COGNITIVE STUDIES | ÉTUDES COGNITIVES, 22
Warsaw 2022

Article No.: 2656
DOI: 10.11649/cs.2656

Citation: Matsyuk, H. (2022). Geopolitical influences and language contacts of the Ukrainian speech community of the Chelm and Podlachia regions in the Kingdom of Poland (1815–1912). *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, *2022*(22), Article 2656. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2656

Halyna Matsyuk

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine
halyna.matsyuk@lnu.edu.ua

Geopolitical Influences and Language Contacts of the Ukrainian Speech Community of the Chelm and Podlachia Regions in the Kingdom of Poland (1815–1912)

Abstract

This paper explores language contacts, unrecorded in Ukrainian-language texts, which occurred during a period of history when Ukrainian was a minority language. In order to reconstruct language contacts, I applied the theoretical framework of the social history of language. The database was constructed using metalinguistic evidence from secondary sources. The characterization of the macro-level of language contacts from the standpoint of the sociology of language was provided through the inductive method and the method of metalinguistic evidence interpretation. The findings of the article on the variable transition of native speakers from Ukrainian as a colloquial code to oral and written forms of Polish, Russian and (occasionally) to the written form of Ukrainian are relevant for studying language contacts in subsequent periods of the social history of Ukrainian, using the linguistic evidence available from the Ukrainian-language sources.
Keywords: Chełm and Podlachia; Ukrainian minority language; sociology of language; language contacts; status and functions of languages

1 Introduction and Background

In Slavic studies, the social history of Ukrainian as a minority language of the autochthonous population in the Chełm and Podlachia regions is a new object of analysis. Its broad-based assessment is complicated by the fact that Ukrainian functioned in different state and political entities over different periods of Ukrainian history. After the three partitions of Poland in the late eighteenth century, these lands were part of the Kingdom of Poland (1815–1912) and Chełm province (1912–1914), subordinate to the Russian Empire; under the German and Austrian military administrations in the First World War (1914–1918); the Second Polish Republic in the interwar period (1918–1939); the General Province during the German occupation (1939–1944) and post-war Poland, from which the native speakers were deported in 1944–1947 in accordance with an agreement signed in 1944 between the Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic. Thus, a researcher of Ukrainian as a minority language in the Chełm and Podlachia regions addresses the issue of "the language of the ethnic community with social history interrupted under geopolitical influence".

After the partitions Polish state, in which Polish language performed official functions, the Ukrainian speech community in the Chełm and Podlachia regions lived in the Kingdom of Poland, which was subordinate to the Russian Empire from 1815 to 1912. During this period, the Russian administration introduced the social functions of the Russian language. To date, historians, theologians and linguists have extensively discussed political–economic, religious and partly linguistic–cultural issues (mainly in the field of dialectology) related to macro- and micro-histories of

the lives of Ukrainian speakers in the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional society of regions within the Kingdom of Poland. Based on archival documents, both published and unpublished, researchers have analysed a wide range of problems. They have focused on national and demographic indicators, the living conditions of the Ukrainian population and the actions of the authorities regarding them (Korduba, 1917; Lewandowski, 1996; Makar, 2006; Makar et al., 2014, 2015), the religious life of Ukrainians, and the reasons for and consequences of their transition from Greek Catholicism to Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism (Fedoriv, 1990; Fedoryk, 2013; Gątarczyk, 2008; Kołbuk, 1988; Korobowicz, 1966; Matsyuk, 2021; Vlasovs′kyĭ, 1977). School education, the publication of contemporary periodicals, and signs of the dialect speech of community members have also been highlighted (Froliak, 2015; Havryliuk, 1994; Kravchuk, 1976; Lesiv, 1997, etc.). However, the history of Ukrainian as a minority language is still unexplored from a sociolinguistic perspective. Issues such as language contacts and conflicts, the socio–historical context of language, its changes, standardization, multilingualism, language ideologies, etc., all need to be critically analysed.

This article is devoted to the study of language contacts as a fragment of the social history of the Ukrainian language. It takes into account the fact that during the period under study, Ukrainian speakers were not educated in their native language and did not use it in official spheres. This circumstance affects the delineation of the main objectives of the study. They cannot relate to the analysis of language contacts from the perspective of variational sociolinguistics due to the lack of primary texts, in particular, those Ukrainian-language sources or records of oral speech of residents that would enable the tracking language changes at the lexical or grammatical levels of Ukrainian under the influence of other languages. As only secondary sources are available, the task of the article is (1) to show the composition of contact languages based on the analysis of their status and functions and (2) to identify the models of language contacts in the official communication of speech community members.

To address these issues, I have critically examined secondary sources thematically related to the Chełm and Podlachia regions, namely memoirs, travel notes, scientific texts and reports of participants in the events of 1815–1912. I then formed a database of metalinguistic evidence based on these texts. Each of them is a medium of historical, social and biographical information about language contacts in a period of the social history of Ukrainian, which was not recorded in the primary Ukrainian-language texts. (This idea will be discussed more extensively in Section 3).

I would like to underline why the reconstruction of language contacts of the Ukrainian speech community in 1815–1912 is relevant from a sociolinguistic perspective. First of all, the issue presented in the article and the sources used for analysis have been researched for the first time and thus make it possible to approach language use in the Ukrainian community in a remote period, which undeniably has a certain heuristic value. In addition, the results of the reconstruction of language contacts in 1815–1912 will serve as a prerequisite for their further study in subsequent periods of the social history of Ukrainian as a minority language, determined by other geopolitical influences.

