

For Bob
with best wishes
Horace Nov/98

NOTES ON THE RUSIN LANGUAGE OF YUGOSLAVIA AND ITS EAST SLOVAK ORIGINS*

Horace G. Lunt

1. The Yugoslav Rusin language (YR) is spoken by over twenty thousand people who call themselves *Rusnaci* or *Rusini*.¹ It is one of the legally valid languages of public life, used in schools, courts, radio and television, and in many publications.² The official designation of the language is Rusin (SC *rusinski jezik*, YR *ruski jazik*), and its sponsors declare it to be a dialect of Ukrainian. The Rusins are descendants of emigrants from the Carpathian valleys of the northern tributaries of the upper Tisa, chiefly those now in eastern Slovakia (the Hornad and Bodrog) but with some, perhaps, from farther east, particularly the valleys of the Už and Latorica. No discussion of the origins of YR is meaningful without a firm background of the linguistic situation in this homeland, eastern Slovakia.

2. Slovak dialects fall easily enough into three groups, West, Central and East; the standard language is based on Central Slovak, with strong influences from the western dialects. Eastern Slovak differs in a number of crucial phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical items. One is in the ethnonym itself: they call themselves *Slovjak* (not *Slovák*).³ Not surprisingly, some of the isoglosses that set ESik apart from CntSlk join ESik with the Polish dialects to the north and northwest and/or the Ukrainian dialects to the northeast. The villages close to the Slovakia-

*May 1997. This article stands as I wrote it in 1990, with an addendum, §14, from 1991; I have no information about what has happened to the Rusins and their language since that time.

¹In English they have been called *Ruthenians* and *Rusinians*.

²Since Duličenko's discussion of YR in the framework of "Slavic literary microlanguages" in 1981, a number of summary articles about this newest Slavic standard language have appeared (and Duličenko has written extensively about grammatical details in contemporary YR). A native student essay (Barič) produces quite misleading conclusions because the author was not yet well enough trained to deal consistently with the complex historical and comparative data. Pohl's informative contemporary account includes a useful map. Švagrovský provides the fullest account of the socio-historical factors and the most extensive bibliography. Witkowski, making use of Horbatsch's listing of details, gives perhaps the most explicit linguistic discussion. Timko provides data about the current status of the language in terms of hours of radio and television, enrollment in schools, and the like; she is rather gloomy, because enrollments are decreasing. Horbatsch 1969 (like Bidwell 1966) puts the Rusin population at c36,000; the 1981 census records 23,285, a decrease of over 5% from official 1971 figures. The loss appears to be more a matter of revised self-definition than of rising mortality and/or falling birth rates (cf. Rašič).

³The term *Slovjak* has apparently died out since 1918, except in the context of 1938-44 efforts by individuals called renegades by Slovak scholars (Pauliny 1947: 91, Švagrovský 260). I will use it without any political intent as a convenient synonym for *East Slovak* — see below.

Ukraine frontier are Ukrainian; scattered enclaves farther west are also Ukrainian.⁴ The Slovak Dialect Atlas (ASJ) records data from 98 points in East Slovakia;⁵ of these, four are called Goral (Polish or Polish-influenced)⁶ and seven Ukrainian. The 87 Slovak points, covering an area of perhaps 18,000 square kilometers, thus provide evidence for a broader language-type we may call East Slovak or, using the local name for purposes of finer subdivision, Slovjak (Sjk). We may further distinguish a central zone (about 8,000 square kilometers between 21° and 22° of east longitude) by excluding the western and eastern zones, leaving 57 points I will call *core Slovjak*: 5 in the Southeastern Spiš dialect, 19 in the Šariš dialect in the north, 9 in the Abov dialect in the south, and 24 in the Zemplin dialect in the east.

3. In the 1740s, families from this zone emigrated south to what is now northern Yugoslavia, to the region called Bačka (the western part of the autonomous province of the Vojvodina), to be followed in subsequent decades by other families and individuals.⁷ Their descendants maintained a separate existence,⁸ and in the twentieth century have declared themselves to constitute a separate ethnos, called Rusnaci (Rusnaks) or Rusini (Rusins).⁹ Yugoslav law recognizes them as a *narod*-

⁴The Southwestern U dialects in eastern Slovakia and to the north in Poland are called *Lemko*, and differ from their neighbors in the Soviet Ukraine, called *Transcarpathian* and *Bojko*. It is Lemko and Transcarpathian that, we may presume, would have been spoken by emigrants before 1918 from this northeastern rim of the Kingdom of Hungary. Soviet Slavists (Samuil Borisovič Bernštejn, Nikita Il'ič Tolstoj, A. P. Klepikova, Josyf Dzendzelivs'kyj, and others) have found good linguistic reasons to speak of a special Carpathian zone with Slavic, Hungarian, and Rumanian interaction. Materials so far published indicate that the Soviet-Czechoslovak frontier generally coincides with a major bundle of isoglosses that set East Slovak apart; it has enough "Carpathian" features to be included in the linguistic union, but deviates so often that it must be termed peripheral.

⁵Volume I shows dialect boundaries based presumably on phonological criteria, while IV has a somewhat simpler classification, with slightly different boundaries, based on lexical criteria. My definition includes points 231-338, and generally follows ASJ I for boundaries; disagreements on details are unlikely to change any of the conclusions I make here. — The Ukrainian dialect atlas for the southwest, AUM 2, is largely irrelevant for Slovjak, for the features mapped simply are not found in Slovakia; the lexical maps, however, frequently show the extremely varied extent that characteristic Sjk words are shared with dialects in the Soviet Union, as do the narrowly regional Transcarpathian atlases (Dzendzelivs'kyj, Bernštejn et al.).

⁶The Goral zone is the northern slopes of the valley of the Poprad, which flows east and north to join the Dunajec, a tributary of the Vistula. The other East Slovak valleys empty eventually into the Tisa and thus the Danube. One of the dialects labelled Goral has far fewer Polish features than the other three.

⁷Some 18th-century emigrants apparently came directly from their northern villages to the Vojvodina, while others spent varying periods of time in Slavic settlements in Hungary before moving on to the Bačka. Information so far published is not full enough to fill in all the details (Laboš, Švagrovský).

⁸This includes some settlers south of the Danube, in Srijem, now part of Croatia.

⁹After c1850, Lemko speakers from Slovakia and neighboring Carpathian regions also emigrated to the Vojvodina; their self-designation is Rusyn, and their speech is decisively East Slavic. Data from three representative Yugoslav Lemko Ukrainian villages are cartographed in AUM II. For socio-political reasons, Rusins and Ukrainians in Yugoslavia have formed joint organizations of many kinds. Carpatho-Rusyn organizations in North America are es-

nost or *nationality*, one of a number of such groups of considerably varying size characterized chiefly by the fact they do not belong to any of the six *narod*i or *nations*, the major indigenous Slavic ethno-cultural groups of Yugoslavia.

3.1 Attention was drawn to the Bačka Rusnaci in 1897-98 by the energetic Ukrainian ethnographer Volodymyr Hnatjuk (1871-1926), who published three volumes that included an extensive collection of folksongs and tales, with thematic analyses and comparative studies, and detailed accounts of customs and traditions. He consistently referred to the group and their language as 'Russian', i.e. *Rusnaci* and *rus'kyj*.

The Norwegian Slavist Olaf Broch was among the first to react to Hnatjuk's publications. In a short review, Broch, a linguist with a particularly sensitive ear, who had done field work around Užhorod with the express purpose of defining the Ukrainian-Slovak linguistic frontier, praised Hnatjuk for the texts and ethnographical observations, but was severely critical of his transcriptions and linguistic remarks. In particular he objects to the label *rus'kyj*, on the grounds that the Bačka dialect is essentially identical with dialects west of Užhorod that he is familiar with and considers to be Slovak. He firmly rejects Hnatjuk's arguments, stating: "To argue about names (*Benennungen*) really makes little sense. [...] In the regions we are talking about, one must always keep clearly in view that *language* is not to be confused with *nationality*" (1899: 57). Thus "from a purely linguistic point of view" the name of the *language* should be Slovak; as for the *speakers*, perhaps indeed their ancestors were not Slovaks. The labels *Rusin*, *Rusnak* and *Slovak* have been sufficiently written about; these "names are valid rather for religious confession than for nationality" (58). Contrary to Hnatjuk's opinion, the "Slovakization" of the dialect was prior to emigration from the north, for in the new environment there were neither the kind of Slovak settlements nor the sort of language contact that might foster such a language shift.¹⁰

In a similar fashion, the Czech linguist František Pastrnek and the Russian A. I. Sobolevskij (who had also done field work in eastern Slovakia) considered Hnatjuk's texts to be in Slovak rather than any sort of East Slavic. In 1902 Vatroslav Jagić, with his usual perceptive common sense, remarked, "Hnatjuk may be right as an ethnologist, Sobolevskij and Pastrnek as linguists" (*AslPh* 24:621).

Hnatjuk in subsequent publications persisted in denying any connection of the Bačka Rusnaks with Slovak language or ethnos; various scholars continued to object to his interpretations. One of Hnatjuk's essays praises a little book of poems in the Bačka dialect published in Żółkwa, Poland, by a 17-year-old native of Bacs-Keresztur (now Ruski Kerestur or Krstur), the major Rusin center. This slim volume, by Gabor Kostelnik Gombos, turned out to be the beginning of a standardized

essentially for Lemko Rusyns, but may include Yugoslav Rusins. Paul Magocsi's bibliographies include YR items; his *Let's Speak Rusyn*, however, is a phrase-book of Lemko. The vocabulary offers many items that are equivalents of YR but not standard U; they are also, however, East Slovak and therefore must be considered part of core YR lexicon.

¹⁰While Broch does not say so *expressis verbis*, he implies that the Uniates, perhaps descendants of Ukrainian speakers, abandoned their parental dialects in favor of Slovak dialects.

language. When the Vojvodina was assigned to the new state of Yugoslavia in November, 1918, the Rusins immediately began to organize politically in order to achieve cultural rights, particularly the right to use their own language, in schools and public life. In 1923 Gabor Kostel'nik published a grammar of the new language, and from then on there was a steady trickle of publications. After 1945 conditions improved for cultural autonomy; by 1970 schooling in Rusin (YR) was available through the secondary level.

3.2 The first non-Slavic scholarly notice of the new status of Rusin was in a brief but informative article by Charles Bidwell, in 1966.¹¹ He states unambiguously that the "Ruthenians" in the Vojvodina

"form a separate ethnic group. ... Although their speech is linguistically classifiable as an Eastern Slovak dialect, they consider themselves a separate national group related to the Russian and Ukrainian and are so recognized by the Yugoslav authorities. They are Catholics of the Byzantine Rite (Uniates)" (32).¹²

After an efficient account of the phonology, with notes on salient grammatical features and brief comparative remarks, Bidwell states,

"Inasmuch as Bačka Ruthenian has been shown in regard to all the crucial features to fall into the West Slavic language group (and hence cannot *ipso facto* be Ukrainian, i.e. East Slavic), to share a great number of phonological features with East Slovak dialects, and to share no feature with any variety of Ukrainian *which is not*

¹¹Eugen Pauliny, in an addendum to his 1948 history of the Slovak literary language, notes briefly that the "Zemplin dialect" is "still used as the literary language of the Greek-Catholic Slovak population of Yugoslavia... These Slovaks consider themselves Rus, i.e. Ukrainians" (91-2). He prints a short sample from Kostel'nik's 1923 grammar and one from a Kerestur newspaper, 1947 (92-93). (The newspaper item is omitted from the otherwise identical text in the 1966 and 1971 editions.) Péter Király, a Hungarian Slavist who is a native speaker of a central Zemplin dialect, paraphrases this statement, modifying the definition to "Abov-Zemplin dialect" (78). Similar short matter-of-fact remarks of this sort apparently are scattered in various Slovak accounts of Yugoslavia, most of them inaccessible to me. (Seemingly of greater interest is a 140-page grammar by Maria Hagovska in a kind of proposed standard ESik, designed specifically for YR schools, published in Košice-Prešov in 1949; I know it only from the negative remarks in Tamaš, 1988: 343-7.) Horbatsch 1962 starts with the premise that YR is Ukrainian; though he accurately lists the salient features of YR, he classes most of them as somehow transitional. He continually states that YR items are found in Slovak or East Slovak, yet he ignores their cumulative significance, since he never focuses on East Slovak dialects as a whole, as a macrodialect.

¹²Bidwell's article remains unknown to most non-US Slavists. Thus Marvan 76 credits a Swedish scholar, Sven Gustavsson, with perceiving unambiguously that Rusin is a West Slavic language. (Gustavsson's Swedish articles, listed by Marvan and Birnbaum, have not been available to me; his translated 1983 lecture does mention Bidwell, 1984 n. 4.) Bidwell's hasty morphological sketch is more than sufficient to answer Marvan's queries as to the East Slovak nature of the system. And of course Bidwell was acquainted with the data and arguments of Broch and Pauliny.

shared with other East Slovak dialects [emphasis added, HGL],¹³ it appears that the linguistic classification of Bačka Ruthenian as East Slovak, rather than Ukrainian, is beyond dispute" (35-36).

Aware of the dismay these incisive formulations might have on the Rusins themselves, he adds a note that should be taken to heart by every linguist:

"The national consciousness of the Bačka Ruthenians which asserts that they are an ethnic group apart from the Slovaks has, of course, no bearing on the linguistic classification of their dialect, just as what I have written concerning the linguistic affiliation of their speech must not be construed as in any sense denying their right to consider themselves either as a separate ethnic group or as Russians or Ukrainians, as they see fit."

Unfortunately, too many linguists, along with ethnologists and social scientists who ought to know better, still identify language with nationality or ethnicity.¹⁴

4. Any twenty or thirty-word sample of Rusin (excepting especially scholarly or journalistic works) amply demonstrates the East Slovak and non-Ukrainian character of the language, precisely as Bidwell specified. It is important to emphasize *East Slovak*, because too much space has been wasted on comparing Rusin to other Slavic standard languages, often with little attention even to standard Slovak.¹⁵ Yet perusal of even the limited sources cited by Bidwell suffices to emphasize how dif-

¹³This is a crucial methodological principle: since if the hypothesis being tested is that YR is basically Sjk, then items found both in East Slovak and Ukrainian count as Sjk; for purposes of comparison other than with YR their value may be something else. Thus *dumac* 'to think' as a lexical item is shared by Sjk and Ukrainian but not Central Slk or SC; for YR it belongs in the Sjk component. YR *pečinka* 'liver' is phonetically more like U than CntSlk *pečienka*, but the Slk/Sjk correspondence is phonologically expected and this word too belongs to the Sjk lexical base of YR. (Standard Slk prefers the non-diminutive *pečeň*.) Although *ruku* 'hand (As)' could be East Slavic or Serbo-Croatian as to both stem and desinence, it too must be assigned to the Sjk component of YR. I will return to lexical problems below.

¹⁴Henrik Birnbaum, torn between the obviously correct conclusions stated by Bidwell and others and the flat statement by the native authority, Mikola Kočiš, that Rusin is a Ukrainian dialect, attempts to reconcile these contradictory definitions. First, at the end of ten pages of abstract and inconclusive discussion about terminology, he implies (1983:10) he is about to illustrate "the possible interface of genetic and typological criteria" in defining the language; the controversy is, he says, whether YR "is at its core East Slavic (i.e. a Southwest Ukrainian dialect) or West Slavic (i.e. a regional variety of East Slovak), or simply some kind of mixture of the two" (emphasis added, HGL). (Apparently *core* means ancient genetic items and *mixture* later borrowing; but the article is too diffuse for me to be certain.) Then he mentions Bidwell's "fairly accurate sketch" and Broch's opinion (cited from Bidwell) and opines that genetically Rusin "appears thus to be closer to Slovak than to Ukrainian" (13) in terms of phonology. Why "appears"? Why no discussion of linguistic materials? If Bidwell is accurate, Rusin is essentially *identical with* East Slovak; if Birnbaum has found data to contradict Bidwell, he should cite it. In contrast, Eva Maria Ossadnik's laudably detailed and judicious 6-page survey has no hesitation in agreeing with Bidwell against Kočiš, Horbatsch, and others. (See also §14 at the end of this paper.)

¹⁵This sort of comparison goes back to Kostel'nik's 1923 grammar, which disingenuously uses standard Slovak selectively to demonstrate the non-Slovak bases of Rusin.

ferent East Slovak is from the Central dialects on which contemporary standard Slovak is based.¹⁶ It is enough to glance through the maps of the Slovak dialect atlas (ASJ) to see why East Slovaks in the past were reluctant to accept books from their western cousins. Their very name, Slovjaci, showed (as they insisted) that they were different. Slovjak efforts to create a standard language were not successful; I suggest that Yugoslav Rusin comes close to an ideal solution. To be specific, I believe that if the Rusin items could be compared to the pertinent ASJ data, it would turn out that nearly always the Rusin corresponds to the majority usages in the central Slovjak regions. The information at my disposal is too incomplete to permit me to undertake this task in full, but a few samples will illustrate what I have in mind.¹⁷

4.1 As a basis, let me mention briefly the fundamental phonological features. MCoS *tl/dl* and *kv/gv* remain (*pletla* 'she plaited', *sadlo* 'lard'; *kvet* or *kvit* 'flower', *hvizda* 'star';¹⁸ *tjldj* resulted in *c/ʒ* (*vracal* 'he returned', *ovoc* 'fruit', *noc* 'night', *cera* 'daughter'; *mezi* 'between', *saza* 'soot', *cuži* 'foreign'); *tort/tert*, *tolt/telt* yielded *trat/trět*, *tlat/tlět*; there is no "epenthetic l", *kape* 'drips' (inf. *kapac*, cf. U *kapaty kaple*) *javjac* 'appear' (U *javljaty*).¹⁹ These reflexes suffice to establish the core Slovak nature of this dialect type within the broader West Slavic frame.²⁰

4.11 Although Slovjak has lost phonemic length in vowels, the reflexes of the long and short *ä* (< **e*) and *e* (< **e* **ž*) are different. The non-distinctive stress falls

¹⁶Birnbaum (1983: 13) offers as non-Slovak two morphological tidbits, the demonstrative *tot* (equivalent to dialectal U) as opposed to Slovak *ten*, and "*dobroho, dobromu* identical with Ukrainian" versus Slk "*dobrého, dobrému* in accordance with the general West Slavic development." He has not looked closely enough. The odd characteristic of Rusin *tot*, as is clear from sources Birnbaum cites, is that the stem is {*tot-*} for nominative and accusative (NAM *tot n toto* Nf *tota*, Af *totu*; NAp *toti*) but oblique {-*t*} (e.g. *toho, tomu*; precisely these forms occur in East Slovak dialects (with an alternate Nsm *toten* in some communities, cf. ASJ II 164). Similarly, though *dobroho, dobromu* occur also in U, they are quite normal in Slovjak (cf. ASJ II map 136, whose many subdivisions should caution against speaking of "the general West Slavic development").

¹⁷A general outline of Slovjak can be established from Pauliny 1963, *passim*, supplemented by the condensed statements in Štolc and Sipos on Slovak/Slovjak enclaves in Hungary, Broch's 1897 sketch of a marginal SE Slovjak dialect, Buffa's excellent monograph about the northernmost border Slovjak dialect, and the texts and glossary in Samo Czambel's book (1906), along with ASJ. Stanislav's work provides historical documentation, but —to judge from references in other Slovak scholarly works— his interpretations are of dubious value.

