

Minority Languages of Poland: Dynamics of Contacts and Changes after 1989

Tomasz Wicherkiewicz

LANGUAGE SHIFT, LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE, LANGUAGE CONTACT

As identified in general or contrastive studies on language maintenance and language shift,¹ language shift and language maintenance constitute a cluster of phenomena concerning various aspects of language dynamics. With no doubts, broadly understood language contacts constitute yet another aspect of language dynamics.² Universally, across language systems, language communities and their shared or mutual constellations, linguistic codes are in a constant process of change in general. Language contacts and language shift repetitively presuppose stressful socio-historical conditions in order to take place, sometimes—if not always—including also various stages of language conflict, although “language contact and conflict are seen as interdependently related elements applicable both to individuals and to language communities, yet these phenomena occur only between speakers of languages, not between languages *per se*.”

According to Thomason (2001),³ historical linguistics came rather late to the knowledge that language contact can, and often does, lead directly to structural linguistic changes. Language contact research usually involves language area studies, so do language shift and language maintenance studies. Therefore, it seems understandable and scholarly legitimate to study arrays of language contacts in a certain language area, especially if other sociolinguistic and glottopolitical factors coincide there. One of such coincidences or connecting factors can certainly be the situation, when the same language functions in the entire area under concern, roofing all the domains of official language use, occupying most or all levels of language policy, constituting a reference for language planning and language ideology, and a determinant of language prestige or language attitudes. Such an understanding of the roofing language is broader than the *überdachende Sprache* or *Dachsprache* introduced to socio-

1 Anne Pauwels, *Language Maintenance and Shift* (Cambridge University Press, 2016); Lukas D. Tsitisipis, “A Phenomenological View of Language Shift,” *Collegium Antropologicum* 28 Suppl. 1 (2004), pp. 55–62.

2 E.g., Peter H. Nelde, “Language Contact Means Language Conflict,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 8:1-2 (1987), pp.33-42; Raymond Hickey, ed., *The Handbook of Language Contact* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 170–207.

3 Sarah G. Thomason, *Language Contact: An Introduction* (Edinburgh University Press & Georgetown University Press, 2001).

linguistics and language policy and planning studies by Kloss and Muljačić⁴ respectively.

In terms of contact linguistics, the dominant or roofing language can function both as a donor (oftener) or a recipient (less frequently) language. This is the case of one of the most homogeneous language areas both in contemporary Europe and in the modern Slavic world—Poland at the turn and first two decades of the 21st century.

RESEARCH AND DISCOURSE ON ENDOGENIC MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE CONTACTS IN POLAND

Even typical guests or tourists in Poland—not to mention sociolinguists or ethnohistorians—realize that one of the founding or at least strengthening myths of the contemporary Polish national identity, increasingly present in discourses both on national and international level, is the proudly stressed *topos* of multilingual and multinational heritage of *Rzeczpospolita*.⁵ Initially, after 1989, the *topos* of a once “multi-kulti” *Rzeczpospolita* served as a counterbalance and a founding distinctive feature of the new state and society, which were to regain not only a(n inter)national subjectivity, but also tried to reduce the overwhelming homogeneity caused by the territorial and population changes following the World War II and imposed by the national-communist ideology.

It is quite evident and predictable that the language, which used to roof not only “two/both” nations (Poland-Lithuania), but actually multiple language varieties spoken within the *Rzeczpospolita*, and functioned as one of the most potent state languages in Europe, served as a recipient in language contact situations with both exogenous and endogenous languages; the former including Latin, Czech, Italian, French, German, Russian and English, the latter comprising the whole constellation(s) of language varieties spoken by the residents of *Rzeczpospolita*.⁶ Those constellations have been undergoing nu-

4 Heinz Kloss, “Abstandsprache und Ausbausprache,” in U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, eds., *Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society/Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft*. Vol. I (Berlin-New York: deGruyter, 1987), pp. 302–308; Žarko Muljačić, “L’enseignement de Heinz Kloss (modifications, implications, perspectives),” *Languages* 21 (1986), pp. 53–63.

5 *Rzeczpospolita* (qualque from Latin *res publica*) is the Polish endonymic term referring to the consecutive state(hood) forms: Commonwealth of Two/Both Nations (Poland-Lithuania or 1st *Rzeczpospolita*), the interbellum independent Polish state (2nd *Rzeczpospolita*—1918–1945), the People’s Republic of Poland (1945/1952–1989), and the 3rd *Rzeczpospolita* (since 1990). The times of the rule of the *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* (=Law and Justice; 2005–2007 and since 2015 to date) party are repeatedly referred to as the 4th *Rzeczpospolita*.

6 See e.g. Leszek Bednarczuk, *Stosunki językowe na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego* (Kraków: Edukacja, 1999); or [<http://www.inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/Frontend/Home/About/>], accessed in July 2017.

merous diastatic and diatopic changes, resulting in a network of language use patterns, language prestige hierarchies, and language attitude structures organized along various language ideologies—in fact untraceable and incognizable from the diachronic perspective, but eagerly used for the purpose to solidify the myth of a once-multinational, multilingual and immigrant-friendly Poland.⁷

From *a posteriori* and long-range perspective, the language policy of the 2nd Rzeczpospolita—overt and covert alike—appears as an intensive and actually rigorous instrument of nation-building policies and Andersonian imaginization of ethnic and/or speech communities into a badly-needed unified Polish nation and can be interpreted as internally colonial and a tardive counterwork to prior language policies exercised in relation to the Polish speech community by the partitioning states of Russia and Prussia (and Austria to a much lesser extent).

Therefore, the Polish linguistics in the 19th and 20th centuries was most interested in the effects of those language interrelations, where Polish served as an—overtly or covertly “victimized”—recipient of language contact products. The research of the donor’s role of Polish in language contacts was intentionally left to linguists representing the nationally “younger” neighboring communities, who frequently and obviously acted in turn under pressure of new national policies in e.g. Lithuania, Ukraine or Belarus. Even nowadays—in the 21st century—most of the research projects in Polish contact linguistics focus on the (post-)colonial constellations of bi- or multilingual language contact in the eastern *Kresy*.⁸

A relatively comprehensive, diachronic overview of language contacts in Poland (but merely between the neighboring state/national languages and Polish plus the then still disputable Polish-Kashubian context) was presented by a team of experts⁹ in chapters 192–199 of the monumental Goebel et al. (1997). In another remarkable volume by Gajda (2001),¹⁰ the question of language contacts was briefly outlined in the context of minority language com-

7 See e.g. [<http://commonwealth.pl>], accessed in July 2017.

8 *Kresy*—the Eastern Border Lands of the 1st and 2nd Polish Republic (cf. e.g. Tomasz Kamusella, *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe* [Palgrave Macmillan, 2009], p. 590).

9 Jolanta Rokoszowa, Józef Wiktorowicz, Jerzy Treder, Elżbieta Smułkowa, Józef Marcinkiewicz, Janusz A. Rieger, Franciszek Sowa, Janusz Siatkowski, in: Hans Goebel, Peter H. Nelde, Zdeněk Starý & Wolfgang Wölck, eds., *Kontaktlinguistik. Contact Linguistics. Linguistique de contact. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Manuel international des recherches contemporaines* (Walter de Gruyter, 1997), pp. 1583–1641.

10 Stanisław Gajda, ed., *Język polski. Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich* (Uniwersytet Opolski, 2001), pp. 45–56. The volume was published in a long-expected and diligently edited series on *the Recent History of Slavic Languages* and designed as a cross-linguistic report on the most current and topical phenomena within the Slavic language systems.

munities currently living in the territory of the Republic of Poland, as well as in a (diachronic again) outline of selected foreign (Russian, German, French, and English) influences upon Polish.

Auspiciously for the comprehensiveness and complexity of the Polish language contact studies, a significant diversification and intensification of research can be observed recently with reference to more complex language contact processes, including language shift and language maintenance related effects of the previously underestimated influence of Polish (as donor language) upon minority languages, where the role of the national state language can be in some instances even interpreted as language killer (or Muljačić [1986]’s *Verdrängungssprache*).

