

Halyna Matsyuk

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-8601-4742

DOI 10.31558/1815-3070.2021.41.29

UDC 81'27'44'0(=1:477)"193/194"

TOWARDS THE TYPOLOGY OF LANGUAGE SITUATIONS IN HISTORICAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE SITUATION IN REICHSKOMMISSARIAT UKRAINE (1941–1943)

Стаття присвячена дослідженню вперше виокремленого періоду в перебігу мовної ситуації під час II Світової війни. Для аналізу використано спогади учасників подій, опубліковані документи з німецьких архівів, архівів Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви та більше тисячі двохсот номерів дев'яти україномовних легальних газет. Обґрунтовано ставлення до мов німецької влади та українського суспільства, особливості комунікативних практик та перспективи розвитку суспільних функцій української та німецької мов. Отримані результати сприяють розбудові типологічного підходу до мовних ситуацій в українській історичній соціолінгвістиці, розширюючи її предметну сферу аналізу.

Ключові слова: історична соціолінгвістика, мовна ситуація, ставлення до мови, взаємодія мова – влада, комунікативна практика, суспільна функція мови.

Problem statement and its relevance. The signs of language situations which are related to the functions of the Ukrainian language in different periods of history are studied by linguists, historians, social geographers, and sociologists. Their works usually highlight the status and functions of languages, the roles of different authorities, as well as the influence of ideology or policy on languages, and examine in detail the use of languages, in particular, the use of languages in social and interpersonal communication, education, church, and other spheres of public life. Certain periods in the development of language situations have been sufficiently studied, such as the period of the 19th century, the Bolshevik Ukrainization in the 20–30s of the 20th century, or language functions in the years of the USSR (Лозинський 2008; Радевич-Винницький 2011; Шаповал 1933; “Українська мова”; “The battle for Ukrainian” etc.).

Historical sociolinguistics, the methodology and source base of which is actively being formed (“Handbook”; Auer et al 2015; Nevalainen 2015), largely contributes to the establishment of a typology of language situations, so it actualizes attention to the periods which have not been sufficiently studied, including the Second World War. Simultaneously, ethnically Ukrainian lands became part of the Reichskommissariat Ukraine (RCU), the General Governorate, and the Romanian Transnistria. The study of language situations in these territories during the temporary German occupation is a new object of linguistic analysis, which will form new theoretical models of analysis of new sources.

The article starts the reconstruction of the language situation during the Second World War from the Reichskommissariat Ukraine. This territorial and administrative entity united districts that did not coincide with the then state borders of the USSR: for the period of 1943 the RCU consisted of 6 general districts, including Volyn / Podillya, Zhytomyr, Kyiv, Mykolayiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Tavria and Crimea (Черняков 2006: 52). It is essential to understand what forms of cultural and social life in these territories were allowed by the German occupation authorities and what was their attitude to languages in this context, how the Ukrainian population under occupation saw their development, in particular language, what communicative practices characterized language use, and what functions languages in society had? The answers to these and other questions will allow us to distinguish the period of the language situation in the RCU as an independent stage in the range of language situations, which will contribute to the development of a typological approach in historical sociolinguistics.

Research of the problem and the obtained results. A range of works by Ukrainian and foreign authors on the national and cultural life of the Ukrainian population under occupation has already been published. Researchers have occasionally analyzed the issues related to the functions or specific systemic and structural features of languages. Primarily, the results obtained in the works, in the absence of a “high treason”, remove the accusations of the Soviet propaganda of “collaborationism” with the German authorities of those figures who were the leaders or simply the executors of national and cultural life of Ukrainians under German occupation (Курилишин 2010). On the contrary, the papers draw attention to the life and work of the representatives of the Ukrainian science and culture, who remained in the occupied Ukrainian territory and continued to perform their civic duties as cultural representatives of a nation doomed to “eviction, extermination and Gernamization” (Попович 1998: 636). For example, in Kyiv, there were 1,139 scientists, including 3 academicians, 180 professors, 253 associate professors, and famous artists, sculptors, and singers. Owing to the work of these people, Ukrainian culture developed, but later gradually declined after the executions of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in late February 1942, as many were repressed, and almost everyone came under ideological pressure (Гедз 2007: 183, 193). In addition, one of the results of these studies is the publication of previously unknown archival materials of the Third Reich and the creation of a new interpretation of the German government’s views on Ukrainians in the context of the theory of Aryan supremacy (Косик 1993). There is a new approach to the cultural life against the background of signs of economic situation and national liberation movement, which expanded under occupation in order to create an independent Ukrainian state (Курилишин 2010; Армстронг 2009). Another conclusion concerns the development of a new system of Ukrainian language units, in particular the terms of local self-government (Наконечна 2011: 103–106). The results of the studies, in turn, encourage the disclosure of signs of the language situation as a little-known manifestation of the everyday life of native speakers in the RCU.

The purpose of the article is to study the signs of the language situation on the territory of the Reichkommissariat Ukraine in 1941–1943. **Tasks:** 1) to show the correlation between *language – power, language – population*; 2) to identify communicative practices and their features; 3) to investigate the development of social functions of languages. Sociolinguistic information from the memoirs of the participants of the events, from documents of German archives and archives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), as well as from Ukrainian-language official publications of the CCU in 1941–1943 was chosen as **the object of analysis**. **The subject of analysis:** the attitude to the languages of the German government and society, language in public communication between government and society, Russian-Ukrainian bilingual urban space, the state of Ukrainian literary language, the development of its social functions in education and UAOC, the development of social functions of German in education and in adult communication.

Corpus description and the methods applied to its analysis. The corpus of the study includes the memories of official administrative, cultural and public figures as participants in the events, in particular L. Forostivskyi (Форостівський 1952), Н. Vyun (В’юн 1973) and Р. Baybak (Байбак 1985: 264–276), К. Pankivskyi (Паньківський 1965), published documents from the German (Косик 1993: 463–627) and church archives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (“Українська Православна Церква” Т. 1), as well as 1243 issues of nine Ukrainian-language legal newspapers (Liberated Ukraine, Revival (Romny), Revival (Myrhorod), Revival (Tarashcha), Horokhiv News, 1943; Vinnytsia News, Dnipropetrovsk Newspaper, Ukrainian News, Uman Voice)*. **Methods of analysis:** elements of content and discourse analysis, biographical, comparative, sociolinguistic reconstruction and sociolinguistic interpretation.

* **Liberated Ukraine** – 57 available issues for 1942–1943 (Chudniv district newspaper); **Revival (Romny)** – 115 available issues for 1941–1943 (Romny city council newspaper); **Revival (Myrhorod)** – 96 issues for 1941–1942 (from Myrhorod district); **Revival (Tarashcha)** – 95 issues for 1941–1942; **Horokhiv News** – 30 issues for 1943 (subtitle Gorochover nachrichten); **Vinnytsia News** – 210 issues for 1941–1943 (subtitle Winnizaer nachrichten); **Dnipropetrovsk newspaper** – 330 issues for 1941–1943 (daily official body of Dnipropetrovsk); **Ukrainian News** – 103 issues for 1942–1943 (Smilyansky District Magazine); **Uman Voice** – 207 issues for 1941–1943 (magazine from Uman).

Scientific novelty, theoretical and practical value of the obtained results. The issue of the language situation in the RCU has not yet been the subject of analysis. It is related to the typology of language situations in the period of statelessness, specifies the interaction of languages and the occupying power, the attitude of the population to languages, communicative practices, the need to develop a literary standard and the functions of the Ukrainian and German languages. The results are relevant not only for historical, but also for applied or typological sociolinguistics.

The analysis is based on the recognition of a multidisciplinary approach to social history in historical sociolinguistics in order to analyze the norms and use of language, as well as the influence of government on codification and standardization (“Handbook”; Auer et al 2015; Nevalainen 2015); the substantiation of the connection between the functions and status of languages and ideology (Scutnabb-Kangass 1989: 450–477), the position of the Prague Linguistic School regarding the role of planned intervention in language development (Havránek et al. 1935; “Planned intervention” 131), works on the history of the press (Гедз 2013: 265–275; Мальчевський 1985: 290–296; Черняков 2006: 51–68; Черняков) and the history of the church (Власовський 1975) during the years of German occupation, as well as the history of Soviet linguistics (Мацюк 2010: 44–54).

Presentation of the main material and the substantiation of research results

With the beginning of the occupation, all domestic policy issues in the RCU were resolved by the Ministry of the Occupied Eastern Territories, which officially began its work on July 17, 1941. In November 1941, Gauleiter (regional leader of the Nazi Party) and East Prussian President-General Erich Koch became Reich Commissar of Ukraine. He was based in Rivne and, according to archival documents, worked as a “second Stalin” (“№ 92. Розмова Гітлера” 533).