¹⁸The morpheme-doublets {*gwězd-/zwězd-*} (cf. Lunt 1981 n 38; Trubačev *ES* sub *zvězda*) and older {*kweit/cweit kvait/cwait kwit/cwit*} and newer {*kwit/cwit kwět/cwět kw ыт/смыт*} (Trubačev sub *kvěť*) are essentially lexical dialectisms, not illustrative of a phonological rule. I include them here because they are in all the lists that deal with Rusin and/or East Slovak, and because the **gw/*zw* we can posit for MCoS is reflected in an isogloss that generally isolates West Slavic from East; the **kw/*cw* of 'flower' is less significant, for the k-isogloss cuts eastward far into Ukrainian and Byelorussian.

¹⁹The administrative term *Zemplín* presumably **zemlin-* < **zemjin-*, (the added *p* being due to Hungarian phonotactics) has been cited as proof that ESik once had the [l] but lost it. This hypothesis is plausible (cf. Lunt *IJSLP* 41: 60), but unprovable.

²⁰Further non-East Slavic features: initial **j* remains before **u*, **e*: *juxa* 'soup', *ješeŋ* 'autumn', cf. U *uxa, osin'* (G *oseny*).

regularly on the penult. Early Slk soft *t/d* have become *c/z* (*zeci* 'children', *izece* 'you go', *cma* 'darkness'). Early Slk soft *l'/n'* became palatal (*-anterior/*). Early Slk soft *s'/z'* became palatal *š/zš*, opposed in much of Slovjak to both *s/z* and *š/zš*, but in a few southern Abov and Zemplin points *š/zš* have merged with *š/zš* (*šestra žima* > *šestra žima*). MCoS *čerT gave *čere-* (*čerevo* vs. CntSlk *črevo* 'intestine').

4.12 Early West Slavic syllabic liquids have been eliminated, but variation in individual roots and words is considerable; detailed lists might be instructive. In general, a vowel developed before or after the liquid, e.g. *arza* 'rust', *čarni* 'black', *červeni* 'red', *umarti* and *mertvi* 'dead', *verx* 'crest', *perši* 'first', *herl'ička* 'dove', *polni* 'full', *tlusti* 'fat', *hl'iboki* 'deep'; cf. *jabluko* 'apple', *oberva* 'eyebrows'.²¹

4.13 In declension, the allomorphic variation of the old twofold desinences has been eliminated (e.g. NAs *pl'eco* 'shoulder'; Gsf *ženi*, *duši*). Though some dialects preserve *-ov* in Gp, in most of Slovjak all nouns have *-ox* in Gp and Lp,²² *-om* in Dp, *-ami* in Ip (*xlopox ženox koscox prašatox*; *xlopom ženom koscom prašatom*; *xlopami ženami koscami prašatami*, from *xlop* 'man', *žena* 'woman', *kosc* 'bone', *praše* 'piglet'). Old "nt-stems" like **poršę* **poršęte* have NAs in *-e* (*praše*), oblique sg *-ec-* (e.g. Gs *prašęca*), but plural stem *-at-* (*prašata*). Instrumental fs is *-u:* *ženu dušu koscu*; cf. personal pronouns, *z ňu*, *zo mnu tobu sobu*.

4.14 The interrogative pronoun is *co*, the negative *nič*.²³ The GAs 3pers pronoun with preposition is *ňho*, e.g. *za ňho* 'for him'. Adjectives and pronouns in the eastern part of core Slovjak have generalized "hard" Gmn *-oho*, Dmn *-omu*, but "soft" GDLf *-ej* (from old **ějě*, **ěji*); even more generally, the merger of **y* with **i* eliminated the contrast in other forms (-LImn *-im*, GLp *-ix*, Dp *-im*, Ip *-ima*).

4.15 Unique to this area is *-o* for NA plural in possessive adjectives and pronouns: *bratovo*, *macerino*, *mojo*, *našo zeci* 'brother's, mother's, my, our children'.

4.16 Infinitives end in *-c*. First person present has *-m* in the singular in WSjk and *-me* in the plural of all verbs in most of the area. The third person has no terminal desinential consonant. The third person imperative marker is *naj*. The verb *kl'ac* 'swear' has the present *kl'ejem kl'eje kl'uju*; 'understand' is generally *rozumic rozumja*. In WSjk 'am' is *som*, 'are' is *ši*, *zme*, *sce*, with third person *je* and *su* that are ordinarily omitted. The same forms are auxiliaries for the past tense: bul *som/ši*, bul'i *zme/sce*. The masculine past desinence is *-l*.

4.17 Some peculiarities of individual stems: *vajco* 'egg; testicle', *meno* 'name', *lokec* 'elbow', *gdova* 'widow', *trezbi* 'sober', *nozgra* 'snout', *veksi* 'bigger', *češki* 'difficult', *čeče* 'flows' (but past *cekol*, *cekla*), *laba* 'paw', *gu* 'to, towards', *štiri* '4' (*štvtiri* 'fourth'), *pejc* '5' (*pjati/pijati* 'fifth'), *bl'adi* 'pale', *cali* 'whole', *lad* 'ice', *večar* 'evening', *žaludok* 'stomach', *šleobodni* 'free', *čolo* 'forehead', *pčola* 'bee', *kobula*

²¹These presumably represent MCoS **r̥dja*, **čvrn-*, **čvrven-*, **u-mvr-l-* reshaped with {t}, **m̥rtw-*, **w̥r̥x̥v̥*, ?**pr̥w̥-žš-*, **g̥rdlička*, **r̥vln-*, **tvlst-*, **gl̥v-ok-*, **jabluko*, *-*br̥w̥-*.

²²As Marvan 78 points out, Birnbaum 1983: 13 is wrong to label Gp in *-ox* as uniquely Rusin.

²³The form *co* is shared by Czech and westernmost Slovak with Sjk, against CntSlk *čo/čuo* (and some minor lexical peculiarities) and the *so* of Soták (a small EŠjk group that is distinctive in many ways) and the *što/šo* of U dialects, ASJ II 168; *nič* is shared by the eastern half of Slovak (with *nišit* in west CntSlk) against the *nič* of westernmost Slk and Cz, cf. ASJ II 169.

'mare', *dižž* 'rain', *išče* 'still, yet', *pokriva* 'nettle', *porvislo* 'straw used for tying sheaves', *harešt* 'jail', *merkovac* 'notice'.²⁴

5. Now, ALL of this applies to Rusin. Although my information is far from complete,²⁵ I offer this hypothesis: between c1750 and c1950 the Rusnak immigrants in the Bačka developed a typical emigrant dialect.²⁶ The many variant forms (phonetic, morphological, derivational, syntactic) brought from subdialects of the Slovjak macrodialect were reduced by a sort of homogenizing and regularizing process.²⁷ Thus the expected *š/ž* merges with *š/ž* as in the minority Abov zone, surely in

²⁴MCos **jajuce*, **bmę* (Gs **bmene*), **olkvъ*, **wъdova* (?*wъd-*), **terzw-* (Slk *triezvy*, U *iverezjy*, SC *triježnit/trežni*), **węjъ-bš-*, **težbk-*, **teče(t-*), **lapa?* (so Trubačev ES), **kъ*, **čblyr-* (**čbvert-*), **peťb* (*peť-b-jb*), **blěd-*, **kěl-*, **led-*, **węčer-*, **slobodъ(n-*), **čelo*, **běčela*, **kobyła*, **dъžъb*, **ješče*, **kopriva* (U *kropýva*), **po-werz-slo* (Slk *povrieslo*); Ger. dial *arešt*, *merken*.

²⁵I have heard spoken Rusin only from a brief tape kindly given to me by Wayles Browne; my information is from printed sources. The "minimal" SC/YR and YR/SC dictionaries for elementary schools (Medješi, Jerković) are helpful but discouragingly limited. Kočič's three schoolbooks, *Macerinska bešeda*, 1965-68, are slightly more informative than his 1974 grammar. I have perused his literary works, along with Hnatjuk's texts, Kostel'nik's works, several volumes of the current journals *Tvorčosc*, *Švetlosc*, and *Nova dumka* (which includes contributions in Ukrainian and items in SC), and some other stories and poems. I will not try to pinpoint the source of every word I cite. It is highly probable that I have misunderstood some words and passages; I hope that my mistakes in this essay will goad some Slavist who is better informed to write more fully on these topics.

²⁶Czambel 127-28 considers that the near-identity of Hnatjuk's Bačka texts with contemporary Zemplin speech demonstrates both the age of the Sjk system and "the complete phonetic, morphological and lexical agreement" (emphasis Czambel's) of Bačka and Zemplin speech. The identity is affirmed for 1978 by an aggressively nationalistic Rusin-Canadian, Julijan Koľesarov, who was puzzled and annoyed that native speakers in the Zemplin region praised him for speaking "pure Zemplin" but refused to call the dialect *Rusin* or at least *Slavic*. A historical dimension is provided by five small books published by Slovjak Calvinists in 1750-58. Péter Király, a native speaker of central Zemplin Sjk, trained as a Slavist in Prague, Bratislava, and Budapest, analyzed the language of these books and found it is essentially the same as modern central Zemplin Slovjak. In a brief passage about Hnatjuk's Bačka texts, he lists important specific features that are not Zemplin, but Abov (1953: 123) and concludes that YR of the early 1900s must have been very close to the speech of the mid-18th century emigrants (125).

²⁷This kind of leveling reorganization of linguistic detail in emigrant communities is well known in Slavic linguistic literature; for two other WSl dialects in Yugoslavia, see Dudok and Mirković. — Local dialect differences within YR, in particular between Kerestur and Kocura, are mentioned, but apart from Horbatsch's extremely interesting list of lexical items (1969 311-12), I have found no systematic treatment. Grammatical variation seems to be minimal (as opposed, for example, to that reported by Dudok, and Király 1962). This perhaps has resulted from the long isolation of the group (as opposed to the continued dribble of newcomers from Slovakia in Pivnica and Tótkomlós). An example is the past plural, *-li* in Kerestur and the standard, but *l'i* in Kocura (e.g. *buli/bul'i*); ASJ II/2 p.163 seems to say that both forms exist in most Sjk regions. Note that I transcribe YR in accordance with scholarly Slovak practice, not by mechanically transliterating the Cyrillic letters: thus *нет*, *ешень*, *язик*, *юха*, *дідо*, *дябол*, *дзегод*, *гибаль*, *даскельо* become *net* 'there is no', *ješeň* 'autumn', *juzik* 'tongue', *juxa* 'soup', *d'ido* 'grandfather', *d'abol* 'devil', *zegod* 'wherever', *hibal* 'maybe',

part influenced by the lack of corresponding phonemes in Hungarian.²⁸ The past masculine desinence is *-l* as in most of Sjk, not *-w* or *-v*, as in a small portion (and U).²⁹ The form *som* is only in a part of WSjk (ASJ II 216), but it is supported by nearly all of Central and WSlk; the *mi* of much of core Sjk (with less common *źmi*) is isolated in the Slavic world.³⁰ The infinitive *buc* 'to be' is ESjk (ASJ II 253), going with *mi*; WSjk has *bic* (and *som*).³¹ Rusin has existential *jest* and negative *ńet*: the former is general Slk, but the latter is WSjk (with *ńit* in a broad eastern zone). Though 1s pres. is *-u* in Zemplin (and U, ASJ II 206), it can be ambiguous (e.g. *idu* 1s and 3p); WSjk *-m* (*ńešem, robim*) is further supported by Central Slovak, as well as SC.³² Sjk 'to want' is usually *hcec* (c **xvt-ě+*), but in SWSjk and YR we find *scec*

daskel'o 'a number of, and the like.—Incidentally, a practical consequence of declaring YR to be Ukrainian is transliteration: in the Harvard University Library catalogue, Кочим is "Kochysh".

²⁸YR now has five vowels (*i e a o u*), seven sonorants (*j m n ń l' r*), and twenty obstruents (*p b t d c z ʒ t' d' č ž k g; f v s z š ž x h*). Perhaps */v/* should be classified as a sonorant, for in syllable-final position it apparently can be pronounced [w], but sources are not unambiguous. Allowing for the lack of */š ž/*, this corresponds exactly to Sjk. The distribution of */g h x/* varies in Sjk, whereby */x/* is likely to be replaced by */h/* in the south, surely a reflection of Hungarian influence (for H has no */x/*, although otherwise the consonantal system has the same inventory). Sipos dispenses with */x/* altogether for the emigrant dialects he describes. In YR, the weak */h/* of SC (for MCoS **x*) is an added factor for possible lexical variation. Cf. YR *xren* 'horseradish', Sipos *hren*, SC *hren/hren*, but YR *hol'em* 'at least', Sjk *xol'em*.

²⁹The past **šbdľb* **šbdla* 'went' lost the *d* in early WSlavic (**šdla* > *šla* = {*šlla*}), so **šbdľb* yielded **šal*) and prefixed the vowel of the present *idze*: *išol* is found throughout Sjk, and sporadically in Central Slk, for standard *išiel* (ASJ I 156).

³⁰Birnbaum 1983: 13 opines that the Rusinian "retention" of the auxiliaries is "possibly" due to SC influence. His alternate wording (1981-83: 42) is less clear; he mentions "influence of the Serbo-croatian super- or adstratum" in YR and then notes "retention" of the auxiliary as "reminiscent" of SC forms. What is important is not *coincidence* with various Slavic dialects, but the *exact correspondence* of Rusin and Sjk forms. All of Birnbaum's alleged non-Slovak traits in Rusin are irrelevant, for all are Sjk. Contrary to his statement (1983: 13), he has not demonstrated any "unusual entanglement of genetic and typological" classificatory criteria. His 1981-83 article lists the same items and then goes into more phonetic detail, but again his failure to look at East Slovak renders his comparisons valueless. He simply fails to answer his own question: What—if anything—is Ukrainian in the multilayered speech of the Rusini? He does not provide a single valid item. Marvan (apparently without having consulted Horbatsch's articles) does considerably better at demonstrating an extremely important but very recent and learned layer of Ukrainian elements, starting with the alphabet and orthography. Contrary to Birnbaum's statement, there is no "inherent difficulty in arriving at a clear-cut, noncontroversial classification" of Rusin (1981-83: 47); what is required is first really to look at the data and second to take a stand—both of which Bidwell did years ago.

³¹Adjacent U dialects have inf. *byti*, past *byv byla*, so Zemplin Sjk *buc bul bula* shows independent adaptation of the root-vowel to the present stem, *bužem* (imperative *buž bužce*); it has no connection with the parallel innovation in the more distant U dialects underlying standard *buty huv bula*.

³²Indeed, a relatively new process is noted as incipient in 1897 in the southeastern Už dialect (Broch 1897: 64-5) and as complete, except for the oldest speakers, in north Šariš (Buffa: 105-6) whereby *-u* is retained in 1s, but replaced by *-a* in 3p.

scem sce scu.³³ The YR third person pronoun *von vono vona voni* shows (1) initial *v-*, as in Zemplin and Abov but not Šariš, (2) *-o-* in Nsm, as in SWSjk (opposed to *vun Z, un Š, ASJ II 163*), and (3) *-n-* (not *-ň-*) in *voni*.³⁴ The Nsm *von*, rather than widespread *on, un, or vun*, fits the Rusin tendency to eliminate vowel alternations before zero-desinences; cf. past fem. *ňesla* 'carried', *mohla* 'could' like m. *ňes mux* (as in Abov) or *ňesol mohol* (only found in western "non-core" Sjk), rather than *ňis mux* (Z Š).³⁵ The demonstrative 'this' is *hevtot hevto hevta hevti*, clearly a combination of the deictic particle *hev* and the old stem *t-*; the particle is noted by Czambel as meaning both 'here' and 'there', but I have found no unambiguous evidence that this pronoun exists in Sjk.

5.1 East Slovak reflexes of jers present a complex picture, with many word-by-word variations; examples are to be found throughout this article, and I will not pause for discussion. Note that *dižž* 'rain', *deska* 'board', *steblo* 'stem, trunk', *pestruško* 'trout', and *sklo* 'glass', as well as the vowel-Ø alternations in diminutives like *kridelko, midelko, metelka* ~ *kridlo* 'wing', *midlo* 'soap', *metla* 'broom' are shared by Sjk and YR.

5.2 The shift of *ir* to *er* in secondary imperfectives (e.g. *naberac, zzerac* ~ perf. *nabrac nabere* 'collect', *zodrec zdre* 'skin' as opposed to *zrivac* ~ *zorvec zorve* 'rip'; sf. also *otverac* ~ *otvoric* 'open') is in part paralleled by Slk. Other examples are inconsistent, e.g. *šternac* '14', *šteracec* '40', *šekera* 'ax' but *štiri* '4', *sir* 'cheese' and *širota* 'orphan'.

5.3 Of course Rusin and Lemko do share many elements, but so do Macedonian and Lemko or Czech and Lemko; what is important is the fundamental disagreement on ancient features (**tl/*dl, *tj/*dj*, liquid diphthongs), and somewhat newer ones (Lem lack of palatalized dentals before old **i, *e*; 3 pers. *-t'/* [not Slk -Ø]). Agreement on striking minutiae must be noted, but on the whole it concerns lexicon; the details affirm the well-known fact that words are diffused more easily than other elements. ASJ's map on *iba* 'only, scarcely; it may be that' (IV p. 367) shows *len* as normal in the west half of Slovakia, and *iba* in east Central Slk. For East Slovakia: *iba* 1, *xibaj* 6, *hibaj* 1, *len* 4, and *l'em* 87. Two of the *len* points are Goral, one Ukrainian. Thus *l'em* is found in 1/4 of Goral possibilities, 6/7 of Ukrainian, and 80/87 of Slovak. The 57 "core Sjk" points show 55 *l'em*, 1 *len* (Zemplin, so isolated as to be suspicious), and 1 *hibaj* (Abov); YR has *l'em, hibaj*, and also *hibal'* (which I cannot document for Slovakia). Although this little word is

³³The YR conjugational system is thoroughly Sjk, but, as is to be expected, has its own combination of variants known from other dialects. I find Pilbrow's description uninformative, and offer an alternative sketch as an appendix to this article.

³⁴ASJ II 172 shows *oňi* in Spiš and NW Šariš, *voňi* in SE Šariš, Abov and Zemplin; *voni* in only the U villages. In the virtually complete absence of U influences at this morphophonological level, I attribute the unchanged stem to inner YR suppression of the expected alternation. In general, reduction of the scope of stem-alternations in inflection is a common type of simplification in dialect-mixing.

