Acta Slavica Iaponica, Tomus 35, pp. 135-145

Featured Review

To the Memory of a Friend
(Stefan Pugh, 1956–2013)

Between an Imagined Language and a Codified Dialect

Pugh, Stefan M., *The Rusyn Language: A Grammar of the Literary Standard of Slovakia with Reference to Lemko and Subcarpathian Rusyn* (Munich, 2009), viii, 224 pp. (Languages of the World/Materials, 476)

Stefan M. Pugh's grammar of the Rusyn language is an ambitious attempt to create the first English-language grammar of the literary and standard variant of Prešov Rusyn (p. 18). As the author points out, this is the first description of Rusyn in a systematic, rigorous, and comparative way unlike a few previous contributions to the study of this language published in the 2000s in German by Aleksander Teutsch and Marc Stegherr, and in English by Juraj Vaňko (p. 9).[1] Even a cursory look into the table of contents of Pugh's grammar allows us to conclude that the author did an admirable job of researching and describing Rusyn, which he treats as a separate East Slavic language. The quality of his study is not surprising since Pugh is well known for his works on East Slavic. A leading specialist in literary Ukrainian, he authored, in particular, two exemplary studies of Middle and Modern Ukrainian.[2]

The grammar, among its many virtues, is coherently presented and structured. The reader will relish not only the description of linguistic phenomena but also some historical and comparative digressions, dealing primarily with the adjacent Slovak language and Modern Ukrainian. The latter language is mentioned here and there throughout the entire text, thus being used as a kind of yardstick against which the linguistic separateness of Rusyn is postulated. In addition to a preface, acknowledgments and a selected bibliography, the volume contains chapters on orthography and phonology, declensional morphology, verbal morphology, the adverb, morphosyntax and syntax, capped by sample texts. The sample texts, however, are less representative than envisioned—it has two extracts from school textbooks, one excerpt from a novella, one poem, a folkloric extract and a prose selection with a clear folkloric foundation (pp. 206–216). The author, however, is hardly to blame for this largely *dialectal* selection since Rusyn is underrepresented in major functional domains, including mass media. What is disconcerting in the volume under consideration is the absence of a word index from which the reader would benefit immensely.

As a recompense, however, the book is supplied with an afterword and a "look forward" which are likely to appeal, in the main, to the ideologically engaged "activists" rather than to a cohort of Slavists truly interested in this linguistic system. At this point, I deem it necessary to express major reservations about the alleged existence of literary Rusyn in conjunction with the sociolinguistic background of Rusyn as reconstructed by the author. The major problem of Pugh's discussion of the status of Rusyn is that the author does not stop short of delving into political vagaries of "non-threatening ethnic and linguistic awakening that today's activists strive for" (p. 219). Pugh, in particular, notes the different degrees of awareness of ethnic identity among the various subgroups of Rusyns that exists today: either their identity was limited by geographic or traditional [?—A. D.] factors, or they were told, he laments, who they were, e.g., "Ukrainians," etc. (p. 219). I am not going to open a new round of debates, conducted on a regular basis by the defenders of the opposite viewpoint, but I believe that both arguments shoot into the wild blue. There are no grounds for claiming that the Rusyn self-identification was suppressed to that extent in the people's memory. Quite on the contrary, despite numerous endurances it has always remained vital among the Rusyns. I will provide only one example. Thus, Pugh writes enthusiastically about the 1920s and 1930s in the First Republic of Czechoslovakia when the Rusyn-speaking regions were not seriously depopulated by the lure of the city and factory, and Rusyn-Slovak bilingualism was not the rule in the countryside (p. 219). He forgets, however, to mention the Ukrainian orientation of the *autonomous* Subcarpathian administration, which was formed after Czechoslovakia having been transformed into the federative republic in 1938. Neither does Pugh mention the name Carpatho-*Ukraine* taken by the province, which on March 15, 1939 proclaimed its independence in the midst of fighting with the Hungarian fascist invaders. It is not then surprising, in this context, that the assimilationist Hungarian government favored the Rusynophile orientation and made an effort to convince the local population that they constituted a separate Uhro-Rusyn rather than Ukrainian nationality[3]

---

[1] Aleksander Teutsch, *Das Rusinische der Ostslowakei im Kontekst seiner Nachbarsprachen* (Heidelberg: Peter Lang, 2001); Marc Stegherr, *Das Russinische: Kulturhistorische und soziolinguistische Aspekte* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 2003); Juraj Vaňko, *The Language of Slovakia's Rusyns* (New York: Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, 2000).