The Ukrainian population had the experience of living in a totalitarian state. It is known that by 1941 the Communist Party of the USSR had developed the functions of the Russian language in the public spheres of the Soviet republics. Formed during the years of independence, a new trend in historical science, namely the historiography of Soviet terror, introduced a new documentary corpus related to the activities of various authorities to destroy the Ukrainian intelligentsia. Taking into account the Marxist theory of language of the Soviet linguist Marr, the following interaction of factors, which contributed to the expansion of the functions of the Russian language, may be presented: 1) the release of a secret document of the State Political Administration in 1926 “On Separatism”, which contained instructions by this state security body to curtail Ukrainization and directed all work on the ground to the physical destruction of Ukrainian humanitarian, scientific and church intelligentsia of pre-Soviet and Soviet periods (“№ 26. Таємний обіжник” 254–267); 2) the loss of millions of native speakers of the Ukrainian language, mostly villagers, during the planned Holodomor of 1932–1933^{*}; 3) the introduction of the Russian language as a compulsory subject in the curricula of all non-Russian schools since 1938 (“Постанова РНК УСРР” 5–7); 4) the application of the “new theory of language” by the academician Marr, as a manifestation of Marxist linguistics, which motivated the development of a single language under communism, i.e. the Russian language (Мацюк 2010: 44–54). In addition, by 1941, Ukrainian society had gone through “cleansings” in various social groups and the terror of 1937–1939 against the clergy and believers of the UAOC formation of 1921, who, according to sociographic research by Shapoval, made 12 million in Ukraine in the 1930s (this is the share of the population who used the Ukrainian language in worship (Шаповал 1933: 70), which was last used in Orthodox churches in 1936).

1. Correlation language – power, language – population. The German authorities explained their presence on the territory of Ukraine by the need to liberate it from Bolshevism. *The attitude to languages* in the context of the tasks of German propaganda and the prospects of cultural and national development of Ukrainians are shown by 194 new archival documents published by the French historian Volodymyr Kosyk. The documents distinguish two groups of political actors who played a

^{*} According to Ptukha Institute of Demography and Social Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the total demographic losses due to the Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932–1934 amounted to 5063 thousand people, including in rural areas – 4428 thousand. Losses of Ukrainians in the then USSR amounted to 91,2% against other nationalities (8, 8%) (Рудницький 2009: 18).

crucial role in the organization and development of cultural and social life in the RCU, one of the manifestations of which was the interaction of languages: Adolf Hitler and his immediate assistants (Alfred Rosenberg and Heinrich Himmler), and executors and direct representatives of the local authorities, in particular Erich Koch and his deputy Paul Dargel. The documents reveal the step-by-step policy of the German authorities towards languages.

It is worth starting with the instruction issued in June 1941 with the order to conduct propaganda “in clear and used language” (“№ 54. Інструкція ОКВ” 501). In July, new instructions were received from Berlin concerning the “order of using languages”: prisoners of war of the Red Army had to be addressed in Russian, and civilians had to speak their language (“№ 58. Лист Гайдріха” 506). I would like to emphasize that the authorities applied the same principle in Germany: Greek Catholic priests were not allowed to give Ukrainian-language prayer books to Ukrainian workers from the East (Паньківський 1965: 205). Obviously, through language use, the authorities did not allow the unity of Ukrainians.

As early as July 1941, the directions of the cultural revival of Ukrainians were controversial even among Hitler’s inner circle as to whether it is essential to promote the development of this nation. There were no instructions, so for some time the local authorities resolved these issues independently (“№ 65. Протокол засідання” 514). In September, local authorities were granted permission to use the oral and written Ukrainian language without restrictions and the right to the Ukrainian press “provided that its limited use and subject to strict censorship” (“№ 88. Основні вказівки” 530).

By the end of December 1941, the course of German power, as confirmed by the formulated prospects for the development of Ukrainian education, was already showing its anti-Ukrainian character. Authorities gave permission for the development of only part of secondary vocational schools and demanded the closure of all other institutions, the document stated: “Higher education institutions: universities, polytechnics; higher schools: gymnasiums and other similar institutions; secondary schools; seminars, general secondary schools; vocational schools: general schools with specialization. All schools belonging to these categories must be closed” (“№ 114. Постанова” 549–550).

Hitler’s attitude to the cultural and educational revival of Ukrainians was in the spirit of the supremacy of the German race. In April 1942, he stated about the education of Ukrainians: “It is impossible to allow even one teacher to suddenly come up with the idea of declaring it obligatory for the conquered peoples to go to school. If Russians, Ukrainians, Kyrgyz, etc., are able to read and write, it can only harm us...” (“№ 125. Думки Гітлера” 560). Koch developed these thoughts: “... We would be scoundrels, if we did anything for Ukrainian education, in particular to raise the level of the intelligentsia!”*, so in May 1942 he allowed only four-year schools for children aged 9–12 to be opened in Kyiv.

Hitler’s assistants raised the question of Germanization, in which the decisive factor was not the German language as the first step, but the eviction of Ukrainians from their territory, because “the East will be inhabited only by people of German blood” (“№ 132. Заява Гімmlера” 566). In November 1942, a secret instruction on the Ukrainian question was issued. Its 16 points contained instructions on the educational, cultural and church life of Ukrainians: to allow education only in 4-grade schools, to close all “Prostiva” groups, all cultural institutions (theaters and cinemas), to prevent the unity of churches (autocephalous and autonomous) (“№ 152 Секретна німецька інструкція” 587). At the same time, Koch issued an order to close higher schools and liquidate the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and in the autumn, he started a campaign against theatrical life, filmmaking, and museums (Гедз 2007: 183, 187–188).

The theory of the supremacy of the German race is illustrated by a document on the value of the German people as opposed to Ukrainians. Thus, in April 1943, Koch claimed: the German people are dominant, so the rest of the “population must work, work and work again”; “the racially simplest German worker is biologically a thousand times more valuable than the local population” (“№ 173.

* Cited according to (Гедз 2007: 198).

Уривок із виступу Коха” 608). All documents reveal the government’s attitude to language as a resource that can be managed: first as a means of propaganda, and later as a manifestation of culture and education of all the conquered people, who, according to the government, had no chance to develop.

The attitude of the population towards languages stemmed from the experience in the Soviet state towards the occupation and from the hopes that people had for the new government. Given its propaganda thesis regarding the liberation from Bolshevism, Ukrainians believed in their political, linguistic, cultural, and religious freedom, which brought new prospects for the development of the functions of the Ukrainian language after Soviet Russification. It is known that on June 30, 1941, the restoration of the Ukrainian state was proclaimed. The document “The Act of Restoration of the Ukrainian State” for the liberation of Ukrainians “from the Moscow occupation” recognized cooperation with Germany (“№ 56. Акт відновлення” 504). However, the scale of the national liberation movement, including the centers in Kyiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv, Mykolayiv, Zhytomyr, and Vinnytsia, alerted the occupying authorities. The reports to Berlin recorded public sentiments, in particular the spread of the idea of an independent state among the urban population and the intelligentsia (“№ 68. Уривок із донесення” 525; “№ 81. Донесення про ситуацію” 525). Therefore, in December 1941, at one of the meetings, Hitler’s demand for the cessation of “Ukrainian aspirations for independence” and the conclusion that only the Führer would decide “on the formation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia” were voiced (“№ 108. Звіт про нараду” 545).

However, by the end of 1941, various forms of Ukrainian life spontaneously revived throughout the RCU, including Ukrainian schools, Ukrainian-language legal periodicals, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Schools, which were destroyed and looted during the war, began to be rebuilt by villagers and towns, and teachers worked in difficult conditions: there were no textbooks, notebooks, and heating in the winter. The emergence of legal periodicals, according to modern historians, was largely supported by the representatives of the Ukrainian national movement, who entered the local authorities in the towns and villages and took care of the cultural and educational sphere, the availability of material and technical base (former Soviet printing houses) and some of their creative workers who survived the years of terror (Стельникович 2013: 235–237). People who revived the linguistic and cultural life had difficult working conditions. According to an eyewitness from Kharkiv, the editorial office and printing house of “Nova Ukrayina” newspaper prepared issues of the newspaper in conditions of famine and cold (Байбак 1985: 274). The restoration of the UAOC continued the tradition of worship in Ukrainian, interrupted by the Soviet authorities in 1936, but this Church was not supported by the German authorities; it tolerated the Autonomous Orthodox Church under the patriarch in Moscow. As it has already been mentioned, there was an order from Berlin to prevent the unity of the churches to weaken the unity of the population. It can be assumed that the very revival of national, cultural and religious life actualized the social functions of the Ukrainian language in schools, periodicals and the Church.