The hitherto neglected field of research on intense language contacts between the Polish language and Poland’s minority languages is slowly but firmly completed by diachronic and/or synchronic studies by e.g.: Birgiel (2005), Marcinkiewicz (2003), Zielińska (1996) and (2013), Jorroch (2015), Łopuszańska-Kryszczuk (2004), Nyenhuis (2011), Księżyk (2008), Magocsi (2004), Knoll (2012), Makurat (2014), Nomachi (2014), Nomachi & Heine (2011), Misiak (2015), and others.¹¹

11 Nijola Birgiel, *Procesy interferencyjne w mowie dwujęzycznej społeczności litewskiej z Puńska i okolic na Suwalszczyźnie* (Warszawa-Puńsk: Aušra, 2005); Józef Marcinkiewicz, *Polsko-litewskie kontakty językowe na Suwalszczyźnie* (Poznań: UAM, 2003); Anna Zielińska, *Wielojęzyczność staroobrzędowców mieszkających w Polsce* (Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 1996); Anna Jorroch, *Die deutsche Sprache der dreisprachigen Altgläubigen in Masuren* (Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2015); Anna Zielińska, *Mowa pogranicza: studium o językach i tożsamościach w regionie lubuskim* (Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 2013); Grażyna Łopuszańska-Kryszczuk, *Die deutsche Sprache im polnisch-deutschen Grenzgebiet* (Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, 2004); Agnieszka Nyenhuis, *Deutsche und Polen im Sprachkontakt. Polnische Spracheinflüsse im deutschen Schlesien* (Peter Lang, 2011); Felicja Księżyk, *Die deutsche Sprachinsel Kostenthal. Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin: Trafo, 2008); Piotr Kocyba, *Sprachenkampf, Sprachkontakt und Sprachstatus. Polnische Perspektiven auf das Idiom der Oberschlesier* (München-Berlin-Lepizig-Washington, D. C.: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2015); Paul Robert Magocsi, ed., *Русыньскый язык. Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich* (Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, 2004); Vladislav Knoll, *Kašubština v jazykovém kontaktu* (Praha: Charles University Faculty of Philosophy, 2012); Hanna Makurat, *Interferencjowé przejmacy w gódcie bilingwalny społězně Kaszub* (Gdańsk: Instytut Kaszubski, 2014); Motoki Nomachi “On the Kashubian Past Tense Form *jô bêt* ‘I was’ from a Language Contact Perspective,” in M. Nomachi, A. Danylenko, P. Piper, eds., *Grammaticalization and Lexicalization in the Slavic Languages* (Otto Sagner Verlag, 2014), pp. 218–242; Motoki Nomachi & Bernd Heine, “On Predicting Contact-Induced Grammatical Change: Evidence from Slavic Languages,” *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 1 (2011), pp. 48–76; Małgorzata Misiak, “O wpływie czynników pozajęzykowych na rozwój mowy - przypadek etnolektu łemkowskiego (wybrane aspekty),” in G. Olchowa & M. Balowski, eds., *Języki słowiańskie w procesie przemian* (Bańska Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici, 2015), pp. 39–51.

THE ETHNO-LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN POLAND AFTER 1989

The ethnic and linguistic situation in Poland is characterized by homogeneity and heterogeneity at the same time.¹² Taking into account the small share of minorities and minority languages within the Polish population (less than 3 per cent and decreasing), Poland can be classified as an ethnically and linguistically homogeneous country. The Polish population makes up about 98 per cent of the total population and Polish is the utterly dominant language in all terms and domains.¹³ Regardless of the proportion of minorities in the Polish population, however, Poland is still branded by its (past) multiethnic character and multilingualism, since the small minority share shows a great diversity: legally recognized are 14 national and ethnic minority languages (Armenian, Belarusian, Czech, German, Hebrew and Yiddish, Karaim, Lemko, Lithuanian, Romani, Russian, Slovak, Tatar, Ukrainian)¹⁴ and one regional language (Kashubian), not to mention Silesian and Wilamowicean (which still strive for official recognition by the Polish state), or other language varieties with disputable glottopolitical status (such as Podlachian).¹⁵ Regardless of the ethno- and sociolinguistic condition of individual minority language varieties and their actual share in Poland's linguistic repertoire, after 1989 they have

12 Monika Wingender & Katarzyna Wiśniewiecka-Brückner, "Konjunktur für Minderheitensprachen. Polens Sprachpolitik und das Kaschubische," *Osteuropa* 57 (2007), pp. 211–224.

13 The 2011 Census included a question concerning the language(s) used at home. Out of 38.5 million Polish citizens an enormous majority (98.02%) turned to be Polish-monolinguals; the final results were published for: Polish 37.8 million, Silesian 529K, Kashubian 108K, German 96.5K, Belarusian 26.5K, Ukrainian 24.5K, Russian 20K, Romani 14.5K, Lemko 6.3K, Lithuanian 5.3K, Armenian 1.8K, Czech 1.5K, Slovak 765, Hebrew 321/Yiddish 90, Tatar 9. See e.g. extensively [<http://inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/Frontend/Home/About>], accessed in July 2017.

14 In spite of many doubts and questions concerning e.g. the "Tatar language" (extinct among the Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatars for ca. three centuries), dubious status of Hebrew as Poland's minority language, or identification of Polish Armenians with contemporary Armenian, etc.—for discussions see e.g.: Alfred F. Majewicz, "Minority Situation Attitudes and Developments after the Return to Power of Post-Communists in Poland," *Nationalities Papers. The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 27:1 (1999) [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/009059999109226>]; Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, "Tożsamość mniejszości językowych w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej" (2000) [<http://www.republikasilesia.com/RS/jynzyk-sloonski/godoomy/messages/36.html>], accessed in July 2017; Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, "Language Policy and Sociolinguistics of Kashubian," in C. Obracht-Prondzyński & T. Wicherkiewicz, eds., *The Kashubs: Past and Present* (Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 141–178; Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, "Minority Language Education in Poland and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages," in M. Olpińska & L. Bertelle, eds., *Zweispachigkeit und Bilingualer Unterricht, seria: Warschauer Studien zur Germanistik und Angewandten Linguistik* (Peter Lang, 2014), pp. 151–178.

15 More on the history, status and situation of Podlachian and Polesian language varieties can be found in the bilingual Polish-English web-portal [<http://inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/Frontend/Language/Details/21>], accessed in July 2017.

certainly been present both in the public debate and in the language landscape of Poland.

This, however, concerns only the recognized standard or standardized languages. The actual plethora of dialect continua spoken in the territory of Poland has been experiencing enormous impoverishment, because of variform results of language policy (or actually dynamically changing language policies) of the state, language planning (both top-down and bottom-up), forced and adopted language ideologies and territorially and diachronically changing language attitudes, the latter representing almost idiosyncratic diversity.

As documented in dialectological archives and confirmed by their analyses, not only Polish, but also all minority languages used as community codes, formed interfering and interrelated diastratic and diatopic continua, rarely divided by actual language borders, and if, mostly by natural barriers: swamps, forests, mountains or rivers. A perfect example here can be the diversity of East-Slavic dialects (in the south classified as Ukrainian, and further subdivided, in the north considered Belarusian, with the vague group of Polesian, Podlachian and several other varieties in between),¹⁶ which smoothly continues into the West-Slavic area, with a superfluity of the so-called “transitional” varieties. These “transitional” (in terms of national dialectologies) vernaculars frequently constitute(d) main codes of communication for considerable local communities, who did not perceive anything interim in their well-functioning local language systems.

Such a diversity of spoken local or regional varieties was in use also in other “borderlands,” be it geographical peripheries of the Polish language area, or a multitude of *Sprachinseln* within. That originally colonial German linguistic phenomenon of “speech islands” (= German(ic) language exclaves) was defined in German sociolinguistics as “a linguistic community formed by a prevented or delayed linguistic / cultural assimilation, separated from its main area, and surrounded by a linguistically / ethnically differing majority community, separated from the contact-community by socio-psychological motives, which motivate the singularity or exclusion” (Mattheier [1994]).¹⁷ Most of the German-speaking *Sprachinseln* ceased to exist after the World War II, in consequence of deportations, displacements and an immense shift of Poland’s borders to the west. The only remnant of that *Sprachinseln*-network seems to be the microlanguage community of Wilamowice in southern Poland.

