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Abstract

Coming Down From the Mountain: Dialect Contact and Convergence in Contemporary Hutsulshchyna

by

Erin Victoria Coyne

Doctor of Philosophy in Slavic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Johanna Nichols, Chair

Despite the recent increased interest in Hutsul life and culture, little attention has been paid to the role of dialect in Hutsul identity and cultural revival. The primary focus of the present dissertation is the current state of the Hutsul dialect, both in terms of social perception and the structural changes resulting from the dominance of the standard language in media and education.

Currently very little is known about the contemporary grammatical structure of Hutsul. The present dissertation is the first long-term research project designed to define both key elements of synchronic Hutsul grammar, as well as diachronic change, with focus on variation and convergence in an environment of increasing close sustained contact with standard Ukrainian resulting from both a historically-based sense of ethnic identification, as well as modern economic realities facing the once isolated and self-sufficient Hutsuls. In addition, I will examine the sociolinguistic network lines which allow and impede linguistic assimilation, specifically in the situation of a minority population of high cultural valuation facing external linguistic assimilation pressures stemming from socio-political expediency. Throughout this examination, I define the current social status of the dialect, its future viability, and the differences in attitudes and behaviors among various social groups, including members of the younger generation, in both the public and private realms. The broad conclusion supported by my research is that, despite Hutsul cultural prestige in Ukraine, their distinct dialect is endangered as a result of socio-economic pressures, including policies actively promoting the use of Ukrainian language in all spheres of public and private life. Through sustained contact, Hutsul has come to resemble Contemporary Standard Ukrainian (CSU) more and more in structural typology. The precise manner and degree to which this has occurred has not been analyzed in previous research.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Structure and scope of the dissertation

The land known as Hutsulshchyna, which spans a portion of Ivano-Frankivs'k Oblast in Ukraine as well as several smaller communities in Romania, is located in the eastern portion of the Carpathian Mountains. The focus of the present dissertation is the Hutsul dialect as spoken in the Verxoyna region of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast, Ukraine. I have chosen the Verxovyna region as this has historically been the undisputed cultural center of the region of Hutsul life, and is often referred to as the “Hutsul capital.” The majority of literature published in the Hutsul dialect was produced by writers from around Verxovyna, and so I have limited the geographic scope to this region to ensure greater consistency in comparative linguistic analysis.

While there has been some disagreement over whether Hutsul should properly be referred to as a language or a dialect, I will refer to it as a dialect, using the broad definition offered by Hinskens, Auer, and Kerswill 2005:

We will use the notion of 'dialect' to refer to a language variety which is used in a geographically limited part of a language area in which it is 'roofed' by a structurally related standard variety; a dialect typically displays structural peculiarities in several language components. (p. 1)

Using this definition, Hutsul can be reasonably referred to as a dialect: it is geographically limited to several territories located in the Carpathian Mountains, it is clearly “roofed” by the Ukrainian language, and displays numerous structural peculiarities in its phonology, morphology, and syntax, and lexicon. It is these structural peculiarities that will be the focus of Chapters 2, 3, and 4 which will cover Hutsul phonology, morphology, and syntax respectively. The goal of these chapters will not be to provide a comprehensive description grammar of Hutsul, however, but to pinpoint areas of contact-induced change resulting from sociolinguistic pressures exerted by Contemporary Standard Ukrainian (CSU). While I refer to this process as convergence--and indeed it is possible that the local realization of CSU is subject to Hutsul substratum interference--here I examine only the effects of CSU on Hutsul.

---

1 The issue of mutual intelligibility is also often used in most definitions of ‘dialect.’ As will be discussed further, the notion is ‘mutual intelligibility’ is problematic in the Hutsul. While there is clearly a significant amount of shared lexicon and grammatical inventory, some CSU speakers claim to understand Hutsul in its oldest form only with great difficulty, due in part to Hutsul’s borrowed vocabulary from non-Slavic source languages, particularly Romanian.

2 Although potentially data-rich, issues of lexicon will not be covered here. Most current research on Hutsul has, in fact focused on its lexicon, leaving grammatical structural largely ignored and in greater need of analysis.

3 As Thomason 2001 notes, “the point of talking about convergence is to emphasize the fact that the interference is mutual, not unidirectional, and the fact that the resulting convergence structures have no single source: either they were already present, but less prominent, in both languages, or they resemble both languages in part but do not
1.1.1 An examination of contact-induced structural change in Hutsul

This is the first research project of its kind to examine both the current structure of the Hutsul dialect as well as the process of contact-induced change by which it is currently being reshaped. In 1965 when Rudnyckyj completed his study of Ukrainian dialects, he noted that Hutsul was among those dialects suffering from a process of loss as the young people of the region were observed to be abandoning dialectal speech in exchange for CSU, “the language of school, theater, books, and journals” (p. 30). Rudnyckyj, however, stops short of providing an analysis of the extent of this attrition, nor does he explore the possible changes taking place on the structural level; rather, he builds his description of Hutsul upon the oldest sources available to him, presenting a “frozen” picture of the dialect features. Describing Hutsul based exclusively on the oldest representatives of vernacular has been the most common strategy in attempts to define the dialect’s structure: this was Boudovskaia’s strategy in her dissertation on Transcarpathian morphology, and Budzhak-Jones’s strategy in her article on Hutsul clitics; when Žylko produced his 1955 description of the dialect, he relied on sources dating from 1928. However, such a strategy leaves the question of dialect change entirely unanswered. Like Rudnyckyj before her, Zakrevs'ka noted in 1991 that the Hutsul dialect appears to be changing both in structure and use; however, she too avoids discussion of precisely how and under what circumstances this has occurred and continues to occur. Only Lesjuk 2012 has argued that Hutsul has changed very little over the past century and continues to be maintained in a form closely resembling that of the early 20th century, although he later admits:

Of course it would be incorrect to assert that the Hutsul dialect hasn’t been influenced by the literary language. Young people who have received a good education, and without an attentive relationship to their language, change their accustomed pronunciation to the literary one. For many Hutsuls, especially of the younger generation (but not those who have an adequate education), one can notice a large number of Russianisms. (Lesjuk 2012: 31)

However, Lesjuk leaves the question of specific points of convergence with CSU largely unexplored, aside from a passing remark about possible phonological interference among the educated and Russian borrowings among the undereducated. Discussion of Hutsul’s current contact situation with CSU is long overdue and assessment is needed to understand how it has and has not changed as a result of that contact, in terms of both structure and sociolinguistic environment. Evidence of language change in progress is illustrated below through by looking longitudinally from early texts to modern, and correlating those findings with data gleaned from interviews. This project has not only immediate implications for the current state of the Hutsul
dialect, but also broader implications for the study of languages—and particularly dialects—in situations of close contact with a dominant language: considering what is currently known and unknown about the processes of contact-induced change, language maintenance in contact environment, and shift outcomes, Hutsul provides a dynamic testing ground for exploration of the factors that contribute to both structural convergence and sociolinguistic restriction.

As a peripheral region geographically separated by the Carpathian mountains, Hutsulshchyna was long able to maintain many of the archaic features of its dialect while developing innovations that distinguished it from all but the most closely neighboring dialects. It is, however, its archaic features which have been the most widely noted and commented upon, both as a local curiosity and as evidence of the historical processes which have shaped the development of modern Ukrainian. As a previously isolated speech community now in close contact with mainland Ukraine, Hutsulshchyna is a natural laboratory for the study of both isolated-induced preservation of archaisms as well as contact dynamics. In analyzing the changes that Hutsul is currently undergoing, it is important to note the trajectory of both archaisms and innovations, and in my analysis, I will seek to discover whether one is more susceptible to change than the other in defining the structural consequences of contact-induced change.

In addition to the relative susceptibility or resistance of archaic vs. innovative features, I will also examine the resistance of marked features to attrition. As Tulloch asserts, “in some contact situations, the most ‘marked’, or distinctive, or regionally limited, or difficult features fall out of use” (2006: 273). Hinskens, Auer, and Kerswill add that it is the social meaning that certain linguistic features carry that explain why some are more resistant to convergence than others. Milroy and Milroy’s notion of “network markers” is useful in discussing such features which they assert are among the most resistant to change as a result of their function in marking group loyalty and identity. However, their retention is predicated on the current strength of the social network: if the network itself has already begun to atrophy, then these network markers will likely also atrophy, which should be interpreted as an indication of possible impending shift (1985). In my analysis, both of grammatical structure and the current state of Hutsul social networks, I will assess the degree to which this holds true for Hutsul within its current contact environment with close examination of the social meaning constructed in dialectal variation as determined by local language ideology. As Eckert 2008 notes, “variables have indexical fields rather than fixed meanings because speakers use variables not simply to reflect or reassert their particular pre-ordained place on the social map, but to make ideological moves” (p. 464). The

---

4 Defined as the most locally-marked, salient features of the speech community.
5 The issue of salience was raised in one of my interviews with a woman who works as a Ukrainian language teacher at a local boarding school serving Hutsul children in the Verxovyna region. In discussing the challenges her students face in producing compositions in CSU, she noted several dialectal feature which prove most resistant to correction. These features—which could be considered “network markers” due to their high degree of salience and local markedness—include syntactic structures with the preposition *do* (Hutsul *d’*), the reflexive marker *sja* (Hutsul *sy*), the phonological reflex *ja*≻*je*, the feminine singular instrumental ending *-øjju* (Hutsul *-ov*), and use of a cliticized form of the synthetic future tense.
underlying ideologies, including notions of valuation and social indexicality by which speakers embed social meaning in language traits, mediate which variables, Hutsul or CSU, become more favored in and in which contexts. From interview data, the evidence supports the notion that, for many Hutsuls, CSU has come to index such qualities as professionalism, education, and competence, whereas Hutsul continues to index local identity and cultural heritage. The resulting ideology in large part determines when, how, and with whom Hutsul continues to be spoken and where CSU has become the dominant code for communication.

Thomason and Kaufman 1988 note the resistance of inflectional morphology to contact-induced interference. They argue that, while phonology and syntax are often most vulnerable, changes in the morphology of a language in contact is a sign of deeper incursions into the structure. In the following chapters, I will examine the three main structural domains of phonology, morphology, and syntax to assess patterns of CSU interference in order to better define the potential patterns in which change takes place, including the relative degree to which inflectional morphology is resistant or vulnerable.

Of significant importance is the current sociolinguistic environment of Hutsul which will determine whether current cultural revival efforts translate into dialect maintenance. As Hutsul identity becomes both locally and nationally esteemed, as well as increasingly visible, it would be logical to assume their dialect would undergo a similar rise in status, particularly when supported by new publications and scholarship. However, the evidence suggests just the opposite trajectory: as Hutsuls become more closely integrated into the Ukrainian nation, their dialect has become more restricted in use through their need to communicate with outsiders. This phenomenon and its accompanying social dynamics will be analyzed in detail.

The Hutsul dialect is currently in a very vulnerable position due to contact-induced encroachments on its traditional linguistic space. It is clear that this encroachment has left its mark on dialectal structure as well as current linguistic behaviors; however, the current situation of the dialect has remained entirely unexplored. These questions will be answered through an examination of textual evidence suggesting the pattern of structural change in Hutsul as well as analysis of the changing nature of Hutsul social networks and interactions which provide an additional layer of meaning to the data of structural change, and predict possible future outcomes.

1.1.2 Sources of data

The data used in this dissertation is the result of two summers of fieldwork conducted in Ukraine in 2011 and 2012. This fieldwork included both the collection of key texts produced from the beginning of the 20th century through the first decade of the 21st century, as well as interviews with a broad range of speakers on the topics of language attitudes and habits.
As Milroy and Milroy note, “linguistic change must presumably originate in speakers rather than in languages. We therefore find it convenient to distinguish between linguistic change, on the one hand, and speaker innovation on the other” (1985: 347). By taking this two-pronged approach coupling text-based structural analysis with interview data, I define both the origin and diffusion of speaker innovation in a contact environment as well as the language attitudes and evaluations precipitating these changes.

1.2 Introduction: Who are the Hutsuls?

“Who is the Hutsul? Science reveals little about his origins. We know one thing—he is blood from the blood and bone from the bone of the Ukrainian people. These are God's children, whom it is impossible not to love—and they are truly loved by all.” (Hnat Xotkevyč cited in Budzak 2009: 185).

The people known as the Hutsuls hold a special place in Ukrainian lore: often imagined as wild men of the mountains, bravely enduring the harsh and capricious forces of nature through their tenacious adherence to an ancient pagan mythology, the Hutsuls have been the object of both extensive ethnographic research as well as numerous literary and cinematic works endeavoring to capture and convey their seemingly impenetrable culture. Their native land, known as Hutsulshchyna, is located in the Carpathian Mountains of Ukraine and Romania, with the vast majority of the territory located in Ivano-Frankivs'k Oblast, Ukraine, and is the most studied ethnographic region of Ukraine (Zakrevs'ka 1991). The Hutsuls have been recognized as a distinct ethnographic group since the 18th century when the first descriptions of their lifestyle and culture were produced by Polish writers who had travelled to the region.

The precise borders of Hutsulshchyna are difficult to define; however, there is general agreement that the majority of the communities are located in Galicia (the regions of Verxovyna, Kolomyja, Kosiv, and Nadviryanskyj in Ivano-Frankivs'k Oblast), Bukovyna (the regions of Vyžnycya and Putul in Chernivtsi Oblast), and Zakarpattja (Raxiv region). This is supported by D. Vatamanjuk, current head of Tovarystvo Hutsulshchyna:

Hutsuls inhabit Ivano-Frankivsk, the whole Verxovyna district, and the territory of the town of Yeremče, the whole Kosiv district, half of Nadviryanska and some villages on the right side of Prut and Kolomyja districts in Bukovyna, the whole Putylskyj district and the largest part of Vižnyckoho; in Zakarpattja, also, Raxivskyj district.

6 In discussing Hutsul relations with their neighbors, an important note must be made about the Hutsul communities of Romania. Despite the political borders which separate the two groups, the Hutsuls of both Ukraine and Romania have maintained a sense of shared identity, in large part as a result of their shared dialect.

There is also debate surrounding the size of the Hutsul population: Stefljuk estimates a population size of 500,000 (2007), while the 2001 Ukrainian census documented a mere 21,400 self-identified Hutsuls.

The Hutsuls are bordered on the west by Ukrainians, to the north live the Bojkos and Lemkos (Poland), and to the east are the Carpatho-Rusyns and Romanians. Of these, Hutsuls are considered to be the most closely related—both culturally and linguistically—to the Bojkos and Lemkos, with whom they are often categorized into a larger Transcarpathian dialect group. However, the classification of these Carpathian dialects continues to be controversial, particularly with the Rusyn revival efforts of recent years. This controversy stretches back to at least the first half of the 20th century when debate arose surrounding the linguistic relationship between Carpathian dialects to other East Slavic dialects. At stake was whether the Carpathian dialects should be classified as part of the larger Southwestern dialect group of Ukrainian, or whether they constituted a distinct dialect group (Duličenko 2006). As Rusyn gained greater prominence in the debate, Lemko and Bojko were often gathered into its fold, while the status of Hutsul was long considered uncertain. Kushko, a specialist of the Rusyn language, admits that the precise relationship between Hutsul and Carpatho-Rusyn remains in dispute and that the dialect has been of relatively limited influence on the development of literary Rusyn (2007: 114). Duličenko also states that Hutsul is generally no longer included in the Carpatho-Rusyn group of dialects; despite numerous shared features with Rusyn, Hutsul, in his estimation, is more closely related to Galician (i.e. Southwestern Ukrainian) dialects (2006). Linguistic analysis, however, has its limitations in such classification and re-classification trends; often it is political, rather than linguistic, factors which provide the primary basis for dialect categorization. While avoiding linguistic considerations, Kuzio 2005 provides perhaps the most convincing explanation for the current dialect groupings:

Rusnaks-Rusyns in the majority of the territories where they lived (Galicia and Bukovina) evolved into Ukrainians by the 1880s under relatively liberal Austrian rule. Rusyns-Rusnaks who lived in the Hungarian portion of the Austro-Hungarian empire were subjected to assimilation and therefore could not undergo this transformation into Ukrainians. The conversion of Rusyns into Ukrainians occurred only later in Trans-Carpathia by the Soviet authorities in 1945, when they annexed the area. (p. 12)

Due their relatively late “conversion,” the Carpatho-Rusyn speakers maintained an identity distinct from that of ‘Ukrainian’ to a greater degree than did the Hutsuls, whose identity became intertwined with Ukrainian at a much early time, allowing it to further solidify. These differing

---

8 As reported in Ukrajins'ka Pravda, Feb. 6, 2003. The census also listed 672 self-identified Lemkos, 131 Bojkos, and 10,200 who claimed Rusyn identity.
senses of identity—particularly as they relate to greater Ukrainian identity—has created the largest rift in the Carpathian dialects, leading to Hutsul’s more frequent classification as Southwest Ukrainian, rather than Trans-Carpathian, despite clear linguistic similarities to the latter.

It also at this time of Austrian rule that the Hutsuls and, by extension, the Hutsul dialect began receiving a good deal of attention, with the first descriptive dialect studies appearing in the late 19th century (Duličenko 2006). Many of these early studies noted both the remarkable number of archaisms present in the dialect, as well as the unique innovations distinguishing it from other regional dialects of Ukrainian. By the early 20th century, Hutsul had begun to take on its mythological aura among Ukrainians, with Xotkevyč proclaiming upon his arrival in Hutsulshchyna in 1906:

> The strongest of my first impressions is the Hutsul language. We Ukrainians are used to our “Little Russian speech,” which is half filled with Russianisms, Moscovisms, Moskalisms, and so on. And to hear the vibrant Hutsul language beating like a fresh stream of mountain water from under a Proto-Slavic root provides great enjoyment. (1966: 544)

At the heart of Xotkevyč’s praise for the Hutsul dialect is the numerous archaisms that it has retained relative to the central and eastern dialects of Ukraine, of which Xotkevyč was a native speaker. The preservation of these archaisms is generally attributed to Hutsulshchyna’s long isolation from the Ukrainian mainland, caused by both the natural barrier of the Carpathian Mountains, as well as political divisions which separated western and eastern Ukrainian through the early 20th century (Duličenko 2006, Zakrevs'ka 1991, Boudovskaia 2006).

The Hutsuls have been the object of study for at least 150 years, from the time that their lands were a western peripheral territory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The first researchers started with ethnographic and folklore research, which then began to extend into dialect studies. The first known attempt at a Hutsul dictionary was made in the middle of the 19th century by Ivan Vahylevyč. This was followed by Sofron Vytvytsky in 1862 whose ethnographic work *Istoryčnij naris pro huculiv* (1863) contained a chapter on the Hutsul dialect including a glossary of approximately 30 lexical items with speculative explanations of their origins. Based on the work of both Vahylevyč and Vytvytsky, Oskar Kolberg compiled a Hutsul dictionary in 1878. The pinnacle of 19th century Hutsul scholarship, however, was the multivolume encyclopedia *Huculščyna* compiled by Šukevyč in 1899 (reprinted in 1997).

The early 20th century was marked by continued interest in both the Hutsuls and their distinctive dialect, which occasionally provided both inspiration and dialog in literary works.

---

9 That Hutsuls are members of the larger Ukrainian nation was the official position taken at the First World Hutsul Conference in 1993 where participants were exhorted, “Let’s remember that Hutsuls come from the unified Ukrainian root” (Xrušč 2008).
produced by non-Hutsul Ukrainian writers, including the esteemed Ukrainian poets Ivan Franko and Lesja Ukrajinka. Most notable perhaps is the writer M. Kotsiubynsky, whose novella *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* provided the basis for the Soviet-era film directed by S. Parajanov.

There has been a good deal of recent scholarship on Hutsul dialect, focused primarily on the lexicon (see, for example: Rieger 1996, Zakrevs'ka 2000, Jastrems'ka 2008, Xobzej 2002, Jakrevs'ka 1997, as well as the Bulletin of the Precarpathian National University Issue XIX-XX (2008) devoted entirely to recent Hutsul philological study). Lesjuk has also written several comprehensive articles on the dialect, including a linguistic analysis of the novel *Dido Ivančik* (2012). Also of particular note is the volume *Linguistic Etudes*, published in 1991 and edited by Zakrev'ska. In her foreword, she notes that the appearance of this work was closely linked to broader trends of Ukrainian language revival coalescing in the early independence era which included, in her estimation, a renewed interest in and study of Hutsul in the context of language revitalization.

When Vahylevyč was compiling his dictionary—the first such attempt to document the Hutsul dialect in a systematic way—he noted the presence of a wide range of lexical items of foreign origin; this led him to conclude that Hutsuls themselves were of foreign ethnic origin; specifically, he proposed the notion of Hutsuls as Slavicized Romanians. While the exact formation of the Hutsul ethnographic group remains in dispute, most scholars now agree that they are of East Slavic origin. Local toponyms and microtoponyms (Zamčysče, Knjaždvir, etc.) indicate that the area now associated with the Hutsuls has been inhabited by East Slav speakers speakers from a very early period (Zakrevs'ka 1991). Fedorak 2009 notes that the first historical record of settlements in the region now known as Hutsulschyna appeared in sources from the 14th to early 15th century, and the first mention of Žab’e (renamed Verxovyna in 1962) dates from 1424 when the Lithuanian prince Svidrigail bestowed it on a certain Vlad Dragosimovič.

Herman contends that the ancestors of modern-day Hutsuls likely arrived in the area as a result of later migrations from central Ukraine, possibly precipitated by waves of Turkic invasions (2008). Dovhan 2009 asserts that Hutsuls first formed a separate ethnolinguistic group no earlier the 16th-17th centuries, and relates their emerging identity to the appearance of the opryšky, whose ranks soon came to be dominated by self-identified Hutsuls. Boudovskaia 2006 points to linguistic data from church registry books to speculate the Hutsuls began inhabiting the Carpathians around the 1730s. The theories surrounding the relatively later migration of the Hutsuls to the Carpathian Mountain lands are supported by recent genetic research conducted by Nikitin, Kochkin, et al. who examined this question from the point of view of genetic markers by analyzing the mitochondrial DNA sequence of Boyko, Lemko, and Hutsuls populations, Their conclusion is that:

---

10 Mountain bandits, sometimes portrayed as fighters against oppression, similar to the Balkan hajduks.
Hutsuls were closer to the Ukrainian population (0.16) than either Boykos (0.32) or Lemkos (0.23). Thus, based on the Euclidean distance analysis of mtDNA haplogroup frequencies, the three Carpathian highlander populations showed greater distances from each other than from other eastern and central European populations used in the analysis. (2009)

In other words, DNA evidence lends genetic support to the most commonly accepted classification of Hutsuls as a subethnos of Ukrainians. It also lends credibility to claims that Hutsuls originated in some part of Rus\textsuperscript{11} and then filtered westward from there at a relatively late date.

Connected to this debate on the ethnographic origins of the Hutsuls are corollary debates on the origin of their ethnonym. The ethnonym “Hutsul” first appeared in writing in 1816, but its origins are likely older. There are numerous hypotheses about the genesis of this term, one of which connects the ethnonym with the personal (sur)name Hucul (from Hucь) which has been documented in the Prykarpattja region of Ukraine since 15th century (Zakrevs'ka 1991: 7). Another very common speculation is that “Hutsul” is a corruption of the Romanian word hoțul (‘brigand,’ with its possible associations with the opryšky). The most complete analysis of the etymology of the Hutsul ethnonym is given by Herman 2008 who outlines numerous possibilities for its origin, the most compelling of which is its likely development from a compound of the tribal names hucь and ułyčь\textsuperscript{12}. His argument is that the ethnonym arose after the arrival of ułyčь from southern Ukraine to the Carpathians, where they settled among the hucь tribe in the 11th-12th century. The word Hutsul then arose from an amalgam of these ethnonyms.

By the 17th century, the Hutsuls had likely established settlements in the Carpathian Mountains, although the extent of those early settlements is unknown. As the earliest descriptions come only in the 19th century, what we can piece together about their traditional lifestyle comes primarily from those later sources. The earliest settlements were very sparse, with rather large distances separating individual homesteads. D. Vatamanjuk writes that:

We talk about the fact that we have the beautiful Carpathians, we have talented Hutsuls, Bojkos, and Lemkos, but we must talk about the living conditions which differ even among these ethnicities. If the Hutsul population lived in the mountains, then the Boykos lived in the middle lying mountain region, in the valleys. Therefore the villages of Bojkivshchyna are compact, and the communities in Hutsulshchyna are more scattered, disconnected. (2006: 81)

\textsuperscript{11} The ancient homeland of the Eastern Slavic tribes which included parts of (modern) northern Ukraine, northwestern Russia, and Belarus.

\textsuperscript{12} The primary stress on the second syllable of hucь would seem to lend some credence to this theory.
This is, in fact, an important difference: because Hutsul communities were traditionally “scattered” and “disconnected”, their social, cultural, and linguistic isolation was not only in relation to other Ukrainians, but at many times, in relation to each other perhaps delaying the process of identity consolidation. The large distances between families also affected the way that Hutsuls socialized. Close social networks were often developed but limited to the extended family, and a few neighbors within walking distance; larger networking occurred through the Church during Sunday service and religious holidays, as well as weekly trips to the market where people traded their goods. Hutsul families tended to be large with generations organized along a strict hierarchy, and the upbringing of children was strict, including the expectation for children to address their parents with asymmetrical $\text{Vy}$. Contact with other Ukrainians was limited: Hutsuls tended not to travel far from their borders, so when contact did occur, it was the result of Eastern travelers venturing into the mountains in search of adventure and creative inspiration, and that only late in the 19th century. According to Xrušč 2008, this lack of daily socializing with larger networks has had the psychological effects of becoming closed, reticent among strangers, and cautious when meeting new people.

It is also well-established that early Hutsuls engaged primarily in agricultural activities, particularly herding and cheese-making, occupations that remained common in the mountains until recent times. Despite several administrative changes in the region, including colonization by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, followed by incorporation into Soviet Ukraine, Hutsuls have been remarkably tenacious in preserving their traditional culture, aided in part by the relative isolation by their mountain dwellings and villages (Fedorak 2009). As Petriv and Petriv 2009 note, “[d]espite the artificial administrative management, the Hutsuls have always created their traditional orders, mountain conditions, daily life, Wallachian shepherd's law, moutain-valley cattle-breeding, a common material and spiritual culture, a particular dialect” (p. 147).

1.2.1 Popular image of the Hutsuls

This isolated lifestyle coupled with a romanticization of proud struggles set in the harsh conditions of the Carpathians fueled the popular image of the Hutsuls as wild and exotic mountain men, battling the forces of nature with the help of pagan rituals led by sinister molfary in their “land forgotten by God and men.” Starting in the 19th century, Hutsulshchyna became a destination for those seeking exoticism at a comfortable distance from their homes. The first among these trips was taken by none other than Emperor Franz Joseph, who was credited for the “discovery” of the mysterious Hutsuls. As Dabrowski described his visit:

---

13 Like all Slavic languages, Ukrainian differentiates between the formal pronoun ‘you’ $\text{Vy}$ and informal pronoun ‘you’ $\text{ty}$.
14 Carpathian sorcerers
15 As it was famously described in Kotsiubynsky’s Hutsul novella Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors, which was adapted into a film of the same name by Soviet director Sergei Parajanov.
Early on, it had been decided that Franz Joseph would be treated to what was most unique in this poor province: its colorful native traditions...With their wild countenance and colorful traditional garb, the Hutsuls inspired much gushing on the part of journalists. (2005: 390-391)

Hnatjuk echoed the delights of these early journalists in his letter to Kotsiubynsky:

If you only knew what a captivating, almost fairytale corner of the world this is, with its dark-green mountains and eternally whispering mountain stream...The customs, the whole structure of life of those nomad Hutsuls...are so unique and beautiful that one feels as if one has been transported to some new and unknown world. (cited in Rubchak 2009)

This description was clearly effective as it inspired Kotsiubynsky’s own travel to the region and the now common astonishment upon “discovering” the Hutsuls: “If only you knew what majestic nature there is here, how interesting the Hutsul people are, with a rich, unique psyche, with wild imagination, with strange customs and language” (Kotsiubynsky cited in Budzak 2009: 185). While in Hutsulshchyna, Kotsiubynsky was inspired to produced several well-received literary works on Hutsul themes, including *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* which was later turned into a cinematic masterpiece by Sergei Parajanov. Through the magic of the big screen, Parajanov brought the mysterious and colorful semi-pagan Hutsuls into the late 20th century popular imagination. More than that, his film made clear connections between the Hutsuls and the larger Ukrainian nation, placing them within a rhetoric of Ukrainian cultural “authenticity.”

The tropes established by Hnatjuk, Kotsiubynsky, and other early travellers to Hutsulshchyna have continued to be projected in pop culture in the 21st century. In 2003, the Ukrainian pop singer Ruslana Lyžyčko released an album called *Wild Dances* which skyrocketed her into stardom with its distinctly Hutsul musical motifs, including the unmistakable wail of the alpine *trembita*. The sleeve notes to the English-version of her CD reiterate the now familiar characterization of the Hutsul lands:

In the very heart of Europe in the majestic kingdom of the Carpathian mountains there lives an ancient culture of the mountains that possesses unique mystic rituals, mountainous rhythms and dances. Ruslana has united the mysteries of the mountains with a new energy and power. (cited in Baker 2008)

As Fedyuk further notes, "the language of her official website, which describes her *Wild Dances* project, overflows with words like: real, authentic, original, ancient, wild, exotic, mystic--all to

---

16 One of the primary themes of the film is the manner in which Hutsuls blend Christian worship with a concurrent belief in witchcraft and sorcery.
describe the Hutsul element in Ruslana's music, shows, and costumes " (2006: 3).

The album was so successful that she was chosen to represent Ukraine in the Eurovision song contest in 2004. On stage, before over 100 million viewers, Ruslana represented Ukraine surrounded by Hutsul-costumed dancers and *trembita*\textsuperscript{17} players, consciously projecting a version of Ukrainian culture mediated by the concept of Hutsuls as bastions of the nation’s ancient past, authentic through their resistance to the trappings of modern life, and the uncorrupted soul of the Ukrainian nation. The discourse of exoticism was also in full view, providing a meeting ground for both Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian viewers alike: through her performance, Ruslana successfully marketed Ukraine to a foreign audience by drawing on Hutsul exoticism. Her victory at Eurovision was overwhelming, and again brought Hutsuls to the forefront of popular depictions of the “true Ukraine.” This has important implications: as Baker 2008 writes, "Since Eurovision is contested between states, the representations performed there appear to represent the nation as a whole. The specific elements of ‘Wild Dances’, identifiable as Hutsul while they remained within Ukraine, were thus attached to Ukraine itself." While Hutsuls continue to be popularly imagined as ‘wild’ and ‘exotic,’ there is a concurrent motif of authenticity, a motif explicitly linked to the essentialization of broader Ukrainian culture. Hutsuls are thus portrayed as kind of “pre-civilized” Ukrainians free of modern--particularly Soviet-era--corruption.

The rhetoric of Hutsuls as “authentic” Ukrainians is not without its political implications. On the satirical site of an ostensibly Pro-Russian Ukrainian organization called the Pridneprovskij-Doneckij Rabočij Soyuz (PDRS), there recently appeared an article denouncing the Western-oriented Euromaidan movement. The authors of the site offer advice on “how to survive the Banderist\textsuperscript{18} occupation.” Included in their advice on how to blend in with the “nationalist extremists,” they recommend:

Learn the Hutsul language using the special dictionaries compiled for you by the PDRS. Yes, the Hutsul language is disgusting to hear, but this knowledge will protect you at the moment when the Banderist’s hand begins to reach for the Mauser.

Dress like a Hutsul. It is disgusting, but it helps. Especially if the patrol is far away and can’t see that you are secretly giving them the bird. Banderists see Hutsuls as their own and never bother them. In old times almost all Banderists were Hutsuls. Even now you will find Hutsul Banderists\textsuperscript{19}.

This portrayal of Hutsuls, accompanied by numerous pictures of Hutsul folk costumes and a

\textsuperscript{17} The traditional Hutsul alpine horn.

\textsuperscript{18} Referencing the World War II-era partisan leader Stepan Bandera, a symbol of Ukrainian nationalism, whose image has been manipulated by both sides in the recent conflicts in Ukraine.

\textsuperscript{19} http://www.pdrs.dp.ua/type/type70.html
glossary of Hutsul terms, draws on the theme of Hutsuls as “true” Ukrainians and a representation of the Ukrainian struggle against Russian influence. This description demonstrates the continuation of the same tropes developed through Ruslana’s appropriation of the Hutsuls as symbols of Ukrainian authenticity.

1.2.2 The end of Hutsul isolation and the decline of traditional lifestyle

As noted above, such popular images first emerged with the “discovery” of the Hutsuls in the late 19th century which precipitated the end of their relative isolation from mainland Ukraine. The event triggering this momentous change was the visit of Franz Joseph in 1880. The territory had been acquired by the Habsburgs in 1772 and had been considered one of the most backward impoverished lands in the Empire. However, many also recognized the region’s potential: it was rich in natural resources (salt, curative mineral water, indications of lead, iron, and silver), and had a wild reputation based on the mountain bandits, the opryšky, at one time lead by the legendary Oleksa Dovbuš, the Carpathian Robin Hood. Franz Joseph’s trip to Galicia, which included a stop in Kolomyja to visit an ethnographic museum, constituted the "true public debut of the Hutsuls" and heralded in an era of domestic tourism to the region and the. (Dabrowski 2005: 388). Among the goals for developing imperial tourism to the region was the import of the “civilizing forces” of modernization, which included the marking of alpine trails and the building of lodges to accommodate the expected visitors. Hutsuls were also put on display, as well as employed as craftsmen esteemed for their fine woodworking skills. This new accessibility to the region and its people had far-reaching implications. As Dabrowski writes, “this 'discovery' likewise served as a catalyst for the physical transformation of the region. Increased interest literally helped to alter the landscape, initiating projects we would consider modernizing" (2005: 382). These events ultimately led to Hutsulshchyna’s broader integration with Galicia and, by extension, Ukraine, with the immediate result that "this [previously] irrelevant, isolated, premodern backwater would become a more integrated and economically developing part of a larger, national whole” (p. 382).

However, the goals of integration and the development of a tourist industry were predicated upon the cooperation and active participation of the local population. This imperative triggered the first stages of decline of the Hutsuls’ traditional lifestyle, as previous mountain herders abandoned their flocks to staff the newly opened lodges and to carve intricate wooden crafts for travellers in search of unique souvenirs steeped in local color. The dilemma this posed to many Hutsuls is summarized by Dabrowski who writes:

Was the Hutsul merely to....make his living not as a shepherd in the high upland but as a craftsman?....Indeed, would the encounter between lowlander and highlander lead to traditional Hutsul output becoming 'commodified' and/or

In many ways, this 19th century dilemma still has currency today as Hutsuls struggle to maintain their identity in the face of increasing physical and cultural encroachment. The parallels are striking:

Still, what kinds of options faced the Hutsul in an increasingly modern world—a world ignored only at his peril? Would the Hutsul still be a Hutsul if he stopped spending his summers on the poloniny and instead devoted his time to producing wares not only for his own household's use (work usually done in the winter) but for broader consumption? Or if he let rooms to guests for the summer, led excursions, or served as a porter for a living? (Dabrowski 2005: 394).

The effects were immediate and so visible that Xotkevyč is already lamenting the seemingly impending loss of Hutsul culture in the first decades of the 20th century:

You look at this incredible energy, at this insatiable persistence, this fantastic endurance and you think to yourself: will it really all be lost? And won’t these people leave their mark on human history? And will this crazy, exciting energy really perish in vain? It just can’t be! (1966: 357)

Xotkevyč’s own role in the exposure of Hutsul culture to the outside world is hard to underestimate. As will be discussed further below, his Hutsul Theater, founded in 1910, brought not only Hutsul history, but also the Hutsul dialect, on tour throughout Ukraine to much acclaim. One of his actors, a Hutsul by the name of Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv who was particularly well-versed in local lore, began compiling the first Hutsul Calendar-Almanacs, which were successfully produced for the years 1935, 1937, and 1939. He also completed the great Hutsul novel Dido Ivančik during these years; unfortunately, however, this work would have to wait over 60 years until it could be published. The early 20th century was also a time of promotion for the education of Hutsuls: the first Hutsul school was opening in the village of Holova and the social organization Prosvita was formed to encourage wider accessibility of schools and literacy for the local population (Sinitovyč and Sinitovyč 2010). Early optimism, however, was short-lived: the Soviet years were marked by tragedy: widespread repressions, including the arrest of both Xotkevyč and Šekeryk-Donykiv, were followed by brutal suppression of perceived nationalist inclinations. During WWII, many Hutsuls participated in the partisan efforts of Stepan Bandera, for which they were punished by mass arrests and Siberian exile. Because of

---

20 There has been some backlash against this in recent times: As Xrušič 2008 notes, local residents who have amassed wealth are increasingly viewed with suspicion. She supports this claim with sociological research which has shown that there is a generally low opinion of those who sell souvenirs and have become "businessmen."

21 Mountain pastures where Hutsul shepherds traditionally live while tending their flocks.
their sympathy for the partisans, many of the local Catholic Churches were closed\textsuperscript{22}, which thwarted the primary social connections Hutsuls maintained with their neighbors. Their culture was marginalized as “backward” and in need of re-education, often in the form of Russification, a policy that many Hutsuls endeavored to resist. Nevertheless, the damage had been done to the integrity of Hutsul culture, and their reputation became associated with a brand of nationalism based on ignorance and obsolete beliefs. The Soviet years also brought another round of modernization to the region, with train and bus lines built to connect it to the rest of Soviet Ukraine; little by little, consumer goods trickled in, and old professions continued to be abandoned in favor of ones more profitable in the contemporary world. When Parajanov arrived in the region to film \textit{Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors} in 1968, he wrote with unconcealed disappointment in the cultural amalgam that had emerged:

\begin{quote}
After deciding to shoot the film, we left for the Carpathians hurriedly, one after the other. When I arrived on the spot and looked around, I was not exactly gripped by enchantment. Rather the opposite. The first thing that you noticed was connected with the most everyday modern life. I saw European shoes, asphalt, bicycles, high-voltage towers. The cliff where the Gutenjuks fought with the Paličuks is no more--it was blown up when a road was put through. Honestly, I was distressed by this strange combination of the ancient and the young. The buzzing of wires and the drawn-out grief of the horn [$trembita$]. Gold watches, crowding a sleeve with homespun embroidery…. One window of my hotel room overlooked the Čeremoš [River], rapid and meandering, and the other overlooked the asphalt courtyard, across which an old woman once went to the market with her cow, and afterward returned alone, jingling the orphaned bell. (Parajanov 1968: 44)
\end{quote}

While Ukrainian independence from the Soviet Union was almost universally welcomed in Western Ukraine, including Hutsulshchyna, many of the trends of forced modernization have continued, now made imperative not by threat of repression, but by the demands of an emerging market economy that can not support the traditional herding lifestyle of the Hutsuls. As in the 19th century, the widespread assumption is that the development of a tourism industry holds the key to the region’s stability and continued relevance. While Hutsul culture is no longer marginalized as it was in the Soviet era--in fact, it is now held in high esteem, exemplified by Ruslana Lyžyčko’s Eurovision success--the lifestyle underlying that culture is in sharp decline. As the contemporary Hutsul writer Marija Vlad writes in her work \textit{Polonyna}:

\begin{quote}
No one wants to keep a cow. Although the administration has encouraged them all
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{22} Prior to WWII, most Hutsuls attended Catholic churches. Following their closure, a number of these churches were re-opened as Orthodox churches leading many Hutsuls to convert to Orthodoxy in the post-war period. When the Catholic churches were allowed to re-opened, some Hutsuls converted back to Catholicism, but many others have chosen to remain Orthodox.
that they can. The villager no longer sees himself as a gospodar. No one wants to deal with hay, manure. Better to drink beer instead of milk. My neighbor, once a good gazdyn'â, developed such a taste for that drink that she doesn't need a cow. And with all of this the Hutsul has lost his essence. Because who is he with all of this? So much has been lost for him, all irretrievably gone. It is so unfortunate, so sad to me, but what of it now…(2005)

Despite the widespread societal changes precipitating the loss of certain aspect of the traditional Hutsul lifestyle, several steps have been taken to counteract the resulting cultural attrition. The steps taken constitute both a cultural revival, as well as a concerted effort to preserve cultural artifacts—including the Hutsul dialect—before potential future loss. The most visible sign is the publication of classic texts written by Hutsul writers at the beginning of the 20th century. Among these are Ž'yb'jivs'ki noveli (2006) by Onufrij Mančuk, Dido Ivančik (2007) by Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv, and the collection Rik u viruvannjax hutsuliv: Výbrani tvory (2009), a re-compilation of the texts produced by Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv for his 1935, 1937, and 1939 Hutsul Calendar-Almanacs. The Hutsul Theater, originally founded by Xotkevyč in 1910, was also revived in 1988, although its productions and influence have been limited due to lack of funding. In addition, several contemporary writers have had their works published in recent years, both on Hutsul themes and in the Hutsul dialect; most notable among these are the literary prose of Hutsul writer and artist Paraska Plytka-Horycvit, including Z najmolodšyx rokov mojix (2005) and Starovicki povistor'kke (2008). A number of research-based texts striving to preserve the old dialect and cultural traditions have also been published recently by scholars, including the detailed lexical analysis of Tradycijne hucul's'ke pastuxuvannja (Jastrems'ka 2008), and the thorough overview of the traditional Hutsul belief system produced by N. Xobzej (Hutsul's'ka mifolohija: etnolinhvistyčnyj slovnyk, 2002). The Hutsul comedian and writer Mykola Savčuk has also published several notable works on Hutsul history and culture, including the 2010 Hutsul Calendar-Almanac (Hutsulskij kalendar-almanak) which provides historical episodes, folk customs, humorous anecdotes, and several lessons in Hutsul vocabulary. Publications have also resulted from several regional conferences and roundtable discussions, including U centr hutsulsčyny (2006) and Ukrajina, halyčyna, hutsulsčyna: Istoriya, polityka, kultura (2009).

In addition to an increase in local publications, annual Hutsul music festivals are also held each year, including the largest summer festival called Polonynske lito which celebrates not only music, but also folklife, folk costumes, and traditional Hutsul pastimes. It was following this festival in 2009 that then-president Viktor Yushchenko issued a presidential decree designed
to facilitate Hutsul cultural revival efforts. This decree (No. 703/2009), entitled “On the preservation and popularization of Hutsul culture,” outlines several steps the state government proposed to take to bolster Hutsul culture as part of the nation-building project including:

- further development of extracurricular activities for school children focused on preserving the traditions of Hutsul folk art
- the expansion of museums offering exhibits of Hutsul folk art and folk life
- the creation and publication of brochures, catalogs, and academic articles covering topics in Hutsul spiritual and material culture
- the creation of audio and video materials covering aspects of Hutsul traditions and art
- the creation of thematic library exhibits
- the financing of ethnographic expeditions and the creation of tour programs for visitors
- the financing of an annual folk festival and market featuring Hutsul folk art

Unfortunately, funding has been limited and the ambitious vision presented in this decree has been left largely unrealized, with the exception of continued roundtable discussions of the pressing need to develop the regional tourism industry while taking steps to preserve the local environment.

1.3 Language Planning in Post-Soviet Ukraine

Throughout the Soviet period, Russian had been successfully promoted as the status language throughout much of Ukraine, creating a population divided along language lines, with Russian speakers predominant in the east and south, and Ukrainian speakers largely limited to the western regions. Not only was Russian promoted through its requirement in higher education and prestigious employment, but the Soviet government also embarked on a program of language engineering designed to artificially bring standard Ukrainian closer in form and content to Russian, including modifications made to its orthography and lexicon (Bilaniuk 2005, Goodman 2009). The policy, therefore, took shape as both status and corpus planning: as Krouglov writes, “the imposed devaluation of the Ukrainian language and culture induced semantic and grammatical shifts, phonetic assimilation and lexical infiltration of Russian forms” (2003: 222). By the 1990s, many Ukrainophiles were promoting a discourse of endangerment, whereby the integrity of the Ukrainian language was perceived as being under threat through Russian encroachment. The nation-building project which emerged was designed to reverse the effects of over a century of Russian language dominance and, therefore, hinged on an agenda of language planning, including designation of Ukrainian as the sole official language of the nation, standardization and codification, language-in-education policies, social promotion of Ukrainian, and media laws. The multi-pronged approach has included the standard components of most language planning programs, which Baldauf 2006 lists as status planning (focused on society),

corpus planning (focused on language), and prestige planning (focused on image).

On the eve of independence, the issue of status planning took center stage in the battle fought over language politics. Many of the early Ukrainian leaders believed that they could turn the tide of the language situation—in favor of Ukrainian—by passing appropriate legislation designed to elevate and legitimize the use of Ukrainian. The Law on Languages passed by the Soviet Ukrainian government in 1989 not only recognized Ukrainian as the language of the administration, but also made the study of Ukrainian mandatory at all state schools, including those where the primary language of instruction was Russian. By the time independent Ukraine had adopted its first constitution, these language goals had led to the official designation of Ukrainian as the sole state language and, because a large percentage of the population was Russian-speaking, education was deemed the key to effecting the desired shift to Ukrainian on a mass scale for, as Baldauf 2006 notes, teachers are “central agents in language policy development” (p. 154).

While Russian-language schools closed or transitioned to Ukrainian language as the primary means of instruction, colleges and universities were also faced with the task of moving away from Russian language textbooks and instructional materials toward those published in Ukrainian, as the Ukrainian language became firmly implanted in most educational institutes throughout the country. While this process was, as noted above, primarily designed to strengthen Ukrainian’s position relative to Russian in the post-Soviet space, local dialects became collateral damage. Krouglov 2003 describes this process as “linguistic cleansing” in which “normativism is deeply embedded in the tradition of Ukrainian schools, where students are taught only the normative language and any deviations are censured. All those who use the Ukrainian language as a means of communication must keep to literary norms.” This correlates with the observation made by Tulloch who writes, “[a]lthough dialects may be highly valued by their speakers, macro approaches to language planning, and more specifically endangered language revitalisation, have traditionally either ignored or undermined dialectal variation, favouring the pursuit of a common, shared speech form as the natural target of interventions” (2006: 269). While Hutsul—or any other dialect—was never an intended target of language planning laws or language-in-education initiatives, the dominance of the codified standard has clearly had a levelling effect on local dialects, contributing to the current situation of attrition among non-standard forms.

In addition to promotion in education, status planning for Ukrainian also took the form of media laws designed to give increased national exposure to the language, considered a particularly necessary step in creating greater linguistic uniformity across a country faced with clear language divisions, as well as fostering Ukrainian’s dominance in both public and private life. These first of these laws required that all Ukraine-based television stations broadcast in Ukrainian and that all public billboards contain Ukrainian text. In 1998, an additional law was passed requiring that all foreign movies, including Russian movies, be either subtitled or dubbed into Ukrainian (Goodman 2009). As with the education initiatives, however, this promotion of
the standard language further crowds out dialectal variation, publicly linking status to CSU. As Kulyk 2006 explains, the language of media “is usually oriented towards the standard versions of respective languages thus embodying the ideologies of purity and identification. It is with the standard that the audience is invited to identify rather than with dialects...even if those varieties are actively used by the audience.” As will be discussed in Chapter 5 of this dissertation, the combined effects of language promotion through education and media have indeed had a detrimental effect on the use and vitality of the Hutsul dialect, despite the singular intention of limiting the influence of Russian.

In addition to status planning through education and media, Ukrainian language planning has also including corpus planning both as means to undo Soviet-era engineering and return to a more “authentic” version of Ukrainian and to codify a single national standard in an ecology which, until that time, effectively had two competing regional standards, Western Ukrainian and Eastern Ukrainian. Language planners decided to yield to tradition and elevate the central (Middle Dnieprian) Kyiv-Poltava as the basis for the national standard, drawing on the historical precedent set by the Kharkiv Conference on Orthography held in 1927 which first established the prestige dialect of the Kyiv-Poltava dialect as the basis for establishing nationwide standardization of norms (Goodman 2009).