³⁵In nouns, Rusin has no alternation of the type *nuž* 'knife' *noža*, which in Sjk are distributed about as in verbs (cf. ASJ I 191); the type *x'ib x'eba* 'bread' (YR *x'eb*) presumably has approximately the same Sjk distribution, but I have found no explicit summary of the facts.

the basis of the label Lemko, its presence in YR in no way justifies considering it a mark of East Slavic ancestry.³⁶

5.4 The little structural words that are so important in any text are on the whole Sjk: e.g., *al'e* 'but', *abo*, *l'ebo* 'or', *tiž* 'also', *ozda* 'perhaps', *prejg*, *prez* 'through',³⁷ *že* 'that; in order to', *jak* 'as', *inšak* 'otherwise', *barz* 'very, greatly', *prave* 'just, exactly', *l'edvo* 'scarcely', *aňi* 'not even', *hoč* 'although', *vec* 'but, already', *už* 'already', *išče* 'still', *až* 'up to, until',³⁸ *ta* 'so, then', *teraz* 'now', *hñed* 'right away', *zaš* 'again', *tedifted* 'then', *kedikted* 'when', *skorej* 'previously', *vloňi* 'last year', *vše* 'always', *kazi* 'whither', *všazi* 'everywhere', *kus*, *dakus* 'a bit, somewhat', *dajaki* 'any', *kel'o* 'how many', *tel'o* 'so many', *daskel'o*, *vel'o* 'many', *vecej* 'more, several', *šicko* 'everything', *či* 'whether [introduces question]', *kotri|xtori* 'who [relative]', *co* 'what', *nič* 'nothing', *nač* 'why', *preto* 'because', *reku* 'so they say', *vjedno* 'together', *naisce* 'indeed', *ňeška* 'today', *daremno* 'in vain, for nothing'.³⁹

5.51 This is not the place and I am not the author for a full analysis of the vocabulary, and here I present only minimal data and remarks in support of the proposition that YR is overwhelmingly Slovjak in lexicon.⁴⁰ ASJ IV cites as specifically Sjk *šumni* 'pretty, handsome', *zoxabic* 'abandon', *pel'uxa* 'diaper', *draha* 'road', *mačka* 'cat', *raška* 'caraway'. Further examples seem to be *tuňi* 'cheap', *švidki* 'quick', *hvaric*, *hutoric* 'speak', *xibic* 'lack', *trimac* 'hold', *tirvac* 'last, continue', *bočkac* 'kiss', *dupac še* 'climb', *durkac* 'knock, rap', *l'igac*, *l'ignuc* 'swallow, gulp down', *rucac*, *rucic* 'throw', *bavic* 'dance', *vazic še* 'quarrel', *patric* 'look', *oxabic* 'abandon', *dril'ac* 'push, poke, shove', *drapac še* 'climb, clamber', *xasnovac* 'use', *pokrutka* 'kidney', *kapurka* 'gate', *kišeňka* 'pocket', *mloda* 'bride', *gamba* 'lip', *tižeň* (G *tižňa*) 'week', *smuha* 'stripe', *jarok* 'brook, ditch', *kameňec* 'hail', *mex* 'sack', *kromka* 'slice (of bread)', *pal'eňka* 'brandy', *šveto* 'holiday', *gunar* 'gander', *hače* 'colt', *kornaz* 'boar', *vivirka* 'squirrel', *vša|uša* 'louse', *xrobak* 'worm', *xl'ista* 'angle-

³⁶*Lem* occurs also in the Transcarpathian zone east of the Slk border (Dzendzeliv's'kyj, map 117), surely as a result of diffusion from the west.

³⁷The difference in meaning eludes me; both are used freely. The vocalism of *prejg* is puzzling, since *ej* usually appears in loans; Sjk has *prig*. Sjk *prez* 'without' was common enough before 1945, but since it also means 'through' and can be misleading in certain contexts, YR now seems to have only general Slavic *bez*. In post-1945 works I have found *prez* only rarely, in colloquial passages intended to reproduce a pre-1940 atmosphere, and in the dissident Rusin-Canadian writer Kol'esarov.

³⁸But *dok*, *dogod* 'as long as', *dok ne* 'until', from SC. The SC emphatic particle *baš* is frequent in YR. *Mežitim* 'in the meantime' has Sjk form, but frequently is used in the sense of SC *medjutim* 'however, on the other hand'. The preposition *u* 'in, at' seems to be possible in part of Sjk (vs. usual *v*, *ve*, *vo*); its form in YR may have been determined by SC.

³⁹Sometimes I suspect a slight difference in usage. E.g. *hej* is Sjk 'yes', and I have found it in YR dialogues where it has at least an affirmative sense; the normal YR 'yes' seems to be *da*.

⁴⁰A valuable source for YR vocabulary is Horbatsch 1969, but some of his etymological interpretations are open to question, see below. Rac is helpful for the standardized forms of YR flora and fauna. I have not yet seen the 1983 *Ruska Leksika* by Ramač that Pilbrow lists.

worm',⁴¹ *nalpa* 'monkey', *petruša* 'parsley', *kosmačka* 'gooseberry', *jarec* 'barley', *dohan* 'tobacco', *kukurica* 'maize', *paradička* 'tomato'.⁴²

5.52 Many words have broader Slovak distribution, e.g. *bivac* 'dwell', *pačic še* 'be pleasing', *šal'eni* 'crazy', *smijadni* 'thirsty', *slunko* 'sun', *konar* 'branch', *cvikla* 'beet', *jarec* 'barley', *porisko* 'handle (of ax, hoe)', *kut* 'corner', *pojď* 'attic', *prikl'et* 'anteroom', *miska* 'dish', *bujak* 'bull', *kura* 'hen', *rozkaz* 'command', or even more general CzsIk or WSlavic, e.g. *zbac* 'to care', *jar* 'spring', *xmara* 'cloud', *tvar* 'face', *hadvab* 'silk', *peňeži* 'money', *križ* 'cross', *komin* 'chimney', *viňica* 'vineyard', *kačka* 'duck', *kohut* 'rooster', *haňba* 'shame', *prebačic* 'excuse', *prec* 'to rot', *vel'ki* 'big', *blazni* 'dim-witted, slightly crazy', *bridki* 'nasty, ugly', *pilni* 'diligent', *sxopni* 'capable, able', *smačni* 'tasty', *vlasni* 'own'. From intimate child-language, *papac* 'eat', *hajkac* 'sleep', *hopac* 'sit', *habik* 'bread'. The root *lap* has replaced MCoS **bm* in many instances, e.g. *prilapic* 'get'. The verbal root in *oxpac*, *zaxpac* 'grab' is attested in Sjk, but original *-px-* seems more normal there. (YR imperfectives are *opixac*, *zapixac*.)

5.53 Some lexemes may show YR idiosyncratic developments. For example, Sjk *pivnica* 'cellar' yields YR *piňvica*. YR *čkoda* 'harm' corresponds to SIk *škoda*.⁴³ The YR perfective of *jest jem* 'eat' is *žest žem* (which thus is a homonym of *žem* 'land', Sjk *žem* < MCoS dial. **zemb*), though *zjavic* 'manifest' shows /z-j/; Czambel attests *žjesc*. There are oddities for which I have found no exact parallels, e.g. *žverkadlo* 'mirror' (Czambel *žveredlo*, Sipos *zerkadlo*, SIk *zrkadlo*, SC *zrcalo*). *Taščok* 'sparrow' shows the usual YR derivational *-čok*, normal with /s š x h/,⁴⁴ presumably added to (*p*)*tax*, although Sjk seems to have *ptak/ftak* 'bird', usual YR *ptica* beside rare *ptax*. *Hlaskac* 'stroke, fondle' seems to be a special YR blend of **glad-* and **lask-*. *Marxva* 'carrot' has the unexpected *x* of Sjk *marxev* (=Pol) but the innovative Ns of standard SIk (and SC) *mrkva*.

5.54 Semantic shifts are to be expected, but in the absence of a fuller dictionary or reliable informant, I have little concrete evidence. Some examples: Sjk *zdohadac* means 'guess, figure out', but YR *zdohadovac* *zdohadnuc* means 'remember'. YR *vistac* *vistaňe* means 'get tired', *vistati* 'tired' (compare R *ustavat'*, *ustalyj*). 'Thank' is *zekovac*, as expected, but *zečňe* has the rather different sense 'gladly' (cf. *bez zeki* 'unwillingly'). *Kl'anka* is apparently 'lock', while Sjk *kl'amka* seems to be rather 'latch' or 'handle, door-knob'.

⁴¹Rac, s.v. *glist*, calls *xl'ist* colloquial, and uses *hl'ist* (cf. SC *glist*, U *hlyst*) for a series of technical terms for intestinal worms; whatever the exact meaning, this word shows initial *x* in YR and Sjk rather than expected *h* from MCoS **g*.

⁴²A YR idiosyncrasy is *betel'ina* 'clover' (MCoS **det-*) with /b/ for expected /z/; Horbač 1969: 312 cites both the Kocura alternative *trebikoňina*, which is attested in SSjk (ASJ IV, p. 72 would lead us to expect any of several further possibilities), and the SC loan *detelina* (311).

⁴³This is an early WSI loan from Germanic, OldHighG *scade* (> G *Schade*), also in Cz, Pol, U, BR.

⁴⁴Kočiš 1971: 16. Compare *hraščok* 'peas', SC *grašak*; *porvaščok* 'rope, cord', Sjk *porvaz*, SIk *povraz*, *šniščok* 'snow (hyp.)' to *šňih*.

5.55 YR surely has some lexemes of its own. One is the deictic particle *nia* 'voilà (SC *evo, eno, eto*)'. I find no parallel for *začiric že* 'sink' (SC *potonuti, Jerković*).

5.56 Finally, the pervasive influence of Serbian surely has shaped many lexemes. To give but one example, YR *krev* (G *krevi*) 'blood' and *kirvavi* 'bloody' are native forms, but I suspect that *krevno zarenko* is a calque on *krvno zrnce* (cf. YR *zarno* 'grain', S *zrno*, with the diminutive *-k-* of Slk not the *-c-* of S).

6. The language of the Yugoslav Rusins is by origin East Slovak, and the ethnic identity of the speakers as different from all of their neighbors is agreed by all participants in the culture and most outsiders. The intriguing question is why the "Rusins of Slovak language", as Pastrnek called them in 1905 (according to Tichý), insist on identifying with the Ukrainians. The answer starts with the label, Rusin, and the Ukrainian ethnologist Volodymer Hnatjuk. As Broch noted, the civil and ecclesiastical authorities long used *Ruthenus* or *Rusin* (in Ukrainian phonetics *Rusyn*), or *Rusnak* to define a Christian of the Slavonic rite, whether Orthodox or Uniate.⁴⁵ Hnatjuk's tenacious persistence that this Bačka group was in fact Ukrainian as to traditions and customs was welcomed in particular by the "Greek Catholic" clergy.

6.1 The schoolboy who published the first book of poetry in 1904 was about to begin theological studies in Zagreb. Gabor/Havrijil Kostel'nik continued in Leopoldis⁴⁶ and then Fribourg (Switzerland), where he received his PhD in systematic philosophy, with Slavistics as an ancillary field. He was ordained priest in Leopoldis in 1913 and became catechist for Leopoldis secondary schools. From 1920 he taught philosophy at the Uniate Seminary, later the Theological Academy. For a decade he edited the journal *Nyva*. Besides his poems and prose in Rusin, he published verse in Croatian and Ukrainian, and a long series of works on philosophy and religion in Ukrainian, Latin, and German. In 1946 he signed the concordat separating the Uniate bishoprics of Galicia from Rome and "reuniting" them with the Moscow Patriarchate. He was assassinated in 1948, presumably for this anti-Vatican activity.

6.2 In YR discussions, a reasonably frank account of Father Kolstel'nik's chief occupations is to be found, as far as I know, only in the introduction of the 1970 volume of his Rusin poetry.⁴⁷ The impression one gets from Kočiš and all non-Rusin linguists is that the author of the 1904 poems and the 1923 grammar was a teacher, with no other noteworthy biographical characteristics. In fact, the creation

⁴⁵As Švagrovský's summary details (254-5), the varied and confusing usage has repeatedly been analyzed by subsequent scholars, e.g. O. R. Halaga. Halaga would like to see a very ancient separate East Slovak unity whose Slavonic-rite Christianity goes back directly to the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, but he is restrained by a reasonably objective recognition that the historical sources are too obscure to yield definitive answers to many important questions.

⁴⁶I use the Latin name to avoid the nationalist problems raised by *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv*, or *L'vov*.

⁴⁷Kostel'nyk (I emphasize the Ukrainian element by this transliteration) is amply noted in Ukrainian publications, where, however, his YR activities are scarcely mentioned. The only notice of the connection between his linguistic work with YR and his religious duties is in the friendly semi-popular sketch by Tichý, in 1947, before Kostel'nyk's death.

and success of Rusin as a written standard is his work, and the work of those he inspired and (as far as I have been able to ascertain) influenced in a direct, personal way.⁴⁸

6.3 Even before his poetic cycle, *Z mojoho valala* (*From my Village*),⁴⁹ Kostel'nik had written to Hnatjuk, and during his first years in Leopoldis the two were closely associated. The Rusin clergy were chiefly YR natives who had been trained in Zagreb and Leopoldis. Especially in Leopoldis, the cultural milieu was Ukrainian. It must be emphasized, however, that in Galicia until the 1930s the normal term for Ukrainian was *Rusyn*, and it also was the usual designation for *grekokatolici*, for in reality most Slavonic-rite Christians in Poland were linguistically and ethnically Ukrainian. From about 1930, however, Ukrainian nationalism was burgeoning, and with it a new insistence on the term *ukrajinec*' and rejection of "Little Russian". *Rus'kyj jazyk*, *Rusyn*, and *Rusnak* came to be understood as subdivisions of *Ukrajins'ka mova* and *Ukrajinec*', with specific ethnic reference.⁵⁰ It is no coincidence that in the *Ruski kalendar* for 1936 Kostel'nik published an article entitled "Why I became a Ukrainian."⁵¹ It discusses this general shift of name, but starts from the premise—perhaps I should say belief—that the Yugoslav Rusins are, and their ancestors have always been, Ukrainians.

6.4 Gabor Kostel'nik the ambitious youth worked out this premise for himself, and Havrijil Kostel'nik/Kostel'nyk the mature teacher, philosopher, theologian, writer, and editor never lost sight of it. His influence on the Bačka seminarians both in Leopoldis and after their return to their homeland apparently was decisive. For them and therefore their flocks the premise became unquestionable dogma. His advice was sought in 1918 about cultural and linguistic matters, and he continued to write verse and prose for publication in the yearly calendars that constituted the chief store of Rusin-language texts. As a writer and practical language planner he was realistic, inventive, and moderate; the example of his own language in belletristic and expository prose went hand in hand with the prescriptions of his short grammar and advice in letters to friends and writers. In the grammar, his remarks about comparative Slavic phonology are generally competent, though not without fault. Unfortunately, two articles in the *Ruski kalendar* for 1922 and 1937 about the origins of Rusin are emotionally anti-Slovak and fail elementary tests of scholarly competence. He exclaims, "For if our speech is indeed Slovak, then we are either by descent Rusnaks but with Slovak language, or we are Rusnakized Slovaks, who with time

⁴⁸Švagróvský rightly calls Kostel'nyk the "chief pillar" of Rusin culture in the inter-war period and emphasizes his personal contacts with other Rusin activists even though he was in Leopoldis, yet his otherwise very full account of the historical background does not indicate how important a leader in Uniate circles Kostel'nyk was.

⁴⁹*Valal*, a loanword from Hung. (where it is now obsolete), is peculiar to East Slovakia (opposed to Central *dedina*, cf. ASJ IV p 330); it has a particularly warm connotation of family and communal intimacy, see Sima 1949.

⁵⁰I am grateful to Omeljan Pritsak, a "Rusyn" who became a self-aware "Ukrajinec" precisely in Leopoldis in the 1930s, for discussion of these terms and their history.

⁵¹"Чом я постаў українец"; I have seen only the reprint in Kostel'nik 1975.

(perhaps through the Greek rite) have lost our Slovak consciousness and accepted a Ruski consciousness, but kept our ancient Slovak language."⁵² Obviously, he found both alternatives to be repugnant.⁵³ Yet his arguments never mention the linguistic facts of East Slovak: he just pours out a hodge-podge of details, not always correct in themselves.⁵⁴ One can respect the emotional identification that is the basis of Kostel'nik's lifetime of dedication to the ideal, but it is impossible to accept the conclusions.⁵⁵ Nor can we endorse more recent efforts to claim an even vaguer early Slavic dialect, not Slovak or Ukrainian, that existed somewhere on the Tisa long before the Magyars arrived, an independent language that eventually became Slovakized and Ukrainianized, with heavy layers of Hungarian and finally Serbo-Croatian.

7. The Yugoslav Rusins or Rusnaks have every right to be treated as a separate ethnic unity, and their language differs from all other standard languages. It deserves to be described and analyzed on the basis of verifiable facts. Though many facts are not available to me, and there is much that will always have to remain conjectural, I believe that there is enough to provide a firm outline of the history, and a partial survey of the origins of the YR lexicon.

8. Since Hnatjuk's YR texts and Czambel's Zemplin, Abov,⁵⁶ and Šariš texts show variant forms of a single macrodialect for the years just before and after 1900,

⁵²"Бо кедже наисце наша бешедя словацка, та теди зме або з походзенья Руснаци, але зос словацким языком; або зме порусначени Словаци, цо за временем (озда пре гречески обряд) страцели свою словацку швидомосц, а прияли руску, але давни свой словацки язык затримали." (1975: 185).

⁵³Americans represent both possibilities: my ancestors changed their nationality in 1776 but retained their forebears' English language; the ancestors of many other Americans abandoned the Irish language without in the least ceasing to be Irish.

⁵⁴It is notable that Slovak scholars normally state, with or without details, that YR is Slovak, occasionally with mild expressions of surprise that there is any problem. Czambel (22) allows a lack of certainty, remarking, "We, with Slovak glasses on our eyes, see everything Slovak." Hnatjuk, however, "a serious, understanding, educated man who has walked through almost the whole East Slovak territory—he sees Rus everywhere in this territory where Slovaks see Slovaks ... and therefore he calls this territory, as to its original nationality, *controversial*" (punctuation and emphasis original, HGL). He then goes on to discuss matters evenhandedly. I find it impossible to believe that Kostel'nik did not know Czambel's book, but he ignores Czambel's copious documentation of dialects from the regions Kostel'nik specifies as the homeland of his ancestors. Moreover, after stating that Slovak makes him think of some relative ("daxto bl'izki") from another world, Ukrainian speech always strikes him as a brother encountered after many years—much changed, but still his own (1975: 196). The lines from the floridly literary Slovak poem he selected for his sample comparison by translation are predictably distant from YR and U.

⁵⁵Similar conclusions, sometimes vague, sometimes specific, are ubiquitous in post-1945 YR linguistic and cultural writings. Birnbaum, without seriously discussing the material from the bibliography he lists, opines that such statements are "not to be simply discarded as merely reflecting wishful political thinking" (1981-83: 46-7); of course they are to be discarded if we pretend to fairminded, professional scholarship.

⁵⁶*Abov* is my adaptation of contemporary standard SIK *abovský*. Czambel used *abaujský*, reflecting the Hung. adj. *abauji*. His chapter "From the labyrinth of place names," pp. 87-114 shows the dangers of relying on standard spellings invented by outsiders (Czechs, western

and, further, the Calvinist Slovak printed books of 1750-58 fit into the same system, we may posit three periods for the history of standard YR: the post-1945 period of an officially recognized Rusin community; the 1750-1945 period following emigration from the Carpathian Hornica (with a 1904-45 subdivision for the conscious elaboration of a written standard); and the pre-1750 era leading up to the common Slovjak dialect group. This last subdivision of course has many historical strata.

Tentatively, I venture as a rough outline

1. Czecho-Slovak Late Common Slavic and/or Early Common Czecho-Slovak, 9th-11th centuries
2. Common Slovak, 12th-14th c.
3. Common East Slovak (Slovjak), 15th-16th centuries
4. Slovjak subdivisions, 17th-18th centuries
5. Emigrant Slovjak dialects, Bačka/Srijem, 1750-1940
6. Consolidation of standard Yugoslav Rusin
 - a. 1900-1945
 - b. post-1945

A comparison of YR and Slovjak (East Slovak) data is a vital step in establishing the position of YR in the Slavic world. It is a step that has been skipped over by most analysts, who tend to compare elements from stage 1 or 2 with those of 6b.⁵⁷ My aim here is to sketch the development of the overall system at the moment of overlap between stages 4 and 5.

8.1 I suggest that for the Late Common Slavic period, say 9th-10th century, there was a group of Slavic settlements somewhere in the Košice-Presov-Michalovce region and probably to the south along the Bodrog and Tisa, that were sufficiently separated from Slavic communities to the west, north, and east, to be developing distinctive linguistic traits.⁵⁸ This broad community would be about contemporary to the Pomeranian, Mazovian, Polanian, Vistulan, and Silesian groups suggested for the Lechitic area by Dejna (86). Its speech shared the basic West Slavic, specifically Czechoslovak developments mentioned above (**il/dl*, initial **ju*, **je*, **tort*, nasal vowels, **tj/dj*, lack of "epenthetic *l*"). In the process of the jer-shift, it continued with broad Slovak innovations (a full set of soft labials and dentals⁵⁹, *ɣ* < **g*, **ǰ* < **b*, **ɸ*,⁶⁰ and /*l*/ and /*r*/ could be /+syllabic/). At about the same time the front nasal

Slovaks, Germans, Hungarians, anyone writing Latin) for understanding the local pronunciation in terms of the local dialects.