16 For abundant references see e.g.: Михайло Лесів, *Українські говірки у Польщі* (Варшава: Український Архів, 1997); Feliks Czyżewski & Michał Łesiów, eds., *Ze studiów nad gwarami wschodniosłowiańskimi w Polsce* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 1997); or the multi-volumed *Atlas gwar wschodniosłowiańskich Białostoczczyzny*. Ossolineum; and in general the website [www.inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl], accessible incessantly.

17 Klaus J. Mattheier, “Theorie der Sprachinsel. Voraussetzungen und Strukturierungen,” in N. Berend & K. Mattheier, eds., *Sprachinselforschung* (Peter Lang, 1994), pp. 333–348.

The socio-political changes started in 1989 have brought significant developments not only in the position of minority issues in debates and discourses, in their public visibility and language policies, but also in substantial changes within language systems themselves. On the one hand, fifteen non-Polish languages gained official recognition; on the other hand, they were exposed to intensified expectations, demands and policies of standardization and unification. As a result, the Poland's linguistic heritage and diversity is fading at a tremendous rate and vanishing irrevocably. Numerous documentation projects carried out recently are coming to an end or will soon be stopped due to the death of the last speakers of individual language varieties.

Most of the non-standard varieties have functioned as "doubly stigmatized" codes, which had to confront their low prestige with primarily Polish (as standard and/or in its local/regional varieties) and secondarily with the minority "titular" state language (e.g. standard Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Czech, Slovak or German). That double stigmatization and double inferiority must have resulted in strong tendencies to intra- and extra-community rejection of habitual codes, commonly considered incorrect or lacking prestige. Those trends were in line with the general stigmatization in post-War Poland of any non-standard-Polish variety. As e.g. Zielińska (2013: 437–438) observed, there had appeared a common thread of repressions caused by the use of a language.

This regards not only primary national and ethnic languages, such as German, Ukrainian, Lemko, Belarusian, as well as Polish dialects, but also the way of speaking Polish with characteristic traits resulting from bilingualism. To put it briefly, every way of speaking that would stray from the model of literary Polish was deprecated. Due to this, every speaker using non-literary Polish was stigmatized. It is interesting that he/she was stigmatized by persons who were not using the standard Polish either. Every group characterized by a different language was simultaneously being stigmatized and stigmatizing others. At the same time, nobody was familiar with the "model" that was so desirable. It was an imagined, idealized model of "the purest Polish."

Among the inhabitants of the territories annexed from Germany in 1945, there appeared a conviction that "pure Polish" should be spoken. This conviction has survived to this day and is confirmed by many utterances of the residents of the examined region [Lebus region; the author]; in these utterances, they express an opinion that "the purest Polish is spoken here," and it is "the purest" Polish in the whole country, as there are "no dialects" here. Embedded here is a certain image of the culture and linguistic situation in the region; it is considered obvious, is deeply internalized, not reflected upon and automatically reproduced by institutions (...)

Meanwhile, academic research that would measure "language purity" in individual Polish regions does not and cannot exist. The category of "purity" is not neutral and cultural, but rather exclusive and ethnic. It is a non-scientific category characteristic of nationalist discourse, and therefore it cannot be used in academic research. Claims that literary Polish is used in the Polish regions annexed after 1945, and that dialects have disappeared from there to a greater extent or faster than from other Polish regions, are not supported by academic research at all.

That policy of recognition of exclusively standard varieties of both Polish as the state language and minority languages was accompanied by the national policy and attitudes towards minority languages after 1989. The main symptoms and interpretations of such an implicit and potent policy might be:

- striving for state's official recognition as "regional languages" (by dint of that fuzzy term introduced to the Council of Europe's language policy) achieved already or desired by the Kashubian and Silesian communities respectively. Neither the past, nor the present or planned language policies refer to language "subvarieties," therefore the recognition as language—be it regional, official, "auxiliary"/supporting, or minority one—conditions the very maintenance of a community language (see e.g. Hornsby & Wicherkiewicz for the Kashubian case study);¹⁸
- ostentatious publication of the text of the 2005 *Law on national and ethnic minorities and on the regional language* in all supposedly(?) "standard(ized)" minority/regional languages in Poland, including e.g. Crimean(*sic!*) Tatar, (modern Eastern) Armenian, (written) Polska Roma and Bergitka Roma(ni), (modern—*sic!*) Hebrew (=Ivrit), or standard Belarusian;¹⁹
- reluctance to display the actually used local place names on officially introduced bilingual place-names in eastern Poland,²⁰ where the formally recognized Belarusian minority speaks the "local East Slavic" tongue, referred to as *Pudłańska mova*;²¹
- refusal to subsidize initiatives aiming at maintenance of local/regional varieties of minority languages within the ministerial grant programs run by the Polish authorities.
- very recent negative opinion issued by the Ministry of Administration in response to Wilamowice's application for official recognition, justified by the allegedly "confirmed" status of Wymysiöeryś as "only" a German dialect.

POLAND'S MINORITY LANGUAGES IN LANGUAGE CONTACT WITH POLISH

The language contact phenomena between Polish and minority languages shall be exemplified by three case studies, namely those of Lemko, Lithuanian

18 Michael Hornsby & Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, "To Be or Not to Be (a Minority?) The Case of the Kashubians in Poland," in I. Horváth & M. Tonk, eds., *Minority Politics Within the Europe of Regions* (Cluj-Napoca: Scientia, 2011), pp. 141-154 [<http://issuu.com/scientiakiado/docs/horvaththonkminortiy>], accessed in July 2017.

19 To be retrieved [<http://mniejszosci.narodowe.mswia.gov.pl/mne/prawo/ustawa-o-mniejszosciac/tlumaczenia/6490,Tlumaczenia-Ustawy-o-mniejszosciach-narodowych-i-etnicznych-oraz-o-jezyku-region.html>], accessed in July 2017.

20 The authorities have not accepted the public use of forms such as Вурля/Ворля, introducing a hybrid form Орля instead.

21 Cf. e.g. [<http://svoja.org>], accessed in July 2017.

and Wilamowicean/Wymysiöeryś. The three language systems and types of their contacts with Polish are essentially different, as far as their typology or genetic classification, language status, prestige and numbers of speakers are concerned. Baltic Lithuanian is a full-fledged recognized state language of Lithuania (with all its language planning tools and institutions), spoken by Poland's Lithuanian minority in both standard and peripheral dialectal forms, often in a triglottic constellation. Slavic Lemko is either considered a variety of a separate Rusyn language, or a dialect of Ukrainian, spoken in the borderland region of Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine, as well as Lemko diasporas in Poland and abroad. Germanic Wymysiöeryś is a severely endangered and unrecognized microlangue spoken in a single town of Wilamowice in southern Poland.

All of them, however, share a parameter of long-lasting contacts with Polish and Polish regional varieties, which, to different degrees, have influenced actually all the above mentioned linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

LEMKO IN POLAND

Up until year 1947 the region of Lemkovyna (Лемковина) had the shape of a latitudinal wedge of about 150 km of length and 60 km of width, located between Polish settlements in the north and Slovak area in the south. The border between Rusyn and Polish settlements has not changed much over centuries, meaning that the line separating these two groups was relatively sharp and stable. The situation was different on the southern border, where the areas of the Rusyn language use were not the same as where the "Rusyn faith" prevailed. After the outbreak of World War II, areas inhabited by the Lemkos were incorporated for the most part into the General Government. During that time, the differences of national attitudes among the Lemkos increased—despite the Ukrainian administration forced on Lemkovyna, in the case of education but not only, a part of the local population resisted enforced Ukrainization even more strongly than before.