To address the issue in a systematic manner, it is essential to know the historical and demographic characteristics of Ukrainian speakers. These indicators shed light on the quantitative manifestations of the processes that caused the language contacts of the Ukrainian community. Hence, the information from secondary sources (see Section 4) can be summarized and viewed as a typical reflection of language contacts in 1815–1912.

2 A Brief Overview of the Ukrainian Speech Community

The autochthonous representatives of the Ukrainian speech community in the Chełm and Podlachia regions were speakers of the Kholm–Volyn and Pidlashchia Ukrainian dialects in a Polish-speaking environment. Being Greek Catholics by religion, they belonged to 538 parishes, which became part of the Diocese of Chełm in 1810. Following the decision of the Synod of Zamość in

1720, services in its churches were held in Church Slavonic with Ukrainian pronunciation, while sermons were delivered in Ukrainian. However, about 100 years after the Council, the Greek Catholic Church began to be Latinized under the influence of the more powerful Roman Catholic Church, related with the majority of the population. This process influenced the expansion of the functions of the Polish language in the Ukrainian community. Interestingly, the Latinization and the spread of the functions of the Polish language coincided with geopolitical changes: after the three partitions of Poland in the late eighteenth century, the ethnically and religiously mixed lands of Chełm and Podlachia, inhabited by Ukrainian Greek Catholics, were subordinated to the Russian-ruled Kingdom of Poland from 1815 (Fedoriv, 1990, p. 51; Gątarczyk, 2008, p. 30; Lesiv, 1997, p. 7; Mytsyk, 2005).

For a long time, the Ukrainian speech community has been "invisible" in Russian public discourse. Terms for its designation appeared quite late, around 1865: *Rusyn, Kholmskie Malorossy, Kholmskiy Ukrainets, Polsko-Russkiy Khlop, Russkoye naseleniye* (Filevich, 1911, pp. xv–xx). Even later, the official term *Russkiy* began to acquire a Ukrainian meaning. For example, in the early nineteenth century for part of the population, which consisted of Kholmshchyna and Pidlashchia residents, there appeared the word *Malorusskiy*, which denoted *stepniaks* (who lived in the southern part of the territory) and *polishchuks* (in the north) (Sobolevskiĭ, 1910, p. 12).

In 1875, these Ukrainian Greek Catholics, or Uniates as they were then known, became the subject of a religious experiment. The tsarist administration decreed their obligatory conversion to Orthodoxy in order to prevent the Polonization of Greek Catholics, seen as part of the "Russian population". According to one source, in 1875, at the time of the abolition of the Union, there were 309,146 Ukrainian believers in the former Chełm diocese ("Interpeliatsiia", 1986, p. 710). According to another, there were more than 246,000 (Sobolevskiĭ, 1910, p. 3). The transition to the Russian Orthodox Church led to the introduction of the functions of the Russian language in both the church and school spheres of life. However, even up to the beginning of the twentieth century some residents remained "persistent" or "resistant", i.e. those Greek Catholics who boycotted Orthodoxy and remained Uniates at heart, as mentioned by the Bishop of Chełm Evlogiy (Georgiyevskiy) (Evlogiĭ, 1947, p. 9). They took advantage of the royal decree "On strengthening the foundations of religious tolerance" of 1905, which did not allow them to return to the Greek Catholic Church, but did permit them to convert to the Roman Catholic Church. Thus, the representatives of the Ukrainian community "resistant" to Russian Orthodoxy became Roman Catholics in 1905–1909. Their number varies, according to different authors, from about 170,000 to 200,000 (Kolianchuk, 2014, p. 442; Korduba, 1917, pp. 21–22) or from 100,000 to 118,000 ("Dopovidna zapyska", 2015, p. 691; Evlogiĭ, 1947, p. 89). It is clear that the transition to the Roman Catholic Church expanded the functions of the Polish language among the Ukrainian community, not only in church and school (religious lessons), but also at the level of interpersonal communication: the older generation still preserved the Ukrainian language, but their children communicated in Polish.

In general, the society in which the Ukrainian population of Chełm and Podlachia lived was multilingual, although there is no consensus on the share of native speakers of Ukrainian and other languages. According to modern research, in 1909 there were 493,134 Poles (46.7%), 359,490 Ukrainians (33.7%), 144,839 Jews (13.6%), 38,422 Germans (3,5%) and 26,319 Russians (2.5%) living in Chełm and Podlachia (Makar, 2013). However, in 1910 Alexei Sobolevskiy wrote that the total population was 450,000, including 300,000 Orthodox, 150,000 Catholics, 150,000 Poles, and 70,000 Jews (Sobolevskiĭ, 1910, p. 3). In 1915, Ivan Krypyakevych argued that the newly formed Chełm Province, based on the Chełm and Podlachia regions, had 327,322 Orthodox, representing 36.5% of the total population, and 404,633 Catholics in 1914 (Kryp'iakevych, 1915, p. 22). In some areas, representatives of the Polish and Jewish language communities knew the Ukrainian language (Voĭtolovskiĭ, 1928, p. 37).

