The Emancipation of the Lemko Language in the Context of Language Ideologies of Lemko Ethnic Activists

Ewa Michna

There are many forms of language emancipation; they can be found in the context of broader processes, such as the emancipation of oppressed groups, and the overcoming of trauma by groups who are underprivileged, marginalised or the victims of discrimination, and also in historical processes of nation-building and more contemporary politics of identity and struggles for recognition. In multilingual societies, as Leena Huss and Anna-Riitta Lindgren argue, languages are rarely equal. Instead, they form a hierarchy of various levels. Those lower down the hierarchy are not represented in all domains; instead, they are used only in the private sphere, often merely in spoken form, in the context of daily life, and are at the same time considered inferior. Often, groups using and identifying with such languages are subject to oppression which goes beyond the sphere of language (Huss and Lindgren 2011: 2). Underprivileged languages are frequently stigmatised as uglier, less pure, less civilised or vulgar. Furthermore, such languages are seen as less usable and viable, and therefore as the ones that should be replaced by the dominant language (Dorian 1998). In such situations, language emancipation aims to ameliorate this underprivileged position.

Language emancipation processes were of considerable significance in historical nation-building. In Protestant countries, language emancipation processes began during the Reformation, when the

appearance of the written form of a language was linked to the argument that the Word of God should be accessible to the faithful in the national language, which replaced Latin in the religious sphere (Huss, Lindgren 2011). Language emancipation and the development of literacy in local ethnolects were significant factors in the history of nation-building among such groups as the Basques, the Romansch, the Kashubians, and the Sorbs (Porębski 1991). In the case of such communities, among which the Carpatho-Rusyn group can be included, we can see demands for the development of a literary standard, literary creation and the translation of the Bible into local dialects. The role of language is of particular importance in nation-building processes in East-Central Europe. According to Józef Chlebowczyk, a sign of the first phase of nation-building processes in this part of Europe could be seen in the promotion and development of language, aimed at the national self-definition of ethnolinguistic groups, through language codification. Dialects and sub-dialects lost their previous variety, to be replaced by a uniform literary language. In this period, national campaigners were compelled to defend the separate identity of their language and the value of its existence; they also endeavoured to achieve its introduction into schools and to see it granted equal rights in various aspects of society (Chlebowczyk 1983). At the same time, emancipation processes are inextricably connected to discussions as to who the language users are, following the popular nationalistic argument that language is the main determinant of national identity (Billig 2008: 71). Language is universally considered to be an essential attribute of a nation: "Every self-respecting nation must have a language which is more than simply a means of communication, a 'sub-dialect' or 'dialect'. It must be a fully developed language. Anything else would imply lack of development of the nation itself." (Haugen 1980: 180). A distinct language, as one of the essential elements of culture, can become the matrix for the construction of cultural borders and a criterion for the classification of the world and the differentiation of what is 'ours' and what is 'foreign'.

The last few decades have seen further language emancipation leading to changes in what was hitherto seen as the fixed language map of the world. This is linked to the global movement of linguistic minorities who are involved in emancipation politics, which they introduce into

new domains (Huss and Lindgren 2011). Contemporary examples of language emancipation promote changes in international law regarding the respect of basic language rights. The adoption of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages was of great importance for the protection of the linguistic diversity of Europe and the realisation of the aspirations of those who wished to defend that aspect of their cultural heritage. Although the ratification of the charter is not obligatory even for European Union member states, it nevertheless represents a significant step forward in the realisation of the rights of language minorities. It focusses attention on the question of the protection of minority languages, and obliges those states that are signatories to implement at least minimal policies to protect the existence of minority languages in aspects of the public sphere such as education, the media, and cultural life (Dołowy-Rybińska 2011: 51).

Processes of language emancipation always include a political aspect, and the activities of groups displaying such aspirations face opposition from various social agents. Often, these opponents are the authorities of nation states who see the attempts to raise the status of a language, and to give it a literary form, as a threat to their authority, and even as the first step towards secession, when these activities are carried out by a group whom they consider to be part of their ethnos. On the other hand, conflicts within the group are also a significant factor, and we can observe opposition to the attempts at emancipation by certain members of one's own ethnic group. The roots of such opposition often lie in the nature of the definition of membership in the ethnic group and, respectively, different attitudes to the question of the separate identity of the language and its status. It is worth noting that the recognition of the separate identity of a language is not so much a linguistic question, but rather a political one, as it is the state which has the power to define, using methods which include legislation, whether a given language exists independently or whether it is part of another language of a group which has authority (Billig 2008).

In this article I will use the definition of language emancipation suggested by Huss and Lendgren, who "…define language emancipation as the process through which the dominated language is brought into use in various sectors of public life, orally and in writing, while the status of

the language is enhanced. It is a recurring sociolinguistic phenomenon that a low status vernacular is introduced in oral as well as written form to one or several prestigious societal domains where it has not been used previously. At the same time, the status of the language is enhanced." (Huss and Lendgren 2011: 2). According to the definition used in the project Language Emancipation in Finland and Sweden, the authors elaborate on this definition. "Language emancipation may consist of one or more of the following elements (among others). The language to be emancipated (…):

– is revalorized and gains respect both inside and outside the group;
– gains an official status through legislation;
– is introduced orally and in writing in one or several prestigious societal domains where it has not been previously used;
– on a societal level, a language shift begins from the high-status language to the low-status language in order to improve the position of the low-status language in society (…);
– an on-going language shift from low-status to high -status language in private life, especially in the home, is slowed down or reversed (…);
– corpus planning is carried out in order to develop written standards, to develop vocabulary for different domains, to write grammars and dictionaries, etc., thus creating a modern infrastructure for the language." (Huss and Lindgren 2011: 3).

The dynamics of the process of language emancipation can be analysed in the light of discussions and polemics within the group concerning the solutions chosen. These debates, determined by ideological linguistic divisions between group members, have considerable significance for the progress of the standardisation and revitalisation of the Lemko language. I believe that the linguistic issues which I intend to analyse require us to consider both the specific situation of a stateless group with identity divisions, and the broader context of the activities undertaken in order to achieve the emancipation of the Lemko language, including the struggle which began in the 1990s, for the recognition of Lemkos as a separate ethnic group.