Lemkovyna was inhabited by the indigenous population until 1947. Right after the World War II there was a massive resettlement of the Lemkos to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and after that, as part of *Operation Vistula*, to the so-called *Recovered Territories*, to Lower Silesia in particular. In addition to this, as a result of Operation Vistula and the prohibition of resettlement of people and Uniate priests, the ministry activities of the Greek Catholic Church were made impossible and the Lemkos were declared a Ukrainian minority. Since then, the Lemkos have lived in dispersion, and only a small part of the group managed to return to Lemkovyna—by the 1980s there were allegedly 10,000 Lemkos in their indigenous areas. The returnees could not rely on any kind of help from the state; they usually had to either buy back or restore their households. Before the year 1947, the number of the Lemkos in Polish Lemkovyna was estimated at about 150,000 people. The local Lemkos inhabited mostly rural areas, while bigger urban centers in Lemkovyna were definitely

Polish in their ethnic character. At the turn of the 21st century, estimates concerning the number of the Lemkos varied greatly. Magocsi (2004) wrote about around 90,000 Lemkos in Ukraine and 60,000 Rusyns (the majority of which are being Lemkos) in Poland, while, as it is often the case with minorities lacking their own state organization, not everyone readily admits their heritage. The official data collected during the National Census of 2002 revealed that 5,863 people declared Lemko nationality and 5,627 people used the Lemko language at home, including 1,444 for whom it was the only language used at home. According to data collected during the National Census of 2011, there are ca. 10,000 people in Poland calling themselves the Lemkos (the Census and its methodology are discussed in details below, in the section on Lithuanian). As representatives of the Lemko community agree, the actual number of people who consider themselves Lemkos is at least twice as high.

After the year 1945, Lemko, similarly to the rest of Rusyn varieties in other countries of the Eastern Block (the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary) was declared a Ukrainian dialect. Despite being consistently used in everyday life, the Lemko language was not taught in schools, and all Lemko publications had to be Ukrainized. Therefore, changes were introduced to writing so that it resembled the Ukrainian spelling (for instance, the letter <ы> was removed and the letter <i> was introduced), whereas the word “Rusyn” was replaced with the term “Ukrainian” in all official writings.

In 1989, the Lemko Society was established. Its aim was to support the development of the Lemko culture and build a sense of the group’s individual ethnic identity. Soon, the society started publishing *Becida* magazine. At the same time, the Lemko Union was formed, an organization of pro-Ukrainian orientation. Today, the Lemkos have the status of an ethnic minority (Michna [1995], Misiak [2006], Wicherkiewicz [2006]).²²

In 1992, the 1st Congress of Rusyn Language was held in Bardejovské Kúpele/ Бардеївскы Купелі in Slovakia, during which it was decided that a common literary language of the Rusyns was to be created. It was to be done by the so-called Rhaeto-Romance rule, meaning that in every country where a variety of Rusyn was spoken (Poland, Slovakia, Ukraine, the former Yugoslavia), a local literary norm was to be established, and on the basis of those local forms, one literary language was to be created.

The Lemko language has hardly been studied in the past as far as the Polish-Lemko language contacts and/or interferences from Polish are concerned. This fact has strengthened a lay observation that actually the Polish adstrate in Lemko constitutes one of the crucial systemic features of its

22 Ewa Michna, *Łemkowie: Grupa etniczna czy naród?* (Kraków: Nomos, 1995); Małgorzata Misiak, *Łemkowie. W kregu badań nad mniejszościami etnolingwistycznymi w Europie* (Uniwersytet Wrocławski, 2006); Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, *The Ukrainian and Ruthenian Language in Education in Poland* (2006) [http://www.mercator-research.eu/fileadmin/mercator/dossiers_pdf/Ukrainian_Ruthenian.pdf], accessed in July 2017.

assumptive distinctiveness from Ukrainian. Analogous could have been the role of Russian in the history of the (Old-)Rusyn language movement.²³ Among recent publications, worth mentioning in the context of Lemko (in) language contact are e.g. Reis (2013) & (2014), Menzel & Reis (2014), Zeller (2017).²⁴

Therefore, interesting might be the observations and analyses made by those linguists who (still) consider Lemko to be one of Ukrainian dialects.

Distinctive Phonological Features:

In his description of Lemko, Лесів (2009) pays great attention to the differences between the Lemko language and the literary Ukrainian language.²⁵ He mentions, along many other features, the lack of pleophony in some words in which it should occur. He also describes an old feature not existing in Ukrainian anymore, namely the differentiation between [и] and [ы]. He also stresses that these features do not change the fact that the variety used by Lemkos is (genetically) Ukrainian.

Other features which currently distinguish Lemko dialects from the Ukrainian language are actually those that have appeared in consequence of contact interference from Polish, and according to Fontański (2004: 222–227), Rieger (1995: 12–22),²⁶ include:

- fixed penultimate stress,
- pronunciation of <л> as a non-vocalic [ɫ]
- the above-mentioned conservation of the difference between the former ы and и [i], unlike in Ukrainian (dialects), i.e. *быти* ('to be'), *бити* ('to hit')
- pronunciation of palatalized s, c, z like Polish [ɕ ʦ ʒ].

23 Cf. Paul Robert Magocsi, "The Rusyn Language Question Revisited," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 120 (1995), pp. 63–84.

24 Anastasia Reis, "Лемковские анафорические местоимения: кодифицированная норма и разговорный узус," *Linguistica Copernicana* 1:9 (2013), pp. 215–237; Anastasia Reis, "Язык лемков на границе между Восточной и Западной Славней: особенности словоизменения анафорических местоимений в речи лемков," in M. Giger, H. Kosáková, M. Příhoda, eds., *Slované mezi tradicí a modernitou*. Červený Kostelec-Praha: Pavel Mervart, 2014), pp. 41–62; Thomas Menzel, Anastasia Reis, "Regularität/Irregularität im Paradigma anaphorischer Pronomen. Zur Rolle des Sprachkontakts im Lemkischen," *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 70 (2014), pp. 119–160; Jan Patrik Zeller, "Wpływ polszczyzny na wariantywność morfosyntaktyczną w lemkowskiźnie—forma przypadkowa rzeczownika w funkcji orzecznika," *Postscriptum Polonistyczne* 1:19 (2017), pp. 117–127.

25 Михайло Лесів "Основні характерні особливості системи лемківських говірок," in O. Лещак, ed., *Studia Methodologica XXVII: Лемківський діалект у загальноукраїнському контексті* (Тарнополь: Редакційно-видавничий відділ ТНПУ ім. В. Гнатюка, 2009), pp. 15–29.

26 Henryk Fontański, "Лемковщина," in Magocsi, ed., *Русыньскый язык*, pp. 211–262; Janusz Rieger, *Słownictwo i nazewnictwo lemkowski* (Warszawa: Semper, 1995).

Morphology and Syntax:

When it comes to grammar, the Lemko language has numerous elements which set it apart from Ukrainian. This fact was noticed, among others, by Аркушин (2009: 71), Панцьо (2009: 76), or Ванько (2004: 74).²⁷ The main features of Lemko which distinguish it from Ukrainian are:

- occurrence of sentences with an implied subject: *Робил єм там цалый день* ('I worked there all day long')
- using the reflexive-reciprocal pronoun *ci* to express mutuality, i.e. *помагати ci* ('to help each other'), unlike Ukrainian *один одному*
- analytical verbal forms, such as the FUT formed by the verb *быти* + INF, e.g. *буду ходити* ('I will be walking'), or by the verb *быти* + PP (ending -л) of the declined verb, i.e. *буду ходил* ('I will be walking');
- the forms *мам, знам, тримам*, in verb declension, and not *маю, знаю, тримаю* ('I have, know, keep') like in Ukrainian;
- F SG nouns in the LOC case use the ending -ом: *над ріком* (Ukrainian: *над рікою* 'by the river');
- 3 SG PRES verbal ending -т, i.e. *ходить* ('is walking'), *робит* ('is doing'), *сидит* ('is sitting'), and not *ходить, робить, сидить* like in Ukrainian;
- the ending -л in the 3 SG PST verbs, i.e. *ходил* ('was going'), *робил* ('was doing'), *спал* ('was sleeping'), and not *ходив, робив, спав* like in Ukrainian
- the ending -ом for F nouns, ADJ and PRO in INS case, i.e. *с том добром сусидом* ('with this good neighbour (F)'), and not *с тов добров сусидов*
- identical forms of M and N nouns and PRO in the LOC and INS cases like in Polish, i.e. *о тым добрым хлопви—с тым добрым хлопом* ('about this good fellow—with this good fellow').