[2] Stefan M. Pugh, *Testament to Ruthenian: A Linguistic Analysis of the Smotryc'kyj Variant* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1996); Stefan M. Pugh and Ian Press, *Ukrainian: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London, New York: Routledge, 1999).

On the whole, the afterward together with the "look forward" can hardly fit into the linguistic narrative of the grammar. Thus, revealing its *doppelgänger* nature, Pugh's grammar warrants two reviews. One of them should deal with the populist digressions in the introductory chapter taken together with the afterward and "look forward," which do distract the attention away from numerous achievements of the work under consideration. Finally, the second review might focus on linguistic merits of the rest of the chapters providing the overall description of Rusyn. However, fused largely together, the structure and the twofold content of Pugh's grammar do not allow for such an opportunity. I will try nevertheless to separate the ideologically tinged non-linguistic content from true linguistic values of the grammar.

The afterward, the "look forward," and the introductory chapter appear rather contentious. Along with Lemko, Subcarpathian, i.e., Transcarpathian in Slavic studies, and Vojvodina (the Rusyn of former Yugoslavia), the author claims that Prešov Rusyn is already an established written "norm" in East Slovakia (p. 8). Without solving the problem of "what is a dialect" vs. "what is a language" with regard to Rusyn, Pugh argues that Rusyn is a language that is close to Ukrainian but that is clearly not merely a dialect of Ukrainian (p. 1). In advancing the said linguistic puzzle, the author leans heavily on the non-linguistic argumentation propagated by Paul R. Magocsi who, in order to prove the existence of a separate language, formulates the situation in terms both of the individual and history. One of the "historical" arguments, endorsed by Pugh, is that Subcarpathian Rus′ was never part of a political union with "Ukraine" until after World War II (p. 2), although, as other Slavic languages demonstrate, this can hardly serve as the decisive argument in positing the literary status of a language. Being cognizant of several "regional standards" of Rusyn, the author chooses nevertheless that one codified in 1995 (proclaimed on January 27th of that year) in Slovakia since this variant has been the subject of a series of studies and is likely to take on, as he believes, the function of a so-called pan-Rusyn literary koine (p. 8).

---

[3] Elaine Rusinko, *Straddling Borders: Literature and Identity in Subcarpathian Rus'* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), pp. 408–409.

Pugh neglects the arguments and factual material as discussed or described by leading specialists in Ukrainian. Among them, I will name, for instance, a seminal book, *Ukrajins′ki hovory Pidkarpats′koji Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej* (cited by Pugh *en passant* on pp. 3 and 84) by Ivan Pan′kevyč and the dialectal *Atlas ukrajins′koji movy*.[4] The latter is conspicuously absent from the bibliography together with other serious studies dealing with Southwest and West Ukrainian (Vasyl′ Nimčuk, Pavlo Čučka, Vasyl′ Doboš and others).

There are two most debatable caveats in Pugh's reasoning, which affect the discussion of the material in his grammar.

First, from the point of view of dialectology, Pugh regrets that many of the later studies of Rusyn and features of Rusyn were treated as part of the general study of the southwestern Ukrainian dialects (p. 4). One might wonder, the author asks rhetorically, why these dialects have been of such interest: it is, according to him, because they are fascinating, and quite unlike "Ukrainian" (p. 4). As follows from Pugh's logic, a true scholar, seeing descriptive terms like "southwestern Ukrainian" or "Transcarpathian dialects," terminological lepers in Rusyn studies, should view them as roughly equivalent to "Rusyn" (p. 4). Interpreting this declaration impressionistically, nobody would dispute the dialectal variety of the Ukrainian-speaking territories. Neither would anybody refute, due to conspicuous dialectal differences, the fact that sometimes a *Sloboda* dialect speaker may feel uncomfortable in communicating with a Transcarpathian speaker. No wonder also that East Ukrainian has been routinely dabbed a distorted Russian and West Ukrainian a deformed Polish.