The considerations contained in this article are based on the results of empirical research carried out since the mid-1990s among the ethnic activists of the Lemko community. This research consisted of in-depth,

free interviews, dealing with broadly understood issues of group identity. An important element of these conversations was the discussion of such issues as the relationship between identity and language, the codification of the Lemko language, the teaching of Lemko in schools, and the future of the language. Interviews from the second half of the 1990s, i.e., the beginning of the codification of the Lemko language and its systematic introduction into the public sphere, showed the early stages of the standardisation of Lemko and the efforts to achieve recognition for it. The empirical material is provided by interviews conducted in July and September 2015 with members of the Lemko community, namely, activists involved in the preservation, development, and dissemination of standard Lemko; Lemko language teachers; Greek Catholic and Orthodox clergy from Lemko parishes, some of who also teach their ethnic language. The material assembled in the course of these interviews is supplemented by the results of observations of various events such as ethnic festivals and the Congresses of the Rusyn Language in Prešov (1999) and in Krakow (2007), by the analysis of Lemko press publications, the programmes of the Lemko internet radio station Lem.fm, and the material from the radio station website. The interviewees were chosen according to fixed criteria. I decided to interview those individuals who have participated since the early 1990s in the standardisation of the Lemko language and who are active participants in the efforts to achieve recognition of Lemko as an independent language and state protection for it, who organise the teaching of the Lemko language both inside and outside schools, and who promote the position of the language in various aspects of the public sphere. The interviewees act to preserve the position of the language in numerous fields, and some of them are also authors, teachers of the Lemko language, and members of Lemko organizations.

This article will present discussions and debates within the group regarding the Lemko language and the activities undertaken for its preservation and development. These debates are the result of various language ideologies. The empirical material gathered since the early 1990s allows us to reconstruct a corpus of ideas regarding the language and shared by the subjects of this research, who are Lemko activists involved in the process of emancipation of the Lemko language and in language policies. These opinions are characterised by a language

ideology consisting of a range of ideas that language users articulate as a rationalization and justification of the perceived structure and use of the language (Silverstein 1979). They cover a range of issues relating not only to the structure of the language, but also to such fundamental questions as its place in the family of Slavic languages. The personal narratives analysed in the course of my research show the subjects' opinions on a range of issues: the contemporary state of the Lemko language and the reasons for this, threats to its existence, and also strategies for emancipation. Interviewees also assess existing achievements in language emancipation and the most important challenges facing groups of activists involved in the preservation and development of the language. Another important question is the problem of the legitimisation of the activities undertaken by Lemko activists to promote the language. We can see the appearance of issues pertaining to the relation between language and identity, and attempts to answer the question as to who should determine the objectives and strategies of emancipation and who should realise them. There is also the question of the form of the 'true' Lemko language. Who is its custodian? What are the relations between the (variously defined) 'true' Lemko language and the propositions, accepted in the course of its codification, which have sometimes been described as 'artificial'? The scope of this article means that some of the ideas pertaining to separate language ideologies will be described in more detail while others will be only briefly indicated. I intend to show the dynamics of internal debates within the group and discussions relating to the language. I will also indicate aspects of the Lemko language emancipation process which have been present since its beginning in the early 1990s, as well as new ones which have appeared in the personal accounts collected in 2015.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are broadly defined by Silverstein as 'any set of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use'. (Silverstein 1979: 193). An important aspect of the functioning of language ideologies is noted by Laura Ahearn (2012). Following Paul Kroskrity, Ahearn

indicates four essential characteristics of language ideologies. First, a clear majority of language ideologies are subordinated to the interests of particular social or cultural groups. They may be used to justify the language emancipation of the group, but also to block the aspirations of groups with such intentions. Second, as in every society, there are various divisions and groupings, as well as different language ideologies. Third, people may show a varying degree of awareness of the language ideologies of their own and other groups. Fourth, language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of speech (Ahearn 2012: 22). It can be argued that the first two characteristics are of particular importance in the context of the processes analysed here. They show that language ideologies should not be perceived as a homogenous cultural matrix. Bartłomiej Chromik (2009), following Kroskrity, argues that an important factor for the revitalisation of a language is a state of ideological clarification, i.e., a state of consensus, or at least a degree of acceptance of differences in opinion by all parties who are in any way affected by the revitalisation of an endangered language.

The concept of language ideology is significant for the analysis of internal discussions regarding the Lemko language, which have accompanied language emancipation attempts since the early 1990s. This is particularly close to the anthropological approach which has been the basis for the research which I have carried out for the last 20 years. This approach enables researchers of language processes to consider the perspectives of language users and to seek interdependence between these perspectives and the structure of the language and social phenomena.

Two Competing Language Ideologies in the 1990s

According to the latest census in 2011, 10,531 Polish citizens declared that they were members of the Lemko community, one of the groups of highlanders whose autochthonous territory is to be found in the Carpathians, in the south-east of Poland (Gudaszewski 2015: 121). After their forced resettlement in 1947 as part of Vistula Operation, the Lemko population is concentrated in two areas. Some are scattered in western Poland, while others live in the Polish Lemko region (*Lemkovyna*).

The Lemko group is divided in terms of identity. Some of its members identify with the Ukrainian nation, some argue that Lemkos form a group which is distinct from Ukrainians on various levels, whether ethnic or national. (Moklak 1997; Duć-Fajfer 2013; Dziewierski, Siewierski, Pactwa 1992; Michna 1995). Such dual identity has considerable significance for language research and for attitudes regarding the Lemko language. Both sides of the identity debate present completely different language ideologies. Lemkos, who consider members of the Lemko community to be part of the Ukrainian nation deny the existence of a separate Lemko Language. They argue that Lemko is only one of the dialects of the Ukrainian language. This fundamental assumption leads to a range of consequences. Lemko-Ukrainians oppose the codification of the Lemko language, considering such objectives to be unnecessary, since in their view Ukrainian is the literary language of the Lemkos. Lemkos with a Ukrainian national consciousness claim that attempts to give a literary form to Lemko will lead to the creation of an artificial language, which, because of its archaic form, will be of no use in the modern world. They also see attempts at codification of Lemko as being anti-Ukrainian and aiming to weaken and divide the Ukrainian minority in Poland (Michna 1995, 2004). Considering the Lemko dialect to be a mere form of communication within the group, they oppose all attempts at its standardisation.

Lemkos who do not self-identify as Ukrainians and who attempt to achieve emancipation have diametrically opposed views on their language arguing in favour of the distinct language identity[1] of their

1 Lemko activists who want to show that Lemko is not a dialect of Ukrainian note the phone ы, which is characteristic of Lemko but which does not appear in Ukrainian, and a range of borrowings from other languages (Polish, Slovakian, Hungarian, and Romanian), which are not to be found in Ukrainian. On the other hand, according to pro-emancipation Lemko activists, certain arguments in favour of the concept of a separate Lemko identity are not linguistic, but are instead connected to questions of the identity of group members. Lemko activists consider that the deciding factor in questions of the separate identity of the Lemko and Ukrainian languages is the awareness of language users who do not see Ukrainian as their mother tongue (Michna 2004: 66–70). A similar view, in relation to the

ethnic group. The standardisation of Lemko, giving it the status of a literary language, as well as efforts to achieve its recognition by the state as a distinct language, and its teaching in school, were seen by them as essential elements of their politics of identity and of the struggle for the recognition of a distinct Lemko community, which, until the democratic transformation of 1989, was considered by the Communist authorities to be part of the Ukrainian nation. Lemkos who believe that they are a distinct group argue that their activities for their language emancipation are justified and that the possession of a codified language by the Lemko group is a very significant element of the process of developing their ethnic distinctiveness.