Lexis:

The basis for the Lemko lexicon is shared with the Ukrainian vocabulary. There are also words of Romanian origin, brought by settlers from Wallachia, or German loanwords. Rieger (1995: 16–17) points out that the number of borrowings, however, is many times lower than the number of Ukrainian words. Examples of Polish borrowings (which in the Лесів's test made up 18% of the Lemko lexicon—[1997]: 16–18) include: *чловек* ('human'), *ксіондз* ('priest') or *фітли* ('jokes'). They are often encountered in the domains of economy, administration and politics, i.e. *право ізды* ('driving license'), *повітовий уряд* ('county office'), *податковий уряд* ('tax office'), *безпосередній податок* ('direct tax'), *фінансовий потентат* ('top executive'), *особовий/товаровий/поспішний потяг* ('passenger/cargo/express train'). Within derivational morphology, worth

27 Григорій Аркушин, "Назви осіб із суфіксом -іст-а у лемківських говірках," in Лещак, ed., *Studia Methodologica XXVII*, pp. 71–74; Стефанія Панцьо, "Префіксальне та префіксально-суфіксальне творення прикметників у лемківському говорі," in Лещак, ed., *Studia Methodologica XXVII*, pp. 75–82; Юрай Ванько, "Класифікація і головні знаки карпатських русинських діалектів," Magocsi, ed., *Русьняський язык*, pp. 67–84.

mentioning are such features, as e.g. the ending -иско instead of Ukrainian -ище, i.e. пасвиско 'pasture').

LITHUANIAN IN POLAND

After both Poland and Lithuania gained their political independence in 1918, and their political boundaries were settled after the armed conflicts of 1919–1922, the ethnic Lithuanians turned into a typical (in at least for Eastern and Central European contexts) typical transborder national minority in the Republic of Poland. The results and the aftermath of the Second World War have limited the Lithuanian-minority territory in Poland to a compact rural area within a single county/district of Sejny/Seinai located in the northeastern corner of Poland (known as Suwalszczyzna/Suvalkija).

Because of their widespread bilingualism, the Lithuanians in Poland, although not numerically strong, constitute an exceptional minority in the otherwise ethnically and linguistically homogeneous population of the country.

The first population census in post-war Poland was carried out in 2001, and its results were published in 2002. According to the census, 5,846 citizens of Poland declared Lithuanian nationality, while 5,838 declared Lithuanian as their home language. Noteworthy is an almost one-to-one correspondence between the registered number of ethnic Lithuanians and speakers of Lithuanian—unprecedented among other minority communities in Poland.

The 2011 census questionnaires also included questions regarding national or ethnic identity as well as the language used at home (double declarations were possible). Contrary to 2001, the 2011 census was based on representative sampling, which considerably decreased the statistical reliability of the results, particularly in reference to small samples of the population (like e.g. the minority communities). The results (obtained in that methodologically inconsistent survey) indicated 7,863 citizens of Poland who declared Lithuanian nationality, whilst 5,303 declared using Lithuanian as their home language. On a microregional scale, Lithuanians constitute about 30 per cent of the population in the county/district of Sejny/Seinai, and up to 75 per cent in Puńsk/Punskas—considered their community center.

Linguistically, the varieties spoken traditionally by the Lithuanian minority in Poland belong to the southern and western Aukštaitian dialectal area and for the most part coincide with the ethno-dialectal region of Dzūkija. In terms used by Polish specialists in Lithuanian dialectology, the varieties used in the area under concern are: *litewska gwara puńska* and *litewska gwara sejneńska*.

Both varieties can be considered endangered, although the degrees of endangerment (according to the UNESCO scale) vary from "critically endangered" in the case of the Sejny/Seinai variety to "unsafe" in the case of that of Puńsk/Punskas. Further, the north-westernmost variety spoken (in the past) in the vicinity of Wizajny/Wižaienis has to be considered extinct.

In the case of the Lithuanian minority in Poland, it is Dzūkian that has formed the primary and most obvious token of local linguistic identity, being also the main code of communication. The community members keep labeling themselves *Dzūkai* (the Dzūks), especially when stressing their integrity and specificity in contrast with the Lithuanian-speaking community of Lithuania. The same label is applied in Lithuania, in a somewhat derogatory sense, as an external identification mark, to Poland's Lithuanian minority. Those young Lithuanians from Poland who decide to continue their education at universities in Lithuania spare no effort to quickly get rid of their Dzūkian idiolects. In their opinion,²⁸ the Dzūks from Poland are perceived as peripheral/provincial (so are the inhabitants of the sparsely populated region of Dzūkija in Lithuania), and their peripheral/archaic lect as odd.

The language constellation of the Lithuanian minority in Poland is undergoing significant transformations as a result of the political developments of the 1990s and 2000s. It is the Lithuanian language (without differentiating between standard Lithuanian and the Dzūkian variety) that constitutes the essential marker of identity among the Lithuanian minority. Over 90 per cent of the Polish Lithuanians consider Lithuanian their basic language of thinking and communication in the family context. The regional center of Suwałki/Suvalkai, with about 120 declared Lithuanians, is the only urban hub of that minority in Poland, next to the earlier mentioned Sejny and the capital Warsaw.

Thanks to an efficient and consistent education system (discussed later) and the compact residence, the Lithuanians preserved their language in the highest degree among all minority language communities in post-war Poland (Wicherkiewicz [2005]).²⁹ Being almost entirely isolated by an impenetrable Soviet-Polish border from the then Soviet Lithuania(ns), the generation of present adults had developed bilingual and polyglottic communication patterns with Dzūkian as the intracommunity and everyday language, literary Lithuanian as the language of education and religious practices, and Polish as the language of external communication (the latter mostly in its typical north-eastern regiolectal variety). Language contacts with and the influence of standard Lithuanian intensified, however, with the Republic of Lithuania regaining its independence and enormously strengthening its state language policy. That resulted in more direct contacts with Lithuanian-language users and mass-media. In 2004 both Poland and Lithuania became member states of the European Union and in 2007 of the Schengen Agreement, which further amplified the presence of

28 According to the results of a small-scale survey with semi-structured interviews presented in: Justyna Walkowiak & Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, "Tangled Language Policies: Polish in Lithuania vs. Lithuanian in Poland," in H. Marten & S. Lazdiņa, eds., *Multilingualism in the Baltic States: Societal Discourses and Contact Phenomena* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018 [in print]).

29 Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, *The Lithuanian Language in Education in Poland* (2005) [http://www.mercator-research.eu/fileadmin/mercator/dossiers_pdf/lithuanian_in_poland.pdf], accessed in July 2017.

standard Lithuanian in everyday life, particularly in that of the youngest generation. The role of Dzūkian is now limited to everyday use in family contacts. More and more language use domains are being filled by standard Lithuanian and/or standard Polish—the process depending considerably on the language biographies of (younger) language users. Young members of the Lithuanian minority develop their language patterns according to their education paths: those who study at Lithuania’s universities become bilingual, with standard Lithuanian as L1 and standard Polish as L2, while those who run their businesses (predominantly) in Poland develop a reverse hierarchy. Worth mentioning is also a new group of Poles who learn Lithuanian (e.g. at universities) as a foreign language (also for business purposes). The role of Lithuanian as the native language of a minority decreases, especially in its Dzūkian variety, while its prestige as an international and transborder language keeps increasing, as a direct result of the European/regional economic integration.

As the studies by Birgiel (2005), Marcinkiewicz (2003), and Walkowiak & Wicherkiewicz (2018)³⁰ reveal, a stable triglossia of Polish Lithuanians tends to disappear in favor of unstable bilingualism, with standard Lithuanian and standard-close Polish with recurrent but frequent code-mixing. The latter includes the two prestigious standard varieties as well as the Dzūkian variety with numerous standard and regional Polish interferences and decreasingly lower prestige. Perceptible is still an (also decreasing) influence of the vicinal Belarusian varieties. While older Lithuanian minority members skillfully avoided mixing their three codes, code-mixing processes increase nowadays in the speech of the younger generations.

Most frequent interferences in Polish Lithuanians’ code can be observed regularly on all language levels, but—as can be expected—most of them consistently occur in phonetics and lexical system.