According to Pugh (p. 11), the geolinguistics differs in different parts of Ukraine—its West is more dialectally differentiated while the eastern and southern parts of Ukraine are dialectally more homogenous, a fact which is easily observed in the dialectal *Atlas ukrajins′koji movy*. But I find it problematic to agree with Pugh's readiness to sign off on some of the westernmost (archaic) Ukrainian dialects as *non*-Ukrainian. Otherwise, *Sloboda* Ukrainian can be treated as a separate linguistic entity, although still related to Southwest Ukrainian as an "East Slavic language." Indeed, the *malorossijskaja* (Little Russian) literature was created with the help of the "regional language" (*Sloboda* Ukrainian). However, it should also be borne in mind that the "Little Russian" variety of Ukrainian contributed to the formation of several regional Ukrainian literary standards in the 19th century which are Central Dnieper, Galician, Bukovyna, and

---

[4] Ivan Pan′kevych, *Ukrajins′ki hovory Pidkarpats′koji Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej* (Prague: Orbis, 1938); *Atlas ukrajins′koji movy*, vol. 1: *Polissja, serednja Naddniprjanščyna i sumižni zemli*; vol. 2: *Volyn′, Naddnistrjanščyna, Zakarpattja i sumižni zemli*; 3: *Slobožanščyna, Doneččyna, nyžnja Naddniprjanščyna, Pryčornomorja i sumižni zemli* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984–2001).

Transcarpathian, with an exception perhaps of Rusyn (Bačvan Sremska) used in the Serbian- and Croatian-speaking milieu.[5]

Finally, from the point of view of sociolinguistics, the alleged existence of codified (Prešov) Rusyn chosen by Pugh as an object of his study (p. 1) is at odds with the actual material sorted out by the author for discussion. I venture to claim that the whole theory about contemporary standard Rusyn is yet a product of wishful thinking of those who are preoccupied by the idea of an ethnic, cultural, and linguistic separateness of the Rusyn people. Interestingly, while calling Prešov Rusyn "a literary, standard variant" (p. 18), Pugh has to admit that at present the language of the Rusyns is still largely the language of rural communities. He hopes, however, that "the level of Rusyn on the intellectual plane" will be raised due to the introduction of the language in schools and the establishment of Rusyn as a subject of study at some universities (p. 14). One can legitimately ask if any literary Rusyn exists then at this moment and *objectively* needs codification? Pugh regrets that this literary standard does not have a Lev Tolstoy, but one can be certain, according to him, that there is a Rusyn Shakespeare or Oskar Wilde (or perhaps more) in the making at the time of his writing (p. 14).

True, it is difficult to ascertain the state of the "literary activity in all Rusyn communities" as well as the quality of "many fine literary works" published mostly in Transcarpathia, including translations of the Holy Scriptures (p. 17). Yet it will be more appropriate, in the case of Rusyn, to welcome the appearance of a *literatus* comparable with Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovjanenko rather than the above-mentioned Russian and British writers, so linguistically and ideologically distant from Rusyn. Moreover, the level of codification, undertaken by a few enthusiasts some twenty years ago, today is still so low that it would be premature to claim that Prešov Rusyn does already exist, to use Pugh's words, as a "literary, standard variant." I wonder if one can compare it with the level of codification in the biblical translations made by Dymytrij Sydor, a priest of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and a moonlighting normalizer of Rusyn based on Southwest Ukrainian likewise. Due to space constraints, I will omit discussing the details of his idiostyle which has been masterfully analyzed by Nimčuk.[6] A Transcarpathian native and an expert in the Biblical translations, Nimčuk argues that Sydor knows the local dialect (Rusyn) poorly, thus using in his high-style translations a helpless mix of the Transcarpathian system with Church Slavonic, Russian, and literary Ukrainian. Even more amateurish is Sydor's grammar, which was published in 2005 under a pretentious title, *Hramatyka rusyns'koho języka iz Jevanheli-*

---

[5] P. E. Gricenko [Hrycenko], "Nekotorye zamečanija o dialektnoj osnove ukrainskogo literaturnogo jazyka," in V. N. Toporov, ed., *Philologia slavica: k 70-letiju akademika N. I. Tolstogo* (Moscow: Nauka, 1993), pp. 284–294; cf. Andrii Danylenko, "The Formation of New Standard Ukrainian: From the History of an Undeclared Contest between Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine in the 18th Century," *Die Welt der Slaven* 53:1 (2008), pp. 82–115; Andrii Danylenko, "A New Ukrainian Standard Language of 1798: Tradition vs. Innovation," in Christina Y. Bethin and David M. Bethea, eds., *American Contributions to the 14th International Congress of Slavists* (Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 2008), pp. 59–74; Andrii Danylenko, "Forward into the Past, or How to Particularize New Standard Ukrainian," *Slavic and East European Journal* 53:3 (2009), pp. 471–476.

