**RUTHENIANS versus UKRAINIANS IN SERBIA AND HOW THEY ARE INTERWOVEN**

Ljudmila Popovic, University of Belgrade
Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University
Sapporo, 27 September 2010

---

**The Constant Ruthenian Dilemma**

“Each people has it’s constant dilemma. For Ruthenians it is the question - is Ukraine their native state or not? Ruthenians settled to Vojvodina 260 years ago, during the reign of Maria Theresia of Austria. Our national holyday is January, 7th - the day when the agreement about the settling of Ruthenians was signed. Ruthenians settled from the borders of present Ukraine, Poland and Slovakia.

There are different opinions about our relationship to Ukraine among Ruthenians. We have two societies – "Ruska Matka" and The Union of Ruthenians and Ukrainians of Vojvodina. They are fighting on this matter. The Union contends that Ukraine is our native state, while Matka claims it was the Habsburg monarchy – according to them, since it doesn’t exist anymore, we don’t have our native state at all,” - says Olena Papuga. Danas, 30. 08. 2010.

---

**Earlier Approaches to the Question**

- Sabadosh Janko. From the History of Struggle of Ukrainians (Ruthenians) for their National and Social Freedom and Unity, their Political, Economic and Cultural Development; Doctoral dissertation, Belgrade university, Department of Law, 1970.

Ethnic structure of Vojvodina


17 January 1761

- The first sizeable Ukrainian enclave was formed by "Bačvanski Rusnaci" [Bačva Rusyns], Ruthenians who settled in Serbia
- The agreement was signed to settle 200 Greek Catholic Ruthenian families from upper Hungary - known as Gornjica - in Ruski Krstur.
- 1763, another group of 150 Ruthenian families arrived in the village of Kucura.

**Folk song**

Господи милосердний, на нас подивися, куда мої рідні брати порозходились.
Один пішов лугом, лугом, другий пішов крайом, третій пішов серединам, та зістрав капальом.
Перший тужить, нарікає, десь там у Банаті, ні земліці, ні хатинки, а подерть шати.
Другий застряг десь у Бачкі, так же мізерія, то робота, то хорота, гірка урубірка.
Третій краде дні у Бога там у Надь Королі, ніде щастя на чужині, ніде нема долі.

*Банат (Banat, Vojvodina),
*Бачка (Bachka, Vojvodina)
*Надь Корол (Nagy Karolyu - Ságei, Romania),

The Uniate church in Ruski Krstur. Cathedral of Apostolic Exarchate of Serbia (1784)
Ruth of Ruthenians?

- There is an interesting hypothesis that the Vojvodina Ruthenians may have sprung from the Zaporog Cossacks. In 1785, the Zaporog Cossacks indeed addressed a petition to the Austrian government to allow them to settle on the Austrian border.
- There is no convincing evidence to show that the Vojvodina Ruthenians originated from the Zaporogs. Ruthenian folklore preserves not the slightest trace of a Kozak memory (PAVAN 2007: 49; ДУЛИЧЕНКО 2009: 339–359).

Djura Vislavski, a Ruthenian from the Banat

- “Kerestur and Kucura were settled in the fourth year of the reign of Maria Theresa, i.e. in 1744, and populated by people from the Tatras, Spishka, Maromarosh and Makow. And many came from Galicia. My grandfather was from Galicia, from the river Vistula, which is why he acquired the surname Vislavski” (Ruthenians in the Banat, ЗОРЯ 1880: 30).

20TH CENTURY (PRO UKRAINIAN)

- VOJVODINA COLONIES IN THE VILLAGES OF RUSKI KERESTUR AND KOCUR, AND IN NOVI SAD BECAME THE CENTRES OF UKRAINIAN CULTURAL AND SOCIAL LIFE.
- PROSVITA SOCIETY (РУСЬКИЙ СОЮЗ) (1904) WAS FOUNDED IN NOVI SAD.
- Руски Календар (1921–1940, 21 issues in all)
- Руски Новини (1924–1941)
- Наšа Загретка (1937–1941)
- in the Ruthenian (Bačka-Srem) dialect of Ukrainian

Gavrîl Kostelnîk

(1886 – 1948)

- A Grammar of the Speech of Bačka-Srem (Лінгвістична бачкансримській білесі), 1923
- This work influenced the development of the language of Ruthenian publications.
- From my Village (З моєго вала) - the collecting of poems published in 1904, in the Ukrainian town of Zhovkva, marked the dawn of a Ruthenian literary tradition
Some Ruthenians came out against the pro-Ukrainian course taken by Prosvita and gathered around the Cultural-Educational League of South-Slav Ruthenians (Культурно-просветни савез јужнословенских Русина - КПСЈР) formed in Vrbas in 1933.