Phonetics and phonology:

- collective replacement of [o] and [e] by [ɔ] and [ɛ]
- ample phonologization of [f] and [x], frequently also [ç] and [ʒ]
- stabilized stress (penultimate) patterns not only in Polish loanwords, but also in internationalisms
- Grumadienė (1994)³¹ noted also a remarkable impact of Polish intonation patterns.

Morphology and syntax:

- Interference-induced changes in grammatical gender (Lithuanian having two genders, Polish—three), as well as occasional changes in grammatical number:

30 Walkowiak & Wicherkiewicz “Tangled Language” [in print].

31 Laima Grumadienė, “Punsko šnektos niveliacijos pobūdis,” *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 34 (1994), pp. 97–105.

- Lt. *telegrama* F vs. LtP. *telegramas* M ← Pol. *telegram* M
- Lt. *kriterijus* M vs LtP. *kriterija* F ~ Pol. *kryterium* N
- Lt. *tualetas* M vs. LtP. *toaletė* F ← Pol. *toaleta* F
- Lt. *kompetencija* SG vs. LtP. *kompetencijos* PL ← Pol. *kompetencje* PL
- Lt. *valdžia* SG vs. LP. *valdžios* PL ← Pol. *władze* PL ('authorities')
- changes in prepositional phrases:
 - Lt. *be penkių minučių trys*
 - 'without five minutes three' [+morphophonetic alternation]
 - LtP. *už penkių minučių trys* [no morphophonetic alternation]
 - ← Pol. *za pięć minut trzecia*
 - 'in five minutes three'
- pronominal phrases in place of inflectional cases:
 - Lt. *antrą, trečią dieną* [ACC]
 - 'next day, the third day')
 - LtP. *į antrą, trečią dieną* [ACC]
 - ← Pol. *na drugi, trzeci dzień*
 - 'on the next, third day'
- impersonal reflexive forms as calques from Polish:
 - Lt. *į diskotekas einu/einame*
 - 'to discos go-1SG/PL'
 - *į diskotekas einasi*
 - ← Pol. *chodzi się na dyskotece*
 - 'to discos [one] goes-REFL'
(we/I go to the disco)
 - Lt. *važiuoju/važiuojame prie ežero*
 - 'ride-1SG/PL to lake'
 - *važuojasi prie ežero*
 - ← Pol. *jedzie się nad jezioro*
 - rides-3SG.REFL to lake
(one goes to the lake)
- changes in morphosyntactic functions:
 - Lt. *dirbu socialiniu darbuotoju*
 - 'work-1SG social worker'
 - LtP. *dirbo kaipo darbuotojas*
 - ← Pol. *pracuję jako pracownik socjalny*
 - 'work-1SG as social worker'
(I work as a social worker)
 - Lt. *kartojame šį spektaklį*
 - 'repeat-1PL this spectacle'
 - LtP. *repetuojam duotą spektaklį*
 - ← Pol. *powtarzamy dany spektakl*
 - 'repeat-1PL given spectacle'
(we are repeating this/ given performance)

- Lt. *atvažiavo, kad nuvežtų į Krasnagrūdės dvārą*
- ‘came-3SG.PST to carry-INF to Krasnagrūda-GEN manor’)
- LtP. *atvažiavo, kad nuvežti į Krasnagrūdės dvārą* ‘
 - ← Pol. *przyjechał, żeby zawieźć do dworu w Krasnogrudzie*
- ‘came-3SG.PST to carry COND to Krasnagrūda-GEN manor’
(he came in order to carry it to Krasnagrūda manor)

- changes in word order:
 - Lt. *liepos dvyliktą, gegužės pirmą*
 - (‘July-GEN twelfth-GEN, May-GEN first-GEN’)
 - LtP. *dzvylikto liepos, pirmo mojaus*
 - ← Pol. *dwunastego lipca, pierwszego maja*
 - (twelfth-GEN July-GEN, first-GEN May-GEN)
(July the 12th, May the 1st)
 - Lt. *aklosios žarnos uždegimas*
 - (‘blind-GEN.DEF intestine-GEN inflammation-NOM’)
 - LtP. *uždegimas aklos žarnos*
 - ← Pol. *zapalenie ślepej kiszki*
 - (‘inflammation-NOM blind-GEN.INDF intestine-GEN’)
(appendicitis)
 - Lt. *mokyklos direktorius*
 - (‘school-GEN director-NOM’)
 - LtP. *direktorius mokyklos*
 - ← Pol. *dyrektor szkoły*
 - (‘director-NOM school-GEN’)
(school headmaster)

Lexis

- word-formation morphemes:
 - *-ka* (F marker):
 - LtP. *židauka, mokytojka*
 - Lt. *žydė, mokytoja*
 - Pol. *Żydówka, nauczycielka*
‘Jewess, school-mistress’
 - *-avas* (color noun marker):
 - LtP. *ružavas, fioletavas*
 - Lt. *rausvas/rožinis, violetinis*
 - ← Pol. *rózowy, fioletowy* ‘pink, purple’
 - *da-* (verbal PFV aspect marker):
 - LtP. *dabeigc mokslų, nedabeigc, dalekc, daplaukc*
 - Lt. *baigtį mokslų, nepabaigtį, nulektį, nuplaukti*
 - Pol. *dokończyć naukę, nie dokończyć, dolecieć, doptynąć*
‘to finish education, not to finish, to reach flying, to reach swimming’

- calques:
 - LtP. *děkoti iš kalno, pats per save*
 - ←Pol. *dziękować z góry, samo w sobie*
 - ('thank-INF from mountain', 'self in self')
 - Lt. *iš anksto děkoti, savaimė*
(‘to thank in advance’, ‘per se’)
- technical vocabulary:
 - LtP. *zamražarkė, spšenglas, komputeris, komurkė*
 - Lt. *šaldyklis, sankaba, kompiuteris, mobilusis telefonas*
 - Pol. *zamrażarka, sprzętło, komputer, komórka*
 - ('freezer, clutch, computer, cell-phone’).

WILAMOWICE AND WYMYSIÖERYŚ

Wilamowice (Wymysoü) is a small town situated in southern Poland in the county district of Bielsko-Biała, province of Silesia. Wymysiöeryś belongs to the group of West-Germanic languages. It is critically endangered because it is spoken by about 30 people in just one town. In consideration of its minority and archaic character, this Germanic linguistic enclave is an exceptionally interesting object of study for linguists.

It is assumed that the ancestors of the inhabitants of Wilamowice came to the area of Lower Silesia between 1250–1300 during the first Germanic colonization of Silesia. The Wilamowiceans believe that their forefathers descend from the Flemish people or Anglo-Saxons. Some researchers also derive it from Middle High German and West Franconian dialects or connect it with the Middle German dialects; however, the Low German influence is also noticeable.

Through the ages Wymysiöeryś was transmitted from generation to generation and used universally by the inhabitants of the town. The sociolinguistic situation changed after World War II. Informants related that in 1945, a priest had introduced the ban on using Wymysiöeryś and on wearing folk costumes. He also announced “the death of the language.” The inhabitants of Wilamowice were persecuted because they were considered to be German. The people who spoke Wymysiöeryś stopped using their language for their own and their children’s safety. In the 1950s, the repressions ceased, but interruption in language transmission had already happened. Today only the oldest inhabitants are proficient speakers of the language and their children just understand some basic vocabulary. However, even the users of the language seldom speak Wymysiöeryś, because their interlocutors often do not know it. From year to year, the number of users is getting smaller. Wymysiöeryś is critically endangered; however, in the last few years activities leading to the maintenance and preservation of the language have been undertaken. Wymysiöeryś is taught (by a method called “weak education”) in the local school and new pieces of literature in the language are being written.