[6] Vasyl' Nimčuk, "Ukrajins'ki pereklady Sv. Pys'ma," in *Sučasni problemy movoznavstva ta literaturoznavstva* 4: *Ukrajins'ke i slovjans'ke movoznavstvo* (Užhorod, 2001), pp. 383–389.

jem od Matfeja. Emulating anachronistically his predecessors' grammars, Sydor's work is criticized even by some supporters of the ethnic and linguistic separateness of the Rusyns. Thus, although extolling Sydor's contribution in the strengthening of Rusyn identity, Pfandl can't help but acknowledge Sydor's incompetence in matters linguistic.[7] To be sure, a more detailed analysis of the Gospels translated from Church Slavonic into Prešov Rusyn by Fr. František Krajňák of the Slovak Association of Rusyn Organizations and Josif Kudzej is needed.

The level of linguistic training of the normalizers of Rusyn also leaves much to be desired. To mention recent textbooks of Rusyn, their authors Vasyl' Jabur and Anna Pliškova erroneously argue, for example, that the formation of perfectives from imperfectives in Rusyn involves, in particular, the loss of a vocalic element as found in *umerty* derived purportedly from *umeraty* 'to die'; Pugh correctly points out (p. 137) that the perfective is actually the base form and the imperfective is formed by means of the suffix *a*.

In the view of Rusyn's low codification, reflected in literary works and translations, compiled sometimes in a hereditary hybrid (*jazyčie*) of Transcarpathian features intermingled with Church Slavonic, Russian, and Ukrainian, one can wonder as to what is in fact described by Pugh in his grammar—a "literary, standard variant" or a sum of rural dialects? There are solid grounds for claiming that Rusyn in Pugh's volume is a mere attestation of dialectal forms, sorted out randomly by some local enthusiasts and transferred by the author to his grammar. In other words, the material discussed by Pugh looks intrinsically dialectal and, what is more arresting in this case, Southwest Ukrainian at its core. Yet many of the southwestern Ukrainian features tend to become obscured in Pugh's grammar because of the postulated literary status of Rusyn. The logic of the author is straightforward—if Rusyn is codified then the relevant Ukrainian material should also be excerpted, by default, from literary Ukrainian. It comes therefore as no surprise that the variety of variants in literary Rusyn appears at odds with the corresponding "distilled" features in standard Ukrainian, based predominantly on East Ukrainian with an admixture of other dialects. In other words, any representative feature in Rusyn would contrast *for certain*, no matter the methods, with a parallel form in standard (Southeast) Ukrainian. Taken for granted, this procedure will inadvertently prove the otherness of Rusyn in comparison with Ukrainian, although the latter exists in several regional variants neglected in Pugh's discussion.

I will return now to the "linguistic part" of the grammar which looks, as I said, exemplary in many ways. For instance, the chapter on orthography and phonology provides exhaustive information on alternations and consonantal phonetics (assimilations, dissimilations, and neutralizations) (pp. 21–42). There are, however, some debatable theses in this chapter. For instance, Pugh postulates the existence of diphthongs in Rusyn (Southwest Ukrainian, by extension) as represented by the elements 'vowel + glide,' e.g., *pr*[aw]*da* 'truth' (p. 27). This hypothesis is phonologically unsustainable. Ukrainian knows only diphthongal sounds which happen to be reflexes of the etymological *o* and *e*, as well as *ě* in the newly closed syllables in North Ukrainian as first described by Hancov.[8] Surprisingly, when speaking about vowel alternations like *dim*—*doma* (G) 'house', *kin'*—*konja* (G) 'horse' and the like (p. 30), the author avoids using the term *ikavism*—is it because the term is used in Ukrainian linguistics and, by default, is not applicable to Rusyn as the allegedly non-Ukrainian dialect?

---

[7] Heinrich Pfandl, "Die Windischen der Ukrainer oder die Kurden Europas?" *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 54 (2008), pp. 105–123. Strangely enough, Pfandl demonstrates a curious logic in praising Sydor's public activities. Turning a blind eye on the long-standing engagement of the Russians in the region and the Russophile movement long ago instigated in the region by the Russian Empire, this scholar argues that Sydor's belonging to the Moscow Patriarchate is in harmony with his "zealous propaganda" of Rusyn. What a twist of logic in the light of the purportedly colonial politics of Ukraine toward its own citizens, Rusyns, in Transcarpathia; see also pp. 2–3 in Pugh's book under consideration. No less problematic is the linguistic argumentation of a leading codifier of Rusyn in Slovakia, Anna Pliškova [Plishkova], cf. Andrii Danylenko's review of her *Language and National Identity: Rusyns South of Carpathian*, published in 2009, in *Canadian Papers* 52:3–4 (2010), pp. 471–473.