Заря" (1934-1936)

Comparing the cultural contribution made by activists of the Ruthenian Prosvita and the later League, researchers stress the great credit due to the former in constituting the literary life of Ruthenians in Yugoslavia, while the latter produced the first literary works in Ruthenian in the spirit of Socialist Realism (ВАВАДОШ 1971: 23).

Ruthenians began to fear that the Ukrainian name and the use of elements of contemporary Ukrainian culture might be equated with harbouring sympathy for the Soviet Ukraine and the USSR.

Cultural-Educational League of South-Slav Ruthenians, which supported the separatism of the Ruthenian minority, received the support of the Socialist Yugoslav government. (САБАДОШ 1971: 23; РУМЯНЦЕВ 2009)

Ruthenians in Serbia

- Ruthenians in Serbia
- press and publishing house, Ruske Slovo (http://www.ruskeslovo.com/)
- Ruthenian department at the government textbook office
- the bureau for culture, radio and TV programmes.

Culture

- Radio programmes in Ruthenian have been broadcast since October 1966.
- Шветлосц (1952-1954, 1966-present)
- Пионирска Заграта
- In Vojvodina, Ruthenian is one of six official languages
- Education through the language is provided all the way from preschool through three primary schools, one secondary (the only one in the world to teach in Ruthenian), and a section for Ruthenian Studies at the Philosophy Department of Novi Sad University.
Education

- Ruthenian was introduced as a discipline in 1972
- Chair of Ruthenian language and literature established in 1983
- Since 1981-82, twenty-eight students have graduated
- One has acquired a master’s degree
- Two have PhDs
- A history of Ruthenian literature, a history of Ruski Krstur, the life and work of Gavrilo Kostelnik, a history of the Ruthenians, a grammar of the Ruthenian Language by Julijan Ramač, a Ruthenian-Serbian dictionary ...

Second wave (1890-1901) from Galicia

- Bosnia-Herzegovina and Galicia, as parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, found themselves in the same state
- The main administrative centre for the Ukrainian colony was in Prnjavor; later Banja Luka, Ćelinac
- The authorities called them Ruthenians, they called themselves Ukrainians and the local population called them Galicians” (HEGESCHI 2005).
The first national reading room opened in Prnjavor in 1909.

Prosvita Society was founded and requested the central organization in Lviv to register it as one of its branches (ТЕРЛЮК 1996: 35–37).

By the end of 1914, Prosvita was represented in all places of Ukrainian emigration in Bosnia.

Kvitka-Osnovjanenko: Свата нан Гончарівці, was performed in 1919 in Prnjavor.

Verhovnicy in 1921.

Prosvita published the first issue of its magazine in Ukrainian: Ridne Slovo, which continued to appear until 1941 and from 1934 until 1941 the illustrated annual almanac.

- The Ukrainians did not meet with much encouragement from the authorities in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, nor subsequently from Socialist Yugoslavia, due to fears of that the minority might form a bridge with the Soviet Ukraine. (КАНАДОР 1991: 37)
Since 1991, Ukrainian Studies have been written, anthologies of Ukrainian poetry and contemporary stories have been edited and translated

- a student magazine in Ukrainian, Vikno, comes out regularly [http://www.ukrainistika.edu.rs/preuzimanje/pdf/casopis/2.pdf](http://www.ukrainistika.edu.rs/preuzimanje/pdf/casopis/2.pdf)

- Ukrainian is gaining an equal footing in Serbia as a Slavic discipline

---

**Ruthenian-Ukrainian – Real or False Dilemma?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Census</th>
<th>Ruthenian</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>% Ruthenian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>9,2%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>11,0%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>12,6%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>13,4%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>21,0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>22,1%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>23,0%</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23,0%</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>20,1%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>24,3%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>17,9%</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>15,6%</td>
<td>4,6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
2. [www.arhiva.srbija.gov.rs](http://www.arhiva.srbija.gov.rs)
**Political manipulation**

- "The Canadian Professor Magocsi forms societies of Ruthenians and Ruthenian sympathizers. This is how he stokes populist national feeling, but in a mini-mini version, since the majority of Ruthenians do not know the facts of their own history, he tries to turn the Ruthenian majority who do not know against the minority who do know the historical facts." (TAMAŠ 2005).