Since the 1990s, Lemko language ideologies representing both sides of the identity debate have been closely linked with the definition of group interests. As in Ahearn's paradigm, they serve to justify activities of those Lemkos in favour of emancipation and are also used by Lemko-Ukrainians, in their attempts to block the aspirations of their opponents. We can see here echoes of Herder's concept of linguistic nationalism, which is also the basis of European ideologies which 'combined particular linguistic traditions with particular types based on the criteria of linguistic nationalism' (Wicherkiewicz 2014: 17). As a result of such convictions, a group endeavouring to achieve national or ethnic self-definition must prove that it has a distinct language, whereas a group which has attained the status of a nation and has a national state aims to achieve linguistic homogeneity and is reluctant to grant rights to those groups wishing to achieve language emancipation.

The Sociolinguistic Situation of the Group

The Lemko language is a minority language in Poland. The Lemko community is characterized by asymmetric bilingualism, as Lemko is primarily spoken in private – in the home and with friends and neighbours.

whole range of Rusyn dialects, is presented by Paul Robert Magocsi, who argues that although these dialects are close to Ukrainian, they should be considered as a separate language system. The decisive factor is the degree of codification of Rusyn dialects, their significant corpus of literature and increasing prestige (Magocsi 1999: 110–111).

Lemko is the medium of communication in everyday situations and also during festivities, where group members speak in their language 'in Church', and also at events of an ethnic character. In an ethnically foreign environment, for example, at school, at work, and among ethnically Polish acquaintances, Lemkos speak Polish. The Lemko language is used above all in rural settings, where there are greater concentrations of Lemkos. As a result, the Lemkowyna region provides an environment which is much more favourable for the Lemko language than the western regions of Poland (Misiak 2006: 111–112), where Lemkos, resettled as a result of Operation Vistula, live mainly in the cities. In cities, even in family settings, Lemko is spoken only occasionally, and intergenerational transmission of the language is disappearing. The younger generation has a passive knowledge of Lemko – children and adolescents understand the language of their parents and grandparents but do not speak it (Duć-Fajer 2004). All the people I interviewed indicated that the decline in the transmission of the Lemko language from generation to generation has been accelerated by the increase in the number of mixed marriages. There is a lack of sociological research to specify the degree of linguistic assimilation of the Lemkos. The most recent available figures on the numbers of Lemko speakers are to be found in the 2011 census, in which 6,0004 citizens of Poland stated that they used the language in a domestic setting (Członkowie… 2011) . The sociolinguist Wicherkiewicz includes Lemko among the potentially endangered languages (Poland's…).[2]

Lemko, Rusyn or Ukrainian? Debates Regarding the Identity of the Language of the Lemkos

Opinions on the identity of the Lemko language expressed by activists studied in my research contain echoes of the debates to be found in

2 Potentially endangered languages have a large number of speakers among the youngest generation yet lack official status and have low or relatively low prestige. They are used in most situations by all age groups, and are securely transmitted from generation to generation. Nevertheless, they are replaced in some aspects of life by the dominant language (Wurm 1998: 192).

academic circles, where there is a lack of consensus on this question. Agreement as to the classification of the language is limited to the statement that Lemko belongs to the group of East Slavic languages. Tomasz Wicherkiewicz comments that there is a debate among contemporary scholars, where three separate positions can be distinguished. The first view is that the Lemko dialect represents a completely distinct language system (Chomiak and Fontański 2004: 12); the second argues that it is a local variant of the Rusyn language (Dulichenko 2003; Magocsi 2004); the third considers Lemko to be a dialect of the Ukrainian language (Łesiow 1997; Rieger 1995). In the interviews I have conducted, I have encountered all three viewpoints. They often mentioned the names of particular scholars, whose views on the identity of the Lemko language or dialect could be seen as supporting their position on its status. However, comparative analysis of interviews dating from the early 1990s and those carried out in 2015 show certain differences. In the early 1990s, which saw the beginning of the processes of emancipation in the Lemko group, the most important difference was the division between those members of the community who considered Lemko to be a separate language (as is suggested by Chomiak and Fontański) and those who saw it as merely one of the dialects of the Ukrainian language. These differences of opinion led to extremely emotional discussions. The question as to whether Lemko should be seen as part of the broader Rusyn language area did not concern my interviewees. However, as the empirical material gathered in 2015 shows, the question whether Lemko belongs to the Rusyn language area has now become a topic of consideration among Lemko activists.

Some of my interviewees, especially those who were active in the Rusyn movement, wanted, in accordance with the decisions of successive Congresses of the Rusyn Language co-organised by the Congress of Carpathian Lemkos, to see a rapprochement between the languages of the Lemkos and Rusyns, especially those from the Prešov region. Some of my interlocutors even consider the possibility of reaching an understanding with the Prešov Rusyn community, and accept language decisions that would be binding in both local versions of the Rusyn language, i.e., Lemko and the Rusyn of the Prešov region. One person even supported the common codification of the Lemko language with the participation of Slovakian Rusyns.

People who share the opinion that the Lemko language belongs to the Rusyn language range are more likely than others to favour the church use of translations made in Slovakia of the Gospels and the Apostolic Letters.[3] Significantly, my interviewees showed a certain terminological confusion: in their comments regarding the church use of Lemko, they did not distinguish between the Rusyn and Lemko languages. They often emphasise that the language of the Prešov Rusyns and Lemko are 'almost the same language' and that 'there are only slight differences'. They also declare that churchgoers from the Lemko region do not have any problems in understanding religious texts translated in Slovakia. Below there are two typical comments:

> "When X organised the Keremesz [a festival of Lemko culture, E. Michna] in Olchowiec, he invited a priest from Slovakia so that it could be in Lemko, so that the reading of the Apostolic Letters and the sermon could be in Lemko." (M-2015-3-V/40–45)[4]

3 The use of the Rusyn language in the Orthodox Church in the Lemko region should be seen in the context of similar processes in the Greek Catholic Church in the Prešov region in Slovakia. Practices in this region have been a model for clergy in the Lemko region, who use translations that have been made in Slovakia. This was decided by Lemko leaders attending the Congress of the Rusyn Language in Prešov, where the question of the language to be used in church contexts was given particular attention. The translation of religious texts was discussed by representatives of the Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches from all the relevant regions. Significant also was the activity of the World Congress of Rusyns, which includes Lemko supporters of emancipation. It is the World Congress which published the Rusyn version of the Gospels translated by Peter Krajniak, a priest from the Prešov region. It is also significant that certain members of the Orthodox clergy in the Lemko region studied at the seminary in Prešov. Apart from the laity, it is these priests who are the chief supporters of the use of Lemko in church ceremonies..

