

How to Cite:

Semashko, T., Kravets, L., & Bondarenko, A. (2021). The "friend-foe" opposition in Ukrainian linguoculture. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 399-408.

<https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS4.1561>

The "Friend-Foe" Opposition in Ukrainian Linguoculture

Tetiana Semashko

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

Larysa Kravets

Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education, Berehove, Ukraine

Alla Bondarenko

Nizhyn Mykola Gogol State University, Nizhyn, Ukraine

Abstract--The friend – foe dichotomy, as a special way of categorising reality, is at the heart of ethnic self-consciousness, building the world around a person. The interpretation "friend" and "foe" is invariably axiological. "Friend" refers to a personal possessor, a socio-cultural group that is identified based on various types of similarity, where "correct", "native", "close", "safe" is perceived as positive. The conceptual model "foe" is the opposition: everything "other", "strange", "unusual", "wrong" is perceived negative. The axiologiness of this opposition is relative and depends on the ethical attitudes of an ethnic group based on the conceptualisation of the friend – foe dichotomy from the standpoint of the binary opposition I – Other; the factors, mechanisms, and results of interaction between the components of the opposition are clarified; the content transformations of the friend – foe dichotomy are traced; the identification function of the latter is updated in the context of modernity. For Ukraine, where the identity development has happened to be incredibly complicated by the incongruity of value, foreign, and political orientations, the issue of borderline, "border strategies", the presence of the "friend" / "foe" dichotomy in the socio-cultural space is extremely relevant.

Keywords---ethnic consciousness, ethnic culture, identification code, national worldview.

Introduction

Global modelling of the universe organises, defines, and describes special categories of human thinking, universal classifiers – a series of oppositions based on the essence of things themselves and the universal tendency to think in opposites. The world is described using various oppositions: binary (*day – night, light – dark*), ternary (*sky – earth – hell*), quaternary (*north – west – south – east; summer – winter – spring – autumn*), and even more complex structures, but they are all based on binary oppositions. Binary oppositions (binary – "consists of two parts, elements; double) are a universal way of world cognition (Yaremenko & Slipushko, 2005), with the help of which people attempt to organise the world around them and ideas about it.

One of the most considerable binary oppositions in popular culture is the *friend – foe* dichotomy. Designated opposition, as a special way of categorising reality, belongs to a number of universal and all-encompassing (at the same time ambiguous), is timeless, since, as a permanent principle of culture, it exists at the heart of ethnic self-consciousness, shapes a collective, mass, popular worldview (Stepanov, 1997), finds expression in all spheres of human activity, building the world around a person. The anthropocentricity of human cognitive interaction with the surrounding world has oriented researchers' eyes at the *friend – foe* opposition as one of the fundamental basic oppositions inherent in the mental space of all ethnic communities at all levels of their development (McCarty et al., 2017). Aggravation of the person's self-determination issue; the designation of the boundaries of "friend", which occurs through the awareness of the boundaries of "foe", and vice versa, observed in modern society, actualised the identification function of the opposition *friend – foe* in the context of modernity and allowed establishing the issue: understanding the essence of the phenomenon in the linguoculturological dimension (Suleymanli, 2021).

The purpose of the study is to cover the features of expressing the opposition *friend – foe* in Ukrainian linguoculture. The methodology of the proposed research is based on the main provisions of anthropocentrism and linguoculturology, which assert the need to study language and culture through the prism of the human factor within world cognition, where man appears as the centre of constructing the universe. The conceptual methodological core of the research is the cultural-semiotic method (Onyshchenko et al., 2021). Other methods were also involved: generalisation, analysis, and synthesis, synchrony, the principles of a systematic approach.

Materials and Methods

The theory of binary oppositions ("binarity", "binarism", "bipolarity", "binary code", "dichotomous division") is not new and has long attracted the attention of researchers of various fields of knowledge: history, anthropology, philology, political science, theology, sociology, cultural studies, etc. (Gumilov, 1989; Selivanova, 2012; Stepanov, 2001). The researchers study the essential features of the dichotomy, the set, essence, and types of opposites as a manifestation of paradigmatic relations and a way of structuring and categorising the surrounding world.