⁵⁷Švagrovský asks the right questions and provides pertinent answers; my replay of the same themes is appropriate only because subsequent comments (e.g. Pilbrow or Timko) show that Švagrovský, like Bidwell and others, has been ignored or misinterpreted.

⁵⁸The Czech archeologist Zdeněk Váňa, who sees little evidence for distinctively Slavic settlements before c500, admits as Slavic certain pottery found in the region and dated as early as c400 (33, 39).

⁵⁹The term *soft* here is used as a technical term for the secondary /-back/ articulation simultaneous with the /+labial/ or /+coronal +anterior/ basic articulation that produces what usually are called palatalized labials and velars; see App. to Lunt in *IJSLP* 41.

⁶⁰Following Jakobson, I have assumed that the first stage of the jer-shift (not his term, but Isačenko's) was a lowering of the /+hi/ jers to a schwa in most regions outside Rus' and central Macedonia. Divergent local development of the schwas (most of them now in morphemes

vowel became /-back +low/ *ǎ*, and /*ě*/ had merged with /*e*/. This Common Slovak system lasted until about 1300, when changed social conditions brought about much closer ties of East Slovakia with the Polish regions to the north; moreover, immigrant "Vlahs" (in part Rumanian-speaking, and in part perhaps Slavs from eastern and southern Carpathian regions) and Germans (and Yiddish-speaking Jews) settled in, and the Magyar rulers were a constant presence. This increased contact with outsiders surely is reflected in the chaotic development of syllables with older syllabic liquids,⁶¹ and in the penetration of individual words with Polish rather than Slovak features: *xlop* 'man' (but *xlapec* 'boy, child!'), *mloda* 'bride', *plokac* 'wash', *smrod* 'stink', *gamba* 'lip'.

8.2 Evidence for the precise chronology of individual changes is not entirely certain; for our purposes here, Pauliny's outline is sufficient, and we may jump to the 1750's, when the Calvinist books indicate that the major developments had generally taken place and something close to the contemporary states of affairs had been established. In the Slovjak dialects, the distinctive feature /back/ ceased to be significant for consonants: soft labials and /*r*'/ merged with plain;⁶² soft dentals became palatal, /+coronal -anterior/, whereby the stops /*t* d'/ assibilated to /*č ǰ*/, which then became /+anterior/ *c ǰ*.⁶³ Until about 1500, /+high +back -round/ *y* was distinct from *i* and *u*, but by the 1750s, rounding had ceased to be distinctive, and [y *ǰ*] shifted to /-back/ and merged with /*i* *ǰ*/. Syllabic liquids were no longer tolerated, but the proc-

where they alternated with zero) in the 11th-12th centuries led to significant regional differences which have more recently become even more variegated.

⁶¹On the scale of *vocalic* to *consonantal* languages, as proposed by Isačenko and elaborated by Andersen 1978, YR is perhaps slightly toward the *vocalic* pole in comparison with CentSlk in that it does not allow syllabic liquids. Further, word-final clusters are generally limited to *continuant* + *stop*, a constraint reflected in two places in conjugation. (1a) The masc. past of consonant stems should produce *mohl*, *vedl*, and *nesl*, but the usual forms are *moh*, *ved* or *mohol*, *vedol*—the pervasive usage has the added vowel, e.g. *šesol*. In *nu*-verbs, the *nu* commonly is found only in the masc. past: *padnul*, *padla padli* 'fell', *rosnul*, *rosla*, *rosli* 'grew', *z'eknul še*, *z'ekla še*, *z'ekli še* 'took fright, got scared'. (1b) With the small anomalous group of *r*-stems, the masc. *-l* is lost (*umar*, *umarla* 'died'). (2) The imperative singular ends in the stem-final consonant, mutated if possible, unless the result would be a cluster with a final sonorant, when the vowel *i* appears: *odobri* 'approve!', *pošli* 'send!', *padňi* 'fall!', *pojašňi* 'clarify!', *počňi* 'begin!', *vežňi* 'take!'. Two sonorants appear in the imperative *karm* 'feed' (more examples in App., n. 21). Although Andersen's observations are tantalizing, I remain skeptical, for his explications are based crucially on Jakobson's 1952 array of distinctive features (or "diacritic signs" in Andersen's suggested revision, cf. 11 n. 6), which have proved to be inadequate or Procrustean in a number of ways. The word-by-word character of developments in East Slovak casts doubt on the thesis that the process is somehow language-inherent.

⁶²The small Soták area did not undergo this shift. In most of Sjk, syllables with labial or *h*'/ + long *ǎ* normally yielded *Pja*, e.g. *p'ǎtok* 'Friday', *z'ev'ǎti* 'ninth', *rob'ǎ* '(they) work', *var'ǎ* 'they cook' > YR *pijatok*, *zevjati*, *robja*, *varja*.

⁶³New *k g* appeared almost at once, through borrowings from Central Slk dialects and Hungarian; loans from Hungarian, German, Polish, and probably Rumanian kept /*g*/ in the system. New YR alternations already occur, see n. 70, below.

ess of development was erratic and subject to considerable local variation.⁶⁴ Pauliny's lists and discussion are far from bringing clarity to the many little problems, but they suffice to sketch the dimensions of the question.

8.3 A major difference between East Slovak and the rest of Czecho-Slovak is the general five-vowel system, with no distinctive length, and with automatic stress on the penult. Sjk dialects still have reflections of former $\acute{e} \sim e$ (< both older e and \acute{e} , and from $*-bje$, $*-bj\acute{e}$), $\acute{o} \sim o$, $\acute{a} \sim \acute{a}$ (< $*\acute{e}$, and from $*-bj\acute{e}$, $*-bja$).⁶⁵ The first two appear chiefly in alternations of closed syllable (before zero) and open syllable, e.g. *ňis* but *nesla* 'carried (past m, f)', *x'ib x'eba* 'bread', *nuž noža* 'knife (Ns, Gs)'; this kind of alternation is severely restricted in Abov Sjk and completely absent in YR (cf. n. 36 above). The third, however, was based on prosodic features that have disappeared and therefore is a matter of morpheme alternations that must be listed in the lexicon. Thus where Slk has *devät* 'nine' but *deviaty* (< *deväty*) 'ninth', *desat* but *desiaty* '10, 10th',⁶⁶ YR has *zevec zevati*, *zešec zešati*;⁶⁷ Slk *pät' piaty* '5, 5th' corresponds to the more complicated YR *pejc pijati*.⁶⁸ Similar quantitative alternations in

⁶⁴Both Sjk and YR offer examples of the type *tvardi* 'hard' but *tverzic* 'to make hard, affirm' that conform to the Polish regularity, *ar* before a syllable with a hard dental, *er* before soft (going back to $*tvrdubj$ vs. $*tvrditi$ > $*tvrdý \sim *tvrd'ic'$). Modern distribution in individual Sjk regions has destroyed any regularity of this sort. Written YR now tolerates syllabic *r/* in Yugoslav place names, but loans from SC usually have *er*, e.g. *kalderma* 'cobblestone road'. Horbatsch reports that syllabic *r* can be heard in SC words used in YR. - YR *molha* 'fog' < $*m\acute{b}gla$ implies an intermediate $*mlha$ (like Cz), rather than the *hmla* of stand. Slk.

⁶⁵Contraction of $*-bjV$ is early, possibly before or at the time of the jer-shift, and shared most of WSI (e.g. $*sbjati$ 'to sow' > $*s'ät'i$ > Stand. Slk *siat'*, Sjk *šac*, YR *šac*). The development in individual morphemes is frequently complicated by morphological boundaries and levelling that very likely began early. Contraction of MCoS $*aje$ to $*a$ was shared by most of SW LCoS, i.e. early SC and Slovene; the change is significant for present tense verbal forms. Contraction in long-form adjective desinenes likewise is early and wide-spread but need not be detailed here.

⁶⁶Stand. Slk retains older \acute{a} only after labials, while long \acute{a} appears in all positions as the diphthong *ia*.

⁶⁷Jovanović, in a rather tentative article, mistakenly believes that the variant development has to do with the soft or hard quality of the following consonant, but it is merely coincidence that older length happens in a series of cases to occur in these particular positions. She does not look at the whole vowel system in either its historical or synchronic relationship. She ignores Slovak scholarship, except for Stanislav's first volume (1956; third, supplemented, edition 1967), whose explanations are not models of clarity. Reference to "accent-intonation" factors is made only in a note and the final parenthetical sentence. She seems not to realize that the stem-alternations in *šveto* 'holiday' and *svjati* 'holy' (a borrowing from the church language and/or U) are on a quite different plane from the purely native pairs, including *žec* 'son-in-law', *žačko* 'dim.', to which we will return below.

⁶⁸Older Sjk *p'et'* 'five' is *pejc* in nearly all of the area and Slk *šest'* is *šejsc* in Zemplin and E Šariš (and YR); a third similar form, with *j* apparently abstracted from the older soft or palatal final consonant group, is *kojsc* 'bone', which occurs, along with a number of nouns with the suffix $*-ostb$ (ASJ I 303), in a more restricted Zemplin area but not in YR. The initial cluster */pj/* is apparently not tolerated, so *pijati* (and *pijatok* 'Friday') insert a vowel, cf. *pijani* 'drunk' < LCoS $*pijan-/pbjan-$.

morphemes with old *č should yield /i/ ~ /e/, but examples are hard to verify (*běl- > *bili* 'white' ~ *belavi* 'blue' seems certain, cf. Lunt, *IJSLP* 41, 1997, note 111).

8.4 The consonants of YR may be divided into three groups, on the basis of morphophonemic behavior. I will call them, arbitrarily, *neutral*, *normal*, and *mutated*. The neutral consonants are the labials plus /r/: *p b f v m r*. They may be followed by /j/ only if a /+back/ vowel /a o u/ follows. The normal and mutated groups take part in important morphophonemic alternations, with the following correspondences:

<i>normal</i>	t	d	s	x	z	h	k	l	n
<i>mutated</i>	c	z	š	ž	č	l'	ň		

The alternations *t~c d~z s~š x~ž z~ž h~ž k~č* are found in stem-final position before word-formational or inflectional suffixes.⁶⁹ The consonants /g ž k ğ/ do not occur in positions appropriate for these alternations.⁷⁰ On the other hand, as we shall see, sometimes /c z/ serve as "normal" and opposed to /č ž/ in *c~č* and *z~ž* alternations.

9.1 In YR, as in most Sjk dialects, the degree of etymological opacity is higher than in Central and standard Slk, and quite different from that of Russian. In Slovak, /c z/ in native words have three sources: (1) MCoS /c z/ from early CoS /k ğ/ resulting from BdC, the progressive palatalization (e.g. *ovca* 'sheep', *zajac* 'hare', *mosadz* 'brass'), (2) dialect late CoS /k ğ/ resulting from KAI, the second regressive palatalization (e.g. *cena* 'price'), and (3) MCoS *tj *dj (e.g. *svieca* 'candle', *meza* 'boundary'). A small number of innovations resulted from reanalysis of certain alternations. The /c/ of BdC—the morphophoneme {c¹}—should alternate with /č/ in parallel with *k~č*, e.g. **ovyc-a* ~ **ovьč-bk-a* like **rqka* ~ **rqč-bk-a*, cf. Slk *ovca*, dim. *ovečka*, *zajecb* ~ **zajęč-jb* like *otrokь* ~ **otroč-jb* cf. Slk *zajac*, *zajačf* 'hare's', *otrok* 'slave', *otročf* 'slave's'. The /c/ from *tj, on the other hand, {c²}, should alternate with /t/, and also with old soft /t'/, representing old /t/ before a front vowel: **svět-j-a* > Slk *svieca* 'candle', but **svět-i-ti* 'to light' > Slk *svietit'* /-kik/. Yet the diminutive is *sviečka* (cf. Cz. *svíce*, *svička*); YR apparently has lost the non-diminutive, and has

⁶⁹The historical contrast between /ti/ and /ty/ and the like is generally maintained in YR as /ci/ vs. /ti/, but compare such items as pl. *vonі buli* 'they were', where a possible distinction between old -y and -i as expressions of different genders has been lost.

⁷⁰All four are alien to the expected historical development, but all are firmly established in numerous morphemes in Sjk and YR. The palatal stops /k ğ/ signify new loans that can usually be easily identified. Thus *sud'ba* 'fate' is a recent borrowing from U, cf. on the one hand native *svazba* 'wedding' and, on the other, *kosidba* 'mowing', a loan from SC. *Діло* /ġilo/ 'work' is new from U, but *zelo* 'cannon' (both **dělo*) shows the expected Sjk shape. One might expect "Zakarpacie" for "Transcarpathia", but the actual form is *Закарпатъе* (with a cluster /kʲ/ not found in native words), adapted from *Закарпаття* (with long or geminate [t't']). Also *staka* 'article' for U *стаття*. Adaptation of SC stems is allowing a new *t~k* alternation. Medješi lists YR *uputic* 'send off' (SC *uputiti*), 1s pres *uputim* and 3p *упуня* /upuka/. Rusin scholars inform me that these are indeed possible, although *upucic*, *upucim* and *upuca* also exist. In word formation *d~g* occurs in *Шудянку* 'of, from Šid (Srijem town with YR minority)', *Войводянку* 'of, from the Vojvodina (region)'. It exists further in *po-lud'-ovu+* 'do crazy things'—based, I assume, on *po-lud'-i+*, adapted from Serb. *polud-e-ti* 'go mad'.

švička, dim. *švičečka*. A second example of this formation is Slk *onučka*, beside *onucka*, dim. of *onuca* 'foot-wrapping, rag' (cf. Cz *onuce*, *onučka*); YR *onučka*⁷¹ MCos **zεtb* > /z'et'/, which yields Slk *zet* /zεk/ and Sjk /žec/, with expected YR /žec/. The hypochoristic /žačko/ shows that the stem-final phoneme has been treated as {c'}⁷². To these examples must be compared *pijačni* 'market, having to do with the market-place', borrowed from SC, along with the noun *pijac*, ultimately from Italian *pijazza*.

9.2 Voiced parallel forms are infrequent. In OCzech (or pre-Czech dialect LCoS), the /ʒ/ of BdC became a continuant /z/, and the expected alternation with /ž/ was in part maintained (**kъnεzъk* > OCz *kněžek* 'princeling', like **kъnigъk-a* > *knižka* 'booklet'), in part replaced by old *z'* > mod. *z* (*mosaz* 'brass', *mosazný* 'of brass'). In Slk, we find the expected /ʒ/ in *mosadz* 'brass', but the adjective *mosadzný* has been restructured (cf. the parallel *mesačný* 'monthly', and *mesiac*, but Pol. *mosiadz*, *mosiężny* like *miesiąc* *miesięczny*).⁷³ Reflexes of **dj* are commoner. A Slk secondary imperfective *saž-a+* (for *sad-i+a+*) was fitted into a framework requiring mutation of root-final consonant in present-tense forms, parallel to *pís-a+*, *maz-a+*, *plak-a+* ~ pres. *píše*, *maže*, *plače*, producing *sáže* 'plants'.⁷⁴

9.3 YR has a further set of complications because /c/ represents not only the results of (1) BdC (*ovca*, *zajac*, *l'ico* 'cheek', *šerco* 'heart'), (2) KAI (*cena* 'price', *civ*

⁷¹This lexeme illustrates a pitfall for users of ASJ. In Vol. I, editorial interest was in CntSlk variants *onica* and *omica*, and map 195 asserts that *onuca* is almost without exception in the east. Vol. III deals with suffixes, and map 257 is utterly different: *onuca* is in only two "core Sjk" villages; *onučka* is the normal form, with the back-formation (and/or Ukrainianism) *onuča* in five "core" points. The word is lexically isolated and synchronically opaque, yet with a clear etymology: the root is **au*, as in MCos **ob-uj-* 'put on (footware)' and **bz-uj-* 'take off'. Archaic **an-au-t-j-a*, is reflected in OCS *onušta*, ESl *onuča*, and WSl *onuca*. U *onučka* represents a regular ESl derivative, but since it is normal in various CzSl dialects (cf. *svička* 'candle'), *onučka* in YR is to be considered a part of the Sjk component.

Modern words with old **au* 'to shoe' provide instructive examples of morphemic re-shaping. Cz retains *ob-uj-* 'to shoe' and *z-uj-* 'to unshoe' (*obout*, *zout* [often *vyzout*]), but Slk is rather *obuj-* and *zobuj-* (*obut'*, *zobut'*; YR *obuc* *obuje*, *zobuc* *zobuje*). In WU *zobuty* is 'put on (shoes)'. *Obuty* is rare and apparently refers to *lapti* rather than modern shoes. Usual is *vzuty* (v-zuj-), with a regularized opposite *rozzuty* (roz-zuj-), but *rozbuty* (roz-buj-?) also is used. Cf. noun formations **obut'je* or **obuv'* 'footware, foot-wrapping' (e.g. SC *obuće*, Slk *obuv*, YR *obuj*), U *obuv'a*, *vzutt'ja*.

⁷²A parallel with the usual masc. dim. formant is *mešačok*, to *mešec*, 'moon'. I can find no parallels with -*ko*: could "zajačko" be possible?

⁷³MCos **vitežb* 'hero, victor', **vitežbn-* 'victorious', **vitež-i+* 'be victorious' shows only /z/ in both Cz and Slk, very possibly because they were lost from the spoken dialects and lived on only in writing; the /ʒ/ of Slk surely indicates a borrowing from Czech. Its problematic twin MCos **retežb* 'chain', appears in YR as *re'az*, marked as a loan by /k/, surely from Slk, ultimately from Cz (cf. OP *rzeciadz*, *wrzeciadz*). See also Lunt 1981: 33. YR *re'az* may have been intended to replace *lanc*, recognizable as a loan from Hung. *lánc* (perhaps itself a Slavic word built on MHG *lanne* 'chain', cf. Bezljaj, sub *lanec*). To what extent were *chains* known to early Slavs? R *cep'* is also of obscure origin.

⁷⁴A parallel with voiceless consonant is *sácat'*, *sáče* 'shove, push, force' (related to *sotit'* [perfective] and *sacat'* 3s *sacia*).

'tube, pipe', *cerkva* 'church', *Rusnaci*), and (3) MCoS *tj (*pl'eco* 'shoulder', *noc* 'night', *cera* 'daughter', *vraca* 'turns'), but also of (4) early Slk /t'/ [a] < MCoS /t/ before any front vowel (*cma* 'darkness', *mac* 'mother', *cixo* 'quietly', *celo* 'body', *cel'e* 'calf', *cahnuć* 'pull', < MCoS *t̥ma, *mat̥b, *t̥ixo, *t̥ělo, *t̥elę, *t̥ęgnuti), including [b] MCoS /t̥j/ (*začace* 'conception' < *za-čęt-bj-e, *šęesce* 'happiness' < *svčęst̥bje),⁷⁵ (5) miscellaneous medieval borrowings, such as *cvikla* 'beet' (unclear mediation, ultimately Gk σεῦκλον [sefklo]), *cibul'a* 'onion' < OHG *zebulle*, *zibolle*, *cil'* 'goal, target' < MHG *zil* (mod. *Ziel*), *šacovac* 'assess' (Slk < G *schätzen*) and numerous more modern ones, such as *ranc* (Hung. *ránc*), *cipela* 'shoe' < SC < Hung. *cipellő* < medieval Latin *zipellus*, not to mention items like *cigareta*, *cirkus*, or *konstitucija*. The sources of YR /ʒ/ are in theory parallel, though examples of the first two categories are lacking, and borrowings are scarce: (3) *dj (*saʒa* 'soot', *cuʒi* 'alien'), (4) /d'/, *zeći* 'children', *ʒivka* 'girl', *medvez* 'bear', *svaʒba* 'wedding'; there are some instances of affrication of older /z/, e.g. *ʒvon* 'bell'.