4 (M-1998-2-C/30–35) – brackets contain information regarding the interview. M/F refers to the sex of the interviewee; the first figure is the year of the interview and the second is the interview number, C/T/V (city, town, village), ...the last digits are the interviewee age range.

> "The liturgy is in Old Church Slavonic, and the sermons are in Lemko, because both priests are Lemkos, but we still read the Apostolic Letters; we call them the Apostle; we read the Apostle in Lemko. And the Gospel as well, the priest reads it in Lemko. This is the Rusyn translation, except that we still fine-tune the Rusyn to make it more like ours. Well, the pronunciation is a little bit different, but really the language in this translation is the same." (M-2015-5-T/60–65)

However, such opinions are met with strong opposition by those who argue that the Lemko language should be seen as a separate language system and reject the possibility of lexical borrowing from the language of the Rusyns from the Prešov region. They emphasise that Rusyn borrowings, lexical items used among Rusyns in Slovakia, aiming to avoid Polonisation or Ukrainization of the Lemko language, are in reality its Slovakisation, as the language of the Rusyns of Slovakia has numerous borrowings from the majority language, in this case Slovak, just as Lemko has elements which come from Polish. Such views are expressed above all by those activists who, while they do not consider Lemkos to be part of the Ukrainian nation, are not active in the Rusyn movement. Some of my interlocutors also indicate that sometimes a better solution would be the acceptance of Ukrainian forms, owing to the similarity in the structures of the Lemko and Ukrainian languages. Those with such opinions often state that a Slovakised language is artificial and foreign for ordinary Lemkos; they comment that 'we don't talk like that'. Some of those who share these views are openly critical of those groups whom they see as responsible for the rapprochement between the Lemko language and the Prešov version of Rusyn. The most frequent allusions in this context are to the radio Lem.fm., which is supported by the organisation Ruska Bursa.

> "The radio scene [Lem.fm – EM] is so keen on Slovakia that you can see this even in their language; they introduce Slovakisms. There are differences between the Prešov version and our language. People don't like this." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)
>
> "There is a lot of fascination with Slovakia and the processes there. They want to introduce them here. I'm surprised by certain tendencies, we have something that people prepared here and we should continue on this path

> and not introduce something new. As for this fascination with what's going on in Slovakia, and bringing it here to our land – no. For instance, this word dostomennist – if you ask older Lemkos what *dostomennist* means, they'll say that it's from Slovak, we have always said *swidomost*. But this is used to avoid Ukrainian; because a word is Ukrainian, they use the Slovak [one – E.M.]."(M-2015-3-V/45–50)

It seems that cooperation within the Rusyn movement, resulting in changes in the language, has not met with acceptance from all members of the group, some of whom would prefer to see the preservation of Lemko linguistic autonomy and are reluctant to accept increased cooperation with Slovak Rusyns and borrowings from the language of Prešov Rusyns.

Opinions Regarding the Sociolinguistic Situation of the Group

All researchers agree that Lemko is an endangered language. In conversations in the 1990s and also in 2015, interviewees expressed concerns that the language of their community might not survive. On the other hand, more recent conversations have been characterised by a much higher degree of language awareness and more detailed diagnoses and explanations of the reasons for the fall in the number of the users of the Lemko language and its Polonisation. In the 1990s interviewees stated that the most important factor for the decided Polonisation and language assimilation of the members of their community was their resettlement after Vistula Operation and their subsequent geographical dispersal. In interviews in 2015, there is a much wider catalogue of explanations for the language situation of the group. I will list the reasons which appear most frequently, quoting typical responses.

The most significant reasons for language assimilation indicated by the subjects of my research were the geographical dispersal of the group as a result of forced resettlement during Vistula Operation and the fact that the group is a minority.

> "If endangered languages include Basque, and even Irish, which benefits from the best possible support from the state, then what can we do, as we don't have the same advantages. If we were not part of a diaspora, if we were all in the same place, then maybe we would have a chance. Basically, we are a minority." (M-2015-4-T/65–70)

Some of my interviewees argue that an important factor is fear of using the language in public as a result of past experiences, such as forced resettlement and persecution during and after Vistula Operation. This is particularly true of the older generation.

> "The resettlement meant that people are afraid, and the fear associated with the resettlement and the later actions of the Communist authorities lasts to this day, especially for the older generation. I remember from my time in Krakow that when people went to church, they spoke Lemko, but when the same people met in the tram and you spoke to them in Lemko, they answered in Polish." (M-2015-9-T/35–40)

A frequently mentioned factor is the influence of the majority language, which, according to my interviewees, is a reflection of a series of phenomena connected with modernity, which means that the majority of the group live in a Polish language environment. The most frequently mentioned factor is the influence of the media, with which children are in contact from their earliest years, school, migration from the countryside to the city, and economic emigration, which has increased in recent years. The following three comments are typical:

> "I think that it's getting worse and worse in the city, where the lack of contact with the Lemko community means that the language is, well… weak in its use. In its spoken use, I won't say anything about the state of its writing, because that's really terrible." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)

> "Here we have migration and emigration, and assimilation in Poland. There is a problem with students. When young people move to Krakow, they lose contact with the Church, the language, and Lemko culture." (M-2015-9-T/35–40)

> "The Lemko language is really endangered, knowledge of Lemko is very rare. There are still some people who can communicate in this language, but it has a lot of Polonisms regardless of whether the speakers are young or old. It's natural, since they have lived in a Polish environment for so many years, they've read Polish books, watched Polish television, gone to Polish schools; this means that the institutions have done their work." (M-2015-6-C/50–55)

The last comment notes an important characteristic of the language of contemporary Lemkos, in that it describes increasingly frequent lexical

borrowings and even significant structural changes. The majority of my interviewees noted this process, which they considered to be a negative phenomenon. One person even stated that, as a result of the low level of language awareness, not all Lemkos know that the language which they use has so many Polish accretions that it is difficult to recognise it as Lemko.

> "Many people think that they speak Lemko, but the level of Polonisation is so high that the borders overlap, and that this language practically stops being a separate language." (F-2015-1-C/55–60)

Interviewees also describe the rapid pace of the disappearance of intergenerational communication, with the reluctance of parents to teach their children Lemko. There are various reasons for this abandonment of the use of Lemko in conversations with children. According to many interviewees this is due, among other factors, to laziness: it is easier, as for those who live in a Polish environment, the use of another language at home requires effort; another significant reason is lack of time for children; some parents do not wish their children to have problems at school, as certain families remain convinced that bilingualism can lead to learning problems.

