.
- Le Page, Tabouret-Keller 1985
Le Page R. B., Tabouret-Keller A., *Acts of identity: creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*, Cambridge, 1985.
- Myers 2006
Myers G., "'Where are you from?': Identifying place," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10, 3, 2006, 320–343.
- Petrović 2009
Petrović T., *Srbi u Beloj Krajini. Jezička ideologija u procesu zamene jezika*, Beograd, 2009.
- Pilipenko 2014
Pilipenko G., "Russian language among Hungarians in Transcarpathian Region (Ukraine): Sociolinguistic Features," in: A. Biagini, G. Motta, ed., *Empires and Nations from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century*, 1, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014, 169–181.
- Pomirko 2010
Pomirko R., "Los ucranianos en Argentina: cooperación intercultural, humanitaria, económica y profesional," in: *Revista del CESLA*, 1, 13, 2010, 257–263.
- Prutsch, Stefanetti Kojrowicz 2003
Prutsch U., Stefanetti Kojrowicz C., "Apóstoles y Azara: dos colonias polaco-rutenas en Argentina vistas por las autoridades argentinas y austro-hungaras," in: J. Opatny, ed., *Emigración Centro-europea a América Latina*, Praga, 2003, 147–160.
- Snihur 1997
Snihur E. A., *De Ucrania a Misiones: una experiencia de transformación y crecimiento*, Apóstoles, 1997.
- Stemplowski 1985
Stemplowski R., "Los colonos eslavos del Nordeste Argentino (1897- 1938). Problemática, fuentes e investigaciones en Polonia," *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, 10, 1985, 169–183.
- Thomas 1982
Thomas A. R., "Change and decay in language," in: D. Crystal, ed., *Linguistic controversies: Essays in linguistic theory and practice in honour of F. R. Palmer*, London, 1982, 209–219.
- Vasylyk 2000
Vasylyk M., *Inmigración ucrania en la República Argentina: Una comunidad por dentro*, Buenos Aires, 2000.
- Wintoniuk 2014
Wintoniuk M., "Identidad, memoria, olvido y tensiones en las políticas lingüísticas (familiares) del ucraniano en Misiones," in: *Fronteras*, 3, 2014, 1–12.
- Zubrzycki, Maffia 2003
Zubrzycki B., Maffia M., "Polish Migratory Groups and their Descendants in the Province of Buenos Aires in Argentina," *Dve domovini Two Homelands*, 18, 2003, 159–173.