Phonetics and phonology

As studied and described by Andrason (2014), Żak (2013) (also in Olko, Wicherkiewicz & Borges),³² one of the most striking phonetic features of Wymysiöeryś that are typical of Polish is the presence of the central close unrounded vowel *y* [i] (or fronted close-mid central unrounded [ɨ]). This sound is highly common in Wymysiöeryś: it is not only found in loanwords from Polish, such as *ryż* ‘rice’ (←*ryż*) or *ryczyż* ‘knight’ (← *rycerz*), but also extensively appears in the genuine Germanic vocabulary, for example: *bathyn* ‘panhandle’, *btynd* ‘blind’, *bthyn* ‘blow’ or *myt* ‘with’. It is regularly used as the vowel of the PP prefix *gy-* [gi] (*gybröta* ‘baked’, *gyšproha* ‘spoken’ or *gynuma* ‘taken’) and in other verbal prefixes, for instance in *by-* (*bynama* ‘call’) or *cy-* (*cybrähja* ‘break up’).

As Andrason (2014) describes, another typical Polish trait may be found in the consonantal system of Wymysiöeryś, i.e. in the series [ɛ z tɕ]. Polish has a complex system of postalveolar fricatives and affricates—it possesses both non-palatal sounds spelled as <sz, rz/ż, cz, and dż> and a palatal series noted as <ś, ź, ć, and dź>. In the genuinely Germanic vocabulary, Wymysiöeryś typically employs the soft palatal postalveolar sounds [ɕ], [z], and [tɕ] (there are no Germanic lexemes with [dz]): *štrös* ‘street’, *meńć* ‘man’ and *gyhüžum* ‘disobedient, naughty’.

Morphology and syntax

In the hitherto linguistic sketches on Wymysiöeryś, the results of strong language contacts with Polish and interferences in the morphosyntactic structure has been listed:

- double NEG: *Yhy wiöe kã möt ny y Błan* (‘I have never been to Bielany’)
- a limited occurrence of the VOC case:
 - NOM *büw*—‘boy’ Voc *büwy*
 - NOM *toüt*—‘people’ Voc *toüty*
 - NOM *müüm*—‘aunt’ Voc *mümy*
 - NOM *pot*—‘godmother’ Voc *poty*
- conjunctions *no*, *bo*, *to*:
 - o *Yhy ho dos bihta bo kouift yh ejs* (‘I have the book because I bought it’)

32 Alex[ander] Andrason, “The Polish Component in the Vilamovicean Language” (2014) [https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/sites/slaviccenters.duke.edu/files/media_items_files/andrason.original.pdf], accessed in July 2017; Andrzej Żak, “Wpływ języka polskiego na zagrożony wymarciem wilamowski etnolekt wymysiöeryś” (2013) [<http://inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/Editor/files/AZak%20wymysiöerys.pdf>], accessed in July 2017; Justyna Olko, Tomasz Wicherkiewicz & Robert Borges, eds., *Integral Strategies for Language Revitalization* (University of Warsaw, Faculty of “Artes Liberales,” 2016). Very recently, a comprehensive reference grammar of Wilamovicean was published as: Alexander Andrason & Tymoteusz Król, *A Grammar of Wymysorys* (Duke University, Slavic and East European Language Resource Center SEELRC, 2016) [https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/uploads/media_items/wymysorys-grammar.original.pdf], accessed in July 2017.

- *Yhy wà dos koïf no bo yhy wyt dos* ('I will buy it because I want it')
- *No to s'öwytš máj mama ziöet* ('well, then in-the-evening my mom says')
- lexeme *do* can be employed with a purposive-final value, corresponding to the use of the Polish *ze(by)*
 - *Yh ho gybata dy tohter do zy mir zo oüzwoša*
I have asked the daughter that she me shall-wash-up
'I have asked my daughter to (help me) wash up'
- free word-order
 - *Wen wyt kuma der nökwér, yhy wà dos maha*
when will come the neighbor, I will this do
'When the neighbor comes, I will do this'
 - *Wen wyt kuma der nökwér wàh dos maha*
When will come the neighbor will-I this do
'When the neighbor comes, I will do this'
- lack of *Consecutio Temporum*
 - *Á ziöet do à lejzt dos bihta*
he said that he reads this book
'He said that he was reading that book'
 - *Wen dy mer dos hetst gyziöet gestyn, wie'h ju mytum gykuzt*
if you me this had told yesterday would-I just with-him talked
'If you had told me that yesterday, I would already have talked to him'

Lexis:

Throughout the ages, the Wymysiöeryš lexicon has been adopting abundant loanwords from Polish, mostly in such semantic domains as plants, animals, food, professions, kinship terminology, names of instruments, objects, buildings, etc. (for voluminous lists of items see Wicherkiewicz [2003], Andrason [2014] or Żak [2013]),³³ such as e.g. *džjada* (Pol. *dziad*) 'grandpa; old man', *kłop* (*chłop*) 'man, husband', (*ćwikła*)*bürok* (*burak / ćwikłowy*) 'beetroot', *mišü* (*miś*) '(teddy-)bear'; *pstrong* (*pstrąg*) 'trout'; *ropüh* (*ropucha*) 'toad'; *stówik* (*słownik*) 'nightingale', *kałamož* (*kałamarz*) 'inkpot', *kapelüs* (*kapelusz*) 'hat'; *ketih* (*kielich*), 'goblet, cup'; *kiöepjec* (*kopiec*) 'mound', or the names of months (e.g. *styćyń*, *lüty*, *kwjećyń*—'January, February, April').

Particularly interesting from the contact-linguistic perspective are verbal loanwords composed of Polish lexical stems and Germanic infinitive/conjunctive endings, such as: *blonkàn zih* (*bląkać się*) 'wander'; *drenowàn* (*drenować*) 'drain'; *düifàn* (*dufać*) 'trust, fancy'; *dümjàn* (*dumać*) 'think', *bàwjàn* and *bàwjàn zih* (*bawić / się*) 'play'; *dwojàn* (*dwoić-dwajać*) 'doubt'; *gardzàn* (*gardzić*) 'despise', *ożyjàn* (*ożyć*) 'come alive'; *trüdzàn* (*trudzić się*) 'toil, trouble'; *wontpjàn* (*wątpić*) 'doubt' (for more examples see Wicherkiewicz [2003] and Andrason [2014]).

33 Tomasz Wicherkiewicz, *The Making of a Language. The Case of the Idiom of Wilamowice, Southern Poland* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003).

The level of saturation with Polish vocabulary was so high in some domains that it allowed for and resulted in frequent code-switching situations. Since the system started losing its communicative functions in the mid-20th century, it also became closed for new loanwords. The speakers either switched off Wymysiöeryś as the primary code or proceeded to mix Wymysiöeryś and Polish; the process of code-mixing was later complemented with standard German interferences. The results could be observed during this author's first fieldwork in Wilamowice (in 1989–1991), when the elderly informants were not afraid of speaking Wymysiöeryś anymore, but they had already experienced various ups and downs in language ideology and attitudes towards both their Wymysiöeryś microlanguage and the standard German language.

More recent loanwords have been introduced by actually only those who actively (re)started using Wymysiöeryś as written language after the 1980s: the writer Józef Gara³⁴ and the language revitalizers Tymoteusz Król and Justyna Majerska.³⁵ Tymoteusz Król is also extremely active in all essential domains of language revitalization, including corpus and acquisition language planning activities. His efforts and their influence upon the lexical inventory of modern (and standardized) Wymysiöeryś cannot be overestimated and require separate and systematic studies. The Wymysiöeryś language board, *Wymysiöeryśy Akademyj / Accademia Wilamowicziana*, established in 2014 and composed of scholars dealing with Wilamowice and its language, has only an advisory role in that respect.

The school instruction of Wymysiöeryś (since 2014) required new smart teaching materials, one of them being an illustrated dictionary for children,³⁶ prepared and published in 2015 with the intention to (re)provide the new-speakers of Wymysiöeryś with basic vocabulary and to persuade them that the “language of grandparents” can also include modern everyday terminology. The lexicon (re)invented by (mainly) T. Król does not avoid Polonisms, if they already somehow came into use (even individual or figurative) by native speakers—in that respect the young revitalizer serves not only as the intergenerational language transmitter but also a receptive and consultative expert in the local corpus planning. Thus, in the 2015 dictionary one can find such lexemes as: *der bankomat* (‘ATM’), *dy karetka* (‘ambulance’), *der prysznic* (Pol. *prysznic*—‘shower’), *der głöšnjik* (Pol. *głośnik*—‘loudspeaker’), *der kaloryfer* (Pol. *kaloryfer* ‘radiator’).