> "The language is endangered; when we look at the youngest children, it's very rare for them to speak Lemko at home… Some parents think that learning Lemko at home is not good, because later there are problems at school." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

> "I think that the reason for all of this is that parents think that it is better not to teach Lemko, because the child will go to school and make mistakes there, and have problems learning." (F-2015-7-V/30–35)

> "But you can see from the beginning which children think in Lemko, and are taught it from the beginning; it's their first language. They are fewer and fewer, and the younger the class, the worse it gets. We can see the changes that have taken place over the last few years: children in the younger classes hardly ever learn Lemko at home; the pace [of this change] is terrible." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

Certain interviewees note that some parents wish to replace intergenerational transmission with language learning in the school system, and would prefer schools to have the responsibility of teaching

children Lemko. This attitude may be interpreted both in the context of parental laziness mentioned above, or lack of time for children as a result of work, as well as particular views on the language. For parents, the Lemko language is important enough to enrol their children in Lemko classes at school, but it is not seen as so important that it requires the effort of independent study at home.

> "Parents think that schools will teach Lemko, although as a teacher I know that this is impossible, but the parents think that when the child goes to school s/he will learn the language there." (F-2015-7-V/30–35)

> "People expect that child should be able to speak [Lemko] after some time at school. Parents think that with three hours [a week E.M.] the child will learn to read, write, speak and sing in Lemko. I try to explain to parents that this can't be done." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

Interviewees also note that some parents have a different attitude to learning Lemko. The parents think that as the child speaks Lemko at home, it is not necessary to learn the language at school. Interviewees believe that this has a negative influence on language skills, as it only ensures knowledge of the spoken language. On the other hand, at school children learn to read and write, which is particularly important for children who do not know the Cyrillic alphabet,[5] as Russian is no longer a compulsory school subject.

> "They even speak Lemko,; it's their first language, but heavily Polonised. The Lemko language should be spoken, written and read. In my opinion, anyone who can't read and write Lemko, and what's more in Cyrillic, doesn't know the language. And the parents don't know how to write [Lemko]. It's only at school that children learn how to read and write [Lemko]." (M-2015-6-C/50–55)

5 The problem of a lack of knowledge of the Cyrillic alphabet among younger Lemkos who began school after 1989, when Russian ceased to be a compulsory school subject, has also been noted by Greek Catholic and Greek Orthodox clergy, whom I interviewed as part of my research in 2015. Although some clergy have introduced the teaching of Cyrillic into religion classes, interviewees argue that the steps taken are far from adequate, if the faithful are to be able to read religious texts with ease.

> "Parental involvement in the teaching of Lemko is, well, I don't want to offend anyone, but it's minimal. Or else they say that the child knows Lemko because they speak Lemko at home, so why should s/he learn Lemko at school and waste time; it would be better if s/he studied something else." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)

The last comment highlights yet another problem. Some parents consider the study of Lemko to be pointless, in that knowledge of the language is not, in their opinion, useful. It does not provide any benefits, as it is only used in the family, or in a very narrow group of members of the Lemko community. Therefore, from a practical perspective, they consider it better to devote time to the study of other subjects or other, more useful languages.

> "What's more, they say 'the language is of no use to him, so why give him even more work? It can only be used to communicate with other Lemkos so what's the point of the language…? Today it's English; everyone speaks English; it's the international language of communication, and as for Lemko…' It's a matter of language awareness of some people." (M-2015-3-V/45–50)

The majority of the interviewees also emphasise that mixed marriages have a very negative influence on the preservation of the Lemko language.

> "The language disappears when there are mixed marriages,; it disappears, to a greater or lesser degree. It isn't used at all at home, and if it is used, then it is changed a lot by the influence of Polish. You can see that the homes are bilingual, and then their Lemko has typically Polish word endings." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)

A small number of interviewees also noted that, despite numerous attempts to increase its appeal and prestige, the Lemko language is still seen by a significant number of group members as a mere means of oral communication. Its low level of prestige is due to the nature of the group – small, with the status of a minority, and without their own state.

> "And sometimes entirely Lemko families don't speak in Lemko. This is also because of this [inferiority] complex. And sometimes in my own family, my relatives say that Lemko is only good for the stable. This is a symbolic saying – 'only for the stable'." (F-2015-7-V/30–35)

> "The activities for emancipation are limited, because they are aimed at a language which never had the status of an official language, because it was never a state language or an administrative language of a recognised country, and so this always gives it this disadvantage." (F-2015-1-C/55–60)

Discussions regarding the language situation of the group show a distinct geographic division. My interviewees from the Lemko region often compare the language situation of the group in their historic heartland to the situation in the west of Poland, which is home to those Lemkos resettled in the wake of Vistula Operation. They believe that the situation of the language in the 'west' is dramatic. Intergenerational transmission is rapidly disappearing, and it is very difficult to organise education there, as the Lemko community is scattered over a large area, and there is a lack of teachers.

Lemko activists involved in the promotion of the language agree in their assessment of the situation: they consider Lemko to be an endangered language, with little potential, and highly Polonised. The view of the majority is that if intergenerational transmission, which is disappearing rapidly, is not replaced by institutional transmission, i.e., teaching in schools, then it will be impossible to preserve the language.

Debates Regarding Codification

The process of standardisation of the Lemko language began in the interwar period, with the appearance of a movement in Lemko literature favouring autonomy and arguing that Lemko culture and literature could develop completely independently, using Lemko as a literary language.[6] As part of the attempts to achieve complete independence of the Lemko language undertaken by this movement in 1933 and 1934, schools in Lemkovina were provided with two textbooks in the local language, authored by Metodyj Trochanovskij, who was the first to try to provide a standardised version of the Lemko language, based on the dialects of Western Lemkowyna. The language was also highly significant in efforts

6 For more on the movement for autonomy and the authors associated with it, cf. Duć-Fajfer (2001).

to achieve institutional emancipation of Lemkos during the Communist period. At the request of Lemko activists, Nashe Slovo published a section entitled 'Łemkowska Stroniczka'. Attempts to 'improve' the Lemko dialect in order to make it more closely resemble literary Ukrainian were the source of continuous conflicts and led to certain Lemkos, who emphasised the distinct identity of both groups, ceasing to collaborate with the Ukrainian periodical. Subsequent publication in Lemko could only take place after the fall of Communism. Processes of codification of Lemko should be viewed in the context of standardisation processes of other varieties of Rusyn. The First Congress of the Rusyn Language in 1992 accepted the Rhaeto-Romance version of standardisation, establishing that the first step would be the standardisation of local variants of the Rusyn language in Slovakia and Ukraine and of the Lemko language in Poland, and then a common literary language for all Rusyns would be developed (Magocsi 2004: 9–11). In Poland, the process of codification was begun by the Lemko Society (Stovaryshynia Lemkiv), an organisation which was part of the Rusyn movement and a member of the Congress of Carpathian Rusyns. However, in contrast to Rusyn organisations in other countries, the Society did not consider including standardisation as one of the main goals in its statute. On the other hand, one of its fundamental objectives was the teaching of Lemko (*Statute*, 1989). It is worth noting that the teaching of Lemko in the school system required standardisation of the language. Steps towards the normalisation of the language were first taken by the Commission of Education, working within the framework of the Society. The main objective of this commission was to introduce the teaching of Lemko into the school system. In the 1991–1992 school year in the primary school in Uście Gorlickie in Lemkowyna, the efforts of Mirosława Chomiak (President of the Education Commission of the Association of Lemkos) led to the organisation of the teaching of Lemko as an optional subject as part of the school curriculum. This met with a positive response on the part of parents, which was important, as Polish law states that the teaching of minority languages should take place at the request of parents or guardians. Attempts at codification of the language began with the preparation of textbooks and grammars for children. This task was given to Mirosława Chomiak by the Education Commission.