However, for the period of February 1942, the occupation authorities knew that the representatives of the national liberation movement held leading positions in the editorial offices of official newspapers. Therefore, a demand came from Berlin to clean the provincial newspapers of “harmful” elements, as was done in Kyiv periodicals. In addition, the Berlin Document recognized the Writers’ Union, headed by Olena Teliha, the Academy of Sciences, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church as nationalist organizations (“№ 120. Уривок із донесення” 555). These and similar decisions marked the beginning of the curtailment of cultural and social work in the RCU.

Thus, the attitude of the German authorities and the Ukrainian population to languages had different perspectives.

2. Communicative practices in society. One of them, *languages in communication between the government and society*, is illustrated by the ratio of newspapers in Kyiv in 1941–1943: 16 Ukrainian-speaking, 9 German-speaking, and 2 Russian-speaking (Гедз 2013: 265). It is logical to assume that the occupying power to some extent constructed public communication as the interaction of three

languages – Ukrainian, German and Russian (this logic is confirmed by the quantitative characteristics of periodicals in the works of historians (Черняков).

Correspondence between a Lviv historian Криворученко and a Kyiv researcher Ohloblin for the period of 1941–1942 reveals the topics of Ukrainian-language periodicals priority for the German command: struggle against Marxism, Bolshevism and Russification, relations with Europe, study of Ukrainian-German relations, publication of sources (Гедз 2007: 194). The problem of using 1243 newspaper issues of 9 official magazines for analysis confirms this algorithm of coverage of events established by the occupation authorities.

All official Ukrainian-language newspapers allowed as channels of influence of the occupying power on the population, first of all reported speeches of Hitler, Goebbels and the representatives of the local occupying power, contained its instructions, revealed the situation on the fronts and covered international events and always opposed Bolshevik terror. German authorities, sometimes included reprints from other publications*.

Nevertheless, the newly created periodicals revived the reader's knowledge of Ukrainian studies by publishing articles on Ukrainian culture and its representatives, on Ukrainian state holidays during the Liberation Struggle of 1917–1921. The articles revealed the work of T. Shevchenko ("Шевченко на Волині" 1943: 4; "Музей Тараса Шевченка" 1942: 4; "До 82-ої річниці" 3; "Тарас Шевченко" 3), conveyed knowledge about H. Skovoroda conveyed knowledge about H. Skovoroda ("Тригорій Сковорода" 3), Lesya Ukrainka ("Де жила в Києві" 4), M. Hohol ("Тут жив Гоголь" 4), P. Kulish and H. Barvinok ("Панько Куліш" 4), M. Lysenko ("Про українську пісню" 4), M. Leontovych ("Микола Леонтович" 3), M. Hrushevskyi ("Останні роки життя" 2), V. Chekhivskyi ("В. М. Чехівський" 5), D. Yavornytskyi ("Спадщина" № 48; "Зберегти будинок" № 49), O. Oles ("Поезії" 3), M. Khvylovyi ("Микола Хвильовий" 3), O. Vyshnya ("Доля" 4) and others. Some of the analyzed newspapers even had a Ukrainian trident in the footer and recorded the greetings of teachers and students "Glory to Ukraine". (Thus, the newspaper "Umansky Holos" began to be published on August 31, 1941, the slogan was in the subtitle until January 9, 1942, issues from January 11 and later were already published without it). However, it should be emphasized, that the number of publications devoted to linguistic and cultural-historical topics was small, only about a hundred of all analyzed newspapers contained such information. However, even this share gives grounds to link Ukrainian studies issues in legal issues with those specialists who sought ways to revive the Ukrainian-centric public consciousness in the new occupation conditions, the nature and essence of which they quickly understood: the new totalitarian system replaced the previous one.

Another example of communicative practice is *communication in the urban space*, which involved the use of Ukrainian and Russian. Thus, an eyewitness from Vinnytsia noted that the Russian language was heard in government offices, shops and restaurants. The speech of the average Ukrainian in the city contained Russian borrowings, so in order to master the norms of the Ukrainian literary language, "Vinnytsia News" advised to read literary works ("Шануймо рідну мову" 1). In Myrhorod, the Russian language functioned in the police, where even questions printed in Ukrainian were answered in Russian; in the housing department, employees served the Ukrainian population in Russian; village elders corresponded with institutions in Russian, and only in the city council did the Ukrainian language sound (I. K. 1942: 1). After 23 years of Soviet rule, changes took place in the Uman region as well: in the city the language of part of the population was influenced by Russian, and part of the population continued to use Russian ("За чистоту" 4) and surzhyk was often heard (T. H. 1941: 3).

The need for an expanded Ukrainian literary movement in education, periodicals and the Church draw attention to *the literary use of the Ukrainian language* and to the norms of Ukrainian

* The publications were created in express mode, when the new government had not yet changed the ideologically colored Soviet street names. One of the newly created newspapers "Revival" from Tarashcha urged in the first issue: "Subscribe to your Ukrainian magazine (address: Drukarnia Radyanska 7). The editorial office is located in the premises of the Cooperative Society", see: ("Передплачуйте часопис" 1). The conversation about the need for mines of Soviet street names arose a little later ("Про назву вулиць" 2).

spelling. Thus, Kremenchuk journal “Dniprokhvilya” in 1942, informed about the need to follow the rules adopted by the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and Lviv Taras Shevchenko Scientific, and the People’s Commissar of Education M. Skrypnyk. The advantages of this orthography were in its scientific foundations (“До питання правопису” 3). The commission created to review the orthography norms used the Academic Orthography was headed by M. Hrunskyi since 1929. It also included Professor I. Sharovolskyi, Professor Ye. Sharovolskyi, Professor Ye. Markivskyi, Professor P. Kovaliv, Professor P. Horetskyi, a writer A. Lyubchenko and others*.

There is a demand for the development of the culture of the Ukrainian language to overcome the consequences of Russification. This topic was forbidden for discussion in Soviet times. However, newspapers raised questions about the political and economic reasons for Russification, analyzed the attitude of the Russian intelligentsia to the Ukrainian language, and reported on the publication of Ukrainian-language editions. The publications assessed the consequences of Russification even during the two years of Soviet rule in Western Ukraine. Soviet ideology promoted the theory of a classless society and the creation of a single language in the near future (because languages will all merge) (Штуль № 19, № 20 1941: 2), which was a clear echo of Marr’s Soviet theory of language. Russification as a planned action of the previous government influenced spelling, orthoepy and syntax, so some editions gave as an example of codified forms of commonly used words (“Очистимо нашу мову” № 23) in order to spread among readers the signs of normative speech without Russian borrowings (“Очистимо нашу мову” № 24, № 25, № 27).

3. The development of social functions of languages. Since the occupation authorities first adopted the propaganda slogan of liberating the Ukrainian population from Bolshevism, they saw the prospect of its own national development. In anticipation of change, “Umansky Holos” newspaper in September 1941 announced the desired official status of languages: “due to the fact that Ukrainians are building the Ukrainian State, Ukrainian and German languages will function in it” (Т. Н. 1941: 3). *Actualization of the official status of the Ukrainian language* in society took place in order to form the Ukrainian identity and the revival of Ukraine (І. К. 1942: 1; “Відродження рідної мови” 3). Therefore, newspaper publications expanded knowledge about the functions of the Ukrainian language outside Ukraine in the territories where the Ukrainian population lived and where the Soviet authorities destroyed Ukrainian language education (Voronezh, Kursk, Kuban, Kazakhstan, the Far East), revealed Soviet propaganda about “national wrecking” and linguists, who were “the enemies of the people” (“Як Москва нищила” 4), described the richness of the Ukrainian language in translations and disseminated knowledge about translators (“Духовний концерт” 3).

The function of the Ukrainian language as the language of instruction was restored. The situation with education was difficult. When the occupying forces entered Kyiv, 80% of Ukrainians lived in the city (Форостівський 1952: 49), who were not evacuated with Soviet institutions. Among 253,956 people over the age of 16, 25,5% were illiterate (Форостівський 1952: 55–56). That is, on the one hand, the population needed different educational institutions, and on the other hand, all the work of the schools was under the control of the German authorities, which required only compulsory education for students in grades 1–4. Over time, poor attendance became apparent, the reasons being the lack of notebooks and the lack of textbooks (Яковчук 1942: 2). In order for the school to realize its task of national development of the students, it was necessary to develop their national consciousness in all subjects, among them were: native language and literature, history and geography of the land, the Law of God, and in high schools – philosophy and Latin (“Завдання нової школи” 1). Such information contrasted with the tasks for schools by the authorities, whose representatives addressed teachers. Thus, in Shepetivka, the Deputy Gebietskommissar made a speech on raising children, taking into account the “culture of Greater Germany” and the experience of Europeans, and formu-

* Interestingly, this article on the need for codification of norms on a single scientific basis was published by three newspapers at once: Revival (Myrhorod). № 76. 04.08.1942. P. 2; Revival (Tarashcha). № 88. 02.08.1942. P. 2; Uman’s voice. № 62. 01.08.1942. P. 2.

lated one of the new tasks of students – to participate in harvesting berries and herbs (“Завдання українського вчителства” 2).