The result of both status and corpus planning is that the Kyiv-Poltava dialect has been firmly established as the prestige dialect within a context of active promotion designed to increase its public and private use. While this was intended to favor the Ukrainian language over Russian, it also has a levelling effects on dialects which have become collateral damage of the language battle. When attention has been paid to programs of language support and maintenance, it has focused almost exclusively on Russian--now a minority language--rather than on local and regional dialects of Ukrainian. As Tulloch notes, “although the argument for recognition of the intrinsic value of linguistic diversity is now widespread in terms of language preservation, it has yet to a concern for the preservation of diversity within languages” (2006: 281). This is precisely the underlying assumption of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, signed by Ukraine in 1996, and ratified in 2006. Under this Charter, the rights of minority language speakers are recognized and protected; however, the Charter offers no similar protections to language forms deemed dialects. The most immediate result of Ukraine’s ratification of the Charter was the mandate to protect the rights of Russian speakers in Ukraine which culminated in then-President Yanukovich’s official designation of Russian as a regional language of Ukraine. This was followed by motions to grant similar status to Rusyn and Crimean and opened the door to the issue of dialect speakers’ rights under the terms of the Charter, as well as a polemic on the very definition of a dialect within the post-Soviet Ukrainian context.

In response to the motions granting regional status to Rusyn, Hennadyj Moskal’, a deputy of the Our Ukraine-People’s Self Defense bloc, satirically submitted a motion to endow Hutsul with the same status of official regional language. As he opined: “tomorrow the Lemkos will
come to me, or the Bojkos--and we’ll add their languages. You can’t turn a law into a theater of the absurd. Kolesnyčenko⁵⁸ has never even seen a Rusyn on TV. Therefore stupidity must be answered with the same stupidity.”⁵⁹ To underscore what he perceived to be the absurdity of such a motion, Moskal’ promised to make his official motion before the Rada speaking entirely in the Hutsul dialect, a promise, in fact, made in a strange caricature of Hutsul involving dialect words and pronunciation popularly associated with southwestern dialects⁶⁰. However, this discourse was far from satirical among regional groups, including the Hutsuls, who staged a small-scale local demonstration demanding official recognition of their language immediately following the passage of the law on regional languages.³¹

This active promotion of CSU in all spheres of public and private life, most notably through education and media laws, has not only marginalized local dialects, but has also brought dialect speakers into close, sustained contact with speakers of CSU, who now often form the linguistic majority in local communities. For some previously isolated dialects, such as Hutsul, this increased contact with CSU has resulted in internal structural changes, affecting its phonology, morphology, and syntax, and drawing Hutsul into greater typological proximity to other dialects of Ukrainian at the expense of unique localized features. The specific features that have been most prone and most resistant to contact-induced changes with the subject of chapters 2, 3, and 4 of this dissertation.

1.4 Language Contact and Convergence

What must be determined for the Hutsul dialect is both the manner in which contact-induced change has occurred as well as its specific manifestations, as very little is currently known about the contemporary structure of Hutsul. Anecdotal evidence has long claimed that Hutsul, like any living language, has undergone various changes over time, particularly during the last century as economic modernization, education, and inter-regional travel have necessitated widespread asymmetric bilingualism, triggering code-switching behavior and providing a natural inroad for borrowing. The questions to be asked are how does contact cause and determine structure and what are the linguistic predictors for the kind and degree of changes which occur. Sankoff 2001, Thomason 2001, and Thomason and Kaufman 1988 have all concluded that both linguistic constraints and social dynamics play a role in contact-induced change; however, socio-historical factors are given particular weight by Sankoff, and Thomason and Kaufman similarly conclude that "linguistics interference is conditioned in the first instance

---

⁵⁸ A member of the Yanukovych's Party of Regions
⁵⁹ Lenta.ru (08/29/12). On August 28, 2012 Novost' Mira reported that Moskal' also attempted a motion to make English and numerous other European languages official regional languages of Ukraine under the same law.
⁶⁰ "Я хочу, щоб, як кажуть гуцули, 'парламент' прийняв цей закон. Тому я вже написав собі промову на 'файній' гуцульській мові і буду звертатись до панів, які сидять у 'парламенті', аби вони 'мали охоту і гонор' і зважили на гуцулів."
³¹ Rosbalt.ru 07/05/2012
by social factors, not linguistic ones. Both the direction of interference and the extent of interference are socially determined; so, to a considerable degree, are the kinds of features transferred from one language to another" (1988: 35). Thomason 2001 lists both the social and linguistic factors which frequently predict the kinds and degree of contact-induced change: social factors include intensity of contact, presence vs. absence of imperfect learning, and speakers’ attitudes; linguistic factors include universal markedness, integration of features into the linguistic system, and typological distance. Other factors often noted in contact-induced change situations are widespread bilingualism, frequent use of code-switching as a communicative strategy, social-indexical properties determined by local language ideology, and identity marking.

Contact-induced change is most frequently the result of cultural pressure exerted from majority speakers onto a minority speaking popular. Crucial to the requisite diffusion of the changed features is intense contact, often through widespread asymmetrical bilingualism. Thomason and Kaufman 1988 are particularly emphatic about the role bilingualism plays in structural borrowing, noting that “all cases of moderate to heavy structural borrowing that we have found involve a group of active bilinguals who speak the source language fluently and use it regularly for at least some ordinary communicative purposes” (p. 967). They further identify the key features of bilingualism which most strongly promote borrowing, including the length of time that the population is bilingual, the relative size of the populations in contact, sociopolitical dominance of one group of speakers over the other, and the formation of mixed households and/or social settings (1988: 72). As will be discussed in detail in chapter 5 of this dissertation, each of these key points noted by Thomason and Kaufman holds particular relevance in the Hutsul case, where bilingualism has been the norm since at least the mid-twentieth century, where the local population is a national minority group currently further subject to local encroachment, where political marginalization has been replaced by economic marginalization, and where mixed households have become increasingly common. While these authors note that the first features prone to borrowing are lexical items (p. 37), they also admit that “strong long-term cultural pressure” can trigger structural borrowing affecting the phonological, phonetic, syntactic, and--in their opinion, far more rarely--morphological systems. In this they distinguish between degrees of intensity of contact: “[a]lthough lexical borrowing frequently takes place without widespread bilingualism, extensive structural borrowing, as has often been pointed out, apparently requires extensive (though not universal) bilingualism" (p. 37). Thomason 2001 adds that “very extensive bilingualism” coupled with social factors favoring borrowing can also ultimately lead to heavy structural borrowing in the recipient language (p. 70-71), a notion favored by Hinskens, Auer, and Kerswill who further posit that the long-term effects of borrowing can be “the convergence of the recipient dialect with the source dialect" (p. 9).

---

32 Michael similarly notes that it is often social-indexical properties which determine which of competing variants are lost and which are maintained.

33 While symmetrical bilingualism can also lead to various manifestations of contact-induced change, it is specifically the situation of asymmetrical bilingualism that characterizes contemporary Hutsul language dynamics and which has led to the current trajectory of change.
While widespread bilingualism is often fostered through the educational system and supported by frequent inter-group communication, it need not always lead to structural change within a dichotomy of source and recipient language. Thomason 2006 notes that there are, in fact, numerous examples of bilingual communities where borrowing either does not occur, or occurs on a very limited scale (p. 13-14). Rather, the deciding factor in which bilingual communities will yield to structural borrowing leading to long-term change is the "cultural pressure [that] is most obviously exerted by a politically and numerically dominant group on a subordinate population living within its sphere of dominance" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 67). The determination, then, of source and recipient languages in a borrowing environment relies primarily on social factors, including notions of indexicality and ideology. For the Hutsuls, the prestige of CSU has been solidified through its use in all spheres of civic life including education, business, and administration. It has also been very successfully promoted through media, a sphere where dialect has never had a firm hold. The necessity of CSU proficiency is reinforced at all stages of public life, starting in elementary school and ending with participation in the workforce, and applies to all segments of the population with singular exceptions of the elderly and the few remaining shepherds who still remain on the *polonyna*. The cultural pressure on Hutsul-speakers is, therefore, quite pervasive, and is often psychologically supported by the Hutsul tendency to identify at once as both distinctly Hutsul and as a legitimate member of the wider Ukrainian nation.

For Hinskens, Auer and Kerswill, the process of contact-induced change is closely tied to the issue of identity: in their view, identity permeability may lead to convergence, but will be limited to certain features, either through their avoidance (in the case of salient local features), or their adoption (competing prestige forms) (p. 7). Croft 2003 also writes of the role of “acts of identity,” describing them as the primary driving force of both change and resistance to change. As he notes:

> For social contact situations, the central distinction we make for a group of speakers is between their heritage society (and language) and their adoptive society. The heritage society is the one represented by the speakers' ethnic ancestry; the heritage language is that spoken by the speaker's ethnic ancestors. The adoptive society is the society which the speakers have come into contact with, and to some extent have socially identified with. If the speakers have not come to identify at all with the adoptive society, identifying instead with their heritage society, then no significant language mixture takes place....If speakers no longer identify with the heritage society at all, and come to completely identify with the adoptive society including its language, then language shift takes place. (p. 6-7)

Croft asserts, however, that in the case where the speakers cease to identify with the heritage
society, there will be little evidence of structural borrowing, as shift will be rapid and total, leaving no intermediary stage of convergence before ultimate shift. Within Croft’s paradigm, it is quite easy to place Hutsuls in just such an intermediary category: for most--although certainly not all--their identity is intrinsically linked to both heritage and adoptive societies, to use Croft’s terminology. As such, the predicted result should be some degree of language mixing or borrowing, a result supported by the data presented in chapters 2, 3, and 4.

In addition to social factors such as social valuation, identity, and sociopolitical dominance, linguistic factors can also play a role in determining whether and how contact-induced change takes place. Most relevant in the case of Hutsul--as in all cases of dialects in contact--is typological distance. Thomason 2001 asserts that “grammatical interference is confined to features that fit well typologically with the structure of the receiving language” (p. 63), and may include even those features which are “highly marked or highly integrated into an interlocking structures” (p. 77). Typological proximity, it is argued, facilitates the transfer and diffusion of borrowed features in contexts of parallel structure between source and recipient language as these features can be readily integrated into the existing linguistic system. This is view shared by Sankoff 2001, who argues that it is specifically those source language features which are most similar to the recipient language that will predominate in structural borrowing. When Croft writes of linguistic hybridization, he also firmly states that such structural transfers can only occur “between closely related languages or, in fact, dialects” (2003: 6).

1.4.1 Patterns of contact-induced change

The typical pattern expected to emerge in situations of language contact is difficult to define. Indeed, while this topic has been studied in numerous linguistic contexts, researchers have often arrived in very diverse assessments, leading some to ultimately conclude that, “no aspect of language change is, in the end, completely predictable” (Thomason 2006: 16). Nevertheless, there some patterns which may described as most typical seem to emerge when those patterns can be correlated with specific circumstances surrounding the contact environment.

Both Thomason 2006 and Kaufman 1988 and Thomason 2006 differentiate between borrowing and shift interference when describing contact-induced change. Each of these situations, in their opinion, is associated with a different expected pattern of change. According to both, borrowing is characterized primarily by lexical transfer, mostly often of non-basic vocabulary; if structure and basic vocabulary are borrowed it all, it can be expected to lag far behind non-basic vocabulary (Thomason 2006: 14)

34 Thomason 2001 further notes that inflectional morphology tends to be the most resistant in borrowing because “its component parts fit into a whole that is (relatively) small, self-contained, and highly organized.” (p. 69). However, in the case of dialects of typological proximity this is likely a less problematic constraint.
reiterated by Thomason 2001 who states that, in borrowing, we can “expect to find lexicon borrowed without structure, but not vice versa” (p. 69). These general observations are confirmed by Sankoff who asserts that lexicon and phonology are the domains most susceptible to transfer in borrowing situation, while morphology and syntax tend to be more highly resistant.

This is contrasted with shift interference in which phonology and syntax appear to be most vulnerable to change, while lexical transfer occurs much later, if at all (Thomason 2006: 14), and Thomason and Kaufman note a strong correlation between phonology and syntax, stating that “in interference through shift, if there is phonological interference there is sure to be some syntactic interference as well, and vice versa." (1988: 60). Phonological and syntactic changes can be observed in even in cases of “slight interference,” whereas “moderate to heavy interference” will include interference in inflectional morphology (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 121). As will be demonstrated in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, CSU encroachments on Hutsul have included numerous cases of transfer in the inflectional morphology, leading to the assumption that it has reached a stage of at least moderate, and likely heavy, interference.

Croft 2003 unifies the phenomena of borrowing and shift interference into a concept he calls “death by borrowing.” In his view, it is the lexicon that is the last to transfer into the recipient language as, he writes, people most often identify a language with its words, which serve as a clear mark distinguishing one language from another. In the case where people wish to maintain and assert their identity through language choice, it is specifically the lexicon which most readily serves as a marker. This is a useful observation in the case of Hutsul, where cultural revival has inspired greater identity expression and, indeed, the retention of much of the local lexicon, despite structural atrophy. The description given by Croft of “death by borrowing” is remarkably relevant to the current situation of Hutsul:

If more and more of the adoptive language were borrowed, there would remain little more of the heritage language than a core of basic vocabulary and some grammatical inflections and constructions. Yet the borrowing society may still resist assimilation into the adoptive society....At some point the competence in the heritage language has declined to the point that it can no longer serve as the everyday language of the heritage society; instead it is appropriated for the function of a special, secret variety. (2003: 9)

As will be discussed throughout this dissertation, this is precisely the picture emerging of the current status and function of Hutsul. Widespread structural transfer resulting from contact has affected the form of the dialect leading to its overall atrophy (chapters 2, 3, and 4), while some efforts aimed at identity maintenance have resulted in Hutsul’s preservation in primarily private and folkloric realms, such as in songs, proverbs, and ritual. Where dialect is consciously maintained, the maintenance efforts are often placed largely on vocabulary as the “true” and most obvious marker of the dialect’s distinction from CSU.
Myers-Scotton 1993 provides a useful model for understanding contact-induced change and language shift which she calls the Matrix Language Turnover hypothesis. In this model, Myers-Scotton identifies two languages in contact as the Matrix Language (which provides the morphosyntactic frame) and the Embedded Language (which provides transferred content). The key manner of interaction between the ML and EL is codeswitching among the ML-speaking population. What Myers-Scotton claims is that, through frequent codeswitching behaviors, the ML can become so full of transferred features, that it switches places with the EL through a shift in language orientation, leaving only “islands of discourse” from its previous position. This shift in language orientation is conditioned along sociolinguistic factors, including assimilation of the minority group into the majority: as she describes, “as a community becomes more assimilated into the L2 culture, the prediction would be that the L2 becomes the community's ML” (p. 214). In this case, the assimilate of Hutsuls into larger Ukrainian society would necessitate their increased use of CSU, initially through frequent codeswitching, and ultimately its adoption as the primary language paradigm for interactions. This takes place in stages, as the L2 (here, CSU) becomes the language of conversations at work places, then invades informal public interactions, and ultimately finds its way into the home environment. It is precisely this trajectory of spread, according to Myers-Scotton, which leads to the turnover affecting structural integrity of the L1 (Hutsul): "My major hypothesis, however, is that a 'turnover' of the ML in CS can set into motion processes leading to one language's borrowing of structural features from another. In a 'turnover' of the ML, the former EL becomes the ML, and former ML becomes the EL" (p. 208). Based on the evidence which will be presented in this dissertation, this process has indeed been set in motion in Hutsul, where public codeswitching has increasingly led to CSU encroachment into private realms, a phenomenon which will be discussed further in chapter 5.

1.4.2 Predicting outcomes of contact

While the precise ordering of transferred features in contact-situations can be problematic to predict, several possible outcome scenarios of contact-induced borrowing and interference exist, including language maintenance with limited lexical and structural transfer, more extreme cases of heavy borrowing often accompanied by restrictions in spheres of use, and finally language death and linguistic shift of the population to the majority language. It is the last scenario of language death and shift which currently seems to be most threatening to the continued integrity of Hutsul. Jakijasu 2009 identifies three processes which he identifies as precipitous to language death: changes under the influence of a dominant language, changes connected to language loss among speakers, and internal structural changes. Hutsul, as will be demonstrated throughout this dissertation, is currently undergoing all three.

Language death affects the endangered in two main ways: through structural atrophy and loss of linguistic material, as well as through social stigmatization limiting its use and influence through cultural pressures exerted by a dominant language. Thomason and Kaufman 1988
particularly emphasize that such such losses in the domains of usage results in new generations failing to learn and replicate previous structures which then quickly fall out of use. Where there are efforts to maintain cultural autonomy in the face of such cultural pressures from a dominant group, the linguistic manifestations are limited to the maintenance of “only portions of the vocabulary,” primarily basic, highly localized terms (p. 48-49). According to Thomason and Kaufman, once this process has been set in motion, there are only three possible linguistic outcomes: a subordinate population may rapidly shift to the dominant language so that the minority languages dies a sudden death, a language shift occurs over several generation leading to slow attrition and language death, or “for reasons of stubborn language and cultural loyalty, the pressured group may maintain what it can of its native language while borrowing such large portions of the dominant language's grammar that they replace all, or at least sizeable portions of, the original grammar....The third outcome, as far as we know, is very rare indeed” (p. 100).

Within her Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis, Myers-Scotton outlines seven possible outcome scenarios, ranging from the most limited to the most extreme in scope. Her contention is that languages undergoing attrition will often move through scenarios in order, which ultimately leads to language death, if nothing inhibits their continued atrophy. Within her paradigm, evidence suggests that Hutsul has reached Scenario IV in which the L1 moves from Matrix Language to Embedded Language resulting in “an 'outside goes inside' change” (1993: 220). The steps by which this occurs are:

1. Speakers become bilingual in both languages
2. Codeswitching takes place in inter-group communication
3. “Environment pressures” cause “a turnover in CS as the ML in ML + EL constituents becomes the new EL” (p. 222)
4. Replacement of the former ML by the EL

However, full replacement need not occur: if speakers seek to maintain a distinct identity through language choice, they may still symbolize their ethnic distinction by maintaining elements of the L1, in which case those elements form a sustained EL inserted into the new ML (CSU). Often this will manifest as limited L1 islands of lexicon and highly marked structural features inserted into a broadly L2 morphosyntactic framework. Myers-Scotton then asks, "What is the final step in the scenario, maintenance or shift?" and responds that "The result is a language which was substantially replaced from the inside out, a result which must be called language shift. (p. 222). This final stage of shift is ultimately reached in Myers-Scotton’s Scenario V.

1.5 Primary sources used for structural analysis

There is no single, monolithic "Hutsul dialect:" like most dialects, Hutsul exists as a
continuum which varies both geographically, with locally encoded salient features, as well as individually, with a range of stylistic options available to speakers who make contextually conditioned choices based on situation, location, and interlocutor identity. In my analysis of Hutsul structural change I will, therefore, limit the data to the dialect base of Verxoyna, traditionally considered the center of Hutsul cultural life. All sources used, therefore, will represent the dialect as it has been and continues to be spoken in the Verxoyna region. These works represent a longitudinal trajectory of the vernacular dialect ranging from the first decade of the 20th century to the first decade of the 21st. The primary texts used for data are as follows, in approximate chronological order of the time in which they were originally produced:

Hnat Xotkevyč, Sočynenija v dvux tomax
Onufrij Mančuk, Žyby'ivs'ki noveli
Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv, Dido Ivančik
Paraska Plytka-Horycvit, Z najmolodšyx rokov mojix, Starovicki povistor'kje
Marija Vlad, Stritenn'e knyžka hucul's'skyx zvičajiv i viruvan'
Tetjana Jastrems'ka, Tradycijne hucul's'ke pastuxuvannja
Verxovyns'ki visti, the regional newspaper of Verxoyna

1.5.1 Hnat Xotkevyč

Hnat Xotkevyč initially made his name as a musician from the eastern Ukrainian city of Kharkiv. The political instability which arose in the wake of 1905, however, motivated Xotkevyč to travel west, where he discovered his true artistic inspiration among the Hutsuls of the Verxoyna region. Upon his arrival, he began writing down local folklore and learning the local dialect, which he held in high esteem. Among his acquaintances was a Hutsul named Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv who was himself actively involved in the collection and preservation of local folklore and traditions and who began collaborating with Xotkevyč in his ethnographic research of the region. One evening, while drinking at a local tavern, Xotkevyč noticed the animated qualities of Hutsul social interactions and was struck by the idea that Hutsuls are natural actors who were born to perform on stage. However, he also realized the inauthenticity of dressing up semiliterate men--the majority of whom had never stepped foot in a theater much less read a play--as Shakespearean heroes and making them recite lines far removed from their experience. His solution was to create his own original plays written specifically for amateur Hutsul actors, on Hutsul historical and cultural themes, and in the Hutsul dialect. In 1910 he founded the Hutsul Theater in the village of Krasnojillja, and in August of that year his troupe held their first performance (“Verxovynci”), soon followed by several other performances. As his theater gained recognition, he began taking it on tour throughout Ukraine where it quickly grew in popularity (Sinitovyč and Sinitovyč 2010). Unfortunately, the changing political climate of Ukraine led to his arrest and execution in 1938.
Although Xotkevyč was not a native speaker of the Hutsul dialect, he was said to have learned it fluently and relied on his Hutsul actors to edit their scripts, ensuring that their lines were as authentic and as reflective of natural speech as possible. In this respect he was highly critical of other Ukrainian writers, such as Kotsiubynsky, who travelled to Hutulshchyna and incorporated stylized Hutul dialog into their works of fiction, which he considered to be too often an inaccurate caricature of the local dialect (Xotkevyč 1966: 548). In my grammatical analysis, Xotkevyč is often used as a baseline for Hutul dialectal speech in the first decades of the 20th century.

1.5.2 Onufrij Mančuk

Onufrij Mančuk was both a Hutul writer and cultural activist in the first decades of the 20th century. He began his writing career as a newspaper correspondent, moving onto to poetry and eventually prose, culminating in his best known work Žyb’jivs’ki noveli which contains short vignettes of Hutul life in the 1920s. In addition to writing, Mančuk was a passionate advocate for the education and literacy of Hutuls, and was himself considered one of the most highly educated Hutuls of his time. In June 1941, following the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, he was arrested by the NKVD and executed two days later. Žyb’jivs’ki noveli was not published during Mančuk’s lifetime; its first publication was in 1992 in Buffalo, NY, followed by publication in Ukraine in 2006.

1.5.3 Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv

Petro Šekeryk-Donykiv was a Hutul writer and ethnographer who, as noted above, collaborated with Xotkevyč in the development of the Hutul Theater. In addition to gathering local folklore and ethnography for Ukrainian writers, such as Ivan Franko, Volodymyr Hnatjuk, and M. Kotsiubynsky, Šekeryk-Donykiv produced several original works in his native Hutul dialect which have recently been republished in Ukraine and which provide modern readers with a unique glimpse into the customs, beliefs, and language of early 20th century Hutuls. The first of these works is the Hutsul Calendar-Almanac which Šekeryk-Donykiv published in the years 1935, 1937, and 1939 with the support and assistance of the Society of the Friends of Hutulshchyna. It is said that these calendar-almanacs were enormously popular among Hutuls at the time (Jakubjak 2006).

The second work of note is the classic Hutul novel Dido Ivančik, which has been called a “monument of our ancient dialect” (Jakubjak 2006). Although this work was written by Šekeryk-Donykiv in the 1930s, its publication was prevented by the changing political climate in Ukraine. The author was subsequently arrested for anti-Soviet activities connected with his involvement in OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) and died in NKVD custody in 1940. The author’s wife and daughter preserved the manuscript by burying underground in a
secret location where it remained hidden for over 60 years, revealing it only on the 110th anniversary of the author’s birth. Until that time, it had been assumed that the manuscript had been irretrievably lost.

In 2008 Dido Ivančik was published; as Lesjuk 2012 notes, “the author’s language is free from all external influences, particularly the influence of the Ukrainian literary language of that time.” (p. 12). This is considered an accurate example of the Hutsul dialect in the first decades of the 20th century, when relative isolation still ensured preservation of archaisms and local innovations which had not yet come under the sway of dialects from the Ukrainian mainland. Šekeryk-Donykiv endeavored to transmit phonological traits through orthographical manipulations: it is assumed that the spelling on his work reflects the local pronunciation of 1930s Verxovyna. According to Zelenčuk 2003, there have been calls for the creation of a dictionary so that the work could be accessible to a wider audience: it is almost entirely incomprehensible to CSU speakers, and even many contemporary Hutsul speakers find it difficult to read, as the language is so outdated. In his estimation, such a dictionary would contain approximately 3,000-4,000 unique Hutsul lexical items.

1.5.4 Paraska Plytka-Horycvit

Paraska Plytka-Horycvit was born in 1926 in the village of Bystrec' in the Verxovyna region. She was a writer, artist, folklorist, and ethnographer, who has been called the “Homer of Hutsulshchyna.” Although she only completed four years of elementary education, she became proficient in several languages, including German. During the war, Plytka-Horycvit was active in the partisan movement for which she delivered food and warm clothing to the soldiers hiding in the forests under the codename Lastivka. For this she was soon arrested and sentenced to ten years of labor in a Siberian prison camp. Upon her release, Plytka-Horycvit returned to Hutsulshchyna and settled in Kryvorinja where she began drawing, writing, and organizing folklore groups as well as a local chorus. However, as time passed, she started to withdraw from public life and rarely left her small house except to attend church services. Despite her local acclaim as both an artist and writer, none of her books were published during her lifetime. Following her death in 1998, her former cottage was turned into a museum dedicated to her life and art; two of her major literary works, Z najmolodšyx rokiv mojix and Starovicki povistor'kje were published in 2005 and 2008 respectively. 35

1.5.5 Marija Vlad

Marija Vlad, born in 1940, is a contemporary Hutsul journalist and writer whose work has been published in Literaturna Ukrajina and been recognized with numerous awards.

---

35 The content of this biographical sketch is based on Oksana Rybaruk’s unpublished manuscript Žyttja i tvorčist Parasky Plytky-Horycvit (2010), used with the author’s permission.
Although she considers her native dialect to be Hutsul, she is fluent in CSU and frequently codeswitches in her literary works, endeavoring to convey local speech as accurately as possible in dialog, while providing narration in the literary standard. For my grammatical analysis, I have used one of autobiographical stories describing her return to her native village in an attempt to understand her own past within the context of her Hutsul heritage. The passages chosen for analysis are those clearly marked as dialectal and which seem to be best illustrate the current dynamics of contact and change in contemporary speech.

1.5.6 Tetjana Jastrems'ka

*Tradycijne hucul's'ke pastuxuvannja* is a scholarly work produced by Tetjana Jastrems'ka who undertook extensive fieldwork to produce one of the thorough analyses of Hutsul pastoral lexicon. Following her discussion of the lexical isoglosses she discovered, she provides transcripts of her interview responses. Each transcription is marked with the interviewee’s date and place of birth, education level, profession, and current village of residence. It is from these transcribed interviews that I have taken examples of the most contemporary layer of Hutsul dialect traits. I have limited the data to those speakers who were identified as native to the Verxovyna region and, where appropriate, have noted their year of birth.

1.5.7 *Verxovyns'ki visti*, the regional newspaper of Verxovyna

Chief editor of *Verxovyns'ki visti*, Ivan Zelenčuk, has been active in the Hutsul cultural revival movement for many years. As part of his efforts to preserve the memories and language of Hutsuls, has undertook a series of interviews with local people asking them about their recollections of various influential historical events. For his interviews, he specifically sought out older speakers, in part because of his desire to preserve “authentic” older speech in response to what he perceives to be the dialect dilution common of the younger generations raised under the conditions of CSU dominance. In publishing the interviews, he strove to convey the speech of his informants as accurately as possible, preserving both the structure, lexicon, and pronunciation. In describing this project, Zelenčuk noted that these interviews “may be among the last documentation of the older form of Hutsul.” Despite this, the language of the interviews often show significant digression from the old dialect as used by such writers as Xotkevyč, Mančuk, and Šekeryk-Donykiv.

36 All speakers were at least 80 years old at the time of the interviews.
37 Zelenčuk informed me that his newspaper actually received numerous complaints from readers who claimed that the language used in the interviews was too difficult for them to read and fully understand.
Chapter Two: Phonology

The Hutsul dialect is most clearly defined by its distinct phonological inventory and patterns. As Bevzenko noted as early as 1969, the dialects of the Carpathian group tend to share similar morphological traits, but demonstrate a great deal of variety in their phonology. Indeed, when CSU speakers are questioned about their impressions of the Hutsul dialect, the most frequently noted response tends to focus on a so-called “Hutsul accent,” indicating greater noticeable salience of non-standard phonological features. Few CSU speakers, when asked, could produce any examples of non-standard grammatical structure, but all could caricature, with varying degrees of accuracy, the “Hutsul accent,” or at least those features which to them seemed most phonologically distinct. Adherence to local phonological norms has even become one of the clearest markers of local identity. In a joke describing who can be rightly considered a “real Hutsul”, M. Savčuk concludes:

It must be so decided: if you wear a keptar, eat kulesh every day, and instead of яблуко you say еблуко, then you are a Hutsul. If you wear shorts, drink Coca-Cola and listen to pop music, then how the devil can you call yourself a Hutsul? (2005)

In addition to other traditional identity markers of clothing and local foods, the phonological reflex of ja > je is here used to unambiguously index Hutsul identity.

As typical of most linguistic systems, the Hutsul dialect has long demonstrated a good deal of phonological variation, not only between different villages and geographic regions, but even with individual speakers occasionally vacillating between competing forms. This variation has led to atrophy under the conditions of dialect contact, yet the phonological system of the modern dialect still remains sufficiently distinct from that of the standard language to continue to provide an identity index as it did long ago. Recent convergence trends have taken their largest toll on those features which were seemingly already quite unstable by the beginning of the 20th centuries, when only a few sporadic tokens remained from what might have been a common feature long ago. Indeed, it has been argued that these tokens represent phonetic processes that ceased to be productive very early on, resulting in fossilized remnants of former reflexes which never extended to the entire lexicon (Zakrevs'ka 1991). More productive phonological reflexes resulted in those features which became more widely established as part of local language by the first half of the 20th century and which have since maintained a good deal of their salience in the modern dialect. Nonetheless, even those features which have remained fairly stable over the past century have demonstrated a tendency toward variation, and such variation could ultimately provides an inroad to phonological change in the dialect.

By examining the evidence of phonological convergence, the nature and depth of overall linguistic vulnerability can be assessed, as incursions made into to the phonetic/phonological
system represent one of the “major ‘gateways’ to all other aspects of contact-influenced change” (Sankoff 2001; Thomason and Kaufman 1988 also note the ubiquity of phonological interference in literature on language shift). Aside from lexicon, it is specifically phonology where the first and often deepest structural changes tend to take place, with morphology and syntax showing greater overall resistance. While phonological incursions often result as part of a process of lexical borrowing whereby borrowed lexical items are integrated into the recipient language with few changes to their phonetic shape, and then those traits begin spreading into native vocabulary, the issue is even more complex in the case of Hutsul, which has a large shared vocabulary with CSU, making phonological incursions sometimes rather subtle, and often rather fluctuating.

By this same token, evidence of phonological maintenance—or, in some cases, even increased divergence—indicates sustained viability of the dialect. Cases of sustained and increased divergence from CSU support the notion of larger identity maintenance, whereby phonological traits serve to distinguish Hutsuls as a group from their neighbors, whether Bojkos, Lemkos, or standard Ukrainian speakers.

In analyzing the most marked features of Hutsul phonology, I will use several main texts. Arguably the most valuable of these is Dido Ivančik since both the narrative language as well as episodes of dialog are written in the Hutsul dialect of the Verxovyna region, with spelling quite accurately reflecting early 20th century phonetic norms (Zelenčuk 2003). This text, along with early writings by A. Šeptyc'kyj, O. Mančuk and H. Xotkevyč, will be contrasted with those of contemporary Hutsul poet Paraska Płytk-Horycvit and modern Hutsul writer Marija Vlad. In addition, I will use excerpts of interviews of Hutsul speakers from both T. Jastems'ka, and the newspaper Verxovyna visti, whose journalists, native Hutsul speakers themselves, made specific effort to preserve the phonetic patterns of their subjects through their orthography. As all of these sources represent a single region, Verxovyna, potential variation caused by geographic parameters can be largely discounted.

2.1 Vowel inventory and distribution

Like CSU, Hutsul is generally considered to have 6 distinct stressed and unstressed vowel phonemes, with some positional variation38 (see Žylko 1955, Zakrevs'ka 1991). However, their realization and distribution differ significantly from that of CSU. In addition, because vowels tend to be generally less stable than consonants, there is a greater tendency toward variation in vocalism, which is precisely what can be seen in Hutsul, both in the old and the modern versions of the dialect.

2.1.1 Etymological *a and nasal vowel ĕ

38 The six vowel phonemes include four unrounded vowels (low back /a/, mid-front /e/, high-front /i/, and mid-front /y/), and two unrounded vowels (mid-back /o/ and high back /u/).
Typically in Hutsul etymological *a has most commonly led to the reflex \( a > e \) (positionally \( ja > je \)). In some cases, particularly in the positionally non-palatalized \( a > e \) this has been the result of harmonic assimilation (Lesjuk 2011), such as in deleko in example (1a) and zdeleku in (1b):

\[ (1) \]
\[ a. \text{ Вже й нi дeлeкo}^{39} бyло \]
\[ '\text{It was already near}' \text{ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 7)} \]

\[ b. \text{ здeлeку}^{40} бyло видкo \]
\[ '\text{It was visible from far away}' \text{ (VV, No, 31}^{41} \text{)} \]

This assimilatory reflex is then extended in the comparative form despite the fact that vocalic assimilation no longer exerts significant pressure, as in (1c):

\[ c. \text{ Ни їдь дeльшe}^{42} \]
\[ '\text{Don’t go any farther}' \text{ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 172)} \]

While this reflex was salient in the old dialect its use has become less uniform among modern speakers. In example (1d), a speaker, born in 1902, demonstrates the realization of \( a \), in correspondence with both etymological origin as well as modern CSU norms:

\[ d. \text{ тaк шo здeлeку бyло їgo видкo} \]
\[ 'and so it was visible from from away' \text{ (VV, No. 29)} \]

Far more salient, both historically and in the contemporary inventory, is the corresponding, positionally soft reflex whereby \( a \) originating from former nasal vowel \( e \) becomes \( je \) after \( j \), soft consonants, and sibilants (Žylko 1955). This feature is ubiquitous throughout Hutsul literature and speech, with (2a), providing an example of the typical phonological environment triggering this \( ja > je \) reflex, in this case following a palatalized consonant \( d' \):

\[ (2) \]
\[ a. \text{ то дeкyвaв}^{43} \text{ Iванчикovi} \]
\[ '\text{then (he) thanked Ivančík}' \text{ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:375)} \]

\[ ^{39} \text{CSU: далеко} \]
\[ ^{40} \text{CSU: здалеку} \]
\[ ^{41} \text{Speaker born in 1933} \]
\[ ^{42} \text{CSU: дальше} \]
\[ ^{43} \text{CSU: дякував} \]
This feature has long been considered a highly marked trait of Hutsul phonology; as Lesjuk 2012 notes, it is a feature not found in any other southwestern Ukrainian dialect. It continues to be quite salient, even among modern speakers, with example (2b) illustrating a post j environment:

b. скбли⁴⁴ не ці ліси
‘If it hadn’t been for these forests’ (VV, No. 45⁴⁵)

Because Hutsul affricate č and sibilants š, ž have retained their palatalization⁴⁶, they are also able to trigger this reflex through a process of ‘a > ‘e, seen in examples (2c) and (2d) with palatalized č.

c. з чесом⁴⁷ мене зачєли⁴⁸ запрошувати іграти забави
‘After a while [people] started inviting me to play at parties’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187⁴⁹)

d. тай зачєли будувати
‘And so [they] began to build’ (Savčuk 2008)

While this trait is still salient, seen in the very recent example (2d), it has begun a process of fossilization whereby the reflex is ceasing to be productive, but is maintained in frozen forms of common vocabulary. This can illustrated by those speakers who have started to vacillate between Hutsul je and CSU ja, greatly preferring the former for high frequency vocabulary, as in (2e), but using it less consistently in words of lower frequency or with higher register associations as in (2f)⁵⁰:

e. Тоти вівці, котрі сгнєт⁵¹ не мали
‘those sheep which didn’t have lambs’ (VV, No. 45)

f. Я це любив і для мене це не було обтяжливо
‘I really loved it and it wasn’t burdensome for me’ (VV, No. 45)

---

⁴⁴ CSU: якби
⁴⁵ Speaker born in the 1930s
⁴⁶ Sibilant palatalization will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.
⁴⁷ CSU: з часом
⁴⁸ CSU: почали
⁴⁹ The speaker is Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920).
⁵⁰ Both (2e) and (2f) are from the same speaker, born in the 1930s).
⁵¹ CSU: ягнят. As this speaker spent his younger years working as a shepherd, this should be considered a high frequency word within the context of his common vocabulary. Also of note in this example is that the reflex ja > je occurs in both the stressed and unstressed position; Lesjuk 2012 has noted that this feature is generally limited to the stressed position, but clearly it is more flexible than that.
The speaker in examples (2e) and (2f) uses the [je] pronunciation with significantly greater frequency throughout his interview, with a few incursions of CSU ja, most often stylistically marked for higher register. This indicates that the speaker is following a variable rule which determines allowable vocal variation within a single phonological environment, a phenomenon also observed and described by Milroy and Milroy 1985.

Despite this, the je pronunciation seems to be remain a relatively stable feature of Hutsul phonology\(^\text{52}\), given its close association with local identity and its widespread use as a truly distinct feature of Hutsul, defining the dialect vis-a-vis both CSU as well as neighboring--and closely related--southwestern dialects. Indeed \(a > e\) is entirely absent even from the Lemko, Subcarpathian Rusyn, and Bojko dialects, as seen in (3a), (3b), and (3c).

(3) a. Lemko: Юрко дякує ти сердечні
‘Jurko, I think you with all my heart’ (Horoszczak)

b. Subcarpathian Rusyn: Зять ходить навколо
‘[Her] son-in-law is walking all around’ (kolyba.org)

c. Bojko: Стефан Козуляк лежав тяжко горий
‘Stefan Kozuljak was gravely ill’ (Kmit)

The main exception to this otherwise salient reflex of \(a > e\) are those cases where \(a\) undergoes a reduction to \(i, y\). This reflex is somewhat less frequent than \(a > e\)^{53}, but is nonetheless of sufficient frequency to be noted, particularly as \(sy\) has become the stable realization of the reflexive marker \(s'a\) (< \(s_e\)). The realization \(sy\) is highly stable in both the old and the modern dialect as seen in examples (4a) (old dialect) and (4b) (modern dialect).

(4) a. дідо на печі з кимос цулустє
‘gramps was kissing someone on the stove’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:42)

b. Не можу сказати, що я дуже набігався коло обец
‘I can’t say that I worked too hard with the sheep too much’ (VV, No. 45^{54})

\(^{52}\) Despite occasional variation among speakers such as ‘Газдам треба роботяги’ ‘Landlords need workers’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 185). Thomason 2001 explains this kind of variation as a function of correspondence rules: such correspondence rules, “are especially evident when they link two languages that are closely related and thus share much of their vocabulary….For phonological interference, at least, a way of viewing the process is to see a change as a result of a failure to apply a correspondence rule (p. 144-146).

\(^{53}\) Lesjuk 2012 describes this reflex as typical of unstressed syllables; it is indeed possible that there was originally a distinction between \(a > e\) and \(a > i, y\) based on prosody, but evidence suggests that \(a > e\) may have spread beyond its stressed position into syllables previously typified by \(a > i, y\).

\(^{54}\) Speaker born in 1930s
What is most noticeable about this $s_e > s'a > se > sy$ reflex is how very little variation there is in both the oldest sources as well as among the most modern speakers. It is really one of the few features where there is almost no variation even among those born after the middle of the 20th century, see in (4c):

c. A баба ваша єк називаласи?
   ‘What was your granny’s name?’ (Vlad 1992)

Even those speakers who speech shows evidence of phonological variation and convergence, remain surprisingly consistent in their realization of reflexive affix $sy$, both when used syntactically as a clitic, and when used as a suffix.

Although most notable in the reflexive marker $sy$, the reflex $a > y$, $i$ does appear in other positions, although with greater variation, both diachronically and synchronically. When it does appear, it most often in unstressed positions, as in (5a), (5b), and (5c).

(5)  a. У дєді з рєду дітий я двайціть$^{55}$ и чєтвертий
   ‘I was the twenty fourth child in my father’s family’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:8)

b. десь дванцить$^{56}$ першого вересня
   ‘Around the twenty first of September’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 219$^{57}$)

c. В тридціть восьмим році
   ‘In 1938’ (Savčuk 2008)

This positional reflex of unstressed $a > y$, $i$ is also frequently found in the relative pronoun, although in this position its salience has greatly weakened in the modern dialect and seems to be yielding to the far stronger, locally marked $a > e$ realization. (6a) demonstrates what was evidently the standard phonological realization of the relative pronoun in the old dialect.

(6)  а.єк би йкій$^{58}$ жєбрак
   ‘like some kind of beggar’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 149)

---

$^{55}$ But after 20, 30, it goes back to the more common reflex $ja > je$: Нi дев’ятьдесет, ни вісімдесет, ни сімдесет, ни шістдесет, ни пiв сотка (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 22).

$^{56}$ Also interesting here is the $c$ seems to have lost its palatalization, in contrast to other examples of 20, 30 where the $c$ retains its palatalization before the ending.

$^{57}$ Speaker born in 1944

$^{58}$ CSU: якiйсь; here Šekeryk-Donykiv also retains the word initial $j$, which is not the case in most other early Hutsul examples of relative pronoun with $y$. 
This realization is still used today, but with less consistency, and only among the oldest speakers, as in (6b) and (6c).

b. Добре пам'ятаю, єк їхала икас паня з Варшави
‘I remember well that some kind of lady from Warsaw came’ (VV, No. 31\textsuperscript{59})

c. Боже, ика\textsuperscript{60} то була дуже кіжка, просто рабська робота
‘God, what very difficult, simply slave-like work that was’ (VV, No. 29\textsuperscript{61})

Plytka-Horycvit, however, consistently avoids the \textit{a > y}, \textit{i} realization in her writing, allowing incursions not of CSU, as much as the common Hutsul reflex \textit{a > e} which has consistently overtaken \textit{y}, \textit{i} in all positions, including the high frequency relative pronoun, (6d), (6e).

d. бо хотіла на галерії походити взад та вперед, удаючі купця, єкній кождої зими приходив купувати гриби
‘Because I wanted to walk back and forth at the gallery pretending to be a buyer who came every winter to buy mushrooms’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 37)

e. перевертали єкіс книги
‘turning over some books’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 209)

In addition to the unstressed \textit{a > y} reflex in the relative pronoun, (6c) also shows \textit{a > i} in a stressed position, in a high frequency environment typical of the old dialect, CSU: тяжко > Hutsul: кіжка\textsuperscript{62}. This is the common realization among the oldest speakers, seen also in 6f.; however this \textit{a > i} environment is also yielding to the more locally salient \textit{a > e}, seen in (6g), from a speaker born exactly 30 years later than the previous speaker in (6f).

f. То була дуже кіжка робота
‘It was very difficult work’ (VV, No. 29\textsuperscript{63})

g. кешко то си жило
‘Living was difficult’ (Jastrems'ka, 2008: 233\textsuperscript{64})

\textsuperscript{59} Speaker born in 1927
\textsuperscript{60} CSU: яка
\textsuperscript{61} Speaker born in 1919
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{t} > \textit{k}’ will be discussed below
\textsuperscript{63} Speaker born in 1902
\textsuperscript{64} Speaker born in 1932
The reflex $a > e$, especially after palatalized consonants and $j$ has been one of the most stable phonological realizations in the Hutsul dialect, marked as distinctly Hutsul in both the old and modern dialect. While $a > y$, $i$ has generally been less stable, it is still the clearly preferred realization in the reflexive particle $sy$, whether used syntactically as a clitic, or morphologically as an affix. Other positional realizations of $a > y$, $i$ have proven far less stable over time; however, they do not seem to be yielding so much to CSU phonological pressures, as they are to the competing and far more frequent local reflex $a > e$, providing variant forms, particularly in the relative pronoun, which the oldest speakers demonstrate clear preference for $y$, and younger speakers vacillating between $y$ and $je$, while the latter is becoming somewhat more preferred, possibly as a result of analogical levelling motivated by the highly stable form of the interrogative pronoun $[jek]$, despite the stress shift to the second syllable of $[jekij]$. What is interesting, however, is the remarkable lack of evidence for incursions from CSU in this environment, with the notable exception of lexical items clearly marked for a higher stylistic register, when standard norms seem to largely determine the phonetic realization.

2.1.2 Etymological *e

According to Lesjuk 2011, one of the most salient features of the Hutsul is retention of etymological ending -e in neuter nouns of the type Hutsul: житє, CSU: життя. This is indeed the most common form in the old dialect, as seen in (7a), and can still be occasionally found among more modern speakers, such as in (7b). Despite the fact that this archaism can be phonologically supported by the generalized local reflex $a > e$, as discussed above, it is fact yielding to the CSU variant form in -ja, demonstrated in (7c):

(7)  

a. ...аби дати житє на світі

‘to give life to the world’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 15)

b. Декуючі долі, я все житє займався музико

‘Thanks to fate, I have been involved in music my whole life’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-187)

c. З худобов і на полонинах я пробув усе життя

‘I have spent my whole life with the cattle in the mountain valleys’ (VV, No. 456)

---

65 There is also a corresponding consonant lengthening, which will be discussed in greater detail below.
66 Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920).
67 This example also provides an interesting example of a speaker whose phonology seems to have largely converged to CSU norms, yet whose inflectional morphology—in the form of the feminine singular instrumental ending -ов—has retained its uniquely dialectal shape. This trait of Hutsul inflectional morphology will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.
68 Speaker born in the 1930s
However, even in the modern dialect there is a good deal of variation, with some modern writers and speakers preferring the older form in -je, such as in (7d) from the writing of Marija Vlad:

d. Так я жию ціле своє довге жите
   ‘And so I live my whole, long life’ (Vlad 1992)

   Both Lesjuk and Hrynčyšyn also note as typical the absence of labialization of $\varepsilon > o$ after sibilants and $j$. Lesjuk makes specific mention of the personal pronoun forms [jemu], [jeho], and [n’eho]. According to their observation, where CSU proscribes йому, його, Hutsul should have dialect variants ему and еро; however, in the old dialect, word initial je seems to have yielded to variants [ji], [ji], under levelling pressure from the unstressed $\varepsilon > i$, i, discussed above, rendering the basic masculine personal pronoun forms [jihó], [jihó], and [jimú], as seen in (8a), (8b), and (8c), respectively.