3 Methodology and Data

In developing the methodology of researching language contacts as a problem of the social history of Ukrainian as a minority language, I assume that the reconstruction of the macro-level of language contacts is consistent with the possibilities of sociolinguistic analysis of historical data from the sociology of language, interactive sociolinguistics and variational sociolinguistics (see Nevalainen, 2015, p. 45). Since I view language contacts in connection with the status and functions of languages, the analysis of language contacts will take place from the perspective of the sociology of language, which provides the possibility of analysing not the usage-based data, but meta-textual data, as posited by Terttu Nevalainen: "… the sociology of language can be extended the furthest back in time, concentrating, as it does, on the status and function of languages and language varieties in language communities. These issues do not always require extensive access to primary usage-based data but can be identified and explored on the basis of meta-textual and secondary sources (although their study will naturally benefit from primary textual materials)" (Nevalainen, 2015, p. 245). These guidelines have played a crucial role in the selection of secondary sources and in the formation of the database.

The linguistic basis for the analysis of language contacts were papers on the social history of language. As a starting point, I have adopted Ulrich Weinreich's position that languages are in contact if they are used alternately by the same person (Vaĭnraĭkh, 1979, p. 22). This principle formed the basis for distinguishing the composition of contacting languages. To illustrate the examples of alternating language use by members of the Ukrainian community in secondary sources, I tried to identify the reasons for changing codes, their status, functions, and interactions in (L) and (H) units (denoting languages with limited functions and a wide range of social functions, as defined by Fishman, 2000, p. 74). This information sheds light on the informal and formal use of languages and allows us to identify the models of alternating use of languages in the official communication of community members. In the analysis, language contacts are considered in conjunction with social processes, which, according to William Labov (1994, p. 1), contribute to the creation of the historical and socio–cultural background of language contacts. They appear as the implementation of codes, manifestations of identities and social differences of speakers (the role of these features in the study of the social history of language is emphasized by Auer et al., 2015, p. 9).

The composition of secondary sources in the article is formed by texts thematically related to the Chełm and Podlachia regions. First are the observations of the Russian official Evfimiy Kryzhanovskiy (1831–1888), from the 1860s. Memoirs of several participants of events related to the political, linguistic and cultural conditions of life of the Ukrainian community and its socio–demographic indicators were also used. For example, the memoirs of the Orthodox Bishop of Chełm Yevlogiy (Georgiyevskiy) (1868–1946); the memoirs of the Ukrainian political and public figure Dr Vasyl Dmytriyuk (1890–1973) from Podlachia, which detail language use in education, the views of Ukrainian youth and their path to the independent study of the Ukrainian literary language; and the memoirs of the Ukrainian historian Ivan Krypyakevych (1886–1967) about visiting Chełm in 1910. Additionally, I examined the memoirs of the tsarist military doctor Lev Voitolovskiy (1876–1941) about the course of military events against the background of socio–cultural and language-related circumstances of life of the Ukrainian population in the Chełm and Podlachia regions before and during the First World War.

Simultaneously, the search for secondary texts with information about the changing use of languages by members of the Ukrainian speech community in 1815–1912 led me to a variety of other valuable sources. These are academic works and reports of participants, which also contain meta-textual information about the functions and status of languages in formal and informal communication. These are the report on Chełm by a high-ranking official of the Kingdom of Poland, the Russian statesman Prince Vladimir Cherkasskiy (1824–1878); scientific research, in particular by A. Sobolevskiy (1857–1929), on the Ukrainian language and its dialects in Chełm and Podlachia; and the works by the aforementioned Ivan Krypyakevych and Myron Korduba

(1876–1947) on the socio–historical and demographic processes related to the Ukrainian speech community. Since there exist works by modern historians, using archival information, on the cultural life of the Ukrainian community in the Kingdom of Poland (such as Havrylyuk, Fedoryk, Makar, etc.), I retrieved relevant information about language contacts in the Ukrainian community from them.

The secondary sources collected in the article enabled the formation of a database of ideal source data, in particular metalinguistic evidence, as proposed by Nils Langer and Anna Havinga (Langer & Havinga, 2015, p. 9), which is consistent with Nevalainen's provision on metatextual data for the sociology of languages. Each piece of metalinguistic evidence from the sources used is the medium of different types of comments on the languages used by the Ukrainian minority: information on languages and on the variable use of languages; on the status and functions of languages that provided communication between community members in the informal and formal spheres; about the interaction between contacting languages and signs of age, social stratum, education, village / city, government actions and policies towards the Ukrainian community (i.e. these are the detailed indicators that will reveal language contacts such as code, the realization of identity and marker of social difference).

Regarding the choice of methods and techniques of analysis of metalinguistic evidence, it is known that in order to achieve sociological and linguistic goals, the sociology of language involves a qualitative approach in the methodology of analysis and use of survey fieldwork and ethnographic fieldwork (Hernández-Campoy, 2014, p. 12). However, these methods do not "work" for the study of linguistic contacts in the past. Therefore, in order to analyse the object of research, namely language contacts of the Ukrainian community in 1815–1912, and to show a broad picture of language contacts, I apply (following Auer et al., 2015, p. 5) the inductive method as the main one, as well as the interpretation of the aforementioned metalinguistics evidence. The effectiveness of inductive analysis is that it combines a linguistic approach to language contacts (as a manifestation of knowledge about the use of languages and their forms depending on their status and functions) revealing the sociological nature of language contacts (in other words, the stratification of a speech community in connection with language use and manifestations of native identities) and the historical context of language contacts. It appears as a link with the government and its domestic policy on languages and their speakers.