As a result of scientific reflections, a wide range of binary oppositions shaped in the mythological consciousness is indicated: *life – death, happiness – misfortune, right – left, good – bad, near – far, past – future, here – there* (Rudnev, 1999). The latter is supplemented with key oppositions of archaic Slavic culture related to the structure of space: *top – bottom, sky – earth, earth – dungeon, east – west; with time coordinates: day – night, summer – winter, light – dark; with colour characteristics: white – black, red – black, light – dark; with nature: water – fire, dry – wet, house – forest, sea – land, sun – moon, and socio-cultural categories: male – female, senior – junior, internal – external, friend – foe, etc* (Ivanov, 1965). This also includes a more general opposition that determines the mode of the entire set within the model of the world: *sacred – profane*. All left and all right members of the opposition are certain unities, the relations between which can be described using more general oppositions that are not localised in the spatial, temporal, natural, or social aspects (Tokarev, 1998).

The vast majority of these cultural dichotomies are a peculiar way of categorising certain aspects of the world model, mostly universal, related to the global modelling of the universe. According to Gurevich (1972), such oppositions are the defining categories of human consciousness; as universal concepts, they are connected with each other and shape a certain model of the world, with the help of which people perceive the surrounding reality. To recreate the cosmologised universe, a system of binary value-based oppositions has been developed (Suwija et al., 2019). In each specific situation, one of the opposition members is the bearer of a positive meaning (the left part of the opposition), the other – a negative one (the right part of the opposition). However, such meanings depend on the "context" or pragmatic attitudes and can change to the opposite: "the sacred and gratifying in some conditions becomes dangerous and insidious in others" (Tolstaya, 2004).

Results and Discussion

The *friend – foe* dichotomy is one of the most notable semantic binary oppositions, which can be defined as a certain reality that determines the ethnocultural conditionality of consciousness, in which natural conditions, forms of economic activity of an ethnic group, and types of social relations establish their own way of seeing and categorising the world (Gaston-Johansson et al., 1990). Manifestations of the *friend – foe* opposition, in reality, characterise it as a semiotic structure, the consequences of which are destructive, creative, and subordinate to the standards, such manifestations of opposition are notable in the culture of any nation. As Stepanov (2001), notes, the corresponding dichotomy is inherent in the mental space of all ethnic communities at all levels of their development, and, as a permanent principle of culture, exists at the heart of ethnic self-consciousness, shapes a collective, mass, popular worldview, manifests itself in all spheres of human activity, building the world around a person (Chand, 2012; De Maesschalck et al., 2011). Modern research identifies two main ways of reality cognition – based on emotional and sensory perception of the world, and cognition based on knowledge and logic. These ways of cognition also establish different worldviews in the human mind – mythological and scientific, respectively, the outlined dichotomy has both sacred and profane meaning (Poulin & Silver, 2019).

The profane content of the analysed opposition, based on the polarity of the components "friend" and "foe", is revealed at the semantic level. Thus, according to lexicographic data, the information content of "friend" has numerous meanings, including: "the one that belongs to itself; not someone else's, native, domestic" and the opposite for the "foe": "not one's own; strange; foreign; having other views", which makes relations between objects possessive, based on the specific features of social values and standards (Bilodid, 1980). The above is confirmed by Selivanova (2005), who notes: "in the consciousness of a person, the opposition "friend" and "foe" is primarily associated with possessiveness, which has a wide range of objects of belonging. ...Depending on the type of possessor in the ethnic consciousness, a stereotypical opposition "friend" and "foe" is established through the specific features of the hierarchy of collective values and views, ethical standards and attitudes" (Fudge, 1996; Daley, 2006). Therewith, the researcher identifies a number of possessors, through which the opposition of "friend" to "foe" is realised: "I, as an individual, a combination of physical and spiritual, personal sphere and environment"; a representative of a certain socio-cultural group to which I belong, that is, "such as me, similar to me socially, spiritually, communicatively suitable"; belonging "to the same genus, family, when close relatives are recognised as one's own"; "family relationships on property possession"; "territorial type of possessive relations" (Selivanova, 2012).