(8)   a. Зачєв мены тогда дыд уповідати за село, бо я йго питав багато разів
   ‘My grandad then started to tell me about the village, for I had asked him many times’ (Rudnytskyj, 1965: 43)

b. навіть си боєли його тіни
   ‘he was even afraid of his shadow’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 144)

c. то йиму нічо ни значіло
   ‘it didn’t mean anything to him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 11)

However, in the modern dialect, a good deal of variation can be seen: older speakers continue to prefer the ji, ji variant, while younger speakers tend to provide the je articulation noted as typical by both Lesjuk and Hrynčyšyn. Example (8d), from a speaker born in 1902, still uses the older realization ji, as does the example in (8e), from a speaker born in 1932. However, example (8f), which comes from a speaker born in 1927, shows the spread of the word initial je, as does example (8g), which comes from a very recent text (2008) written by a younger modern speaker. Similarly, Plytka-Horycvit (8h) consistently uses je word initially in masculine pronouns which, again, could be a result of phonological levelling stemming from the spread of the the $a > e$ reflex, which is particularly strong following $j$.

\[69\] The process of labialization in CSU has not been satisfactorily explained due to the large number of apparent exceptions. For a thorough discussion of this issue, see Shevelov 1979.

\[70\] As Hrynčyšyn notes this positional realization of $\varepsilon$ would also also apply to words such as [šestyj], [ženatyj], etc.

\[71\] From an interview conducted with a Hutsul speaker and recorded in 1926.
d. так що здалеку було йо видко
‘so it was visible from far away’ (VV, No. 2972)

e. За цису роботу поляки йму платили гроші
‘For this work the Poles paid him money’ (VV, No. 3173)

f. несла камінь й пидкладала йго під колесо
‘I carried a stone and laid it down under the whee’l (VV, No. 2974)

g. Єго файно будували
‘They built it well’ (Savčuk 2008)

h. маю можливість усе розказати єму
‘I have the opportunity to tell him all about it’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 205)

Notably, Jastrems'ka’s youngest speaker, born in 1944, shows preference for the CSU form [jomu], in (8i):

i. і тут помагає йому мити посуд
‘And here helps him wash the dishes’ (Jastrems'ka, 2008: 21975)

The unstressed word initial syllable of the masculine singular pronouns has demonstrated considerable variation over the past century, from ĵi, ĵi to the more modern ĵe, possibly supported by the spread of ĵe < ja. However, the unstable situation created by this variation has left the position vulnerable to incursions from the standard, which is seen in the appearance of CSU variant [joho], [jomu] among modern speakers, as seen in (8i).

This same tendency can be seen in other examples of variation in the realization of unstressed e. Lesjuk 2011 has noted that positionally the unstressed e is most often articulated as ĵ, readily seen in the negative particle, as well as nyma (CSU: nema), typer (CSU: teper), apyka (CSU: apteka), etc. However, as in the case of the masculine pronouns, there is a good has been significant fluctuation over the past century. Lesjuk is certainly right about in terms of the old dialect, where ĵ > ĵ is quite consistently found, especially in the negative particle [nį] (CSU [nɛ]), seen in (9a), which also shows the same reflex in the 1st person dative pronoun [mën’i] (CSU: [men’i]):

---

72 Speaker born in 1902
73 Speaker born in 1932
74 Speaker born in 1927
75 Speaker born in 1944
The old dialect also demonstrates unstressed $e > y$ is other positions, seen in (9b) and (9c):

b. купуємо краскі до крашінь 76
   ‘We buy dyes for decorating’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43 77)

c. та тоді прийшли багато людей 78
   ‘then many people came’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

Example (9c) also demonstrates the relationship between phonology and morphology in Hutsul. Here the phonological reflex $\varepsilon > i$ extends into the genitive plural ending. It is actually here, in the inflectional morphology, 79 that the reflex is most resistant to change:

d. ші богато людей
   ‘still more people’ (VV, No. 29 80)

Even among the most recent of sources--such as the writing of contemporary novelist Maria Vlad whose writing tends to demonstrate some of the strongest evidence of convergence--the dialectal ending -$yj$ still appears frequently, despite some vacillation between the Hutsul (9e) and CSU (9f) variants:

e. у місті людей густо
   ‘the city is crowded with people’ (Vlad 1992)

f. Господи, єк я уже людей ни пизнаю. 81
   ‘Lord, how I no longer recognize people’ (Vlad 1992)

As example (9d) shows, another position where the $y$ realization has been fairly common for the unstressed etymological *e is in the adverb ші. 82 However, there are fluctuations even here and even among the oldest speakers, see in (9g).

---

76 CSU: крашінь
77 Speaker recorded in 1926
78 CSU: людей
79 In this case, the genitive plural inflection.
80 Speaker born in 1927
81 While Vlad does shift between dialectal and literary language in her text, this phrase is marked as dialectal by the inclusion of the highly marked [jek].
82 CSU: ші
Despite the ubiquity of this adverb, the former local pronunciation [ši] has shown clear signs of yielding to CSU norms, with even old speakers wavering in their choice of phonological variants.

Most striking, however, is the amount of variation seen in the negative particle\(^{84}\) which, in the old dialect, was very consistently realized as [nɪ], as seen in (9a). While this realization can still be found, particularly among the oldest speakers (examples 9h, 9i), those speakers born even a mere ten years later (in the 1930s) show a preference for the CSU-influenced variant [nɛ] (examples 9j, 9k, and 9l):

\[\text{\textit{\textgreek{ni} treba pro ce pisati...}}\]

\(\text{‘Don’t write about that’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:187\(^{85}\))}\)

\[\text{\textit{i. observarii \textgreek{ni} bulo}}\]

\(\text{‘there was no observatory’ (VV, No. 29\(^{86}\))}\)

\[\text{\textit{j. Ne mozhu sказати, шо я дуже набігаєи коло обец}}\]

\(\text{‘I can’t say that I wore myself out [tending to] the sheep’ (VV, No. 45\(^{87}\))}\)

\[\text{\textit{k. я д’хати \textgreek{ne} приходів за літо}}\]

\(\text{‘I didn’t come home all summer’ (Jastrems’ka, 2008:236\(^{88}\))}\)

\[\text{\textit{l. на зло злом \textgreek{ne} відповідати.}}\]

\(\text{‘[You shouldn’t] respond to anger with anger’ (Vlad 1992)}\)

Of the contemporary sources, only Plytka-Horycvit consistently uses the older dialectal variant [ny] and avoids the CSU form [ne] in most all contexts:

\[\text{\textit{m. Mamy \textgreek{ni} bulo doma}}\]

\(\text{‘Mama wasn’t at home’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 34)}\)

---

\(^{83}\) Speaker born in 1919
\(^{84}\) CSU: ne
\(^{85}\) Speaker born in 1920
\(^{86}\) Speaker born in 1900
\(^{87}\) Speaker born in 1930s
\(^{88}\) Speaker born in 1932
Despite this exception in (9b), the modern dialect has begun to show signs of CSU incursions into the realization of unstressed $e$ as $y$, a reflex which had been substantially widespread in the old dialect. Even the negative particle, one of the most frequently used lexemes, has shown signs of yielding to CSU phonological norms, while the most resilient position appears to be precisely that case where phonology merges with morphology, the genitive plural ending.

Zakrevs'ka has also noted the positional realization of phoneme /ɛ/ as ă and provides the examples [klān] (CSU [klen]) and [sārcę] (CSU [serce]). Examples of this realization can indeed be found in the old dialect, as in (10a), although this is not generally a high frequency position. Perhaps for this very reason, evidence of the continued positional realization of ă is all but entirely absent from the modern dialect (examples 10b, 10c):

(10)  
   a. купуємо краскі до крашінь вовни на запаске 89..и сардаке 90.  
   ‘We buy dyes to decorate the wool for the apron... and the shirt’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43) 91  
   b. Плакало моє серце  
   ‘My heart cried’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 204)  
   c. ни в голову, ни в серце  
   ‘Neither in the head, nor in the heart’ (Vlad 1992)  

This realization was likely weakening early on, as examples from the 1930s are also very rare:

(10d) д. бо його серце нараз закаменіло  
   ‘for now his heart hardened’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 283)  

As can be seen from (10d) even the early writers avoided representing a pronunciation of [sārce], preferring instead the CSU [serce].

Somewhat less consistently, stressed $e$ is lowered and backed to $a$, as seen in the lexeme [traba] versus CSU [treba], as well as in its related verbal form. Even in the old dialect, the realization of the lexeme demonstrates a great deal of variation, even within a single text by a single author, as seen in example (11a) and (11b):

(11)  
   a. тай тим ни трабую  
   ‘and I don’t require that’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:18)  

89 CSU: запаска  
90 CSU: сердаки  
91 Recorded in 1926
b. А нашо дідови тої води треба?
‘Does gramps need this water?’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:18)

Interestingly, not only are (11a) and (11b) from a single source, but they are located on the same page of that source, demonstrating that even in the old dialect, this reflex was only very inconsistently realized. In the modern dialect, the situation is even more complex, with frequent shifts between the two variants, traditionally Hutsul [traba], in (9h) above and (11c), and CSU variant [tреба], in (11d), (11e), and (11f):

c. Але єк треба, то муситси
‘But if you must, you must’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 29)

d. Бо треба д’хаті вертатиси
‘Because we need to get back to the house’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 26)

e. історію Гуцульщини треба добре знати
‘One must know the the history of Huculshchyna’ well (Savčuk 2008)

f. А тобі дуже це треба!
‘You really need this’! (Vlad 1992)

It should be noted that this shifting between [traba] and [tреба] frequently occurs even within a single source and, quite similarly to (11a) and (11b) examples (11g) and (11h) show this vacillation between forms occurring even within a single page of a text:

g. треба було воду з рікє
‘We needed to get water from the river’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 31)

h. ни хочу або ни треба
‘I neither want nor need [this]’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 31)

Despite such evidence of continued fluctuations between forms, the majority of recent evidence clearly points to a strong preference for [tреба] among modern speakers, especially those who are relatively young. While the source of this shift toward [tреба] is most likely the increasing influence of CSU on local phonology, it is also notable that other Carpathian dialects do not show e > a in this position and therefore would also fail to provide local phonological support for this feature’s continued retention:

i. Lemko: Треба нам люди наших вчыті
‘We need to teach our people’ (Horoszczak)

j. Subcarpathian Rusyn: не треба ся обмежовати
‘You don’t need to limit yourself” (http://rue.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scheme)

2.1.3 Former jat and the phoneme /i/

One of the most distinct phonological features of the Carpathian dialect group is the existence of three allophone of phoneme /i/. These can be described as the retracted high-mid front vowel /ɪ/, shared with CSU and represented orthographically as и; the close front vowel /i/, also shared with CSU and represented orthographically as і; and the close central rounded vowel /ɨ/, absent from CSU, but similar to Russian ы, which also lends its orthography to this sound.

While the existence of these allophones in the Carpathian group is not debated, not all scholars agree as to whether specifically the Hutsul dialect can be considered to retain all three and, if it does exist, how it can be precisely described. In 1955 Žylko had asserted that the /ɨ/ allophone was present in all Carpathian dialects with the singular exception of Hutsul in which, he stated, the old ɨ has already merged with i/y as in the standard language92. He further stated that y and i have merged into a single phoneme becoming y which was acoustically very close to e (Żylko 1955). Kushko 2007 also notes the preservation of the high back vowel ы as one of the most distinctive characteristics of the Rusyn language, making no mention of Hutsul. According to Zakrevs'ka 1991, however, that the allophone ɨ does appear in Hutsul and is particularly characteristic of Romanian Hutsul. Additionally, Žylko 1955 stated that the phone i in the Carpathian dialects differs from the Russian phone і in that it is a back vowel, usually labialized, rather than a central vowel, as in Russian; Zakrevs'ka 1991, however, describes Hutsul і as a central vowel.

Authors of texts in the old dialect avoid making an orthographic distinction between і, i and ɨ, so there is little evidence about the nature and prevalence of this allophonic triad at the turn of the 20th century. It is certainly possible that this vowel і was present in speech, but writers did not have adequate means for providing written representation. This would seem a more likely explanation for the total absence of і in texts by Šekeryk-Donykiv, Xotekvyč, and Mančuk than the speculation that this allophone simply wasn’t current at the time. In his 1926 recording of a Hutsul speaker Rudnytskyj in fact does represent three distinct allophone orthographically, using the Russian ы to convey the і, not represented within the standard Ukrainian alphabet.

(12) а. Зачєв мены тогда дыд уповідати за село, бо я їго питав багато разів

---

92 The merger of ы > і occurred in Ukrainian in the 11th through 15th centuries.
‘My grandad then started to tell me about the village, for I had asked him many times’ (1965:43)

The presence of all three phones within this single utterance indicates that the speaker was clearly making some phonetic distinction between i, i and i, with dialectal i taking the place of former jat’. However, contemporaneously with this speaker, Šekeryk-Donykiv uses the spellings мині (2007:376) and дід (2007: 8), orthographically corresponding to the CSU reflex ɨ > i, although this may not be an accurate representation of the phonology of the time, based on the transcribed speech of Rudnytskyj’s speaker. Indeed, the outcome of former jat’ is quite inconsistent: Šekeryk-Donykiv sometimes replacing it with i, as in (12b), which could reflect an underlying [i], although could also be a case of word internal vowel assimilation in syllabification:

b. Я привитався93 з ними
‘I greeted them’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:12)

Texts and reproductions of speech in the modern dialect very often make a clear distinction between the three allophonic variants, as seen in (12c) and (12d):

c. Нашего дєдю сегодне убыв грім
‘Our dad was killed by the thunder today’ (Vlad 1992)

d. у тый колиби
‘at that cafe’ (VV, No. 29)

The quote from Vlad in (12c) provides a token of the dialect middle vowel in a fairly contemporary written source, and while the three word utterance of (12d), made by an older speaker born in 1900, does clearly show the differentiation and currency of three allophones, the distribution is different from the of Rudnytskyj: here the middle i originates from a back jat, but the prepositional ending indicates the CSU reflex ɨ > i, and the middle и reflexes the larger historical Ukrainian merger of i, i > i. Indeed, evidence from both the old and modern dialect demonstrates that the developmental trajectory of phoneme /i/ follows a fairly similar pattern to CSU; specifically, the initial merger of i, y > y, followed by newly closed syllables and jats > i. Hutsul, however, follows several additional positional tendencies which determine the ultimate phonetic realization of former i, y, back and front jers, and jat.

2.1.3.1 Word initial i realized as y

---

93 CSU: привітався
This is very consistent in the old dialect, seen in (13a, 13b, and 13c), and seems to have been quite stable throughout the 20th century, (13d), (13e):

(13)  a. але туда рідко коли я ишов
‘but I rarely went there’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

b. то дєкував Иванчікови
‘he thanked Ivan’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 375)

c. Витєгла люльку из зубий
‘He pulled the pipe out from his teeth’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

d. шо вже їй нинче робити
‘that she already has other work to do’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

e. Идемо94 в долину
‘We are going to the valley’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 28)

However, the most recent evidence suggests increasing inconsistency in this realization and growing incursions of CSU phonology, leading to word initial i, seen in example (11e) (історію) and (13f):

f. окрім діда95 Івана
‘except for grandpa Ivan’ (Vlad 1992)

However, this same author vacillates between variants in the case of the verb “to go”:

g. іду у стайню
‘[I’m] going to the stable’ (Vlad 1992)

h. Иду-ко я грушу Чоканову рубати96
‘[I’m] going to cut down the Čokan pear tree’ (Vlad 1992)

---

94 CSU: ідемо
95 This follows the CSU reflex of ţ > i in the manner as Šekeryk-Donykiv’s representation; although Vlad does use the ы grapheme in here written representation of Hutsul speech, she uses it sparingly and avoids it here, despite the dialectal articulation of Rudnytskyj’s informant in this same lexical position.
96 This phonological trait typical of old dialect is also seen in the same author’s text with the phrase “ішли та й робили” (1992). Interestingly this phrase is contained in dialog attributed as being one of the oldest residents of the village. This articulation could, therefore, be a conscious attempt by the author to replicate older versions of the dialect.
While (13g) reflects a CSU-influenced phonetic structure, (13h) adheres to the shape more typical of the old dialect, paralleling both Šekeryk-Donykiv’s ишов in (13a) and Płytka-Horycvit’s идемо in (13e).

2.1.3.2 y in unstressed positions realized as i

This correspondence was only inconsistently realized in the old dialect of the early 20th century at which time it appears that certain tokens of this phenomenon had become fossilized forms, while the reflex itself had ceased to be productive. This can be seen in the variation of the spelling for forms of the verb ‘to look,’ CSU: дивитися, in early 20th century, a tendency for for unstressed y>i seems stable in the imperative form of the verb, seen in (14a) and (14b), while present and past tense forms already conform to CSU spelling and phonology, seen in (14c) and (14d):

(14.) a. Ану дивиси
   ‘Please look’ (Mančuk 2006: 51)

b. Ану дивиси
   ‘Please look’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:12)

c. Дивлюси, а уна коло порога лежит
   ‘I look and she is lying by the threshhold’ (Mančuk 2006:50)

d. дивилиси на мене своїми скловими очіма
   ‘they looked at my with their glass eyes’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007:12)

This tendency seems to have disappeared from the modern dialect; for example, Płytka-Horycvit consistently using y through the paradigm, including in the imperative in (14e), as well in the underlying infinitive of of (14f). Further, Vlad also uses the CSU vocalism in this position, even in the infinitive form of (14g), precisely the form had previously shown the most resistance to convergence pressure:

e. Дивиси обзеранично
   ‘ take a close look’ (2008: 21)

f. приємно дивитиси з боку
   ‘it’s nice to look from the side’ (2008: p. 17)
g. Дивиси, аби люди мали з чого посміватиси.
‘look [out], or people will have something to laugh at’ (Vlad 1992)

However, it should be noted that this change in vocalism need not necessarily reflect convergence to CSU; rather, as in the case of привитавси in (12b), another possible explanation for the reevaluation of $y > i$ in this position could simply be assimilation between the vowels of the first and second syllable, further supported by the local realization of the reflexive affix -sy.

2.1.3.3 $y$ in stressed position lowered to $e$

Etymological *ɪ is positionally realized as ɛ. According to Zakrevs'ka, this is the result of Hutsul [e] tending to have a higher articulation that parallel CSU vowel in stressed position.97 This articulation is quite widespread in the old dialect (seen in 15a, 15b, 15c, 15d), but has become only sporadically used in more recent years with far fewer tokens (such as 15e):

(15) a. Понад граців хєтро пролетів половик
‘the rug sneakily flew over the huts’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 15)

b. весні половег убев дві курці
‘in the spring the fieldhand killed two chickens’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

c. бо він лиш довгий, єк коромесло
‘for he was long, like a shoulder pole’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 376)

d. була дуже файнá дівчина
‘she was a very nice girl’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 139)

e. Учитель був дуже задоволений
‘the teacher was very satisfied’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 31)

The changing distribution of this articulation is realized can be seen in the high frequency lexeme [odm], in examples (15f), (15g), and (15h):

97 She gives the examples of Hutsul бєк (CSU: бїк) and Hutsul сєн (CSU: сїн)
98 CSU: хєтро
99 CSU: убив
100 Interview recorded in 1926
101 CSU: коромесло
102 In this example, $y > e$ is accompanied by palatalization resulting in ’e; CSU: дівчина
103 Similarly to the previous example, $y > e$ is here accompanied by palatalization resulting in ’e; CSU: учитель
f. А ти, шибенику оден, ни знаєш чьо?
   ‘And you, one little varmint, don’t know what?’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 13)

g. абі відгєсти один сук
   ‘to cut off one bough’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

h. буду один продавати\textsuperscript{104}
   ‘I will sell one’ (Jastrems’ka 2008: 264)

The most recent examples, (15g) and (15h), indicate that indeed this variant form is currently fluctuating in its frequency, as the CSU form [od\textsubscript{ɪ}n] often overtakes the local realization [oden], which had formerly been relatively stable in Hutsul phonology.

This recent phonological reevaluation of the status of stressed \(y\) can also be seen in previous example (12c) from Vlad 1992. In this example she uses the spelling убяв [ub\textsubscript{ɪ}v] to convey her preferred articulation, one that is clearly divergent from previous Hutsul pronunciation [ub\textsubscript{ɛ}v] and yet is not wholly CSU [ub\textsubscript{ɪ}v]. This realization, however, indicates a current degree of instability of this phoneme which creates further vulnerability to increased variability and change.

2.1.3.4 \(y\) positionally lowered to \(e\) in unstressed nominative plural endings

The CSU nominative plural ending -\(y\) is most frequently realized as Hutsul \(e\)\textsuperscript{105}. This ending was well established in the old dialect and, for many speakers, remains stable in the modern dialect, seen in examples (15i), (15j), and (15k):

i. Мене викутали і виростили чужі люди
   ‘Other people fed and raised me’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-187)

j. старші жінки та чоловіки\textsuperscript{106}
   ‘old women and men’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 20)

k. Послухайте, люди добри
   ‘Listen, kind people’ (Savčuk 2008)

\textsuperscript{104} Speaker born in 1931
\textsuperscript{105} It should be noted that in CSU the lines of articulation can be blurry between \(y\) and \(e\) in unstressed positions as a result of neutralization in some phonological environments.
\textsuperscript{106} CSU: жінки та чоловіка
Despite this general stability, there are cases of variation resulting from CSU interference, such as Vlad 1992, who consistently uses the CSU nominative plural ending \( y \), seen in examples (15i):

1. А єк люди зачєли молитиси
   'And as people started to pray'

Even in well-established phonological traits—and, more importantly, in those phonological realizations that directly affect the morphological system—cases of variation and change are evident and tend to adhere to the norms of CSU. With its ubiquity in both written language and oral speech, the nominative singular ending provides meaningful evidence of the extent to which Hutsul phonology has destabilized in recent years, under increased pressure of CSU contact. While Vlad strategically codeswitches between Hutsul and CSU in her writing, the examples above come from passages clearly marked as Hutsul speech. It is perhaps this manner of codeswitching—becoming more and more typical of Hutsul sociolinguistic interaction—that has provided this inroad into convergence between the Hutsul and CSU nominative plural endings.

2.1.4 Phoneme /o/ and newly-closed syllables

According to Boudovskaia 2006, etymological *o in strong position was frequently attested in Western Ukrainian starting in the mid-fourteenth century (p. 4).\(^{107}\) In Hutsul, this tendency was regularized into \( \text{ukanje} \), frequently found in old dialect sources (16a, 16b, and 16c):

(16)  

\[ \text{a. єк мені Микула}^{108} \text{ розказував} \]
   'like Mykula told me' (Mančuk 2006: 12)

\[ \text{b. у тій печірі сидит Дониково сукровише} \]
   'the Donykiv treasure is in that cave' (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

\[ \text{c. хуч кому} \]
   'to anyone at all' (Xotkevyč 1966: 344)

Remnants of \( \text{ukanje} \) can still occasionally be found in the modern dialect:

\[ \text{d. Дуже коркіло знати єк то фугурафуют}^{109} \]

\(^{107}\) By the late 16th-17th centuries, it was most often attested as \( ju \), and by the mid-17th century \( i \).

\(^{108}\) CSU: Микола

\(^{109}\)
‘it is very useful to know how they photograph’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 165)

Example (16d) demonstrates the reflex $o > u$ under the pressures of harmonic assimilation$^{110}$, a phenomenon also noted by Lesjuk 2011, who provides the example [unuk] (< CSU: [onuk]). This phenomenon of $ukanje$ resulting from harmonic assimilation can indeed be commonly found in the old dialect (example 16e), although evidence from the modern dialect shows variation that may indicate that convergence pressures are superseding even internal assimilatory pressure (16f):

e. купуємо краскі до кращінї вовни..на унучі$^{111}$
‘we buy dyes to decorate the wool for the leggings’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)$^{112}$

f. Ми дітьми бігали йгратиси з її онуками
‘As kids we ran to play with her granddaughters’ (Vlad 1992)

While $ukanje$ is one possible outcome of newly-closed syllables in Hutsul (Žylko 1955 gives the examples of $prynjus, mjud$)$^{113}$, more typically the reflex $o > y$ is found in newly-closed syllables following hard consonants, especially in stressed position. This provides a clear phonological contrast between Hutsul $y$ and CSU $i$ in such syllables, as seen in (18a) and (17b):

(17)  a. бідна жинка тай бідні гіти
‘poor woman and poor children’ (Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011)

b. але ретенно було їх бирше
‘but of course there were more of them’ (Mančuk 2006: 12)

These examples from the old dialect show the typical phonological contrast between Hutsul $y$ and CSU $i$ in newly-closed syllables. This reflex was highly consistent in the old dialect, and salient enough to allow little variation. In the modern dialect, however, variation can be seen with speakers fluctuating between the old Hutsul vocalism (17c) and that more typical of CSU (17d):

c. чім бирше овец, тим уже бирьша зарплата$^{114}$

$^{109}$ CSU: фотографують
$^{110}$ This is process by which one vowel located in an adjacent syllable with another vowel changes its articulation to become more similar to that vowel.
$^{111}$ CSU: на онучі
$^{112}$ Recorded in 1926
$^{113}$ Kushko 2007 also notes the transformation of $o$ in the East Slavic newly closed syllables into $u$ for Subcarpathian Rusyn and gives the examples kun' (CSU: kin') ‘horse’, stul (CSU: stil) ‘table’
$^{114}$ Speaker born in 1932
‘the more sheep, the more profit’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 236)

d. більше цього не буде
‘that won’t happen again’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 10)

Similarly, in example (15j) Plytka-Horycvit uses the CSU form жінкє (2008: 20), and on (15m), Vlad uses жінки (1992), as both contemporary authors consistently avoid the backed articulation previously more typical of old Hutsul closed syllables. This is in significant contrast to Šeptyc'kyj’s parallel variant жинка in (10a) above.

An example from the old dialect demonstrating the articulation гирша115 not only supports the general claim that newly closed syllables consistently resulted in ĭ in Hutsul, but further raises the issue of prepositional forms which arose through the Ukrainian phenomenon of closed syllables116 (вид117). This phonological context also consistently demonstrated in the old dialect (18a):

(18)  a. Вирвався я вид діда
‘I pulled away from gramps’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

This modern dialect, however, demonstrated a wide range of variation in the articulation of this proposition, including the some retention of the old Hutsul form with ĭ (18b, 18c) to a somewhat intermediary form in ĭ (18d) to CSU form in ĭ (18e).

b. Тай видкрили оцес музей118
‘and they opened this museum’ (Savčuk 2008)

c. прийшло вид цісаря
‘it came from the emperor’ (Vlad 1992)

d. вид Господа
‘from the Lord’ (VV, No. 55119)

e. а вид діда сховає

---

115 CSU: гірша; found in 'уна гирша вид злої мачохи!’ ‘she is worse than an evil stepmother’ (Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011)
116 In Ukrainian, newly-closed syllable arose when a syllable ended in a consonant: o and e changed to ĭ when followed by a jer.
117 CSU: вид (<од< оть). Unlike the feminine singular and plural personal pronouns, this preposition consistently takes the epenthetic -v in both old and modern Hutsul.
118 CSU: видкрили
119 Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916.
‘he hides it from gramps’ (Vlad 1992)

As examples (18c) and (18e) demonstrate, it is not uncommon for a single speaker to waver between variant (here [vyd] vs. [vid]). Indeed, Plytka-Horycvit has even fluctuated between these two competing forms within only a few pages of text despite that fact that both prepositions appear in very similar phonological environments, (18f) and (18g):

f. Єк ішла вид хати
   ‘As I left the house’ (2005: 21)

g. бо рейвашили на нас вид хати
   ‘because they stormed out of the house after us’ (2005: 27)

Surprisingly, despite their similar historical forms, the prepositions ‘from’ (CSU: від < отъ) and ‘under’ (CSU: під < подъ) have had quite different outcomes, with the CSU form becoming sufficiently stable in the modern dialect to edge out the old Hutsul preposition almost entirely (18d, 18e):

d. аби ня видко їх з-під полі
   ‘because you can’t see them beneath the field’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 18-19)

e. там під нев мають бути гроші
   ‘there should be money under it’ (Vlad 1992)

Modern speakers do, however, seem to make a phonological distinction between the prepositions ‘from’ and ‘under’. Examples (18f) and (18g), from a single speaker, demonstrate that this speaker is clearly differentiating the vowel articulation with the outcomes i and i, respectively:

f. стримувалися вид горівки
   ‘they held back from vodka’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-187)

g. Моя мама жила тогда під горов
   ‘my mama lived below the mountains then’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-187)

Although it seems clear that most speakers do articulate the same vowel differently in similar contexts, for the otherwise similar ‘from’ and ‘under’, the ultimate outcomes vary considerably from speaker to speaker. Most frequently the phonological contrast seems to be i vs. i, but as examples (18d), (18f), and (18g) illustrate, the possible range can also include the middle vowel j.

120 Speaker born in 1920
Similar in both historical shape and outcome is the masculine singular personal pronoun (CSU: він < онъ). Unlike the feminine and plural personal pronouns, the Husul masculine does take the prothetic v- and, because of the newly-closed syllable, could be predicted to contain i in Hutsul, paralleling the outcome of the preposition “from” (Hutsul: вид, CSU: від.) Indeed this is precisely the outcome described by Zakrevs'ka 1991, who noted that the phone i appears in stressed syllables and corresponds to former o after labials, and specifically gives the example of Hutsul вин vs. CSU він. However, a look at the evidence provides a more complex and less predictable scenario for the masculine singular pronoun. In fact, Hutsul sources from the early 20th century already quite frequently use the CSU pronoun [vin], as seen in examples (19a), (19b), and (19c):

(19)  a. колис він продав
‘once he sold’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

b. він казав, що весна ліпша того року
‘he said that the spring is better than it was that year’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 109)

c. Де ж він
‘Where is he’ (Mančuk 2006: 12)

Somewhat more predictably, the CSU masculine pronoun has become fairly stable in the modern dialect (examples 19d, 19e, and 19f):

d. Де він їх рятував?121
‘Where did he save them?’ (VV, No. 45)

e. А він за мнов
‘he [was] behind me’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 10)

f. а він питаєси
‘he tries’ (Vlad 1992)

Although one of the most modern speakers, Vlad does occasionally fluctuate between Hutsul and CSU forms. These fluctuations, however, are a stylistic device used by the author specifically to linguistically mark an older speaker. While she most frequently uses CSU [vin], an emphatically older village resident is given the dialog line in (19g):

g. а вин лише прийшов

121 Speaker born in 1930s. Note also the CSU articulation of ‘а in the verb “saved.”"
‘he alone came’ (Vlad 1992)

(19g) shows one of the few tokens of old Hutsul [vɪn] to be found in a modern source. Notably, it is only used when dialog is attributed to a character being clearly indexed for age, indicating that this author may attribute this articulation specifically to older versions of the local dialect. The majority of other characters in her work consistently use the CSU variant [vin], even when their speech is otherwise clearly marked as dialectal. Similarly, another modern exception to the otherwise stable form [vin] comes from a speaker born in 1920, also a relatively older speaker:

Вин дуже файно играв у скрипку
‘he played the violin very well’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-187)

While [vɪn] may have been at one point a common phonological realization of the masculine singular personal pronoun, the earliest sources indicate that this feature was already quite unstable and becoming increasingly rare even by the beginning of the early 20th century. While tokens of this older realization can still occasionally be found in modern sources, they are clearly marked as the dialect variant most typical of the oldest speakers, indicating that this feature has become rather archaic and is likely falling out of use among younger speakers.

In his examination of southwestern Ukrainian dialects, Hrynčyšyn 2005 observes that a feature typical of southwestern dialectal phonology is the lack of change from etymological *o to a before syllables with a stressed [a] or its phonological equivalent [y]; for example, [bohato] (CSU: [bahato]), [bohač] (CSU: [bahač]), etc. He further notes that this lack of change from etymological *o to a was widely the case in Ukrainian written sources from the 14th to 17th centuries and continues to be preserved in several modern southwestern dialects, including Hutsul. While his observation on the resistance of assimilation in the case of etymological *o holds some validity, the status of this phonological trait has long been quite unstable and subject to variation, even in the early 20th century sources.

Example (9c), from an interview conducted in 1926, already demonstrates the vowel assimilation typical of CSU in the word багато, in which the etymological *o of the first syllable has changed to a under phonological pressure exerted by the a in the following syllable. Writing around the same time, Mančuk also consistently uses the assimilated realization, seen in (20a):

а. е багато
‘There are many [of them]’ (2006: 12)

---

122 The speaker in (19d) who used the CSU pronunciation [vin] was, for example, born over 10 years later.

123 This parallels the CSU багато ‘many’ (<богатъ). However, the the same author expressed the derived form with o: Я знат одного богача (54), ‘I knew one rich man’
In a similar phonological environment, Šekeryk-Donykiv, writing in the late 1930s, wavers between forms including and lacking the assimilated o. While, in example (20b), he demonstrates use of the assimilated form мальфарь [mal'far'] ‘sorcerer’124, he elsewhere uses the o variant spelling мольфарі [mol'fari] (2007:20)125.

b. Мальфарь порадив її
   “the sorcerer advised her; (2007: 139)

Interestingly, greater variation between etymological *o and assimilated a can be seen in somewhat later sources126, such as the speaker in (9d), born in 1927, who used the southwestern variant богато during an interview in 2010. Similarly, this preference for the locally-marked o can be seen in the sources for examples (20c) and (20d):

c. Нибогато Довбуш думав
   “Dovbuš thought for a bit’ (VV, No. 55127)

d. Уже богато було тих приладів
   ‘there were already a lot of those devices’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 165)

Examples (20c) and (20d), while relatively modern, do come from somewhat older speakers and, indeed, this localized form with non-assimilate [o] seems to have been most diffused around the middle of the 20th century, just after the time of the earlier writers, but before the emergence of more modern speakers. Generation seems to play a significant role in the realization of this feature:

e. перше--нибогато
   ‘the first was small’ (Jastrems'ka 2208: 267128)

f. нибагато цього літа був
   ‘there weren’t many that summer’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 258129)

124 The CSU spelling of this word is мольфар; however, it should be noted that this is a distinctly Hutsul term, one that was adopted into CSU from the Carpathians.
125 Šekeryk-Donykiv also occasionally uses богато (2007: 85)
126 Mančuk, writing in the 1920s, also uses o, but in a few specific lexemes, such the Hutsul word ‘sorcerer’: то великий мольфарь, ‘he’s a great sorcerer’ (2006: 60). Otherwise, he uses a, with (21a) as a typical example.
127 Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916.
128 Speaker born in 1935
129 Speaker born in 1953
Examples (20e) and (20f) above show both possible phonological variations, with (20e) typical of locally marked tendencies, and (20f) demonstrating closer similarity to the CSU form. What is significant in the comparison of these two examples is the age gap between speakers, as the speaker using the marked dialectal form o was born nearly twenty years earlier than the speaker using the CSU typical form with a. This shift is even more apparent in the most recent sources from relatively younger speakers. The writer Marija Vlad, for example, consistently uses the CSU form with vowel assimilation, such as in example (20g):

```
g. голова уже багато позабувала\textsuperscript{130} 'my head has already forgotten a lot' (1992)
```

A final feature of o often observed in the Hutsul dialect is its tendency towards elision in the preposition [do] (Lesjuk 2011, among others). This pattern appears to be quite stable throughout the 20th century and is frequently found in both the old (21a) and the modern dialect (21b, 21c):

```
(21)  a. летів я д’горі
  ‘I flew to the mountains’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

  b. шо я д’хаті не приходів за літо
  ‘I didn’t come to the hut all summer’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 236\textsuperscript{131})

  c. верталисми бр’хаті
  ‘we had returned to the hut’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 32)
```

While the pattern of elision itself is fairly stable in the dialect, a less consistent but notable possibility is for the elided o to create a new consonant cluster subject to assimilation, see in (21d):

```
d. побігли т’хаті
  ‘we ran to the hut’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 12)
```

In (21d), the loss of o creates a cluster of d and x. This causes the x to exert regressive assimilation pressure resulting in the d being devoiced to t. This tendency, however, is somewhat rare, both in the old and modern dialect.

\textsuperscript{130} She also uses assimilated [a] in related forms, as in: ‘А що, такий багач не мав города?’ The exception is speech marked for age or time period, such as in the re-telling of the legend of Oleksa Dovbuš when she uses the unassimilated [o] form: ‘Що Олекса зв’язав свого ворога богача Дідушк’

\textsuperscript{131} Speaker born in 1932
The elided *о* is also prominent in the personal pronouns of the old dialect. The elision in these pronouns—*вона* ‘she’, *воно* ‘it’, and *вони* ‘they’—renders innovative base forms of *вна*, *вно*, and *вни*, which are they subject to harmonic rules creating the most commonly found variants *уна* (22a), *уно*, *уни* (22b):

(22)  

a. уна гирша вид злої мачюхи!
‘she is worse than an evil stepmother’ (Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011)

b. лиш уні маленьками вивмерали
‘only they died young’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

These forms are still sporadically found in the modern dialect (22c, 22d):

c. подивитися, єк уні виглядають
‘look how they look’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 208)

d. хоть уна остра була
‘although it was sharp’ (Vlad 1992)

However, variation of these forms has started appearing in the contemporary sources indicating that they are starting to destabilize. Indeed, the variation itself is sometimes rather inconsistent, such as use of the seemingly Russian-influenced form *она* in (22e) as well as the clearly CSU-influenced form *вони* in (22f):

e. Она свого чьоловіка добре пам’ятала
‘She remembered her husband well’ (VV, No. 51)

f. вони тоді вийшли
‘then they came out’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 235)

2.1.5 Conclusions

Table 1 summarizes the primary data on Hutsul vowel phonology:

132 Speaker born in 1916
133 Speaker born in 1932
### Table 1: Phonology: Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflex</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Status: Early 20th c.</th>
<th>Status: Late 20th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a &gt; e)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>rare following C, stable following C'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a &gt; y, i)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>positionally stable in reflexive marker, otherwise rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etymological ending -e in neuter nouns</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ɛ &gt; i)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ɛ &gt; ā)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stressed e lowered to a</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word initial (i &gt; y)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stressed y lowered to ɛ</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o &gt; u)</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o &gt; y) in newly-closed syllables</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retention of (o) before stressed syllables with a</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elided o</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The broad conclusion to be drawn about the Hutsul vocalic system is that the system has undergone far-reaching changes as a result of CSU influence. Across nearly all vowel categories, the old Hutsul reflexes have declined significantly since the beginning of the 20th century. The singular exception is the reflex \(a > e\) following a palatalized consonant, which has proved relatively resistant to CSU phonological influence. In this way, \(a > e\) following C' can be
assessed as what Milroy and Milroy considered to be a network marker with a high ability to index local identity among speakers even as other phonological traits of their speech atrophy.

The conclusion of a phonological change in process is in direct contrast to Lesjuk’s recent assertion that:

> Having analyzed this and other texts, we can conclude that the phonetic traits of modern residents of Verxovyna virtually do not differ from the phonetic traits of the novel Dido Ivančik, and this means that the phonetic system of the Hutsul dialect has been resilient. (2012)

Interestingly, one of the few traits that Lesjuk admits has begun to atrophy among contemporary speakers is precisely the $a > e$ reflex which he believes is waning among younger speakers in an endeavor to “окультурить” their speech (p. 29). If this assessment is true, the result would be a vocalic system broadly subject to increasingly rapid convergence to CSU.

2.2 Consonants

Hutsul and CSU share a common consonant inventory, including consonants paired for voicedness. In addition, Hutsul has generally followed the phonological reflexes typical of all East Slavic dialects, including pleophony which, as in CSU, is the only form that has maintained its place in the lexical system. Hutsul, however, has retained several archaic features in its system of consonants which were lost in CSU, most significantly the pattern of palatalization affecting sibilants affricates, and trills in which Hutsul has traditionally differed significantly from CSU. In addition to archaisms, Hutsul is also phonologically marked by several innovations typical of the Carpathian dialect group, including several unique consonant mutations, particularly those affecting dental stops. While it is thought that the Hutsul consonants system has tended to be more stable than the vowel system, the data from contemporary sources indicates that consonants have been similarly affected by CSU contact, with many features undergoing atrophy and loss.

2.2.1 Labial stops $b, p$

As in CSU, Hutsul has two labial stops paired for voicedness: $b, p$. The primary distinction between their behavior is that, in Hutsul, labials followed by $j$ do not trigger an epenthetic $l$. This mainly affects first person singular and plural present tense verbal morphology. Žylko 1955 notes such paired examples as Hutsul: куп’ю, CSU: куплю; Hutsul: люб’ю, CSU: люблю; Hutsul: роб’ю, CSU: роблю. This was a well-established feature of Hutsul phonology in the old dialect and, as in most cases where phonology intersects directly with morphology, has
generally remained stable throughout the last century. Examples (23a) and (23b) illustrate typical cases from the old dialect:

(23)  a. З вовни робить нитки
‘They made thread from the wool’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

  b. А бездітники любить малі діти
‘The childless love small children’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

Examples (23a) and (23b) both contain second conjugation verbs in the third person plural form. In addition to the replacement of epenthetic l following the labial+/, these forms also reflect typical vocalism resulting from the treatment of -ja in the inflection, as discussed above. (23b) reflects the more contemporary inflection whereby ja > je has overtaken y in most positions, even when unstressed. The l of CSU has fallen out, leaving only the apostrophe which preserves the hardness of the consonant preceding the jotized vowel, a tendency which continues in the modern inflectional patterns, seen in examples (23c) and (23d):

c. Я це зроблю
‘I will do this’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 201)

d. бо навіть сплять робітники на земні
‘for workers even sleep on the ground’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 21)

(23c) and (23d), typical examples of the modern dialect, continues to avoid the epenthetic l of CSU139; however, a resulting paradigm shift has occurred in the third person plural form of (23d). Following the jotized labial, the inflection shifts from the second conjugation to the first conjugation.140

2.2.2 Dental stops d, t

Unlike the labial stops, dental stops d, t undergo several processes including mutations which clearly differentiate Hutsul from CSU. As is typically the case, it is in those positions where phonology most directly affects morphological paradigms that these processes have been

---

134 CSU: роблять
135 Recorded in 1926
136 CSU: люблять
137 CSU: зроблю
138 CSU: сплять
139 There are occasional tokens on the epenthetic l appearing within the conjugational paradigm, such as ‘вони килими виробляют’ (Jastrems’ka 2008: 264, from a speaker born in 1931). Such tokens appear to still be relatively rare, although may indication incipient instability and variation.
140 This phenomenon of the modern dialect will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.
most resistant to convergence pressures. Consonant mutations limited to phonology exclusively have proven a good deal more vulnerable to change over time.

Lesjuk 2011 among others has noted the retention of word final -t in present tense verbal inflection. While this will be discussed further in the chapter on Morphology, the phonological results of this archaism should be noted here, particularly in their salience in both the old (examples 24a, 24b) and modern (examples 24c, 24d, 24e). dialects:

(24)  a. вна нi розумiст
‘she doesn’t understand’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 67)

b. З цього хлопця буде колись чоловiк
‘someday this boy will be a man’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

c. тa знают старi люди
‘and the old people know’ (VV, No. 55)

d. Дiвки пишуть, єк мiши
‘The girls squeal like mice’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 38)

e. Ноги болють, уже не хочуть служити.
‘Their legs ache and they no longer want to work’ (Vlad 1992)

Examples (24a) and (24b) not only demonstrate the salience of word final -t in Hutsul, but also indicate that this ending was salient enough to preserve the old first conjugation third person singular inflection entirely intact, departing from CSU which lost the word final -t in first conjugation verbs and preserving it in the second conjugation alone. In addition, the phenomenon of mixing verbal categories can again be observed, particularly in example (24e) from the writer Marija Vlad, where a second conjugation verb (болють) shifts to the first conjugation in its desinence while preserving the archaic [hard] -t. These verbal inflections have proven very stable over time with little evidence of vulnerability to CSU influenced change.

More dramatic than the preservation of the archaic verbal inflection are the innovations specific to southwestern dialects and most particularly to old Hutsul (Žylko 1955). These innovations include the mutations affecting the palatalized dental stops which change to to palatalized velars before front vowels i, e and, less often, soft sign. The resulting reflexes are \(d' > g'\) in voiced positions and \(t' > k'\) in voiceless positions. This phenomenon has been noted numerous times, including Žylko 1955, who gives the examples of infinitive хотити (CSU: хотити), 3pl present tense [вони] плакає (CSU: платять), кiло (CSU: тiло), кiсто (CSU: тiсто), кишко (CSU: тяжко), гiло (CSU: дiло); Lesjuk 2011, who notes the forms гiвка (CSU: дiвка),

\(^{141}\) Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916
гіло (CSU: діло), вигів (CSU: видів), понеґівнок (CSU: понеділок), негілі (CSU: неділя), CSU: гіти (діти), кіло (тіло); and Zakrevs'ka 1991, who adds гіт (CSU: дід), and кісно (CSU: тісно). While this reflex was likely widespread early on in Hutsul--particularly considering the number and variety of tokens identified by scholars--by the early 20th century it was already becoming only sporadically used. Rudnytskyj’s speaker provides example (25a) in 1926:

(25)  a. с петека гістают сукно
‘they get the cloth from the loop’ (1965: 43)

While (25a) shows the basic mutation typical of the old dialect, the earlier writings of Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011, seen in (25b) reflect the variant d' > ɦ' which seems to have co-existed as a possible variant to the more archaic mutation d' > g' before eventually overtaking it:

b. бідна жінка та бідні гіти
‘poor woman and poor children’

However, by the the first decades of the 20th century, both Mančuk and Šekeryk-Donykiv have abandoned these mutation variants in favor of the form more typical of CSU preserving the palatalized dental stop (25c, 25d):

c. мала чим діти погодувати
‘there was something to feed the children’ (Mančuk 2006: 64)

d. навіть будуть нього пам'ятати діти
‘even children will remember him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007 : 33)

Indeed, palatalized dental stop mutations had become sporadically used by the 1930s, appearing very inconsistently from speaker to speaker. While Xotkevyč, writing in the 1920s, demonstrates an active use of the mutation t' > k' (25e), Šekeryk-Donykiv retains the etymological dental stop approximately a decade later (25f):

e. то буде повеся смідескъ і сім
‘it will be more than seventy seven’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 358)

f. Ни дев’єдесість, ни вісімдесість, ни смідесість, ни шістьдесість, ни пів сотка
‘Not ninety, not eighty, not seventy, not sixty, not half a hundred’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 22)

142 CSU: дістають
143 Recorded in 1926
144 CSU: діти
It is likely that, by the 1930s, this mutation had lost its productivity and was already slowly being replaced by retention of etymological dental stops. It further appears likely that that a following front vowel was more apt to trigger the mutation than was a soft sign, as seen in the switch in numerical endings in (25f).

In the modern dialect, the mutated velar forms have reverted back to etymological dental stops, remaining now primarily in fossilized forms of a limited number of high frequency lexemes. Only one of Jastrems'ka’s speakers uses this mutation consistently, such as in (25g):

\[ g. \text{ то страшне } \text{гіло}^{146} \]
\[ ‘\text{it’s a frightening business’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233) } \]

Plytka-Horycvit, however, consistently avoids this mutation, even in places where it appears to have once been well-established, included positions phonologically analogous to (25g), such as in (24d) ‘дівки’ (2005: 38), and (25h) below:

\[ h. \text{ діти страхалися тогда} \]
\[ ‘\text{the children were scared then’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27) } \]

The same speaker cited above in (25g) (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233) even uses the mutation in positions where the dental palatalization occurs as a function of the following soft sign, rather than a front vowel. Example (25i) shows numeric forms very similar to those used by Xotkevyč almost a century earlier:

\[ i. \text{Тридці́ть } \text{i ші́́сько́ рокі́в} \]
\[ ‘\text{Thirty six years’ (1966) } \]

However, this speaker seems to be an exception to an otherwise strong trend toward loss of this mutation. In example (5c) Savčuk 2008 demonstrates the more common modern numeric form ‘тридці́ть’ with retention of the etymological dental stop.

The exception to this general trend toward loss of mutation is fossilized forms of certain high frequency lexemes, most commonly the local realization of CSU тя́жко, which currently exists in three main variants, two of which demonstrate the preservation of the \( t' > k' \) mutation: the older form хі́жко and the intermediary form кє́шко, which retains the consonant mutation, but has undergone levelling resulting in the vocal articulation \( e < ja < \varepsilon \). Indeed, a timeline can be constructed illustrating the trajectory of this lexeme’s local development кі́жко > кє́шко > тє́жко \[ > CSU \text{ тя́жко?} \].\(^{147}\) The speakers cited in 6c. and 6f. (born in 1919 and 1902,

---

145 Born in 1932; from ді́ло (CSU: справа)
146 CSU: ді́ло (although the more standard lexeme is справа)
147 This chronology of sound changes is further supported by the impossibility of the forms *ті́шко and *кя́шко.
respectively) consistently use the oldest local form кіжка whereas Jastrems'ka’s speaker in (6g), born somewhat later in 1932, already uses the intermediary form кєшко with consonant mutation intact but with vocalism resulting from the levelling process.