4 Research Findings

The analysed metalinguistic evidence covers approximately 100 years of the language contacts of the Ukrainian community, recording (if we summarize their newly-discovered detailed content) the historical, geopolitical and biographical indicators of variable language use in informal and formal communication. I classified the metalinguistic evidence, systematized by periods, which allowed me to distinguish the models of linguistic contacts realized by the Ukrainian community in the period 1815–1912.

4.1 Ukrainian–Polish Language Contacts

For the age group "children", this interaction of languages began at school. From the currently available records of one church school in the village of Klishcheli in northern Podlachia, where 80 students studied in 1820, it can be assumed that Greek Catholic students studied religion, Church Slavonic and Polish literacy, arithmetic, etc. (Havryliuk, 1994, p. 515). The students did not study their native language, which had the status of a conversational code.

In the 1860s, the adult population from the peasantry still remained Ukrainian speakers, despite the lack of Ukrainian schools and in contrast to the already Polonized city residents. Peasants communicated with everyone, even with representatives of the upper class, in their dialect (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911b, p. 139). However, the influence of the Polish language was already being

felt: in Greek Catholic churches in the villages, the Ukrainian parishioners could simultaneously pronounce the prayer *Virgin Mary, Rejoice* in Ukrainian, its Polish-language counterpart, or even a combination of parts of these prayers (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911b, p. 111). Nevertheless, language contacts between Ukrainian and Polish were not so common among the peasants in comparison, for example, with Greek Catholic priests.

The Greek Catholic clergy was the only educated social group in the Ukrainian population. Until 1831, in private conversation and in the Church, priests used the colloquial form of the Ukrainian language. However, in 1831 tsarist authorities suppressed the Polish uprising. Historians believe that this influenced the growth of Polishness as a manifestation of internal protest against the tsarist administration. At the language level, it strengthened the functions of the Polish language among the Ukrainian minority: there is metalinguistic evidence of borrowings from Polish in the oral speech of Greek Catholic priests, their violation of customs and rites in churches and worship (many parts are missing). Although services were still conducted in Church Slavonic with a Ukrainian accent, the priests professed the faith in Polish (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911b, pp. 111–119).

There is information about the linguistic views of one of the Greek Catholic clergy, a priest living in Bila (Podlachia) in the 1860s and 'a true Ruthenian', as he called himself, using the ethnonym of the time to refer to Ukrainians. Today we can assume that his knowledge, formed on the basis of available sources, could reflect the ideology launched by the Polish socio–political discourse about the common roots of Poles and Ukrainians. Thus, this priest believed that "the Lyakhs and the Ruthenians first had one language", then the Masurian, Belarusian, and Malorussian dialects began to appear; that the Polish–Ruthenian intelligentsia created "one educated language – Polish", so the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language is a dialect of Polish, not Russian, and that he himself, accepting the Polish language as a priest, did not cease to be a good Ruthenian, because he speaks this educated, literary Ruthenian language. The priest still remembered the time when the clergy spoke their native language (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911b, pp. 123–126), but he lived his own life in the stream of Polish culture. This is an explanation for why he switched to Polish in interpersonal communication with the peasants or when preaching sermons from the church pulpit.

It should be emphasized that the Polonization process among the Greek Catholic clergy is confirmed by other metalinguistic evidence: the report on the use of Polish in the family communication of priests by the tsarist gendarmerie in the 1860s (Fedoryk, 2013, p. 108), and the permission granted to Ukrainian peasants to satisfy their spiritual needs in the Roman Catholic Church (this information was preserved by documents on the activities of the Greek Catholic Bishop Ivan Terashkevych (1793–1863), an administrator of the Chełm diocese from 1851) (Vlasovs′kyĭ, 1977, p. 244). As the clergy switched to Polish in everyday use, Polish was also used in communication with Ukrainian believers, who were the "Russian population", according to the tsarist administration. It is clear that such evident Polonization tendencies were not looked on kindly by the authorities.

Starting with specific examples, I generalize them to typical ones, reflecting the transition from Ukrainian as a colloquial code (L) to oral and written forms of Polish as the language of official communication in school and Church (H). This transition illustrates the first model of alternating language use by Ukrainians in the Chełm and Podlachia regions, related to age (children, adults), social strata (peasants, city residents, Greek Catholic clergy), and local authorities interested in the penetration of the Polish culture into the Ukrainian speech community.

4.2 Ukrainian–Russian Language Contacts

The tsarist administration began to introduce Russian into the administration and schools in 1840, but not in the field of church education. By 1866, there were virtually no Polish-language schools left (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911a, p. 366). However, Polish remained for a long time in the Greek Catholic seminary in Chełm and in some union schools, where religion was also taught in Polish.