In the autumn of 1941, teachers began to discuss the problem of teaching the Law of God, based on the connection of Ukrainian culture with religion. Students needed to know the history of the Ukrainian religion, so teachers of God’s law should not only acquaint young people with religion, but also instill love for it (Загнибіда 1941). Thus, the Law of God was introduced into the program of the Teachers’ Seminary opened in Uman in 1941; 245 students began to study there (“Директор Учительської семінарії” 3) (until 1941, the USSR authorities introduced the ideology of atheism).

In January 1942, meetings of primary school teachers took place, at which speakers discussed issues of national education and emphasized the role of religious and moral education (“Нарада вчителів” 1). Interestingly, in the schools of the Romensky district in March 1942, there was a common greeting “Glory to Ukraine” (Глинський 1942). As of January 1, 1942, there were 14,068 students in the schools of this region, and a year later – 16,452 students. In 1942, there were 576 teachers, and a year later, on January 1, 1943, there were 680 (provided that the number of schools remained unchanged at 228) (“Кадри шкіл” 2). In Zhytomyr region, the school year ended on July 1, 1942, during which time there were 1,210 schools with 111,085 children under the guidance of 3,187 teachers. At the end of July, teachers’ meetings were held in Zhytomyr and Vinnytsia, at which teachers considered the issue of raising children in the national spirit and Christian morality (“Шкільне життя” 4). In 1942/1943, the school year was to begin on September 1 (“Наказ № 164” № 62). However, in Kyiv in 1943, schools did not work due to lack of fuel, education began with the consent of the commissioner on April 5 only in the first 40 schools in the city. Another 1,500 students were scheduled for the summer (“Початок навчання” № 33).

The function of the Ukrainian language as a language of worship and unity of believers in the UAOC was restored. In November 1941, a congress of priests from all regions occupied by the German army took place in Kyiv, and there were representatives of the UAOC and the Greco-Russian church (in other words, the Autonomous, subordinate to the Moscow patriarch). The Congress agreed “1. To conduct God’s service in Ukrainian in Ukraine. 2. To adhere to the canonicity of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Congregational Church until the future cathedral” (“Церковний з’їзд” 2).

The newly created UAOC covered 2,100 parishes. In them, the Ukrainian language returned to worship and became a means of unity of the faithful (as opposed to 2,800 parishes of the Autonomous Orthodox Church revived during the war with legal subordination to the Moscow Patriarchate) (Гордієнко 1999: 10). An eyewitness to the events, an active organizer and activist of the Ukrainian Red Cross in Poltava, Halyna Vyun rightly notes that the Autonomous Church was specifically inspired by the German authorities “to break up the Ukrainian community and weaken the influence of the Ukrainian church” (В’юн 1973: 38).

The UAOC clergy socio-group united hierarchs, priests, monks and others. Each biographical reference in the press about the hierarchs illustrated the pro-Ukrainian position through its connection with the Liberation Struggle, which revived the church movement in Ukraine in 1917–1921 (such as the report on Archbishop Polykarp, who on December 24, 1941, was appointed Administrator of the UAOC in the lands under German occupation (“З життя нашої Церкви” 6) or Bishop Ihor of Uman, known as Archpriest Ivan Huba (“Єпископ Ігор” 4)).

The hierarchs of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church revived communication in the Ukrainian language with the clergy and the faithful. In a polemic with Moscow Patriarch Sergiy, Archbishop Polykarp interpreted the Church with a living Ukrainian language as the Church “truly Ukrainian” as opposed to the Church “with Slavic language, which is essentially a symbol of Moscow’s domination over the Ukrainian Church”; language and the Church were inseparable in his explanation of the ecclesiastical situation in the Ukrainian lands for the period of 1942, which the ecclesiastical authorities of the Russian Orthodox Church did not want to accept or recognize (“Заяви архієпископа Полікарпа” 657). The publications explained the connection between language, Church history and ideology, as well as the stages of development of the Ukrainian Church (Юрченко 1941).

The issue of the Ukrainian language of worship in the Orthodox Church became the subject of discussion with the followers. At the general meeting of the Orthodox clergy of Uman region in the report “Our immediate pastoral tasks”, the priest Mykola Hrabovetskyi argued that the church service should be conducted in plain language, that the native language is the weapon with which the Christian faith conquered the world; therefore, every nation heard the word of God from the apostles in their own tongue. The speaker argued that Ukrainians should also pray in their native language, provided that the Ukrainian church is independent (“Церковні справи” 2).

In language use, attention was paid to the official status of the German language. German was studied by schoolchildren and adults. However, there were rural schools that lacked German language teachers, as in Dnipropetrovsk region (“Середні школи” 2). In the primary schools of the Myrhorod district in Poltava region, which began classes in January 1942, new subjects also for the first time – German language, calligraphy and needlework (“Заняття в школах” 1). The lack of textbooks in German was obvious, however, as there were creative teachers who helped children learn the features of this new language (Степовий 1942: 2), and eventually the first newly created textbook under occupation (Степовий 1942: 1) was concluded.

To study German in various cities of Ukraine, the authorities organized courses for adults. For example, in Uman, 350 teachers and staff members studied German (“Курси німецької мови” 3). For its independent study, periodicals created new sections, the proposed material was divided into lessons (“Самоучок німецької мови” № 34, № 36, № 38, № 39; № 41; № 46; № 49). In Vinnytsia, courses existed at the Pedagogical Institute and trained German language teachers for schools. Here, in addition to the German language, the cadets studied German literature, methods of teaching German, Ukrainian literature, history of Ukraine (“Українці вивчають німецьку” 3). By order of the German authorities, the German Pedagogical Institute was to open in Kyiv on September 15, 1942 (“Педагогічний інститут” 3). Newspapers disseminated information about German-language publications (“Німецькі українознавчі видання” 2).

Conclusions and prospects of the study. Analysis of the language situation in 1941–1943 on the basis of memoirs, documents and legal Ukrainian-language periodicals, which could not fully reflect the spheres of educational, cultural and church life under occupation due to censorship, allows us to take only the first steps in understanding the language situation in the RCU.

The analysis revealed that the attitude of the occupying power and the Ukrainian population to languages had a different purpose. The German authorities used language to introduce a manipulative resource of their propaganda that obscured the real goals of the occupation leadership’s plans for the Ukrainian population. That is, languages for the government were a means of influence and a component of the permitted or impermissible cultural and national development of the people under occupation. The Ukrainian population realized the requirements to revive the functions of the Ukrainian language as a national code (hoping for its free development after years of Russification in the Soviet state) and to develop the functions of the German language as a means of communication of the new government with the population. Hence, the attitude of Ukrainian society to languages was based on the awareness of the need for normative proficiency in Ukrainian and German.

Communication practices were different. The public communication of the authorities with the population was illustrated by the newly organized legal periodicals in Ukrainian, German and Russian. Urban space often reflected Russian-Ukrainian bilingualism. The presence of two languages in the communicative practices of cities in society was interpreted as a consequence of Russification in the conditions of the Soviet state. Differences between urban and rural environments were shown through the use of surzhyk by the townspeople.

The functions of the Ukrainian literary language as a language of instruction and legal periodicals were developed, and the share of Ukrainian-language periodicals was the largest. The Ukrainian language returned to the UAOC as the language of worship and the unity of the faithful. This was a continuation of the tradition of 1921–1936, which was interrupted by the Soviet government. The social functions of the German language as a subject and a means of communication for adults were formed.

The analysis revealed the connection between the concepts of language and power (occupation), revealed the attitude of the population to the functions of languages, illustrated the signs of communicative practices and trends in the development of social functions of languages. These previously unknown indicators expand the possibilities of typological characterization of language situations in historical sociolinguistics.

The prospect of studying the language situation in the Ukrainian lands during the Second World War is to study Russian-language and German-language periodicals and archival documents, as well as to study the language situation in 1939-1944 in the General Governorate, a quasi-state entity, where the autochthonous Ukrainian population in the ethnically Ukrainian lands of Kholm and Pidlasiе lived.