9.4 Confusion of č and c in individual morphemes or words has been noted in passing above. The c in *cesn-* 'garlic' is listed among examples of *distant assimilation* by Buffa 56 (č-s → c-s), a term suitable also for Sjk general *češki* 'difficult' (*ceški*, as expected, in Dlhá Lúka, Slk *t'ažky*),⁷⁶ though Czambel suggests the influence of Polish *ciężki* [čęski]. Sjk seems to have the expected forms of the root *tek-* 'run' (*cečem*, *cekla*), but YR has a new infinitive *čećic* and present (3s *čečem*, 3p *čeću*) along with the traditional past, *cekol*, *cekla*. This sort of sporadic change adds to the opacity of YR examples as evidence of LCoS etymology.

10.1 Against this background we may examine items that might be taken for old Ukrainian elements in YR.⁷⁷ The /č/ of *onučka* and *svička* have already been accounted for in the morphophonemic framework of modern Slk (and Cz). The /č/ in the infinitives *moći*, *pomoći* is also surely an internal development, see below in the appendix on conjugation. *Mačoxa* 'stepmother' is puzzling; Sjk generally has *ma-coxa*. The range of Sl dialect forms requires MCoS *tj, but the origin of the *j is obscure, and the number of x-suffixes requires us to assume a series of local innovations. The /č/ in this affective formation is as unclear as the /c/ in YR *cesnok* 'garlic' and its Slovak equivalents.⁷⁸

⁷⁵Cf. SC *začęće*, U *začętt'ja*, *ščastja*. For *Zakarpal'je*, with /k̥j/, see note 70.

⁷⁶Buffa also lists *čvičic* 'exercise' for *cvičic* (replaced in YR by *vežb-aj+* (< SC *vežbati*, cf. older **vęst-bb-a*) and *čęčin* (poss. adj to *cetka* 'aunt'), possible YR *cecin*, but I have not seen it. - This kind of change is not infrequent in multisyllable borrowings; the *revolver* 'revolver' Buffa lists is paralleled by *levolver* in various Yugoslav dialects. Buffa's *inžimir* 'engineer' differs from the *enžel'ir* Hnatjuk recorded for YR nine decades ago, now normalized to *in-žeŋer*.

⁷⁷It is not always easy to separate new, conscious borrowings. One is surely *tisjača* 'thousand', with the cluster /sj/ and /č/ for MCoS *tj. Surely this is a recent puristic substitute for Hung *ezer*, which is freely used in conversational passages.

⁷⁸*Gači* 'trousers, underpants' (Sjk *gače*, U *hači*, SC *gače*, Hung. *gatyá*), could have /g/ from Hung. or Polish, but the /č/ is puzzling. *Serenče* 'luck' is MCoS **svreťja* (> SC *sreća* > YR *sre't'a*, rejected by YR authorities in favor of *šęesce*, Slk 'happiness'), taken early into Hung. and borrowed by YR. SC family names in -ič, however, are regularly written with -ič.

10.2 Adjectives derived from animal names such as *mačaci* 'cat's, feline' (Slk *mačáci*) and *cel'ači* 'calf's' are unexpected.⁷⁹ The base nouns have the reflexes of MCoS *-*et*-. In earliest Slk they surely still had the anomalous "C-stem" front-vowel singular desinences, and therefore a soft stem-consonant: *-*ät'*-e Gs, *-*ät'*-i DLs. When these declensional endings were discarded in favor of -*a* and -*u*, stem-final /t'/ or its successor /k/ or /c/ remained to yield Sjk -*eca*, -*ecu*. MCoS adjectives with the formant **j* or **bj* should produce t' > c as well, so that *-*et-j*- yields *-*äc*-, e.g. *cel'ači*. On the other hand, an adjective built on an old BdC /c/ produces WSl /č/: *zajac* 'hare' *zajči* (Sjk; Slk *zajačŕ*), *ovca* 'sheep' *ovči*. In YR, the distinction between {c1} that alternates with {č} and {c2} that alternates, very rarely, with {t} is being lost; marking the derivative form as "derived" becomes more important. Hence *mačaci* (correlated with *mače mačeca*, pl. *mačata*) gives way to *mačáci*.

10.21 The adjective *medveži*, correlated with *medvez* 'bear' < *medved'* < MCoS **medvëdb*, is parallel with *zajači* from *zajac*; the "legitimate" reflex of **medvëd-j*- would be *medvezi*, cf. Slk *medvedŕ*. Another example is found in Hnatjuk, *haži*, from *had* 'snake'. What is involved is not, I maintain, any influence of Ukrainian, but the beginnings of a new set of derivational relationships which, in turn, have arisen in response to a fundamentally changed phonological system.⁸⁰

10.3 YR *meža*, for the textbook model **med-j-a*, is also unexpected, cf. the preposition *mezi* 'between' with normal WSl /z/. On the other hand, Czambel records *meži* as normal usage in Sjk villages. I have not seen *meža* in YR texts, and am not sure of the precise meaning '?limit, boundary, frontier'? (Sipos lists *meza* as 'furrow'). It could be a borrowing from Lemko, as Horbatsch assumes, or a new word introduced to replace *xotar/hotar* (Slk *chotár*), a loan from Hung. *határ* 'boundary'.⁸¹

11.1 The mixed character of YR vocabulary required Hnatjuk to provide a glossary to his prose folk-texts, about 1000 entries (1911: 335-350). Most are Magyarisms, with a large number of Serbisms, and many items Hnatjuk regards as Slovakisms; they are, rather, Slovjak or East Slovak and therefore, I maintain, native.⁸² Kostel'nik in his 1923 prescriptive grammar remarks on the many *cuži slova* and

⁷⁹Only Witkowski mentions them, and he gives only these two, plus *medveži* 'bear's, ursine', which Horbatsch also notes (as a U-Lemko element, 314).

⁸⁰The suffix -*ina*, denoting 'meat of' or 'skin of' as in Slk *zajačina*, *ovčina* but *sviňacina* 'meat of a young pig' produces the expected YR *hovežina* 'beef' (*hovedo* 'cattle'). Hnatjuk lists *hažina* 'snake' where the suffix has a different meaning. Note that SC, where **tj*/**dj* remain distinct from any alternant of /*td*/, has *prasetina* 'pork' but *praseči* 'pig's, porcine', *govedo* and *govedina* 'beef', but the adjective *govedi*, precisely as expected. However the neuter adjectives *praseče* and *govede* are often used to refer to meat (*meso*), and blends *prasečina* and *govedina* now exist. I suggest that similar processes are at work in YR, but the different phonological possibilities give rise to different results. Words of this type are infrequent in texts; I hope someone will provide the YR details.

⁸¹Horbatsch notes *omežovac* 'limit, delimit (?)'; it may be correlated with "omežic" or "omežic". Standard Slk has *omedzit'* *omedzovat'*.

⁸²The very first item, "Abrim, ábrin' - velykan", adds to the list of derivatives of **obrvr* 'Avar' that denote legendary giants, cf. Sjk *olbrin* (defined by Czambel as stand. Slk *obor*), Pol. *olbrzym*, old *obrzyn*.

temperately advises elimination of foreign synonyms when a native equivalent is available (§ 101).

11.2 Oleksa Horbatsch provides data about some three thousand lexemes, partly in lists illustrating historical phonological phenomena, and partly in separate lists intended to illustrate significant lexical strata. His major category is "Carpatho-Bačka lexicon" (337-347, some 1400 items), and a particularly interesting group is the synonyms from different YR villages (311-12, over 70 pairs or triplets). He lists separately groups he calls borrowings: Rumanian (320, 15 items), German (320-24, about 300 items), Hungarian (324-29, some 330 items), Serbo-Croatian (330-35, over 450 items) and standard Ukrainian (over a hundred) and a few from Russian. This is precious information, but still, I submit, raw material that calls for reanalysis. Horbatsch starts from the premise that YR is somehow a Ukrainian dialect. My remarks are based on a different principle: given the demonstrable conclusion that YR is a type of Slovjak, all comparison should start with Slovjak. There should be an explicit niche for YR innovations; Horbatsch provides none.⁸³

11.3 The "Carpatho-Bačka" stratum might be renamed "18th-century Slovjak" — the vocabulary the first generations of emigrants brought with them from their homes in East Slovakia. This is already a heterogenous body of words; *kupic kupovac* goes back to a Germanic root that for Middle Common Slavic must be considered native, and for a study of the place of YR among modern Slavic dialect continuums, the verb-pair is on the same level as *nešec prišec* or *nošic prinošic* 'carry, bring'. Horbatsch is obviously fully aware of the historical complications, but he does not pause really to try to formulate this crucial basis of comparison. A continual problem is that East Slovakia was never homogenous: Magyars were present throughout the retrievable history, and numerous ripples of immigrant German and Slavic speakers from various regions must be assumed. The communities surely contained speakers who were bidialectal or even multilingual.⁸⁴ Words wandered from community to community, back and forth from one language to another. Much of the detail is lost, but we can recover enough to establish (in a new context - no new principles are involved) the kinds of ways these processes acted.

⁸³An example: Horbatsch classes *repara* 'sugar beet brandy' as a SC borrowing, citing SC *bela repa*. *Repa* means 'sugar beet' also in Slk, and the brandy name seems to be only YR. Unless some evidence to tie it to Slovakia exists, I maintain that the word should be credited to YR coinage. — Recent scholarship has paid more attention to the time of borrowing and to multiple sources, e.g. Udvari's distinctions among loans from varieties of church language, Ukrainian, Russian, and SC, along with the difficulties in discerning sources for words made of Slavic morphemes.

⁸⁴Horbatsch's explicit aim (310, n.9) is to deny the Slovak character of YR by demonstrating its transitional status (*perexidnist'*). Indeed, East Slovak is, like any other Slavic macrodialect (e.g. Central Slovak, kajkavski Croatian, Ukrainian) transitional; the question to be asked in every case is, transitional from what to what? and on what linguistic level? Here we might say that Western Ukrainian lexicon is in many ways transitional from East Slovak and/or Polish to Eastern Ukrainian and/or Belorussian. Everything depends on focus, on defining the central point of study: I insist here on "core Slovjak" as the primary term of comparison to YR.

Even the most intimate vocabulary can present problems. *Ujko* 'mother's brother' and *striko* 'father's brother' both are Slk and SC, while *strina* 'wife of *striko*' is West Ukrainian as well. *Ujna* 'wife of *ujko*', however, is (as far as I could discover) only SC. Moreover, the less specific *teta* 'aunt' cannot be Slovak (orth. *teta* is [keta]) or normal Slovjak (we'd expect *ceta*), but it could be either SC or U. *D'ido* 'grandfather', on the other hand, can only be Ukrainian. Dilemma: is *teta* to be classed with *d'ido* as a pre-1800 heritage in YR, or with *ujna* as a word acquired in the Bačka? Marriage to Serbs and Croats was not uncommon. I have no answer, but disagree with Horbatsch's decision to put *teta* and *ujna* in the Carpathian list.⁸⁵

11.4 Since Horbatsch on the whole ignored Slovak and East Slovak vocabulary, his lists call for revision. *Život* 'life', *pl'en* 'booty', *trup* 'trunk (of body)', *kravar* 'cowherd', *mornar* 'seaman', *tabla* 'table', and *ponukac* 'urge, goad', for example, belong to the Slovjak component.⁸⁶ *Bešnic* 'to enrage' fits Slk *besnit* and *zbešnešina* 'hydrophobia' corresponds more closely to Slk *zbesniet* 'sa' 'become hydrophobic' than to any SC form. *Siverni* 'northern' surely belongs among recent Ukrainian borrowings; [si-] is unlikely in Bačka SC or Sjk.

11.5 The "Rumanian" borrowings, chiefly from sheepherding terminology, are of particular interest. Horbatsch states that they penetrated "the Lemko dialects" with the "Vlah" colonization in the Carpathians in the 14th-17th centuries. What is important is that not only the Lemko and other varieties of Ukrainian were affected, but also Carpathian Polish, along with East, Central, and West Slovak and to some extent Czech. For Rusin, it is not without interest that much of the same terminology is found in Serbian, e.g. *guša* 'crop, throat'.⁸⁷ Horbatsch notes that in one village 'shepherd' is not only *ovčar* (= both SC and Sjk), but *juhas* (Hung., normal in Sjk) and *čoban* which is normal Serbian, though a loan from Turkish; it is also Rum., and Horbatsch, inappropriately, in my opinion, puts it in his short Rumanian list. One wonders whether the three are really interchangeable; it is highly possible that they are semantically slightly different.

⁸⁵Horbatsch, I assume, heard these words from Rusin speakers. The school dictionaries (Medješi, Jerković), however, give only Magyarisms as YR: *and'a* for 'ujna, strina', *bači* (G *bačika*, Np *bačikove*) for 'ujko, striko' [Slk *bačik*], and *nina* for 'tetka' [Sjk; H *néne*]. It appears that Rusins have abandoned the old Slavic distinctions that are still normal in Serbian usage.

⁸⁶Sometimes YR helps solve special problems. Horbatsch puts *znoj* 'sweat' in his SC list (331). Tolstoj argued for a specific distribution from southern Poland to north central SC, but found it hard to attest for Slovakia. Its presence in YR is to be interpreted as affirmation that it is Sjk (attested by Czambel for Šariš), thus supplementing and validating Tolstoj's arguments.

⁸⁷A detail: Horbatsch 321 attributes YR *žoxtar* 'milk pail' to the German component of YR, citing *Seiher* 'strainer'; though ultimately it may represent Germanic, it belongs rather with the "Rum." complex of pastoral terms, surely borrowed before 1400, with this special shape that is characteristic of the eastern half of Slovakia (*šextr* in stand. Slk, cf. ASJ IV p. 274 [*dojčik* in the U villages]), most plausibly ultimately from Lat. *sextarius*, by way of OHG *sehtari* [mod. *Sechter*], but very possibly the specific Sjk form was filtered through (or influenced by) old Hungarian phonetic shapes, Kniezsa 734-6.

11.6 The Magyar layer that was brought from the north⁸⁸ has doubtless been modified during the past two centuries by contact with Bačka Hungarians.⁸⁹

11.7 The Ukrainian lexical component is, as Horbatsch's lists show, rather superficial. Though some words (*d'ido* 'grandfather') surely were used in the old homeland,⁹⁰ most have been added since 1904, chiefly to the written language.⁹¹ It has a far more important Serbo-Croatian stratum that includes such structural elements as *dok* 'while', *dok ňe* 'until', and the indefinitizer *-god* (*cogod* 'whatever', *kotrigod* 'whichever', *ke'ogod* 'however many'), some derivational suffixes, and many idiomatic phrases⁹² and surely some deeper syntactic patterns.⁹³ A German lexical stratum going back to the Middle Ages but continuing through Hapsburg times surely has also been modified in the new homeland.⁹⁴

12. Yet despite this lexical heterogeneity, as unbiased scholars from Broch to Bidwell, Švagrovský, and Witkowski have concluded, the linguistic structure as a whole belongs with the Abov, Zemplin and Šariš dialects in a macrodialectal unity that is clearly different from Central Slovak, Southeastern Polish (małopolski), and

⁸⁸Švagrovský 261 lists over 40 YR loans from H that still are in normal use in Sjk, including *falat* 'piece', which was singled out by Ukrainian dialectologists as typically Lemko over against its neighbors (AUM II 407). His list could easily be extended, e.g. *bajusi* 'moustache' (*bajusz*), *fajta* 'sort, kind', *lada* 'chest, trunk', (*láda*), *šor* 'row, rank' (*sor*). Adaptation to Sjk morphology is common, e.g. *pošoric pošorovac* 'put in order', *xasnovac* 'use' (with *x* for Hung. *h* in a 1758 book [Király], in Dlhá Lúka and YR, legitimized by Kostel'nik and common in prescriptive grammatical discussions), *banovac* 'regret, be sorry' (*bánat* 'sorrow', *banni* 'be sorry') *sanovac* 'pity' (*szánni*). Horbatsch's list needs to be divided among those shared with Sjk, and those shared with Serbian Vojvodina dialects; further, all items should be reviewed as to origin, since many (both Magyar and non-Magyar) have moved back and forth among communities. (Kostel'nik was fully aware of this in 1923, cf. reprint p. 244, fn.). Thus, while YR *natxa* 'cold (in the head)' indeed corresponds to H. *natha*, it is phonetically Slovak (and Slk, ASJ IV p. 407). The H is a Slavic (prob. Slovak) loan: stand. Slk spelling *nadžha* indicates the etymology, **na-dъx-a*, Kniezsa 354.

⁸⁹E.g., *parast* 'peasant' (H. *paraszt* is itself from Slavic *prost*) seems to be absent from Slovak.

⁹⁰Sjk sources need to be checked for comparison; Horbatsch lists *blukac*, though it is in Buffa.

⁹¹Striking examples of the latter include *ozero* 'lake' and *horod* 'city', surely replacing Hung. loans *tov* and *varoš* (which still is apparently normal usage; it is standard Serbian).

Similarly *vovk* 'wolf' (Sjk *vil'k*) sticks out as phonologically incongruous; why not *volk*? (Cf. *volna* 'wool', *polni* 'full' [Sjk also *velna*, *pelni*]). *Farkaš* (H *farkas*) is apparently the only word for 'wolf' in Hnatjuk's materials, where *liška* 'fox' is more usual than *rovka* (H *róka*). Perhaps the native term for the more dangerous animal was lost because of a tabu.

Some items are from the church language, rather than U. For example, *sl'idujušči* 'following' has a U root (cf. YR *š'lid* 'track') and a ChSlavonic formant—it is an inept adaptation of the Russian *следующий*, not a real U word. *Voobšče* 'in general' is Russian (Slavonic?), surely introduced to avoid the explicitly Serbian *uopšte*.

⁹²E.g., *mod'im vas* 'please'.

⁹³An eye-catching phrase from a story: *A čože jesc za esc?* 'And what is there to eat?' *Za* + inf. is reminiscent of Ger. *etwas zu essen*, or Italian *qualche cosa a mangiare*. It occurs in Dalmatian and Slovenian dialects, but seems odd in the Vojvodina.

⁹⁴E.g., *vinčovac* 'wish well, congratulate' from *wünschen* is normal Sjk. *Klajbas* 'pencil' apparently was known in Sjk; it belongs with *plajbas*, borrowed from *Bleiweiß* 'lead', possibly with Hung. mediation. *Hajziban* 'Eisenbahn, railroad' must be a post-1830 word.

Southwestern Ukrainian (Lemko, Transcarpathian).⁹⁵ The ties to Central and Western Slovak are firmer than those that connect it with SE Polish, the ties with Serbo-Croatian are more modern but vital, while the links with SW Ukrainian are weakest of all.