My research regarding the Lemko activists in the early 1990s, at the time of the initial stages of the teaching of Lemko in Polish schools and the first attempts at standardisation, revealed that codification was not a subject which gave rise to strong emotions. Apart from the Ukrainian Lemkos, who opposed any form of codification of the Lemko language, there were no major controversies concerning the choice of basic language norms. The standard for the language, based on the West Lemkowyna dialects, gained the approval of the majority of Lemko activists and authors in favour of Lemko language emancipation. Interviewees stated that one of the reasons for the lack of controversy regarding the choice of language norms was the resettlement of the Lemkos, which meant that the differences in Lemko dialects became negligible. As they are scattered throughout the western and northern regions of Poland, group members today speak in a similar way. According to my interviewees, the result of the dispersal and resettlement of the Lemko community was that there were no larger concentrations of Lemkos or strong pockets of regional difference, where the inhabitants would have postulated that their dialect should become the literary norm. On the other hand, one of the crucial decisions which codifiers had to make was the choice of alphabet. Although the teaching of Russian ceased to be compulsory after the fall of Communism, and the Cyrillic alphabet is not universally known among the younger generation of Lemkos, codifiers had no doubts that the eastern alphabet was the only one to allow continuity of tradition of literacy.

At the same time, Lemko activists saw the standardisation of Lemko as a long-term, gradual process, involving the introduction of Lemko into numerous areas of public life, the development of Lemko literature and the publication of Lemko periodicals. They did not believe that the Lemko language was in need of an official act of codification. Since the early 1990s, the Polish state had allowed for the financing of publications in Lemko and its teaching in the classroom. Interviewees argued that codification was necessary so that Lemko authors could write correctly, and was, above all, crucial for teachers of Lemko (Michna 2004).

Codifiers were more concerned with work on what language norms to accept, rather than whether their propositions would meet with the approval of all the members of the group. When the first Lemko grammar

book, written by Mirosława Chomiak and Henryk Fontański, was published in 1999, the first stage of codification was seen as complete. Although some of my interviewees in 2000 expressed reservations regarding certain propositions, the majority hoped that there would be a process whereby the norms would become universally accepted by members of the group.

The interviews which I conducted in 2015 indicate certain new issues. They show that the optimism of activists in the early 1990s was somewhat excessive. Certain interviewees express questions about the process of codification: they comment that, in reality, codification has not taken place; there is a grammar book, but not everyone accepts it. At the same time, the Lemko community has no alternative proposition that might replace the solutions that are suggested there. The rules it contains do not meet with the agreement of all those who were involved in the codification of the language, which means that there are those who do not believe that its grammar is binding for everyone. The following is one of the typical comments:

> "Contrary to various opinions, I believe that Lemko isn't codified; there is a grammar book, but there isn't any codification. There is no act, there is no codification. The view still persists that there should be a document. At least the Lemko Society should do this. I mean for instance that the Lemko Society should agree that this grammar is binding. I am of the opinion that there should be a document, that the grammar is binding. And we'll see how the community accepts this; if it recognises that the language is codified, then it is the success of this community. And if it doesn't accept it, then we'll have to think about it." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)

Those who recognise the codification norms are aware of the existence of opposition among those within the group who either entirely reject the process of codification or do not accept the norms which it proposes.

> "Those who decided on the rules in the past are now the ones who dispute them. They say that some of them are artificial. That's right, there is always something that's accepted in codification. For example, I don't agree with everything that's in the grammar book, I hear something else, but I write as it is in the first grammar book." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

> "There are people who don't agree with the codification and claim that there is no [Lemko] language. But how can you teach a language when you say it doesn't exist? If it doesn't exist, then I don't teach it. But this is somehow allowed by parents, and schools, and school boards." (F-2015-7-V/30–35)

Some of the interviewees, in contrast to opinions expressed in the 1990s, believe that the intra-group debate relating to codification has a wider scope. Scepticism towards codification has been expressed not only by Lemko-Ukrainians, who at the beginning of the 1990s openly opposed measures for the emancipation of the Lemko language.

> "Pro-Ukrainian organisations are no longer a threat for the language. The borders have been clearly marked, we know who they are and one can choose… I don't think that it's a question of being pro-Ukrainian. Some people are very locally-minded, they want things to be just like in their village. Its rather the effect of a lack of a broader perspective." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

The majority nevertheless say that the opposition of Ukrainians and Lemkos with a Ukrainian national consciousness can still be dangerous for the emancipation processes of the Lemko community. According to my interviewees, opponents of codification act, whether deliberately or not, in order not to antagonise those Lemkos who are the objects of their activities, and conceal that they support Lemko-Ukrainians in activities aimed at removing the distinctions between the two groups.

> "When we started the codification, those who were supporters of the other option didn't believe that we would manage. When it came to fruition, when Watra[7] started, then they had to think how to cause problems. Now they want to take over everything." (M-2015-4-T/65–70)

Some of those who share the opinions expressed in the last fragment believe that, since the state recognition of Lemko language and the

7 Watra, an ethnic festival which first took place in Czarna in 1983, and later in other localities in Lemkowyna (Hańczowa, Bartne, Żdynia), was a significant event run by Lemkos of the Rusyn affiliation; since 1990, when activists from the Union of Lemkos took over its organisation, it has been given a pro-Ukrainian character.

inclusion of Lemkos in the Statute of 6 January 2005 on national and ethnic minorities and on regional languages has made it the language of the Lemko ethnic minority, Lemko-Ukrainians cannot so openly oppose attempts at emancipation. They believe that they have, therefore, somewhat changed their strategy.

> "For the Ukrainian group, the teaching of Lemko is absolutely a bone of contention. The Ukrainian activists use a silent strategy. They write anonymous articles opposing the teaching of Lemko, I am sure that they are against our activities, this can be seen in the articles appearing anonymously in *Nashe Slovo*… All the time there is this rhetoric, that we are inventing some kind of artificial language, or Russian. At the time of the last Matura examination[8] they wrote on Facebook that there are questions in Russian in our Matura. X wrote that everything in Ruska Bursa is in Russian." (F-2015-1-C/55–60)

Some of my interviewees are of the view that the codified version is an 'artificial' language invented in universities, differing from the Lemko of their fathers and grandfathers. They argue that the 'pure', 'true' language is that of the oldest users. For them, it is important to maintain many varieties, and be as close as possible to the language spoken by 'ordinary' Lemkos.