Література

Армстронг, Дж. Героїчне і людське : спогад про українських національних провідників 1941–1945 років / пер. Вадим Ковалюк. 2009
<https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Armstrong_John/Heroichne_i_liudske/> 21.12.2020.

[Armstronh, Dzh. Heroichne i liudske : spohad pro ukrainskykh natsionalnykh providnykiv 1941–1945 rokiv / per. Vadym Kovaliuk. 2009
<https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Armstrong_John/Heroichne_i_liudske/> 21.12.2020]

Гедз, В. Джерела до вивчення культурного життя в окупованому Києві (1941–1943 pp.). *Спеціальні історичні дисципліни : питання теорії та методики* 15, 2007: 181–204.

[Hedz, V. Dzherela do vvyvchennia kulturnoho zhyttia v okupovanomu Kyievi (1941–1943 rr.). *Spetsialni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannia teorii ta metodyky* 15, 2007: 181–204]

Гедз, В. А. Україномовна преса в окупованому Києві : до історіографії проблеми. *Література та культура Полісся. Серія : історичні науки* 6. 2013: 265–275.

[Hedz, V. A. Ukrainomovna presa v okupovanomu Kyievi : do istoriohrafii problemy. *Literatura ta kultura Polissia. Serii : istorychni nauky* 6, 2013: 265–275]

Гордієнко, В. В. Православні конфесії в Україні періоду Другої світової війни (вересень 1939–вересень 1945 pp.) : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Київ, 1999.

[Hordiienko, V. V. Pravoslavni konfessii v Ukraini periodu Druhoi svitovoi vijny (veresen 1939–veresen 1945 rr.) : avtoref. dys. ... kand. ist. nauk : 07.00.01. Kyiv, 1999.]

Косик, В. Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Львів : [б.в.], 1993.

[Kosyk, V. Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhij svitovij vijni. Paryzh – Niu-Jork – Lviv : [b.v.], 1993.]

Курилишин, К. Українське життя в умовах німецької окупації (1939–1944 pp.) : за матеріалами україномовної легальної преси / НАН України, ЛННБ України ім. В. Стефаника. Львів. від. Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського. Львів, 2010.

[Kurylyshyn, K. Ukrainske zhyttia v umovakh nimetskoï okupatsii (1939–1944 rr.) : za materialamy ukrainomovnoi lehalnoi presy / NAN Ukrainy, LNNB Ukrainy im. V. Stefanyka. Lviv. vid. In-t ukr. arkheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M. S. Hrushevskoho. Lviv, 2010.]

Лозинський, Р. М. Мовна ситуація в Україні (суспільно-географічний погляд) : монографія. Львів : Вид. центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2008.

[Lozynskyj, R. M. Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini (sucpilno-heohrafichnyj pohliad) : monohrafiia. Lviv : Vyd. tsentr LNU im. Ivana Franka, 2008.]

Мацюк, Г. Суспільна природа мови в радянському мовознавстві : концепція М. Марра. [В:] *Лінгвістичні студії* : зб. наук. праць. Донецьк, 2010, 44–54.

[Matsiuk, H. Suspilna pryroda movy v radianskomu movoznavstvi : kontseptsiiia M. Marra. [V:] *Linhvistychni studii* : zb. nauk. prats. Donetsk, 2010, 44–54]

Наконечна, Г. Українська термінологія місцевого самоврядування часів німецької окупації (1941–1944) (на матеріалі українських періодичних видань). [В:] *Проблеми української термінології. Вісник нац. ун-ту «Львівська Політехніка»* 709. Львів : Вид. Львів. політехніки, 2011: 103–106.

[Nakonechna, H. *Ukrainska terminolohiia mistsevoho samovriaduvannia chasiv nimetskoï okupatsii (1941–1944) (na materiali ukrainskykh periodychnykh vydan)*. [V:] *Problemy ukrainskoï terminolohii*. *Visnyk nats. un-tu «Lvivska Politekhnikha»* 709. Lviv : Vyd. Lviv. politekhniky, 2011: 103–106]

Попович, М. Нарис історії культури України. Київ : АртЕк, 1998 : іл.

[Popovych, M. *Narys istorii kultury Ukrainy*. Kyiv : ArtEk, 1998 : il.]

Постанова РНК УСРР і ЦК КП(б)У «Про обов'язкове вивчення російської мови в неросійських школах України» : зб. наказів та розпоряджень НКО УСРР 33. 1938.: 5–7.

[Postanova RNK USRR i TsK KP(b)U «Pro obovjazkove vyvchennia rosijskoï movy v nerosijskykh shkolakh Ukrainy» 33: zb. nakaziv ta rozporiadzhen NKO USRR. 1938: 5–7]

Радевич-Винницький, Я. К. Двомовність в Україні: теорія, історія, мововживання : монографія, Київ–Дрогобич : Посвіт, 2011.

[Radevych-Vynnytskyj, Ya. K. *Dvymovnist v Ukraini: teoriia, istoriia, movovzhivannia : monohrafiia*, Kyiv–Drohobych : Posvit, 2011.]

[Рудницький, О. П. Висновок експерта. Київ. Ін-т демографії та соціальних досліджень ім. М. В. Птухи НАН України. 2009. 49 с. <<https://www.idss.org.ua/golodomor/pdf/expert.pdf>> 23.12.2020]

[Rudnytskyj, O. P. *Vysnovok eksperta*. Kyiv. In-t demohrafii ta sotsialnykh doslidzhen im. M. V. Ptukhy NAN Ukrainy. 2009. 49 s. <<https://www.idss.org.ua/golodomor/pdf/expert.pdf>> 23.12.2020]

Стельникович, С. В. Офіційна україномовна преса генерального округу «Житомир». *Гуржіївські історичні читання* 6, 2013: 235–237.

[Stelnykovych, S. V. *Ofitsijna ukrainomovna presa heneralnoho okruhu «Zhytomyr»*. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia* 6, 2013: 235–237]

Українська мова у XX сторіччі: історія лінгвоциду. Київ : Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2005.

[*Ukrainska mova u XX storichchi : istoriia linhvotsydu*. Kyiv : Vydavnychyj dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», 2005.]

Черняков, Б. І. Періодична преса на окупованій території України. *Електронна бібліотека Інституту журналістики* <<http://journalib.univ.kiev.ua/index.php?act=article&article=1648>> 16.12.2020).

[Cherniakov, B. I. *Periodychna presa na okupovaniij terytorii Ukrainy*. *Elektronna biblioteka Instytutu zhurnalistyky* <<http://journalib.univ.kiev.ua/index.php?act=article&article=1648>> 16.12.2020]

Черняков, Б. Офіційна преса Райхскомісаріату Україна : розбудова і функціонування (1941–1943 рр.) : наук. зап. Ін-ту політ. і етнонац. досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України 31, 2006: 51–68.

[Cherniakov, B. *Ofitsijna presa Rajkhskomisariatu Ukraina : rozbudova i funktsionuvannia (1941–1943 rr.) : nauk. zap. In-tu polit. i etnonats. doslidzhenj im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy* 31, 2006: 51–68]

Шаповал, М. Соціографія України – 1. Соціальна структура України. Прага : Вільна Спілка, 1933. Ч. 1.

[Shapoval, M. *Sotsiohrafiiia Ukrainy – 1. Sotsiialna struktura Ukrainy*. Praha : Vilna Spilka, 1933. Ch. 1.]

Шаповал, Ю., Пристайко, В., Золотарьов, В. ЧК–ГПУ–НКВД в Україні. Особи. Факти. Документи. Київ : Абрис, 1997.

[Shapoval, Yu., Prystajko, V., Zolotariov, V. *ChK–HPU–NKVD v Ukraini. Osoby. Fakty, Dokumenty*. Kyiv : Abrys, 1997.]

The battle for Ukrainian. A comparative perspective / ed. by Michel S. Flier and Andrea Craziosi. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2017.

Planned intervention in language development. [In:] Josef Vachek (in collaboration with Josef Dubský). *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics* / ed. by Libuše Dušková. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2003.

Scutnabb-Kangass, T. "Mother Tongue": The theoretical and sociopolitical construction of a concept. [In:] Phillipson R. *Status and function of language and language varieties*. 1989, 450–477.

Havránek, B., Jakobson, R., Mathesius, V., Mukařovský, J. et al. Úvodem. *Slovo a slovesnost*. 1935; 1: 1–7 <<http://sas.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?lang=en&art=1>> 16.12.2020.

Handbook of historical sociolinguistics / ed. by J. M. Hernández-Campoy, J. C. Conde-Silvestre. 2012. 704 p.