The most recent data, however, suggest that even in these lexical items where the mutation became frozen and established as the primary phonological shape, etymological dental stops are now being widely maintained (25j, 25k):

j. Тєжко то було на душі
   ‘It was heavy on my soul’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 24)

k. дуже тєжка була робота
   ‘the work was very difficult’ (Vlad 1992)

While the consonant mutation is receding, as examples (25j) and (25k) demonstrate, there is little evidence that this is actually the result of CSU convergence, rather than an internally-motivated change. Very few tokens of the CSU form тяжко can be found among even recent speakers, primarily due to the continued local salience of the highly-marked vocal reflex ja > je which maintains the lexeme as a distinctly Hutsul form, rather than a borrowed form from CSU. The few exceptions which can found are generally in derivational forms indicative of register shift, such as seen in example (2f) where the speakers uses the more literary lexeme ‘обтяжливо’ in conformance with CSU phonological norms.

While CSU does not typically have word final voicing assimilation (including word final devoicing), there is often word internal assimilation. Hutsul, however, demonstrates voicing assimilation in a wider variety of positions, both word finally and word internally, which is generally reflected in the orthography. Specifically, Zakrevs'ka notes the prevalence in Hutsul of word final devoicing of plosives, both word finally and before a voiceless consonant. The latter can be seen in example (22d) in the phrase т’хаті (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 12) where the dropped vowel o creates a cluster of voiced д and voiceless x triggering voicing assimilation d > t. It should be noted, however, that this instance of assimilation is rather inconsistent with numerous examples of places where is does not seem to occur.148 Further, Žylko 1955 notes that voiceless consonants become voiced before sonorants, even across morpheme boundaries, such as Hutsul [tud robiš] vs. CSU [tut robiš], in which the voiceless dental stop t is voiced to d before the voiced sonorant of the following word in the phrase. This phenomenon of consonant devoicing seems to have occurred fairly regularly in the old dialect, as seen in (26a) and (26b) which demonstrate assimilation both word internally and word finally respectively:

148 In example 22c, it can be observed that the same author does not express assimilation in the same position and, instead, uses д’хаті (2005:32).
From the examples of writers in the early 20th century, however, who indicate such instances of devoicing only rarely, it can be assumed that this type of assimilation belongs to the oldest layer of Hutsul phonology, one which was already receding by the 1920s and 1930s, with only occasional exceptions. Even Mančuk, whose dialectal forms tend to be among the most conservative, avoids assimilation in an example paralleling (26a):

c. A відки ідете, пане?
‘And where are coming from, mister?’ (2006: 69)

Similarly, both Mančuk and Šekeryk-Donykiv consistently avoid word final devoicing, as in examples (26d) and (26e):

d. я перший переди кождим святим помолющи
‘I was the first to pray before each saint’ (Mančuk 2006: 56)

e. Всі ждали на Иванчікову сповідь
‘Everone was waiting for Ivan’s penance’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 283)

Word final devoicing has been particularly susceptible to loss, creating greater phonological conformity to CSU in the modern dialect where such instances of devoicing has become increasingly rare. A typical example is seen in (26f):

f. Мій прадід, Палагнин дєдя, жив на Царині
‘My great grandad, Palahna’s dad, lived in Caryn’(Vlad 1992)

Similar to the phenomenon of consonant assimilation is that of consonant simplification which also seems to have been relatively more widespread in the old dialect than in the modern. Lesjuk particularly notes simplification of the clusters ts, ds', and s'k > c. In the examples transcriptions of Hutsul speech, such as Rudnys't'kyj’s 1926 speaker, this tendency is strong enough to affect even the reflexive affix:

(27) а. Рано нене встает, умиацит, Богу си молит и кушацит.
‘Mother gets up early, washes, prays to God, and eats’ (1965: 43)

This orthographic representation of the assimilation affecting the reflexive affix is otherwise nonexistent in the early Hutsul texts, as it is in the modern text; therefore, its status, even in the early period is unknown. However, there is occasional evidence of this cluster simplification in other morphological contexts. In the case of numbers, for example, the dental element of the cluster sometimes appears as a glide\textsuperscript{156} (27b) or simply omitted (27c, 27d):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[b.] У деді з рєду дітий я двайціть і чєтвертий. А миже живими дітми однайцітий и найменчий

‘I was my father’s twenty fourth child. Among the living children, the eleventh and the youngest’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

\item[c.] Ни вісімнаціть, ни сімнаціть, ни шішнаціть, ни п’єтнаціть, ни штирнаціть…

‘Not eighteen, not seventeen, not sixteen, not fifteen, not fourteen’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 22)

\item[d.] єк би я двайціть рук мав

‘if I had twenty hands’ (Mančuk 2006: 40)
\end{enumerate}

This simplification of numerical endings has largely fallen out of the modern dialect, as seen in example (5c) from Savčuk 2008 who uses the form тридціть. Similarly, Vlad 1992 retains the cluster in this context:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[e.] Десь тридцять коров було на стайни

‘There were around thirty cows in the herd’
\end{enumerate}

However, evidence simplification of consonant clusters can still be found occasionally, such as in (27f), but they tend to be somewhat rare:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[f.] тай знов чюю голос люцкій\textsuperscript{157}

‘and again I hear a human voice’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 172)
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{153} CSU: мати
\textsuperscript{154} Hutsul: умиват си, CSU: умивається
\textsuperscript{155} Hutsul: кутат си, CSU: їсти
\textsuperscript{156} Shevelov described this process thus: “In a shift from the coronal to dorsal palatalization in dentals, their articulation moved back toward the palate, where /j/ is articulated. The closeness of their new articulation position to that of /j/ made possible shifts from palatal dentals to /j/ and vice versa. (1979: 88)
\textsuperscript{157} CSU: людський
While Plytka-Horycvit does demonstrate such cluster simplification in some contexts, it is certainly no longer consistently evident in modern Hutsul. Vlad, for example, renders the same lexeme with the etymological cluster intact:

g. Але ти не пиши, бо то людськи\textsuperscript{158} вигадки
‘but don’t write [that], for it’s human fabrications’ (1992)

While simplification of consonant clusters seems to have been a feature of Hutsul phonology, it is likely that this feature was losing its prevalence even by the early 20th century when it was very inconsistently expressed by the existent texts. While tokens can still be found in modern sources, it is clear that this tendency to simplify clusters has greater receded, creating stronger connections between Hutsul consonant articulation and that of CSU. This is also the case with gemination where, in CSU, consonants positioned after vowels and before e from the old front jer are doubled\textsuperscript{159}. Similar to other southwestern dialects, Hutsul did not develop this feature during its early period (Żylko 1955, Lesjuk 2011). This is consistently seen in a range of neuter nouns from old dialect sources:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(28)]
\begin{itemize}
\item a. волось\textsuperscript{160} на голові
‘the hair on [his] head’ (Mančuk 2006: 60)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Written nearly a decade later, Dido Ivančik also provides clear evidence that gemination was entirely absent in the old dialect, admitting only forms with a single consonant, of which there are a wide range:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(28)]
\begin{itemize}
\item b...аби дати життя\textsuperscript{161} на світі
‘to let them live in the world’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 15)
\item c. видповів я на закінчення\textsuperscript{162}
‘I finally answered’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 19)
\item d. Рвали одно одному волось на голові
‘they tore one another’s hair out’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 39)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

This single consonant, prevalent in the old dialect, has been retained by some later 20th century speakers, as seen in more recent examples (28e) and (29f):

\textsuperscript{158} The palatalization of s is further evidence of the a full convergence to CSU phonology, as will be discussed below.
\textsuperscript{159} According to Shevelov, gemination had been completed in CSU by the late 15th to 16th century and affected all palatalized consonants followed by j (with the exception of labials) (1979: 362).
\textsuperscript{160} CSU: волосся; in addition to the absence of gemination, it should be noted that these older forms also demonstrate the archaic ending -e retained by Hutsul throughout much of the 20th century.
\textsuperscript{161} CSU: життя
\textsuperscript{162} CSU: закінчення
I have played music all my life’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)

‘and the hair on [my] head’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008 p. 19)

Nevertheless, in recent years gemination has made clear incursions into the modern dialect, with CSU-influenced consonant doubling becoming more common than the old Hutsul forms which arose as part of the phonological inventory of the southwestern dialect group. Indeed, most modern speakers show greater preference for the geminated forms:

‘I have spent my whole life with the cattle on the polonya’ (VV, No. 45)

‘and various tools’ (VV, No. 29)

While geminated forms are gaining predominance in the modern dialect, there are a few exceptions which appear to be forms of high frequency lexemes which have fossilized despite the overall trend toward gemination, such in the following example from Vlad 1992:

‘So I have lived my whole long life’

‘My grandma became accustomed to drinking’

While Vlad retains the non-geminated form (28j) for the high frequency lexeme житє, she also uses the doubled form пиття (28k). It should be noted that frozen form of (28j) also demonstrates the retention of etymological [e] which is typical of old Hutsul. The more modern form of (28k), in addition to gemination, has further convergence to CSU norms in the word final reflex ɛ > a. This pair of examples from a single source is particularly interesting as they illustrate the dynamics of the convergence process where speech is subjected to variation and frequent shifts between competing forms. In the case of gemination, the CSU forms are

---

163 Speaker born in 1920
164 Speaker born in 1930s
165 Speaker born in 1927
166 As above, there seems to be a correlation between the absence of gemination and the retention of the archaic ending -e, whereby only two possible variants exist: the old Hutsul -t’ɛ and CSU -t’a. The intermediary variants *t’ɛ and *t’a appear to be impossible. Where gemination occurs, it consistently occurs with the CSU vocalism ‘a.
becoming increasingly more prevalent, but the process is not without some retention of archaisms, particularly in more semantically weighted lexemes.

2.2.3 Dental fricatives $z$, $s$

The most characteristic feature of the Hutsul dental fricatives $s$, $z$ is their depalatization (Zakrevs'ka 1991), a phenomenon which both differentiates Hutsul from CSU, as well as links it to other dialects of the southwestern group (Žylko 1955). This depalatalization occurs primarily word finally and in the adjectival suffixes (Lesjuk 2011). Examples (29a), (29b), and (29c) demonstrate the depalatalization of $s$ in a word final position from old dialect sources:

(29) a. єк говорит із кимос
   ‘how he speaks with someone’ (Mančuk 2006: 55)

b. З цего хлопця буде колис чоловік
   ‘someday this boy will be a man’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

c. єк би йкийс жєбрак
   ‘like some kind of beggar’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 149)

This word final depalatalization has generally been resistant to convergence, with the majority of modern sources demonstrating the $s$ phoneme word finally:

d. А колис, єкби не ці ліси
   ‘And some time, had it not been for these forests’ (VV, No. 45)$^{167}$

e. то було у когос колис
   ‘someone sometime had it’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 39)

f. Добре памнітаю, єк їхала нкас паня з Варшави
   ‘I remember well how some lady from Warsaw came’ (VV, No. 31)$^{168}$

g. Колис давно
   ‘Sometime long ago’ (Savčuk 2008)

In all of the above examples, the word final $s$ is derived from the morpheme $s’$ which forms the Ukrainian indefinite pronoun ‘someone’ as well as the indefinite adjectives ‘some time,’ ‘some

---

$^{167}$ Speaker born in 1930s
$^{168}$ Speaker born in 1927
kind.’ Even in modern Hutsul, examples of palatalization of this particle are quite rare, indicating continued stability in the dialect’s phonology. This, however, is not the case with the dental fricative of the adjectival suffixes which has, in recent years, destabilized with a trend toward the palatalization found in CSU.

According to Shevelov 1979, the palatalization of s is the adjectival suffix -ьск- began around the 14th century, originally as a result of assimilation triggered by the weak front jer: Cьsk > C’sk > C's'k (340). This then expanded to many adjectives with the original suffix -ьk- (488), forming the basis of the CSU adjectival suffix. Hutsul, like several other southwestern dialects, has traditionally preserved the non-palatalized dental consonant of the adjectival suffix. Examples from old dialect sources are consistent in the phonological treatment of this suffix formed with the non-palatalized dental, whether voiced as in (30a) or voiceless as in (30b):

(30)  a. близко одна коло одної
‘close to each other’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 20)

b. гуцульский ліжник
‘Hutsul blanket’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 10)

While this suffix form appears to have been stable in the old dialect with very few digressions toward palatalization, the situation in the modern dialect is a good deal less clear, characterized by frequent variation between speakers, with younger speakers demonstrating a greater preference for the CSU palatalized ending. As seen from the examples below, Plytka-Horycvit is consistent in her use of Hutsul non-palatalized suffixes (30c, 30d), as is the speaker in (30e) who, born in 1919, represents one of the oldest modern speakers. By contrast, the relatively younger (b. 1930s) speaker in (30f) has already shifted away from the Hutsul non-palatalized ending and toward CSU palatalization, as has the writer Vlad who uses the CSU palatalized form without exception (seen in previous example (27g) ‘людські’, as well as below in (30g)):

  c. файна ціарска ношя
‘a good imperial’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 192)

  d. ни одну дитину гуцульську
‘not a single Hutsul child’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 12)

  e. то була дуже кіжка, просто рабська робота
‘it was very difficult, simply slave work’ (VV, No. 29)

  f. який коштував 333 російські рублі

---

169 This absence of palatalization of the adjectival suffix also appears in the phonological variant ьк, as in this example from Mančuk: каже тот ворохтсниньй (2006: 68).
‘which cost 333 Russian rubles’ (VV, No. 45)

g. то був наш гуцульський посол
‘he was our Hutsul ambassador’ (Vlad 1992)

As examples (30c-e) illustrate, the Hutsul adjectival suffix in -sk- still remains in the phonology of the oldest speakers; however, this once highly salient feature has clearly receded in recent years with relatively younger and more recent speakers preferring the palatalized dental ending more typical of CSU. While the hard dental of the adjectival suffix has destabilized sufficiently to allow incursions for CSU in the form of palatalization, this is not at all the case of word final dental fricatives which, even among younger modern speakers, still retains it locally-marked depalatalization and has proven thus far resistant to change.

Example (30a) above also hints at a possible resistance to (regressive) voicing assimilation of the type “sonorant before obstruent” as the orthography seems to indicate the likely realization of voiced dental fricative z in the cluster -zk: близьko170. Indeed, while CSU lacks this regressive voicing assimilation, examples of such assimilation can be found in in written sources from the 14th century, and is well-preserved in several dialects of the southwestern group, including Pokuttja-Bukovyna, Zakarpattja, and southern Volynsk (Hrynčyšyn 2005). As in the other instances of assimilation, this feature does appear in Hutsul but is inconsistently seen, both diachronically and synchronically:

(31) a. Але хата ни блиско
‘but the hut is not close’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 26)

Yet, as the examples in (30a), (31b), and (31c) demonstrate, even by the early 20th century this feature was prone to variation.

b. котрий понизку віглєдаєт
‘which looks from below’ (Mančuk 2006: 55)

c. усі люде из близька171 та з делеку
‘all the people from near and far’ (Mančuk 2006: 57)

Evidence from neighboring dialects also indicates that localized voicing assimilation is not currently widespread, as this typical example from Lemko shows:

---

170 It is, of course, possible that the author has here chosen to use etymological orthography rather than phonological, although this would be highly inconsistent with his linguistic style which otherwise has a strong tendency to reflect dialect traits rather the literary convention. Indeed, the given spelling does in fact reflect the dialectal non-palatalized z in the suffix.
171 Although somewhat anomalously, the author does indicate a palatalization of the adjectival suffix here.
d. Поможеме їм впливати на своїх молодих близьких.
‘Let’s help them influence their younger friends’ (Horoszczak)

2.2.4 Dental Affricate \(c\)^172

In most Ukrainian dialects, including CSU, the dental affricate \(c\) preserves its palatalization both word finally and before word-final \(-a\), \(-u\), and \(-i\), most notably in the nominal suffixes \(-ec\)', \(-yc'(a)\), etc. (Shevelov 1979: 619). While the affricate \(c\) in these nominal suffixes \(-ec\) (from \(-ьць\)) and \(-ic'a\) does generally retain its palatalization in many Carpathian dialects, the Hutsul\(^{173}\) affricate is hardened in word final position before \(u, a, e, y\) (Żylko 1955, Zakrevs'ka 1991, Lesjuk 2011). This feature was consistently realized in the old dialect (examples 32a and 32b), and appears to have remained stable throughout most of the 20th century (32c):

(32) a. то би був конець світа\(^{174}\)
‘that would be the end of the world’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

b. Половица лиш
‘Only a half’ (Xotkevyć 1966: 344)

c. у баби хлопець
‘the granny had a boy’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 233)

Interestingly, Vlad 1992 uses this affricate suffix to mark the age of her speakers, with older speakers uses the non-palatalized \(c\) (32d) contrasted with phonology which she attributes specifically to younger Hutsul speakers who are marked by, among other features, a palatalized \(c'\), creating the impression of a stronger CSU influence on their articulation of this suffix (32e):

(32) d. мертвець\(^{175}\) звісни і сів
‘The dead [person] arose and sat down’

e. Єк, мамо, мертвець звісни?
‘How, mama, did the dead [person] arise?’

This contrast between the non-palatalized and palatalized suffix is further highlighted by their proximity within the context of a single conversation taking place between a mother (32d) and

---

172 The phoneme /c/ is represented in IPA as \(\tilde{c}\); however, the Ukrainian articulation is dental.

173 This is also the case in Lemko: На кінець дистал ем книжечку (Horoszczak)

174 However, as Example 29b. (‘з цего хлопця’) demonstrates, there is an underlying palatalization evident in the oblique cases (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

175 This is also the form used by Mančuk: ‘мертвець би устав’ ‘the dead [person] would rise’ (2006: 15).
her daughter (32e). Despite the presence of other marked local features in the speech of the younger speaker ([jek] and reflexive affix sy), the affricate is clearly marked for palatalization in the nominal suffix. The impression created is that, despite the continued prevalence of non-palatalized [-ec] among many modern speakers, this feature is beginning to recede among younger speakers to a degree large enough that it has become noticeable among native speakers of Hutsuls. This phrase in (32e), then, serves as an indication of those features which continue to remain salient despite increased CSU contact ([jek] and reflexive affix sy), and those which are receding as a result of CSU influence (depalatalized c).

2.2.5 Postdental Consonants: Palatal sibilants š, ž and palatal affricate č

In approximately the 10th - 13th centuries the Ukrainian palatal sibilants and fricative lost their original palatalization176, resulting in a hardening of the sibilants in most positions (Rudnyts'kyj 1965). The phonological status of the postdental consonants has, however, been problematic in Ukrainian. Although they have been largely depalatalized across the Ukrainian spectrum, there are several phonetically and morphologically conditioned exceptions, leading Shevelov to conclude that the status of postdentals in Ukrainian “appears to be fairly motley” (1979: 549) as a result of a historical depalatalization process that was “rather sluggish” and led to numerous cases of partial preservation of palatalization (1979: 550). This process was also very unevenly diffused throughout the Ukrainian-speaking space resulting in inconsistent distribution of palatalized and non-palatalized articulation, particularly affecting the Carpathian dialects which, in many cases, preserved the original palatal quality of the the postdentals:

Soon after [the end of the 16th century] the dispalatalization of postdentals (except in some specific positions) became an earmark of the entire area east of the Carpathian mountains. The dialects of the mountaineers with their conservative twinge did not accept the innovation. (Shevelov 1979: 554)

Hutsul, along with Bukovyna, Pokuttia, and Bojko, are considered to have largely retained the former palatalization177 (Žylko 1955, Zakrevs'ka 1991, Lesjuk 2011), although this palatalization has been positionally conditioned for at least the last century. The morphological limitations are unclear, as palatalization can appear in both roots and in suffixes, although the latter is more common for the palatal sibilant š, whose palatalized quality can be most clearly observed in both nominal (33a) and adjectival feminine suffixes (33b, 33c):

(33) а. кашя молочна

176 These palatalized postdentals arose following the palatalization of the velars and the resolution of j clusters (Shevelov 1979: 549).
177 Sometime in the 17th century Lemko depalatalized postdentals in all positions (Shevelov 1979).
‘milk kasha’ (Manchuk 2006: 14)

b. бо земня свєта—нашя матір
‘for the earth is our mother’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 36)

c. Ти гірша зола вид мене
‘You are worse than angry at me’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 37)

The tendency in the modern dialect, however, has been to depalatalize to postdental sibilant in all positions where such a depalatalization has occurred in CSU. Examples (33d), (33e), and (33f) provide parallel morphological contexts to the examples above (nominal and adjectival feminine suffixes), but demonstrate that depalatalization has occurred fairly consistently in these positions, with example (33d) showing a nominal feminine suffix, and example (33e) showing adjectival suffixes:

d. Заклєта, видко, груша
‘The pear tree is apparently cursed’ (Vlad 1992)

e. Наша стара хата
‘Our old hut’ (Vlad 1992)

From the modern sources, it is only Plytka-Horycvit who continues to demonstrate sibilant palatalization in such positions:

g. Йой, душя в п’єтках
‘Yes, my soul was shaken’ (2008: 345)

h. біда нашя
‘our misfortune’ (Plytka-Horysvit 2005: 21)

The palatal affricate is also most commonly marked for palatalization in the old dialect with fewer morphological constraints: as examples (34a - d) demonstrate, this palatalization was just as possible in the root as in the suffix, indicating that the fricative palatalization was likely more extensive positionally than was the palatalization of the sibilants:

(34)  a. У дєді з рєду дітий я двайціть і четвертий
‘I was my father’s twenty fourth child’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

b. і робйі петек білий або чьорний.
‘and the workers’ woolen belt is either white or black’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

c. ни таке велике чудо
‘not such a big miracle’ (Manchuk 2006: 16)

d. Я простий чоловік
‘I am a simple man’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 37)

It is the palatalized articulation that caused such lexemes as час to undergo a dual vocalization process, whereby a>ʾa>e, rendering the local form чєс (examples 2c, 2d.). However, even in the old texts there is occasional shift to the depalatalized articulation, such as in (34e), but such examples are exceedingly rare in the early period, particularly when the fricative is followed by o:

e. чоловік не схотів з нев жити
‘the husband didn’t want to live with her’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 343)

The example in (34e) presents a rather rare expression of old Hutsul phonology: in addition to the depalatalized postdental fricative, the negative particle is also atypical of the old dialect, in which the unstressed e is most often realized as y.

Contemporary dialect evidence suggests, however, that palatal variation has increased in recent years, with speakers demonstrating inconsistent tendencies in their palatalization/depalatalization of the postdental fricative. While the writer Plytka-Horycvit consistently uses a palatalized fricative (such as in (15j) ‘чьоловікє’), other speakers--even those who are members of the older generation of speakers--have depalatalized the fricative in the same lexical context (34f, 34g, 34h):

f. Мий покійний чоловік
‘My late husband’ (VV, No. 31)179

g. Файний був чоловік
‘He was a good man’ (Vlad 1992)

h. Чудо, а не книжка.
‘A miracle, and not [just a] book’ (Vlad 1992)

Example (34h), an example directly parallelling the palatalized variant of (34c), demonstrates a fully converged utterance. In addition to the depalatalization of the formerly palatalized postdental fricative, the negative particle has also converged from local ‘ни’ to CSU ‘не’. Unlike

179 Speaker born in 1932
example (34e) which is clearly marked by the distinctly Hutsul feminine instrumental ending, there is no phonological way of distinguishing the phrase in (34h) from CSU. This indicates that the postdental depalatalization has been a part of the modern layer of phonological change, precipitated by increased CSU contact which has created clear oppositional pairings between the old and new dialect (34c vs. 34h is only one such example).

Another manifestation of the affricate palatalization can be seen in the 1st person singular and third person plural present tense verb endings. In the old dialect, this ending is consistently realized as ču, as in (34i) and (34j):

i. Я ни плачю
   ‘I’m not crying’ (Mančuk 2006: 21)

j. Я всамперед хочу перебути свою старину
   ‘I first was to visit my past’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 48)

Despite the fact that phonological variation affecting morphology has generally been some of the most most resistant to change, in this context the affricate has largely undergone depalatalization, as in (34k) and (34l), which now appear as forms directly paralleling CSU verbal endings:

k. І хочу, аби я ніколи не вмирав
   ‘And I don’t want to ever die’ (Vlad 1992)

l. Послухайте, люде добрі, шо хочу казати
   ‘Listen, kind people, to what I want to say’ (Savčuk 2008)

Another phonological process affecting the Hutsul postdentals is assimilation which has taken a number of different forms depending on position. Voicing assimilation, by which word final sibilants and sibilants before a voiceless consonant, has already been seen and demonstrates evidence of convergence as the sibilants become more resistant to their previous assimilatory tendency resulting in modern forms such as кіжка in (6f) and тєжко in (25j), but with some evidence of variation especially as it relates to lexemes that can be considered “frozen forms” and which retain phonological traits typical of the old dialect even when most modern sources point to their attrition. Other manners of assimilation, such as cluster simplification, have been significantly more resistant to change. One form of this simplification is the assimilation in the cluster šč which, in Hutsul, is most often realized as [šš] (Lesjuk 2011):

(35) а. стали платити краще
    ‘[they] started to pay better’ (VV, No. 29)

---

180 CSU: краще
However, the most ubiquitous manifestation of this Hutsul sibilant cluster simplification is likely the reflex šč > š most commonly found in the pronoun шо \(^{182}\) and adverb шийше.\(^{183}\) Šekeryk-Donykiv provides one such example from the old dialect:

b. Шо ж ти ни видишь
   ‘don’t you see’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

This cluster simplification has remained prevalent in the modern dialect. In part, this may be due to the fact that such simplification can occur in colloquial CSU, reducing the convergence pressure otherwise exerted by standard speech. Indeed, almost no tokens of CSU careful pronunciation ščo exist in Hutsul, even among modern sources. Examples (35c) and (35d) (as well as previous example 34l) all demonstrate the cluster simplification šč > š:

c. Але шо було, то минуло
   ‘But what has passed has passed’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)

d. Шо нам мама скажет?
   ‘What will mama say to us?’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 21)

This simplification in the adverb can further result in varied vocalic realizations, most often demonstrating palatalization of the resulting sibilant as in (35e) and (35f):

e. то стало шє гърше
   ‘it became even worse’ (VV, No. 29)\(^{184}\)

f. ші богато людей
   ‘more people’ (VV, No. 29)\(^{185}\)

Other examples from modern sources validate the assertion that this manner of cluster assimilation has not demonstrated signs of convergence, with the simplification š clearly preferred to CSU šč, even among modern speakers. Even the passages from Vlad which are constructed to convey contemporary speech, the simplification is consistently used:

g. Шо уже здається
   ‘what already seems’ (Vlad 1992)

---

\(^{181}\) Speaker born in 1919  
\(^{182}\) CSU: шо  
\(^{183}\) CSU: ше  
\(^{184}\) Speaker born in 1919  
\(^{185}\) Speaker born in 1927
It is only when the author is purposefully changes to CSU in her narration, that the cluster remains intact and is therefore a conscious marker of codeswitching into the standard language, such as in (35i):

i. А що знаю я про свій рід?
‘What do I know of my family?’(Vlad 1992)

This simplification in the pronoun уя has further implications for sibilant assimilation: specifically, when the indefinite particle с is attached to the pronoun, the word initial palatal sibilant triggers an assimilatory process whereby the dental sibilant changes to the palatal sibilant. This causes the Hutsul realization of the indefinite pronoun as шо.186 Examples (36a) and (36b) show its use in the old dialect:

(36) a. Ніби то шош поможе
‘As though something will help’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 30)

b. Шош дідо нічо не говорють
‘For some reason, gramps doesn’t say’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 337)

As with уя, the indefinite pronoun has also been largely preserved in the modern dialect, seen in (36c) and (36d):

c. говорити шош
‘to say something’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 45)

d. шош покажу
‘[I] will show you something’ (Vlad 1992)

Typically in CSU a cluster of dental + postdental or postdental + dental is resolved through the assimilation of the place of articulation of the first component to the second (Shevelov 1979: 484). In Hutsul, this process is more often manifested in cluster simplification of the type postdental + dental > postdental, or жо > ж187:

---

186 CSU: щось
187 A less frequent, but possible, outcome of this cluster simplification is ж.
This cluster simplification has remained a feature of the modern phonology, albeit in limited lexical context, particularly in the high frequency lexeme ‘always’:

b. вин завше носив гуцульську убірню
‘he always wore Hutsul clothes’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)

c. Бо гуцул завше лишається гуцулом
‘For a Hutsul will always remain a Hutsul’ (Vlad 1992)

This high frequency lexeme may constitute a frozen form, with the tendency to simplify this postdental + dental cluster receding. Although Vlad uses the simplified cluster in this lexeme in (37c), she consistently preserves the unassimilated cluster in all other lexemes:

d. Микує тиждень
‘A week passed’ (Vlad 1992)

e. кождий кожного видит
‘they see one another’ (Vlad 1992)

Interestingly, in example (37e), the postdental + dental cluster has been preserved despite its loss in CSU.189

Somewhat less regularly the sibilant fricative š mutates to an affricate č, particularly as part of an adjectival ending:

(38)  a. Може, в снічні селі
‘Maybe in another village’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 360)

There is some, albeit limited, evidence of the retention of this mutation in the modern dialect, such as (13d) нче (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22) and (38b) below:

b. бо була менччя від сестри
‘for she was smaller than her sister’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 143)

188 CSU: завжди
189 CSU: кожній
190 CSU: інший, в іншому
191 CSU: менша
In addition to the mutation, example (38b) also shows palatalization of the affricate in feminine adjectival ending, while (13d) demonstrates a vocalic contrast to (38a), but retention of the mutation before the final desinence.

One last postdental mutation which should be mentioned here is a kind of *cokanje* in which the palatal affricate ġ is replaced by the dental affricate ć. Although this mutation seems limited to interrogative particle, it is notable in response to Shevelov’s assertion that the loss of ġ in favor of ć is “alien to Ukrainian as a whole” (1979: 739). Indeed, it appears to be a trait unique to a small number of Carpathian dialects and, despite its positional limitations, one that is resultantly highly marked. As with many highly marked features, however, its prevalence in the old dialect (39a) has not ensured its retention in the modern dialect, which demonstrates frequent variation between the Hutsul form (39b) and the CSU form in ġ (39c):

(39)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Ци йти в колєдники, Ци ні</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘to go carolling, or not’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. село наше Розтоки Ци Ростоки?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘is out village Roztaky or Rostoky?’(Vlad 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Чи винен був, Чи не винен 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘whether he was guilty, or whether not guilty’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.6 Velar consonants *k, g, x* and voiced glottal fricative ɦ

Sometime in the later 12th or early 13th century193, the Ukrainian voiced velar stop underwent spirantization causing a sound change of *g > (pharyngeal spirant) ɣ* which in the 16th century further lenited to the voiced glottal fricative ɦ194. According to Shevelov this sound change was both widespread and consistent, with complete loss of the former voiced velar stop in all positions195 across the entire Ukrainophone space. (1979: 355).

However, the evidence from Hutsul indicates that in fact this process of lenition actually spread somewhat unevenly in Ukrainian, arriving late--and perhaps initially incompletely--to the Carpathian dialect zone. One piece of evidence is the retention of the cluster ɣd in the word *моду* which, following spirantization before *моди* though the process

---

192 Speaker born in 1932
193 This is the time period posited by Shevelov 1979. Andersen 1977, however, asserts that this occurred significantly earlier.
194 In some Ukrainian dialects, this phone is articulated as pharyngeal ɦ.
195 Except the cluster zg
If spirantization had in fact been unevenly diffused in the Carpathian region, this fact would account for the preservation of this cluster, which was widely observed in the old dialect, well through the 20th century:196

(40) a. Тай спам'ятали аж ТОГДИ
‘And I remembered even then’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 201)

b. ТОГДИ уже і я не відрізняв
‘then I no longer take it’ (Mančuk 2006: 71)

c. та ТОГДИ прийшли багато людей
‘and then many people arrived’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

While the modern dialect has begun to show a weakening of the cluster and resulting variation with some speakers showing preference for the CSU cluster simplification, the older consonant pairing has shown some resilience, likely as this is a very high frequency lexeme, making its original shape prone to fossilization. Indeed, the older shape retaining the etymological cluster is still more frequently found in Hutsul (40d, 40e) despite occasional use of the CSU influenced shape seen above in example (19g) (‘вони ТОДІ війшли’).

d. діти страхалися ТОГДИ
‘the children were scared then’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

e. БО гроші ТОГДИ були дуже дорогі
‘For money was very valuable then’ (Vlad 1992)

In addition to the retention of the cluster гд in the lexeme ТОГДИ, old Hutsul provides other evidence indicative of the preservation of the original voiced velar stop: writers of the old dialect utilized the orthographic symbol ґ, much as modern Ukrainian writers do, to differentiate the stop from the new fricative г. This letter ґ, representing a retained stop, is widely found in distinctly local terms, such as the highly marked Carpathian lexemes ТАЗДА and ЛЕГІНЬ. In addition, some lexemes to common to all Ukrainian dialects, preserve the stop where CSU has clearly lost it: as with ТОГДИ above, the negative indefinite pronoun ‘nowhere’ both preserves the consonant cluster lost to CSU, but further has clearly retained the stop, with the Hutsul orthography НІДЕ.197 Sometimes the evidence for longer retention of the voiced velar stop comes from places of phonemic confusion, where a certain misinterpretation of the velar could only occur if the voiced stop had been retained longer in the Carpathian dialect group than in

196 It should be noted, however, that the most frequent realization of the velar stop of this cluster has long been ŧ, but the late and uneven arrival of lenition likely led to its retention.
197 CSU: ніде; Examples can be seen in Šekeryk-Donykiv, ‘ни найшов ніде’ (2007:19).
CSU. So, for example, the traditional Hutsul dance, locally named Аркан, has been codified into as Аркан, showing a clear conflation of velar stops, which would only be possible when a lexeme crosses the isoglossic boundary of lenition. Similarly, Hutsul writers of the old dialect also sometimes conflated the velar stops, such as in (41a), where Šekeryk-Donykiv uses a г in place of к, changing voicing, but preserving manner or articulation:

(41)  a. Тай ни треба мині того пустяги на кішню
     ‘I don’t need such trifles for my pocket’ (2007: 376)

Occasionally, Hutsul preserves stop г--made explicit by use of the orthographic convention г--in places where CSU has long ago adopted a fricative (clearly marked in CSU with з), such as (41b):

b. гвавтуючі на всій рот
   ‘barking as loud as he could’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

In CSU, the voiced velar stop was re-introduced specifically to phonologically accommodate foreign loanwords into Ukrainian and it continues to serve this purpose today, in part marking the degree to which a word has been assimilated in the native lexicon. Words that have been assimilated, often take the phonological shape of native Ukrainian lexemes, including lenition for any former etymological voiced velar stops, orthographically represented by р > з. As retention of the voiced velar stop was more typical of Hutsul, even into the 20th century, the trajectory of phonological assimilation was also delayed longer than in other Ukrainian dialects, leading to longer retention of the г in words of foreign origin. This can be seen in example (16b) ‘футуґрафуют’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 165) which preserves the etymological velar stop in ‘to photograph”, versus CSU’s phonologically assimilated borrowing фотографувати. This is also the case with her marking of the word initial stop in ‘gallery’ in (41c), in contrast to CSU assimilated ‘галерея’:

c. бо хотіла на галєрії походити взад та вперед
   ‘Because I wanted to walk back and forth at the gallery’ (Płytk-Horycvit 2005: 37)

With the greater diffusion of lenition into to the Carpathian dialects, this tendency to preserve the etymological voiced velar stop in foreign loanwords has receded and, like CSU, there is a general tendency to phonologically assimilate words less marked for foreignness, as seen (24d) where Vlad uses the Ukrainian fricative in “photograph,” in contrast to earlier example of (16b):

d. То лиш хіба на фотографії
   ‘That’s only in the photograph’(Vlad 1992)
Another issue affecting the articulation of the velar inventory in Hutsul is that of regressive voicing assimilation. The nature of this assimilation is rather similar to that of CSU, where words with velar clusters of sonorant + obstruent (most commonly the clusters гк and гт) undergo devoicing of the first element, resulting in either h, or x in reflection of the CSU manner of articulation as a glottal fricative. In Hutsul, however, the assimilation is more easily observed in texts, as orthography often clears reflects pronunciation, making it possible to trace the patterns of dialectal velar assimilation.

Evidence from the old dialect demonstrates a tendency toward both word final devoicing (42a) as well as word internal devoicing within a cluster (42b):

(42)  a. За мнов убіх Педлешко у хату  
‘Pedleško ran behind me into the hut’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

b. Юру можна найлекше пізнати  
‘It is easiest to recognize Jura’ (Mančuk 2006: 12)

In the above examples, the devoicing of the glottal fricative ɦ is resolved in two ways: with the voiceless velar fricative x, as in (42a), and with the voiceless velar stop k in (42b). What is interesting about these two resolutions--which clearly differ in their manner of articulation--is what they seem to reveal about the status of original voiced phoneme. The use of the voiceless fricative in (a) may indicate the voiced/voiceless pairing ɦ/x in which г has already lenited to a fricative; where the velar stop in (b) implies a voiced/voiceless pairing g/k, in which г retains its original articulation as a stop (> *l̥g).

Not surprisingly, the modern dialect demonstrates even greater variation indicative of the unstable status of г. In (42c) Plytka-Horycvit devoices г to fricative x, seemingly indicating the fricative articulation or the underlying voiced phoneme. This is particularly striking as it further indicates dissimilation within the cluster, which both contrasts with the cluster assimilation/simplification more typical of Hutsul, and reflects the resolution of гк cluster most commonly found in CSU:

(42) c. Лехко то міні підавалоси  
‘It is easy to influence me’ (2005: 9)

However, the instability of this phoneme’s status is underscored by the increased variation found in the manner of representing the articulation of its voiceless pair, and such variation can even be found for a single author within a single text. Such is the case with example (42d), also from the same text by Plytka-Horycvit:
d. лазати нi легко
‘it isn’t easy to climb’ (2005: 10)

In this example, the author uses a standardized spelling, in contrast to her clearly phonetic spelling in (42c). If this is to be interpreted, the most likely explanation is that this spelling reflects the standardized norms of Ukrainian phonology, whereby the ɐ represents an underlying voiced fricative subject to devoicing and realized as a variant of [x]. This standard spelling is the same one consistently used by Vlad and therefore may best represent the modern resolution of this cluster in Hutsul:

e. І буде тобі легко
‘And it will be easy for you’ (Vlad 1992)

In the corresponding comparative form (CSU: легше), there is also some variation between a phonetically spelled form indicative of an underlying velar stop whereby r in paired with and devoiced to κ (as in 42f and 42g), and a standardized spelling likely reflective of an adoption of CSU norms governing these clusters (42h):

f. Міні то гірько, то легше
‘It is sometimes bitter and sometimes easier for me’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 9)

g. на душі стало легше
‘my soul was lightened’ (VV, No. 55)198

h. У місті легше
‘It is easier in the city’ (Vlad 1992)

2.2.7 Nasal consonants m, n

A further characteristic trait of Hutsul phonology in nasal assimilation which can take several forms, including the nasalization of clusters, consonant lengthening and, less commonly, the denasalization of clusters. Evidence suggests, however, that most of these sound changes have ceased to be productive; however, in some cases they have left behind several frozen forms of high frequency lexemes still in common use with their previously, locally-marked, phonological shape.

In the old dialect, one of the most frequently encountered nasal reflexes is a sound change from j to palatalized dental nasal n’, particularly in the cluster mj > mn’, which demonstration this manner of nasal assimilation. In the early 20th century, this nasalization was salient enough to have created frozen forms common still in the modern dialect, despite the fact that this sound

198 Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker who was, born in 1916
change is no longer productive. Examples (43a) and (43b) both demonstrate the reflex of the neuter noun ‘name,’ \(im\) > \(im+ja\) > CSU: \(im'j\), > Hutsul (i)\(mn'e\):

\[
(43) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. вітки то } & \text{мис } \text{це носит село} \\
& \text{‘where the village got its name’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. ні світити } & \text{имис } \text{твоє} \\
& \text{‘I’m not familiar with your name’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 36)}
\end{align*}
\]

In addition to the nasalization of the cluster, these two examples also demonstrate the vocalic change \(ja > je\) typical of both old and modern Hutsul. This is indeed the most typical resolution to the cluster, also seen in the noun ‘to remember,’’ CSU: пам’ятати > паминяти:

\[
(43) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{c. навіть будуть } & \text{його паминати } \text{діти} \\
& \text{‘even the children will remember him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 33)}
\end{align*}
\]

The nasalized form паминяти was seemingly salient enough to fossilize despite a general receding of this assimilation in other lexical contexts. It is in fact still fairly widely found in the modern dialect (43d, 43e) despite occasional variation (43f) suggesting a general weakening, even in those lexemes which have remained in frozen form for several decades:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. Вуйка } & \text{добре памітают} \\
& \text{‘They remember by uncle well’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e. памітаю } & \text{лиш двох братив} \\
& \text{‘I only remember two brothers’ (VV, No. 29)}^{199}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f. руки пам'ятати} \\
& \text{‘hands remember’ (Vlad 1992)}
\end{align*}
\]

A similar form of cluster nasalization resulting in the Hutsul sound change \(m+j > mn\) provides an interesting departure from otherwise common East Slavic historical phonology: this is specifically the local resolution of historical \(m+j\) as cluster \(mn'j\) in striking contrast to the East Slavic reflex \(m+j > ml'a\). As with the nasalization resulting in the form ‘паминати’, this local sound change has ceased to be productive; however, several high frequency lexemes have remained frozen, most notably земля: \(^{200}\)

\[
(44) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. на земню} \\
& \text{‘onto the ground’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 11)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{199}\) Speaker born in 1927

\(^{200}\) CSU: земля
b. бо земня света--наша матір
‘for the earth is holy—it is our mother’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 36)

c. бо навіть сп’ют робітники на земни
‘for the workers even sleep on the ground’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 21)

Both Zakrevs'ka 1991 and Žylko 1955 note another kind of nasal assimilation in Hutsul, one which results in a lengthening of the nasal consonant in a cluster in which the dental nasal follows a dental stop: \( dn, tn > n \). Noting that this manner of lengthening is a phonological trait of all Carpathian dialects, Žylko provides numerous examples which he describes as specifically Hutsul; among these are the lexemes ‘binna’, (CSU: bidna), ‘slinno’ (CSU: slidno), ‘honny’ (CSU: hodny), ‘rinna’ (CSU: ridna), ‘onnako’ (CSU: odnako), ‘segonne’ (CSU: s’ohodni), ‘dvanny’ (CSU: dva dni). However, and despite Žylko’s impressive list, there are actually an extremely small number of tokens of this nasal lengthening, even among the oldest sources. For example, Andrij Šeptyc'kyj, writing at the turn of the century uses the dental stop + dental nasal cluster in ‘бідна жінка’ (example 25b)\(^{201}\). A few tokens can be found in Xotkevyč (45a), as well as in the speech of some of the earliest informant transcripts, such as that recorded by Rudnytsky in 1926 (45b):

(45)  a. а то в хаті -- єк у нину\(^{202}\)
‘but in the hut it is like day time’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 347)

b. онна\(^{203}\) осталаси
‘one remained’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

However, even Xotkevyč, writing in the 1920s, does not use nasal lengthening consistently, and numerous instances of variation can be found in his texts, as in (45c). Mančuk, writing at approximately the same time, invariably avoids the lengthened form, preserving instead the dental stop + dental nasal (45d, 45e):

(45)  c. а я то вже не голна на горівку навіть і дивитися
‘I am no longer in the condition to even look at vodka’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 365)

d. і зробив з днини ніч
‘And made the day night’ (Mančuk 2006: 35)

\(^{201}\) The full phrase is бідна жінка таї бідні гіти ‘poor woman and poor children’ which shows the former dental > velar sound change, but does not show the nasal lengthening which indicates that nasal lengthening is indeed part of the oldest layer of Hutsul phonology.

\(^{202}\) CSU: днину

\(^{203}\) CSU: одна
e. Я знав одного богача
‘I knew one rich man’ (Mančuk 2006: 54)

It is likely that this manner of lengthening as a resolution to nasal clusters was part of the oldest layer of Hutsul phonology; while tokens could still be found in the early 20th century, there was already a good deal of inconsistency in their use and a seeming preference for cluster retention. It is not surprising then that this sound change has continued to recede, practically into non-existence, with any extant tokens in modern sources being rare exceptions, rather than a functioning rule.

f. Скрізь однако.
‘Everywhere is the same’ (Vlad 1992)

g. а худоба рує, голодна
‘the cattle are hungry’ (Vlad 1992)

Predictably Vlad preserves the $dn$ cluster in all positions, such as in (45f) and (45g). More interesting is Plytka-Horycvit’s similarly consistent retention of $dn$, even in those passages where she is explicitly describing Hutsul formulaic speech, a context where archaic phonological traits would otherwise likely be preserved. For example, she explains to her readers the traditional Hutsul manner of greeting:

h. Єк днусте? Єк дновали?
‘How are you?’ Plytka-Horycvit (2008:28)

Even as she captures this example of formulaic Hutsul colloquial speech, preserving its dialectal vocalism, she does in fact show a retention of the cluster $dn$, rather than resorting to lengthening as, perhaps, had been the common articulation a century ago.

In her description of assimilatory lengthening resulting from the $dn$ nasal cluster Zakrevs'ka (1991) provides the illustrative example ‘vynno’ (CSU: vydno). In fact, both old and new sources indicate that this is not the most typical resolution of the nasal cluster in this lexeme which, instead of lengthening, undergoes de-nasalization whereby $n > k$. While this de-nasalization was always less common than lengthening, there are a few high frequency lexemes salient enough to preserve this reflex even in modern speech, including the lexeme ‘vydko’ (CSU: vydno). Even today this is the most frequent realization, making ‘vydko’ another frozen form preserving evidence of phonological processes which long ago ceased to be productive in Hutsul. Both old (46a, 46b.) and recent (46c., 46d., 46e.) consistently use the de-nasalized form:
As example (46e) illustrates, even Vlad who, in all other positions consistently retains the \( dn \), de-nasalizes the cluster in this particular lexical context.

2.2.8 Lateral \( l \)

In both CSU and Hutsul lateral \( l \) at the end of closed syllables undergoes labialization \( l > \gamma \), represented orthographically as \( a \). However, the degree to which this labialization takes place varies from dialect to dialect and, in CSU, is largely limited to \( СъlC \) sequences\(^\text{205} \) and word final position in masculine singular past tense verb forms (Shevelov 1979). In Hutsul, this labialization results from a hardening of \( l \) at the end of syllables before a former back jer, creating such lexical shapes as ‘horivka’ (CSU: horilka) and ‘stiv’ (CSU: stil) (Lesjuk 2011). While the labialized forms have receded somewhat in modern Hutsul, as is the case with other dialectal phonological traits, several high frequency lexeme contain fossilized labialization; the most common of these is the noun for ‘vodka’ which consistently takes the shape горівка\(^\text{206} \) in both old (47a, 47b) and modern sources (47c, 47d):

(47) a. мала за шо горівку купити
‘she had something to buy vodka with’ (Andrej Šeptyc'kyj in Lesjuk 2011)

b. а я то вже не годна на горівку навіть і дивитися
‘I am no longer in the condition to even look at vodka’ (Xotkevych 1966: 365)

c. хлопці дуже любили музику, файно играли, стримувалися вид горівки.