There was prejudice against the use of Russian language in the sphere of church education. Thus, there was opposition to its introduction from the Greek Catholic bishop-nominee Ivan Kalynskyi, who became the administrator of the Chełm diocese in 1863. One of the reasons for his opposition was the language issue in the seminary (Gątarczyk, 2008, p. 34). The bishop insisted on teaching theological subjects at the Chełm Union Seminary in Latin, not Russian. Teachers also claimed ignorance of Russian and did not teach Union theology in Russian. In this seminary, therefore, some subjects were taught in Polish until Kalynskyi's exile to Vyatka in 1866, although Russian language and literature had already been taught as subjects in the seminary from 1865. There were other forms of rejection of Russian by teachers and seminarians. For example, 24 seminary students asked to be taught theology in Latin instead of Russian. The representative of the Russian government, Prince Cherkasskiy, knew Latin well, so he conducted an educational experiment: at the request of the prince, the teacher gave a lecture in Latin and asked students to retell the content, but no one was able to reproduce it (there were difficulties even at the level of sentence construction). Then, the teacher read the text in Russian and the students repeated it. The question of using Latin disappeared (Kryzhanovskiĭ, 1911a, p. 368).

Tsarist authorities linked the formation of Russian identity amongst the Ukrainian population with the development of Russian-language education for the entire Ukrainian population in Chełm and Podlachia. In a speech at the First All-Slavic Congress in Moscow in 1867, Prince Cherkasskiy noted that for one million of the population in Tula province, there was only one men's *gymnasium*, while throughout Poland the government had established 24 institutions ("Rech′ vo vremia", 1879, p. 286). Before the First World War, in Chełm and Podlachia there were *gymnasiums* and seminaries, 550 primary schools of various types, and the population had a high literacy rate: in 1909 the literacy rate was 64.8% among men and 37.9% among women (Shevchuk, 2008, p. 99). Ukrainians could get a job as a teacher, a doctor or become a soldier. The villages had libraries with Russian books and a 4-grade school with Russian as the language of instruction.

The functions of the Russian language spread through the Orthodox Church. After the forced Orthodoxization of Greek Catholics in 1875, Russian authorities abandoned the Ukrainian pronunciation of Church Slavonic texts, the Ukrainian language of sermons, and some church rites from the time of the union. (This was facilitated by the decree of the Holy Synod of May 4, 1875 on the permission to use union traditions that did not contradict the Orthodox canons) (Kubiĭovych, 1975, p. 295). However, over time the Russian language became active in the sermons of visiting Russian Orthodox priests (Fedoryk, 2013, pp. 133–135). Thus, the contacts between the Ukrainian language and oral and written forms of Russian intensified. It is clear that the educational sphere and the Orthodox Church led to the active variable use of Ukrainian as a spoken language and Russian as a spoken and written language in official communication.

In informal communication, however, the rural population maintained their native language. This is confirmed by the biography of a native of the Chełm region, born in 1900, from the village Malyi Vasyliv:

> The population of Chełm province was Ukrainian. Ukrainian was spoken in the villages. However, the administration in the village, in the commune and above was Russian. Children were taught Russian in schools, although Russian was not spoken at home. I remember that in the first class of the rural primary school where I studied, the teacher beat the students with a ruler on the palms of the hands for guilt, including for misunderstanding his explanations in Russian (children did not know Russian). It was called 'to give a paw'. ("Kopiĭ", 2014, p. 791)

Linguistic stability in the peasant environment is illustrated by metalinguistic evidence that even in the early twentieth century, religious books written in Cyrillic were read by peasants with Ukrainian pronunciation (Karvatiuk-Pus′ko, 2014, p. 221).

Communication in the cities of the Chełm region was more heavily influenced by Russian. Ivan Krypyakevych mentioned that in 1910 Chełm impressed him as a Russified city. Ukrainian was used only by peasants, so the Russified students of the "boarding house of noble maidens" did not even want to talk to him, a Ukrainian student from Galicia (Zabolotna, 2010, p. 486).

The metalinguistic evidence presented here testifies to the distribution of language contacts of the Ukrainian population on the basis of informal communication and illustrates the second model of alternating transition of representatives of the Ukrainian community, from native language (L) to Russian as language (H). This model illustrates the broad context of the interaction between languages and power and education, reveals the Ukrainian identity of the peasants in connection with their linguistic stability, and testifies to the Russification of urban space.

4.3 Ukrainian as a Colloquial Code and a Literary Language

After the revolution of 1905, national and cultural life began to be revived in Chełm and Podlachia for the first time. The initiators of the spread of Ukrainian ideas were representatives of the small educated Ukrainian intelligentsia, who received not only church but also secular education. At the end of 1906 and in 1907, Ukrainian Enlightenment Societies were established (in Sidlec, Hrubieszów, and in the village of Kobylyany Nadbuzhni in Bielsko County). In 1907, the first Ukrainian newspaper *Buh* was published in Hrubieszów, but the entire circulation was confiscated by the police. Later, being unable to publish a magazine in Ukrainian, a group of Ukrainian activists began publishing the short-lived newspaper *Zapadnyi Bug* in Berest (modern-day Brest), informing the Chełm region about the lives of Ukrainians. In the same year, 1907, the newspaper *Bratskaya Beseda* began to be published in Chełm as a body of the People's Educational Society of Kholmskaya Rus. Although the newspaper published some of material in Ukrainian using Russian orthography, readers got a chance to read works by Ukrainian authors, including Taras Shevchenko, Panteleimon Kulish and others (Kravchuk, 1976, pp. 82–83). For a very short time, these were the first steps taken by the Ukrainian intelligentsia in order to switch the population from Ruthenian/Rus/Orthodox self-identification to Ukrainian. However, the government stopped this process of Ukrainian cultural revival in 1907.