Auer, A., Peersman, C., Pickl, S., Rutten, G. et al. Historical sociolinguistics : the field and its future. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 2015; 1(1) : 1–12.

Nevalainen, T. What are historical sociolinguistics? *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 2015; 1, 2 <<https://www.degruyter.com/view/journals/jhsl/1/2/article-p243.xml>> 19.12.2020.

Використані джерела

№ 26. Таємний обіжник ГПУ УСРР. «Про український сепаратизм». 4 вересня 1926 р. Шаповал, Ю., Пристайко, В., Золотарьов, В. *ЧК–ГПУ–НКВД в Україні. Особи. Факти. Документи*. Київ : Абрис, 1997. С. 254–267.

[№ 26. Taiemnyj obizhnyk HPU USRR. «Pro ukraïnskyj separatyzm». 4 veresnia 1926 r. Shapoval, Yu., Prystajko, V., Zolotariov, V. *ChK–HPU–NKVD v Ukraïni. Osoby. Fakty, Dokumenty*. Kyiv : Abrys, 1997: 254–267]

№ 54. Інструкція ОКВ про застосування пропаганди в плані «Барбаросса». Берлін, червень 1941 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 501.

[№ 54. Instruktziia OKV pro zastosuvannia propahandy v plani «Barbarossa». Berlin, cherven 1941 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 501]

№ 56. Акт відновлення Української держави. Львів, 30 червня 1941 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 504.

[№ 56. Akt vidnovlennia Ukrainskoi derzhavy. Lviv, 30 chervnia 1941 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 504]

№ 58. Лист Гайдріха (СД) до найвищих керівників СС і поліції. Берлін, 2 липня 1941 р. Таємна справа Райху. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 506–507.

[№ 58. Lyst Hajdrixa (SD) do najvyschykh kerivnykiv SS i politsii. Berlin, 2 lypnia 1941 r. Taiemna sprava Rajkhu. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 506–507]

№ 65. Протокол засідання Гітлера з керівниками Райху. Головний штаб фюрера. 16 липня 1941 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 512–515.

[№ 65. Protokol zasidannia Hitlera z kerivnykamy Rajkhu. Holovnyj shtab fiurera. 16 lypnia 1941 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 512–515]

№ 68. Уривок із донесення айнзацгруп поліції безпеки і СД про діяльність і ситуацію в СРСР № 1. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 517.

[№ 68. Uryvok iz donesennia ajnzatshrup politsii bezpeky i SD pro diialnist i sytuatsiiu v SRSR № 1. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 517]

№ 81. Донесення про ситуацію в Україні. 27 серпня 1941 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 525.

[№ 81. Donesennia pro sytuatsiiu v Ukraini. 27 serpnia 1941 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 525]

№ 88. Основні вказівки про поведження з українським населенням. (Вересень 1941 р.) Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 529–530.

[№ 88. Osnovni vказivky pro povodzhennia z ukrainskym naselenniam. (Veresen 1941 r.) Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 529–530]

№ 92. Розмова Гітлера, записана Кеппеном. Головний штаб фюрера, п'ятниця, 19 вересня 1941 р.). [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 532–533.

[№ 92. Rozmova Hitlera, zapysana Keppenom. Holovnyj shtab fiurera, piatnytsia, 19 veresnia 1941 r.). [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 532–533]

№ 108. Звіт про нараду в райхскомісара освіти 5 грудня 1941 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 545–546.

[№ 108. Zvit pro naradu v rajhskomisara osvity 5 hrudnia 1941 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 545–546]

№ 114. Постанова VII секції вермахту зони Б (Україна) стосовно навчання. 29 грудня 1941 року. Постанова № 34. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 549–550.

[№ 114. Postanova VII sektsii vermakhtu zony B (Ukraina) stosovno navchannia. 29 hrudnia 1941 roku. Postanova № 34. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 549–550]

№ 120. Уривок із донесення про події у СРСР № 164. Берлін, 4 лютого 1941. Секретна справа в Райху! Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 554–555.

[№ 120. Uryvok iz donesennia pro podii u SRSR № 164. Berlin, 4 liutoho 1941. Sekretna sprava v Rajkhu! Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 554–555]

№ 125. Думки Гітлера з приводу України. (11 квітня 1942 р.). [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 560.

[№ 125. Dumky Hitlera z pryvodu Ukrainy. (11 kvitnia 1942 r.). [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 560]

№ 132. Заява Гімmlера з приводу германізації (червень–липень 1942 р.). [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 566.

[№ 132. Zaiava Himmlera z pryvodu hermanizatsii (cherven–lypen 1942 r.). [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhiy svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 566]

№ 152. Секретна німецька інструкція стосовно України. Листопад 1942 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 587.

[№ 152. Sekretna nimetska instruksiiia stosovno Ukrainy. Lystopad 1942 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhij svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 587]

№ 173. Уривок із виступу Коха про поводження з населенням на Україні. Головний штаб 1 квітня 1943 р. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 608.

[№ 173. Uryvok iz vystupu Kokha pro povodzhennia z naselenniam na Ukraini. Holovnyj shtab 1 kvitnia 1943 r. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhij svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 608]

Байбак, П. Т. Смолоскип ОУН на Слобожанщині. *На зов Києва: Український націоналізм у II світовій війні* : зб. статей, спогадів і документів. Торонто – Нью-Йорк, 1985. С. 264–276.

[Bajbak P. T. Smoloskyp OUN na Slobozhanschyni. *Na zov Kyieva: Ukrainskyj natsionalizm u II svitovij vijni* : zb. statej, spohadiv i dokumentiv. Toronto – Niu-Jork, 1985: 264–276]

В. М. Чехівський. *Вінницькі вісті*. 28.12.1941. № 42. С. 5.

[V. M. Chekhivskyj. *Vinnytski visti*. 28.12.1941; 42: 5]

В'юн, Г. Під знаком Червоного Хреста в Полтаві 1941–1942 рр. : спогад-звіт для історії. Новий Ульм : Українські вісті, 1973. 46 с.

[Vjun, H. Pid znakom Chervonoho Khresta v Poltavi 1941–1942 rr. : spohad-zvit dlia istorii. Novyj Ulm : Ukrainski visti, 1973. 46 s.]

Відродження рідної мови. *Уманський голос*. 16.07.1942. № 57. С. 3.

[Vidrodzhennia ridnoi movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 16.07.1942; 57: 3]

Глинський, Г. По школах Роменського району. *Відродження (Ромни)*. 31.03.1942. № 24.

[Hlynskyj, H. Po shkolakh Romenskooho rajonu. *Vidrodzhennia (Romny)*. 31.03.1942; 24]

Григорій Сковорода – предтеча українського відродження. *Уманський голос*. 17.09.1942. № 75. С. 3.

[Hryhorij Skovoroda – predtecha ukrainskoho vidrodzhennia. *Umanskyj holos*. 17.09.1942; 75: 3]

Де жила в Києві Леся Українка? *Українські новини*. 03. 02. 1943. № 1. С. 4.

[De zhyla v Kyievi Lesia Ukrainka? *Ukrainski novyny*. 03. 02. 1943; 1: 4]

Директор Учительської семінарії П. Левицький / Учительська семінарія. *Уманський голос*. 19.10.1941. № 14. С. 3.

[Dyректор Uchytelskoj seminarii P. Levytskyj / Uchytelska seminariia. *Umanskyj holos*. 19.10.1941; 14: 3]

До 82-ої річниці з дня смерті Т. Г. Шевченка / Шевченко на Волині. *Уманський голос*. 14.03.1943. № 20. С. 3.

[Do 82-oi richnytsi z dnia smerty T. H. Shevchenka / Shevchenko na Volyni. *Umanskyj holos*. 14.03.1943; 20: 3]

До питання правопису. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 04.04.1942. № 27. С. 3.

[Do pytannia pravopysu. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 04.04.1942; 27: 3]

Додатки. Документи. [В:] Косик, В. *Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні* / пер. з фр. Р. Осадчука. Париж–Нью-Йорк–Львів : [б. в.], 1993. С. 463–627.

[Dodatky. Dokumenty. [V:] Kosyk, V. *Ukraina i Nimechchyna u Druhij svitovij vijni* / per. z fr. R. Osadchuka. Paryzh–Niu-Jork–Lviv : [b. v.], 1993: 463–627]

Доля Остапа Вишні. *Уманський голос*. 30.04.1942. № 35. С. 4.

[Dolia Ostapa Vyshni. *Umanskyj holos*. 30.04.1942; 35: 4]

Духовний концерт у соборі Св. Андрія Первозванного. *Уманський голос*. 30.08.1942. № 70. С. 3.