The idea "friend" and "foe", developed in the archaic consciousness, is based on noticing and memorising objective opposites and the eternal conflict of reality. As a result, the consciousness of ancient man built a system of the internal organisation of the surrounding world – an ordered network of dualistic representations, which in the process of human awareness of their individuality, caused the division of reality into two spaces – "friend", in which everything was familiar and understandable, and "foe", which was unknown and posed a threat. In the context of the proposed study, it is important to consider the ethnocentric worldview of ancient Ukrainians, for whom the identification of one's geographical space was the basis for the 'friend – foe' opposition (Singh et al., 2016;). The validity of this statement is proved by the fact that the word Ukrainians itself, as the ancient name of the inhabitants of the Dnieper region, which played an integral role in the development of the Ukrainian people and their language, has 'friend' seme in its meaning, which follows from the interpretation of the lexeme *Ukraine*. Thus, H. Pivtorak, referring to V. Skliarenko, connects the name *Ukraine* with the word *krai* (*land*), which convincingly substantiates the name development. According to comparative historical studies, the noun *land* (**krajъ*), which in the proto-Slavic language meant 'plot', 'piece of land', acquired a new meaning – 'territory belonging to the tribe'. "Each tribe has its own land (Xian et al., 2019; Suardiana, 2016). In each specific case, this territory had a clearly defined beginning and end (distant outskirts), so the noun **krajina* – 'territory belonging to the tribe', was originated in the proto-Slavic period from **krajъ* using the suffix *-ina* (Pivtorak, 1993). There is a similar interpretation of the word *kraianyn* (*landsmen*) – "a resident of a certain land (country) in relation to another resident of the same land (country); a compatriot, a fellow countryman" (Bilodid, 1980) – that is, "friend". This ideological opposition is realised in hierarchical relations in a different order since the *friend – foe* dichotomy is an ethnocultural phenomenon that is reflected and embodied in various cultural phenomena (Badaruddin, 2016).

The centre of research (primarily cultural) was to study the connection of the opposition *friend – foe* with the processes of cognition, to analyse the role of the opposition in the establishment and development of society and culture, where the relations between "friend" and "foe" are recognised by the ability of a person to consider oneself as an object of cognition, by self-identification and differentiation (Ghiasi & Safabakhsh, 2013). Within the framework of the corresponding approach, "friend" and "foe" are reduced to contrasting different ethnic communities. Gumilov (1989), considers an ethnic group as a group of people who "oppose themselves to all other similar groups, based on a sense of complementarity – a subconscious sense of mutual sympathy or antipathy to the community of people, which determines the opposition *we – they* and makes it possible to divide "friends" and "foes". Therefore, it is rational to conclude that one of the key stages of a person's cognition of the surrounding world and one is the separation of oneself/one's own from someone else's.

Belonging to the categories of consciousness that ensure the orientation of a person in the surrounding space and affect the processes of cognition, binary opposition *friend – foe* can occur at different levels: at interpersonal/intergroup/interethnic levels there is an awareness of oneself as a cognition object and the ability to self-identify; moreover, there is an awareness of oneself as a member of a group (*I/we – friend*); subsequently – others, not like me (*you/they – foe*), which allows discovering the role of opposition in the inner world of the individual and in external communication. The need to separate such areas of study of the *friend – foe* dichotomy is determined by considerable differences in the features of the course of these two types of communication (Vygotsky, 1996).

The unity of the subject-object characteristics of people and their activities necessitates a double form of their description: external and internal (Kon, 1984). External communication is the relationship between the self and the environment; internal communication implies the relationship within the self. The importance of the *friend – foe* dichotomy for the inner world of an individual (interpersonal level) is determined by its role in the self-identification of a person, which is a means of uniting with some and distancing from others. Features of the opposition development in terms of attitudes within the self are based on achievements in the fields of psychology aimed at studying the splitting of personality and self-concept – a dynamic system of one's ideas about oneself, which accommodates the awareness of one's physical, intellectual, and other properties; self-esteem; subjective perception of the factors that affect an individual. The diversity of personality makes the self-concept heterogeneous and multicomponent, according to which at least two subjects are defined in the structure of the self: the self in the eyes of the individual, and the hypothetical self in the eyes of another (Petrovsky, 1996). Despite this splitting of the Self, it retains its self-identity; self-rejection from oneself is one of the modes of self-identification (Levinas, 2000). The splitting of the Self presupposes a person's ability to discover oneself since an individual can do it through relations with others (Selivanova, 2005). The key to discovering one's own inner world is the need to know another by contrasting the Self with something or someone and acquiring meaning in this context.