\(^\text{204} \)Speaker born in 1902
\(^\text{205} \)This labialization creates such pairs as Ukr: жовтий, Rus: жёлтый; Ukr: мовчати, Rus: молчать
\(^\text{206} \)CSU: горілка
‘the guys really loved music, they played well, and they abstained from vodka;
(Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)

d. Дай бірше го́рівкє
‘Give more vodka’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008:: 28)

In addition to illustrating the labialization of \( l \), example (47d) also demonstrated another reflex of the laterals consonant in the specific morphological context of comparative forms of the adjective, \( l > r \). As with labialization, this reflex has been well preserved by the high frequency lexemes in which it appears, despite the fact that it appears to be no longer productive. Although there is evidence of variation early on (48a), the trilled variant seems to have gained enough salience (48b, 48c) to be maintained well into the 20th century (48d):

(48)  

a. моці більше не мала  
‘she had no more strength’ (Mančuk 2006: 47)

b. Даєт Бір бірше  
‘God will give more’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 19)

c. видко, ни хотіла бірше з дідом і слова говорити  
‘It was clear that she didn’t want to say another word to grandpa’(Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 38)

d. бірше цего ни буде  
‘there will be no more of it’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 10)

However, unlike the de-nasalized form ‘vydko’ and labialized ‘horivka’, this reflex in the comparative adjective has not proven strong enough to maintain its original shape with the \( l > r \) lateral change. Increasingly, Hutsul speakers are demonstrating preference for the etymological--and CSU--phonological shape ‘bil’še’, with palatalized \( l \) before the sibilant:

e. Більше двох разів  
‘More than two times’ (VV, No. 29)208

f. уже більше має  
‘[he] already has more’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 267)209

g. Більше на ній нічого не було

207 CSU: більше
208 Speaker born in 1927
209 Speaker born in 1935
‘There was nothing more for her’ (Vlad 1992)

2.2.9 Trill r

According to Lesjuk 2011, one of the characteristic features of Hutsul phonology is the retention of palatalized r’ both word-finally and at the end of syllables.\(^{210}\) While Žylko states that this r’ palatalization is also a feature of general Carpathian phonology, he notes the interesting exception of those Carpathian dialects in direct contact with Slovenian, creating a isogloss between dialects such as Hutsul and those of the Carpathian Rusyn group\(^ {211}\). Word-final trill palatalization was fairly consistently represented in the writing of Šekeryk-Donykiv, such as in example 21b. ‘мальфарь’ (2007: 139), and in (49a) below:

\[(49)\]

a. Добре, що тє нехарь ни скалічіла
‘It’s good that the wolf didn’t make you a cripple’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 11)

However, this position appears to have been too weak to support the continued palatalization of r, as even by 1920s, Mančuk had already depalatalized almost all word final trills:

b. Тепер треба на Свєтвечір шош купити
‘Now we need to buy something for Christmas Eve’ (Mančuk 2006: 26)

Similarly, Vlad uses only depalatalized r word-finally:

c. а тепер ступит ногов на підлогу
‘and now he’s stomping his foot on the floor’ (Vlad 1992)

The situation is much less clear with word-internal r’. According to Shevelov, “the original distribution of r and r’ is preserved [in Carpathian dialects, including Hutsul] and, in addition, in some places r’ is used in the reflexes of the СърC groups, especially before velars” (1979: 637). This original softness was indeed preserved in Hutsul into the 20th, and most sources are consistent in this trait, illustrated in (49d) and (49e):

d. єк у нашій церкві такі файні святи
‘how nice the holidays are in our church’ (Mančuk 2006: 11)

e. У такєх напористих підйомах у верх

\(^{210}\) Shevelov outlines the timeline for the general Ukrainian process of depalatalization—a process which seems to have initially evaded the Carpathian region—thus: ‘r’ lost palatalization in the Polissian area by or in the 11th c. Several centuries later, r’ underwent dispalatalization in Volhynia and in the Lvov region. Volhynia was affected by dispalatalization sometime in the 15th c, the Lvov area by the end of the 16th c.” (1979: 636)

\(^{211}\) Indeed, even Lemko shows word-final depalatalization of the trill: ‘никто нас уж тепер не силає до ничого’ (Horoszczak).
“In such difficult ascents to the top’ (Plytka Horycvit 2008: 24)

However, the most recent sources are marked by increased variation and greater use of the depalatalized forms typical of CSU and, in fact, most other Ukrainian dialect groups:

f. виліз на самий верх
“[he] climbed to the top’ (Vlad 1992)

Despite the tendency to preserve palatalized \( r' \) in the old dialect, there are some phonological contexts in which Hutsul depalatalizes an \( r \) otherwise palatalized in CSU. Specifically, there was a tendency in the old dialect to depalatalize \( r \) before \( o \) and \( a \) at the beginning of a syllable (Lesjuk 2011). While an interesting feature, it is unlikely that this depalatalization was ever widely diffused, if only because of its contextual limitation. It can be found occasionally in old sources (such as 50a), but likely was never salient enough for long term retention. Indeed, has become increasingly rare in modern sources, with greater demonstrated preference for CSU palatalized forms, such as in (50b):

(50)  a. Їх лиця були черлені, єк буряки\(^{212}\)
‘Their faces were red like beets’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 41)

b. Де він їх рятував?
‘Where did he save them?’ (VV, No. 45)\(^{213}\)

2.2.10 Conclusions
Table 2 summarizes the primary data for Hutsul consonant phonology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulation</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Status: Early 20th c.</th>
<th>Status: Late 20th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>absence of epenthetic ( l ) following labial stop</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable within the verbal paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d' &gt; g' )</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>rare, with the exception of a few fossilized lexical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t' &gt; k' )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplification of cluster ( ts, ds', s'k &gt; c )</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{212}\) CSU: буряки
\(^{213}\) Speaker born in 1930s
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Archaic</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Sporadic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of consonant gemination</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word final depalatalization of s, z</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depalatalization of s, z in adjectival suffix</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardening of c</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalization of š</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalization of č</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplification of cluster šč &gt; šš</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ř &gt; c</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+j &gt; mn'</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>rare, with the exception of a few fossilized lexical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplification of cluster dn, tn &gt; n</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l &gt; y</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare, with the exception of a few fossilized lexical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l &gt; r</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word final r'</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r' at the end of a syllable</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 2, the Hutsul consonant system is characterized by a mixture of incipient changes and nearly complete changes, with only a few features that have proven resistant to broad CSU phonological influence. Interestingly, there appears to be some relatively greater resilience among archaic features when compared to local innovations, although several
notable exceptions exist, such as the palatalized postdentals.\textsuperscript{214} It is possible that the greater attention afforded to archaisms in the dialect has created a stronger association between these features and notions of cultural “authenticity” among speakers, particularly in “fossilized forms” which have been maintained as markers of local identity. The most frequent cases of phonological maintenance, however, are found in places where phonology and morphology intersect, such as in inflectional endings of the verbal paradigm. In this case, it is reasonable to assume that morphological stability has extended to the phonological properties embedded within the inflectional system. Also worth noting in consonant phonology is that simplification does not determine maintenance: while simplification has been maintained in the clusters šč > šš, this is not the case for clusters ts, ds', s'k > c and dn, tn > n. The motivation for change, therefore, can not be attributed to internal patterns of simplification, but rather must be seen as the direct influence of CSU, even when that influence causes complexification.

\textsuperscript{214} However, it is possible that these seemingly resistant features are in fact also beginning to atrophy among younger speakers: Lesjuk, for example, has noted highly educated members of the younger generation have a tendency to mix palatalized and nonpalatalized postdentals in their speech, particularly in high frequency lexemes such as чоловік, що, ще, чого, etc. (2012: 29).
Chapter Three: Morphology

Traditional Hutsul morphology is marked by the presence of both archaic and innovative features (stemming from both phonetic origin and grammatical analogy), and systemically bears greater similarity to the morphological systems of other dialects in the Southwestern groups even in those cases where there is significant phonological divergence (Bevzenko 1969). In addition, the pressures from contact-induced phonological change may extend into the morphological system creating a deeper incursions into the structure of the dialect. It has been argued by Sankoff 2001, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, among others, that morphology is far more resistant to contact-induced change then is phonology; Thomason and & Kaufman even argue that morphology is the least susceptible to change, lagging far behind both phonology and syntax (1988:38). As they explain, “inflectional systems, in particular, tend to be highly structured and thus relatively closed, [thus] the integration of borrowed features into such systems may be difficult" (p. 52).

When contact-induced change extends beyond the phonological and syntactic systems into morphology, the results can be disastrous to the integrity of the dialect as a whole, and can indeed be indicative of imminent language shift. According to Myers-Scotton, "in some situation of heavy contact between two language, one language takes on not only cultural and even core lexical forms from the other language, but also the syntactic patterns and/or inflectional affixes and function of words in the second language. Or, heavy contact, in the right sociolinguistic climate, may lead speakers to shift from their first language (their L1) to a second language (L2) as their main means of communication. When language shift occurs, a possible outcome for the L1 is language death." (1993: 208). It is indeed incursions into the morphological system that seem most indicative of a possible shift > death scenario.

The most frequent impetus for this process is the spread of bilingualism/bidialecticalism among among a large portion of speakers, as “all cases of moderate to heavy structural borrowing that we have found involve a group of active bilinguals who speak the source language fluently and use it regularly for at least some ordinary communicative purposes. The contact in these cases is intimate enough that we can reasonably speak of a joint community" (Thomason & Kaufman  1988: 967). This is indeed precisely the case among dialect-speakers in post-independent Ukraine. With increasing bidialecticalism among Hutsuls, CSU morphosyntax has an open gateway into the Hutsul dialect structure, resulting in linguistic convergence and change: "the result is a language which was substantially replaced from the inside out, a result which must be called language shift." (Myers-Scotton 1993: 222)
Indeed, there is ample evidence of contact incursions into the morphological system of Hutsul: even Bevzenko, writing in 1969, made mention of archaic morphological forms falling out of use in modern Hutsul and, at best, becoming parallel forms used far less frequently than their parallel CSU-based doublets. It should be noted, however, that CSU incursions are not yet uniformly diffused in the Hutsul dialect area; as was the case with phonological change, in some cases there continues to be a great deal of variation among speakers. Yet, this continued variation and, at times, indicated preference for CSU forms in some morphological contexts, is likely one of the clearest signs of the kind of dialect change that leads to atrophy and ultimately shift to the dominant standard.

3.1 Verbal inflection

In many respects, Hutsul verbal morphology seems to have always adhered to paradigms closely paralleling those of other East Slavic languages with only minor divergences, some of which are archaisms preserved in the dialect, while others are innovations resulting from local phonological norms and processes. Among the noted archaisms is the preservation of the old form of the infinitive suffix -čy which, in CSU, was replaced by the normative suffix -ty in verbs of the type печи 215, помочи 216, течи 217 (Bevzenko 1969). These forms can be found in Old Ukrainian written sources and are still used in many southwestern dialects, in addition to Hutsul (Hrynčušyn 2005). Noted innovations also typical of the general southwestern dialect group include forms of 1st person singular present tense ходю 218, ношу 219 as well as the infinitive in -t’ (Bevzenko 1969).

While the evidence is somewhat sparse, the data found does indicates that these features have receded; Vlad, for example, uses exclusively CSU forms for both the 1st person singular (1a) as well the infinitive in -ty (1b):

(1)  
   a. ек я ходжу від рання до схід сонця  
       ‘how I walk from morning until sunset’ (Vlad 1992)

   b. аж страшно подумати  
       ‘it’s even frightening to think’ (Vlad 1992)

Most modern sources consistently use the converged forms seen in the examples above, indicating some degree of CSU influence into Hutsul verbal morphology. However, the

215 CSU: пекти
216 CSU: допомогти
217 CSU: текти
218 CSU: ходжу
219 CSU: ношу
inflectional patterns of the 3rd person singular and plural forms for both 1st and 2nd
conjugational patterns have been far less consistent, and have generally demonstrate substantial
resistance to CSU influence. These 3rd person inflections are largely a function of phonology;
indeed, as has been seen in other Hutsul phonological contexts, those features in which
phonology directly intersects with morphological shape are frequently be the most resistant to
change.

3.1.1 Third person inflection

In CSU, verbs with the stem vowels -e- and -je-, henceforth 1st conjugation verbs, are
inflected in the third person singular present and perfective future tenses without any overt
desinence; for example (він) пише, каже. First conjugation third person plural forms take the
ending -ut', -jut': (они) пишуть, кажуть. Verbs with the stem vowels -i- and -y-, henceforth
second conjugation verbs, typically have third person singular and plural forms ending in
palatalized -t': for example, (він) говорить, (они) говорить. It is in these third person
conjugational patterns that Hutsul most greatly differs from CSU in terms of verbal morphology
which, to a great degree results from local phonological traits.

Most typically, Hutsul 1st conjugation third person singular verbs take the overt ending -t;
this is true for the third person plural forms as well, such that the depalatalization of the word
final dental consonant serves as a dialect marker, phonetically differentiating it from CSU third
plural which is characterized by its palatalization. For the second conjugation, Hutsul most
characteristically loses the overt third singular ending, which occasional reinterpretation of the
theme vowel, creating a conflation of historically first and second categories, ultimately
stemming from local phonological interference. The third person plural of second conjugation
verbs at times takes over ending in depalatalized -t, and at times also loses this overt desinence,
creating a zero ending. The vowel in the third plural of 2nd conjugation is also subject to
variation, resulting from dialectal phonological patterns.

The divergence between CSU and Hutsul third person verbal inflection is summarized in Table 1:

| Table 1 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| **1st Conjugation:** бuti | **2nd Conjugation:** ходити |
| **CSU** | **Hutsul** | **CSU** | **Hutsul** |
| 3rd sg. буде | будет | 3rd. sg. ходить | ходи/ходе |
| 3rd. pl. будуть | будут | 3rd. pl. ходять | ходя ²²⁰/ходют |

²²⁰ Phonological variant: ходє indicating underlying я
While the 1st conjugation paradigm has typically been quite stable, the 2nd conjugation paradigm has been characterized by variation from at least as early as 1920s. In the modern dialect, however, there is considerably less variation found in both 1st and 2nd conjugation, as the local paradigms have largely stabilized, with clear incursions from CSU inflectional patterns, particularly in those places where the desinence is primarily morphologically determined and is reflected in the form of the ending (overt ending vs. zero ending). In places where phonology exerts greater influence on the morphological shape of the inflection, such as in the palatalized vs. non-palatalized quality of the the 3rd person marker -t, there has been considerably less convergence toward the CSU form. This phonological maintenance contemporaneous to morphological atrophy is rather surprising as the literature suggests that it is specifically phonology which is most vulnerable to contact-induced change, and that morphological change tends to lag behind (Sankoff 2001, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, among others); yet here it is the phonologically determined desinences which have proven relatively more resistant, while the CSU-triggered loss of the overt ending has become widely and consistently applied.

3.1.1.1 First conjugation verbs: third person singular present and future perfective tense

Like several other Carpathian dialects, Hutsul long preserved the archaic inflected forms of the 3rd person singular 1st conjugation verbs, an ending which is found very often in Old Ukrainian texts (Marcuk 1969: 174), but which was lost in the the modern language. As a result, the divergence of the Hutsul third person singular form from that of CSU has traditionally been primarily morphological (overt ending -t vs. zero ending), rather than phonological (based solely on the phonetic quality of the desinence). By the early 20th century, this overt ending -t was already quite unstable and prone to frequent variation with the CSU zero-ending form, with vacillations in the desinence even with a single text or, more extremely, a single line of text:

(2) а. Єк ків одітий у луб, то книзь буде богатий. Єк голий, то книзь буде бідний.
‘If the kiv is covered in wood, then the prince will be rich, If it is bare, then the king will be poor’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 61)

Example (2a) demonstrates this instability of forms for the 3rd person singular, where the author rapidly shifts between (CSU) zero ending and (Hutsul) overt ending within a single line of two semantically linked phrases. Writing in the 1930s, Šekeryk-Donykiv still demonstrates a strong preference for the local 3rd person form, even if he applies the overt ending somewhat inconsistently with occasional use of the CSU zero-ending, as in (2a) above. A more typical example from his writing is (2b):
b. Ану дівиси, ика біда мала, а так думаєт мудро. З цего хлопця будет колис чьоловік.
‘Look what a misfortune befell him, but he thinks wisely. This boy will be a man someday.’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

The text in example (2b) is highly marked as dialectal speech: the author opens the phrase with the unmistakably local term ‘ану’, and adheres to traditionally Hutsul phonological patterns, including the reflexive ending ‘си’, the reflex of unstressed {ja} to {y} in ‘ика’, the depalatalized sibilant in ‘колис’, and the palatalized postdental africate of ‘чьоловік.’ Almost every element of this excerpt is, therefore, highly marked as Hutsul speech. It is not surprising, then, that both tokens of the 3rd singular ending are also marked by the Hutsul desinence -t. Like Šekeryk-Donykiv, Mančuk also demonstrates a strong preference for the Hutsul archaic verbal inflection, such as in (2c) and (2d):

c. кожда слабість маєт
‘each has its weakness’ (Mančuk 2006: 37)

d. поки ще даєт вам говорити
‘[he] is still letting you talk’ (Mančuk 2006: 37)

Of the early sources, it is actually only Xotkevyč who demonstrates a preference for the CSU zero-ending:

e. то буде поверх сімдесєкь і сім
‘it will be more than seventy seven’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 358)

f. то вам так си здає
‘that how it seems to you’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 347)

Even when the phrases are otherwise clearly marked as Hutsul, such as in the archaic phonological realization of ‘seventy’ as ‘сімдесєкь’ in (2e) and the use of the reflexive clitic in (2f), Xotkevyč consistently uses the zero-ending in his verbal forms. It is, in fact, the zero-ending form that has ultimately become the primary form used by most modern speakers. Both Plytka-Horycvit and Vlad use the uninflected form exclusively in their writing, seen examples (2g) and (2h) respectively:
g. лише вибули відзій потік сміху
‘[he] only explodes in a stream of laughter’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 14)

h. бо ніхто тобов не твердить
‘for no one needs you’ (Vlad 1992)

In addition, most modern speakers who have been interviewed in an effort to preserve localized speech patterns, also demonstrate a strong preference for zero-ending forms. In example (2i), an interview subject born in 1916 is reciting the lyrics to a Hutsul folk song Oleksa Dovbuš, which he remembers from his childhood:

i. заре місцем
‘[he] begins to laugh’ (VV No. 55)

This example in particular is quite revealing as to the extent of the uninflected form’s incursion into the dialectal verbal paradigm, as the speaker providing the example was born in the second decade of the 20th century, and is recalling a traditional song from his youth. Such a source would often be assumed to provide evidence of archaic local forms and yet--either through the song’s original lyrics or through the speaker’s possibly faulty memory of these lyrics--the third person singular verb here has a morphological shape reflective of CSU and divergent from what is thought to be the most common conjugational pattern in the old dialect. This therefore demonstrates either that there was a good deal of variation between the forms quite early on, or that the new uninflected form has made such deep incursions that even the oldest generation of speakers is prone to reinterpret even memories of the 3rd person singular in adherence to the (modern) CSU paradigm.

Jastrem'ska’s informants also consistently used the uninflected 3rd person singular form; this was true both of the oldest layer of speakers (2j) as well as the relatively younger (2k):

j. осінь приходит знов
‘autumn will come again’ (Jastrem'ska 2008: 264)221

k. корова дає п’ять літрів молока

221 Speaker born in 1931
‘a cow gives five liters of milk’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)

3.1.1.2 Third person singular reflexive in first conjugation

Although the 3rd person singular in the 1st conjugation is uninflected in CSU, the formation of the reflexive requires the insertion of the 3rd person marker -t' between the root and suffix, resulting in forms such as (ви) знає vs. (ви) знається. Traditionally in Hutsul the reflexive marker functioned as a clitic which could both precede and follow the verbal host. In the modern dialect, however, this reflexive particle has begun to lose its status as clitic and, as in CSU, is becoming increasing attached onto the verb as a suffix. However, the morphological change to the verbal host as a result of suffixation has not yet stabilized in the dialect, allowing room for variation in its realization among modern speakers. In many cases, modern speakers seem to adhere to the norms of CSU, whereby the inflected ending -t is inserted before the addition of the reflexive suffix; however, even in these cases, the -t is consistently depalatalized, thereby maintaining a phonological distinction from its CSU parallel, despite the similarities in morphological shape. This is the tendency, for example, in the Plytka-Horycvit:

(3) a. здається вся радість
   ‘it seems all happiness has left’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 25)

One of Jastems'ka’s informants, born in 1953, makes this clear distinction between the zero-ending of the basic 3rd singular verbal form, and the inserted -t of the reflexive form:

b. хто випасає велику рогату худобу, то си називає бовгарь...то називається
   ‘he who grazes large horned cattle is called a bovgar’...[he] is called’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)

While the morphological shape approximately adheres to the CSU shape, there are still some important dialect markers which are preserved: specifically, the depalatalized -t inflection, and the phonological realization of the reflexive particle as -sy, whether it is treated as a clitic or an affix.

As Marčuk notes, however, there are some dialects of Ukrainian in which the 3rd person marker -t' is not added back onto the verbal host prior to suffixation of the reflexive particle

---

222 Speaker born in 1953
Although there are very few tokens of this in old and modern Hutsul, it is evident that such a form is possible, as seen in this example from Vlad:

с. Бувало, з опівночі гріє воду, вимиваєси, довго убераєси

‘Sometimes in the middle of the night she would heat the water, wash, and clean for a long time’ (1992)

In (3c), the reflexive suffix is attached on to the third person singular verb without the insertion of the marker -t, which is rather unexpected for such a modern source. Indeed, Vlad’s language often tends to adhere quite closely to the norms of CSU, yet here she deliberately leaves out the 3rd person inflected marker. It should be noted that this line of dialog is attributed to an older speaker, so it may well be Vlad’s way of marking speech as typical of the older generation. If that is the case, it is still rather anomalous, as even the oldest Hutsul sources do not support such forms as widespread; indeed, even when the reflexive particle is treated as a suffix to the verb, there is no need to add the 3rd person marker -t, as this marker was already widely used in the basic form of inflected 3rd person singular verbs. It is only in more modern forms of Hutsul that the CSU zero-ending has become widely and consistently used, making adjustments in the reflexive form necessary. As seen in (3a) and (3b), however, most modern speakers tend to follow the norms established in CSU, where the zero ending changes to overt ending -t (’) prior to adding the reflexive suffix.223

3.1.1.3 First conjugation verbs: third person plural present and future perfective tense

The most typical feature of all Hutsul 3rd person verbal forms is the depalatalization of the ending -t (Marčuk 1969, Zakrevs'ka 1991), which is a tendency also commonly found in other southwestern dialects (Mozer 2006, Žylko 1955). This depalatalized form of the third person plural of the 1st conjugation is characteristic of both the old and modern dialect. As this third person form is primarily a function of phonology (it is marked solely by the depalatalization of the word final dental), rather than than primarily morphologically determined (such as the case of the singular with overt ending vs. zero ending) , it has demonstrated greater stability and far less tendency toward convergence with CSU: the word final inflection is consistently depalatalized even in the most modern sources, with very little evidence of a growing tendency to palatalized the ending along the lines of CSU. Example (4a) shows a typical 3rd person plural form in the old dialect:

Example (2i) demonstrates the use of the uninflected 3rd single form with a post-verbal reflexive particle; however, the speaker transcribing the informant’s speech has provided the visual indication that this reflexive should be treated as as a post-position clitic, rather than a suffix attached directly onto the basic verbal form.
This example in (4a) shows the typical formation of the third person plural; i.e. the word final -t is depalatalized, in contrast to CSU where the 3rd person inflection is uniformly soft. This depalatalized desinence has remained a fixture in the modern verbal paradigm, with varied sources from the second half of the 20th century providing ample evidence that the hard -t is still a salient and generally stable feature of the contemporary conjugational pattern (4b, 4c, 4d, 4e).

b. та знають старі люди
‘and the old people know’ (VV, No. 55)²²⁴

c. подивитися, єк уб виглядають²²⁵
‘look what they look like’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 208)

d. тримають уже менше, менше худоби
‘they keep less and less cattle’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)²²⁶

e. ни пускають людей з хати
‘they don’t let the people out of the hut’ (Vlad 1992)

What is particularly notable about the retention of this depalatized ending is that it has resisted convergence pressures even in those contexts where other phonological features have, in recent years, begun to yield to pressures from the standard language. As was discussed in the previous chapter, Hutsul has long avoided the epenthetic -l in labialized verbal stems; however, recent data suggests increased variation indicative of recent changes toward the CSU norm in 1st person singular and third person plural forms such as (CSU) сплю, сплять. This is a fairly new tendency in Hutsul, one which has not reached uniform distribution among speakers, yet which is starting to make incursions, particularly the among (relatively) younger generations. And yet, even in those “modern” Hutsul forms where the epenthetic -l is inserted, the traditionally Hutsul depalatalized third person desinence is retained:

f. вони килими виробляють
‘they make rugs’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)²²⁷

---
²²⁴ Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916
²²⁵ CSU: виглядають
²²⁶ Speaker born in 1932
Although the example in 4f. comes from a relatively older speaker, the verbal shape is a result of recent changes motivated by CSU contact, namely the appearance of the epenthetic -l which is not historically characteristic of Hutsul. However, despite this recent innovation in verbal form, the Hutsul desinence remains intact, indicating that the depalatalization of the 3rd person marker -t has been relatively highly resistant to convergence pressures.

This is not to imply, however, that CSU-motivated palatalized forms are entirely impossible in Hutsul speech, but as variants they do remain anomalous. Example (4g) shows one instance of vacillation between palatalized CSU and depalatalized Hutsul articulation of verb final dental inflection:

\[\text{g. ни можуть цілий рік бути разом.....не можуть усі однакі мати знаки}\]

‘They can’t be together for the whole year...they can’t all have the same marks’
(Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)\(^{228}\)

As evidence of the modern Hutsul dialect, example (4g) provides a very curious--and somewhat contradictory--example of the balance between dialectal and standard norms, particularly at the level of the individual speaker. In addition to a shift in verbal desinence quality можуть - можуть, the speaker also shifts in the quality of articulation of the negative particle ни- не. However, these paired utterances can not be considered codeswitching, shifting between CSU and Hutsul as registers, because the negative particle articulations do not corresponding with the quality of the desinences in a clear delineation of codes; rather, the Hutsul articulation of the negative particle ни is paired with the CSU verbal form можуть (with the palatalized dental inflection), while the CSU articulation не is paired with the Hutsul verbal form можуть (with the depalatalized dental inflection). As a result, there is no clear explanation for the speaker’s motivation to shift between verbal forms, although the quality of the following phoneme may play some role, with the dental palatalization followed by the palatalized postdental c’, and the depalatalized dental followed by a vowel. This, however, is highly speculative.

3.1.2 Second conjugation verbs

The second conjugational paradigm in Hutsul is rather more complex, and more prone to variation, than that of the first conjugation. This is true of both the third person singular and plural forms which often shift between inflected and zero-ending, as well as for the full paradigm.

\(^{227}\) Speaker born in 1931
\(^{228}\) Speaker born in 1931
as occasional mergers between the conjugational categories tend to occur resulting in historically -y- stem verbs shifting to an -e- based paradigm. Marčuk: 1969 outlines the many inflectional patterns of the 2nd conjugation in Hutsul noting the existence of such attested forms as він мовчит, вони мовча/мовчу229; він сидить, вони сидя/сиду/сиде230; він ходить, вони ходя/ходу/ходе231 (173). In addition to Marčuk’s acknowledgement of variation in the 3rd plural form, there has also historically been corresponding variation in the 3rd singular, with diachronic shift between localized zero-ending and CSU-motivated overt ending.

3.1.2.1 Second conjugation verbs: third person singular inflection

Zakrevs'ka 1991 describes the Hutsul 3rd person singular 2nd conjugation verbal form as characterized by loss of the word final -t, and notes the forms він носи, ходи as typical examples of local conjugational patterns. This is in direct contrast with Marčuk 1969 who, writing 30 years earlier, asserted that the 3rd singular form was marked by the overt ending -t, similar in shape to CSU inflection, but differing in phonetic quality through its depalatalization232. Indeed, most old examples of the 3rd person singular second conjugation verbal form support Marčuk’s descriptions of the prevalence of word final (depalatalized) -t (5a, 5b, 5c., 5d):

(5) а. У твої рот добре ходить
‘Her mouth runs well’ (Mančuk 2006: 65)

b. іди собі, де си око дивить
‘go wherever your eye looks’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 360)

c. так болить увес чєс
‘it hurt the whole time’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 347)

d. церква серет села файно сидить
‘the church stood well in the village’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)233.

---

229 CSU: він мовчить, вони мовчать
230 CSU: він сидить, вони сидять
231 CSU: він ходить, вони ходять
232 Specifically, Marčuk believes that that loss of t was the result of local phonology where e and y are not distinguished in unstressed positions which causes a merger of I and II category verbs.
233 Recorded in 1940
From the examples above, it can be concluded that, at least by the early 20th century, the 3rd person singular 2nd conjugation inflection was already relatively stable, with consistent use of the word final -t characterizing the paradigm. However, Zakrevs'ka’s form in zero-ending is not without attestation; indeed, isolated tokens of this form can be found, even in the modern sources. For example, one of Jastrems'ka’s informants provides this token of the zero ending form:

e. вона ціле літо носи
‘she carried [it] all summer’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)²³⁴

The evidence for the zero-ending form is rather sparse. Nevertheless, the continued existence of tokens of this form attest to the fact that a zero-ending is a possible verbal shape, perhaps one that had been more widely diffused in an earlier period of the language.

As with the 3rd person plural 1st conjugation desinence, the depalatalized inflection -t of the 3rd person singular 2nd conjugation has been remarkably stable. While the shape bears close resemblance to that of CSU, it is the depalatalized quality of the word final dental which has remained distinct from that of the (palatalized) standard desinence. Examples (2f - 2i), which come from a variety of sources, demonstrate both the stability and salience of this verbal feature:

f. ходит сумний
‘a sad person walks’ (VV No. 55)²³⁵

g. мама говорит
‘mama says’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 23)

h. собі спит, лежит, або сидет
‘he sleeps, lies, or sits’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)²³⁶

i. кождий кожного видит
‘each sees the others’ (Vlad 1992)

3.1.2.2 Second conjugation verbs: third person plural inflection

²³⁴ Speaker born in 1931
²³⁵ Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916
²³⁶ Speaker born in 1953
Marčuk 1969, Žylko 1955, and Lesjuk 2011 all make particular note of the Hutsul 3rd person plural second conjugation inflection, characterising it by the loss of word-final -t('), a trait common to several dialects of the southwestern group. According to Marčuk, this loss of -t(') in the second conjugation was likely the result of a local phonology where e and y are not distinguished in unstressed positions, motivating a levelling effect based on a conflation of first and second conjugational paradigms (1969). The evidence from the early decades of the 20th century, however, indicate that this uninflected ending was already unstable and prone to variation, despite continued occasional paradigm conflation, which will be discussed further below. In (5a) Xotkevyč uses the uninflected form paired with the Hutsul vocal reflex ja > je, but without any evidence of a reinterpretation of conjugational categories:

(5)   a. болє́ мене рукі, ноги

‘my arms and legs hurt’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 356)

Writing in roughly the same time period, Mančuk demonstrates the instability of the uninflected form, but marking the 3rd plural with the desinence (depalatalized) -t. The stem vowel is similarly the result of Hutsul phonological norms (ja > je) and is therefore also not indicative of paradigm conflation:

b. то уже такі очі погані, шо видє́т наскрі́ть

‘[his] eyes are so bad that he sees right through it’ (Mančuk 2006: 54)

Examples (5a) and (5b) demonstrate that variation between zero and overt ending was occurring by the early decades of the 20th century, even in those contexts with no direct evidence of paradigm conflation, but merely the manifestation of the salient Hutsul sound change ja > je.

By the time of Šekeryk-Donykiv’s writing, this form in -t had become the preferred form, with significantly little variation from that time period (the 1930s) on.

c. А бездітники люб’єт малих дітій

‘Childless people love young children’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

237 CSU: болять
238 A similar example can also be found in Xotkevyč: ‘А ци довго ви не талуб нось, дідючку?’ (1966: 358).
239 CSU: бачать
The modern dialect, however, is characterized by the stabilization of the overt inflection -$t$. While this demonstrates some convergence toward the morphological shape of CSU inflection, which is also marked by an overt ending in the voiceless dental, it still retains the dialectally salient depalatalization, clearly marking it as distinctly local. While there is still some variation in stem vowel articulation resulting from the Hutsul reflex $ja > je$, the ending itself has become remarkably consistent in both its shape (overt) and quality (depalatalized).

d. у хаті сидять\(^\text{240}\) три мужики
‘three men sit in the hut’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)\(^\text{241}\)

Example (5d) shows the modern shape of the 3rd person plural second conjugation inflection, an overt ending in depalatalized -$t$. In addition, it demonstrates the characteristic Hutsul sound change $ja > je$, but with no evidence of paradigm merger. While the vowel articulation has destabilized somewhat, varying from speaker to speaker, as well as within the speech of a single speaker, the -$t$ desinence has become consistently used regardless of the vocalism. Examples (5e) and (5f) below illustrate the fact that a single speaker may shift between vowel articulation, but not in the depalatalization of the inflection:

e. а коні сходять\(^\text{242}\) на верхи
‘the horses walk to the top’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)\(^\text{243}\)

f. вони їх там доять\(^\text{244}\)
‘they milk them there’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)\(^\text{245}\)

Examples (5e) and (5f) indicate that the 3rd person plural 2nd conjugation inflection in depalatalized -$t$ is one of the most stable elements of the Hutsul morphological and phonological inventories, perhaps because it is precisely a case where those two inventories directly intersect. Despite its longstanding status as one of the most marked features of Hutsul speech, even the $je < a$ has begun to recede in the context of increased variation and nascent preference for the CSU articulation $ja$. This is particularly well demonstrated by the speaker in (5g-i) who, born 20 years

\(^{240}\) CSU: сидять
\(^{241}\) Speaker born in 1932
\(^{242}\) CSU: сходять
\(^{243}\) Speaker born in 1931
\(^{244}\) CSU: доять
\(^{245}\) The same speaker as (5d)
after the speaker of (5e) and (5f), have developed consistently in the CSU-motivated ja articulation, while clearly retaining the Hutsul depalatalized, but overt, 3rd plural inflection:

g. тó тепèр говорят
‘they speak now’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)\textsuperscript{246}

h. там сèдят голови колгоспу
‘there sits the head of the kolkhoz’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)

i. люде приходят
‘people arrive’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)

The articulation of je has long been a highly salient feature of Hutsul phonology, one that is only beginning to show signs of convergence towards CSU [ja]; the consistent presence of the ja articulation in examples (5g-i) therefore indicates that these utterances are among the most recent layer of the Hutsul vernacular. It is thus quite notable that the speaker also consistently uses the depalatalized -т inflection in the 3rd person plural form, indicating that this is indeed one of the features that seems to be most resistant to convergence pressure, either through its morphological function or its phonological qualities. Most likely it is the very intersection of morphology and phonology that has allowed this features to remain so resilient.

3.1.3 Paradigm conflation

Paradigm conflation refers to the reinterpretation of the stem vowel which causes a merger of the conjugational categories, most frequently resulting in a 2nd conjugation verb being treated as a 1st conjugation verb. This phenomenon has been well documented in Hutsul and result in such 3rd person plural forms as (вони) виходять\textsuperscript{247}, платять\textsuperscript{248}, роблять\textsuperscript{249} (Lesjuk 2011). According to Marčuk this merger of categories is phonologically based on the reflex of unstressed \( y > e \), creating the shift from a local 3rd singular form such as ходит\textsuperscript{250} to its

\textsuperscript{246} Speaker born in 1953
\textsuperscript{247} CSU: виходять
\textsuperscript{248} CSU: платять
\textsuperscript{249} CSU: роблять
\textsuperscript{250} Marčuk 1969 asserts that the default Hutsul form of the 3rd person plural in second conjugation is uninflected.
phonological doublet ходє (251) which, in turn, triggers a reinterpretation of its conjugational category, causing a reshuffling of the paradigm (1969: 171).

Tokens of this paradigm conflation can be found in both the old and the modern dialect; however, it seems to be rare relative to the competing inflectional forms discussed above. When it does appear, it most clearly manifests in the 3rd person plural form through a change from the historical 2nd conjugation 3rd plural desinence -jat to that typical of the 1st conjugation -jut, such as seen in (6a):

(6) а. шо ходють по світі
‘who walk the earth’ (Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011)

In (6a) the 2nd conjugation verb ходити takes a typical 1st conjugation ending in the 3rd plural form, illustrating the Hutsul doublets ходять/ходять (252) and ходят. Of this pair, the former seems to have been of higher salience and variation between these forms appears to be more the exception than the rule. Notably, both forms are marked by the depalatalized -t, maintaining a local differentiation from the CSU paradigm. Examples (6b) and (6c) provide two modern tokens of the reinterpretation of a 2nd conjugation verb as a 1st conjugation with the resulting 3rd person plural inflection:

b. бо навіть сп’ють робітніка на землі
‘for the workers even sleep on the floor’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 21)

c. Ноги болють, уже не хочуть служити.
‘My legs hurt, they no longer want to work; (Vlad 1992)

Examples (6b) and (6c) illustrate the outcomes of paradigm conflation on the historically 2nd conjugation verbs ‘спати’ and ‘боліти,’ respectively. Both maintain the Hutsul depalatalized ending, and сп’ют additionally lacks the epenthetic l characteristic of the standard inflection. (6c) provides an interesting contrast to the form in (5a) ‘болє’; although the former comes from a modern source, they likely both represent part of an older layer of Hutsul verbal inflection, one which for some time supported the maintenance of a wider variety of possible forms, including forms reflecting paradigm merger, as well as both uninflected and inflected paradigmatic forms;

251 CSU: ходять
252 These represent the same underlying form differing only in articulation of the stem vowel; examples can be found in (5e) and (5i).
253 CSU: сплять
254 CSU: болють
however, as the merged form was of more limited salience, it eventually receded giving increased preference to the historically determined paradigmatic forms, eventually stabilizing the inflected ending -t, with only minor phonological variation in the vocalism. Yet this history of competing variants has left its mark on some interesting mixed modern resolutions, such as seen in (6d):

\[ \text{d. а вони так дивляться}^{255} \text{ на мене} \]
\[ ‘they look at me’ (Jastrems'ka, 2008: 233)^{256} \]

This example in (6d) shows some traits of the internal dynamics of the modern dialect as it changes through CSU contact. While it reflects the older, more limited tendencies of paradigm conflation as well as the typically Hutsul depalatalized dental inflection, these highly marked local morphological elements are paired with the very modern, CSU-motivated phonological shifts, including the epenthetic l and, most surprisingly, the reflexive affix articulation -sjə, in contrast to the canonical Hutsul realization -sy. The resulting form ‘дивляться’ is therefore reflective of the complex process of morphological and phonological change occurring in modern Hutsul, manifested as a hybrid, transitional form incorporating and integrating elements of both traditional Hutsul and CSU within a single lexeme.

Although paradigm conflation is most often manifested in 3rd person plural, it can also be found in other person/number places in the paradigm, although this appears to be less common. Example (6e) provides a token of a 3rd person singular form, demonstrating the merger of a 2nd conjugation verb with a 1st conjugation theme vowel e. As with (6d) this examples also reflects the active negotiation between dialect maintenance and convergence: while it preserves the older Hutsul variant form of paradigm conflation through its theme vowel, it also reflects CSU-influenced verbal morphology through the uninflected 3rd singular ending, resulting again in a sort of hybrid form.

\[ \text{e. мама ходит}^{257} \text{ у хаті} \]
\[ ‘mama walks in the hut’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)^{258} \]

While the 3rd person singular verb in (6e) is uninflected in correspondence with the CSU conjugational paradigm, this very fact underscores the dialectal process of paradigm conflation:

---

255 CSU: дивляться
256 Speaker born in 1932
257 CSU: ходить
258 Speaker born in 1932
it is precisely because the verb has shifted from 2nd to 1st conjugation that the uninflected ending is possible, as CSU requires 3rd person singular 2nd conjugation verbs, as хотити historically is, to take the inflection ты in both singular and plural 3rd person forms.

3.1.3.1 The verb ‘хотити’

The verb ‘хомиму’ provides a particularly interesting illustration of Hutsul paradigm conflation and the range of variation in Hutsul verbal inflection. In CSU, this verb has a regular 1st conjugational pattern, as shown in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>хочу</td>
<td>хочемо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>хочеш</td>
<td>хочете</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>хоче</td>
<td>хочуть</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Hutsul, however, ‘хомиму’ has shifted between treatment as a 1st conjugation and a 2nd conjugation verb and has yet to stabilize as clearly belonging to one or the other conjugational paradigm. Even within the parameters of a single paradigm, this verb in particular demonstrates a range of alternative inflectional patterns. Variation in the 3rd person form can be seen in examples (7a) and (7b):

(7) a. А на Ільцях уже хотє музей будувати
In Il'ci they want to build a museum’ (VV No. 29)

b. не хотят брати
‘they don’t want to take’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)

---

259 CSU: хочуть
260 From a Hutsul song about the building of an observatory on Pip Ivan.
261 Speaker born in 1931
Although example (7a) comes from a relatively modern source, the 3rd person plural form used here is the variant form typical of the old 3rd plural 2nd conjugation, exemplified by the type ‘ходя’ in Table 1, but with the common Hutsul phonological reflex ja > je. In contrast, 7b. already shows signs of convergence with the CSU 2nd conjugational paradigm, reflecting the standard 3rd person plural inflection -jat, but with distinctly Hutsul depalatalization of the word final dental consonant. However, it should be noted that while the shape of ‘хотят’ looks largely standardized, in fact the verb ‘хотим’ belong to the 1st conjugational paradigm in CSU, giving it the standardized shape ‘хотьт.’ It is further interesting that this speaker has paired the hybrid form ‘хотят’ with a phonologically converged negative particle ‘не’ in contrast to the articulation ‘ны,’ which was far more common in the old dialect. This example, therefore, is illustrative of this intermediary stage between convergence and retention, where traditionally dialectal morphophonemic traits are integrated with those motivated by contact with CSU.

The dynamics of this manner of variation can also be seen on the level of the individual speaker, where shifts between dialect and standard forms are not uncommon, even within the space of a single utterance:

с. дуже багато хочет...він дорого хоче
‘he really wants, he desperately wants’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 264)

Example (7c) illustrates a shift in inflectional patterns in the 3rd person singular form of ‘хотим.’ In the first clause, the speaker uses the inflected form of the 3rd singular 1st conjugation verb with a depalatalized ending -t. This is indeed the traditional Hutsul pattern for a 1st conjugation verb, while at the same time it conforms with the CSU norm of this verbs treatment as a regular 1st conjugation paradigm. The second clause demonstrates an even more fully converged form ‘хоче,’ which differs from CSU ‘хоче’ only in the typically Hutsul palatalization of the postdental č preceding the stem vowel. There are several other elements of this utterance which indicate the influence of CSU, particularly on the phonological level, including the CSU form of the masculine 3rd person singular personal pronoun ‘він,’ as well as the adverb ‘багато’ with CSU vocalic harmony. This large degree of phonological influence is then further underscored by the morphological evidence, particularly in the uninflected 3rd person singular verbal form in the second clause. It is noteworthy, however, that the speaker of (7c) is the same speaker cited in (7b) where, despite the clear signs that his speech has been heavily influenced by CSU norms, he shifts from treating ‘хотим’ as a 1st conjugation verb (as in CSU), to inflecting it as a 2nd conjugation verb. It is this very vacillation, from a single speaker, which best demonstrates the current state of the Hutsul dialect on the morphophonemic level; it is a state characterized by frequent variation, shift, and ultimately the integration of both.

262 Speaker born in 1931
traditional Hutsul and CSU morphophonemic traits, but often yet without clear stability in the patterns.

Although paradigm conflation tends to occur most widely and most visibly in 3rd person forms, the phenomenon does occasionally manifest in other places of the paradigm. Example (7d) shows a modern token of the 2nd person singular form of ‘xomimu’ clearly treated as a 2nd conjugation verb through the shift of the stem vowel from \( e \rightarrow i \):

\[
d. \text{Кого хочіш зчарувати?} \\
\text{‘Whom do you want to charm?’ (Vlad 1992)}
\]

3.1.4 Stem contraction

Another morphophonemic process which has characterized Hutsul verbal inflection is the phenomenon of stem contraction, which most commonly occurs in the 2nd and 3rd person singular form of a limited set of verbal lexemes.\(^{263}\) This contraction is characteristic only for verbs that are -e- theme with stressed root vowel -a-.\(^{264}\) (Mařčuk 1969). At the often noted point of intersection where phonology exerts influence over morphological shape, this feature of Hutsul is typified by the reduction and loss of sounds in unstressed syllables, especially in the post-tonic position (Żylko 1955).\(^{265}\) The most high frequency example of this process, and an example which well illustrates the diachronic and synchronic features, is the verb ‘казати’ for which Lesjuk 2011 notes the common Hutsul forms 1st sing. ‘каю’\(^{266}\) and 3rd plural ‘кажуть.’\(^{267}\)

Evidence, however, indicates that even by the early 20th century, these forms had become increasingly rare. Examples (8a) and (8b) from Xotkevyč and Mańčuk respectively, demonstrate that by the 1920s and early 1930s, the 1st person singular was consistently given full articulation with no post-tonic sound truncation:

\[
(8) \quad \text{а. так, єк я вам кажу} \\
\text{‘as I am telling you’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 360)}
\]

---

\(^{263}\) According to Mařčuk 1969 stem contraction rarely occurs in the 1st and 2nd plural forms, and never in the 3rd person plural (p. 176).

\(^{264}\) Loss of intervocalic \( j \) may also occur concurrently, depending on the lexeme’s structure, such as in ‘бог ёна’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 345)

\(^{265}\) This same process also determines the Hutsul vocative form, which will be discussed below.