13. The aim of this sketch has been primarily to present enough structural detail to show that Yugoslav Rusin is a standardized form of an emigrant dialect representing the East Slovak (or Slovjak) macrodialect. YR is therefore *West Slavic*, although the value of this term for discriminating among post-1400 dialects is low. *It belongs with Slovak and Czech as opposed to Polish and Sorbian, but with all of them as opposed to Ukrainian or Serbo-Croatian.*⁹⁶

13.1 YR is more distant from Middle Common Slavic than Central Slovak, not to mention Russian. As a source of information about Middle Common Slavic, YR is severely limited by the opacity created by the presence of /c ʒ ʒ/ of multiple origin,⁹⁷ by a confusion in individual lexemes of /c/ and /č/, and of /h x g/, and by the multiple reflexes of MCoS *ě and *ę. As an example of the combining of phonological elements from many dialects, largely as a result of lexical borrowing, and of the adaptation of words from heterogeneous sources, YR is outstanding. In morphology, it shows such far-reaching simplification that it is not helpful for reconstructing even early Slovak, much less MCoS. With the comparative data available, most YR developments are easily fitted into known patterns of development. Yet at least one puzzle remains: why do forms like *mojo* and *bratovo* function at the same time as neuter singular and as plural, e.g. *mojo slovo* and *mojo slova*?⁹⁸

⁹⁵Pilbrow 151 warns that Yugoslav Rusin "is not the Karpato-rusinski language as spoken today in North America, which does not share the West Slavic component" [emphasis supplied, HGL]. Since YR is phonologically and morphologically at least 95% WSl, derivationally at least 80%, and lexically 60% (I am guessing at the figures, of course), that leaves little for Carpatho-Rusyn. In fact, the latter is one or another form of Lemko, with a significant WSl lexical component, but otherwise structurally East Slavic, cf. n. 4 above. The confusion again involves strictly linguistic definition versus sociopolitical terminology. Timko in 1989 writes (122) that the relationship and place in the family of Slavic language is not decided, but this seems to be an obligatory attitude for Yugoslav scholars. She wrongly attributes to Király the theory that YR is a standardized transitional dialect between Sjk and WU: he firmly stands with not only Pastrnek and Sobolevskij, whom Timko mentions, but with those modern scholars she does not name, from Tichý, Pauliny and Bidwell to Gustavsson, Švagrovský, and Witkowski.

⁹⁶Let me stress that my focus has been on the 1900-1920 system that underlay Kostel'nik's grammar; although inevitably I have mentioned elements that came in later, I have not attempted to analyze the derivational and lexical elements that have changed the physiognomy of the language since 1945.

⁹⁷Most important, loss of the distinctions between old *tj *dj *sj *zj and Late CoS (or Early CzSl) *t' *d' *s' *z' have obliterated a series of morphological possibilities, as well as potential differences among individual words. It is not hard to imagine etymologists who would find it significant that *šeno* 'hay' and *žima* 'winter' are phonetically closer to Lith. *šienas* and *žiema* than other Slavic dialects (or indeed those who might explicate the psychological subtleties of the borrowing of G *Schmerz* 'pain' to YR *šmerc* 'death').

⁹⁸This desinence has spread to the plural for -ov- adjectives denoting color (neut. sg. *kafove patlno* 'coffee-colored cloth', but pl. *kafovo pantaloni* 'coffee-colored trousers'). In the spo-

14. ADDENDUM (1991).⁹⁹ Julijan Tamaš's long 1988 essay on Hnatjuk was not available to me when this paper was written. It is an eloquent defense, by an intelligent ideologue, of the dogma that the Bačka-Srem Rusins are the bearers of a unique variant of Ukrainian folk culture, and that the YR language is East Slavic, Ukrainian. That Tamaš is aware of most of the pertinent literature is clear from his 1981 sketch proposal for Rusin studies, but his direct citations in 1988 omit such authors as Broch and Király. (Bidwell is missing from most YR discussions!). Tamaš is poorly grounded in linguistics and his discussion of linguistic detail is hopelessly muddled. He has chosen to trust the garbled presentation of the history of YR phonology by Pešikan (1980) — a travesty that is all the more embarrassing because its author is a professional linguist. Tamaš remarks in his conclusions (357) that after Hnatjuk "we know that our language is not Slovak and that we belong to the East Slavic cultural tradition. Here scholarship ends (*nauka prestava*). Everything beyond is politics." Unfortunately he has misplaced the boundary between objective scholarship and political manipulation. I am unable to judge about the traditions of weddings and folk poetry, but the facts I have set forth above suffice as empirical proof that YR is overwhelmingly East Slovak (Slovjak) in its structure, with a significant layer of Serbian added chiefly during the last half-century, and a superficial overlay of Ukrainianisms. Tamaš has every right to declare himself a Ukrainian, but to claim that his language is not, fundamentally and pervasively, extremely close to the Zemplin-Abov types of East Slovak destroys his image as an objective scholar. The point was made cogently and tactfully as long ago as 1966 by Charles Bidwell; it is a pity that such matters cannot be handled rationally.

Appendix: A sketch of the major features of Rusin conjugation.

"Knowing a language" entails two classes of information: a series of rules that describe the active processes of the system, and a lexicon containing the elements that are used in these processes, with special information about deviations from rules. Knowledge of the behavior of individual verbs in a Slavic system consists in varying amounts of elements from these two classes (which are not sharply distinct from each other). It is characteristic of Slavic languages that most words in any text consist of a stem and a desinence. Desinences are finite in number and part of the

ken language, *-ov-* adjectives denoting material have *-o* in both forms (*dubovo porisko* 'oak handle', pl. *dubovo poriska*), though the written language requires *dubove porisko*, *dubovi poriska*.

⁹⁹In the references to this article I cite the original Leopolis publications for those of Hnatjuk's ethnographic texts that I used as sources of linguistic data; they are reprinted in the first four volumes of Djura Latjak's Novi Sad edition. The fifth volume consists of YR translations of eight essays about the Bačka-Srem Rusins, plus one on the sex life of Ukrainian peasants in Austro-Hungary — unfortunately without bibliographic information as to the place(s) and date(s) of original publication — and Tamaš's essay about Hnatjuk and the significance of his work.

lexicon; stems are in principle infinite in number, but restricted in type and therefore in potential combinations with desinences. The great majority of verbs in a language will require relatively few rules. Some of the most important verbs in daily life, however, require many special rules: they stand alone or nearly alone. Although they may be of great significance for a linguistic historian, they are, as Meillet put it, "linguistic debris", that must simply be memorized by anyone who wishes to speak the language. A descriptivist's task, as I see it, is to organize the multiplicity of patterns into groups that make possible the identification of productive elements and combinations, thereby showing the relationship to the common but non-productive types and the vital but arbitrary items—the "linguistic debris".

Slavic declensional stems are uniform throughout paradigms, with exceptions that are morphologically predictable.¹⁰⁰ Verbal stems, however, are variable. Roman Jakobson realized that the difference is rooted in early Slavic phonotactic regularities. A word consisted of a sequence of open syllables, consonant (C [including a limited class of consonant clusters]) plus vowel (V): CVCVCVCV. Declensional stems all ended in C (were consonantal), while endings all began in V (were vocalic); any combination of stem + ending therefore produced CV. Both verbal stems and verbal endings may be either consonantal or vocalic. He proposed that every verb has an invariant *basic stem* from which every form of the paradigm is generated: if addition of ending to stem results in VC or CV there is no problem, but if either VV or CC results, there must (in the majority of instances) be some sort of adjustment. The infinitive ending is consonantal: addition of a C-suffix produces the "infinitive stem"; addition of a V-suffix produces the "present stem".¹⁰¹ These insights have been exploited in describing most standard Slavic languages and a good many dialects. Inspection of the forms of a system easily establishes a fair number of regularities and appropriate rules of cooccurrence and/or generation can be formulated.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰Predictability may be essentially phonetic and automatic (e.g. C is soft before Ls *-e* in R [the sequence *hard C + e* being a mark of a foreign root], *dom ~ dom'e*) but more often is morphological (e.g. OCS stems in /k g x/ mutate to /c ʒ s/ before Npm *-i* and any ending beginning with *-ě*, e.g. *bogъ* Np *bozi*, Ls *božěxъ*) and governed by rule.

¹⁰¹In fact the infinitive versus present contrast is only a generality, see, for example, the table of OCS stem-types in Lunt 1974, p. 73. This one-stem abstract approach is opposed to variants of the Dobrovský-Miklosich type of description based on the infinitive stem or of the Schleicher-Leskien type based on the present stem. Pilbrow offers yet another version of the latter, but with a great many abstract elements expressed by brackets, slashes, colons, and zeros. The assumptions underlying his analysis (particularly Diagram 1) remain obscure to me. His essay was not quite finished (e.g. the 20 stem-types of his table on p. 157 do not quite correspond to later discussion; cf. types O, P, Q, R on pp. 164-5); problems remain. E.g., if *buc* 'to be' with its unique present is a separate class, where do *dobuc* 'get' and *zabuc* 'forget' with pres. *-buze* and past passive participle *-bužen* go? He gives no hint that, for example, type D contains only two verbs (*stac* 'stand', *bac še* 'fear'), while B (*bivac* 'dwell', *čitac* 'read') and M (*kupovac* 'buy') contain hundreds and are productive.

¹⁰²*Regular* of course means 'fitting the rule(s)': rules are in theory something actually encoded in the individual brain of each individual speaker, but for our purposes they are formulas elaborated by a linguist. Pilbrow apparently believes that every last detail is to be formulated

YR conjugation has three major stem-types (i-verbs, aj-verbs, ova-verbs) that account for the overwhelming portion of the lexicon,¹⁰³ along with two or three minor types (most important are the nu-verbs),¹⁰⁴ and a number of idiosyncratic groups and individual verbs that loom large statistically in any body of running text. Here are some of the rules I suggest for YR.¹⁰⁵

1. The YR verb conforms to these structural patterns:

- {basic + present + person/number}
- {basic + imperative + person/number}
- {basic + past tense + gender or number}
- {basic + past passive participle + gender or number}
- {basic + infinitive}

Conjugation consists in combining the morphemes representing each of the elements in these formulas for individual verbs.

The past tense, in the absence of a subject personal pronoun (or a noun for third person), consists of the gender or number I-form plus the auxiliary *som*, *ši*, -, *zme*, *sce*, -. If the explicit subject is expressed, the auxiliary is omitted. The conditional is made by the inflected auxiliary *bim*, *biš*, *bi*, *bizme*, *bisce*, *bi* plus I-form, but the person-specific desinences *-m* *-š* *-zme* *-sce* are usually omitted if the personal pro-

as a rule; I prefer Jakobson's attitude that most deviant forms violate only one or two specific rules that are worth formulating, but some are so special that it is simpler to declare them anomalous.

¹⁰³The i-stems still have limited productivity, though I have too little comparative data to cite specific items; in any case, i-stems constitute a large portion of the verbs in the YR lexicon. Ova-stems are enormously productive: they make secondary imperfectives (e.g. *obnovjovac*, *pre-slavovac*, *podrazumjovac* to *ob-nov-i+* 'renew', *pre-slav-i+* 'celebrate', *pod-razum-i+* 'mean'), and serve to adapt foreign stems, as Frejsa's list of borrowings from English, some very new (usually from SC) show (e.g. *kidnapovac* 'kidnap', *intervjuovac* 'interview', even *haligalijovac* 'dance the hully-gully'). Aj-stems are important in the native lexicon and the list continues to grow with loans (e.g. *spikaje* 'speak [3s pres]'), esp. with *-ir-aj*, despite the objections of purists (e.g. 3s *hendikapiraje* vs. *hendikapuje* '[he] handicaps', Frejsa, esp. 120-1).

¹⁰⁴Nu-stems are marginally productive as perfectives (e.g. sports terms, *boksnu-* to *boksova-* 'box', *finišnu-* 'finish', *šutnu-* to *sutaj-/šutiraj-* 'shoot (a ball)'; Frejsa records *slipnuc* 'sleep').

¹⁰⁵Basic stems are expected to provide maximal information. In OCS and Russian, the rule of thumb is that the longer of the two stems in the infinitive (discovered by removing the consonantal desinence *-ti* or *'*) and the 3p pres (found by removing the vocalic desinence): *pisa-ti* *piš-qtъ* yields *pisa-*; *děla-ti* *dělaj-qtъ* yields *dělaj-*. (The shorter or truncated stems *piš-* and *děla-* are predictable from the longer; the opposite is not true.) If the stems are the same length, one must decide which is more informative: *nes-ti* *nes-qtъ* *ves-ti* *vez-qtъ*, and *ves-ti* *ved-qtъ* show a contrast in 3p that is not revealed in the inf., so *nes-* and *ved-* are the basic stems. Historical restructuring of present stems in YR led to 3p *neš-u*, *veš-u*, *ved-u*; the past feminines are *nes-la*, *vez-la*, *ved-la*. The unmutated *s* and *z* are needed to produce the past forms, and the present *š ž* can be predicted, so we start with *neš-∅+*, *vez-∅+*, *ved-∅+* (adding the classifier *-∅+* that indicates that this is a verbal stem).

noun (*ja, ti, my, vy*) is present.¹⁰⁶ The imperfective future is *buzem, bužeš, buže, bužeme, bužece, budu* plus infinitive.¹⁰⁷

2. Every basic stem necessarily contains a root and a formative suffix (the classifier), which may be zero.¹⁰⁸ YR has nine classifiers: -i+, -(č)-a+;¹⁰⁹ -aj+, -ova+, -a+, -e+, -ej+; -nu+; -Ø. The basic stem is given in the lexicon. The inflectional elements are the following:

3.1 *Present* means a present-marker. There are three sets:

1-3-sg, 1-2 pl	3pl	
i	a	: required by -i+, (č)-a+, -oj-Ø+, and sp-a+
Ø	u	: required by -aj+
e	u	: required by all other stems. ¹¹⁰

3.11 *Person-number* desinences: -m -š -Ø -me -ce -Ø¹¹¹

3.12 In the context *imperative*, 1s does not occur, 2s is Ø.

4. *Imperative* is *i*, which disappears unless it follows certain consonant clusters.

There is no first person sing. imper. For third person, *naj* plus 3s/3p present is used.

5. *Past tense* marker: -l-

It triggers two rules: 1. if -l-Ø (past masc.) is added to an obstruent stem, **either** /o/ is inserted before the *l*, or the *l* is deleted: *ved-Ø+l-Ø* → *vedol/ved* (the disyllabic forms are definitely preferred in writing.¹¹² 2. before -l-, a stem-final *i* is lowered to *e*: *robic robel robela*.¹¹³

¹⁰⁶An alternative in the absence of a pronoun is *bi som*, etc. Notice that the near-equivalence of *ja čital* and *čital som* (or of *ja bi čital*, *čital bim*, and *čital bi som*) raises questions of syntax as well as morphology.

¹⁰⁷Verbal adverbs from certain imperfectives may be made by adding -ci to 3p pres, e.g. *čita-juci* '(when) reading', Kočiš 1974: 109. (He cites one in a sentence illustrating a causal genitive, 61: *Vracajuci še do xizi, strosala še od žimi*, 'Returning home, she was shaking with cold.'). Terms like *označujuci (odrekajuci) zlučnik* 'defining (negational) conjunction' I take to be simply adjectives.

¹⁰⁸There may be other suffixes between the root and the classifier, but this is irrelevant for conjugation. Prefixes create new *lexical verbs*, that belong to one *morphological verb*, represented by the basic stem. Thus *pis-a+* 'write', *na-pis-a+* 'write down', *pre-pis-a+* 'copy', etc., represent one morphological verb (inf. *pisac, napisac, prepisac*, 3s pres *piše, napiše, prepíše*) but three lexical verbs.

¹⁰⁹The hyphen indicates the boundary between root and classifier, and the plus marks the end of the classifier. The "(č)" denotes any/-anterior/ obstruent /č ž š/. E.g. *krič-a+* 'shout, cry', *bež-a+* 'flee'.

¹¹⁰Accordingly, one may speak of i-presents (types *robi, hvari, vizi, kriči*), zero-presents (type *čita*), and e-presents (types *kupuje, piše, hiše, zvihne, bije, žije, čuje*, etc.). Pilbrow lumps the classifiers and the present-markers together as mechanical "Integration Segments", thus erasing the primary boundary between invariant morphological basic stem and a series of flectional elements.

¹¹¹This Ø functions as a consonant (while the zero classifier and the zero present-marker have no phonological content): *čit-aj+Ø-Ø* → *čita* (3p *čit-aj+u-Ø* → *čitaju*). - The imperative 2s has a zero person-marker; 1p has -me, 2p -ce.

¹¹²Current YR tends to restrict the shorter forms to non-prefixed stems, thus *vedol* but *povedl/povedol*. - Variants of these two alternations occur in most dialects. A rule inserting a

6. Gender-or-number suffix: masc neut fem plural
 -Ø -e -a -i

7. Infinitive desinence: -c

It triggers two rules:¹¹⁴ 1. /t d s z/ become /s/ (pl'et-Ø+c, klad-Ø+c, griz-Ø+c → pl'esc, klasc, grisc),¹¹⁵ 2. /k h/ are replaced by /či ži/: pek-Ø+c steh-Ø+c → pečic, strežic.¹¹⁶

8. Past passive participle is (1) -n-, (2) -t-, or (3) -en-.

n is added to -a+, -aj+, and r-Ø+; t to -nu+ and sonorants (j, r, l, m, n); en to all other stems.¹¹⁷

9. Consonantal alternations are tied to three sets of consonants I dub *neutral*, *normal*, and *mutated*.

<i>neutral</i>	p b f v m r
<i>normal</i>	t d s x z h k l n
<i>mutated</i>	c z š ž č l' ň

The alternations t~c d~z s~š x~š z~ž h~ž k~č are found in stem-final position before specific endings. Under parallel conditions, the neutral consonants are unchanged unless followed by /a/: then *pja bja fja vja mja rja* appear. Two descriptive strategies are available: (1) to allow a mutated neutral set *pj* (etc.) wherever appropriate, with a rule deleting *j* before /-back/ *i, e*, or (2) to formulate rules only for the cases where overt /j/ occurs. I choose the first here.

10. Informal rules:¹¹⁸ (1) add present-markers [or imperative] to basic stem; (2a) if CC, delete first C.¹¹⁹ (2b) if VV (') if -ova+V, change *ov* to *uj*, (2') delete first V (= remove stem-final V); (3) if *tu/du* result, quit; otherwise (4) mutate stem-final

vowel between consonants is valid for OCS aorists (wed-Ø+x-ъ > vedoxъ, wed-Ø+x-Ø > vede); I did not use this formulation in Lunt 1974 10.11, but taught it this way for years.

¹¹³This distribution is significant in terms of Slk dialectology, for in most of Slovak the past of i-verbs is -il -ila; -ew -ela is normal in Abov, and -el -ela in a small Prešov zone (ASJ II 264). As in the case of the auxiliaries *som, sme*, this detail shows the importance of the Abov dialect in the generally Zemplin-based selection of Sjk elements in YR.

¹¹⁴Truncation rules triggered also by *l, n*, and *t* are given below.

¹¹⁵Kostel'nik cites also *skubsc* and *hrebsc*, but they are improbable in Sjk and apparently unknown in YR, which has *skubac, hrebac*, a-verbs.

¹¹⁶This class apparently includes no more than six stems in -k- and two in -h-. The two roots in -h- exhibit complications. For *steh-Ø+*, see note 141 below. The verbs *moh-Ø+* 'be able' and *po-moh-Ø+* 'help' require a special rule: -hc- is replaced by -či — *moči, pomoči*.

¹¹⁷My information is incomplete, and certain doublets exist, e.g. *dani/dati* 'given', from d-aj+, *zahnati/zahnani* 'driven out', from irregular za-hnaC -ženV. Also *rozjašneti/rozjašneni* 'clarified' from roz-jašŋ-i+.

¹¹⁸Rules are to be applied in order, as numbered.