It is important that *I* also acts as part of the image of *We* (intergroup level). Since the *friend – foe* dichotomy is considered primarily from the standpoint of human communication, the strangers or others are an integral feature of intergroup communication (Selivanova, 2005). Whereas, *I/We* are generalised in the friend component, acting as its concretiser, and delineated as transitive units of the foe value. Accordingly, the *friend – foe* opposition is actualised when people are aware of their own or interpersonal claims, possessions, desires or claims, possessions, desires of a representative of another society (interethnic level). Therewith, there is a substantial difference between the relations of people within a group and the relations between groups: the relations in the *We*-group are based on the principle of consent, and the relations between groups determine ethnocentric views on the world. People perceive the life of another based on the idea of their own world and life taking into account the differences in lifestyle, culture, and so on. The other acts as a necessary condition for the semiotisation of the individual and the regulator that organises one's experience and behaviour. As Arutyunova (1999), notes, "...by discovering ourselves, we comprehend our image in our consciousness. The "other" uncovers me to me. My identity gets additional parameters. Apparently, the "other" acts as an intermediary in my relationship with myself, an observer of my thoughts and feelings". This opinion is supplemented by Benveniste (1995), who claims that "self-awareness is possible solely through opposition".

Although the components of the *friend – foe* dichotomy are extreme opposites of the same scale, a detailed examination reveals their indissoluble connection and mutual dependence. The division by "friend" and "foe" is possible only if they are considered in parallel since the boundaries of one are determined by the boundaries of the other. These boundaries are not constant: depending on the circumstances, an object can become either "friend" or "foe". Conceptual is the idea that "only the balance of the Self and the Other, a kind of symbiosis of "friend" and "foe" can offer new opportunities for maintaining the value of the Self and ensure one's further existence next to the Other through a possible dialogue between them (Selivanova, 2012). The above makes it possible to perceive the components of the *friend – foe* dichotomy as two poles, between which there is an inseparable connection and interdependence. Nevertheless, it is worth noting the axiological area of the friend – foe dichotomy: the positive image of the *We*-group is created in contrast to the negative image of the *They*-group, which is reflected primarily in the evaluative element directly related to the standards when everything "own", "familiar" is perceived as 'correct' – true, real, positive, and everything "unfamiliar" as 'wrong' –false, untrue, negative. And if they are reserved and unsociable, then we are most likely emotional and open; if they are avaricious and selfish, then we are probably generous and selfless. The "foe" is considered bad not due to it being worse than "friend", but because it is "someone else's" which is inherently negative.

The studies confirm the ambivalence of the "foe" image: on the one hand, everything "foe" is sinful, and a representative of the other group is perceived as a dangerous and otherworldly being; on the other hand, "foes", precisely because of their connection with the "other" world, are endowed with supernatural properties that can be useful (Belova, 2005). However, "foes" can be a source of not only hostility but also fascination, not only the cause of conflicts (both in the family,

state, and culture) but also the prospect of enriching other experiences; they can be presented as a subject in need of protection (Yavorska, 2005). Hence, the expansion of the spectrum of axiological characteristics: "foes" can be both positive and negative, but, in any case, they must be different. The semantic content, which is the conceptual minimum of the *friend – foe* opposition, in Ukrainian culture clearly defines the understanding of "one's own" as native, close, safe, and "someone else's" as another, strange, unusual, dangerous, and hostile (Semashko, 2015). In the author's opinion, this is primarily conditioned by the type of Ukrainian society (according to Donchenko (2001), Ukraine belongs to the "introverted, rational, emotional, sensory, infernal, executive societies"), where the prevailing sign is the introversion of Ukrainian society, which is characterised by secrecy, focus on internal trends and traditions, needs and interests, opportunities and goals. As is commonly known, a person who lives in a society has a certain portrait and learns a lot from it, in particular, people in introverted societies are prone to self-development rather than developing relationships with other societies. "I'm my own master" is the life credo of a Ukrainian who dreams of having a personal piece of land, a house, or a business. The individualism of Ukrainians is not just socio-psychological, but also bioorganic. This individualism: 1) is not active, but sensualistic-contemplative, introverted; individualism of self-isolation and alienation; 2) it lacks an intentional component. It is the individualism of escape, elementary biological survival; 3) through its biological orientation, it is the antithesis of publicity, the sphere of common affairs (Donchenko, 2001).