Other criticisms of the codifiers accuse them of conscious and deliberate removal of Ukrainian elements from the Lemko language, leading to a separation of language systems which are close to one another. There is also a parallel discussion relating to the correct strategy regarding loanwords. A frequent argument states that it is important to remember that 'Ukrainian is closest to us'.

A new aspect of the intra-group discussion concerning the codification of Lemko is the belief on the part of some of my interviewees that it is harmful, in that it can lead to the disappearance of the rich variety of sub-dialects of the Lemko language. Such arguments were present during the codification of Rusyn in Slovakia as well as in Ukraine, mainly among Rusyns with a Ukrainian national consciousness. They now appear in discussions within the group regarding the codification

8 Matura examination: – a state examination at the end of secondary school.

of Lemko, although at the beginning of the codification processes, my interviewees stated that variations between the dialects of the Lemko language had faded as a result of the resettlements.

Codification and What Then?

Further controversy is caused by the refusal of certain groups or individuals to legitimise activities of other parties who wish to revitalise and emancipate the Lemko language and promote its codified version. There are debates regarding the role of certain parties in this endeavour. Should teachers teach according to the rules in the grammar book, and if so, which version should they use, as 2004 saw the publication of the second, amended edition by Chomiak and Fontański? There is also a significant dispute as to who should teach Lemko. As there are now more university graduates with a degree in philology qualified to teach in schools, should they replace existing, unqualified teachers? Can teachers from outside the group (i.e., Poles) teach Lemko? In the interviews from 2015, there were differences of opinion regarding these issues.

Some interviewees consider that the improvement of the teaching of Lemko requires professionalisation and that unqualified teachers of Lemko should be replaced by graduates of Lemko philology who are also well-trained professionals. Some interviewees expressed radical opinions, suggesting that incompetent teachers should resign.

> "Some teachers have no knowledge of Lemko. Some teachers don't know Lemko well. Children finish the whole school cycle without having learnt anything. Teachers like that should resign." (F-2015-2-V/30–35)

> "We should think about quality. We can see the results of the work of those teachers who have studied philology. Because they know about literature, they know how to encourage children, and the children are eager to learn. They read literature, even the archaic kind, because it's theirs. But here, we don't have this awareness; children, some children go to Lemko classes like to religion classes; they don't learn a lot, but the group allows this to happen." (F-2015-1-C/55–60)

However, not all of my interviewees are supporters of such changes. Some consider that if someone knows Lemko as a result of their heritage

then they can teach it, since it is not a philological education that is most important, but rather that the teacher should be a member of the Lemko ethnic group. One interviewee claimed that only such people can transmit not only the Lemko language, but Lemko culture as well:

> "How can a teacher who is not a Lemko instil patriotism in a child? I think that the teacher should be a member of the group, and for many Lemkos this is linked with our religion. A Polish teacher will never teach this." (M-2015-8-T/45–50)

Views on the appropriate choice of teachers represent one of the new areas of disagreement among activists of Lemko organisations in this research. The reasons for this are not only the interests of particular individuals but also different ideas regarding the language.

Supporters of professionalization are to be found mainly among those of my interviewees who are involved in the process of codification and the education of qualified teachers. They consider that the Lemko language is an essential value of the group, and that language emancipation is their important task. They see its preservation and growth above all in the conscious realisation of language policies, and attach most importance to the development of teaching in the school system. They argue that only professional teaching can replace disappearing intergenerational transmission. However, my interviewees also include those for whom codification and professionalization are of lesser importance. They do not see the teaching of Lemko in schools in the broader context of activities of a planned language policy and emancipation processes.

We can inquire as to the reasons for these changes and the appearance of competing language ideologies. Ahearn's work could be seen as relevant in this regard, as she argues that a marked majority of language ideologies serve the interests of specific social or cultural groups. This is true of the Lemko community, whose members display deep divisions regarding their identity. A further reason is the continuing institutionalisation of the collective life of the Lemkos at the beginning of the 21st century, with the appearance of new organisations, as well as a new generation of Lemko leaders in existing organisations. These have somewhat different concepts of the direction to take, and are often more inclined to cooperate with Lemko-Ukrainian organisations, or declare that there is a multidimensional identity whose various elements

can and should be recognised. A frequent argument declares the need to end conflicts within the group and to achieve 'the reconciliation of the Lemkos', who, as a minority group, are additionally weakened by such divisions.

With the appearance of new organisations, there has been a blurring of previously marked divisions. The new situation contrasts with the circumstances of the 1990s, when the opponents of codification of the language were mainly Lemkos with a Ukrainian national consciousness, connected in particular with the Lemko Union. Today, we can hear criticisms, of both the methods of codification and the strategies for the revitalisation and preservation of the Lemko language, which originate from opposition within the group, and from leaders of organisations whose activity is aimed at the entire Lemko community, and who are not involved in the Rusyn movement. In the early 1990s, it was the group of activists linked with the Lemko Society, and involved in the Rusyn movement who began the emancipation processes of the group, an essential element of which was work on the standardisation of the language, endeavours by both specialists and members of the group to achieve recognition of its distinct identity, and its introduction into new areas of use. The appearance of new parties who reject the strategies of their predecessors has initiated a new series of discussions and debates. Groups intending to maintain marked lines of divisions, additionally confirmed by recognition in Polish law of Lemkos as a minority distinct from Ukrainians, now have ideological rivals within their own community. This leads to questions regarding the legitimacy of the activities of both communities and the right to decide the language policies of the group. Moreover, it can even be argued that in the case of the language community, in addition to the two fundamental language ideologies who have been rivals since the early 1990s, we have seen new ones with somewhat different methods of rationalising and justifying their views on the structure of the language and its use. Certain leaders who do not consider the maintenance of clear distinctions between the Lemko and Ukrainian communities to be the main responsibility of the group are involved in activities that involve both cultural areas. This of course has an influence on their perspective on the language. Leaders with such views believe that cultural and artistic events can combine

both Lemko and Ukrainian elements. They are involved in publishing, but do not think that it is essential that their texts should be bound by the norms of the grammar book which came out in 1999 or 2004; they attach greater importance to the preservation of archaic language, the search for old words, and respect for the usage of 'ordinary' Lemkos. They do not see the need for codification of the language or the development of its standard form. This meets with the opposition of other activists, associated with the Rusyn movement, who can be characterised as guardians of a separate Lemko identity, and who believe that previous decisions should be respected, that the norms based on the grammar book of 1999 should be further developed and perfected, that texts should be published in the codified Lemko language, and that the purity of the language should be maintained by following the accepted language solutions. They argue that teaching should be based on the norms that have been developed, and it should be professionalised and monitored as much as possible. For them, the language is not merely a means of communication but a significant ethnic marker. It must be remembered that some of these ethnic leaders began their involvement in the movement to emancipate their language during the period of the struggle to achieve recognition of the separate identity of the Lemko community, when maintaining a clear distinction between the Lemko and Ukrainian communities was an essential element of their strategy.