Assimilation of voicelessness (devoicing) like *ba*[p]*ka* 'grandmother', [f]*čora* 'yesterday' as well as word-final devoicing like *mu*[š] set Rusyn, according to Pugh (pp. 38–39), apart from Ukrainian, but it is not to be seen as a divergence from Ukrainian; rather, it is Ukrainian, as the author points out, that is the odd man out, as it is the only language in the continuum stretching from Russian in the northeast to West Slavic in the southwest in which the loss of voice does not happen (pp. 38–39). There are two oddities in the said reasoning.

First, the geography of the East Slavic continuum needs a typological reinterpretation. The question of devoicing in East Slavic has been discussed, among others, by Flier, according to whom, a northern pattern (most Russian and northern Belarusian dialects) shows the marks of a phonemic voicing system with neutralization before all obstruents, whereas a southern pattern presents evidence of phonemic protensity (tenseness) with voicing as a redundant feature, or traces of it.[9] Remarkably, the latter pattern is characteristic of most eastern Ukrainian dialects and Modern Ukrainian, which demonstrate partial neutralization of the type *pro*[z'b]*a* 'request', as opposed to western Ukrainian dialects, including western Polissian, Volhynian, Dniester, Podolian, Bukovyna, and southwestern Ukrainian dialects, which show complete neutralization: *du*[šk]*a* 'arc' (dim.), and, in case of the most advanced southwestern dialects, before a word boundary (*di*[*t*]# 'grandfather'), including the pharyngeal *h*, although in a smaller territory as compared with the dentals and labials.[10] The above typology of voicing sandhi seems to be out of line with Pugh's argumentation in that, from a historical perspective, one can assume that proto-Ukrainian had a phonemic protensity system that developed earliest in Southwest Ukrainian, is changing from a protensity to a voicing system farther east (West Ukrainian), but is maintained in East Ukrainian and Modern Ukrainian.[11] This is why Pugh's claim that Rusyn [f]*čora* in contrast to Ukrainian [u]*čora* / [w]*čora* 'yesterday', is also possible because of spelling pronunciation under the influence of long contact with Russian (p. 38) looks very contentious—[f] *krav*, [f]*čera* and the like are typical of the Southwest Ukrainian phonological system.[12]

---

[8] Vsevolod Hancov, "Xarakterystyka polis'kyx dyftonhiv i šljaxy jix fonetyčnoho rozvytku," *Zapysky Istoryčno-Filolohičnoho Viddilu* 2–3 (1920–1922) (Kyiv, 1922), pp. 116–144.

[9] Michael S. Flier, "Segmentation, Rank, and Natural Class in Ukrainian Dialectology," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 18:1–2 (1994), pp. 137–153; cf. Andrii Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica: Ukrainian in Context* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 2006), pp. 189–191.

[10] *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol. 3, part 3, pp. 243–244.

[11] Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, p. 190.

Second, the term "Ukrainian" used by Pugh in the context of Rusyn devoicing is misleading inasmuch as the author does not specify which literary variant of Ukrainian he means. The complete neutralization as an indigenous phenomenon is also observed in many northern and southeastern Ukrainian dialects. Moreover, this type of devoicing is found in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century writings of Taras Ševčenko, Lesja Ukrajinka, Pavlo Tyčyna, Lina Kostenko and many other authors who are speakers of different Ukrainian dialects; some scholars propose to treat this devoicing as a norm.[13] Clearly, the concept of "Modern Ukrainian" is taken too "narrowly" by Pugh.

Chapter on declensional morphology marshals the existing declensional patterns and offers in-depth comments on spelling variations and parallel forms in Lemko and Subcarpathian (pp. 43–104). Morphemic notation in some cases is, however, dubious as in suffixes "the primary function of which is to create nouns specifically expressing feminine biological gender," e.g., *-arnja*, *-ka*, *-ička* and the like instead of *-arnj-a*, *-k-a*, *-ičk-a* where *-a* is the gender desinence and not part of the suffix as simplified by Pugh (p. 68). Among interesting phenomena, Pugh mentions "a new vocative characteristic of the spoken language" derived through the loss of the nominative singular marker *-a*, hence *mam*! (< *mama* 'mother') next to *mamo*! (V) (p. 47). The author compares this truncated form with the analogous forms in Russian suggesting that there is a tendency for the vocative to develop across East Slavic (p. 47). Interestingly, new vocative expressions can develop not only in an East Slavic language with a declensional system but also in languages without case inflection as in some Romance languages.[14] Discussing relative pronouns, Pugh notes *inter alia* that pronominal forms are followed as a rule by *što* and *xto*, although in practice one does also find *što* after nouns, occasionally even in reference to animate beings (p. 87). I would add here that the use of this relativizer with the resumptive pronoun is typologically representative of all the Ukrainian dialects while *kotryj* and *jakyj* in the same function are supported by the parallel forms in the neighboring languages (Slovak–Polish–Russian).[15]