Constant stress genesis due to invasions of aggressors of different origins and their attempts to acculturate Ukrainians; constant migrations caused a complex of inferiority and feelings of redundancy, alienated isolation, marginal (fear of certainty) existence ultimately led to the struggle for ambitious Self and neglect of common interests, lack of We-feeling. The Ukrainian thinks in a category I – not me rather than I – you, I – we, or I – nature. The external world, which does not concern one's immediate needs and interests, is non-existent, everything familiar is good, and unfamiliar, unusual is evil, any "other", "strange" is no longer perceived as equal: "strangers, others can be benefited from indefinitely, exploited, manipulated, and the attitude towards them will obviously no longer be social, but purely animal, biological" (Donchenko, 2001). Moreover, introversion is transformed into social blindness, as a result of which a "psychological closure" is developed with a hostile division into "friends" and "foes".

Conclusion

The dichotomy *friend – foe* belongs to a number of universal and all-encompassing; it exists at the intersection of discursive-every day and mythological; it is considered profane and sacred through multi-level human connections: linguistic (*native/foreign language, dialect*), family (*one's own/someone else's family*), ethnic (*one's own/someone else's nationality*), confessional (*one's own/someone else's faith*), social (*one's own/someone else's society*), it is a cognitive structure that models ideas about the universe. Profane understanding of the opposition *friend – foe* is designed to define its essential features, where it, firstly, acts as a means of reflecting reality, with which other phenomena are covered and described; secondly, the corresponding opposition is

considered as an independent unit – an object of description, the components of which are perceived as statically polar marked entities, based on the possessiveness of relations between which there is an indissoluble connection and mutual dependence, those components are axiological: positive for the component *friend* and ambivalent for *foe*, and it contributes to the "step-by-step" development and consolidation of a generalised image of *Other* through the prism of its one's system of values and cultural filters, it is embodied in cultural products. The integration, globalisation, multiculturalism, and pluralism observed in the modern mass culture condition the existence of opposition *friend* – *foe* as an identifier of ethnic consciousness and specific features of the national perception of the world.

References

- Arutyunova, N. D. (1999). *Language and the world of man*. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture.
- Badaruddin, M. S. (2016). The meaning of tulembang and tupakbiring mantras in the life of makassar ethnic. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 2(2), 1-15.
- Belova, O. V. (2005). *Ethnocultural stereotypes in the Slavic folk tradition*. Moscow: Indrik.
- Benveniste, E. (1995). *Dictionary of Indo-European social terms*. Moscow: Progress-Univers.
- Bilodid, I. K. (1980). *Dictionary of the Ukrainian language: In 11 volumes*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka.
- Chand, P. (2012). The effects of ethnic culture and organizational culture on judgments of accountants. *Advances in Accounting*, 28(2), 298-306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adiac.2012.09.007>
- Daley, P. (2006). Ethnicity and political violence in Africa: The challenge to the Burundi state. *Political Geography*, 25(6), 657-679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.05.007>
- De Maesschalck, S., Deveugele, M., & Willems, S. (2011). Language, culture and emotions: exploring ethnic minority patients' emotional expressions in primary healthcare consultations. *Patient education and counseling*, 84(3), 406-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2011.04.021>
- Donchenko, O. (2001). *Archetypes of social life and politics (deep regulations of psychopolitical everyday life)*. Kyiv: Lybid.
- Fudge, R. C. (1996). The use of behavior therapy in the development of ethnic consciousness: A treatment model. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 3(2), 317-335. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229\(96\)80021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229(96)80021-6)
- Gaston-Johansson, F., Albert, M., Fagan, E., & Zimmerman, L. (1990). Similarities in pain descriptions of four different ethnic-culture groups. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 5(2), 94-100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3924\(05\)80022-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3924(05)80022-3)
- Ghiasi, G., & Safabakhsh, R. (2013). Offline text-independent writer identification using codebook and efficient code extraction methods. *Image and Vision Computing*, 31(5), 379-391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imavis.2013.03.002>
- Gumilov, L. N. (1989). *Ethnogenesis and biosphere of the earth*. Moscow: Iris Press.
- Gurevich, A. Ya. (1972). *Categories of medieval culture*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.