- The dilemma was evidently artificially created in order to propagate ideas in vogue in the countries in which the Ruthenian/Ukrainians had previously lived.

**Real or false?**

- A 1970 conference on the traditional culture of Vojvodina Ruthenians and Ukrainians noted that the problem of having to decide between being Ruthenian or Ukrainian was a false dilemma.

- In Austro-Hungary, and after its demise in Czechoslovakia, there was a faction that promoted the idea of a separate Ruthenian or Rusyn nation. This faction was supported by ruling Hungarian circles and the Czech government (CARADOZI 1971: 7).

  Julian Tamáš, says: "Unfortunately, the former SFRY and today Serbia and Montenegro, arbitrated in the final separation of the Ruthenians from the Ukrainians, which is historically unjustified.

**Origin of Ethnonyms**

- 1915 a group of Ruthenian members of parliament from Austrian Galicia asked the Austrian parliament to change the then official terms Ruthyns, Ruthenian to Ukrainians and Ukrainian.

- The opinion was sought of two professors at Vienna University, Hans Ibersberg and Vatroslav Jagić.

  "On the Ukrainian language and the term Ukrainians"

  "Both appellations 'Ruthyns' and 'Ukrainians' are equally correct, with the very important difference that the former, because of historical events in the late 18th century, was used only for that part of Little Russia which belonged to Austria, while the latter is well founded, politically and geographically, as far as Little Russians living in Russia are concerned."

Ivan Franko

“The great Ukrainian writer and slavist, Ruthenian by origin (1856 - 1916)

GAVRIL KOSTELNIK – THE AUTHOR OF THE FIRST GRAMMAR OF THE RUTHENIAN SPEACH

Why did I Become an Ukrainian?

“The Ukraine-Ukrainian is another, more recent name for the people of Little Russia and and their country and is linked to the definition of Little Russians - our people.

“Our older name [is] Rus’ (the country), Ruthenian (the old Rusič) or Rusyn.

“The name ‘Ukraine’ denotes the Kiev and Poltava region at the time when they were part of Poland and represented the end, the border of the Poles. Before our people acquired the name Ruthenian they had not one but various tribal names – Poljani, Tiverci, Dulibi etc.

RUSNAYK

“Russians call the Ruthenians Little Russians, in the late 19th century they called themselves Ukrainians. That appellation they have taken to continue the tradition of Cossack’s Ukraine. Polish scholars still use the appellation Ruthenians because that word has been used with that meaning for centuries... Their territory stretches from East Carpathians to Don, from rivers San and Bug to Caucasus, from Black and Azov sea to the river Pripyat. Carpathian Ruthenians, like all highlanders are divided to smaller branches: Lemkos, Boykos, Hutsuls. Some groups of Lemkos call themselves Horn’aky. Ruthenian language group in Yaslon district calls themselves Mixed People.

A whole group of Lemkos, together with the Mixed People call themselves Rusnaky” (FISCHER 1928: 24)

STUDY OF LEMKO SPEECH

IVAN VERHRATSKI (1907)
Ruthenians are any of those Ukrainians who were formerly Polish or Austrian and Austro-Hungarian subjects. The name is a Latinized form of the word Russian, but the Ruthenians are Ukrainians who, by accidents of history in the late Middle Ages, were absorbed into the territory of Lithuania, which in turn was united with Poland. The term Little Russians has also been applied to them. The upper-class Ruthenians in Galicia, Bukovina, and the Carpathian mountains were assimilated into the conquering nations, whose language and Roman Catholic faith they adopted.
• Antoine Meillet “Certain linguists talk of mixed languages. This is an expression... which is unsuitable, because it conjures up the idea that such a language would be the result of the mixing of two languages placed in equal conditions and that one could never tell whether a language is the continuation of a language A or a language B...” (Meillet 1921: 83)

• Kostelnik thus presents the language of Bačva Ruthenians as a Ukrainian substrate with integrated elements of Polish and Slovak adstrata.