34 1920–2013, known under his Wymysiöeryś nick- and pen-name *Toter-Juza*.

35 Both born in 1993, known also under their Wymysiöeryś nick- and pen-names: *Tiöma-fum-Dökter* and *Jusiä-fum-Biöetuł* respectively.

36 *Tiöma fum Dökter, Tomasz Wicherkiewicz & Jūsja fum Biöetuł, Ynzer jyšty wyjthä* (Warsäwyšer Uniwersytet, 2015).

CONCLUSIONS

As shown in the paper, the three discussed case studies represent very different language contact situations:

1. the officially recognized Lithuanian national minority in Poland speaks Dzūkian as their first community language, with rather low and decreasing prestige, particularly in relation to standard Lithuanian and standard Polish; the linguistic and sociolinguistic boundaries between the two latter languages are clear-cut, the local Dzūkian serving as the contact-field of intense language interferences between Slavic (=Polish and Belarusian) and Baltic (=Dzūkian Lithuanian), in the past and nowadays.
2. the officially recognized Lemko ethnic minority in Poland speaks an unstandardized and internally diversified Lemko language complex, sometimes defined as the westernmost dialect of the Ukrainian continuum. Language attitudes of the Lemko vary from generation to generation and even on the micro-level, but generally its prestige is nowadays remarkably higher than in the pre-1989 past. Crucial for the Lemko linguistic status and sociolinguistic identity are long-lasting contacts between East (Ukrainian~Ruthenian, Russian) and West Slavic (Polish, Slovak), which have resulted in the today condition of Lemko, frequently considered a sort of “mixed language” even by its native speakers.
3. the officially unrecognized community of Wymysiöeryś in the town of Wilamowice, where a tiny minority of elderly and new speakers use an archaic variety, classified by linguists as a Silesian diachronic variety of Middle High German with strong systemic interferences from Polish (and from German), although the ethnic identity of Wilamowiceans remains non-German. After decades of language abandonment, Wymysiöeryś enjoys a dramatic increase of its prestige and some symptoms of language revival. Wymysiöeryś has always constituted a target of interferences from Polish, the latter both in its standard and regional form. The newly revitalized language system remains Germanic, although Polish elements are not normatively rejected.

Since most non-standard(ized) varieties actually spoken by minority communities in Poland remain largely unknown not only to the Polish society at large but sometimes even to the “titular” minority communities themselves, an essential task is their documentation and archiving, as well as popularization. Some of the varieties have already vanished irrevocably, some other—like Wymysiöeryś, Podlachian, or to a lesser extent Dzūkian—are in some degree being revitalized within their communities. On the other hand, most of the local varieties of Czech (e.g. in Zelów/*Zelov*), Slovak (in Spisz/*Spiš*) or German (in Silesia/*Schlesien*) are disappearing at a worrying rate without being documented. Therefore, in 2012, this author’s team started a project *Poland’s Linguistic Heritage. Documentation Database for Endangered Languages* with the intention to

extensively archive, disseminate and make accessible records (spoken, written, photo-documented etc.) of non-standard varieties used by Poland's minorities in the (recent) past and nowadays. The first results of the project can be accessed at www.inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl

All three language communities have undergone substantial changes in their ecolinguistic vitality and sociolinguistic situation after 1989, resulting in a considerable strengthening of their status and/or prestige, but they vary in recognition and status: from an uninterrupted post-War status as minority in the case of Lithuanians, through a long-expected recognition of the Lemko language and ethnicity, to a still awaited recognition of Wilamowice's *Wymysiöeryś*. A previously-mentioned growing interest in the linguistic diversity can be observed on the part of the Polish majority, from the perspective of both scholars and laymen.

On the other hand, most—if not all—language systems used as native by Poland's minorities display substantial internal changes. Until recently, these changes could have been interpreted as contact-induced (as shown in the case studies presented in this paper), but after 1989 they seem to bear hallmarks of language death caused not only by assimilation by the majority language (in the discussed cases Polish as Poland's state language), but also centrally promoted standardization (understood both qualitatively and quantitatively) of language diversity. The standardization trends have become so irrefutable that the top-down policies are frequently strengthened by bottom-up ideologies within the minorities themselves, which condemnably endeavor to “purify” and “unify” their language systems around standards—very often exogenous to the very communities in question, but tolerated by the Polish administration. In these two ways, Polish becomes a killer language not only directly—as a tool and objective of linguistic assimilation, but also indirectly—as an instrument and meta-reference of panoptic standardizing policy efforts in the country.

The processes, which currently occur within and between the (recognized and self-determined) speech communities, definitely require complex exploration and analyses, one of them being study of increasing code-mixing and/or ‘translanguaging’ / ‘polylanguaging’—more and more common not only within minority language speakers' groups. These tendencies seem to essentially reshape the subjective (individual and intra-community) images of and objective (linguistic) structures of particular (minority) language systems.

As described by Hornsby (2015): 3.³⁷

the sociolinguistic environments in which many young new speakers are being raised with the minority language are radically different from previous generations. As they gain critical mass in some communities, tensions may emerge about their role in language revitalization or about hierarchies of speakers promoted by community language ideologies. Therefore issues of

37 Michael Hornsby, *Revitalizing Minority Languages: New Speakers of Breton, Yiddish and Lemko* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

authenticity, legitimacy, hierarchies and power relations are often at the heart of “new speakerness.” Furthermore, their speech may be perceived as (considerably) different from traditional speech. Of course, some new speakers may come from traditional speaker backgrounds, that is to say they were exposed to their parents, grandparents or other close families and friends who spoke the language “traditionally” but who did not pass it on, at least not in the speakers’ childhood. Such speakers may present a complex mixed model of revivalist and maintenance strategies.

Language users may generally think of several linguistic features as belonging together, as “words” belong in a “vocabulary.” Typically the language users may also assign this group of features to a name, such as “Lithuanian”—so that a vocabulary would be “the vocabulary of Lithuanian.” Thereby the language users have constructed and agreed upon the idea of a “language” which they call “Lithuanian.” “Speaking a language” therefore means using features which are associated with a given language—and only such features. However, in real life speakers may and do use the full range of linguistic features at their disposal, in many cases regardless of how they are associated with different “languages.” *Languaging* is therefore the use of language, not of “a language.” “Translanguaging” (or “polylanguaging”) is the phenomenon when speakers use all their communicative skills, whereas some parts of their codes are associated with different language systems, including the cases in which the speakers know only few features associated with a given “language.”

A key element of the concept of “new speakerness” relates to the incorporation of the new language into active language use. Many new speakers aim to improve their active competence in the target language in one or more domains outside of (semi-)formal language learning. This may involve an overt stigmatization of multilingual practices such as translanguaging or undue attention to acquiring a native-like accent and/or prosody. Some new speakers have lower levels of competence than others, of course, but compensate for this by employing all the linguistic resources which they possess by different means and for different purposes, depending on the context and domain of use. Such contexts may be outside what have been perceived as more traditional domains for the language in question, for instance, formal education or social media, or limited to occasional social activities (Hornsby [2015]: 3–4).

That general scheme of the processes occurring recently within and among the minority language (new-)speakers’ communities indicate explicitly and inherently the need and course of prospective research in the field of minority language contact (socio)linguistics.³⁸

38 A very interesting research suggestion was made by a reviewer to this paper, and namely to try to connect the sociolinguistic situation of the (discussed) minority languages with the amount and quality of contact phenomena they exhibit, i.e. with the depth, intensity, strength of language contact.

List of Abbreviations:

1	1st person
3	3rd person
ACC	Accusative
ADJ	Adjective
COND	Conditional
DEF	Definite
F	Feminine
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
INDF	Indefinite
INF	Infinitive
INS	Instrumental
LOC	Locative
Lt.	Standard Lithuanian
LtP.	Lithuanian in Poland
M	Masculine
NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominative
PL	Plural
Pol.	Polish
PFV	Perfective
PP	Past Participle
PRES	Present
PRO	Pronoun
PST	Past
REFL	Reflexive
SG	Singular
VOC	Vocative