\(^{266}\) CSU: кажу

\(^{267}\) CSU: кажуть; Lesjuk does note this 3rd plural form as attested, despite Mařčuk 1969 assertion that contracted forms do not occur in the 3rd plural. Example (8e) supports Lesjuk’s observation.
b. кажу вам

‘I am telling you’ (Mančuk 2006: 37)

Although Marčuk 1969 states that the contracted forms are most common in 2nd and 3rd person singular, the evidence again indicates that by the early 20th century, even these had greatly receded in favor of the fully articulated forms. Examples (8c) and (8d), again from Xotkevyč and Mančuk, demonstrate their strong preference for fully articulate verbal stems:

c. каже вартовий

‘the watchman says’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 344)

d. далі вітрєсай усьо - каже

‘then shake it all out--he says’(Mančuk 1966: 27)

Somewhat surprisingly, in light of Marčuk’s suggestion that the 3rd person plural form could not be contracted, the only token of ‘казати’ in its contracted form appears precisely in the 3rd person plural:

e. таке кают

‘such things they say’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 360)

While Xotkevyč does generally tend to avoid verb stem contraction, seen in examples (8a) and (8c), he does provide a few isolated token of the contracted form of ‘казати,’ but in the place least expected: the 3rd person plural. What is clear from the evidence, however, is that by the early 20th century, these contracted forms were already receding; the occasional tokens that remained indicate that this was likely current for some time in the old dialect, but atrophied fairly consistently among speakers. It is not surprising then that tokens of the contracted form of казати, are exceedingly rare in the modern dialect. This is true of all person/number forms: example (8f) illustrates a fully articulated 1st person singular, examples (8g) and (8h) show fully converged uninflected but fully articulated 3rd person singular forms, examples (8i-8k) demonstrate the 3rd person plural as a fully articulated, inflected form differentiated from CSU only by the depalatalization of word final -t.

f. добре, кажу
'good, I say’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)\textsuperscript{268}

g. мама \textit{каже}  
‘mama says’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)\textsuperscript{269}

h. одна з дівок \textit{каже}  
‘one of the girls says’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 23)

i. Та \textit{кажут} люди  
‘So people say’ (Vlad 1992)

j. Ну, нічого -- \textit{кажут} чеїдь  
“‘Well, that’s OK--say the women’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 23)

k. і тепер так \textit{кажут}  
‘that’s what they say now’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)\textsuperscript{270}

Despite the early atrophy of contracted forms of \textit{казати}, some contracted verbal lexemes were preserved, largely through fossilization. This is the case with another high frequency verb, \textit{жити}. What is surprising about this verb, however, is that the contracted forms were both developed and maintained in a pre-tonic environment, rather than the more commonly observed post-tonic reduction (as in the case of the often cited example of \textit{казати}). The contracted forms of \textit{жити} are frequently found in early 20th century sources, particularly in the third person singular, as in examples (9a) and (9b):

(9) a...лиш нев \textit{жит\v{e}}\textsuperscript{271}  
‘..he lives only for her’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

b. Отакже “востро” він і \textit{жит\v{e}}  
‘That’s how ‘hotly’ he lives’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 355)

\textsuperscript{268} Speaker born in 1932  
\textsuperscript{269} Speaker born in 1932  
\textsuperscript{270} Speaker born in 1932  
\textsuperscript{271} CSU: живе
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While examples (9a) and (9b) both demonstrate use of the contracted form of жити, they also provide a contrast in the treatment of the inflection: while Šekeryk-Donykiv shows preference for the traditional Hutsul inflected form of the 3rd person singular ending in depalatalized -t, Xotkevyč uses the CSU-motivated uninflected form. Despite this difference in resolution of the conjugational ending, they both maintain the contraction which had likely been the predominant form in the old dialect. Mančuk, writing in the 1920s, also prefers the contracted form of жити, which he shows here in this 2nd person singular:

c. поки жиєш, то йош шо можеш
‘As long as you live, you can still do something’ (Mančuk 2006: 37)

Unlike казати, which appears to have already receded by the early 20th century, the continued preference for the contracted form of жити, a preference bolstered by its high frequency, has been rather consistently maintained in the modern dialect, in all person/number places in the paradigm. Examples (9d) and (9e) demonstrate the continued use of the contracted form in the 1st person singular; examples (9f) and (9g) show the 3rd person singular form with contraction paired with the CSU-motivated uninflected ending; and example (9h), shows a 3rd person plural contracted form with the locally marked depalatalized –t desinence.

d. так і жижу на цему місці
‘so I live in this place’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 233)272

e. Так я жижу ціле своє довге житє
‘So I live my whole, long life’ (Vlad 1992)

f. жиє людина
‘there lives a person’ (Vlad 1992)

g. а депутат жиє отут
‘the deputy lives here’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 256)273

h. З чього уни жиют?

272 Speaker born in 1932
273 Speaker born in 1953
‘How do they live?’ (Plytka Horycvit 2008: 128)

Although such contracted verbal stems are considered to be a typical trait of Hutsul verbal morphology, in reality such contractions are highly limited to a few high frequency lexemes. The often-cited example of казати (Lesjuk 2011, among others) had already begun to atrophy in use by the early decades of the 20th century, and remains quite rare in the modern dialect. In contrast, the contracted form of жити has proven stable throughout the 20th century, and continues to be the preferred form today. Although both verbs can be considered very frequency-making them likely candidates for fossilization—the difference between the contraction in казати and жити actually lies in their internal phonological shape: the extended present tense stem of жити, жив-, ends in the labio-dental ʋ which in Ukrainian can alternate with bilabial β before vowels, making it phonologically more prone to ellision. The resulting contracted forms have, in the modern dialect, become hybrid forms often combing the dialectal stem truncation with CSU-typical inflection, particularly in the 3rd person singular, marked by the word final open syllable.

3.1.5 Imperative mood inflection

Like the common Hutsul 3rd person present tense endings, the 2nd person plural imperative inflection is also marked by a depalatalized -t contrast with CSU -t’. This has been highly stable throughout the 20th century (10a-c), and continues to be the preferred form in the modern dialect (10d, 10e):

(10)  a. Поможіт нам нічку переноочувати
       ‘Help us find a place to stay for the night’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 33)

       b. зробіт порєдок
       ‘put [things] in order’ (Mančuk 2006: 37)

       c. А йдіт-но
       ‘Go’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 334)

       d. ідіт-ко до йкоїсь роботи
       ‘go to some kind of work’ (Vlad 1992)
e. простіт мене
‘forgive me’ (VV No. 55)\textsuperscript{274}

3.1.6 Conclusions

Table 3 summarizes the primary data for Hutsul verbal inflection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Status: Early 20th c.</th>
<th>Status: Late 20th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person sg., conjugation I, inflection in -t</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depalatalization of -t in 3rd person plural, conjugation I</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person sg., conjugation II, depalatalized inflection -t</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person plural, conjugation II, loss of dessinence -t</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stem contraction</td>
<td>innovative</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>absent, with the exception of fossilized forms of жити</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2rd person plural imperative with depalatalized -t</td>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{274} Lyrics to a Hutsul song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916
Compared to the phonological system, Hutsul verbal inflection has been relatively more resistant to change. This provides some support to the assertion that morphological change tends to lag behind changes to phonology and syntax (Thomason & Kaufman 1988, among others). What is most interesting in the Hutsul data is that archaic features of verbal inflection have generally proven significantly more resistant to change than have innovative features. The most parsimonious explanation for this resistance is the broad generalization of the depalatalized -t which has become the most frequent inflectional marker in the third person forms, with the exception of third person singular inflection of first conjugation verbs. The third person desinence -t in the plural for first conjugation verbs, and in the singular and plural for second conjugation verbs is broadly supported in CSU; however, in CSU this -t inflection has become palatalized, which is still clearly the case in Hutsul. As seen in several other other features, maintenance of Hutsul phonological traits is most likely in cases where the trait is embedded into the morphological system. When phonology and morphology intersect, this intersection seems to provide a bulwark against contact-induced incursions. In terms of the most highly-marked or divergent features, stem contraction has largely disappeared from the contemporary dialect, with the important exception of a few high frequency fossilized forms; the maintenance of these fossilized forms seems to provide strong enough network marking to allow the productivity of contraction to atrophy without greater repercussions to social indexicality.

3.2 Nominal inflection

As was the case with verbal inflection, Hutsul nominal inflectional paradigms are marked by both archaisms and innovations, the latter often stemming from archaisms conditioned by local phonological processes. In terms of the residual archaisms found throughout the paradigms, as early as 1969 S.P. Bevzenko noted that such forms were no longer the primary inflection in most southwest dialects, but had already become merely doublets of literary forms and which have, indeed, become increasingly out of date in contemporary speech. In particular, he noted the declining use of the archaic masculine nominative plural, masculine and neuter instrumental inflections, as well as the dative and prepositional plural forms (p. 9).

While there are several inflectional forms that are considered to be local innovations, there are two main underlying sources: some of these forms are actually archaisms in origin which arose through analogy in the southwest or, in other cases, CSU underwent a process of analogical levelling which evaded the southwest dialect area leaving variant inflectional endings determined by the noun’s historical classification. The latter is the case of the dative and prepositional singular form of soft-ending nouns which, in southwest dialects retained the inflectional ending -y, whereas eastern and northern dialect groups--including CSU--analogized the inflection to the ending -i which then became -i, giving pairs such as CSU na zemli, na koni vs. southwestern na zemly, na kony. This is also generally true in the development of the plural desinences which, in the east and north, underwent systemic paradigm levelling, a phenomenon
which did not occur—at least not fully—in the southwest. As a result, the southwest dialect group-including Hutsul—demonstrate noticeably more variety in inflectional categories and shapes.

The question, however, is whether Bevzenko’s assessment of the contemporary situation of southwestern inflectional doublets holds true for the Hutsul dialect and, if so, to what degree archaic desinences have receded or disappeared. The logical assumption in light of contact with CSU would be that Hutsul should be simplifying its inflectional morphology through the same process of paradigm levelling that has already occurred in CSU. However, this is not necessarily the case: several traits of nominal inflection have proven more resistant to contact-induced change than phonology or even the closely related area of verbal morphology. This is perhaps a surprising result, both because the Hutsul inflectional system is inherently more complex due to its diversity of forms, but also because morphology has not become as highly marked an indexer of identity as has phonology which has indeed shown a proclivity toward CSU convergence in a more uniform way than has nominal morphology.

3.2.1 The nominative plural ending

While the nominative plural ending of feminine nouns is fairly consistent across all Ukrainian dialects, this is not the case with masculine nouns which in the southwestern dialect group have preserved the archaic ending -ove (from the former u-stem nouns) for masculine plural animates such as bratove, synove (Żylko 1955). Bevzenko 1969 notes that this ending -ove did occur quite frequently in southwestern texts from the late 19th to early 20th century, but that its frequency had greatly receded by the time of his analysis (p. 10). The data from Hutsul suggests that this ending was, in fact, already quite limited in use by the early 20th century has all but entirely disappeared from contemporary speech.

While it was a viable plural marker in Hutsul, its use was delimited by animacy, rather than historical stem. For example, таcда, a Romanian loan word conforming to the former a-stem Slavic noun shape, was able to take this u-stem plural ending by virtue of its semantic animacy:

(11) а. А по застiльно сидєт газдове

‘and the important householders attend the feasts’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 86)

Duličenko 2006 has noted that the ending -ove has remained the primary nominative plural marker in Carpatho-Rusyn, while the older endings -i and -e are used only quite rarely.
Interestingly, in example (11a) Šekeryk-Donykiv uses the the u-stem plural -ove with an a-stem noun, yet avoids this ending when pluralizing o-stem noun, despite its adherence to the animacy criteria for the -ove ending, seen in (11b):

b. усі братя рідні
‘all brothers are kin’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 29)

What this inconsistency shows in not that one semantic context became more favorable than another for the -ove ending, but rather that this ending had already greatly receded by the beginning of the 20th century. When considering the most current evidence from neighboring Carpathian Rusyn, as well Bevzenko’s 1969 analysis, the conclusion is that in this particular feature Hutsul has been particularly prone to change, if not specifically contact-induced, at least prone to paradigmatic simplification. Indeed, other writers of the early 20th century consistently avoid the -ove ending, as in (11c) from the 1920s:

c. Газди гимблюют
‘the householders do trading’ (Mančuk 2006:14)

In example (11c) Mančuk provides a direct counterexample to Šekeryk-Donykiv in (11a). While the latter utilizing the archaic u-stem ending -ove, Mančuk creates the plural from the semantic doublet -y. The suggestion here is that, by the early 20th century, -ove and -y coexisted with -ove limited to masculine animate nouns. However, even then -ove had greatly atrophied in use, such that even original u-stem masculine animate nouns were no longer taking the archaic ending, and those nouns to which the ending had, at some point, spread, already vacillating between the archaic ending and the levelled nominative plural desinence. In the contemporary dialect of the late 20th century, the levelled ending -y had clearly won out, with residual forms in -ove exceedingly rare. Example (11d) illustrates the predominant plural form of the same noun as in (11a) and (11c):

d. Газди слух мають
‘The householders have good ears’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008:14)

More commonly, Hutsul has utilized a phonological variant ending in forming the nominative plural for all categories of nouns whereby y is positionally lowered to e in the unstressed plural ending. This was already common in the early 20th century, and has been fairly widely retained in the contemporary dialects, with some occasionally indications of nascent yield to CSU pressures. This can seen through an examination of the high frequency plural noun for ‘people’, in which the underlying shape--and CSU realization--is люди, but with the Hutsul reflex of unstressed ending y > e rendering люде:
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e. його люде дуже навиділи
‘people really hated him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 13)

f. Вісипалися люде з церкви, єк вівці з кошєри
‘People poured out of the church, like sheep from a pen’ (Mančuk 2006:16)

These two examples from texts representing the old dialect are typically mirrored in contemporary sources, as in (11g) and (11h):

g. Послухайте, люде добрі
‘Listen, kind people’ (VV No. 29)276

h. Мене викутали і виростили чужі люде
‘Other people fed and raised me’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 184-186)277

While the люде dialectal realization still appears to be predominant among contemporary speakers, there are also tokens demonstrating incursions from CS (11i):

i. Наші люди ніколи не казали Піп Іван, а Попіван
‘Our people never called it Pip Ivan, but Popivan’ (VV No. 29)

Example (11i) demonstrates current variation in the nominative plural ending. What is significant about this variation is not its indication of paradigmatic resilience, but rather the fact that this is a phonological feature, not based on dialectal morphological categories, and one which has some support throughout other Ukrainian dialects. Even in CSU, in some (unstressed) morphophonemic contexts, the phonological distinction between е and ы can be neutralized, with a resulting partial merger; however, it is notable that the speaker in (11i) is in fact making a clear phonetic distinction, as evidenced by his articulation of the negative particle не. While this (unstressed) negative particle is another area of potential phonetic merger in CSU, this speaker is apparently differing his articulation for each morphological context.

One additional note about the formation of nominative plural nouns concerns the treatment of nouns with word-final velar consonants. In CSU, the conflation and spread of the endings of nominative and accusative o-stem plural endings led to a loss of distinction between the masculine nominative and accusative plural forms across all categories of nouns. The result is that o-stem nominative plural і yielded to accusative plural ы which was then generalized throughout all paradigms as the basic nominative plural ending -y. However, the velar consonant

276 Lyrics to a song about the building of an observatory on Popivan.
277 Speaker is Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920).
alternations resulting from the original nominative plural desinence -i were initially preserved in CSU and, only after their elimination were the two cases fully merged with the complete loss of masculine-feminine distinctions in the plural. In Hutsul, this process halted at the second stage, by which the basic ending merged to -y, but the previous -i induced velar alternations were preserved. While Bevzenko 1969 notes the occasional appearance of velar nominative plural forms such as druży and ptasy, he also notes that by the time of his writing they have become relatively rare (p. 9). This most common resolution can be seen in (11h):

h. Василь простудив собі ноги
‘Vasyl’s legs got cold’ (VV No. 31)\textsuperscript{278}

3.2.2 The prepositional case

3.2.2.1 Singular

While the basic prepositional singular ending for all noun categories in CSU is -i (through analogizing the ending -Ѣ which became -i and spread through all noun categories), Hutsul is characterized by its variation between both the -i and archaic -y endings (Lesu’k 2012, Hrynčyšyn 2005, Herman 2008, Rudnytskyj 1965). The differentiation between these two variant endings was likely originally linked to the historical stem class of the noun (as will be discussed further), the distribution by the early 20th century is far more complex and no longer clearly organized along stem class lines.

The only clear stem class-ending correlation occurs with the former i-stem nouns. This category of noun consistently took the -y desinence in the old dialect. The historical locative in the category ended in -i (rather than -Ѣ as generalized in CSU) which, following vocalic merger, led to its retention in Hutsul as -y. (12a) and (12b) from Šekeryk-Donykiv illustrate the typical shape of former i-stem nouns in the prepositional singular in Hutsul\textsuperscript{279}:

(12) a. По моїй смерті
‘Upon my death’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 184)

b. штуркав зло го духа в груди

\textsuperscript{278} Speaker born in the 1930s

\textsuperscript{279} The same holds true for ost-Ѣ stem nouns whose inflection conforms to the i-stem paradigm, eg. В тєжкі слабості попадают люди (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)
'he poked the evil spirit in the chest' (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 190)

Evidence from contemporary sources, however, show a shift toward CSU inflection, with i-stem nouns most frequently taking the analogized -i inflection:

c. у домашній печі
‘in the house oven’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 16)

The former a-stem/ja-stem nouns demonstrate the vacillation between -i and -y prepositional endings. Historically the a-stem class was inflected with -Ѣ in the locative, while the ja-stems, characterized by a soft palatal consonant preceding the desinence was inflected with -i. This historical shape should have led to a clear distinction between classes in Hutsul, with a-stem locatives characterizes by -i and ja-stems by -y; however, this is not always the case, even in the old dialect. Instead, we find tendencies, but with evidence of crossover between the categories. Example (12d), (12e), and (12f) illustrate the historical a-stem ending in Hutsul, which corresponds both the historical desinence -Ѣ as well as the modern inflection in CSU:

d. Ріс я пестуном у хаті
‘I grew up the favorite in the house’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

e. на жінці стоїть забухтований
‘the was a coil on the woman’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 345)

f. у середині
‘in the middle’ (Mančuk 2006: 11)

While this ending -i is both predictable from the a-stem historical inflectional paradigm as well as supported by the development of CSU, the pattern is occasionally undermined, as in (12g):

g. єк би лежєв на долини
‘how I would lie in the valley’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

The contrast between (12f) and (12g) is particularly interesting as it provides two resolutions to nouns which, in the nominative, have parallel shapes, середина and долина, and which both come from approximately the same time period (1920s, 1930s). Yet, (12g) seems to indicate some conflation of endings between historical a-stem and historical ja-stem paradigms with долини being treated as a ja-stem.
By the time we reach the second half of the 20th century, however, the historical and standard -i prepositional ending is firmly entrenched among the former a-stem nouns, demonstrating little variation:

h. єкшо по дорогі
   ‘if along the road’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 13)

i. Він сидів у хатці
   ‘He say in the hut’ (Vlad 1992)

Ja-stems nouns seem to have been equally prone to conflation and variation. While ja-stem nouns should be predictably resolved with the -y desinence in the prepositional case (from historical -i), this is sometimes, but not always, the case. It is possible that, historically, this inflection had been treated more consistently in the old dialect, but that was apparently no longer the case even in the early 20th century. Examples (12j) and (12k) show contrasting endings of two ja-stem nouns in prepositional declension:

j. висипав у ту дірку вид кола в земни воду
   ‘[he] poured water in to the hole in the ground which was made by the stick’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 20)

k. Єк на душі стало ле́ке
   ‘How my soul was lightened’ (VV No. 52)

The most likely explanation for the apparent inconsistency in desinence is that the palatalized nasal consonant n’ of земня (< *zemja) is being treated as a true ja-stem (with the desinence originating in the former ending -i), whereas душа (< *duxja) in example (12l) is being treated as an a-stem, perhaps as a result of the postdental š. This is rather surprising, particularly as Hutsul has traditionally maintained the postdental š as a palatalized consonant in most contexts, leaving a base form душя which has a clear ja-stem shape as well as the historical inflection duš-i. There is no clear explanation for the -i inflection, but there are two possibilities: either the palatalization of the postdental is strong enough to elicit a soft-series ending -i (instead of the post merger hard-series allophone -y) or, by the first half of the 20th century this inflection was already merging with CSU normative -i. If the latter is the case, it is also clear that such a merger remains incomplete. Example 12m demonstrates that the historical ja-stem desinence was still at least partially in use by the 1990s, directly paralleling the inflection of (12j) from approximately 60 years earlier:

---

280 However, in the old dialect such examples as ‘и на тілі, й на душі’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 26) can be found.
281 Lyrics to a folk song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916.
The former o-stems, both masculine and neuter, tend to demonstrate stability and consistency in most cases. As the historical prepositional desinence was -Ѣ, both the old and modern dialect utilize the -i inflection with little variation. Examples (12m) and (12n) illustrate this inflection in the old dialect, while (12o) and (12p) show nouns of the former o-stem class in the contemporary prepositional case:

m. єк мене нi станет на свiтi
'how I would no longer be in the world’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 13)

n. Може, в єнчим селi так
'Maybe that’s the way it is in another village’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 360)

o. У мiстi легше
'It’s easier in the city’ (Vlad 1992)

p. Я вже знов у страсi
'I am again in fear’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 6)

Similarly, the former jo-stems, which were inflected in -i in the locative, have taken the post-merger inflection -y in Hutsul. This desinence, while not supported by CSU which underwent complete analogical levelling, has been relatively stable, particularly in those nouns ending in a post dental:

q. на її поморшіним лицi282
'on her wrinkled face’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

r. на тiм самiм мiсци283
'in that very place’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

s. Я мав на полi кощєри

282 The underlying Ukrainian form is лице.
283 Similarly, ‘вiн блишиєси на сонци’ (VV No. 29) from a speaker born in 1902.
‘I had a flock in the field’ (VV, No. 45)\textsuperscript{284}

t. в однім кінци\textsuperscript{285}
‘on one end’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 17)

Despite the clear association of postdentals with the jo-stem paradigm, there remained a
delineation between between o-stem and jo-stem inflection. Example (12u) illustrates an o-stem
noun in which the inflection -i triggers a velar palatalization $k > c$, yet retains the original
desinence despite the appearance of the postdental ending:

u. єк піна на молоці
‘like the foam on milk’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)

The problematics of the former ū-stem nouns can be illustrated by the degree of variation
in the high frequency lexeme ‘church,’ rendered in the nominative in Hutsul as цер(ь)ква < crky
(-ьве). While the historical locative desinence of this noun class was -e, the inflection in both the
old and new dialect has vacillated between generalization of either -y and -i case marker. This
variation of ending can be found in both the old dialect (12v and 12w) as well as the new dialect
(12x and 12y):

v. учют про него попи у церкві
‘the priests teach about him in the church’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 194)

w. У церкві така духота
‘It is so stuffy in the church’ (Mančuk 2006: 14)

x. усі люди, присутні у Церкві
‘all the people present at the Church’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 38)

y. так єк їх у церкві колєдуют на Різдво дєки
‘how the deacons sang of him in church on Christmas’ (Vlad 1992)

\textsuperscript{284} From a speaker born in the 1930s

\textsuperscript{285} The underlying form is кінець, which has a clearly palatalized postdental suffix. While this palatalized postdental
suffix would place it in the jo-stem class, it would also give phonological impetus to a soft series vowel desinence, -
\textit{i}. However, its association with the jo-stems seems to have been strong enough to prevent this manner of
reclassification. Similarly, Plytka-Horycvit has ‘котрі лишилиси на місці’ (2008: 42).
It seems likely that the old dialect inflected this noun class with the -y (>e) prepositional ending. Indeed, nouns of this declension class tend to follow hard declension patterns throughout the paradigm, as well be demonstrated below, indicating that the former ū-stem nouns likely did originally inflect -y in the propositional case in old Hutsul. However, this pattern became inconsistently applied fairly early on, and was clearly variable by the early 20th century, albeit leaving trace evidence in a few fossilized forms which still appear even in contemporary writing and speech. It is notable that example (12y), with its converged -i locative desinence, also lacks the old Hutsul palatalization r’, suggesting that this is already a converged form influenced by CSU phonological norms.

3.2.2.2 Plural

As with the singular, the Hutsul prepositional plural paradigms have historically tended to fall along stem class lines, where CSU long ago analogized the -ā (-fā) paradigm across all nouns classes. There have been several descriptions of traditional Hutsul inflection of the prepositional plural across noun classes. Zakrevs'ka 1991 notes that stems ending in a soft consonant take the -yx inflection, which Žylko 1955 describes as a result of the phonetic system which triggers a vocalic reflex of a > y, resulting in a base ending of -ax being realized as -yx, rather than a retention of archaic inflectional morphology. Former i-stem nouns, according to Zakrevs'ka, are inflected with -ex (<ьхъ) in the prepositional plural, with such examples from Žylko as na plechex, na ochex, pry ljudex, pry hostex. However, even by the early 20th century, the lines between stem classes--and CSU norms--had become very blurred, with the -yx/-ix desinences all but disappearing entirely from the dialect.

Of the former stem classes, the most straightforward inflectional development occurred in Hutsul as it did in CSU, in the former the -a/-ja-stem nouns. The historical locative plural ending -ahъ was firmly established in Hutsul from the early dialect and has remained stable since, supported by its generalization across all noun classes in CSU. Not surprisingly, there is little variation in this ending between the old dialect (13a, 13b) and the new (13c):

(13) a. глибоко в долинах
   ‘deep in the valleys’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

   b. читаючи в моїх думках
   ‘reading in my thoughts’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 344)

---

286 Among the examples he provides are na kon’yx, na tyx dn’yx.
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с. Я робила все житє на дорогах
‘I worked my whole life on the roads’ (Vlad 1992)

Further, the former ū-stems, which have a historical locative plural desinence of ʼ(ъ)ʼахъ also stabilized early in Hutsul, likely owing to their paradigmatic similarity to the -a/-ja stems, typically illustrated in (13d):

d. у тих церквах
‘in those churches’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 30)

The other nouns classes, however, are a good deal more complicated. Table 4 illustrates the historical locative plural inflection for the former -o, -jo, -i stems.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Class</th>
<th>Historical locative plural inflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o-stem</td>
<td>-ЪХЪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo-stem</td>
<td>-іХЬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-stem</td>
<td>-ЬХЪ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases in Hutsul, the prepositional plural endings had apparently stabilized by the early 20th century, even when they had resulted from paradigmatic levelling which crowded out previous inflectional patterns. This is clearly the case with the former o-stems which yielded to levelling quite early on, reflected in consistent use of the a-stem locative plural inflection by the early 1900s:

e. на заклєтих скарбах
‘on the promised treasures’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

f. прислопатині в садах
‘dug up in the gardens’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)
By the time of Šekeryk-Donykiv, there seems to have been no evidence of any meaningful retention of the historical o-stem inflection in the Hutsul plural prepositional declension which would have resulted in an inflectional ending of -Ѣхь > iѫь.

Similarly, examples (13g) and (13h) show the prepositional plural form of two jo-stem nouns, море and край, in the old and contemporary dialect, respectively:

**g. Сонце купається у синих морях**

‘The sun bathes in the blue seas’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

**h. у чужих краях**

‘in foreign countries’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 23)

Even though both of these nouns conform to shape of the former jo-stem class, their inflection in the prepositional plural has developed along the lines of the -a/-ja-stems, likely the result of the same levelling that has taken place in CSU, as there is no trace of their historical ending -Ѣхь.

Despite Zakrevs'ka’s description of soft-stem nouns consistently inflecting in -yx (1991), this phenomenon is in fact not observed here, even though it is precisely the ending one would expect (-Ѣхь > ѐx, following the vocalic merger). Even more interesting is that the soft series desinence -jax has preserved the quality of the back vowel and avoided the fronting to -je, so typical of Hutsul phonology. Beyond these instances, however, the paradigms begin to look a good deal more muddy.

In the description of Hutsul inflectional morphology cited noted above, both Žylko and Zakrevs'ka described the Hutsul inflection of the former i-stems as an archaism, based on the historical locative i-stem ending -ьхъ > -ex. This is indeed what we consistently find in early 20th sources, attesting to the limits of paradigmatic levelling in the old dialect, particularly among former i-stem nouns. Examples (13 i-k) show typical prepositional plural inflections of three i-stem nouns from the old dialect:

**i. потемніло у очах**

‘his eyes darkened’ (Mančuk 2006: 28)

**j. а при людех наєві**

287 This noun is described as an s-subtype aligned with i-stem paradigm. Mančuk, however, vacillates in inflection: ‘шо у очах ми потемнило’ (2006: 23). Šekeryk-Donykiv is more consistent: ‘Аж світ ми темнів ув очах’ (2007: 10).
‘it is visible to people’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 375)

k. на його широких грудех
‘on his broad chest’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 25)

Tokens of this archaic ending can still be found in the contemporary dialect; however, most recent evidence point to its atrophy and consequent levelling under paradigmatic pressure from the a-stem inflection, clearly supported by CSU inflectional morphology.

Where the archaic ending still occurs, it is most common in the high frequency lexeme ‘people’ (CSU: люди):

l. при люди
‘in front of people’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

There are likely two explanations for this fossilization of люди: First, this is a high frequency lexeme whose shape has become entrenched through frequent reproduction. Second, the underlying nominative plural in Hutsul is лüде, rather than CSU люди, a base form containing the theme vowel -e corresponding to the i-stem inflectional shape of -ex, thereby phonologically supporting its retention288. There are occasionally other, less high-frequency tokens of the archaic i-stem, but the former inflection has become very inconsistently applied. For example, in (13m), Plytka-Horycvit retains the archaic inflection in грудех, yet in (13n) and (13o), she uses the inflection ending [-ax], entirely consistent with the levelling of CSU’s inflectional morphology:

m. сорочька на грудех була розшнікана
‘the shirt was tight across his chest’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 19)

n. то вже ретувало народ у трудностях
‘it already saved the people in times of hardship’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

o. корови дуже мучилися у болях
‘the cows suffered in pain’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 26)

288 This is also true in the case of the dative plural form.
As examples (13m - 13o) illustrate the application of endings to former i-stem nouns is fairly unstable, with occasional tokens of the archaic ending still appearing in contemporary speech, but with the CSU paradigm becoming increasingly preferred in determining the nouns shape in the oblique cases. This is also true for the former n-stem nouns, which tended to conform to the i-stem paradigm, and have hence also yielded to the same paradigmatic levelling pressures:

p. по тих каміннях
‘along those rocks’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

q. на тих каменях\textsuperscript{289}
‘on those rocks’ (VV No. 29)

What is also interesting about examples (13n - 13q) is that, in addition to showing the atrophy of the archaic ending in favor for the CSU inflection, they also suggest a weakening of the phonological processes governing the shape of the desinence, which was also seen in (13g) and (13h). Specifically, earlier observations, made by Žylko 1955 and Zakrevs'ka 1991, predicted that the soft series ending \textit{-jax} would be articulated as \textit{-yx}, but there is little evidence of that here.\textsuperscript{290} Instead, what we find is the elements of a paradigm currently coming into closer correspondence with that of CSU.

Another curious case of the Hutsul prepositional plural is the inflectional shape of the lexical item ‘shoulders’, \textit{плечє} (CSU: \textit{плечі}) in nominative plural. Žylko 1955 uses this word as an illustration of the influence of the former i-stem paradigm which, in his view, leads to the prepositional plural form \textit{на plechex}. While this form may have been extant either further back in the dialect’s history, or in a limited geographical area, the sources of the Verxovyna dialect of the early 20th century indicate a different preferred inflection, \textit{плечьох}. This inflection \textit{-ox} which seem to arise from the u-stem locative plural ending \textit{-ъхъ}; however, there is no reason to believe that this class was particularly influential among other classes of nouns and word-final stress may actually play a larger role in its appearance in a limited group of lexical items.\textsuperscript{291}

Additionally, the shape of CSU: \textit{плече} indicates a jo-stem which would have originally inflected

\textsuperscript{289} Speaker born in 1900.
\textsuperscript{290} It is certainly possible that the realization \textit{[-yx]} is still current in other areas of the Hutsul dialect, but the data here suggests its low frequency and likely loss in the Verxovyna region.
\textsuperscript{291} Interestingly this inflectional shape is not entirely unique and, in fact, seems to have been in use with other lexical items of similar morphological shape (in the case with a base form from the former jo-stems ending in a postdental consonant): Šekeryk-Donykiv also inflects ‘fingers’ in the same manner as ‘shoulders,’ such as in na палььох (2007: 24). In this case, stress placement would seem to play much less of a role in the inflectional shape. While Bevzenko 1969 notes the variant prepositional plural ending in \textit{-ox} (< -ъхъ), he provides only the example of na kon’okh while also noting the form na kon’ikh; he also specifically notes the prepositional plural form of ‘fingers’ as ‘na pal’cikh’
in -iχь which, post-merger, would render the desinence -yx, an ending made additionally appropriate by the palatal quality of the final consonant. Examples (13r) and (13s), however, reveal the most typical inflected form плечьох:

г. Тай упав долівлиць разом з міхом на плечьох
‘And he fell together with the fur on his shoulders’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 183)

s. А я з лисом на плечьох посовпав зимами д’хаті
‘And I, with a fox on my shoulder, wandered home every winter’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 61)

Tokens of this same inflection can still be found in the modern dialect, as in (13t):

t. несли на плечьох
‘[they] carried on [their] shoulders’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

However, the current state is one of atrophy, with the CSU form becoming increasingly dominant, as in (13u) and (13v):

u. на плечах носили
[they] carried on [their] shoulders’ (VV No. 29)

v. то убраннє нести на плечах
‘carry clothes on their shoulders’ (Vlad 1992)

3.2.3 The Dative case

3.2.3.1 Masculine singular

While paradigmatic simplification and levelling have been the typical course of CSU inflectional morphology, the masculine dative is somewhat of an exception in that two competing endings are currently and widely in use, -овi and -у. While it is clear that the -у

---

292 Speaker born in 1902.
293 A rough generalization can be made that -овi is most typical of masculine animate nouns, whereas -у is somewhat more common for masculine inanimate and neuter nouns. However, the reality is that there is a good deal of overlap in their use in CSU and no hard and fast rule governing their domains. Further, Lesjuk 2001 notes that inflectional
desinence arose from the o-stem paradigm, -oëi originates in the former u-stem class (> ovi), although it appears quite early on in Ukrainian texts as a less common variant ending for o-stems nouns. Following the vocalic merger of i and y, the ending underwent the systematic change -ovi > -ovy and then spread across all categories of masculine nouns. However, in approximately the 16th century, this desinence again underwent an internal sound change which reverted it back to -ovi294, the form which ultimately stabilized and became the CSU masculine dative ending, resulting in a change illustrated as bratovy > bratovi and generalized throughout the inflectional system.

Hutsul, however, did not undergo this secondary sound change and, where the -ovy occurs, it remains in post-vocalic merger form, distinguishing it from CSU and most other Ukrainian dialects295. This ending has proven quite stable over time and is still most commonly found in the contemporary dialect with very few incursions from the CSU inflectional form. Because of its clear consistency of use, few examples are needed to illustrate this stability. Typical examples from the old dialect can be seen in (14a - 14c), while the contemporary dative can be found in (14d - 14f):

(14) a. єк коханка д’коханцеви, єк жінка д’своєму чьоловікови
‘like a lover to her lover, like a wife to her husband’ (Mančuk 2006 :33)

b. я си боєв признаватиси дідови
‘I was afraid to confess to grandpa’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

c. то дєкував Иванчікови
‘he thanked Ivančik’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 375)

d. гуцул гуцулови
‘a Hutsul to a Hutsul’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 28)

e. на погрозу дідови
‘in threat of grandpa’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 14)

f. я уже підлітком помогала братови Николаєви на полонині
‘as a teen I helped brother Nykolaj on the polonyna’ (Vlad 1992)

form does not exist in Hutsul. Indeed, tokens of this ending are exceedingly rare in Hutsul sources of both the old and contemporary dialect.

294 This change from -ovy > -ovi likely arose under the influence of the a-stem dative ending Æ > i (Hrynčyšyn 2005).
295 Several other Ukrainian dialects, including Lemko, also retain the shape -ovy for masculine singular nouns in the dative.
3.2.3.2 Plural

The formation of the dative plural follows a pattern quite similar to that of the prepositional plural, relying primarily on the former stem class of nouns. While CSU generalized the a-stem endings to all noun classes, Hutsul retained several relics of the archaic inflectional system. Žylko’s 1955 description of the Hutsul dative plural notes the possible variant endings -um, -ym, and -im for former o-stem and jo-stem nouns and the ending -em (<ьмъ) for nouns of the former i-stem class. What appears to be the case by the early 20th century is that the a-stem ending -am/-jam have already been generalized throughout the paradigm as in CSU, with the exception of the former i-stems which have retained their archaic inflection. This process of generalization of the a-stem inflection is ongoing and, in the contemporary dialect, there is evidence that the a-stem inflection is beginning to overtake the i-stem paradigm which will likely result in the same manner of paradigmatic levelling as occurred in CSU. Examples (15a) and (15b) show the predominant dative plural ending of the former a-stem class, am < -amъ; examples (15c) and (15d) illustrate the process of levelling through incursions into the former o-stems, a process that was clearly already well underway by the early 20th century and quite entrenched today:

(15)  a. Ґаздам треба роботяги
‘Landowners need workers’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 185)

b. дівочкам доказували
‘they proved to the girls’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 13)

c. галасливим вітрам
‘to the noisy winds’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

d. я внукам це розказую
‘I won’t tell my grandsons’ (Vlad 1992)

As was the case with the prepositional plural, the archaic form of the i-stem noun for ‘people’ (Hutsul люде), a noun of the former i-stem class, has been particularly resilient in preserving the archaic ending -em and therefore provides solid evidence for the manner and speed of incursions of the a-stem inflectional endings into the i-stem paradigm. The i-stem ending was clearly the default form by the early 20th century (15e, 15f) and has remained remarkably stable in the

---

296 Zakrevs’ka 1991 also discusses this i-stem dative plural inflection in Hutsul.

297 Speaker is Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920)
contemporary dialect among a variety of speakers (15g - 15i) possibly owing to its high frequency (and resulting proclivity to fossilization) as well as its underlying plural form with the plural marker -e well-established. However, tokens of the levelled ending -am are starting to appear in the dialect despite the previous ubiquity of the archaic ending (15j):

e. стаєть людем шораз то тежче жити на світі
‘it will become difficult for people to live in the world’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)

f. Єк хотів, то викрив’єв людем роти
‘If he wanted, he showed people’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 184)

g. не лишеню людем
‘not only for people’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 25)

h. усім людем ми бажаєм мирно проживати
‘we wish all people to live peacefully’ (Savčuk 2008)

i. людем добре коло тебе
‘people feel good around you’ (Vlad 1992)

j. Она помогає людям жити
‘It helps people live’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 187)\textsuperscript{298}

While the preferred form is clearly людем even in the contemporary dialect, tokens of the standard form людям have begun appearing even among people whose speech is otherwise fairly conservative, such as the musician cited in (15j)\textsuperscript{299}. It has been noted that all forms of the noun люде ‘people’ have tended to remain more intact in their archaic and localized shape than other lexical items, which hints to the likelihood that in general this i-stem inflectional category is currently waning and being replaced by the standard inflectional paradigm, similar to the current situation with the prepositional plural endings.

3.2.4 The Genitive case

3.2.4.1 Feminine singular

\textsuperscript{298} Speaker is Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920)

\textsuperscript{299} Note, for example, that two of the four lexical items in this phrase are dialectically marked (она, помогає), while a third (жити) is neutral. It is only the form людям that clearly demonstrates CSU influence in its inflected shape.
While much of the Hutsul genitive inflection has developed along the same patterns as that of CSU, the feminine singular and the plural are notable exceptions. In both cases they have retained a form phonologically distinct from that of CSU.

In the case of the feminine singular, the distinction affects those nouns ending in a palatalized consonant in their nominative singular form, primarily the nouns of the former i-stem class ending in -ist. For this category of noun, the addition of the genitive desinence -y depalatizes the preceding consonant, in contrast to CSU where it is the palatalized consonant which affects the quality of the desinence triggering the soft series variant ending -i. Hrynčyšyn 2005 notes that this genitive form, mylosty, smerty, radosty, etc., had been proposed as the standard form for the genitive singular in the 1920s, but that it ultimately failed to take hold in CSU. In Hutsul, however, the form both took hold (16a) and has remained the preferred form in the dialect for former i-stem nouns (16b - 16d):

(16) a. вид старости
    ‘from old age’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

b. нема єсності
    ‘there is no clarity’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 44)

c. від байдужості
    ‘from indifference’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

d. й так до самої старости
    ‘and so until very old age’ (Vlad 1992)

While this process of depalatalization triggered by the addition of the genitive feminine singular ending is most frequently observed in nouns of the former i-stem class, Herman 2008 has also noticed its occurrence in former ū-stem nouns, such as krov, ljubov > krovy, ljubovy; however, he specifically notes that this declensional form has atrophied in recent years as a result of contact with CSU. However, tokens of this genitive form in -y can still be found in the

---

300 This desinence is historically as the original genitive singular ending for i-stem nouns was -i which, after vocalic merger, would become -y.
301 However, in addition to Hutsul, this forms is also frequently found in several neighboring dialects in Carpatho-Rusyn and Lemko.
302 Historically the genitive singular desinence for the ū-stem nouns was -e, so the Hutsul -y is not truly an archaism; it was likely innovated under the influence of the i-stem ending through the conflation of femiine nouns.
contemporary dialect (16g). The more significant change appears to be the retention of the stem vowel [o]: in the old dialect, *krov* would undergo a vowel change $o > y$ in the oblique cases (16e, 16d). This was a residue of the noun’s historical shape *kry* $> k\breve{r}y$, and is also found in the adjectival derivation *крівавий*, still current in CSU.

e. Сорочку від *криви* змиває
‘[He] washed blood off the shirt’ (Mančuk 2006 : 46)

f. єкби в нім ніколи нієкої *криви* й ни було
‘as if there had never been any blood in him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 186)

g. Прецінь одної *крови*
‘Nevertheless of the same blood’ (Vlad 1992)

What example (16g) seems to indicate is that the internal shape of кров in the oblique cases has begun to conform to CSU norms, preserving the nominative stem vowel rather than preserving its historical stem shape *kry*, which had been the tendency in the old dialect. (16g) further demonstrates that the genitive inflectional ending -y is still in use in the contemporary dialect, perhaps bolstered by the resilience of the former i-stems, creating a generalized genitive singular feminine ending -y. If that is the case, however, it does not appear to affect all categories of feminine nouns equally; in particular, feminine nouns ending in a postdental consonant consistently inflect in -i in the genitive case. This likely reflects the instability of the postdentals in the Hutsul phonetic system: although this set of consonants had previously been consistently palatalized, they are currently in a process of depalatalization. However, despite this depalatalization process, they tend to be inflected with the soft series genitive ending -i, reflecting a morphophonemic system that is currently in a state of flux and re-organization.

h. з першої *зустрічі*
‘from the first meeting’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 28)

i. Она зразу Довбушеvi *до душi* припала
‘She at once touched Dovbuš’s soul’ (VV No. 52)

---

303 CSU: крови
304 CSU nominative singular: зустріч; genitive singular: зустрічі
305 CSU nominative singular: душа; genitive singular: душі
306 Lyrics to a folk song about Oleksa Dovbuš, as recalled by a speaker born in 1916
Examples (16h) and (16i) both demonstrate genitive singular forms which conform precisely to the CSU declensional paradigm, despite the fluctuating status of the Hutsul postdentals. What is significant here is that, while the \(-y\) desinence originating from the former i-stems seems to have spread widely into other classes of feminine nouns, this spread has been inhibited in some cases on phonological grounds. This tendency is further supported by the changes taking place in the inflection of other grammatical cases. For example, (12l) shows a prepositional singular form from the contemporary dialect as \(нa \ dушi\), in contrast to an older example from Šekeryk-Donykiv which gives \(нa \ dушi\) (2007: 26). In both cases, the contemporary form seems to be yielding to contact-induced change, triggering a change in phonological quality of the desinence while shifting the inflectional paradigm toward that of CSU.

3.2.4.2 Plural

This genitive plural also demonstrates several instances of divergence from that of the CSU paradigm, in some cases paralleling the inflectional tendencies of the feminine singular. As was the case with feminine i-stems, masculine (predominantly former o-stem) nouns have a hard series ending \(-yv\)\(^{307}\) in contrast to CSU which developed the base masculine ending \(-iv\ (<u\text{-stem}-ovь)\). This has remained current even in the contemporary dialect:

(17)  a. памнiтаю лиш двох братив\(^{308}\)

‘I remember only two brothers’ (VV No. 29)\(^{309}\)

b. Я ни з ким из сусiдiв\(^{310}\) не мала сварки

‘I never had arguments with any of the neighbors’ (Vlad 1992)

As with the other grammatical cases, the i-stem paradigm has been particularly influential in the development of the Hutsul genitive plural inflection. While CSU has retained the i-stem genitive plural desinence \((i > eи)\) for an extremely limited number of nouns\(^{311}\), Hutsul has both changed the phonological quality of the ending \((-eи > -uи)\) as well as extended its domain to include a far

\(^{307}\) Although, in the case of nouns ending in a postdental, the genitive plural ending has been \(-iv\): нiгтi из пальнiв (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9), Серед хлопцiв кращих вибира (VV No. 52). This seems to parallel the tendency in the feminine singular, and is also likely a function of the changing phonetic quality of the postdental consonants in Hutsul.

\(^{308}\) CSU: брати

\(^{309}\) Speaker born in 1927

\(^{310}\) CSU: сусiдiв

\(^{311}\) This ending is used far less frequently in CSU than in standard Russian; however, it does encompass a few high frequency nouns such as люди > людей, дiти > дiтей, кiнь > коней.
wider range of lexical items, including both nouns of category and pluralia tantum (regardless of the noun’s former stem class), making this inflection far more productive than in the standard language.

For pluralia tantum, where CSU has also largely generalized the former i-stem ending, the primary distinction between Hutsul and the standard language ending is phonological, based solely on vowel quality of the desinence. Because the base shape of the inflection parallels CSU, this ending is very well-entrenched in Hutsul, both in the old dialect (17c, 17d) as well in the contemporary dialect (17e - 17g):

c. Через таких людій
‘Because of such people’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)

d. А бездітники люб’єт малих діти
‘Childless people love little children’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 12)

e. ші богато людій
‘many more people’ (VV, No. 29) 312

f. від самих людій
‘from the people themselves’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 13)

g. діти застанов’ювали
‘they interrupted the childrens’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

Similarly, this group includes the lexical item кони ‘horse’, whose genitive plural ending -yj is morphologically supported by the CSU genitive plural form konej:

h. Мій дєдя мав пару файних коний
‘My dad had a pair of good horses’ (VV No. 29)

While this ending, particularly in pluralia tantum, is both well-entrenched and supported by similar inflection in CSU, the phonological realization has become less stable and subject to

312 Speaker born in 1927
interference by CSU in part, perhaps, because of its clearly parallely shape which creates a close association with the CSU ending -ej:

i. Господи, єк я уже людей ни пизнаю
‘Lord, how I no longer recognize people’ (Vlad 1992)

j. Кілько я склала цих грошей
‘How much of this money I made’ (Vlad 1992)

Examples (17i) and (17j) demonstrate fully converged genitive plural endings. The point of convergence here, however, is not truly in the morphology, but rather is phonological in nature. Indeed, there is no pressure for morphological change in the case of these pluralia tantum as the two forms--Hutsul and CSU--already clearly coincide, making the small phonological adjustment a fairly predictable step in the context of close dialect contact.

The more marked difference in morphology is the extent to which the inflection -yj/-ej has been generalized in Hutsul. As noted above, the ending is limited to a very small number of nouns in CSU--far fewer than in Russian, for example. In Hutsul, however, this ending, i-stem in origin, has spread across various noun classes. Example (17k) below shows the genitive plural of море ‘sea’ as морий, quite similar to Russian морей, but in contrast to CSU морів313, which uses the generalized -iv that spread through the levelled CSU paradigm.

k. из-за далеких морий
‘from distant seas’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

More surprisingly, however, is that this ending -yj has been generalized to some lexical items belonging to nouns classes with no precedent at all for this genitive plural shape. In CSU, as in Russian, the default genitive plural ending for feminine nouns is the zero-ending. A lexical item such as xara ‘hut’ would lose the feminine marker in the genitive plural to become [бацамо] xам314. In Hutsul, however, the genitive plural desinence -yj provided a levelling force that entered into even former a-stem nouns, albeit it in a somewhat piecemeal manner, tending to first and foremost affect high frequency lexemes, such as the basic word for house/home, xama:

---

313 As a former jo-stem, the historical genitive plural ending was -h.
314 Historically such a-stem nouns would have had the genitive plural ending -h, which led to the contemporary zero-ending.
Where this ending occurs, even outside of its more common morphological environment, it has remained, likely as a fossilization. Further evidence of this fossilized quality is the tendency for the ending in these non-canonical environments to retain the local phonetic shape -yj, rather than yielding to CSU -ej, as in the case of the pluralia tantum.

$m$. єка й з хатий викочовала

‘who then rolled it out of the hut’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 30)

On the other end of this phenomenon is another unique trait of Hutsul inflectional morphology: semantically masculine but grammatically feminine nouns--former a- and ja-stems--are inflected as masculine nouns taking their ending from the u-stem paradigm.

$n$. скаржитися на газдів

‘[he] complains about the householder’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

$o$. бо то казали мама й дєдя, єкі знають від своїх дєдів тай мамий

‘for that’s what was said by mom and dad, who know from they dads and moms’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 27)

Interestingly, in both (17n) and (17o), the genitive plural ending used contains the soft series -i, unlike the more common Hutsul desinence containing the hard series -y, as discussed above. The indication is that grammatically masculine nouns--primarily of the former o-stem class--developed the hard series ending -yv, whereas masculine a-stems, because of their inherently different morphological shape, developed along a slightly different trajectory, leading to the normalization of the soft series ending -iv.