The newly found biography of Vasyl Dmytriyuk grants an insight into an individual's experience of mastering the literary form of Ukrainian and the formation of Ukrainian identity. He was born in 1890 in the village of Kostomoloty (Sidlets province, Podlachia), which was inhabited by Ukrainians (or "Little Russians" or "*Khakhly*": these names were used by village residents) (Dmytriiuk, 2012, p. 9). The language of communication of Dmytriuk's family was "simple language" (as Ukrainian was then called), whereas the language of instruction was Russian (Chełm Theological Seminary and the Medical Faculty of the University of Warsaw). Dmytriyuk learned about the Ukrainian language when he read Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar* as a young man. The communicative practice of Dmytriyuk prior to 1912 reveals the role of self-education in mastering the literary form of the Ukrainian language in the Kingdom of Poland and shows that some members of the Ukrainian speech community in the Chełm and Podlachia regions could alternately switch from the colloquial form of Ukrainian to its literary form.

Therefore, there are grounds to distinguish a third model of language contact, related to the use of the literary form of the Ukrainian language. It first performed the role of (H) language. The model illustrates the beginnings of the manifestations of Ukrainian identity and the self-education of educated people in order to learn about their roots, as well as the actions taken by the authorities against the national and cultural revival of the Ukrainian community.

4.4 Conclusions

The present study has analysed the linguistic contacts of the Ukrainian community in the Chełm and Podlachia regions in the Kingdom of Poland in the period 1815–1912, which was not recorded in Ukrainian-language texts. During this period, Ukrainian speakers gradually switched from the official Polish language to the official Russian language.

The analysis of language contacts was performed through the prism of theoretical positions on the social history of the language from a sociolinguistic perspective in general and, taking into consideration the tasks and secondary sources, the sociology of language in particular. The

retrospective qualitative approach used for the analysis of the macro-level of language contacts, based on the inductive method and the method of interpretation of metalinguistic evidence, allowed me to obtain results on the composition of the contacting languages and models of their interaction in official communication, taking into account the dynamics of identities and the broad context of social differences in the Ukrainian community in the period 1815–1912.

The results demonstrate that in informal communication, members of the Ukrainian community used their native language (*L*) as the main means of interpersonal interaction, while in public communication they switched to the two other languages (*H*). Polish and Russian, having official status, were used in school and church. The composition of languages that native speakers could alternately switch between testifies to three models of language contacts: the transition from Ukrainian as a spoken language to oral and written forms of Polish (1st model), oral and written forms of Russian used in official spheres (2nd model), and (occasionally) literary Ukrainian, used during only two years of the revival of Ukrainian culture allowed by the authorities from 1905 to 1907 (3rd model). The correlation between the functions of languages, in particular between spoken Ukrainian as (*L*) and Polish, Russian and literary Ukrainian as (*H*), indicates that the linguistic contacts of Ukrainian speakers took palace in a diglossic language situation.

Linguistic contacts appear not only as a code, but also inform about the identity and social differences of Ukrainian speakers. Despite all the attempts of the tsarist government to impose Russian identity, the Ukrainian community slowly formed a Ukrainian identity, most clearly manifested in 1905–1907. Then, a small group of educated Ukrainians began to promote their own Ukrainian culture and literary language. Linguistic stability in informal communication in the native language was maintained mainly by the majority of the community comprising the rural strata. The official Polish and Russian languages were influenced by small social groups. Thus, urban residents and representatives of the Greek Catholic clergy were already Polonized by the 1860s, and city dwellers became Russified by 1910 (as, for example, in Chełm). It is remarkable that few people knew literary Ukrainian.

The social differences of the speakers are shown in the interaction of the status and functions of the contacting languages (as the realization of language material) with age (children and adults), social strata (peasants, city residents, Greek Catholic clergy, Orthodox clergy, educated Ukrainians) and the community as a whole. Its representatives were not simply speakers of a minority language amongst the Polish-speaking majority, but were the object of special policies on the part of the tsarist administration. The actions and intentions of the authorities to assimilate the Ukrainian population manifested themselves in several directions: in the absence of Ukrainian-language schools for the entire period of 1815–1912; in the forced conversion of Ukrainians from the Greek Catholic Church to Russian Orthodoxy in 1875; and in permitting Ukrainians who did not accept Russian Orthodoxy to convert only to the Roman Catholic Church in 1905–1909. The leaders of such domestic policies were high-ranking officials who formulated tasks for the school and the Church of Ukrainians, first towards Polonization and later towards Russification.

In general, the study of language contacts reveals unknown fragments of the culture of the Ukrainian community in the Chełm and Podlachia regions in the past. The results of the analysis of language contacts on the basis of metalinguistic evidence create the necessary prerequisites for their further study in subsequent periods of social history of Ukrainian as a minority language with the help of linguistic evidence collected from primary Ukrainian texts after 1917.

References

Auer, A., Peersman, C., Pickl, S., Rutten, G., & Vosters, R. (2015). Historical sociolinguistics: The field and its future. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, *1*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1515/jhsl-2015-0001

Dmytriiuk, V. (2012). *Dorohamy viĭny ĭ myru: Spomyny z dodatkamy materialiv do istoriĭ sim'ĭ*. Vydano koshtom rodyny Vasylia Dmytriiuka.