References

- Auer P., "From Codeswitching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech." *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3, 4, December 1999, 309–332.
- Bohdanova T. Ie., Pogromskiy V. O., "The Ukrainian Ethnic Community in Argentina in the End of XX – Early XXI Century," *Istorychnyi arkhiv*, 4, 2010, 82–86.
- Belova O. V., "Svoi-chuzhoi," in: *Slavianskie drevnosti*, 4, Moscow, 2009, 581–582.
- Budzhak-Jones S., "Developing Diagnostics: Word-internal Code-switching versus Borrowing," *Cahiers linguistiques d'Ottawa*, 26, 1998, 1–14.
- Casale O'Ryan M., *The Making of Jorge Luis Borges as an Argentine Cultural Icon*, London, 2014.
- Chumak-Horbatsch R., Garg S., "Mmmmm... I Like English! Linguistic Behaviors of Ukrainian-English Bilingual Children," *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 10, 2, 2006, 3–25.
- Cipko S., Lehr J. C., "Contested Identities: Competing Articulations of the National Heritage of Pioneer Settlers in Misiones, Argentina," *Prairie Perspectives: Geographical Essays*, 3, Winnipeg, 2000, 165–180.
- Cipko S., Lehr J. C., "Ukrainian Settlement in Paraguay," *Prairie Perspectives*, 9, 1, 2006, 31–46.
- Cipko S., "The Ukrainian Experience in Argentina, 1897–1950: An Historical Overview," *Studia Migracyjne – Przegląd Polonijny*, 38, 4 (146), 2012, 103–116.
- Cipko S., "The History of Researches about Ukrainians in Argentina," *Movoznavstvo*, 1, 2013, 203–205.
- Dzhon A. A., Khavaza F. N., "Change in Dungan (Huitzu) Anthroponymy, as a Marker of Identity," in: *Kitai: istoriia i sovremennost': materialy IX mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii. Ekaterinburg, 21–23 oktiabria 2015 g.*, Ekaterinburg, 2016, 63–70.
- Eslami-Rasekh, A., Ahmadvand M., "Name-giving Variations in Kurdistan Province of Iran: An Ethnic Identity Marker Categorized," *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18, 2, 2015, 5–22.
- Evtukh V. B., Kaminsky E. E., Kovalchuk E. A., Troshchinsky V. P., "Ukraintsy v dal'nem zarubezh'e," in: N. S. Polishchuk, A. P. Ponomarev, eds., *Ukraintsy*, Moscow, 2000, 81–95.
- Filipow Kolada B., *Historia de la Iglesia ucrañiana greco católica en el Paraguay*, Encarnación, 2014.
- Garagulia S. I., "On the Problem of Anthroponymic Identity (with Reference to English Given Names)," *Problems of Onomastics*, 2 (13), 2013, 43–52.
- Głuszkowski M., "Uwagi teoretyczne na temat zmiany kodu w monologach starowierców mieszkających w Polsce," *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, 39, 2015, 159–173.
- González H., *Historia crítica de la sociología argentina: los raros, los clásicos, los científicos, los discrepantes*, Buenos Aires, 2000.
- Gumperz J. J., "Conversational Codeswitching," in: J. J. Gumperz, ed., *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge, 1982, 55–99.
- Hrymych M., "Movna identychnist' ukrainsiv Brazylії: istoriia doslidzhen'," *Ukraїnoznavstvo*, 4, 2010, 62–63.
- Hrymych M., "Foundation of the Ukrainian Community in Argentina: Analysis of Publications," in: *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' Natsional'noho naukovo-doslidnoho instytutu ukrainoznavstva ta vsesvitn'oi istorii*, XXIX, Kyiv, 2012, 41–68.
- Hrytsenko P. Yu., "Naddnistrians'kyi hovir," in: V. M. Rusanivsky, O. O. Taranenko, M. P. Zyblyuk, eds., *Ukrains'ka mova. Entsyklopediia*, Kyiv, 2004, 387–388.
- Koshman I. M., "Ukrainskii antroponim v ruskom tekste," in: *Komparatyvni doslidzhennia slov'ians'kykh mov i literatur*, 11, Kyiv, 2010, 100–104.
- Kuzhel L., "Ukrainian Calendars (1914–1939) in Argentina and Brazil as Information Source about Western Ukrainian Book," *Zapysky L'vivs'koi natsional'noi naukovoї biblioteky Ukraїny imeni V. Stefanyaka*, 11, 2008, 73–95.
- Laihonen P., "Language Ideologies in Interviews: A Conversation Analysis Approach," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12, 5, 2008, 668–693.
- Le Page R. B., Tabouret-Keller A., *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*, Cambridge, 1985.
- Matveev A. K., "In Apology of Name," *Problems of Onomastics*, 1, 2004, 7–13.
- Myers G., "Where are You from?: Identifying Place," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10, 3, 2006, 320–343.
- Narumov B. P., "Ispanskii iazyk," in: *Romanskie iazyki*, Moscow, 2001, 411–462.
- Narumov B. P., "Istrorumynskii iazyk/dialekt," in: *Romanskie iazyki*, Moscow, 2001, 656–671.
- Novoselova A. A., *Ukraintsy v Srednem Priirytsh'e: identifikatsiia i samoidentifikatsiia v kontse XIX–XX vv. (po polevym etnograficheskim materialam)* (<http://ethnography.omskreg.ru/>; last access: 01.08.2018).
- Oliinyk I. O., "Hispanisms in the Language of Ukrainian Diaspora in Argentina (Based on the Literary Texts)," *Naukovyi visnyk Volyns'kogo natsional'noho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukraїny. Filolohichni nauky. Movoznavstvo (Scientific Bulletin of Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University. Philological Science. Linguistics)*, 5, 1, 2011, 55–60.
- Petrović T., *Srbi u Beloj Krajini. Jezicka ideologija u procesu zamene jezika*, Beograd, 2009.

Pilipenko G. P., "The L2 Use among Transcarpathian Hungarians: Sociolinguistic and Structural Analysis," in: *Ukrainian-Hungarian Contacts: Past and Present*, Uzhhorod, 2014, 246–265.

Pilipenko G., "Russian Language among Hungarians in Transcarpathian Region (Ukraine): Sociolinguistic Features," in: A. Biagini, G. Motta, eds., *Empires and Nations from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century*, 1, Cambridge, 2014, 169–181.