• Граматика бацваньско‐рускей бешеди (Grammar of the Bačva‐Russian Speech), published in Ruski Krstur in 1923

• Корінь нашої бешеди, pointing to the presence of Ukrainian substrate in Krstur speech which, in the opinion of the prominent Ukrainian linguist Oleksa Horbach, belongs to the “mixed Ukrainian‐Eastern Slovak speeches of the Zemplin‐Uzh type. (ГОРБАЧ 1961)

• Hnatiuk concludes: “The greatest support for the theory of the Slovak origin of Ruthenians comes from the language, which is very Slovakized, but is still not Slovak;

• There are no traces of an historical or literary Slovak tradition among the Bačva Ruthenians; if they had originated from the Slovaks, some trace of this would certainly have remained” (HATIJK1901: 39).
"Ruthenian language should be studied together with Ukrainian language at Slavic departments, as its historical and contemporary special branch" (Barč 2007: 337).

PRO AND CONTRA

Pro Slovak:
- A. Sobolewski, F. Pastrek, J. Pata, O. Broch, V. Francov, S. Czambel, F. Tichý, J. Belej, E. Barcie...

Pro Ukrainian:
- V. Hnatjuk, H. Kosteljnik, M. M. Kostiljuk, O. Horbach, H. H. Nadji, J. J. Dzendzelivsky, P. P. Chuchka, M. Mushinka, E. Baric...

West or East Slavic?

- West Slavic characteristics (according to Sven Gustavsson 1983: 24):
  1. the retention of the Proto-Slav groups ę, ę, unlike the Eastern-Slav ę, ę (as in Polish, kąsć // kąści, ąchćim)
  2. absence of the epenthetic ą following softening of the bilabials (constituents, ḋęmitz)
  3. the development of Proto-Slav groups *tort, *tolt, *tert to *tort, *tolt, *tert (łuha, krum, striena, pras, brę, a̯rčo)
  4. absence of the epenthetic ę after Proto-Slav groups *tort, *tolt, *tert to tort, *tolt, *tert (kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić)
  5. the development of Proto-Slav groups *tort, *tolt, *tert to tort, *tolt, *tert (kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić, kwić)

- East Slavic characteristics of Ruthenian:
  1. the existence of Ukrainian and Belarusian group ę: kaćma, kaćma, kaćma, kaćma,泉水
  2. the existence of Proto-Slav groups ę, ę, unlike the Eastern-Slav ę, ę (as in Polish, kąsć // kąści, ąchćim)
  3. the development of primary unaccented Proto-Slav groups with reduced phonemes after accent, such as *tort, *tolt, *tert, *tort, *tolt, *tert (żąźło, żźło, żźło, żźlo, żźlo, żźlo)
  4. the development of ḋęmitz into a filling syllable and the next hard consonant (kwićılmę, kwićılmę)
  5. the development of some parallel forms with epenthetic ę: kwańča, kwańča, kwańča, kwańča, kwańča

Among the Ukrainian characteristics of Ruthenian speech, Kosteljnik includes the following:

At phonetic level:
- retention of the prothetic phoneme ę, specifically in morphological forms: von, vona, vona, vona, vona
- the existence of the prothetic phoneme i: Ruthenian conj ęk, Slovac ęk, ęk, Ukrainian ęk
- the development of ie from the Proto-Slav long vowels i into i: bili, dido, vynychane, rika, kviču, kviču, and so forth.
Nothing has been said about the:

- **At morphological level:**
  - the absence of gender differentiation in the nominative plural of adjectives and pronouns (�ੋਮੁ ਦੋਹੀ ਦੇਹੁ), in contrast to the Polish, Slovak and Serbian
  - suffix **-а/-н** in the Genitive singular of masculine nouns: коня, плауга, стола, динара, атома, квадрата; меду, шнїгу, цименту, бою, жалю, гнїву, страху, крику, краю, парку, еха, Београда, Новога Саду;
  - suffix **-овн** in the Dative/Locative singular of animated masculine nouns: орлови, псови, сушенови, пайташии, коньови, влакови, столови;
  - suffix **-ми** in the Instrumental plural of some nouns (the same as in the Ukrainian): хвильи, подоли, двери, дверцы;
  - short forms of adjectives: подов, годов, рад;
  - double stems of pronominal forms мебі-мобі; себі-/собі;
  - the using of the pronominal form себе as a particle in initial and final formulas of tales: Жили себе дідо и баба; Жили себе и тераз кел не помере;
  - suffix **-ам-** in plural forms of neuter nouns: катача, качатох, качатох;
  - diminutive forms with the suffix **-ам-к(-о)**, like: качатко, жератко.