The section on numerals (pp. 90–104) is particularly informative. It contains a variety of dialectal expressions of quantity, including cardinal, ordinal, collective numerals, and other numerals. Among some oddities Pugh mentions the element *-tsjat-*, "distilled from *-dtsjat'-*" which occurs in the teens but no longer expresses any connection to '10', whence *stotsjatyj* 'one hundredth', *dvastodtsjatyj* 'two hundredth' and so forth (p. 98). Of interest are also fractions, in particular *pivdruha* '1.5', *pivtretja* '2.5' and the like. Pugh argues that this formation does not occur in standard Ukrainian since dictionaries cite two of them (*pivtretja* and *pivčverta/ pivčvarta*), but describe them as "dialect" forms (i.e., most likely from the southwestern [Ukrainian] dialects, or Rusyn)

---

[12] F. T. Žylko, *Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy*, 2nd ed. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1966), p. 179.

[13] S. I. Dorošenko, "Ohlušennja dzvinkyx u kinci slova: orfoepična norma ukrajins'koji movy," in *Linhvistyčni doslidžennja* 1 (Xarkiv: Xarkivs'kyj deržavnyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. H. S. Skovorody, 1998), pp. 3–11.

[14] Franck Floricic, "La morphologie du vocatif: l'exemple du sarde," *Vox romanica* 61 (2002), pp. 151–177.

[15] Andrii Danylenko, *Predykaty, vidminky i diatezy d ukrajins'kij movi. Istoryčnyj i typolohičnyj aspekty* (Xarkiv: Oko), pp. 188–194.

(p. 101). First, much more formations of this type are attested in different dialects and reflected in Ukrainian dictionaries and reference books.[16] Second, these formations, as well as other quantitative expressions were quite common in *standard* Ukrainian before it was literally purged as a result of the abrogation of the policy of Ukrainianization in the 1930s.[17] The same caveat applies to the syntax of quantity (pp. 191–196). To take the construction *pryšlo 21 študentiv* (Gpl) treated as representative in Rusyn (p. 192), it is attested in the Dniester dialects and treated as a result of Polish interference.[18] It is tempting therefore to ask the author which "modern Ukrainian" he means in his argumentation, the pre- or the post-purged Ukrainian? Not quite idle question since the author declared to be objective in his study of Rusyn in its relation to Slovak and Ukrainian.

Chapter 4 on verbal morphology is devoted to conjugational patterns and verbal-stem-types (pp. 105–162). What is particularly useful in the description of these types is stresses supplied throughout the corresponding sections, because, as the author correctly argues, this is an important feature of Prešov Rusyn vis-à-vis the rest of East Slavic (p. 108), e.g., Rusyn (Southwest Ukrainian) *ukážu* next to Central Dnieper Ukrainian *ukažú* (1 sg. pres.) 'to show' (p. 122). Overall, this chapter presents a very detailed analysis driven by the desire to describe all the peculiarities of most representative paradigms and stressing patterns. The author describes the differences between the aspects, with a special emphasis on the so-called gradation ('Ablaut'), e.g., perfective *načaty*—imperfective *načinaty* 'to begin,' although, I believe, the notion of degrees of action ('Aktionsart') should be addressed in a more systematic way.

The tense system in Rusyn shows both synthetic and analytic forms. Interestingly, the "synthetic" imperfective future like *čytatymu* 'I will read' is not found in Rusyn (p. 139) as well as, I would add, in Southwest Ukrainian, in general.[19] There are in Rusyn two past tense formations. One of them is the basic ("synthetic") past tense as in many Slavic languages like *ja pysav*, and the second is a more specific ("analytic") past tense formation, e.g., *pysav jem* 'I wrote' (pp. 107–108) which allegedly demonstrate no real functional difference (p. 140), thus reflecting parallel tendencies in the formation of the past tense; the feminine forms are separated in writing by a hyphen, e.g., *pysala-m* which is a mere convention. Pugh adds that other elements can occur between the two principal parts of the construction, i.e., the "personal marker" and the form in *-v* (< *l*), e.g., *skadȳ jes' sja tu vzjav* 'how (by what route) did you get here?' (p. 140). The order of elements in such a construction should be elucidated in more detail. The auxiliary clitic (rather than the personal marker!) in Southwest Ukrainian, including Rusyn, tends to get *degrammatized* for tense, while drifting from Wackernagel second position to become a past-tense person-and-number ending. The placing of the clitic mentioned by Pugh is linked to the grammaticalization chain, which has not been completed in Southwest Ukrainian where the auxiliaries occur routinely either as second-position or verb-adjacent clitics.[20]

---

[16] Serhii Smerečyns'kyj, *Narysy z ukrasjins'koji syntaksy* (Xarkiv: Radjans'ka škola, 1932), p. 111.