¹¹⁹Truncation rules are chiefly needed for consonantal basic stems (with Ø classifier); this rule, removing stem-final *j*, is identical with T3, see below. T1 and T2 have priority, but since they affect few stems, I am ignoring them for the moment, see notes 133-34.

consonant(s) if possible; (5) if *imperative*, delete marker *i* unless it follows CC (where the second C is a sonorant).¹²⁰

Some sample derivations:

3p	rob-i+a-Ø	hvar-i+a-Ø	viz-i+a-Ø	krič-a+a-Ø	stoj-Ø+a-Ø
2b ²	rob+a	hvar+a	viz+a	krič+a	stoj+a
4	robja	hvarja	viza	kriča	stoja
1s	rob-i+i-m	hvar-i+i-m	viz-i+i-m	krič-a+i-m	stoj-Ø+i-m
2b ²	rob+im	hvar+im	viz+im	krič+im	stoj+im
4	robim	hvarim	vizim	kričim	stojim
3p	čit-aj+u+Ø	kup-ova+u-Ø	rez-a+u-Ø	ñes-Ø+u-Ø	pl'et-Ø+u-Ø
2b	"	¹ kup-uj+u	² rez+u	² ñes+u	³ pl'et+u
4	čitaju	kupuju	režu	ñešu [3.]	pl'etu
1s	čit-aj+Ø-m	kup-ova+c-m	rez-a+e-m	ñes-Ø+c-m	pl'et-Ø+c-m
2	čit-a+m	kup-uj+c-m	rez+em	ñes+e-m	pl'et+e-m
4	čitam	kupujem	režem	ñešem	pl'ecem
3p	šmej-a+u-Ø	šm-c+u-Ø	vjej-Ø+u-Ø	bij-Ø+u-Ø	ber-Ø+u-Ø
2	šmej+u	šm+u	vjeju	bij+u	ber+u
4	šmeju	šmu	veju	biju	beru
1s	šmej-a+c-m	šm-c+c-m	vjej-Ø+e-m	bij-Ø+c-m	ber-Ø+e-m
2	šmej+em	šm+em	vjej+em	bij+em	ber+em
4	šmejem	šmem	vejem	bijem	berem

Imperatives:¹²¹

2s	rob-i+i-Ø	britv-i+e-Ø	plak-a+i-Ø	posl-a+i-Ø	stoj-Ø+i-Ø
2b	rob+i	britv+i	plak+i	posl+i	stoj+i
4	"	"	plač+i	pošl'+i	"

¹²⁰Mutation generally applies to consonant clusters, but certain exceptions exist, e.g. inv. *šžezñi* 'disappear' from *šžez-nu+* (cf. *z'leknuc še* 'become frightened', where the *z-* is [at least historically] a prefix. On the exclusion of *C+sonorant* in word-final position, see n. 61 above). Examples: *tarhñi* (*tarh-nu+* 'pull'), *zamlñi* (*za-mk-nu+* 'lock'); *odobri* (*o-dobr-i+* 'approve'), *britvi* (*britv-i+* 'shave'), *pošl'i* (*posl-a+* 'send'), *načisl'i* (*na-čisl'i-* 'enumerate'), *pohñi* (*pohñ-i+* 'fill'), *padñi* (*pad-nu+* 'fall'), *behñi* (*beh-nu+* 'flee'), *l'igñi* (*l'ig-nu+* 'swallow'), *rošñi* (*ros-nu+* 'grow'), *pojašñi* (*po-jašñ-i+* 'clarify'), *počñi* (*po-čn-Ø+* 'begin'), *vežñi* (*v-žn-Ø+* 'take'); but *karm* (*karm-i+* 'feed'), *skarž še* (*skarž-i+* *še* 'complain'), *starč* (*starč-i+* '?'), *okoñč* (*o-konč-i+* 'finish'), *pušč* (*pušč-i+* 'release'), *čisc* (*čisc-i+* 'clean'), *namesc* (*na-mesc-i+* 'replace'), *utverz* (*utverz-it* 'affirm'), *vož* (*vo-žd-* 'go in'), *rajb* (*rajb-a+* 'wash'), *farb* (*farb-i+* 'dye'), *hañb še* (*hañb-i+* *še* 'be ashamed'), *cerp* (*cerp-i+* 'suffer').

¹²¹From *patr-i+* 'look', beside expected *patri* a shortened form *pat'* (*pat'me*, *pat'ce*) is found, also *opatrilopat'* 'notice', *popatri/popat'* 'take a look'. Similarly, beside *vežñi* *vežnice* 'take', *vež vežce* is possible (Kočič 1971: 15). See also n. 46.

5	rob	britvi	plač	pošl'i	stoj
1p	hvar-i+i-me	čit-aj+i-me	kup-ova+i-me	pl'et-Ø+i-me	šm-e+i-me
2	hvar+i-me	čitaj+i-me	kupuj+i-me	pl'et+i-me	šm+i-me
4	"	"	"	pl'ec+i-me	"
5	hvarme	čitajme	kupujme	pl'ecme	šmime

Summary of classifiers¹²²

-i+: a large, somewhat productive class. Includes most former -e+: *cerp-i+* 'suffer', *l'ec-i+* 'fly', *šež-i+* 'sit', *šmerz-i+* 'stink', *viž-i+* 'see', and many former -ěj+: *rozum-i+* 'understand'. Other examples: *rob-i+* 'do', *karm-i+* 'feed', *hvar-i+* 'speak', *doj-i+* 'milk', *poraj-i+* 'put in order, tidy up'.¹²³

robic	robel	robi	robja	rob	robeni
rozumic	rozumel	rozumi	rozumja	rozum	rozumeni
hvaric	hvarel	hvari	hvarja	hvar	hvareni
vižic	vižel	viži	viža	viž	viženi

-(č)-a+: Fewer than 20 stems, only four original in this class (*bež-a+* 'run', *krič-a+* 'shout', *kl'eč-a+* 'kneel', *l'ež-a+* 'lie'), plus the isolated *sp-a+* (pres. *špi*) 'sleep'.¹²⁴

kričac	kričal	kriči	kriča	krič
spac	spal	špi	špja	špi

-aj+: large and productive class; it has absorbed many former -a+ verbs (e.g. *strih-aj+*/*štrih-aj+* 'cut [hair]') and some others (*pl'uv-aj+* 'spit', *bl'uv-aj+* 'vomit'). Includes non-syllabic roots *d-aj+* 'give', *hr-aj+* 'play', *m-aj+* 'have', *zn-aj+* 'know'.¹²⁵

čitac	čital	čita	čitaju	čitaj	čitani
dac	dal	da	daju	daj	dani/dati

¹²²My inventory comes chiefly from various works by Kočiš and the "minimal" dictionaries by Medješi and Jerković, supplemented by evidence from texts I have perused. I have tried to be complete with the unusual and unique types, but surely there are verbs I have missed. My glosses may well be inaccurate or dead wrong in some cases. The sample "principle parts" are inf., past masc (sometimes also fem.), 3s pres., 3p pres., 2s imperative, past passive participle.

¹²³New SC loans require modified rules, cf. *uputic uputim uput'a* 'send off' (see n. 70 above); we expect mutated consonants if possible before the -i+ classifier and the i-present marker (as in *plac-i+* 'pay' *placim placu*). This verb needs a mark to show that *t* mutates to *k*.

¹²⁴In terms of ES1k, this class is unexpected, for normal forms in ESjk are *kričic kričel kričela* and in WSjk *kričec kričew -ela* (ASJ II 237, 264); -a- in inf. is not normal Sjk. Could SC have determined these forms? NB that Kočiš 1971 condemns *kl'ečic kl'ečel* 'kneel', which of course means that it is widely used; *kl'ečac*, unlike *bežac*, *kričac*, *ležac*, has no equivalent in SC. In Kocura, past forms have -el -ela -elo -el'i. - Other stems are: *rič-a+* 'roar', *rehoč-a+* 'whinny, guffaw', *sušč-a+* (*šušča*)-a+ '?', *fuč-a+* 'whiz', *huč-a+* 'howl', *gravč-a+* 'bark', *sič-a+* 'hiss', *trašč-a+* 'crackle, pop', *pl'ušč-a+* 'splash'. I am guessing at meanings; some of these surely were originally -a+ stems (**ryk-a*, **rehot-a*, **huk-a*, **syk-a*, **pl'usk-a*). See also n. 32.

¹²⁵The contrasting present in *hrajem hraje* vs. *znam zna* (but 3p *hraju* like *znaju*) indicates a different interpretation of the segments *aj*, where the *j* is something of a historical puzzle. I have elected to posit *aj* as a classifier in YR *zn-aj+* but part of the root in *hraj-Ø+*. See n. 133.

-ova+: the principle productive class.¹²⁶

kupovac	kupoval	kupuje	kupuju	kupuj	kupovani
obnovjovac	obnovjoval	obnovjuje	obnovjuju	obnovjuj	obnovjovani

-a+: limited and unproductive. Includes some old members of this class (čes-a+ 'comb', kol'is-a+ 'rock', opas-a+ 'belt, gird', pis-a+ 'write'; u-kaz-a+ 'show', l'iz-a+ 'lick', rez-a+ 'cut', vjaz-a+ 'bind'; plak-a+ 'weep', brex-a+ 'bark', posl-a+ 'send'; kap-a+ 'drip; disappear', sip-a+ 'pour', drim-a+ 'doze'; perhaps kašl'-a+ 'cough'), with kaj-a+ še 'rue', šmej-a+ še 'laugh',¹²⁷ and newcomers from other classes.¹²⁸ Two anomalous stems may be added, with anomalous *-ec* in inf.¹²⁹

zlamac	zlamal	zlamе	zlamu	zlam	zlamani
rezac	rezal	reže	režu	rež	rezani
plakac	plakal	plače	plaču	plač	plakani
šmejac še	šmejаl še	šmeje še	šmeju še	šmej še	(na)šmejani
zorvec	zorval	zorve	zorvu	zorvi	zorvani

-e+: only three roots: sc-e+ 'want' (*x_{bt}-ě Lunt 1974 §15.233), šm-e+ 'dare' (old ěj §15.9) žň-c+ 'sound' (*zvbn-ě+, Slk zniet').

šmec	šmel	šme	šmu	šmi
------	------	-----	-----	-----

-ej+: (1) semi-productive with adjectival stems, but no inf. may be formed (e.g. bil'-ej+);¹³⁰ (2) 5 stems with non-syllabic root: ml'-ej+ 'swoon', tl'-ej+ 'be rotten', pl'-ej+ 'weed', pr'-ej+ 'wither', zr'-ej+ 'ripen'.

¹²⁶Includes *sn-ova+* (*snoval, snuje snu*) 'found' which in LCoS could apparently form a present **snov-e-*. – This classifier was productive as early as MCoS. When Slavic verbs were borrowed into medieval Rumanian, Rumanian endings were added to basic Slavic stems; the endings were vocalic, so *ova* automatically became *uj*, e.g. *lěk-ova+ 'doctor, treat' with *-i* becomes *lecul*. In time, the truncated suffix *-uj-* became a major Rum. device for creating new verbs from stems of all possible origins, see Lunt 1966.

¹²⁷My OCS description of the early 1950's did not mark classifiers, and such revisions were not possible for the 1974 edition. I would not now posit the "ja" class (15.4) that was marginal for OCS; it is preferable to see it as a subdivision of the *-a+* group, but with a number of special stems that deviate slightly. Even more importantly, 15.9 should distinguish the numerous and productive types *děl-aj+* and *bogat-ěj* and separate them from the few but important root-verbs like *buj-Ø+* 'beat' or *myj-Ø* 'wash' (15.93-4). [See also Lunt 1995: 199-201.]

¹²⁸I will not guess at meanings: *-dab-a+* 'resemble', *drap-a+ še* 'climb', *rip-a+*, *ščip-a+*, *trep-a+*; *dlob-a+*, *grab-a+ še* 'climb', *hrab-a+* 'rake', *hreb-a+* 'dig', *jeb-a+*, *rub-a+* 'cut', *skap-a+* 'disappear', *skub-a+* 'pluck', *škrab-a+*, *žub-a+*, *zlam-a+* 'smash'; *kar-a+* 'blame, punish', *or-a+* 'plow', *šamr-a+*; *kres-a+*.

¹²⁹In *-rv-a*+* (*odo- pre- u-*) 'rip, tear' and *o-zv-a*+ še* (*odo-*) 'respond', *a* may be replaced by *e* before *-c*. Kočiš 1971 gives *prervec* (129) and *urvec še* (147), but explicitly condemns the infinitives *odorvec* (120) and *ozvec še* (121).

¹³⁰Pilbrow's type S, with inf. *bil'ec* (implying an uncomplicated *ej-*verb by my analysis) is not justified by Kočiš, whose 11th class (1974: 102) has *bil'ic*, with the express note that the present *-eje-* forms are sometimes confused with *i-*verbs, his 13th class. Kočiš obviously disapproves of this confusion, but his advice that infinitives like *bil'ec* and *červeňec* be used (1978: 70) is clearly language planning, not description. I postulate that the infinitive is suppletive. Medješi has *zmocňic zmocňeje* 'become stronger' vs. *zmocňic zmocňi* 'make strong'. (Note that SC has lost the old *ěj-*verbs entirely.)

[bil'ic]	bil'el	bil'eje	bil'eju	–	–
ml'ec	ml'el	ml'eje	ml'eju	ml'ej	(za)ml'eti
zrec	zrel	zreje	zreju	zrej	zreti

-(V)-nu+: -nu- constant; very few stems, with V before classifier (hi-nu+ 'perish').

C-(nu)+: -nu- deleted before *l* in non-masculine past; fairly large class, e.g. *zvih-nu+* 'lift', *šed-nu+* 'sit down', *rek-nu+* 'say' (some with non-syllabic root [za-mk-nu+ 'lock', zo-h-nu+ 'bend']).

nacahnuc	nacahnul	nacahŕe	nacahŕu	nacahŕi	nacahnuti
zamknuc	zamknul	zamkŕe	zamkŕu	zamkŕi	zamknuti
	zamkla zamkli				

-Ø+: these are the "linguistic debris".

They are subdivided according to root-final consonant: *j*, nasal, *r*, *l*, obstruent.

Some require Truncation rules.

Coj-Ø+: *boj-Ø+* 'fear', *stoj-Ø+* 'stand'.

T1 *oj-Ø+* → *a+*:¹³¹ *stoj-Ø+c* → *stac*, *stoj-Ø+l-a* → *stala*

stac	stal	stoji	stoja	stoj
------	------	-------	-------	------

Cej-Ø+: 8 stems; *hrej-Ø+* 'heat', *kl'ej-Ø+* 'swear', *l'ej-Ø+* 'pour', *-ŕej-Ø+* 'take' (ob-od- pod- z-), *šej-Ø+* 'sow', *vjej-Ø+* 'blow, waft', *-zej-a+* 'put' (na- o- ob- po- pre- z-).

T2 *Cej-Ø+* → *a+*:¹³² *vjej-Ø+c* → *vjac*; *ob-ŕej-Ø+c* → *obŕac*

hrac	hral	hreje	hreju	hrej	hrati
kl'ac	kl'al	kl'eje	kl'eju	kl'ej	(za)kl'ati
odŕac	odŕal	odŕeje	odŕeju	odŕej	odŕati
vjac	vjal	veje	veju	vej	vjati

CVj-Ø+:¹³³ *kraj-Ø+* 'cut, tailor', *hraj-Ø+* 'play', *laj-Ø+* 'swear', *bij-Ø+* 'strike', *hŕij-Ø+* 'rot', *krij-Ø+* 'hide', *mij-Ø+* 'wash', *pij-Ø+* 'drink', *rij-Ø+* 'dig', *šij-Ø+* 'sew', *šŕij-Ø+* 'dream', *vij-Ø+* 'wind', *žij-Ø+* 'live'; *čuj-Ø+* 'hear; feel', *duj-Ø+* 'blow', *obuj-Ø+* 'shoe' (z-obuj-Ø+ 'unshoe').

krac	kral	kraje	kraju	kraj	?(pre)krati
bic	bil	bije	biju	bij	biti
obuc	obul	obuje	obuju	obuj	obuti

¹³¹Historically *oj-a+* of basic stem contracted to *ā* in most WSl; for YR *all* [= both!] verbs in *oj-* (1) have *i*-presents, and (2) become *-a-* before C-endings.

¹³²This group, *Cej-Ø+*, is distinct from the six non-syllabic roots with the classifier *-ej+* (*ml'ej: mlec mleje*) plus the adjective-based *-ej+* verbs that do not form infinitives (*bil'ej+: bil'eje*). Historically, this class goes back in part to LCoS alternating stems *C₂ja+C* but *C₂je-*, cf. OCS *ljati ljetv* 'pour' (Lunt 1974 §15.48), with WSl contraction of **bja* to **ā*, which persisted in Slk, yielding /ja/ in Sjk if long and after labial or *r*, /a/ if long after other consonants, and /e/ if shortened. (For YR, positing *vjej* means that in non-truncated forms the *j* must be deleted by a universally valid restriction of *j* between *neutral C* and front vowel.) Old **bn/*bm* stems have been restructured completely; part of them ended up here (cf. n. 134).

¹³³The formula means not *oj* or *ej*, but any other vowel plus *j*; the root-final *j* of these verbs, as well as the classifier-final *j* in *-aj+* and *-cj+*, is now deleted by **T3** (= 2a in 10, above): *j* may not stand before C.

N-Ø+: 6 stems; prim-Ø+ 'get', vin- 'take out', -čn-Ø+ 'start', -tn-Ø+ 'cut' (po- na- za-), žn-Ø+ 'harvest', plus v-žn-Ø*+ 'take'.

T4 N-Ø+ → ja:¹³⁴ prim-Ø+c → prijac, -tn-Ø+c → -tjac → -cac, -čn-Ø+c → čjac → čac, žn-Ø+c → žac.

v-žn-Ø+ 'take' inserts *e* in prefix in the presence of vocalic suffixes; v-žn-Ø+e-Ø 3s → ve-žn-Ø+e → vežňe, but v-žn-Ø+c → vžac.¹³⁵

prijac	prijal	prime	primu	prim	prijati
viňac	viňal	viňc	viňu	viň	viňati
počac	počal	počňe	počňu	počňi	počati
rozocac	rozocal	rozotňe	rozotňu	rozotňi	rozocati
vžac	vžal	vežňe	vežňu	vežňi/vež	vžati

Cer-Ø+: 2 stems, ber-Ø+ 'gather', per-Ø+ 'support'.

T5 er-Ø+ → ra:¹³⁶ ber-Ø+c → brac, per-Ø+ → prac

brac	bral	berc	beru	ber	brani
------	------	------	------	-----	-------

Col-Ø+: 1 stem, kol-Ø+ 'stab' (pres kol'e).

T6 ol-Ø+ → la: kol-Ø+c → klac

klac	klal	kol'e	kol'u	kol'	klani
------	------	-------	-------	------	-------

Cel-Ø+: 1 stem, mel-Ø+ 'grind, mill' (pres. mel'e).

T7 el-Ø+ → l'e:¹³⁷ mel-Ø+c → ml'ec

ml'ec	m'lel	mel'e	mel'u	mel'	ml'eti
-------	-------	-------	-------	------	--------

obstruent stems: *t d, s z, k h*.

hňet-Ø+ 'knead', met-Ø+ 'sweep', pl'et-Ø+ 'plait, knit'; klad-Ø+ 'place', pred-Ø+ 'spin', ved-Ø+ 'lead'¹³⁸

ňes-Ø+ 'carry', tres-Ø+ 'shake', pas-Ø+ 'pasture', griz-Ø+ 'gnaw', l'ez-Ø+ 'crawl', vez-Ø+ 'transport'¹³⁹

pek-Ø+ 'bake', vl'ek-Ø+ obl'ek-Ø+ 'dress', tluk-Ø+ 'knock', vi-rek-Ø+ 'express'; also cek-Ø+ 'run', with anomalous initial *č* except in past.¹⁴⁰

streh-Ø+ 'guard';¹⁴¹ moh-Ø+ 'be able', pomoh-Ø+ 'help'.¹⁴²

¹³⁴Other **bn*/**bm* stems are here. Generation of *ja* is required both by *prijac prime*, and by the need to account for the *t-c* alternation in *-ňe -cac*. The *j* is deleted from other stems by the general prohibition of /*j*/ after mutated consonants (cf. 9). The alternation of prefixal *ve~v* perhaps is part of broader rules of YR.