Each of the two groups claims that the other does not have the right to represent the Lemko community as a whole. If we are to follow Kroskrity's concept of *ideological explanation*, my research shows that in questions regarding its own language, the 21st century Lemko community is not only far from achieving a consensus but has not even reached the stage of accepting differences of opinion. Apart from agreement as to the endangered status of the Lemko language, most activists involved in the preservation and development of Lemko are divided in their views regarding the language. There are debates regarding the classification of the Lemko language and assessment of the processes of its emancipation, as well as its codification and the solutions that this has entailed, but also discussions as to who has the right to act in the name of the group to maintain, develop and protect the language. The origin of these

differences is to be found in separate language ideologies. To be sure, this does not facilitate attempts to preserve and revitalise the language of this small and dispersed minority.

References

Ahearn 2012 – L. M. Ahearn. *Living Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Billig 1995 – M. Billig. *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE Publications.

Chlebowczyk 1983 – J. Chlebowczyk. *Procesy narodotwórcze we Wschodniej Europie Środkowej w dobie kapitalizmu (od schyłku XVIII do początku XX w.)*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Chomiak and Fontański 1999 – M. Chomiak and H. Fontański. *Gramatyka języka łemkowskiego*. Katowice: Śląsk.

Chomiak and Fontański 2004 – M. Chomiak and H. Fontański. *Gramatyka języka łemkowskiego*. Warszawa: Fundacja Wspierania Mniejszości Łemkowskiej Rutenika.

Chromik 2014 – B. Chromik. Aspekty pojęcia ideologie językowe istotne z perspektywy działań rewitalizacyjnych. *Zeszyty Łużyckie* 48.

Członkowie mniejszości narodowych i etnicznych w rozumieniu ustawy o mniejszościach narodowych i etnicznych według najczęściej wymienianych języków kontaktów domowych. 2011. http://mniejszosci.narodowe.mac.gov.pl/mne/mniejszosci/wynikinarodowego-spis/7001,Czlonkowie-mniejszosci-narodowych-ietnicznych-w-rozumieniu-ustawy-o mniejszosci.html

Dołowy-Rybińska 2011 – N. Dołowy-Rybińska. *Języki i kultury mniejszości w Europie: Bretończycy, Łużyczanie, Kaszubi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Dorian 1998 – N. Dorian. Western Language Ideologies and Small-Language Prospects. In: Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.). *Endangered Languages. Language Loss and Community Response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–21.

Duć-Fajfer 2001 – H. Duć-Fajfer. *Literatura łemkowska w drugiej połowie XIX i na początku XX wieku*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

Duć-Fajfer 2004 – H. Duć-Fajfer. Соціолінгвістічный аспект – Лемковина. In: *Русиньскый язык*. [Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich] Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej.

Dziewierski, Pactwa and Siewierski 1992 – M. Dziewierski, B. Pactwa and B. Siewierski. *Dylematy tożsamości: studium społeczności łemkowskiej w Polsce*. Katowice: Randall & Sfinks.

Kroskrity 2004 – P. Kroskrity. Language Ideology. In A. Duranti (ed.). *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Gudaszewski 2015 – G. Gudaszewski. *Struktura Narodowo-etniczna, językowa i wyznaniowa ludności Polski. Narodowy Spis Powszechny Ludności i mieszkań*. Warszawa: GUS.

Huss and Lindgren 2011 – L. Huss and A. Lindgren. Introduction: Defining Language Emancipation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (209), 1–15.

Jahns 2010 – M. Jahns. To nie jest fajka. Alienacja znaczenia jako przykład ideologii językowej, In: B. Mikołajczyk, J. Taborek, and W. Zabrocki (eds.). *Język w poznaniu*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.

Łesiów 1997 – M. Łesiów. *Ukraïns'ki govìrki u Pol'ŝi/Gwary ukraińskie w Polsce*. Warszawa: Vydavnyctvo "Ukraïns'kij Arhiv".

Magocsi 1999 – Paul R. Magocsi. The Rusyn Language Question Revisited. In: Paul Magocsi (ed.). *Of the Making of Nationalities There Is No End*. New York: Columbia University Press/East European Monographs, 86–111.

Magocsi 2004 – Paul R. Magocsi. *Rusin'skyj jâzyk*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski. Instytut Filologii Polskiej.

Michna 1995 – E. Michna. *Łemkowie. Grupa etniczna czy naród?* Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy NOMOS.

Michna 2004 – E. Michna. *Kwestie etniczno-narodowościowe na pograniczu Słowiańszczyzny wschodniej i zachodniej. Ruch rusiński na Słowacji. Ukrainie i w Polsce*. Kraków: Polska akademia umiejętności.

Misiak 2006 – M. Misiak. *Łemkowie. W kręgu badań nad mniejszościami etnolingwistycznymi w Europie*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Moklak 1997 – J. Moklak. *Łemkowszczyzna w II Rzeczypospolitej. Zagadnienia polityczne i wyznaniowe*. Kraków: Historia Jagiellonica.

Nowakowski 1992 – K. Nowakowski. „Sytuacja polityczna na Łemkowszczyźnie w latach 1918–1939". In: J. Czajkowski (ed.). *Łemkowie w historii i kulturze Karpat*, Cz. I. Rzeszów: Editions Spotkania, 313–350.

Poland's Linguistic Heritage - Documentation Database for Endangered Languages. T. Wicherkiewicz, et al. "Lemko Rusyn". http://innejezyki.amu.edu.pl/Frontend/Language/Details/23 [accessed 11.12.2016].

Porębski 1991 – A. Porębski. *Europejskie mniejszości etniczne. Geneza i kierunki przemian*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Rieger 1995 – J. Rieger. *Słownictwo i nazewnictwo łemkowskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper.

Silverstein 1979 – M. Silverstein. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In: P. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, and C. L. Hofbauer (eds.). *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Wicherkiewicz 2014 – T. Wicherkiewicz. *Regionalne języki kolateralne Europy – porównawcze studia przypadku z polityki językowej*. Poznań: Rys.

Wicherkiewicz 2016 – T. Wicherkiewicz. *Język rusińsko-łemkowski, Dziedzictwo językowe Rzeczpospolitej*. http://www.inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/Frontend/Language/Details/23, (dostęp 30.10.2016)

Wurm 1998 – Stephen A. Wurm. Methods of Language Maintenance and Revival with Selected Cases of Language Endangerment in the World. In: K. Matsamura (ed.). *Studies in Endangered Languages*. (Papers from the International Symposium on Endangered Languages, Tokyo, 18–20 November 1995). Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.