Dopovidna zapyska pro natsional′ni stosunky na terytoriï staroho Kholms′koho hubernatorstva ta otsinka pryiednannia danoï oblasti do pol′[s′koho] Heneralhubernatorstva. (2015). In IU. Makar, M. Hornyĭ, & V. Makar, *Vid deportatsiï do deportatsiï: Suspil′no-politychne zhyttia kholms′ko-pidlias′kykh ukraïntsiv (1915–1947): Doslidzhennia. Spohady. Dokumenty: U tr′okh tomakh* (Vol. 3, pp. 690–692). Bukrek.

Evlogiĭ, mitropolit [Georgievskiĭ, V. S.]. (1947). *Put′ moeĭ zhizni: Vospominaniia Mitropolita Evlogiia izlozhennye po ego rasskazam T. Manukhinoĭ.* YMCA Press.

Fedoriv, IU. (1990). *Orhanizatsiĭna struktura Ukraïns′koï TSerkvy.* Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka v Kanadi.

Fedoryk, IU. (2013). *Pravoslavne dukhovenstvo v TSarstvi Pol′s′komu v 1875–1905 rokakh.* LANDON–XXI.

Filevich, I. P. (1911). Predislovie: K Kholmskomu voprosu. In E. M. Kryzhanovskiĭ, *Russkoe Zabuzh′e (Kholmshchina i Podliash′e)* (pp. v–xlvi). Tip. “Mirnyĭ trud”.

Fishman, J. A. (2000). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 74–81). Routledge.

Froliak, L. D. (2015). Teksty z Pidliashshia iak dzherelo dialektolohichnykh doslidzhen′. *Naukovyĭ visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu: Seriia. Filolohiia*, *2015*(19/2), 61–65.

Gątarczyk, A. (2008). Dzieje parafii unickiej w Radzyniu Podlaskim. *Radzyński Rocznik Humanistyczny*, *6*, 28–54.

Havryliuk, IU. (1994). Oseli Pivnichnoho Pidliashshia. In M. Martyniuk (Ed.), *Nadbuzhanshchyna: Sokal′shchyna, Belzchyna, Radekhivshchyna, Kaminechchyna, Kholmshchyna i Pidliashshia: Istorychno-memuarnyĭ zbirnyk* (Vol. 3, pp. 495–532). Ob’iednannia nadbuzhantsiv.

Hernández-Campoy, J. M. (2014). Research methods in Sociolinguistics. *AILA Review*, *27*, 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.01her

Interpeliatsiia posla d-ra Stepana Barana do Prem’ier-ministra. (1986). In M. Martyniuk (Ed.), *Nadbuzhanshchyna: Sokal′shchyna, Belzchyna, Radekhivshchyna, Kaminechchyna, Kholmshchyna i Pidliashshia: Istorychno-memuarnyĭ zbirnyk* (Vol. 1, pp. 700–713). Ob’iednannia nadbuzhantsiv.

Karvatiuk-Pus′ko, V. (2014). “Ne ty budesh tse zhyto zbyraty”. In M. Ivanyk (Ed.), *Krov ukraïns′ka, krov pol′s′ka…: Trahediia Kholmshchyny ta Pidliashshia v rokakh 1938–1948 u spohadakh* (pp. 218–249). Vydavnytstvo L′vivs′koï politekhniky.

Kołbuk, W. (1988). Przechodzenie unitów na obrządek łaciński w diecezji chełmskiej w XIX wieku. In R. Łużny (Ed.), *Dzieło chrystianizacji Rusi Kijowskiej i jego konsekwencje w kulturze Europy* (pp. 211–221). Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

Kolianchuk, O. (2014). Spomyny pro perezhyte. In IU. Makar, M. Hornyĭ, & V. Makar, *Vid deportatsiï do deportatsiï: Suspil′no-politychne zhyttia kholms′ko-pidlias′kykh ukraïntsiv (1915–1947): Doslidzhennia. Spohady. Dokumenty: U tr′okh tomakh* (Vol. 2, p. 442). Bukrek.

Kopiï tserkovnykh metrychnykh zapysiv ta ukraïnomovnyĭ pereklad chastyny statti “Malyĭ Vasyliv u Kremli”. (2014). In IU. Makar, M. Hornyĭ, & V. Makar, *Vid deportatsiï do deportatsiï: Suspil′no-politychne zhyttia kholms′ko-pidlias′kykh ukraïntsiv (1915–1947): Doslidzhennia. Spohady. Dokumenty: U tr′okh tomakh* (Vol. 2, pp. 787–793). Bukrek.

Korduba, M. (1917). *Pivnichno-Zakhidna Ukraïna.* Nakladom Soiuzu Vyzvolennia Ukraïny.

Korobowicz, A. (1966). *Stanowisko prawne obrządku greckounickiego w Królestwie Polskim (1815–1875).* Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Kravchuk, M. (1976). Ukraïns′ka presa Volyni, Kholmshchyny, Pidliashshia ta Polissia. *Ukraïns′ka knyha*, *6*(4), 81–85.

Kryp’iakevych, I. P. (1915). *Kholmshchyna.* Vydavnytstvo Soiuzu Vyzvolennia Ukraïny.