3.2.5 The Instrumental case

---

315 The nominative singular form is газда.
316 The nominative singular form is дєдя.
317 The form мамий provides another illustration of the levelling effects of the i-stem paradigm in the genitive plural. The nominative form, мама, would take the zero-ending in CSU, rendering [від] мам.
3.2.5.1 Singular

As was the case with the genitive plural, semantically masculine but grammatically feminine nouns are treated as grammatically masculine nouns in the instrumental singular inflection. This can be seen in example (13s) above (я з лисом на плечох: Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 61), as well as in more contemporary examples:

(18) a. Разом з моїм дядькем
‘Together with my dad’ (VV No. 29)

However, the more significant issue of the instrumental singular is that of the inflection for feminine nouns, a feature which is highly marked as a salient, uniquely local feature. In CSU, the feminine singular arose from the reflex -ojo (<ού) resulting in the modern desinence -oju. However, a Hutsul phonological innovation—lost intervocalic j, and postvocalic u > w—led to a secondary development -oju > -ou > -ow, orthographically rendered as -ov, phonetically realized as -(o)ў (Bevzenko 1969). As the stability of this form in the old dialect is of little question, only a few examples are offered to illustrate its usage (18b and 18c):

b. Лиш махнув байдужно руков
‘He only waved his hand indifferently (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 25)

c. Гірко бути сиротов!
‘It is bitter to be an orphan’ (Andrej Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk 2011)

Because this inflectional ending is so highly marked as an index feature of Carpathian—and very much Hutsul—identity, it has been quite resistant to contact-induced change and convergence toward the CSU paradigm. (18d - 18f) are but three examples of its contemporary use; what is

---

318 This is also true in Carpatho-Rusyn, as noted by Kushko 2007.
319 Nominative singular: лиса
320 Speaker born in 1927.
321 Its markedness is likely rivaled only by the phonological reflex ja > je. However, it should be noted that several other Carpathian dialects, including Carpatho Rusyn and Lemko, also share this feminine singular instrumental inflection.
322 In fact, this feature is so highly marked and well-known that it has been noted and discussed not only in Bevzenko 1969, but also in Herman 2008, Koval'čuk 2011, Lesjuk 2011, Mozer 2006, Zakrevs'ka 1991, among others.
323 Although the variant shape of the instrumental plural of кров’о is also of note: тот погар наповнився кров’ою (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 186). CSU: кров’о > кров’ою
most notably, however, are that converged forms with the CSU desinence -ою are exceedingly rare, even today:

d. лишень из мамов
‘left with mama’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 21)

e. я все житє займався музыков
‘I’ve played music by whole life’ (Vatamanjuk 2006: 187)324

f. З худобов і на полонинах я пробув усе життя
‘I have spent my whole life with the cattle in the mountain valleys’ (VV, No. 45)325

Example (18f) is particularly interesting as it hints as the ordering of some features of contact-induced change Hutsul. While the morphology of dialectal instrumental ending -ов remains fully intact, the noun життя demonstrates clear signs of phonological interference: the old Hutsul form житме, as seen in (18e), not only shows the typically Hutsul vocal reflex ja > je, but also the lack of the consonant gemination characteristic of CSU. While germination has been rather widely imported into the contemporary Hutsul dialect, the je vocal articulation is considered highly marked and resulting resistant to convergence; however, from example (18f) it seems possible that the highly marked instrumental feminine inflection may be even more resistant to contact induced change in the contemporary dialect.

3.2.5.2 Plural

It has been noted by several researchers (Bevzenko 1969, Žylko 1955, among others) that the old Hutsul dialect--along with several other southwestern dialects--was marked by a masculine and neuter instrumental plural form -y (<-ы), which arose from the o- and jo-stem paradigm326. Even by the time of Žylko’s description, this inflection had already become quite rare through replacement by the CSU universal instrumental plural ending -amy/-jamy. Indeed, today it should be considered that this archaic desinence is no longer in use in Hutsul, with the instrumental plural paradigm fully converged with that of CSU327.

3.2.5 The Vocative case

324 Speaker is Hutsul musician by the name of Mogur (born in 1920)
325 Speaker born in the 1930s.
326 Bevzenko gives the examples z braty, z voly, z barany, z kolesy
327 Current divergences from the CSU instrumental plural inflection are phonological in nature and do not constitute morphological variation.
While the vocative case is widely used in Ukrainian, particularly in CSU and the western dialects, the unique conditions of Hutsul life has led to the formation of a secondary, truncated vocative form. This form was made most famous by the film *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* in the memorable scenes of Marička called out to her beloved across the mountain range, “Iva!” Indeed, this vocative form arose from the need to communicate across long distances in the mountainous region inhabited by the Hutsuls. As Lesjuk notes, “This phenomenon [of the Hutsul vocative] should be connected, obviously, with the surroundings of the Hutsuls, with the living conditions in a mountainous area. Lumberjacks and herders, who were located great distances from one another, could shout out to each other only in mono or disyllabic bursts. This accounts for the vocalic reduction in post-tonic position” (2012). The formation of this vocative is achieve through truncation of the unstressed syllable in the ending. Hutsul writers have often used this form in their works to convey that sense of distance, and the need to bridge that distance, conditioning the lifestyle of their characters. However, the form became so entrenched that it was soon transferred to other communicative contexts, whether this issue of shouting across mountaintops was no longer an imminent need. In this way, the truncated vocative has become an alternative, informal means of address.

(19)  

a. ци чуеш, Дми’? 329
‘Do you hear, Dmy’?’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 261)

b. Будим видіти, ек ти шє так мудро говориш, Іва’330!
‘We will see how wise you talk, Iva’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 264)

c. Ану, Пала331, розказуй
‘Please, Pala, tell me’ (Mančuk 2006: 64)

The examples in (19a -19c) are taken from dialog in works by Šekeryk-Donykiv and Mančuk. These particular dialogs take place with the speakers in close proximity to one another, speaking in neutral tones not requiring the increased volume of loud bursts. This demonstrates the spread of the Hutsul vocative beyond its original domain as a way of calling to others across the mountains. Indeed the pragmatic context of the vocative form is indicative that the address is part of a conversation that could not have been sustained under the original communicative conditions within which the vocative was formed.

---

328 From the nominative form Іван.
329 Дмитро; CSU vocative: Дмитре
330 Іван; CSU vocative: Іване
331 Палагна; CSU vocative: Палагно
While this truncated vocative was originally limited to proper names, its spread into wider domains included extension to common nouns when used to address an interlocutor:

d. то я тебе, хло^332, ни знав лично
‘I didn’t know you personally, boy’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 356)

It would be noted, however, that even with the development of marked local vocative form, the standard vocative declensions were also commonly used.

e. А ти, брате, сиди
‘And you sit, brother’ (Mančuk 2006:60)

f. Юру--каже
‘Jura, he says’ (Mančuk 2006: 12)

g. На, Євдішко, лиш ни плачь
‘Here, Jevdiška, just don’t cry’ (Mančuk 2006 : 21)

The Hutsul vocative existed as a local variant which, once expanded beyond its original use of calling from across long distances, came to compete with the standard vocative form as there was little left in the way of semantic or pragmatic differences. While this local form still exists in the contemporary dialect, its use has declined greatly through replacement by the standard vocative. This may be due in part to the changing conditions of life among the Hutsuls: as people move into cities and discover the conveniences of cell phones, the monosyllabic bursts once used to call someone’s attention from far away are no longer as relevant. One speaker even informed me that the Hutsul vocative form had come to sound rather silly to him^333. As a result, tokens of this local form have become increasingly rare, while the standard vocative form fills the gaps:

h. Иди, Анно
‘Go, Anna’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 6)

i. Иди, Васильку
‘Go, Vasil’ka’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 5)

j. сто років, Марічко, аж страшно подумати.
‘a hundred years. Marička, it’s scary to think’ (Vlad 1992)

332 Хлопець; CSU vocative: хлопче
333 From personal conversation with Ivan Zelenčuk, a native Hutsul speaker and editor of Verxovyns'ki visti.
3.2.6 Conclusions

While Hutsul nominal inflectional morphology has shown signs of attrition through paradigmatic levelling over the past century, the maintenance of several key traits is worth noting. In particular, it is clear that the feminine instrumental single ending –ov serves the function of a network marker and has been widely retained among contemporary speakers. However, its articulation as –oû does not significantly diverge from that of the CSU feminine desinence of –oju, which suggests that it does receive relatively greater support from the standard language than do other inflectional endings which demonstrate greater distance from those of CSU. While many inflectional endings have undergone leveling leading to overall systemic simplification, clear divergence has been maintained in Hutsul. As was the case with verbal inflection, those points of divergence which have been most resilient are those where the morphological shape is determined by local phonological traits, particularly the maintenance of the continued salience of the nominative plural ending –e and the genitive plural ending –ej. Where there is less clear phonological support—such as the prepositional singular ending and the prepositional plural ending—there is an apparent pattern of CSU incursions into Hutsul inflection. In general, it can be said that Hutsul phonology has been more prone to CSU influence than has morphology, but that morphology has also demonstrated clear vulnerability to contact-induced change. However, the intersection of the two systems at the morphophonemic level has provided the relevant traits relatively greater resistance to such change.
Chapter Four: Syntax

While some aspects of Hutsul syntax—the continued use of the dual and the relatively robust clitic system, among other noticeable structural archaisms—have been pointed out by numerous researchers (Koval'čuk 2011, Zakrevs'ka 1991, Bevzenko 1969, Hrynčyšyn 2005, Lesjuk 2012, among others), the analysis has focused primarily on a static snapshot of peculiarities, rather than the dynamics of the syntactic system over time and under the conditions of contact with CSU. However, the degree to which syntax yields to contact-induced pressures is very much still under debate. Sankoff 2001, for example, prefers to avoid dealing directly with syntactic change, instead subsuming it under the classifications of lexical or pragmatic change, with any syntactic modifications simply a by-product on larger structural change. In this paradigm, syntactic change is triggered by phonological changes, lexical borrowing, or other issues, making syntax a function of discourse/pragmatics, rather than a topic warranting separate investigation. As she reasonably concludes, "markedness is often less clear in syntax than in phonology, and internally motivated change is often as likely, and more parsimonious, an explanation" (2001). In the case of Hutsul syntax, the investigation is further hindered by its typological proximity to CSU which has led to the development of numerous parallel structures, making the notion of markedness both critical and ephemeral. This explains why most researchers have prefers to emphasize a handful of clearly archaic traits which have been largely and unarguably lost in the standard language, rather than attempt to untangle the less clear examples of a distinct Hutsul syntactic system.

Thomason and Kaufman take a somewhat more optimistic view about the possibility of teasing out syntactic change in contact languages, although they too link syntactic change to other changes in the language system, particularly phonological: "In such cases, where there is phonological interference, there will be a comparable degree of syntactic interference too….Even in cases of minor phonological interference, it may well be that minor syntactic interference is to be expected" (1998: 38). The primary condition they place on such structural interference is widespread bilingualism among the target population, a condition readily met by contemporary Hutsul-speakers. Interestingly, Thomason and Kaufman also posit that syntactic change—because of its link to phonological change—it will precede changes to inflectional morphology. Previous chapters of this dissertation have assessed the degree and trajectory of change in both Hutsul phonology and morphology, including inflectional morphology; the goal of this chapter is to investigate the degree and manner to which the syntactic system has evolved through sustained contact with CSU, as well as the condition of widespread bilingualism/bidialectalism noted by Thomason and Kaufman.

4.1 Prepositions
4.1.1 The preposition до

In Hutsul, as in other Slavic languages, the preposition *do* indicates movement toward an object, place, or person. While CSU has generalized its meaning and usage to a greater degree than has Russian, with Ukrainian *do* used in contexts requiring *k* in Russian, the grammatical case triggered is consistently the genitive regardless of meaning or purpose. In Hutsul, however, the domain of the preposition *do* is further expanded, taking over the function of the CSU preposition *v/u* in its directional use indicating a movement to or into a place. In addition, the grammatical case required by *do* is often unclear, seeming to allow at times dative, accusative, and genitive (the last in conformance with CSU norms). The use of genitive is determined by the pragmatic purpose of movement towards a person--rather than to a place--which is structurally parallel to the syntax found in other Ukrainian dialects, including CSU:

(1)  

a. Добре, що дорогу знав до діда

‘It’s good I knew the road to grandpa’*[s house]* (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

b. з’їди знов до нас

‘come to us again’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 24)

The more interesting aspect of these examples lies in the form of the preposition *do*. As previously noted (see chapter “Phonology: Vowels”), this proposition can be truncated to *d’*, which is not the case in the above examples using genitive. Where the truncated form *d’* is used, the more frequent structure contains the noun in the dative case. There is no shortage of examples of this in the old dialect, illustrated below in examples (1c-1f):

(1) c. летів я д’горі

‘I flew to the mountain’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

d. з того світа д’нам

‘from that world to us’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 66)

e. Тай обернувся д’жінці лицем

‘He turned his face to the woman’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 192)

f. єк коханка д’коханцеви, єк жінка д’своєму чьоловікови

‘Like a lover to her lover, like a wife to her husband’ (Mančuk 2006: 33)

---

334 In this way, the Hutsul preposition bears greater similarity to Lemko than to Carpatho-Rusyn, which retains use of *v/u* (Kushko 2007).
The contrast in grammatical case between those examples in (1a-1b) and those in (1c-1f) is intriguing as it seems to indicate that vowel truncation in the preposition in some way determines grammatical outcome (genitive vs. dative) and/or semantic content (differentiating the closely connected movements of to/up to vs. toward/in the direction of). In this sense, it may be that the full form preposition do followed by the genitive case is the equivalent of the CSU directional structure v/u followed by the accusative, whereas truncated d’ + dative functions as the CSU structure do + genitive (i.e. Russian k + dative). Although the evidence thus far is inconclusive, it is potentially indicative of a tendency observed in the old dialect. Furthermore, this tendency is often replicated in the contemporary dialect. Where the truncated d’ appears, it is followed by a noun in the dative:

- g. вертались до хати
  ‘we returned to the hut’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 32)

- h. можна до мамці заскочіти
  ‘it’s possible to rush to mama’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 13)

- i. та й такі навертала д’ям…
  ‘so she turns to us’ (Vlad 1992)

- j. най би присилав д’нему старости
  ‘let him be sent old age’ (Vlad 1992)

The truncated preposition d’ occurs far more frequently than do in both the old and contemporary dialects; however, where do occurs, it continues to be followed by the genitive case:

- k. причиляв до колиби з ліса
  [he] trudged to the kolyba from the forest’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 39)

---

335 In addition, the truncated form d’ may have arisen from the old form id, which also appears in sources of the old dialect. Where the preposition takes the form id, the syntactic resolution is invariably the dative case: прийшов ід нему сам Михайло Прокін’юків (Şekeryk-Donykyiv 2007: 74); А ід нему (VV, No. 55). This conflation of do and id into a single elided form may indeed explain the appearance of the dative following d’.

336 The preposition id seems to have fallen out entirely from the contemporary dialect.
The semantic implications of *do* + genitive vs. *d’* + dative are unclear: while it would indeed be tempting to posit a clear semantic dichotomy based on the norms of CSU *v/u* + accusative vs. *do* + genitive, the implications may in fact be more complex. Within the space of a single transcribed page, an informant338 from Jastrems'ka 2008: 233, uses three distinct expressions of motion to a destination, each seeming to indicate a slightly difference inference:

m. дуже мало ходив до школи
‘I didn’t go to school very often’

n. пішов я у школу
‘I went to the school’

o. прийшов я д’хаті
‘I arrived at the house’

In example (1m) which uses *do* followed by a genitive, the context is clearly one of general repeated motion, indicated by both the adverb *malo* and the use of the indeterminant verb *xodyty*. In contrast (1n), using *u* + accusative--a structure that had been previously largely absent from the old dialect, but which has begun appearing339--indicates a one time, single motion. The example in (1o) of *d’* + dative, however, seems to indicate the motion of arrival at a specific destination. While the most frequent Hutsul syntactic expression of motion to/toward a destination remains *d’* + dative, there does seem to be indication of semantic differentiation of the variant prepositions, although it is difficult to determine whether that has long been the case, or whether this is a new development. What does appear clear is that *d’* + dative remains salient in Hutsul, despite its lack of correspondence to any CSU syntactic structure; however, the more

337 In the old dialect, the desinence in церкви could have indicated either dative or genitive; however, this contemporary writer uses the CSU-influenced dative form церкви elsewhere in the text, indicating that this context is indeed genitive.
338 Born in 1932
339 The use of v/u + accusative seems to be a fairly new--and almost certainly contact-induced--development in Hutsul. It appears to remain relatively rare, but occasional tokens do appear, such as молоко у хату, а ни з хати (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 23)
recent emergence of \(v/u\) + accusative, while still limited, is likely the product of contact, and may provide further impetus to differentiation among the variants.

4.1.2 The preposition ‘about’

The structure used in CSU to express the notion of thinking/talking/telling/etc. ‘about’ someone/something is the preposition \(pro\) + accusative. In Hutsul, however, the more common preposition expressing the idea ‘about’ has been \(za\) (+accusative)\(^{340}\). While the construction with \(za\) was more frequent in the old dialect (2a, 2b), even by the early 20th century, \(pro\) had begun appearing as a variant (2c, 2d):

(2)  

a. Забув навіть \(за\) свої нидороблені хати
   ‘[He] even forgot about his unfinished huts’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)

b. \(за\) мене ніхто нічо нифайного не говорить
   ‘nobody says anything bad about me’ (Mančuk 2006: 17)

c. лиш тепер \(про\) це я си боєв признаватиси дідови
   ‘only now am I afraid to confess to grandpa’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

d. лиш \(про\) ню мислит
   ‘[he] only thinks about her’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

Evidence from the contemporary dialect, however, indicates a marked decrease in the use of the preposition \(za\) as \(pro\) gains increasingly wider use:

e. розказували и \(про\) свої колибарські обжитиці
   ‘I also told about our cottage residences’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 34)

f. Та ж \(про\) него є у Шухевича
   ‘Šukevyč also [wrote] about him’ (Vlad 1992)

\(^{340}\) Kushko 2007 notes that Carpatho-Rusyn uses both \(za\) and \(pro\) + accusative, whereas Lemko typically uses \(o\) + locative.
g. я розкажу про него

‘I will tell about her’ (Vlad 1992)

While the structure utilizing *pro* seems to have been in use as a doublet to *za* even fairly far back into the history of the dialect, what is new is that it has apparently begun forcing *za* out of use. While such semantic doublets tend to be unstable as a result of redundancy creating equivalence, it is significant that the preposition which has gained predominance is the one parallel in CSU and most other Ukrainian dialects.

4.2 The dual

Unlike most dialects of Ukrainian, including CSU, Hutsul has preserved the dual form for feminine (and rarely neuter) as a counting form for nouns after the numbers 2 and 3 (and rarely 4). This dual form is identical in shape to the singular prepositional/dative forms, and contrasts phonologically with the standard nominative plural form used after 2,3, and 4 in other Ukrainian dialects. The preservation of this archaic morphosyntactic feature is highly unusual in Slavic: as Schenker writes, “Of all three Proto-Indo-European numbers--singular, dual, and plural--the dual has shown itself to be the least stable. It was still a regular category in Old Church Slavonic, and its vestiges are found in all the Slavic languages, but as a grammatical category it has survived only in Slovenian and two Sorbian languages” (1995: 104). Indeed, the fact that it has survived in Hutsul is quite surprising, particularly as this is precisely a place where ongoing phonological change and reassortment--particularly in the distribution of the *i/y* phones--might be expected to trigger syntactic change. However, the dual form is has been fairly stable in Husul throughout the 20th century. It was apparently well-entrenched in the old dialect: with the exception of Mančuk, most sources consistently use the dual form for feminine nouns after the numbers 2 and 3, a fact readily apparent when the same source offers a phonologically contrasting plural form, ruling out phonemic merger as a potential explanation for the true form:

(3) а. дві голубі кварти

‘two blue jugs’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 17)

This form dual form is contrasted with the nominative plural in the same passage:

---

341 Mančuk uses the plural form for feminine nouns following the numbers 2 and 3 rather than the dual: уже дві ГОДИНИ Я ЗА НИМ ХОДЖУ (2006: 12); ДВІ ПАРИ ПОСТОПІ В МЕТ КОШТУВАТИ 4 ЗЛОТІКИ (2006: 26). This corresponds to the syntactic rules of CSU and most other East Slavic dialects.
b. тоти кварти
‘those jugs’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 17)

Because the context provides for a tokens of the both the dual and the plural form, it is clear that the ending *i* is an intentional choice of dual, rather than a possible product of phoneme conflation. Further, because the feminine dual ending is soft series [i, it triggers velar palatalization, as it does in both the propositional and dative cases, such as in (3c) and (3d):

c. весні половег убев дві курці⁴²
‘in the spring, the fieldsman killed two chickens’ (Rudnytskyj 1965: 43)

d. там голі дві дівці⁴³
‘there were two naked girls there’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 61)

The dual has been remarkably resilient throughout the 20th century, despite its lack of support in East Slavic in general, and in Ukrainian in particular. Until recent times, it remained salient, and is still in use in contemporary speech:

e. були у нас три корові⁴⁴
‘we had three cows’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 234)⁴⁵

f. стоит воно там дві годині
‘it stands there for two hours’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 263)⁴⁶

Evidence for the dual’s erosion, however, is also easily observed. By the early 21st century, Plytka-Horycvit was already vacillating between the dual (3f) and the plural (3g):

f. навіть дві-три мінуті
‘even two-three minutes’ (2005: 27)

g. єк дві - три ниткє шитні
‘like two-three sewing threads’ (2008: 20)

---

³⁴² CSU plural form: курки
³⁴³ CSU plural form: дівки
³⁴⁴ He also makes a clear phonological contrast with the plural form корови
³⁴⁵ Speaker born in 1932
³⁴⁶ Speaker born in 1953
In the most contemporary, converged speech, the dual has atrophied to the point of loss. In this example from Vlad, not only in the plural form of the noun used (in place of the former dual), but the verb conjugation also represents a CSU contact-induced inflection:

h. вона знає дві пташки
‘she knows two birds’ (1992)

While it is rather remarkable that the dual form has been preserved in Hutsul as long as it has, the current trajectory seems to be toward weakening in favor of the plural form. This is likely the result of both externally-motivated and internal change: First, CSU contact has almost certainly played a role in the decline of this form which has long since disappeared throughout the mainstream speech community. Second, it is likely that an internal levelling process has motivated syntactic conflation of feminine, neuter, and masculine nouns, the latter which has long required the plural form in Hutsul. Despite these complex dynamics--none of which work in favor of dual retention--the form seems to have been salient enough for a long enough period of time in the dialect’s history, that it has remained a current form, at least in the most conservative speech. In more converged speech--among speakers whose dialect has been heavily influenced by CSU in other areas of morphology and phonology--the form has apparently already fallen out, a fact that predicts a pessimistic for one of the few remaining duals in Slavic.

4.3 Animate direct objects

Animacy in Ukrainian became syntactically encoded started due the old Ukrainian period (approx. 11th-14th centuries). During this period, when a singular noun denoting a person appeared as a directed object, the genitive--rather than the nominative--became required. By the early middle period (approx. 14th-16th centuries) this was expanded to include plural nouns indication persons, leading to a move from znaju bratenyky to znaju bratenykuv ‘I know the brothers’ (Shevelov 1993). Hutsul, however, originally preserved the nominative form of animate nouns used as direct objects in a phrase. While the evidence for this phenomenon is rather limited, it was clearly still in use in the early 20th century:

(4) а. він ласився дивити разом з хлопчішами на голі дівки
‘he and the boys little enviously at the naked girls’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 61)

347 Specifically, this is nouns denoting persons and excludes nouns denoting animals and other organically animate beings. Unlike Russian, many dialects of Ukrainian do not treat animals as grammatically animate, although variation exists. See examples 3c and 3h for animals as non-animate direct objects.
This construction, however, has failed to survive in Hutsul which now uses the genitive in direct objects denoting persons, syntactically aligning with CSU and other East Slavic languages in this case:

b. я собі підобрав хлопців
‘I chose some boys for myself’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 236)348

c. а тепер пастухів тяжко найти
‘but now it is hard to find shepherds’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 258)349

4.4 Possession

This issues surrounding possessive constructions in Hutsul highlight the problems of both typological proximity and markedness. CSU admits two constructions indication possession: The first utilizes a nominative subject followed by the very maty + accusative object. The second construction requires the preposition v/u followed by a genitive noun indicating the possessor and a nominative subject denoting the item possessed. These two constructions are considered semantic and often stylistic equivalents, although average distribution is often geographically determined, with eastern speakers--under greater influence from Russian--more inclined toward the v/u + gen. + nom. structure, and western speakers more frequently using the structure with the verb maty. When all things are equal, it is difficult to gauge whether either structure could be marked, as both a clearly salient, even across geographic lines. In the Carpathian dialects, the distribution of possessive constructions also appears to be unevenly distributed, with Carpatho-Rusyn typified by the u + gen. + nom variant, and Lemko predominantly using the maty structure (Kushko 2007). Hutsul has historically shown preference for the maty possessive construction, although u + gen. + nom has also long been in use, with little apparent semantic or stylistic distinction. Table 1 illustrates the relative distribution of the two possessive constructions in sample texts from the old dialect:

348 Speaker born in 1932
349 Speaker born in 1953
Table 1  Possession: Old Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maty + accus</th>
<th>u + gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč</td>
<td>1910-1920</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk</td>
<td>1920-1930</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 illustrates, there was a strong preference for the *maty* possessive construction in the old dialect, although the construction with *u* was also in use. *Maty* was particularly preferred in affirmative statement of possession, such as:

(5)  a. а в мене такий дедя
     ‘I have such a dad’ (Xotkevyč 1966: 333)

b. він наймудріший голос має
     ‘he has a most wise voice’ (Mančuk 2006: 15)

c. Я мав страх
     ‘I had fear’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 9)

There appears to be a correlate slight preference for *u* construction in negative statements:

d. дітей нема
   ‘[he] has no children’(Xotkevyč 1966: 359)

e. у них ні паски, ні мясо, ні хати
   ‘they have no bread, no meat, no hut’ (Mančuk 2006: 22)

f. у моєго деді цього звичаю нима
   ‘my dad didn’t have such a habit’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 14)

---

350 Pages 333-361
351 Pages 11-21
352 Pages 8-27
However, the *maty* construction was also possible in the negative, although this seems somewhat less common:

\[ g. \text{ уже ни має біданка чім голов прикрити} \]
\[ ‘The poor girl has nothing with which to cover her head’ (Mančuk 2006: 26) \]

In the contemporary dialect, the two possessive constructions continue to co-exist, although their relative distribution has shifted somewhat, as illustrated in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maty + accus</th>
<th>u + gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit 353</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 354</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 355</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the construction with *maty* continues to be preferred, the *u* construction has become slightly more frequent. This seems to parallel trends in CSU, as well as most other southwestern dialects. Any syntactic difference that may have existed between affirmative and negative statements has been largely levelled. Affirmative statements are primarily expressed with *maty* (5h), although the *u* construction is also used, if somewhat less frequently (5i):

\[ h. \text{ Я мав на полі кошєри} \]
\[ ‘I had two flocks in the field’ (VV, No. 45) 356 \]

\[ i. \text{ Є цего народу} \]
\[ ‘These people have’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 16) \]

\[ 353 \text{ Born circa 1928} \]
\[ 354 \text{ Speaker born in 1932, from Jastrems'ka 2008: 233-236} \]
\[ 355 \text{ Speaker born in 1953, from Jastrems'ka 2008: 256-264} \]
\[ 356 \text{ Speaker born in 1930s} \]
Although the u construction is still used in negative statements of possession (5j, 5k), the maty construction has been more common in such cases (5l - 5n), with such variation common even for individual speakers (5k, 5n):

j. Але у свекрухє нима жєлостини
   ‘But the mother-in-law doesn’t have mercy’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 14)

k. у нас був голод - зерна нема, хліба нема
   ‘We had hunger--no grain, no bread’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 235)357

l. Они дітий ни мали
   ‘They didn’t have children’ (Vatamanjuk 2006:184-187)358

m. Тоти вівці, котрі єгнут не мали
   ‘Those sheep which didn’t have lambs’ (VV, No. 45)359

n. нічо не мали
   ‘they had nothing’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 236)360

4.5 The Imperfective Future

Ukrainian has developed two constructions for expressing the imperfective future: the first, composed with the auxiliary verb buty, is often referred to as the analytic future; the second, formed with maty, is generally referred to as the synthetic future. The former likely spread to Ukrainian361 at the end of the 14th century, while the latter emerged somewhat earlier, around the 13th century. While both are considered standard forms admitted in CSU, their relative distribution and possible differentiation has been the subject of speculation (Danylenko 2010, Franks and King 2000, among others)362. Danylenko draws an intriguing parallel between the dynamics of the two imperfective future constructions with the two possessive structures discussed above:

---

357 Speaker born in 1932
358 Speaker born in 1920
359 Speaker born in 1930s
360 Speaker born in 1932
361 Possibly from the Czech area (Danylenko 2010)
362 In particular, Danylenko 2010 has argued that the synthetic future has an essentially inceptive meaning in both the southwestern and southeastern dialects, while Franks and King 2000 conclude that the synthetic future has yielded to the analytic in most dialects of Ukrainian, including CSU. Danylenko 2012 also doubts the spread of the future with buty into the most archaic southwestern dialects, including Hutsul.
If the so-called *have*-oriented possessive patterning is typical of the WE languages, while the *be*-oriented patterning is characteristic of East Slavic, one legitimately wonders how the inflectional future with the auxiliary ‘to have’ could have emerged in Ukrainian….Thus the *be*-constructions prevail in the east (presumably under influence from Russian literary norms), while the use of *have*-constructions in the west is strengthened by Polish traditions. (2010: 160)

Following this line of reasoning, it seems logical to conclude that the relative distribution of the future forms would organized along geographic line, as is also the case with the possessive expression. This would place Hutsul firmly on the side of the *have*-oriented dialects with a preference for the future with *maty*.

Table 3 illustrates the relative distribution of the future tense with *maty* vs. the future tense with *buty*. The first three sources demonstrating tendencies in the old dialect clearly indicate that the future with *maty* was clearly preferred in the early 20th century. However, the second three sources, representing the contemporary dialect, indicate that this distribution differential has decreased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>With <em>maty</em></th>
<th>With <em>buty</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč³⁶³</td>
<td>1910-1920</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk³⁶⁴</td>
<td>1920-1930</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv³⁶⁵</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit³⁶⁶</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1³⁶⁷</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2³⁶⁸</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

363 Pages 333-361
364 Pages 11-21
365 Pages 8-27
366 Born circa 1928
367 Speaker born in 1932, from Jastrem'ska 2008: 233-236
368 Speaker born in 1953, from Jastrem'ska 2008: 256-264
The future with *maty* was undeniably in wider use in the old dialect, often formed with a clitic form preceding the infinitive verb:

(6) a. Меш видіти єк  
‘You will see how’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 26)

b. Ти ше меш багато говорити?  
‘Are you going to keep talking?’ (Mančuk 2006: 16)

c. хто бирше віробит дерева, мет бирше мати грошій  
‘he who cuts more wood will have more money’ (Mančuk 2006: 25)

While less common, the construction with *buty* was also in use in the old dialect, with little pragmatic or semantic differentiation:

d. Єк ти ни хочь говорити, то я буду говорити  
‘If you don’t want to speak, then I will speak’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 38)

e. баба будет бити  
‘granny will beat [you]’(Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 19)

f. бо буду бити, єк знайду  
‘I will beat [him] when I find [him]’(Xotkevyč 1966: 343)

As Table 3 also illustrates, the construction with *buty* is becoming increasingly common in the contemporary dialect:

g. мама єк умре, шо я буду робити?  
‘if mama dies, what will I do?’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2005: 9)

h. Бог буде карати газдів  
‘God will punish the householders’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 22)

This construction with *buty* co-exists as an equivalent expression to the *maty* future:
i. спати вже мут по людське
‘they will sleep like people’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 40)

j. за оце мете платити
‘they will pay for that’ (Jastrems'ka 2008: 234)

An important aspect of the future tense with maty is the manner in which it has been historically formed. While forms of the auxiliary originally functioned as clitics, frequently appearing in pre-position, they later became grammaticalized as post-position affixes in CSU. In Hutsul, this process remains incomplete, with forms of maty still functioning as clitics, able to appear in both pre- and postposition. As will be discussed below, Hutsul the current Hutsul clitic system has destabilized greatly in recent years and is currently undergoing a process of atrophy and, in some cases, loss. This collapse of the clitic system has implications for the status and distribution of the Hutsul future tense with maty which is largely dependent on a clitic auxiliary. As the clitic weakens, the tense itself must either be reorganized with the CSU postposition affix, or decline in use. In fact, the evidence indicates the tense itself is--slowly--losing some ground to the future with buty. However, it is highly unlikely that the future tense with buty will completely overtake maty in the near future; rather, as CSU demonstrates, both can exist in roughly parallel usage, albeit it with altered distribution. These future tenses will be discussed in greater detail below.

4.6 The Compound Past Tense

In addition to the compound future tense which has developed and remained throughout Ukrainian, several southwestern dialects have retained various forms of a compound past tense. In some cases, this takes the shape of the the old perfect composed of the personal forms of the auxiliary verb buty combined with an l-participle. The auxiliary is often cliticized, creating the verbal shape khodyv-em, khodyla-m, etc., which was common throughout the southwest until recent times, now surviving in only a handful of dialects (Bevzenko 1969). While this form

---

369 Speaker born in 1932
370 According to Danylenko 2010, the postpositioning of the auxiliary clitic started in the 16th century in Western Ukraine, and from there spread to Southeast Ukrainian, and finally to Northeast Ukraine possibly as late as the early 18th century.
371 -jem, -m < jesm, -jes, -s < jesy, -smo < jesmo, -ste < jeste
372 Including Pokuttja-Bukovina, and Lemko, the latter in a somewhat altered form, e.g. pryšlyzme (CSU: my pryjšly). Carpatho-Rusyn has also retained the pluperfect tense, e.g. ljubyv jem bym: I had liked it (Kushko 2007).
373 This form is archaic in origin but fell out of most Ukrainian dialects between the 15th-18th century (Rudnytsky 1965), although Mozer 2006 notes that they continued to be used in Galician texts through the first half of the 19th century.
of the compound past does not seem to have been widely used in Hutsul, a similar tense, arising from the aorist form of the auxiliary *bутy*, was widespread in local speech. While the auxiliary was always syntactically paired with an l-participle, it was also functionally a clitic which could attach to almost any prosodic element in the phrase, either pre- or post-verbally. The old dialect demonstrates a full range of these forms, used with some frequency.

The masculine first person singular and plural arose *ми < есмъ (єсми, есмо)* followed by the masculine marker *x* which arose from the first person singular aorist form of *бутi*, rendering the form *смiх* (7a, 7b):

(7) a. Ни розумів емiх, цi вiн добрий, цi сердитiй.
   ‘I didn’t understand whether he was kind or angry’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 47)

b. Тай сокотили емiх
   ‘We watched’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 80)

The feminine singular form arose from the same source, but lacks the final -*x*:

c. так емi гo знiнавiдiла
   ‘so she hated him’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 46)

The second person singular an plural have the shape *єс* (7d) and *єсте* (7e, 7f):

d. А що єс чов?
   ‘And what did you hear?’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 66)

e. що єсте помагли у мирностi
   ‘what did you help to create peace’(Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 33)

f. що єсте на таку бiданку зауважали
   ‘so that you would respect such as poor person’ (Mančuk 2006:21)

In the above examples, the compound past auxiliary is treated as a clitic, a phenomenon which will be discussed further below. However, the auxiliary also be treated as an affix; when this occurs, the initial *e* is dropped before being attached onto the verbal stem:

g. Чюлисте, їй перше галасував по надвiрю

---

374 Its placement within the phrase will be discussed further below in the section on past preterit clitics.
‘You’ve heard that recently he was shouting in the yard’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 46)

Of the contemporary sources, only Plytka-Horycvit uses the compound past tense with any regularity, and then primarily in the first person singular form with the shape сми:

h. сми сама постаріласи
‘I myself tried’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008: 174)

Other persons are far more rare in her writing and, when they do appear, the ending has been conflated with a now-generally past tense marker сми, such as in the third person masculine singular form in (7i):

i. таке, сми признавси
‘so he confessed’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008:170)

From the paucity of examples of the compound past tense in the contemporary sources, it is evident that use of the past tense auxiliary marker has greatly atrophied over the past century. In part, this is likely the result of a lack of parallel in CSU, as well as general atrophy of the clitic system needed to support its continued use. The current status of the clitic system, including the compound past clitics, will be discussed below.

4.7 Clitics

As early as 1935, Jakobson noted that the southwestern dialects of Ukrainian were unique in East Slavic for their preservation of a robust clitic system which had been lost to other East Slavic dialects. This he attributed to the dialect group’s relatively weaker prosodic system (1971). Jakobson’s brief attention to the clitic system of the southwestern Ukrainian dialect group was left largely unresearched until recent years although, as Onyškevyč notes, the existence of these clitic forms is one of the defining features of the southwestern group of dialects (1969). In addition to Jakobson’s conclusion about the role of prosody, these dialects have also been relatively isolated which has further enabled the preservation of archaic features lost in other East Slavic languages, including clitics.

4.7.1 Pronominal Clitics
Unlike contemporary standard Ukrainian (CSU), which has only full forms of the personal pronouns, the Hutsul dialect has parallel clitic forms of both accusative and dative pronouns.375

According to Onyškevyč 1969, the clitic forms of the personal pronouns in East Slavic developed under the influence of the reflexive clitic sy which was then extended to the dative case of personal pronouns. For some period of time, pronominal clitics became the primary pronominal form, overtaking the use of the full form dative singular pronouns. Evidence of this can be found in Kievan Rus and Old Ukrainian written sources. The loss of the clitic forms in East Slavic occurred gradually: first, the reflexive clitic sy became grammaticalized as an affix, then, starting in the XV century the 2sg dative clitic pronoun ty began to disappear. By the XVI century the 1sg dative clitic pronoun my was finally lost. However, throughout this time, these clitics forms were maintained in the relatively isolated southwestern dialect group, particularly in the more remote areas of the Transcarpathian subgroup, including Carpathian Rusyn (Zakarpattia dialect), Lemko, Bojko, and Hutsul.376

As Onyškevyč 1969 further notes, the formation of the clitic pronoun forms in contemporary southwestern dialects can be divided into two groups: the first is the oldest group which arose as reflexes of archaic forms my, ty, sy; the second is a newer, contaminated forms which arose as a result of the influence of stressed (i.e. full, non clitic) forms: mi, ti, si.377 In the modern southwestern dialects secondary stressed (full) forms are now the unmarked form, but the previously primary clitic forms are still in use,378 albeit in more restricted contexts.

Notable in the use of pronominal clitics in the old Hutsul dialect, is a strong preference for the clitic form in dative experiencer constructions expressing feeling or state of being, with numerous instances of the type illustrated in (8a-8c):

(8) a. Добре, що дорогу знав до діда, то ж страху ми нi було
   good     that  road.accus knew.past to grandpa.gen, so =emph fear.gen my  ny  bulo
   =me.dat =neg   was.PAST
   ‘It’s good that I knew the way to grandpa’s, so I had no fear.’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

375 Bevzenko 1969 also notes that the accusative and dative pronominal clitics are largely restricted to the singular in contemporary southwestern dialects. Indeed, while a few, seemingly rare, examples of a plural pronominal clitic can be found in Old Hutsul, I have not encountered any plural pronominal clitics in the modern Hutsul dialect.
376 Mozer 2006 notes that pronominal clitics were used in written sources from many southwestern dialects in Galicia well into the first half of the 19th century; in particular, these clitics regularly appeared in early 19th century poetry.
377 Onyškevyč 1969 states that only dative pronominal clitics are currently in use in modern southwestern dialects; however, the Transcarpathian groups retains both dative and accusative with varying degrees of salience.
378 Budžak-Jones 1997 further adds that pronominal clitics are always definite, i.e. they are used exclusively to encode old or specific information. However, it could also be argued that all pronouns are by nature referential and therefore have a tendency for definiteness in their usage.
b. то трошки ми попустила
so little =he.dat allowed.past
‘So he was allowed a little’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 10)

c. Робітник ми дорого коштивав
the worker =him.dat dearly cost.past
‘The worker cost him a lot of money’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

Similar examples can be widely found in the older texts, indicating a clear preference for pronominal clitics in this context. However, this structural pattern appears to be changing: current evidence suggests that this use of pronominal clitics has not been strong enough over the past 100 years to resist pronominal clitic atrophy, paralleling CSU’s historical trajectory toward ultimate clitic loss. In (8d), for example, Plytka-Horycvit uses a full form personal pronoun where a clitic form had previously been strongly preferred in old Hutsul:

d. бо ми в клубі нога заболіла
for so me.dat at club.gen leg hurt. PAST
‘Because at the club my leg started to hurt’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008)

The historical preference for clitic forms in this construction can be illustrated by these typical examples from old Hutsul, dating approximately 70 years prior:

e. З печі порсла ми на ногу іскра
from stove.gen flew.past =him.dat at leg.accus spark
‘From the stove, a spark flew onto his leg’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 18)

f. а вогонь ми в лиці
and fire =him.dat to face.accus
‘And the fire flew into his face’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

Examples (8e) and (8f) demonstrate a historical parallel to (8d) and suggest a process of atrophy among pronominal clitics. Similarly, the old dialect provides evidence of the common use of dative pronominal clitics to indicate possession, as in (8g):

g. серце ми сі б’є з радості
heart =me.dat =refl beats from happiness.gen
‘My hearts beats from happiness’ (Andrej Šeptyc'kyj cited in Lesjuk)
The contemporary dialect, however, shows little maintenance of this dative of possession seen in (8g). Rather, the pronominal clitics that remain in common use seem to be largely restricted to either direct or indirect objects, with a strong tendency toward second position enclitic ordering whereby the object clitic directly follows a fronted verbal host.

Examples (8h) and (8i) demonstrate verbal fronting with second position pronominal enclitics, with an accusative pronoun (8h) and a dative pronoun (8i):379:

h. опиймили ґо різні думкє
bothered.past  =him.accus  various thoughts
‘various thoughts bothered him’ (Płytna-Horycvit 2008)

i. зробили му таку примівку
made.past  =him.dat  such spell.accus
‘They put a spell on him’ (Płytna-Horycvit 2008)

In (8h) we see a structure of verb=clitic.dat.subj and in (8i) verb=clitic.dat.direct object, with second position post-verbal clitics. This verb=clitic ordering was not as strictly observed in the older dialect, as in (8j) with a second position clitic preceding a negated verb, with a nominative subject intervening:

j. Добре, шо тє нехарь ни скалічіла
good  that  =you.accus  wolf380  = neg. cripple.past
‘It’s good that the wolf didn’t make you a cripple’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 11)

To get a greater sense of the degree to which pronominal clitic usage has changed over time, the following two frequency charts gauge the use of dative and accusative singular pronouns in both clitic and full form from select sources spanning a time period of approximately 100 years.381

---

379 Onyškevyč notes that in most southwestern dialects, indirect object clitic pronouns can stand in both pre and post position of the verb, but notes that in Lemko they appear almost exclusively in postposition.

380 Нехарь has the additional meaning of “evil thing” or “unclean force.” This is true for both CSU and Hutsul.

381 The specific passages used to compile these charts were randomly selected and averaged 10-15 pages in length, with the exception of the informant sources which averaged about 5 pages each of transcribed speech.
### Table 4  Dative singular pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1sgC (^{382})</th>
<th>1sgFF (^{383})</th>
<th>2sgC</th>
<th>2sgFF</th>
<th>3sgC</th>
<th>3sgFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč</td>
<td>1910-1920</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk</td>
<td>1920-1930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit (^{384})</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 (^{385})</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 (^{386})</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 (^{387})</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{382}\) C = Clitic  
\(^{383}\) F = Full form  
\(^{384}\) Born circa 1928  
\(^{385}\) Born 1908, from Zelenčuk 2011, www.ualogo.kiev.ua  
\(^{386}\) Born 1932, from Jastrems'ka 2008.  
\(^{387}\) Born 1951, from Jastrems'ka 2008.

### Table 5  Accusative singular pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1sgC</th>
<th>1sgFF</th>
<th>2sgC</th>
<th>2sgFF</th>
<th>3sgC</th>
<th>3sgFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč</td>
<td>1910-1920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk</td>
<td>1920-1930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Zaliznjak 2008 contends that the pronominal clitics of East Slavic fell out of use largely because they were simply doublets for the full form personal pronouns, differentiated only by emphasis, rather than semantics. This made them relatively unstable and subject to atrophy, a phenomenon which can also be observed in modern Hutsul.

As Tables 4 and 5 illustrate, by the early 20th century, pronominal clitics were likely not the strongly preferred form and, even so, overtime there has been a general decline in their use. Among the old dialect sources, Mančuk seems to generally prefer full form pronouns (but with strong tendency for clitics on in the 2sg accusative), while both Xotkevyč and Šekeryk-Donykiv show an almost even distribution of clitics and full forms for dative 1sg, and a weak preference in dative 2sg and accusative 2sg. Xotkevyč prefers dative 3sg clitics, but other writers in the old dialect show greater tendency for full form 3sg datives.

Recent sources, however, demonstrate little use of pronominal clitics, particularly in oral discourse (Speakers 1, 2, and 3). The striking exception is the written text produced by Plytka-Horyevit 2008, which contains an unusually high proportion of pronominal clitics in 3sg accusative and dative. Such distribution of clitic vs. full-form pronouns is not supported by other contemporary sources, however. Rather, it seems more likely that her wider use of pronominal clitics is somewhat idiosyncratic, perhaps based on her written genre and poetic predilections: she is, after all, first and foremost a Hutsul poet. In addition, several of her pronominal clitics appear in phrases that are clearly formulaic, as in (8k):

\[ \text{k. Царство му небесне!} \]
\[ \text{kingdom =him.dat heavenly} \]
\[ \text{‘ May he rest in peace’} \]

Such phrases, which appear multiple times in her narrative, contain clitics which have become phraseologically frozen and therefore resistant to the changes otherwise occurring in the contemporary dialect, particularly that of oral discourse.

4.7.2 Reflexive Clitics

In additional to pronominal clitics, the Hutsul dialect has also preserved the reflexive clitic which arose from the East Slavic clitic form of the reflexive pronoun sebe –sä. While Old Ukrainian texts show that this clitic could be either preverbal or postverbal, there appears to

---

\[388\] The Hutsul realization of the reflexive auxiliary as sy is the result of the sound change 'a \(\rightarrow\) e (y, i) and the hardening of s', both characteristic of the dialect. The process can be described illustrated as: se > s'a > s'e > s'y > sy
have been a strong preference for postverbal position fairly early on\textsuperscript{389}, with eventual grammaticalization as an affix in CSU. In Hutsul, as in other southwest dialects, the reflexive clitic can also occur in both preverbal and postverbal position, but traditionally with a preference toward a second position immediately preceding the verb\textsuperscript{390}, as in (9a-9c):

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Міні си здавало
\> me.dat =refl seem.past
\> ‘It seemed to me’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 15)

\item b. Я си боєв прізнаватися дідови
\> I =refl afraid.past confess.inf grandpa.dat
\> ‘I was afraid to confess to grandpa’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

\item c. ше раз си солит і готова бриня
\> another time =refl salt and ready cheese
\> ‘It is salted once more and the cheese is ready’ (Jastrems'ka 2008)
\end{enumerate}

In less common cases a second position pre-verbal *s'ya* is not in direct contact with the verb, but separated from it by other parts of speech\textsuperscript{391}, as (9d-9g).

\begin{enumerate}
\item d. Я си ни міг випрошєти з мамов
\> I =refl =neg could.past say goodbye.inf with mama.instr
\> ‘I could not say goodbye to mama’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

\item e. Насмерть би си був убив, єк би був ни умів падати
\> to death =cond =refl aux.3sg kill.past, if =cond aux.3sg =neg umiv padaty
\> ‘You would have been killed, if you had not known how to fall’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007)

\item f. А де ж би я си так дер?!\textsuperscript{392}
\> and where =emph =cond I =refl so hid.past
\> ‘And where would I have hidden myself’ (Mančuk 2006: 15)
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{389} Zaliznyak 2008 described this phenomenon in early East Slavic: as a weak clitic, sę had a strong tendency to appear postverbally, eventually becoming fixed in that position, then ultimately becoming fused to the host verb.