- **At phonetic level**
  - changes й > е, ъ > о: пес, сон, мок
  - development of primary unaccented Proto-Slavic groups with reduced phonemes after sonants, such as *трыт, * тхват, * тхват, * тхват, into the combinations ур, ни, (прача, дривча, дригач, хрибеж, гирча, блыча, слича, кирибави)
  - йа > а : вояк
  - с > о after ж, ч, ш: мачоха, облачок

- **As we see,** Kostelnik does not provide a complete list of the Ukrainian characteristics of Ruthenian speech. In fact, nothing has been said about the

- **At morphological level:**
  - suffix **-ого** in forms of the auxiliary verb: мого, люго, добортого, каного.

- **At lexical level:**
  - the existence of the comparative conjunction ї in contrast to the Slovak
  - change of -a into -о in forms of the auxiliary verb: бръма (бъ, брема), in contrast to Slovak and Polish forms: бдяла, бдяла, бдяла.

- **At syntactic level:**
  - dropping of auxiliary verbs in compound noun predicates: воні добри люди, ввам ть наво ть.
At phonetic level:
1. A stable accent always on the antepenultimate syllable;
2. Lingua-dentals т, д change to ц, дз:
   робиц, знац, шпивац, шмерц, треци, штварцина;
3. Nasalised front vowels changed to a front vowel [e]:
   курче, кич, кичка, кичка as in the Ukrainian - Lj.P.;
4. Soften alveolar sibilants:
   шмерц, швиня, жима, жем;
5. Palatalisation of the alveolars н, л before front Proto-Slavic vowels:
   гущенїца, терлїца, аловнїк, католїк;
6. Hard sonant syllabic р becomes ар:
   гарло, маркя, витарти;
7. Retention of the Proto-Slavic groups dl, tl:
   шидло, садло, мидло;
8. Unvoiced к becomes voiced г:
   лїгац, лїг, варгоч, мозгу.

At lexical level:
1. Adverbial borrowings: шицко, ютро, кельо, вельо, тельо, вец, вецей, шак, нідле, нідда, кеди, теди, нїгде, нїгда;
2. Borrowing of certain verbs: руцац, волац;
3. Dependent conjunction же instead of Ukrainian що:
   гварим, же пойдзем.
4. Some noun borrowings (чулка, вечурня, кравенца) as indicated by the phoneme y instead of the former Ukrainian о from the Old Russian е; nasalized ё.

At morphological level:
1. Alternating к and ц before front vowel и: Руснац, Поляц, Словац.
2. Absence of final non-syllabic i in adjectival suffixes:
   добри, красни, святи;
3. Suffixes -ем, -ім in first person singular of the present tense: -дзем, знам, віддым, шпивам;
5. West or South Slavic features?
   We could speak here about South Slavic trat, тлат, тлет, тлет - робота, молода, голова, берег etc. (see texts in Najnowshe dzieje językow sołowskich, Русыньскый язык, ed. P. Magocsi, Opole, 2004, pp.393-424)

FROM SLOVAK CHARACTERISTICS, KOSTELNIK SELECTS

At phonetic level:
1. Development of Proto-Slavic groups *tort, *tolt, *tert, *telt to trat, tlat, tret, tlet (глава, крава, страна, прах, брег, щрекено)
   It’s also Gustasson’s argument supporting his thesis about Bachva-Ruthenian as West Slavic language (Густассон 1983: 24)
2. The presence of trat, tlat, tret forms in Bachva-Ruthenian:
   глава, крава, страна, прах, бреж, щрекено
Rutenians in Slovakia use forms with tort, tolot, teret - рота, молода, голова, берег etc. (see texts in Najnowshe dzieje językow sołowskich, Русыньскый язык, ed. P. Magocsi, Opole, 2004, pp.393-424)
   West or South Slavic features?
   We could speak here about South Slavic trat, тлат, тлет, тлет - робота, молода, голова, берег etc. (see texts in Najnowshe dzieje językow sołowskich, Русыньскый язык, ed. P. Magocsi, Opole, 2004, pp.393-424)
3. Unvoiced glottal-fricative x becomes the voiced pharyngeal г: 20ч instead 20ч;
The “Our Speech” article

The description of the relationship of Ruthenian speech to the Ukrainian language:

“My brother has greatly changed, but he is mine” (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975:196).