[Dukhovnyj kontsert u sobori Sv. Andriia Pervozvannoho. *Umanskyj holos*. 30.08.1942; 70: 3]

З життя нашої Церкви. Архієпископ Полікарп (короткий життєпис). *Вінницькі вісті*. 08.02.1942. № 11. С. 6.

[Z zhyttia nashoi Tserkvy. Arkhyiepyskop Polikarp (korotkyj zhyttiepys). *Vinnytski visti*. 08.02.1942; 11: 6]

- За чистоту і охайність української мови. *Уманський голос*. 04.09.1941. № 2. С. 4.
[Za chystotu i okhajnist ukrainskoï movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 04.09.1941; 2: 4]
- Завдання нової школи в вихованні національної свідомості. *Відродження (Тараща)*. 12.10.1941. № 6. С. 1.
[Zavdannia novoi shkoly v vykhovanni natsionalnoi svidomosti. *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 12.10.1941; 6: 1]
- Загнибіда, Т. Найбільшу увагу викладанню закону Божого. *Вінницькі вісті*. 10.09.1941. № 5.
[Zahnybida, T. Najbilshu uvahu vykladanniu zakonu Bozhoho. *Vinnytski visti*. 10.09.1941; 5]
- Завдання українського вчителства. *Відродження (Тараща)*. 20.08.1942. № 93. С. 2.
[Zavdannia ukrainskoho vchytelstva. *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 20.08.1942; 93: 2]
- Заняття в школах. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 15.01.1942. № 5. С. 1.
[Zaniattia v shkolakh. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 15.01.1942; 5: 1]
- Заяви архієпископа Полікарпа в справі виступів проти нього Московської патріархії. [В:] *Мартирологія українських церков. Т. I. Українська православна церква України : документи, матеріали, християнський самвидав / упор. і зред. Осип Зінкевич і Олександр Воронин. Торонто – Балтимор : Укр. Вид. «Смолоскип» ім. В Симоненка, 1987. С. 657.*
[Zaiavy arkhieypyskopa Polikarpa v spravi vystupiv proty nioho Moskovskoi patriiarkhii. [V:] *Martyrolohiia ukrainskykh tserkov. T. I. Ukrainska pravoslavna tserkva Ukrainy : dokumenty, materialy, khrystyianskyj samvydav / upor. i zred. Osyp Zinkevych i Oleksandr Voronyn. Toronto – Baltymor : Ukr. Vyd. «Smoloskyp» im. V Symonenka, 1987: 657]*
- Зберегти будинок Д. І. Яворницького. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 05.12.1941. № 49.
[Zberehty budynok D. I. Yavornytskoho. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 05.12.1941; 49]
- І. К. Рідне слово. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 21.01.1942. № 7. С. 1.
[I. K. Ridne slovo. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 21.01.1942; 7: 1]
- Єпископ Ігор у Смілі. *Українські новини*. 25.08.1943. № 67. С. 4.
[Yepyskop Ihor u Smili. *Ukrainski novyny*. 25.08.1943; 67: 4]
- Кадри шкіл Роменської округи. *Відродження (Ромни)*. 19.01.1943. № 5. С. 2.
[Kadry shkil Romenskoï okruhy. *Vidrodzhennia (Romny)*. 19.01.1943; 5: 2]
- Комісія для перегляду українського правопису в Києві. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 04.08.1942. № 76. С. 2.
[Komisiia dlia perehliadu ukrainskoho pravopysu v Kyievi. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 04.08.1942; 76: 2]
- Комісія для перегляду українського правопису в Києві. *Відродження (Тараща)*. 02.08.1942. № 88.
[Komisiia dlia perehliadu ukrainskoho pravopysu v Kyievi. *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 02.08.1942; 88]
- Комісія для перегляду українського правопису в Києві. *Уманський голос*. 01.08.1942. № 62. С. 2.
[Komisiia dlia perehliadu ukrainskoho pravopysu v Kyievi. *Umanskyj holos*. 01.08.1942; 62: 2]
- Курси німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 01.02.1942. № 10. С. 3.
[Kursy nimetskoï movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 01.02.1942; 10: 3]
- Мальчевський, І. Українська преса під німецькою окупацією. «Райхскомісаріат Україна» та землі під військовою окупацією. [В:] *На зов Києва : Український націоналізм у II світовій війні : зб. статей, спогадів і документів. Торонто – Нью-Йорк, 1985. С. 290–296.*
[Malchevskij, I. Ukrainska presa pid nimetskoïu okupatsiieiu. «Rajkhskomisariat Ukraina» ta zemli pid vijskovoïu okupatsiieiu. [V:] *Na zov Kyieva : Ukrainskyj natsionalizm u II svitovij vijni : zb. statej, spohadiv i dokumentiv. Toronto – Niu-Jork, 1985: 290–296]*
- Микола Леонтович – одна із жертв большевизму. *Уманський голос*. 04.04.1943. № 26. С. 3.
[Mykola Leontovych – jedna iz zhertv bolshevyzmu. *Umanskyj holos*. 04.04.1943; 26: 3]
- Микола Хвильовий – жертва більшовизму. *Уманський голос*. 19.11.1942. № 93. С. 3.
[Mykola Khvyliovuj – zhertva bilshovyzmu. *Umanskyj holos*. 19.11.1942; 93: 3]

- Музей Тараса Шевченка в Кирилівці. *Українські новини*. 26.09.1942. № 77. С. 4.
 [Muzej Tarasa Shevchenka v Kyrylivtsi. *Ukrainski novyny*. 26.09.1942; 77: 4]
- Наказ № 164 по Роменській Міській Управі, від 12 серпня 1942 р. Про початок 1942–43 навч. року в школах м. Ромна і округи. *Відродження (Ромни)*. 14.08.1942. № 62.
 [Nakaz № 164 po Romenskiy Miskiy Upravі, vid 12 serpnia 1942 r. Pro pochatok 1942–43 navch. roku v shkolakh m. Romna i okruhy. *Vidrodzhennia (Romny)*. 14.08.1942; 62]
- Нарада вчителів. *Відродження (Ромни)*. 21.01.1942. № 6. С. 1.
 [Narada vchyteliv. *Vidrodzhennia (Romny)*. 21.01.1942; 6: 1]
- Німецькі українознавчі видання. *Уманський голос*. 26.10.1941. № 16. С. 2.
 [Nimetski ukrainoznavchi vydannia. *Umanskyj holos*. 26.10.1941; 16: 2]
- Останні роки життя проф. Михайла Грушевського. *Уманський голос*. 25.06.1942. № 51. С. 2.
 [Ostanni roky zhyttia prof. Mykhajla Hrushevskoho. *Umanskyj holos*. 25.06.1942; 51: 2]
- Очистимо нашу мову від русизмів. *Уманський голос*. 20.11.1941. № 23. С. 4.
 [Ochystymo nashu movu vid rusyzmiv. *Umanskyj holos*. 20.11.1941; 23: 4]
- Очистимо нашу мову від русизмів. *Уманський голос*. 23.11.1941. № 24. С. 4.
 [Ochystymo nashu movu vid rusyzmiv. *Umanskyj holos*. 23.11.1941; 24: 4]
- Очистимо нашу мову від русизмів. *Уманський голос*. 27.11.1941. № 25. С. 4.
 [Ochystymo nashu movu vid rusyzmiv. *Umanskyj holos*. 27.11.1941; 25: 4]
- Очистимо нашу мову від русизмів. *Уманський голос*. 04.12.1941. № 27. С. 4.
 [Ochystymo nashu movu vid rusyzmiv. *Umanskyj holos*. 04.12.1941; 27: 4]
- Паньківський К. Роки німецької окупації. Нью-Йорк – Торонто : Ключі, 1965. 479 с. (Життя і мислі ; кн. 7).
 [Pankivskyy, K. Roky nimetskoї okupatsii.. *Knyzhka sioma*. Niu-Jork–Toronto : Kliuchi, 1965. 479 s. (*Zhyttia i myslі*; kn. 7)]
- Панько Куліш і його дружина Ганна Барвінок. *Українські новини*. 03.04.1943. № 26. С. 4.
 [Panko Kulish i joho družhyna Hanna Barvinok. *Ukrainski novyny*. 03.04.1943; 26: 4]
- Педагогічний інститут у Києві. *Уманський голос*. 17.09.1942. № 75. С. 3.
 [Pedahohichnyj instytut u Kyievi. *Umanskyj holos*. 17.09.1942; 75: 3]
- Передплачуйте часопис! *Відродження (Тараща)*. 24.09.1941. № 1. С. 1.
 [Peredplachujte chasopys! *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 24.09.1941; 1: 1]
- Про українську пісню і Миколу Лисенка. *Українські новини*. 26.08.1942. № 68. С. 4.
 [Pro ukrainsku pisniu i Mykolu Lysenka. *Ukrainski novyny*. 26.08.1942; 68: 4]
- Поезії О. Олеся. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 14.12.1941. № 57. С. 3.
 [Poezii O. Olesia. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 14.12.1941; 57: 3]
- Початок навчання в Київських школах. *Вінницькі вісті*. 25.04.1943. № 33.
 [Pochatok navchannia v Kyivskykh shkolakh. *Vinnytski visti*. 25.04.1943; 33]
- Про назву вулиць. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 23.11.1941. № 39. С. 2.
 [Pro nazvu vulyts. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 23.11.1941; 39: 2]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 26.04.1942. № 34. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 26.04.1942; 34: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 03.05.1942. № 36. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 03.05.1942; 36: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 10.05.1942. № 38. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 10.05.1942; 38: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 14.05.1942. № 39. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 14.05.1942; 39: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 21.05.1942. № 41. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 21.05.1942; 41: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 07. 06.1942. № 46. С. 4.
 [Samouchok nimetskoї movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 07. 06.1942; 46: 4]
- Самоучок німецької мови. *Уманський голос*. 18.06.1942. № 49. С. 4.