[17] George Y. Shevelov, *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century: 1900–1941* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1989), pp. 140, 141–147.

[18] Smerečyns'kyj, *Narysy z ukrasjins'koji syntaksy*, p. 115; George Y. Shevelov, *The Syntax of Modern Literary Ukrainian: The Simple Sentence* (The Hague: Mouton, 1963), p. 242.

[19] Andrii Danylenko, "Naskil'ky ukrajins'kyj syntetyčnyj majbutnij čas je syntetyčnym?" *Movoznavstvo* 4–5 (2010), pp. 113–121.

The conditional in Rusyn involves both person and tense, with the auxiliary conditional clitic either frozen, as in all the most East Slavic dialects, or inflected as evidenced in the first and second singular forms, e.g., *pysav bŷm* 'I should write,' *pysav bŷs'* 'you would write' (p. 150). Pugh argues that Rusyn differs from literary Ukrainian in the ability *morphologically* to express the fact that the conditional statement is definitely in the past, e.g, *(vin) bŷv bŷ pysav* 'he would have written' (pp. 150–151). What is significant in this case is that morphologically the past conditional occurs in the Dniester, Central Dnieper and other Ukrainian dialects, as well as in Modern Ukrainian, for instance in the language of Taras Ševčenko.[21]

Variegated adverbial forms are discussed in the chapter on adverb (pp. 163–175). Of interest are deadjectival adverbs marked by the formants *-o* or *-ï* (which are semantically and functionally indistinguishable), or rarely *-e.* The existence of many doublets like *jasno* and *jasnï* 'clearly' is not all uncommon in Slavic, as Old Church Slavonic evidence shows: *bistro—bystrě* 'quickly' (p. 164). Due to the treatment of Rusyn dialectal material as literary (standard), thus putting the cart before the horse, Pugh argues somewhat ambiguously that perfectly normal constructions without any indication of motion in the adverb like *de ideš*? 'where are you going?' are not acceptable in "the other standard East Slavic languages" (p. 166). To put the cart back after the horse, such constructions are characteristic also of the Galician and Bukovyna variants of literary Ukrainian; incidentally, they are observed also in the Russian dialects.[22]

A true treasure-trove of dialectal patterns and forms, chapter 6 deals with morphosyntax and syntax (pp. 176–205). The author offers a survey of prepositional constructions as well as a comprehensive description of particles, conjunctions, and interjections, including the so-called "verbal interjections," or onomatopoeic words like *bux* 'thump!' (p. 202); it bears emphasizing that such interjections are associated with and ultimately derived from the verbs in *-nu-* with a notion of one-time action of the type *buxnuty*.[23] Among peculiar syntactic patterns, Pugh addresses the word order of genitival phrases. In addition to *book student*-G which is typical of East Slavic, the order *student*-G *book* is in fact found as well, "if not terribly often," e.g., *popa sŷn* 'a priest's son' (p. 178). In fact, that is an archaic word order. Since it is linked to verb-final order in the Indo-European simple sentence[24] it would be interesting to probe if the order *student*-G *book* tends to occur in sentences with the basic word order SOV.

---

[20] Žylko, *Narysy*, pp. 100, 187.

[21] Jurij Šerex [George Y. Shevelov], *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (Munich: Molode Žyttja, 1951), p. 313.

[22] V. V. Nimčuk, "Slovotvir pryslivnykiv imennykovoho (bez pryjmennykiv) poxodžennja v zakarpac'kyx hovirkax," *Praci XII Respublikans'koji dialektolohičnoji narady* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1971), p. 266.

[23] Danylenko, *Predykaty*, pp. 222–223, also "The Chicken or the Egg? Onomatopoeic Particles and Verbs in Lithuanian and East Slavic," in Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet, and Brjörn Wiemer, eds., *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics* [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs] (Berlin, etc.: Mouton de Gruyter, forthcoming).

[24] Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, p. 327.