Kryzhanovskiĭ, E. M. (1911a). Kniaz′ V. A Cherkasskiĭ i kholmskie greko-uniaty. In E. M. Kryzhanovskiĭ, *Russkoe Zabuzh′e (Kholmshchina i Podliash′e)* (pp. 203–369). Tip. “Mirnyĭ trud”.

Kryzhanovskiĭ, E. M. (1911b). Pis′ma iz Podlias′ia. In E. M. Kryzhanovskiĭ, *Russkoe Zabuzh′e (Kholmshchina i Podliash′e)* (pp. 103–146). Tip. “Mirnyĭ trud”.

Kubiĭovych, V. (1975). *Ukraïntsi v Heneral′niĭ Huberniï, 1939–1941: Istoriia Ukraïns′koho TSentral′noho Komitetu.* Vydavnytstvo Mykoly Denysiuka.

Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of linguistic change: Vol. 1. Internal factors.* Blackwell.

Langer, N., & Havinga, A. (2015). Invisible languages in historical sociolinguistics: A conceptual outline, with examples from the German-Danish borderlands. In A. Havinga & N. Langer (Eds.), *Invisible languages in the nineteenth century* (pp. 1–35). Peter Lang.

Lesiv, M. (1997). *Ukraïns′ki hovirky u Pol′shchi.* Ukraïns′kyĭ arkhiv.

Lewandowski, J. (1996). *Na pograniczu: Polityka władz państwowych wobec unitów Podlasia i Chełmszczyzny, 1772–1875*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Makar, IU. (2006). Kholmshchyna v roky nimets′koï okupatsiï. In *Ukraïna – Pol′shcha: Vazhki pytannia: Materialy XI Mizhnarodnoho seminaru istorykiv "Ukraïns′ko-pol′s′ki vidnosyny pid chas Druhoï svitovoï viĭny": Varshava, 26–28 kvitnia 2005* (Vol. 10, pp. 200–231). Tyrsa.

Makar, IU. (2013). Kholmshchyna. In V. A. Smoliĭ (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istoriï Ukraïny: Vol. 10: T–IA* (p. 688). Naukova dumka.

Makar, IU., Hornyĭ, M., & Makar, V. (2014). *Vid deportatsiï do deportatsiï: Suspil′no-politychne zhyttia kholms′ko-pidlias′kykh ukraïntsiv (1915–1947): Doslidzhennia. Spohady. Dokumenty: U tr′okh tomakh* (Vol. 2). Bukrek.

Makar, IU., Hornyĭ, M., & Makar, V. (2015). *Vid deportatsiï do deportatsiï: Suspil′no-politychne zhyttia kholms′ko-pidlias′kykh ukraïntsiv (1915–1947): Doslidzhennia. Spohady. Dokumenty: U tr′okh tomakh* (Vol. 3). Bukrek.

Matsyuk, H. (2021). Multicultural aspects of names and naming in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church: The thematic group "The names of new saints". In O. Felecan & A. Bugheșiu (Eds.), *Names and naming: Multicultural aspects (pp. 57–72). Palgrave Macmillan.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73186-1_5

Mytsyk, IU. A. (2005). Zamoĭs′kyĭ sobor ukraïns′koï hreko-katolyts′koï tserkvy 1720. In V. A. Smoliĭ (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istoriï Ukraïny: Vol. 3. E–Ĭ*. Naukova dumka. http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Zamoysky_sobor

Nevalainen, T. (2015). What are historical sociolinguistics? *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, *1*(2), 243–269. https://doi.org/10.1515/jhsl-2015-0014

Rech′ vo vremia pervogo Vseslavianskogo s″ezda, na prazdnike v Moskve, v Sokol′nich′eĭ Roshche, 21 maia 1867 goda. (1879). In *Kniaz′ V. A. Cherkaskiĭ: Ego stat′i, ego rechi i vospominaniia o nem* (pp. 283–289). Tip. P. A. Lebedeva.

Shevchuk, T. IE. (2008). Etnosotsial′na sytuatsiia na Kholmshchyni ta Pidliashshi v pershiĭ chverti XX stolittia. *Istorychnyĭ arkhiv: Naukovi studiï*, *2008*(1), 92–103.

Sobolevskiĭ, A. (1910). *Kholmskaia Rus′ v ėtnograficheskom otnoshenii*. Tip. "Mirnyĭ trud".

Vaĭnraĭkh, U. (1979). *IAzykovyye kontakty (sostoianie i problemy issledovaniia)*. Vyshcha shkola.

Vlasovs′kyĭ, I. (1977). *Narys istoriï Ukraïns′koï Pravoslavnoï tserkvy: Vol. 3. (XVIII–XX st.)*. Ukraïns′ka Pravoslavna TSerkva v SShA.

Voĭtolovskiĭ, L. N. (1928). *Po sledam voĭny: 1914 i 1915*. Gosudarstvennoe izdatel′stvo.

Zabolotna, I. (2010). Spohady Ivana Kryp'iakevycha (1904–1911). *Ukraïns′kyĭ arkheohrafichnyĭ shchorichnyk*, *2010*(15), 476–486.

The publication was financed at the author's expense.

The author declares that she has no competing interests.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Author 2022

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Publishing history: Received 2021-09-30; Accepted 2022-07-21; Published 2022-12-28.