we should also include here

- development of Proto-Slav groups *dj, tj, kt > dz, c (медзи, ноц, голиця)*
- the retention of the Proto-Slav initial *ie* (*iєнь, iєлень*);
- the retention of the Proto-Slav groups *qy, kv*, unlike the Eastern-Slav *zv, sv* (*звізда, квітця, цвіт, бутук квіт*);
- contractions such as баг ше, шаа (багтися, свати);
- absence of the epenthetic *n* following softening of the bilabials (*составленні, комої, бутграбли*);
- regressive assimilation according to the voicing of the consonant at the end of a word or syllable before the sonants *м, н, л, р* (*були зміє, брода ми зміють*);
- absence of the prothetic consonants *з, ґ, в* (*око, ухо, ієлка*).
BORROWINGS FROM THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE IN RUTHENIAN SPEECH (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975: 207-315.)

- analytical form of the infinitive да + презент in conditional sentences, where the meaning is imperative-optative and the mood is the unreal conditional (гварел да му дам).
- prefix and suffix forms such as год (яки год), кои (койки, коийто etc.)
- not only words were taken over, but also grammatical forms: “Certain Serbian words have become so customary in our speech that we are no longer capable of omitting or changing them, even though they introduce new forms into our speech” (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975: 247)
- Ukrainian base and Serbian affix (for instance одховац from the Serbian одгоити and Ukrainian виховати) or a Serbian base and Ukrainian affix (послидок from the Serbian последица and Ukrainian наслідок)

Kostainik letter to Alexey Shahmatov and Yuri Bindas

- contaminated suffixes of the locative singular of masculine nouns which appeared under the influence of Serbian: на гробу, у Загребу
- borrowings from the Serbian written language, (у denoting a high front vowel, before which there is a hard variant of the phoneme)
- “Do not adhere to the Croatian-Serbian extreme phonetics, because you will distance yourselves too much from the Ukrainian and Ruthenian” (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975: 338)
- Ruthenian teachers of Šrem in 1950 in which the principle “write as you hear it” was abandoned and voiced consonants were written in front of unvoiced (З НАШОГО ПРАВОПИСА 1951: 53).

“Our speech really can help us to recognise all Slavic languages” (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975: 333)

borrowings as a factor known in contemporary linguistics as transfer (ИПУКТИНКО 2000: 212)

“sticking like a burr to a fleece, not subject to or harmed by any [other] language”

“something originating on the border of three peoples has to be so” (КОСТЕЉНИК 1975: 194)

It’s not just a matter of an external phenomenon

- Examining the influence of one language on another, linguists observe that this is not just a matter of an external phenomenon, but also relates to the internal development of the language which absorbs everything that suits its structure and the internal laws of its development
- Therefore, among the factors influencing language, we can also list the structural characteristics of the receiving language (primarily of its lexis), the presence, absence or level of development of its literary tradition and written matter, the number of speakers and the status of the language group, since language hierarchy correlates to other hierarchies – economic, national, educational etc.
One's own language should be protected from foreign words as much as possible. When we have a word of our own, we should not take on a foreign one... Where no word of our own exists, a new one should be coined by taking it from our standard language [Ukrainian - Lj. P.] or from Serbian, but this word should be changed to fit the spirit of our speech) (КОСТЕЛЬНИК 1975: 246)

**Conclusion**

- History, ethnography and linguistics confirm that Ruthenians and Ukrainians in Serbia represent one people, a single national minority which in Vojvodina was artificially divided into two enclaves.
- This division was the product of politics dating back to Austro-Hungary and continuing through the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to Socialist Yugoslavia.
- Confrontation among the emigrants, basically the usual division in any environment into the autochthonous population and the new settlers, has over time, due to ignorance of the historical facts and the fanning of populist ideas, grown into partial antipathy.
- Antagonism between Ruthenians and Ukrainians is not expressed in urban intellectual circles, where both are grouped around the Greek Catholic Church.

**Literature:**

- Ruthenian as a micro-language will continue to have a future.
- Ruthenian literature will also continue to develop and it would be wrong to hinder this natural course of things.
- The Ukrainian language will increasingly gain in importance as the language of an existing national minority, but also as the language of a large Slavic country.
- Debates on the originality of Ukrainian or Ruthenian belong to the past.
- Guiding people to discover their historical roots and sources and informing both the Ruthenian and Ukrainian population in Vojvodina while suppressing attempts to politicize the issue will contribute to closer cooperation between these two parts of a single historical matrix.
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