- [Samouchok nimetskoï movy. *Umanskyj holos*. 18.06.1942; 49: 4]
Середні школи Дніпропетровщини. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 23.10.1941. № 13. С. 2.
[Seredni shkoly Dnipropetrovshchyny. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 23.10.1941; 13: 2]
Спадщина Д. І. Яворницького. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 04.12.1941. № 48.
[Spadschyna D. I. Yavornytskoho. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 04.12.1941; 48]
Степовий, М. В школах Шишацького району. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 25.04.1942. № 32.
С. 1.
[Stepovuj, M. V shkolakh Shyshatskoho rajonu. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 25.04.1942; 32: 1]
Степовий, М. До питання про нові умови в роботі школи. *Відродження (Миргород)*.
21.03.1942. № 23. С. 2.
[Stepovuj, M. Do pytannia pro novi umovy v roboti shkoly. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*.
21.03.1942; 23: 2]
Т. Н. В українських установах українська мова. *Уманський голос*. 21.09.1941. № 6. С. 3.
[T. N. V ukrainskykh ustanovakh ukrainska mova. *Umanskyj holos*. 21.09.1941; 6: 3]
Тут жив Гоголь. *Українські новини*. 03.03.1943. № 17. С. 4.
[Tut zhyv Hohol. *Ukrainski novyny*. 03.03.1943; 17: 4]
Українська Православна Церква під час Другої світової війни (1939–1944). [В:]
Мартирологія українських церков. Т. 1. Українська православна церква України : документи,
матеріали, християнський самвидав / упор. і зред. Осип Зінкевич і Олександр Воронин.
Торонто – Балтимор : Укр. Вид. «Смолоскип» ім. В Симоненка, 1987. 1207 с.
[Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva pid chas Druhoi svitovoi vijny (1939–1944). [V:] *Martyrolohiia
ukrainskykh tserkov. T. 1. Ukrainska pravoslavna tserkva Ukrainy* : dokumenty, materialy,
khrystyianskyj samvydav / upor. i zred. Osyp Zinkevych i Oleksandr Voronyn. Toronto – Baltymor :
Ukr. Vyd. «Smoloskyp» im. V Symonenka, 1987. 1207 s.]
Українці вивчають німецьку мову. *Уманський голос*. 06.09.1942. № 72. С. 3.
[Ukrainci vuvchaliut nimetsku movu. *Umanskyj holos*. 06.09.1942; 72: 3]
Форостівський, Л. Київ під ворожими окупаціями. Буенос-Айрес : Видавництво Миколи
Денисюка, 1952. 79 с.
[Forostivskij, L. Kyiv pid vorozhymy okupatsiiamy. Buenos-Ajres : Vydavnytstvo Mykoly
Denysiuka, 1952. 79 s.]
Церковні справи. *Відродження (Миргород)*. 27.05.1941. № 41. С. 2.
[Tserkovni spravy. *Vidrodzhennia (Myrhorod)*. 27.05.1941; 41: 2]
Церковний з'їзд у Києві. *Дніпропетровська газета*. 07.11.1941. № 25. С. 2.
[Tserkovnuy zjizd u Kyievi. *Dnipropetrovska hazeta*. 07.11.1941; 25: 2]
Шануймо рідну мову. *Вінницькі вісті*. 26.09.1941. № 12. С. 1.
[Shanujmo ridnu movu. *Vinnytski visti*. 26.09.1941; 12: 1]
Шевченко на Волині і Вечір пам'яті Т. Г. Шевченка. *Українські новини*. 13.03.1943. № 20.
С. 4.
[Shevchenko na Volyni i Vechir pamjati T. H. Shevchenka. *Ukrainski novyny*. 13.03.1943; 20: 4]
Шкільне життя Житомирщини. *Українські новини*. 03.10.1942. № 79. С. 4.
[Shkilne zhyttia Zhytomyrschyny. *Ukrainski novyny*. 03.10.1942; 79: 4]
Штуль, О. Русифікація. *Відродження (Тараща)*. 19.11.1941. № 19; 30.11.1941. № 20. С. 2.
[Shtul, O. Rusyfikatsiia. *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 19.11.1941; 19; 30.11.1941; 20: 2]
Юрченко, Є. Будуймо рідну церкву! *Відродження (Тараща)*. 05.11.1941. № 13.
[Yurchenko, Ye. Budujmo ridnu tserkvu! *Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha)*. 05.11.1941; 13]
Як Москва нищила українську мову. *Уманський голос*. 23.07.1942. № 59. С. 4.
[Yak Moskva nyshchyla ukrainsku movu. *Umanskyj holos*. 23.07.1942; 59: 4]
Яковчук, М. Й. Робота шкіл Таращанської округи в 1941–42 навчальному році.
Відродження (Тараща). 19.07.1942. № 84. С. 2.
[Yakovchuk, M. J. Robota shkil Tarashchanskoï okruhy v 1941–42 navchalnomu rotsi.
Vidrodzhennia (Tarashcha). 19.07.1942; 84: 2]

TOWARDS THE TYPOLOGY OF LANGUAGE SITUATIONS IN HISTORICAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE SITUATION IN REICHSKOMMISSARIAT UKRAINE (1941-1943)

Halyna Matsyuk

Department of General Linguistics Ivan Franko Lviv National University, Lviv, Ukraine

Abstract

Background: The article provides insight into the features of one of the periods of the language situation during the Second World War. Language functions in ethnically Ukrainian lands were not the focus of interdisciplinary discussion of the lives of ordinary people during the years of occupation. The relevance of studying this issue in Ukrainian historical sociolinguistics is in the need to develop a typological approach to the characterization of language situations.

Purpose: The aim of the study is to reveal the signs of the language situation based on the analysis of new sources, including recollections of participants, published documents from German archives and the archives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) and more than one thousand two hundred issues of Ukrainian-language legal newspapers.

Results: The obtained results highlight the trends in the language situation: the attitude to the functions of languages by the German authorities and the Ukrainian population, which influenced the implementation of their cultural and educational life; the interaction of Ukrainian, German and Russian languages in communication between the government and the population; the popularization of attitudes among the population regarding the need to expand the literary use of the Ukrainian language in order to overcome the consequences of Russification; the introduction of the Ukrainian language as the language of teaching school subjects, the language of worship and the unity of the faithful in the UAOC, the introduction of the German language as a subject and an independent code in public communication.

Discussion: The identified features of the language situation reveal the relationship between language and power, language and population, communicative practices and social functions of language. The study of the language situation in the Ukrainian lands during the Second World War gained new perspectives based on the analysis of Russian and German-language periodicals, archival documents, as well as by studying the language situation in 1939-1944 in the General Governorship, a quasi-state entity, which included the autochthonous Ukrainian population from the ethnically Ukrainian lands of Kholm and Podlasie.

Keywords: historical sociolinguistics, language situation, attitude to language, language-power relationship, communicative practice, language social function

Vitae

Halyna Matsyuk is Doctor of Philology, Professor of Department of General Linguistics at Ivan Franko Lviv National University. Her areas of research interest include theoretical and applied sociolinguistics, political communication, onomastics, text linguistics, theory and history of linguistics science.

Correspondence: halyna.matsyuk@lnu.edu.ua

Надійшла до редакції 25 березня 2021 року
Рекомендована до друку 8 квітня 2021 року