Among the prepositions, deserving of attention are *k*, *ku*, and *id* (p. 181) occurring with the dative not only in Rusyn but also in many other southwestern Ukrainian dialects. Moreover, based on extensive textual evidence, they are attested in various Middle Ukrainian records extent from different dialectal areas, including Dnieper Ukraine. The preposition *ku* is obviously a borrowing from West Slavic, either Slovak (Czech) or Polish depending on a particular Ukrainian dialect.[25] The form *id* (~ *d*) 'to' is a blend of *yk* (~ *k*) with *do* 'up to.' Still, it is remarkable that the area of *yd* (~ *d*) roughly coincides with the area of *k'* and *g'* from *t'* and *d'*, for instance in Southwest and, historically, North Ukrainian.[26] In discussing the preposition(s) *z*, *zo* used with the genitive, the author derives *z* 'from (out of)' taking the genitive case, from **izъ* (p. 182). Yet no *jer* is to be reconstructed for this preposition nor for a few other prepositions and prefixes, cf. Old Church Slavonic *bez* 'without', *vъz* 'up', *raz-/roz-* 'asunder,' but *ot~ otъ* 'from.' On the other hand, a reconstruction with a *jer* for the preposition *z* (< **sъ*) 'with' governing "the instrumental case (only)" (p. 183) is correct.

The final section of chapter 6 analyzes the basic syntactic constructions and word order, which in fact do not show anything extraordinary as compared with the rest of Slavic languages (pp. 203–204). The author states that the syntax of Rusyn is very much like that of Ukrainian, though influence from Slovak is also noticeable in individual morphological constructions (p. 203). He claims, for instance, that the dative reflex enclitic pronoun *si* in forms like *želati si* "to wish" (p. 83) is a Slovak borrowing. Both areal and historical evidence proves that this is an old East Slavic form, typical not only of the most archaic Ukrainian dialects but also of Southwest Ukrainian in general.[27]

With hindsight, the above-mentioned shortcomings do not diminish the overall quality of the grammar. The latter, as has been emphasized, is well done and well structured in accordance with a well-elaborated explanatory model used in descriptive linguistics. Nevertheless, serious objections should be verbalized with regard to the "content" of the grammar. My major concern is that Pugh's grammar of Rusyn, as well as similar linguistic works, draws "too much" from the *ideological* rhetoric, no matter the linguistic reality. Such a stance is pregnant with serious aftereffects, especially in the realm of East Slavic literary languages where each literary language is a synthesis of ethnic aspirations, taken together with literary tradition(s), and its dialectal foundations.[28] Historically, the Rusyn literary tradition has been an intrinsic part of the mainstream all-Ukrainian literary tradition.[29] Even the language program of Myxajlo Lučkaj (Pop) (1789–1843) who authored a grammar of local Church Slavonic "with a Rusyn flavor" (p. 5) is no exception in this sense. He remained within the confines of the older Ruthenian literary tradition retained largely in Galicia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia, in contrast to the vernacularizing tendency cultivated at that time in North and Southeast Ukraine.[30]

---

[25] George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979), p. 246.

[26] Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology*, p. 690; *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol. 2, maps 88, 89.

[27] *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol. 2, map 248; Danylenko, *Predylaty*, pp. 380–388.

[28] N. I. Tolstoj, *Istorija i struktura slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), pp. 19–20.

[29] Andrii Danylenko, "Between the Vernacular and Slaveno-Rusyn: The *Huklyvyj Chronicle* and the Eighteenth-century Rusyn Literary Language," *Slavia Orientalis* 59:1 (2009), pp. 53–75; Andrii Danylenko, "Polemics without Polemics: Myxajlo Andrella in Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Literary Space," *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 53:1 (2008), pp. 12–46.

All in all, I am prepared to state that literary [Prešov] Rusyn as postulated in Pugh's grammar is rather an "imagined product," dissociated with the linguistic reality as reflected, to name a few most reliable scholarly sources, in the dialectal *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy* and *The Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* by George Y. Shevelov. In other words, what Pugh took to be a "newly-born" literary East Slavic language, is in fact a group of rural dialects used in combination with Church Slavonic and loan elements from Russian, Slovak, and Polish. Pugh's grammar offers at best the description of a regional variant of the Ukrainian literary language *in making* rather than of a separate East Slavic literary language.

ANDRII DANYLENKO

---

[30] Andrii Danylenko, "Myxajlo Lučkaj: A Dissident Forerunner of Literary Rusyn?" *Slavonic and East European Review* 87:2 (2009), pp. 201–226.