¹³⁵The imperative is *vežňi*, by this procedure, or anomalous: *vež vežme vežce*.

¹³⁶Historically, this was *br-a- ber-e-, pvr-a- per-e-* (Lunt 1974 §15.6441). The comparable *dr-a- der-e-* has been influenced by *br-C br-e-* (16.533) and **mer-C *mr-e* (§15.832) > *Slk mre-C mr-e-*. There seems to be some variation in spoken YR among these possibilities, e.g. inf. *drac*.

YR *hnac hnac žene ženu* is historically parallel, but surely is to be regarded as anomalous (prefixed with *na pre rozo u vi za zo*).

¹³⁷Old *kol-C* and *mel-C* with *j*-present, *kol-j-e, mel-j-e* (Lunt 1974 §16.511,513). In YR *l'* in present is generated by normal rules.

¹³⁸By rule 3 in 10 above, 3 plur pres *kladu, hňetu*, etc.

¹³⁹Rule 4 applies: 3 plur. pres. *ňešu, grižu*, etc.

¹⁴⁰Subject to special rule before *c* of infinitive, see 7: *pečic, tlučic, čečic*. The two roots in *-h-* are less straightforward.

pl'esc	pl'etol	pl'ece	pl'ecu	pl'ec	pl'eceni
presc	predol	preze	predu	prez	prezeni
ńesc	ńesol	ńeše	ńešu	ńeš	ńešeni
pečic	pekol	peče	peču	peč	pečeni
pomoči	pomohol	pomože	pomožu	pomož	

Anomalous verbs:

- The root 'drive' is *hna-* before C-endings and *žen-* before V.

hnac	hnal	žeňe	žeňu	žeň	(vi)hnati
------	------	------	------	-----	-----------

- 'Stand up; stop' is *sta+C* but *stan+V*, infinitive *stanuc*.¹⁴³ *vistac* 'get tired; do sg. badly' (*vistati* may be simple adj, not ppp.), *dostac* 'obtain', *nastac* 'start, arise', *ńestac* 'disappear', *ostac* 'remain', *postac* 'become', *prestac* 'cease', *pristac* 'join; agree'.

stanuc/-stac	stal	staňe	staňu	staň	(vistati)
--------------	------	-------	-------	------	-----------

- Six stems have one shape for pres. and inf., and another for other C-suffixes; it would be arbitrary to derive either one from the other. Further, the *l* of mpast is deleted: e.g. inf. *trec* 'to rub'; mpast *tar*, fpast *tarla*, past pass part *tarti*; 3s pres *tre*, 3p *tru*, imv. *tri trice*; also *drec* 'flay', *umrec* 'die', *vrec* 'boil', *-strec* 'spread' (*pre-*), *zo-prec* 'prevent'.

trec	tar tarla	tre	tru	tri	tarti
------	-----------	-----	-----	-----	-------

- The verb 'to eat' has the stem *jed-* except for present 1-3s, 1-2p, which have *j-*; 3p pres has marker *i/a*. Therefore *jem, ješ, je, jeme, jesce, jeza*; imv. *jez jezme jezce*, inf. *jesc*, past *jedol/jed, jedla*, ppp. *jezeni*. Also *ž-/žed-* 'eat up, consume', *žem, žesc*. Similarly 'tell' *poved-/pov-* (*roz-*): *povem pove poveza*; *povez, povesc, poved/povedol povedla, rozpovezeni*.

jesc	jedol/jed	jem ješ je jeme jesce jeza	jez	jezeni
povesc	povedol/-ved	povem poveš ... poveza	povez	povezeni

- The root *bud-* deletes *d* before C: e.g. *za-bud-Ø+1-Ø* → *zabul*. This applies to *zabud-* 'forget', *zdo-bud-* 'obtain', *od-bud-* *še* 'take place' and unprefixed *bud-Ø+* 'be'. The latter has a set of present forms (*buzem buze budu*) with future meaning, and an anomalous present *som ši Ø, sme sce Ø*.

zabuc	zabul	zabuže	zabudu	zabuž	zabuti
buc	bul	som ši	sme sce	buž	

- The root 'go' is *id-* (*-jd-*) for present and infinitive,¹⁴⁴ *išol išla (-šol -šla)* for past: *obisc* 'go around', *odisc* 'go away from', *prisc* 'arrive, come', *rozisc še* 'disperse',

¹⁴¹Forms derivable from *streg-Ø+* are *streže strežu strehol*, as well as inf. *strežic*. There is an alternative infinitive, *strehnuc*.

¹⁴²Special rule produces infinitives *moči, pomoči*, note 116 above; alternatively, there is a fully regularized *pomohnuć pomohnuł pomohla pomohŕe pomohŕu*.

¹⁴³The inf. *stac* is now obsolete or obsolescent in this sense.

¹⁴⁴If made transitive by a prefix, *-id (-jd-)* is base for the passive participle, *obizeni, najzeni*.

visc 'exit', *zisc* 'descend'; *dojsc* 'reach', *najsc* 'find', *pojsc* 'start off',¹⁴⁵ *prejsc* 'cross', *vojsc* 'enter'.

isc	išol išla	ize	idu	iz	
najsc	našol	najze	najdu	najz	najzeni

This verbal system illustrates once again the tangle of items that can be marshalled into orderly patterns, along with the items that are just a bit out of line and those that stubbornly resist fitting into any niche at all. Like all Slavic verbal systems, it exhibits a broad orderly framework that is obscured here and there by errant details and further confused by little pockets of chaos. The productivity of a given paradigm is in no way correlated to formal characteristics; the analyst can do no more than attach descriptive comments. The postulating of ten or a dozen explicit verb-making elements, however, does make it easier to discuss the regularities and the deviations. It is useful to be able to say that "ova- and aj-verbs are still productive, i- and ej-verbs less so" rather than to refer to the "types M, B, C, and S" of Pilbrow's proposal. My ordering of classes here starts with the rule for selection of present-markers (i/a goes with i- and (č)a-verbs, Ø/u with aj-verbs, e/u with all others), but it has no significance in itself. On the whole this is an economical type of description, and above all it affords a framework for comparing these verbal details systematically with the details of other Slavic dialects in time and space.¹⁴⁶ Ideally, it should include a section on the derivation of aspectual pairs of verbs. The creation of secondary imperfectives in particular is an active process in each dialect, and new verbs may well indicate new morphophonemic patterns (cf. note 70 in the main article).

Postscript. I should like to thank Ljubomir Medješi of the Novi Sad publishing house *Ruske Slovo*, and Professor Julijan Ramač and his assistant Mixajlo Frejsa of the University of Novi Sad for materials. Their answers to some last-minute questions [in 1990] have allowed me to eliminate some errors; they are in no way responsible for the mistakes and misunderstandings that surely remain.

¹⁴⁵First person pl imper. *pojzme* is usually shortened to *pome* 'let's go'.

¹⁴⁶Pešikan's brief sketch merely juxtaposes LCoS and Rusin equivalents without pointing out the significant points of change, e.g. that root-final *s*, *z*, *n* in -Ø+ verbs are subject to mutation before the present-marker in all possible forms, but *t* *d* remain in the third plural, so *ñešu*, *vežu*, *šedžu* but *pletu*, *vedu*. For OCS no rule is needed; for YR an older stage of softening consonants before /e/ fits a more general rule, but its extension to 3p requires something like rules 3 and 4 sub §10, above.

References

- Andersen, Henning. "Vocalic and Consonantal Languages," *Studia Linguistica Alexandro Vasiliu Filio Issatschenko a Collegis Amicisque Oblata* (ed. Henrik Birnbaum et al.), 1978. 1-12.
- ASJ = *Atlas slovenského jazyka*, I-IV. Bratislava, 1968-84.
- AUM = *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol II. Kiev, 1988.
- Barič, Evhenija. "Ruski jazik ošviceni z priznačkami zaxodnoslavjanskix i vos-točnoslavjanskix jazikox," *Croatica* 19: 7-19. Zagreb, 1983.
- Bernštejn, S. B., V. M. Ill'ič-Svityč, G. P. Klepikova, T. V. Popova, V. V. Usikova. *Karpatskij dialektologičeskij atlas*. Moscow, 1967.
- Bezljaj, France. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana, 1977-.
- Bidwell, Charles E. "The Language of the Bačka Ruthenians in Yugoslavia," *SEEJ* 10: 32-45. 1966.
- Birnbaum, Henrik. "What is Ukrainian in the Multilayered Speech of the Yugoslav Rusini?" *Annals of the Ukr. Acad. of Arts and Sci. in the US*, no. 39-40, 39-47. 1981-83.
- _____. "Language Families, Linguistic Types, and the Position of the Rusin Micro-language within Slavic," *WdS* 28: 1-23. 1983.
- Broch, Olaf. *Studien von der slovakisch-kleinrussischen Sprachgrenze im östlichen Ungarn* (= *Videnskabselskabets Skrifter. II. Historisk-filosofiske Klasse, No. 5*). Oslo, 1897.
- _____. "Aus der ungarischen Slavenwelt," *AslPh* 21: 49-61. 1899.
- Buffa, Ferdinand. *Nárečie Dl'hej Lúky v Bardejovskom okrese*. Bratislava, 1953.
- Czambel, Samo. *Slovenská reč a jej miesto v rodine slovanských jazykov*. Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1906.
- Dejna, Karol. *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław, Warsaw, Krakow, Gdańsk, 1973.
- Dudok, Daniel. *Nárečie Pivnice v Báčke*. Martin, 1972.
- Duličenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievič. *Slavjanskije literaturnye mikrojazyki*. Tallin, 1981.
- Dzendzelivs'kyj, Josyf A. *Linhvistyčnyj atlas ukrajins'kyx narodnyx hovoriv Zakarpats'koji oblasti URSS (leksyka)*. Č. I-II (= *Naukovi zapysky*, Užhorods'kyj deržavnyj universytet, 34, 42). Užhorod, 1958-60.
- Fejsa, Mixajlo. *Anglijski elementi u ruskim jaziku*. Novi Sad, 1990.
- Gombos: See Kostel'nik.
- Gustavsson, Sven. "Ruski jazik u Jugoslaviji - dijaxronija i sinxronija," *Tvorčosc* 9: 20-30. Novi Sad, 1984.
- Halaga, Ondrej R. *Slovanské osídlenie Potisia a východoslovenskí grékokatolíci*. Košice, 1947.
- Hnatjuk, Volodymyr. *Etnohrafični materijaly z Uhors'koji Rusy II* (= *Etnohrafičnyj zbirnyk*, Naukove tovarystvo im. Ševčenko), L'viv, 1897-98.
- _____. "Rus'ki oseli v Bačci," *Zapysky Tov. Šev.* 22: 1-58. 1898.
- _____. *Etnohrafični materijaly z Uhors'koji Rusy III* (= *Etnohrafičnyj zbirnyk*, t. 9) L'viv, 1900. [reprinted in Latjak, vol. IV, 1986.]

- _____. *Etnohrafyčni materijaly z Uhors'koji Rusy V* (= *Etnografičnyj zbirnyk* 29). L'viv, 1910. [reprinted in Latjak, vol. III, 1986.]
- _____. *Etnohrafyčni materijaly z Uhors'koji Rusy VI* (= *Etnografičnyj zbirnyk* 30). L'viv, 1911. [reprinted in Latjak, vol. II, 1986.]
- _____. *Etnografični materijali z Uhors'keji Rusi, Rozpravi i statji o Rusnacox Bački, Srimu i Slavoniji*. [= Latjak, vol. V, 1988.]
- Horbač (Horbatsch), Oleksa. "Literaturna mova bačvans'ko-srimc'kyx ukrajinciv ('rusyniv)," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka* 169: 265-82. Paris-NY-Munich-Toronto-Sydney, 1962.
- _____. "Leksyka hovirky bačvans'ko-srimc'kyx ukrajinciv," *Naukovyj zbirnyk Muzeju ukrajins'koji kul'tury v Švydnyku* 4: 309-349. 1969.
- Išačenko, Aleksander. "Versuch einer Typologie der slavischen Sprachen," *Linguistica Slovaca* 1/2: 64-76. 1940.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. Review of M. Vrabel', *Uhro-russki narodny spěvanky* (Budapest, 1901), *AslPh* 24 (1901): 620-23.
- Jerković, Jovan, and Radovan Perinac. *Minimalni rečnik srpskohrvatskog jezika: srpsko-hrvatsko-rusinski*. Novi Sad, 1981.
- Jovanović, Gordana. "O rusinskom refleksu praslovenskog nazala ę," in Latjak 1979, pp. 109-114.
- Király, Péter. *A keletiszlovak nyelvjárás nyomatott emléki*. Budapest, 1953.
- _____. "Beiträge zur Frage der Mundartmischung (Ursprung und Ausgestaltung der slow. Mundart von Tótkomlós)," *Studia Slavica* 8:339-77. Budapest, 1962.
- Klepikova, G. P., ed. *Karpatzkaja dialektologija i onomastika*. Moscow, 1972.
- Kniezsza, István. *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényiszavai*. Budapest, 1955.
- Kočiš, Mikola M. *Macerinska bešeda*, 1-3. Novi Sad, 1965-68.
- _____. *Pravopis ruskoho jazika, školske vidanje*. Novi Sad, 1971.
- _____. *Gramatika ruskoho jazika*. Novi Sad, 1974.
- _____. *Lingvistični roboti*. Novi Sad, 1978.
- Kol'esarov, Julijan D. M. *Nasilne odnarodzovaže Rusnacox u Slovackej 1978*. Montreal, 1979.
- Kostel'nik, Havrijil. *Gramatika bačvanjsko-ruskej bešedi* [Sr. Karlovci]. 1923, reprint in 1975.
- _____. *Poezija* (ed. Djura Papharhaji). Novi Sad, 1970.
- _____. *Proza na bačvansko-srimskim ruskim literaturnim jaziku* (ed. Djura Latjak). Novi Sad, 1975.
- Laboš, Fedor. *Istorija Rusinox Bačkeji, Srimu i Slavoniji 1745-1918*. Vukovar, 1979.
- Latjak, Djura, ed. *Ruski jazik i literatura 1978 / Rusinski jezik i književnost 1978*. Novi Sad, 1979.
- _____. *Etnografični materijaly z Uhors'koji Rusy*, by V. Hnatjuk, vols I-IV, Novi Sad, 1985-1986.
- _____. *Etnografični materijali z Uhorskeji Rusi*, by V. Hnatjuk, vol. V. Novi Sad, 1988.

- Lunt, Horace G. Review of N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik* (Vienna 1952). *Language* 31:117-24, 1955.
- _____. "On Slavic Structural Loans in Rumanian," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 4: 66-77, 1966.
- _____. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*⁶. The Hague, 1974.
- _____. *The Progressive Palatalization of Common Slavic*. Skopje, 1981.
- _____. "How Close is Russian to Old Church Slavonic?" in *The Language and Verse of Russia*. In Honor of Dean S. Worth on his Sixty-fifth Birthday, ed. Henrik Birnbaum and Michael S. Flier (= *UCLA Slavic Studies*, New Series, Vol. II), pp. 198-204. Moscow, 1995.
- _____. "Common Slavic, Proto-Slavic, Pan-Slavic: What Are We Talking About? I. About Phonology," *IJSLP* 41: 7-68, 1997.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. *Let's Speak Rusyn*. Englewood, NJ, 1976.
- _____. *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies, An Annotated Bibliography, Volume I: 1975-1984*. NY-London, 1988.
- Marvan, Jiří. "Vojvodina's Rusinian and its Ukrainian Component," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 10/1: 73-81, 1985.
- Medješi, Helena, and Pavlina Sabadoš. *Minimalni slovnjnik rusko-horvatski*. Novi Sad, 1989.
- Mirković, Dragutin J. *Govori Čeha u Slavoniji (Daruvar i okolina)*. Belgrade, 1968.
- Ossadnik, Eva Maria. "Das Russinische in der Bačka," *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 31:145-50, 1985.
- Pastrnek, František. Review of Hnatjuk 1898 ("Rus'ki"), *Listy filologické*: 404-406, 1898.
- Pauliny, Eugen. *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny*. Bratislava, 1947.
- _____. *Fonologický vývin slovenčiny*. Bratislava, 1963.
- Pešikan, Mitar. "Istorijske osnove rusinskog glagolskog sistema," in *Latjak* 1979. pp. 115-128.
- Pilbrow, Tim. "Inflectional Morphology of the Verb in the Rusinian Language of Vojvodina," *IJSLP* 35-36: 151-169, 1987.
- Pohl, Heinz Dieter. "Die Rusinen - ein Volksstamm slowakischer Herkunft in Jugoslawien," *Der Donauraum* XX 1/2: 40-46. Vienna, 1975.
- Rac, Janko D. "Slovnjnik biologijnyx terminox i virazox, serbskohorvatsko-ruski," *Tvorčosc* 5: 65-105. Novi Sad, 1979.
- Rajnoch, Karl. "Die ostslowakische Sprache und Literatur," *Slovak Studies* 19:21-74. Rome, 1979.
- Rašič, Nikola. "O pitanju rusko-horvatske identiteta," *Tvorčosc* 11: 70-77, 1985.
- Sima, František. "Vychodoslovenské valal," *Jazykovedné štúdie* 10: 24-37, 1949.
- Sipos, István. *Geschichte der slowakischen Mundarten des Bükk-Gebirges*. Budapest, 1958.
- Sobolevskij, A. I. "Ne russkie a slovaki!" *Ètnografičeskoe obozrenie*, 1898/4: 147-49, 1898.
- Sopka, Djura. "Varvarizmi njemeckoho poxodzenja u našim jaziku," *Tvorčosc* 2/2: 25-32. Novi Sad, 1975.

- Stanislav, Jan. *Dejiny slovenského jazyka I. Úvod a hláskoslovie*³. Bratislava, 1967.
- Štolc, Jozef. *Nárečie troch slovenských ostrovov v Maďarsku*. Bratislava, 1949.
- Švagrovský, Stefan. "K otázke genézy a konštituovania jazyka juhoslovanských Rusínov (Rusniakov)," *Slavica Slovaca* 19: 248-263, 1984.
- Tamaš, Julijan. "Značenje i mogućivoci rusinističnih vyhljedovan'ox u nauki o jazyku, literaturi, folklore i istoriji," *Tvorčosc V/7* (1981): 10-14.
- _____. "Volodimir Hnatjuk i identitet Rusnacox Uhorskej i Juhoslaviji," in Latjak 1988, pp. 297-358.
- Tichý, Fraňo R. "Rusíni jazyka slovenského," *Kultúrny život* No. 2, vol. 2: 5. Bratislava, 1947.
- Timko, Oksana. "Rusinski jezik," *SOL Lingvisticki časopis* 8: 122-28. Zagreb, 1989.
- Tolstoj, Nikita Il'ič. "Iz geografii slavjanskix slov: 7. pot-znoj," In Klepikova 1972, pp. 248-257.
- Trubačev, Oleg N. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*. Moscow, 1974-.
- Udvari, Ištvan. "O cerkovnoslavjanskix i rusijskix elementox u bačvansko-srimskim ruskim jazyku," *Švetosc* 27: 369-90. Novi Sad, 1990.
- Váňa, Zdeněk. *The World of the Ancient Slavs*. Detroit, 1983.
- Witkowski, Wiesław. "O Baczvaricax i ich jazyku," *Slavia orientalis* 32/1: 3-18. 1984.

*Slavic Department, Boylston 301
Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138*