- Ivanov, V. V. (1965). *Slavic language modeling semiotic systems (Ancient period)*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kon, I. S. (1984). *In search of oneself: personality and its self-consciousness*. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Levinas, E. (2000). *Favorites. Totality and infinite*. SPb: University book.
- McCarty, J. L., Neigh, C. S. R., Carroll, M. L., & Wooten, M. R. (2017). Extracting smallholder cropped area in Tigray, Ethiopia with wall-to-wall sub-meter WorldView and moderate resolution Landsat 8 imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 202, 142-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.040>
- Onyshchenko, K. M., Hiha, S. P., Hlukhanych, O. M., Zelinka, V. S., & Vihula, V. I. (2021). Interaction of national cultures in the development of musical life of Transcarpathia in the second half of the 20th century. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 722-732.
- Petrovsky, V. A. (1996). *Personality in psychology: The paradigm of subjectivity*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix
- Pivtorak, G. P. (1993). *Ukrainians: Where we and our language*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka.
- Poulin, M. J., & Silver, R. C. (2019). When are assumptions shaken? A prospective, longitudinal investigation of negative life events and worldviews in a national sample. *Journal of research in personality*, 83, 103866. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2019.103866>
- Rudnev, V. P. (1999). Psychotic discourse. *Logos*, 3(13), 113-132.
- Selivanova, O. O. (2005). Opposition is alien in ethnic consciousness. *Linguistics*, 1, 26-34.
- Selivanova, O. O. (2012). *The world of consciousness in language*. Cherkasy: Yu. Chabanenko.
- Semashko, T. F. (2015). Interdependence of "own" and "foreign" within ethnocultural stereotypes. *Scientific Notes of Kirovograd State Pedagogical University. Series: Philological Sciences (Linguistics)*, 137, 527-532.
- Singh, A., Dutta, M. K., & Sharma, D. K. (2016). Unique identification code for medical fundus images using blood vessel pattern for tele-ophthalmology applications. *computer methods and programs in biomedicine*, 135, 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2016.07.011>
- Stepanov, Yu. S. (1997). *Constants. Dictionary of Russian culture*. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture
- Stepanov, Yu. S. (2001). *Semiotics. Anthology*. Moscow: Academic Project.
- Suardiana, I. W. (2016). The language power, acculturation model towards urban society of transmigration region: wayang ménak sasak art studies in lombok. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 2(3), 77-86.
- Suleymanli, M. (2021). Modernization and culture in Azerbaijan: second half of the XIX century: beginning of the XX century. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 125-138.
- Suwija, N., Suarta, M., Suparsa, N., Alit Geria, A.A.G., Suryasa, W. (2019). Balinese speech system towards speaker social behavior. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(5), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.754>
- Tokarev, S. A. (1998). *Myths of the peoples of the world. Encyclopedia*. Moscow: Scientific publishing house "Great Russian Encyclopedia".
- Tolstaya, S. M. (2004). *Semantic oppositions. Slavic antiquities: ethnolinguistic dictionary in 5 volumes*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie Otnosheniya.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1996). *Thinking and speech. Psychological research*. Moscow: Labyrinth.
- Xian, G., Shi, H., Dewitz, J., & Wu, Z. (2019). Performances of WorldView 3, Sentinel 2, and Landsat 8 data in mapping impervious surface. *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment*, 15, 100246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsase.2019.100246>
- Yaremenko, V., & Slipushko, O. (2005). *New dictionary of the ukrainian language*. Kyiv: Aconite.
- Yavorska, G. M. (2005). The Muslim East in Ukrainian discursive practices: The dynamics of doxy. *Visnyk of Kyiv National Linguistic University. Philology Series*, 8(1), 127–140.