Pilipenko G. P., "The Ukrainian Enclave in Bosnia and Hercegovina: the Field Research on the Language and Culture," *Litseum*, XXII, 17, 2016, 89–98.

Pomirko R., "Los ucranianos en Argentina: cooperación intercultural, humanitaria, económica y profesional," *Revista del CESLA*, 1, 13, 2010, 257–263.

Prutsch U., Stefanetti Kojrowicz C., "Apóstoles y Azara: dos colonias polaco-rutenas en Argentina vistas por las autoridades argentinas y austro-hungaras," in: J. Opatny, ed., *Emigración Centro-europea a América Latina*, Praga, 2003, 147–160.

Rylov Yu. A., "Sistemnye i diskursivnye svoistva ispankikh antroponimov," in: Yu. A. Rylov, V. V. Korneva, N. V. Sheminova, K. V. Lopatina, E. V. Varnavskaia, *Sistemnye i diskursivnye svoistva ispankikh antroponimov*, Voronezh, 2010, 5–104.

Ryzvanyuk S. O., "Ukraïns'ka mova v Latyns'kii Ameryti," in: V. M. Rusanivsky, O. O. Taranenko, M. P. Zyblyuk, eds., *Ukraïns'ka mova. Entsyklopediia*, Kyiv, 2004, 728–729.

Sapelyak O., *Ukraïns'ka spil'nota v Arhentyini: istoriko-etnolohichni aspekt*, L'viv, 2008.

Sapelyak O., *Paragvaici ukraïns'koho pokhodzhennia: tserkovno-hromads'ke zhyttia*, L'viv, 2011.

Sirotkina T. A., "Ethnic Terms as Speech Markers of Ethnicity," *Problems of Onomastics*, 6, 2008, 37–36.

Shabel'tsaū S., *Belarusy ū Arhentsine: Hramadskaia dzeinas' i reemihraciia ū SSSR (1930–1960 hh.)*. *Zbornik dokumentaū wspamināū*, Minsk, 2009.

Shabel'tsev S., *Immigranty-chakarero iz II Rechi Pospolitoi v Argentine i Paragvae. Vospominaniia belorusov i ukraintsev*, Minsk, 2011.

Snihur E. A., *De Ucraina a Misiones: una experiencia de transformación y crecimiento*, Apóstoles, 1997.

Sobolev A. N., "Obshchie nabliudeniia nad leksikoi i frazeologiei," in: A. N. Sobolev, A. A. Novik, eds., *Golo Bordo (Gollobordē)*. *Iz materialov balkanskoj ekspeditsii RAN i SPbGU 2008–2010 gg.*, Sankt-Peterburg, München, 2013, 60–70.

Stemplowski R., "Los colonos eslavos del Nordeste Argentino (1897–1938). Problemática, fuentes e investigaciones en Polonia," *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, 10, 1985, 169–183.

Strelko A. A., *Slavianskoe naselenie v stranakh Latinskoj Ameriki*, Kiev, 1980.

Sushynska I., "Ukraïns'ka mova u brazylis'kii diaspori: stan i status," *Linhvistychni studii*, 20, 2010, 250–253.

Thomas A. R., "Change and Decay in Language," in: D. Crystal, ed., *Linguistic Controversies: Essays in Linguistic Theory and Practice in Honour of F. R. Palmer*, London, 1982, 209–219.

Valentsova M. M., "Kut'ia," in: *Slavianskie drevnosti*, 3, Moscow, 2004, 69–71.

Vasylyk M., *Immigración ucrania en la República Argentina: Una comunidad por dentro*, Buenos Aires, 2000.

Wintoniuk M., "Identidad, memoria, olvido y tensiones en las políticas lingüísticas (familiares) del ucraniano en Misiones," *Fronteras*, 3, 2014, 1–12.

Yarosh O., "Vychennia ridnoi movy v umovakh ukraïns'koï diaspori v Arhentyini," in: *Ukraïns'ka mova u sviti: zbirnyk materialiv Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii (8–9 lystopada 2012 roku)*, L'viv, 2012, 341–347.

Zubrzycki B., Maffia M., "Polish Migratory Groups and their Descendants in the Province of Buenos Aires in Argentina," *Dve domovini Two Homelands*, 18, 2003, 159–173.

Глеб Петрович Пилипенко, к. филол. наук

Институт славяноведения РАН,

старший научный сотрудник Отдела славянского языкознания

119991 Москва, Ленинский проспект, д. 32-А

Россия/Russia

glebpilipenko@mail.ru

Received February 23, 2017