\textsuperscript{390} The pre-position of *s’ya* in Ukr dialects has sometimes been attributed to Polish influence, but as Zaleskyj 1969 notes, this also exists in the Zakarpattia dialects which were never in contact with Polish.

\textsuperscript{391} Zaleskyj 1969 notes that in Ukrainian texts from the XIV-XV centuries, the reflexive clitic *s’ya* most often directly follows the verb; however, when separated from the verb, it is most commonly separated by a clitic form of the personal pronoun (or *ym*).

\textsuperscript{392} Infinitive: дертиси
In (9d) a second position preverbal reflexive clitic is separated from the verb vyproš’ety by both the negative particle ny—itself a clitic—as well as the finite verb mih, placing it in a different clause from where it originated. 9e shows a parallel structure in the first clause where the reflexive clitic is separated from ubyv by the past tense auxiliary buv; however, the conditional clitic by, hosted by the adverb nasmert’, precedes the reflexive string. In (9f) the reflexive clitic, hosted by the 1sg nominative personal pronoun, is separated from its verb by an adverb. In the most recent example, (9g), the reflexive is separated from zaynteresuvav by the negative proclitic.

When other clitics are present, the reflexive tends to come at the end of the string:\footnote{As Franks and King 2000 note, "Reflexive clitics are ordered distinctly from their nonreflexive counterparts in that they are always located at the periphery of the pronominal cluster." While pronominal clusters are rare in Hutsul, the general observation of peripheral positioning of reflexive clitics in a clitic string often holds true in both the old and contemporary dialect.}

\texttt{g. бо николя цим си не заинтересував}
\hspace{1em}for never I this.inst =refl =neg be interested.PAST
\hspace{1em}‘because I was never interested in this’ (Jastrems'ka 2008)

Example (9h) shows an interesting demonstration of an incomplete utterance incorporating a clitic string with a future auxiliary clitic followed by the reflexive clitic, with the assumption that this interrupted phrase would be immediately followed by an imperfective infinitive verb, thereby completing the compound future tense form.

Example (9h) shows an interesting demonstration of an incomplete utterance incorporating a clitic string with a future auxiliary clitic followed by the reflexive clitic, with the assumption that this interrupted phrase would be immediately followed by an imperfective infinitive verb, thereby completing the compound future tense form.

When the conditional by is present, the reflexive tends to immediately follow, as in (9i) where the structure follows a pattern of =cond=refl.verb and (9j) where the negation is ordered =cond=refl=neg.verb:

\texttt{i. Єк би си псувати}
\hspace{1em}they.accus =cond =refl ruin.inf
\hspace{1em}‘They would be ruined’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

\texttt{j. Дай би си нн снів нікому}
\hspace{1em}let.imp =cond =refl =neg dream.past no one.dat
'I hope no one dreams of it' (Mančuk 2006: 17)

Lemko also demonstrates this same preferred ordering of COND. REFL.VERB in (9k) and (9l):

k. же міг би ся навчити по нашому
   that could.past =cond =refl learn.INF by our.dat
   ‘he could learn in our way’ (Horoszczak)

l. міг би ся од него вчити
   could.past =cond =refl from him.accus learn.INF
   ‘he could learn from him’ (Horoszczak)

An example from Bojko (9m), however, gives a postverbal string with reversed ordering where the conditional clitic precedes the reflexive VERB.REFL.COND.

m. наша баба била би ся
   our granny beat.past =cond =refl
   ‘Our granny would fight’ (Kmit)

While pronominal strings with a reflexive clitic are rare in Hutsul, the second clause in (9n) shows this possibility in Lemko where a dative clitic intervenes between the reflexive clitic and its verb, giving the order REFL.DAT.VERB:

n. Я ся обіцял же му прінести, але ся мі забуло
   I =refl promised.past conj =him.dat bring.inf, conj =refl =me.dat forgot.past
   ‘I promised to bring (it) to him, but I forgot’ (Horoszczak)

In Bojko (9o), however, we can see postverbal ordering with a dative clitic pronoun following the order of VERB.DAT.REFL:

o. Снит ми ся
   dream =me.dat =refl
   ‘I dream’ (Kmit)

While Hutsul does allow both preverbal and postverbal positioning for the reflexive clitic, in CSU the reflexive became fixed postverbally until it was ultimately grammaticalized as an affix. As Hutsul evolves under CSU influence, the position of the reflexive clitic has apparently been affected, as seen in Table 6:
Table 6  Reflexive auxiliary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Preverbal Position</th>
<th>Postverbal position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč</td>
<td>Approx. 1910-1920</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk</td>
<td>Approx. 1920-1930</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that by the 1930s, the affix s’a (sy) was already moving toward the postverbal position; furthermore, this tendency has significantly increased in the contemporary dialect, with almost all recent speakers strongly preferring the postverbal position. As such, the reflexive clitic seems to be in an ongoing process toward grammaticalization as an affix, paralleling the changes which occurred in CSU. With continued influence from CSU, it is possible that the Hutsul sy will also eventually become affixed onto the verb host.

4.7.3 Imperfective Future Clitic

In CSU, the imperfective future tense can be rendered in two structurally different manners: the so-called analytic future, comprised of the auxiliary buty ‘to be’ followed by an imperfective infinitive, and the so-called synthetic future\(^{394}\), comprised of an imperfective infinitive suffixed with a series of personal endings originating from the lexical word imaty ‘to take’\(^{395}\) which became cliticized as an auxiliary and later grammaticalized\(^{396}\) as an affix. The process can be illustrated as follows:

\(^{394}\) This term 'synthetic future' is problematic even in terms of CSU. For the Southwestern dialect group, where the auxiliary 'to take' is still functionally a clitic rather than an affix, it is even more problematic and, in fact, quite obviously inaccurate. However, for the sake of convenience and clarity, I will use the established term 'synthetic future' when discussing the imperfective future tense formed with the auxiliary imaty 'to take'.

\(^{395}\) According to Danylenko 2012, the synthetic future originated from a paraphrase with the inceptive perfective LCS *jeta - jimo 'to take'
In Hutsul the future auxiliary is still functionally and syntactically a clitic, placing at the second stage of the developmental trajectory of CSU, as seen in (10a):

\[(10)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Хто мет } \text{ його } \text{їсти} \\
& \text{who } =\text{aux.3sg it.accus eat.INF.} \\
& \text{‘Who will be eating it’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007)}
\end{align*}
\]

In this example, the future auxiliary \text{met} has a pronominal host \text{xto} and precedes the infinitive verb \text{jisty}, separated from it by the full form object pronoun \text{jiho}.

As Mykhaylyk 2010 observes, in modern Western Ukrainian dialects where the process of grammaticalization remains at its clitic stage, the word order has two possibilities: =clitic.verb (10b), (10c) or verb=clitic (10d), with the latter occurring more frequently400:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Половицу лиш } & \text{мут за грунт давати} \\
& \text{board.accus only } =\text{aux.3pl for foundation.accus give.inf} \\
& \text{‘They will only give the board for the foundation’ (Xotkevyč 1966)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. Ти ще } & \text{меш багато говорити?} \\
& \text{you still } =\text{aux.2sg a lot talk.INF} \\
& \text{‘Are you going to keep talking?’ (Mančuk 2006: 16)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \text{бо } \text{му рабітник дорого } \text{коштувати} \\
& \text{for } =\text{him.dat worker dearly cost.fut}
\end{align*}
\]

\[396\] Danylenko 2012 has argued that the process of grammaticalization is as of yet incomplete even in the standard language.

\[397\] Based on Danylenko 2012

\[398\] Based on Mykhaylyk 2010

\[399\] For a thorough demonstration of the clitic properties of the future auxiliary, see Mykhaylyk 2010. In addition, Danylenko 2012 offers invaluable insights to the current status of the so-called synthetic future in the standard language.

\[400\] According to Danylenko 2012, the de-inceptive future auxiliaries were clause-second until the fifteenth and sixteenth century. By the mid-sixteenth century there are attested forms in West Ukrainian showing a concatenation of the auxiliary with the verb. (like the modern synthetic future). This structure, showing a movement from second position to verb-adjacent position, spread to Southeast Ukrainian by the mid-seventeenth century.; "Historical evidence indicated that the SF was a new formation spreading from Southwest Ukrainian via the western and northern dialects to Southeast Ukrainian."
‘for the worker will cost him dearly’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

As (10b) and (10c) further show, the auxiliary need not immediately precede the verb, but is often separated from it by other words/phrases, such as a prepositional phrase in (10b) and an adverb in (10c).

The continued preference for preverbal position is demonstrated in Table 7:

**Table 7**  Imperfective future auxiliary clitic (‘synthetic future’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Preverbal Position</th>
<th>Postverbal position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xotkevyč</td>
<td>Approx. 1910-1920</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mančuk</td>
<td>Approx. 1920-1930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šekeryk-Donykiv</td>
<td>Late 1930s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plytka-Horycvit</td>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0^401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7, it can be seen that over time, the synthetic future has maintained its preverbal position which would, at first glance, seem to indicate resistance to CSU convergence. However, it should be noted that there is a concurrent phenomenon of increased usage of the analytic imperfective with the buty auxiliary among Hutsul speakers^402^ which has two important implications: first, as in CSU, and likely the result of CSU influence, the analytic future is gaining prominence as the unmarked for of the imperfective future^403^; second, where the

---

^401^ Where imperfective future was used, this speaker preferred the analytic form with buty, rather than synthetic personal auxiliary.

^402^ Interestingly, Danylenko 2012 makes the following claim: "[I]n some Central Transcarpathian (e.g., Xust), Hucul, Pokuttja, and Bukovyna dialects the future tense, comprised of the future auxiliary clitic =mu in Wackernagel position, is the only possible future formation." There seem to be two implications to this statement: first, that the clitic can only appear preverbally and second, that the analytic future is not in use in Hutsul. Recent evidence contradicts this claim.

^403^ Danylenko 2012 contends that the synthetic future is semantically differentiated from the analytic future in that the former has an inceptive meaning (I will begin to read vs. I will read): "The inceptive semantics of the auxiliary 'to
synthetic future is used, its ordering is parallel to the structure of the analytic future: =aux.verb. In other words, the fact that the clitic auxiliary has remained preverbal may, despite first appearance, actually be a product of CSU convergence vis-à-vis the influence of the analytic future with buty⁴⁰⁴.

4.7.4 Conditional Clitics

Conditional clitics in the Hutsul dialect remain stable in their ordering and usage, paralleling the syntactic requirements typical of CSU. While Hutsul has both inflected and uninflected forms of the conditional clitic, it is the uninflected forms which prove more common in both the old and contemporary dialect, with (11a) providing a typical example of second position ordering and use:

(11) a. Ніхто би був ми в ні спер⁴⁰⁵
    no one =cond aux.3sg me.accus =neg catch.past
    ‘No one would have caught me’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 8)

Example (11b) demonstrates a second position uninflected conditional clitics with a nominal host. A dative clitic intervenes before the verb, showing an ordering of =cond=dat.verb:

b. біда би ти упала на голов
    bida by ty upala na holov
    hardship =cond =you.dat fall.past onto head
    ‘misfortune would befall you’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007: 16)

Similarly indicative of a common ordering, (11c) shows a uninflected second position conditional clitic with pronominal host, with an accusative pronominal clitic intervening before the verb, demonstrating the order of host=cond=accus.verb:

c. я би го побила на кавальчики
    I =cond =it.accus beat.past tiny pieces.accus
    ‘I would smash it to bits’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

take’ has been largely retained in the archaic southwestern Ukrainian dialects.” This is a very interesting claim, one that I will examine more thoroughly in future analysis of Hutsul.

⁴⁰⁴ I will look at analytic vs. synthetic in a later work, both in terms of relative frequency as well as semantics

⁴⁰⁵ Infinitive: сперти
Example (11d) demonstrates a negative conditional phrase with a second position reflexive clitic with infinitive verbal host, followed by dative pronominal clitics, offering the expected ordering of host=cond=dat=neg.verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \text{дихати би му ни дало} \\
& \text{breathe.inf } =\text{cond } =\text{him.dat } =\text{neg} \ \text{let.past} \\
& \text{‘They wouldn’t let him breathe’ (Mančuk 2006: 17)}
\end{align*}
\]

Carpathian Rusyn (Zakarpattia dialect) and Lemko parallel Hutsul in their use of conditional clitics. (11e) provides an example from Carpathian Rusyn of second position =cond=accus where the conditional clitic is followed by an accusative pronominal clitic and a nominative subject intervenes between the clitic string and the verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e. } & \text{Най бі го фрас узяв!} \\
& \text{let } =\text{cond } =\text{him.accus} \ \text{devil take.past} \\
& \text{‘Let the devil take him!’ (http://www.kolyba.org.ua)}
\end{align*}
\]

Example (11f), from Lemko, has a second position =cond=refl ordering with a non-finite verb acting as clitic host:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f. } & \text{міг би ся од него вчиті} \\
& \text{can.past } =\text{cond } =\text{refl } \text{from him.accus} \ \text{learn.inf} \\
& \text{‘he could learn from him’ (Horoszczak)}
\end{align*}
\]

Unlike CSU, Hutsul also has an inventory of inflected conditional clitics\(^\text{406}\); however, these inflected forms appear to have always been less frequently used than their uninflected counterparts. According to Budzhak-Jones 1997, unlike the more common uninflected conditional clitics which must always follow a prosodic host, the inflected conditional forms can appear in sentence initial position. However, based on the available data, this is extremely rare and the inflected forms most commonly followed the uninflected pattern of second position, as seen in (11g):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{g. } & \text{моці бис ни мала} \\
& \text{strength.gen } =\text{cond.2sg } =\text{neg } \text{had.past} \\
& \text{‘you wouldn’t have had strength’ (Mančuk 2006: 16)}
\end{align*}
\]

Example (11g) shows a nominally hosted inflected conditional in second position with the negative particle intervening between the conditional and verb, for an ordering of =cond=neg.verb.

\(^{406}\) These forms are remnants of the aorist: 1sg бих, 2sg бис; more rarely, 1pl бисмо 2pl бисте
Similarly, (11h) demonstrates an inflected second position conditional with a conjunctional host in the first clause and an inflected second position conditional with a verbal host in its second clause:

   h. Єк бих тє ни уважєв, то видів бис.
      if \(=\)cond.1sg =you.accus =neg respect.past then see.past =cond.2sg
      ‘If I didn’t respect you, you would see [that]’ (Mančuk 2006: 16)

Less commonly, the inflected conditional can attach onto a verb creating a compound verbal form, particularly if there is an additional reflexive auxiliary, with an ordering of ver=cond=refl\(^{407}\):

   i. Питав бихси ксьондза
      ask.past=cond.1sg=refl priest.accus
      ‘I would have asked the priest’ (Mančuk 2006: 12)

The inflected form is still used in the contemporary dialect, although tokens are fairly rare and, when they do appear, seem to have an emphatic function, as in (11j). This corresponds to Budzhak-Jones’ observation that the inflected conditional tends to express “a strong wish and hence is used more as an imperative than a conditional auxiliary.”

   j. Ни їв бих!
      neg eat.past =cond.1sg
      ‘I won’t eat (it)!’ (Plytka-Horycvit 2008)

4.7.5 Past Preterit Clitics

One of the defining features of the verbal inventory of southwestern Ukrainian dialects is the preservation of the past preterit formed from the present tense form of the auxiliary \(buty\).\(^{408}\)

\(^{407}\) Despite the apparent orthographic conventions, Danylenko 2012 correctly observes that "multiple concatenation (agglutination) of auxiliaries, with no morpheme-boundary sandhi (morphophonemic change), is likely to involve cliticization rather than suffixation in this case."

\(^{408}\) As noted by Koval'čuk 2011, most southwestern dialects are characterized by the perfect ending \(-m\) for 1sg; however, in Hutsul, the past perfect is most commonly realized as 1sg \(-smy\) and 1pl \(-ste\). Other personal endings are quite rare, even in the old dialect. Danylenko 2012, however, argues that the form \(-smy\) is not typologically representative and should be adjusted to the historical reflex \(-sme\): "In the bulk of the Ukrainian dialects, \(i\) and \(y\) coalesced between the late thirteenth through the fifteenth century, triggering the merger of jesmy and jesy ‘as contextual variants of older jesm’ ‘I am’ in Middle Ukrainian. The distinction might have been maintained only in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects, partly because of their conservatism (in the case of Hutsul) and partly
According to Danylenko 2012 the preterit clitic in Southwest Ukrainian occurs either in Wackernagel position or after the main verb participle. However, the ordering is actually a good deal more flexible, as this auxiliary clitic has very low selectivity for host: examples (12a) and (12b) provide examples of the past auxiliary with a verbal host, although the auxiliary can attach to any part of speech capable of carrying stress:

\[(12)\]

\[a. \text{ казав-смі тобі} \]
\[\text{said.past=aux.1sg you.dat} \]
\[\text{‘I said to you’ (Xotkevyč 1966)} \]

\[b. \text{ Я також мала-смі таку саму хоробу три роки тому} \]
\[\text{I also had.past=aux.1sg such illness.accus three years ago} \]
\[\text{‘I also had the very same illness three years ago’ (Xotkevyč 1966)} \]

This preterit seems to be waning in the contemporary dialect with very few tokens appearing among speakers. However, it can still occasionally be found in literary works, such as (12c) and (12d) from Plytka-Horycvič 2008 which show a verbally hosted past auxiliary clitic and a conjunction-hosted clitic, respectively:

\[c. \text{ йшла смі} \]
\[\text{went.past=aux.1sg} \]
\[\text{‘I went’} \]

\[d. \text{ але смі встали відвернути} \]
\[\text{but aux.1sg managed.past turn away.inf} \]
\[\text{‘but I managed to turn away’} \]

### 4.7.6 Clitic Ordering and Strings

According to Jakobson 1971, clitics in Slavic can appear in either Wackernagel second position or be verb adjacent; however, evidence from East Slavic demonstrates several important deviations from this ordering. In his analysis of early East Slavic, Zaliznjak 2008 attributed these deviations to what he termed the Barrier Rule. Budzhak-Jones 1997, writing specifically of the 

---

because the distinction i-y was never lost there (in the case of Lemkian). This is why in Hucul jesmy survived in the form =sme PRET.AUX.1SG. This is a normal reflex of =smy PRET.AUX.1SG, because in Hucul y changed into e in the seventeenth century."

409 According to Bevzenko 1969, the past perfect is dependent on pro-drop, allowing the past tense forms kazav-jem or ja kazav, but preventing *ja kazav-jem. Example (42), however, contradicts this view. Interestingly, Danylenko 2012 notes that in some situations the preterit auxiliaries serve as allomorphs of the personal pronouns. This then may explain Bevzenko's assumption that the preterit structure is dependent on pro-drop as he may be associating the auxiliary with the pronoun and assuming that an explicit personal pronoun would therefore be redundant.
Hutsul dialect, noted a similar phenomenon which caused her to distinguish between “linear second position” and “hierarchical second position.” While Wackernagel second position is, in most cases, the most common position for clitics in Hutsul, apparent deviations should be viewed in the context of certain additional syntactic items which can push a clitic further right into linear third position. As Zaliznjak 2008 explains, when a clitic appears to be in third position, rather than the expected second position, this indicates the presence of a "barrier" which has pushed the clitic to the next available spot, a phenomenon which continues to be observed in Hutsul.

Clitic strings containing more than two clitics, particularly when one of the constituents is a pronominal clitic, tend to be avoided in both old and contemporary Hutsul dialect. For this, various strategies are employed, such as substituting a full form pronoun in place of a clitic form where other clitics are employed as in (13a), where a full form dative pronoun is used to host the reflexive clitic, thereby avoiding a pronominal clitic string:\footnote{According to Tolstaja 2012, where a reflexive clitic occurs with a pronominal clitic, it is the grammatical function of the pronoun which determines the order: most commonly a dative pronoun clitic will precede reflexive clitic $sy$ (dative-reflexive-verb), whereas an accusative pronoun will follow $sy$ (reflexive-accusative-verb).}

(13)   a. Мині си здавало
Me.dat =refl seem.past
‘It seemed to me’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007)

Similarly, in (13b) the full form accusative pronoun is used in a phrase containing the future auxiliary clitic, thereby avoiding a cluster:

b. Хто мет йиго істи
who aux.3sg it.accus eat.inf
‘Who will be eating it’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007)

As there can only be one reflexive clitic per string, (13c) demonstrates the logical resolution of where the first reflexive particle appears as a second position proclitic, and the second reflexive particle takes a post-verbal suffix-like position in the phrase.

c. я си боєв прізнаватиси дідови
I =refl afraid.past confess.inf grandpa.dat
‘I was afraid to confess to grandpa’ (Šekeryk-Donykiv 2007)

Where clitics strings do occur, the most common clitics involved are the conditional and reflexive auxiliaries. Example (13d) shows the typical ordering =cond=refl:

---

\footnote{According to Tolstaja 2012, where a reflexive clitic occurs with a pronominal clitic, it is the grammatical function of the pronoun which determines the order: most commonly a dative pronoun clitic will precede reflexive clitic $sy$ (dative-reflexive-verb), whereas an accusative pronoun will follow $sy$ (reflexive-accusative-verb).}
d. Йик би си псувати
they.accus =cond =refl ruin.inf
 ‘They would be ruined’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

With a negation, the order is maintained with the negative clitic completing the string, as in (13e):

e. дай би си ни снив нікому
let.imp =cond =refl =neg dream.past no one.dat
 ‘I hope no one dreams of it’ (Mančuk 2006)

In addition, clitic strings rather consistently appear in Wackernagel position regardless of which clitics are employed. Example (13f) shows another second position string with an ordering of =cond=accus pronoun:

f. я би го побила на кавальчики
I =cond =it.accus beat.past into tiny pieces.accus
 ‘I would smash it to bits’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

The ordering is the same with dative pronominal clitics in (13g) and, with a negative particle in (13h).

g. дихати би му ни дало
breathe.inf =cond =him.dat =neg give.past
 ‘They wouldn’t have let him breathe’ (Mančuk 2006)

h. користи би тє ни було
use.gen =cond =you.dat =neg be.past
 ‘there would be no use for you’ (Mančuk 2006)

A future tense auxiliary clitic paired with a reflexive takes the order =aux=refl in (13i):

i. Що вни мут си….
what they there =aux.3pl =refl
 ‘What will they…’ (Xotkevyč 1966)

This typical ordering of =cond=refl. and cond=accus/dative pronoun seems to be fairly stable with little variation. What is significant, however, is a lack of clitic strings containing both dative and accusative pronouns in the same phrase, as well as a general avoidance of strings containing
more than two clitics of any kind. Regardless of clitics used, however, second position is consistently observed.

In some rare cases, a clitic string can be broken by an intervening element, often either a full form pronoun or a verbal phrase, as in (13j) where the 1sg pronoun intervenes between the conditional and reflexive clitic, maintaining the basic =emph=cond=refl ordering despite the broken string:

j. А де жби я си так дёр?!
and where =emph =cond I =refl so hide.past
‘And where would I have hidden myself’ (Mančuk 2006)

Example (13j) additionally provides evidence of Zaliznjak’s Barrier Rule: here the barrier ja separates a strong clitic (in second position) from weak clitics (which are moved further to the right). In (13j) ž and by, strong clitics, appear in linear second position, but the weak clitic sy is affected by the barrier and its position is moved further to the right.411 According to Budzhak-Jones 1997, such broken strings would be ungrammatical in Hutsul; nevertheless, there are occasional examples, such as (13j).

4.8 Conclusions

The Hutsul syntactic system demonstrates significant contact-induced change under the influence of CSU. This includes evidence of the restructuring of the prepositional system, early signs of erosion of the archaic dual counting form, as well as increased use of the u/v + genitive possessive structure and the imperfective future tense with the auxiliary buty. Most dramatic, however, has been the atrophy of the archaic system. While clitics were once a fairly salient feature of Hutsul morphosyntax, evidence indicates that they are undergoing a process of attrition under the increased influence of CSU. This issue is a symptom of a larger process of dialect convergence, whereby Hutsul is facing increasing contact and pressure from CSU within the context of modernization, greater focus on formal education, and economic migration. This process further gives us greater insights to processes through which languages change over time: where previous isolation led to the preservation of archaic features at a time when the standard language was rapidly changing, increased and sustained contact with standard speakers over the course of the past century has manifested in a dynamic process of change conditioned by 21st century socioeconomic expedience.

411 Zaliznjak 2008 notes that weak clitics--including the reflexive se--tend to have a high rate of deviation from Wackernagel's law.
Chapter Five: Internal and External Factors Affecting Dialect Attitudes and Behaviors

While the previous chapters detailed the structural changes occurring in the Hutsul dialect, this chapter will analyze the sociocultural underpinnings of those changes; specifically, I will discuss which social, cultural, and economic factors have most favored or disfavored linguistic change in Hutsulshchyna by correlating linguistic patterns (dialect, CSU, or a combination of both) with differences embedded in the contemporary social structure to pinpoint which social factors most influence language variation and ultimately change and attrition. The guiding notion is that increased contact with CSU has coincided with intense pressure to adopt standard norms. This has not only led to the numerous structural consequences previously outlined, but has also affected the issue of who continues to speak in dialect, when, with whom, and under what circumstances. More importantly, this has determined which speakers have begun a process of dialect abandonment which, with time, could lead to large-scale language shift.

The question of which social factors predict what kind of linguistic change has been discussed widely in sociolinguistics research. Thomason 2001, for example, enumerates such determinants as intensity of contact, including the cultural pressure imposed by one group upon another in the context of this contact; widespread bilingualism which provides a gateway to extensive structural interference; use of code-switching and code alternation strategies; and speakers’ attitudes which, she notes, “can be either barriers to change or promoters of change” (p. 85). Eckert 2008 focuses her analysis of variation on the dual notions of indexicality and ideology whereby variants are associated with social traits such as professionalism, education, and competence, authentic, local, etc. As she notes, “different ways of saying things are intended to signal different ways of being” (p. 456); thus, by accessing and using different variables, speakers are consciously adopting a specific stance and projecting the desired image to their interlocutors.

In her article on the ethnolinguistic repertoire, Bunin Benor notes the particular utility of placing the analytic focus of change on the social unit of an ethnic group:

[E]xamining an ethnic group's distinctive language enables a better understanding of the group's ancestral migrations, activities, ideologies, allegiances, contacts with other groups, boundaries between insiders and outsiders, and, especially, variation within the group.....[F]ocusing on the group level allows us to explore how a group's repertoire crystallizes, often after migration or colonization; how features are added to and removed from the repertoire; how people who use the repertoire come to be seen as speakers of a dialect; and how a repertoire changes as its speakers integrate into other groups (2010: 160).
This key to this kind of analysis, she claims, is the identification of the underlying group ideologies which construct the boundary between “core members, marginal members, and non-members” (p. 170). This view highlights the role of identity in linguistic choice, a role which is particularly complex for a group like the Hutsuls who often see themselves at once kindred to the larger Ukrainian nation, as well as culturally distinct, in no small part due to their dialect which has historically often defined membership boundaries. Fellin 2002 also notes the critical role that speakers’ language ideologies play, calling them “crucial agents” which “determine attitudes, approaches, and practices that can enhance or downplay the prestige of a given code, determine its roles and functions, and foster or hinder its use, transmission and thus, its vitality” (p. 46). Such a determination is of significant importance in a situation like that of the Hutsul dialect, which currently stands at a crossroads between revival and loss, a particularly poignant bifurcation within the context of current cultural revival and interest.

Cultural revival, however, is in itself not enough to engender the kind of language ideology necessary to support dialect maintenance. Indeed, cultural revival has led to increased outsider interest in and travel to the region, increasing the already close contact and language pressures faced by the dialect. Aside from its symbolic role—particularly as it indexes group identity and membership—language has a purely functional role of facilitating communication, in some cases beyond in-group membership. To this end, Keller 1994 proposes the “invisible hand” theory of language change which is conditioned through the collective goal of communication. As Keller writes, "when we are talking, we try to kill several birds with one stone: we try to conform, attract attention, be understood, save energy" (1994: 105). This goal becomes paramount as Hutsul revival gains the attention of mainstream Ukraine—through folk festivals, green tourism, or perhaps most visibly, Ruslana’s Eurovision performance—drawing unprecedented numbers of outsiders into the region. The imperative for effective inter-group communication has necessitated the adoption of a more widely understood linguistic code than Hutsul, which many Ukrainian speakers find quite difficult to understand. The language negotiation that results from these physical movements of peoples often heavily favors CSU at the expense of Hutsul though widespread asymmetrical bidialectalism.

The changing nature of the Hutsul social network in many ways parallels and influences the linguistic change currently taking place, creating a tension between social mobility and local solidarity. Schilling-Estes 2002 uses the term “post-isolated communities” to describe precisely this situation of a geographically remote area previously characterized by dense, multiplex social networks, historical continuity of the population, and limited in-migration which has since become increasingly accessible to outsiders and thus recently subject to significant outside influence. Within the bounds of an isolated community, speakers “do not confront heterogeneous usage norms from outside varieties and the leveling pressure such heterogeneity brings” (p.80); this paradigm shifts once isolation yields to access, as has happened in recent years in Hutsulshchyna within the context of modernization and contemporary nation-building within
Below I will discuss the specific social, cultural, and economic dynamics shaping the issue of language change in contemporary Hutsulshchyna. In doing so, I will consider both current research in the field of sociolinguistics, as well as interview data gleaned from two summers of fieldwork in the region. Among the crucial questions to be answered is how local ideologies, including notions of valuation and social indexicality, have influenced the linguistic behavior of contemporary speakers, and how social meaning is currently constructed through language choice. While Hutsuls were once marginalized, their culture has recently undergone a revival, both nationally and locally; their language, however, has been neglected within the context of this larger cultural revival, as its use has become more socially restricted. The underlying ideologies mediating such restriction have led to larger concerns about the process of shift, despite the many speakers who expressed a desire for further dialect maintenance. While Hutsul provides an important link between speakers and their cultural heritage, its socially-stigmatized associations have led to an unstable situation which has allowed CSU incursions into both its grammatical structure as well as its continued use among younger speakers.

5.1 Methodology and summary of interview data

Interviews were conducted in Kolomyja, Kosiv, Kryvorivna, Buxovec, Šešory, and Verxovyna over two summers in 2010 and 2011. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and one hour and was structured around both specific and open-ended questions. Interviewees were welcome to respond in whichever language was most comfortable for them, with most choosing CSU, or a combination of CSU and Hutsul. All interviewees are self-identified Hutsuls. In total, 32 interviews were conducted among 19 women and 13 men between the ages of 19 and 89, representing a wide range of educational backgrounds, professions, and life experiences.

Through these interviews, I sought to gauge to current social status and function of the Hutsul dialect, as well as make predictions on its future viability as a linguistic form in contemporary Ukraine, in part by assessing correlation between opinion, ideology, and language practice. The most recurrent theme throughout the series of interviews was that a high level of reported pride in one’s identity in general, and even in one’s local dialect in particular, does not always correlate with dialect maintenance and use. In fact, despite the clear Hutsul cultural pride, use of the dialect has become increasingly restricted, with several interviewees claiming that “real” dialect no longer even exists, except perhaps very high up in the mountains. Most people I spoke with also urged me to seek out people over the age of 70, as anyone younger--by their estimation--was very unlikely to speak the dialect well anymore. Many interviewees expressed a desire to see the dialect revived, but held out little hope of that, with most pointing to Soviet era
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412 The only exception to this is Interviewee #7, as noted below.
policies and attitudes as the primary trigger for dialect attrition.

5.1.1 List of interviews

*Interview #1:* male, mid-50s, head shepherd, spends four months out of every years on the polynya in Šešory herding cows and sheep.

*Interview #2:* male, mid-40’s, priest of a Hutsul church

*Interview #3:* female, late 80’s, local poet, spent 12 years in a Russian labor camp

*Interview #4:* female, mid-40s, hotel administrator

*Interview #5:* female, late 50s, museum docent

*Interview #6:* male, 50s, museum docent and historian

*Interview #7:* female, late 50s, teacher of Ukrainian language and literature at a boarding school serving Hutsul children, married to Hutsul but does not herself identify as Hutsul

*Interview #8:* male, 60s, husband of Interviewee #7

*Interview #9:* male, late 50s, Hutsul museum director

*Interview #10:* female, late 40s, works in tourism industry

*Interview #11:* male, 50s, economist, works for the tax inspectorate

*Interview #12:* female, 40s, museum operator

*Interview #13:* female, 80s, was arrested in 1947 and sent to a Russian labor camp where she says she forgot how to speak her native (Hutsul) dialect

*Interview #14:* male, 70s, spent a number of years in a Russian labor camp where he claims to have lost much of his dialect knowledge

*Interview #15:* female, 19, currently studying at a university in Kyiv

*Interview #16:* female, 80s

*Interview #17:* female, 80s

*Interview #18:* female, 40s, pharmacist

*Interview #19:* female, 40s

*Interview #20:* male, mid 40’s, writer, performer, comedian

*Interview #21:* male, 60s, was born in a Siberian labor camp to Hutsul parents, but moved back to her historical homeland in 1958

*Interview #22:* female, 50s, bank employee

*Interview #23:* female, 50s, local poet

*Interview #24:* female, 70s

*Interview #25:* female, 50s, bank employee

*Interview #26:* female, 40s, bank employee

*Interview #27:* male, mid 40’s, writer, performer, comedian

*Interview #28:* male, mid-60s, journalist, historian, editor of local newspaper

*Interview #29:* female, 60s, bank director

*Interview #30:* female, early 40s, museum docent, wife of Interviewee #2, daughter of Interviewee #28.
Interview #31: male, late 60s, head of Hutsul sociocultural organization
Interview #32: male, 50s, museum director

5.2 Identity and language choice

It has been widely noted that feelings of and toward a certain identity influence language choice, as language acts as a means for expressing a sense of cultural/social affiliation and indexing group membership. In addition, as Schilling-Estes 2002 rightly notes, linguistic differentiation often results from a sense of cultural distinctiveness, whereby one cultural/social group demarcates a symbolic boundary between in-group membership and outsiders, a boundary expressed through the maintenance of nonstandard linguistic features. This view is shared by Hinskens, Auer, and Kerswill who write that "motivations for short-term divergence...stress social or personal identity, or to demarcate the ingroup from the relevant outgroup. In the longer term, language can thus become the symbol of an entire minority group" (2005: 6). Eckert 2008 expands upon this view to include the embedding of social meaning into specific local language variables:

[Variables that historically come to distinguish geographic dialects can take on interactional meanings based in local ideology...about what the locality is about--what kinds of people live there and what activities, beliefs, and practices make it what it is. Local identity is never an association with a generic locale but with a particular construction of that locale as distinct from some other. Local identity claims are about what it means to be from ‘here’ as opposed to some identified ‘there.’ (p. 462).

Schneider 2008, following Labov 1972, specifically notes that the demarcation of social boundaries often translates directly into the use of distinct linguistic features which contrast with the norms of other groups of speakers. When a large enough number of members seeks to index this distinct group identity, the result should be the maintenance of the local dialect. As Milroy writes, “sociolinguists commonly assume that an ideological motivation underlies the long term maintenance of distinctive, often stigmatized, local norms in the face of pressures from numerically or socially more powerful speech communities; speakers want to sound...unlike whatever social group they perceive themselves as contrasting with" (2002: 9-10). Indeed, in contact situations, a strong enough motivation to remain distinct from a culturally more powerful group can offset the effects of convergence and attrition. Tulloch 2006 notes that “contact may even reinforce dialectal distinctiveness, when speakers exaggerate or favour differences in their speech forms to mark in-group identification and solidarity....[Language attitudes] shape speakers’ linguistic behaviour, and thus the outcomes of language contact.” (273).

In the case of the Hutsuls, however, the situation is complicated by a dual sense of
identity: the localized, ethnic identity of Hutsul, and the more generalized national identity of Ukrainian. This sense of identity ambivalence was expressed by several interviewees, with most recognizing and taking pride in their Hutsul heritage while acknowledging the integration of the Hutsul subethnos into the larger ethnonational Ukrainian identity. This view was particularly strongly expressed by interviewees 10, 11, 20, 25, all of whom stated in unequivocal terms that Hutsuls are Ukrainians and part of the Hutsul nation. Interviewee #2 made an additional observation that (Western) Lviv has demonstrated greater support for the Husul cultural revival than has (the centrally-located capital) Kyiv, reinforcing a specifically western-orientated sense of regional Ukrainian identity among many Hutsuls. No interviewees made the claim that Hutsuls form a separate national group, entirely distinct from that of Ukrainian, in contrast to recent claims by several Carpatho-Rusyn activists413.

This dual sense of identity--local Hutsul identity supported by general Ukrainian identity--influences the linguistic ecology of Hutsulshchyna, where competing language forms--Hutsul dialect and CSU--are manipulated to index competing identities. This dilemma feeds into occasional ambivalence about the role that language--and language knowledge--plays in people’s daily lives. For Interviewee #25, the resolution to this dilemma was clear: "As Ukrainians, we should know Ukrainian." This was a fairly commonly held view, with most interviewees acknowledging a need for Hutsuls to gain proficiency in CSU, rather than rely solely on dialect in their interactions, both intragroup and intergroup. This motivation to gain the communicative competence necessary to consciously index multiple identities has resulted in near universal bidialectalism414. The choice between codes is most often mediated situationally and conditioned by the corresponding goal of indexing one identity over the other, or what Ochs refers to as “shifting social identities” (1993: 287). Bunin Benor describes this linguistic behavior as a forms of situational codeswitching, emphasizing that the categories--and therefore the behaviors--are mutable according to the speaker’s extralinguistic communication goals:

Speakers are seen as using linguistic variation--consciously or subconsciously--to align themselves with some people and distinguish themselves from others. The social meaning is not fixed; it changes according to context, and it is negotiated in interactions, partly based on contrast or distinction. (2010: 160)

In the case of the Hutsuls, the most frequent result is greater restriction placed on the use of dialect, which is often relegated to the status of private language in favor of elevation of CSU as the code most appropriate for public use. Interviewee #30 described her language behavior in

413 Several interviewees, however, did make the claim that Hutsul either is or previously was a separate language, rather than a dialect of Ukrainian. Both Interviewees #31 and #32 stated the view that Hutsul was originally a language distinct from Ukrainian, but that over time it has taken on so many Ukrainian features that it has become a dialect. Interviewee #9 was insistent that it is still a separate language--and not a dialect--to this day.
414 The ability to index multiple identities through language strategies is further discussion in Myers-Scotton (1993: 213) and Andersen 1988.
precisely these terms, with Hutsul as the language of home-based family interactions, and CSU as the language to speak in public, even when those public interactions involve others identifying as Hutsul. While Interviewee #24 noted that Hutsul greetings are still widely used in public, once the greeting is over, the rest of the conversation shift quickly to CSU. Interviewee #20 restricts his dialect use even further, specifying that the only occasions when he communicates in dialect is when he speaks to his parents: all other contexts call for CSU, even those contexts where he is speaking with (Hutsul) friends and acquaintances. Interviewee #5 noted that her father, a native Hutsul speaker, had taught at a village school where he spoke and taught in CSU, but always came home and spoke Hutsul to his family and close friends. In her own practice, she notes a similar tendency of speaking CSU in most of her daily life, restricting use of dialect to occasions when she travels to her native village, as a means of reconnecting with “her own.” Interviewee #10 described a similar experience of dialect, noting that people will speak Hutsul at the Saturday market, a weekly event that draws down people who live high in the mountains and who rarely have occasion to meet; dialect is their means of “reconnecting” after a long separation.

For all interviewees, professional communication is conducted exclusively in CSU: for many speakers, it is CSU that indexes the desired professional identity of a competent, educated speaker; dialect, to these speakers, indexes the complementary qualities of being unskilled, undereducated, and relatively unsophisticated. In professional situations, then the ability of CSU to index the desired traits outweighs expression of local solidarity. Interviewee #10 was particularly emphatic in this view of dialect restriction, stating that dialect use in public is “rude” and to be avoided as it can potentially alienate those who seek to use Ukrainian “appropriately.” Several interviewees explicitly linked language choice with identity projection in professional contexts, particularly those who work in an official capacity for state enterprises. Interviewee #11, an economist employed by the tax inspectorate, noted that he speaks exclusively in CSU while at work to index his status as a state worker through his use of the official state language. Interviewee #26, who works at a state bank, explained that they “consider themselves Ukrainians” at work, and thus speak only in the state language, whereas at home their local identity is stronger and dialect use is more common. Through such behaviors, a local ideology becomes apparent whereby CSU functions as an indexing agent of professionalism, education and competence; while Hutsul may index local authenticity, it concurrently indexes lower education, lack of skills, and an agricultural lifestyle. By shifting to CSU in the workplace, Hutsuls are consciously “indexing one’s association with institutions of legitimacy and the power they represent” (Eckert 2008: 467). CSU, in the workplace, indexes the most socially desirable traits in professional social contexts.

While public use of dialect is clearly restricted, there are several notable exceptions where is seen as not only appropriate, but preferred. These exceptions generally fall into niche use in overt expressions of folk culture, particularly in songs and rituals, where dialect functions
as a symbolic link to ancestral heritage and regional history. Several interviewees (#2, #8, #12) stated that folk songs, called *spivanky*, are the currently best place to hear the “real” Hutsul dialect, drawing the conclusion that, if the dialect is to be preserved, it is likely through the act of passing down these songs between generations, and are sometimes the only consistent source of dialect knowledge among young people. Interviewee #12 also spoke at length about the role of holiday celebrations (particularly Christmas carols called *koljadky*), wedding and funeral rites, and prayers in preserving the dialect but, unlike *spivanky* which have an audience even among children, many of these ritual uses of dialect find support mainly among older speakers, with less modern attraction for the younger generation. In this case, Hutsul’s ability to index the qualities associated with local authenticity situationally outweigh those qualities widely associated with CSU, as the context of folk culture and cultural heritage specifically rely on expression of locality rather than overt displays of professional competence and formal education.

The result of such social restriction, however, is greater impediment to replication of dialectal forms among speakers. As Michael writes, cross-speaker replication relies on “access to the social contexts in which the given competence is used.” When these social contexts become limited, the chances for localized linguistic traits to be maintained wanes. The expansion of social contexts supporting CSU thus undermines replication of Hutsul variables, leading to the kind of dialect convergence and atrophy discussed in the previous chapters.

5.3 Coming down from the mountain: bidialectalism among Hutsuls

Because speakers feel that Ukrainian social norms dictate use of CSU in many, if not most, public contexts, bidialectalism is nearly universal among Hutsuls. While the choice between Hutsul and CSU acts as an indexer to a particular identity, or even aspect of identity, the competition between language ideologies has largely resulted in CSU encroachment on the spheres of Hutsul use. This not only restricts the situations in which dialect is deemed appropriate to use, but has also influenced the contact-induced changes which have taken place the dialect, as discussed in previous chapters. In this way, the asymmetrical bidialectalism typical of Hutsuls has provided a gateway to both structural convergence of the dialect as well as overall attrition in dialect use. This phenomenon has been well-researched, although often with a focus on bilingualism in more typologically-distant languages. Writing of convergence phenomenon among bilingual speakers, Thomason describes an often stated “generalization linking level of bilingualism with amount of interference: very often, in fact most often, more bilingualism will correlate with more interference; level of bilingualism is one aspect of the intensity of contact” (2001: 151). In many cases, the dual phenomena of dialect convergence and attrition can act as a catalyst to shift; Tulloch notes that, “numerous cases have documented speakers’ preferences to switch to the dominant language rather than be told they are speaking a poor or incorrect form of their mother tongue” (2006: 277). In this sense, awareness of the dialect’s structural convergence and functional restriction can ultimately motivate its
abandonment in favor of codified CSU. Labov 1970 makes a similar observation when he states that “we have not encountered any non-standard speakers who gained good control of a standard language, and still retained control of the non-standard vernacular...Although the speaker may indeed appear to be speaking the vernacular, close examination of his speech shows his grammar has been heavily influenced by the standard.” Indeed, this precisely describes the tendency of rapid attrition noted among younger generations of Hutsuls who have grown up under conditions of CSU dominance in education and media.

Where dialect has been maintained, it is almost exclusively among older speakers who have had less access to formal education and need for intergroup communication. When Boudovskaia 2006 and Budzhak-Jones 1997 conducted their studies of Carpathian morphology and syntax respectively, they specifically sought out older women as informants with the assumption that it is specifically this demographic that has best preserved older dialect features as their speech had been better insulated against the effects of CSU influence. While women have often been cast in the role as language innovators leading linguistic change (e.g. Labov 2001, Campbell 1998, Milroy and Milroy 1985, among others), in the case of Hutsul, innovation and conservatism are determined by age to a far greater degree than by gender. This is conditioned by the probability that age primarily determines social mobility; older people of both genders tend to have relatively fewer opportunities or ambitions for the upward mobility that CSU could bring, inhibiting their motivation for bidialectal proficiency. As bidialectalism often triggers linguistic interference, those speakers least exposed to CSU--particularly through formal education--are also the speakers most likely to have preserved the dialect in its oldest form. As a result, in their endeavor to record the oldest dialect traits, Boudovskaia and Budzhak-Jones correctly identified their target group. When the newspaper Verxovynski visti sought to record Hutsul dialect through a series of interviews, they too focused specifically on speakers over the age of 80 years old as the best sources of “authentic” dialect “uncorrupted” by CSU influence. That only the oldest speakers still preserve the “real” Hutsul dialect was a view expressed by several interviewees. Interviewee #10 explained that older speakers have best preserved the dialect specifically because they never received formal education; she believes that dialect attrition among younger people--under the age of 70--can be directly attributed to the role of schools in language development and choice. Among my interviewees, only two ( #16 and #17) stated that they had never learned to speak well in CSU, although both clearly had a proficient passive knowledge. All other interviewees, even those relatively advanced in years, spoke CSU easily and well, with only minor phonological deviations from the standard norm415.

Another factor in dialect preservation often mentioned by interviewees is location of residence. A commonly held view is that only those speakers who remain high in the mountains
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415 Milroy and Milroy note that “items lagging behind in the shift occur in the speech of older informants, as stylistic variants” (1985: 341). This notion accounts for the general tendency among researchers to specifically seek out older informants for their dialect analyses.
still speak “authentic” dialect with little CSU influence; those who have migrated to centrally-located villages and towns already speak a “corrupted” form of Hutsul, if they still speak Hutsul at all (mentioned by Interviewees #1, #2, #12, #24, #26). This, however, indicates the same underlying belief that exposure to CSU is the trigger to dialect attrition; in addition, it does not contradict the view that age is a primary determinant of dialect proficiency, as many of those who still remain in the mountains are also of advanced age, with younger people increasingly migrating to more urban centers as the traditional occupation of herding becomes less economically viable. When Jastrems'ka 2008 conducted her extensive survey of the Hutsul lexicon, she based her fieldwork on the polynyna, primarily among those shepherds who spend four to six months out of every year tending their flocks far away from village society (including Interviewee #1, whom she also interviewed in her study). As Interviewee #12 explained, “it is only on the polynyna that life hasn’t changed; there they live as they did 100 years old ago. The shepherds who live there still speak dialect, as do very young children who have not yet started school. Otherwise, even in the smallest of villages, life is becoming more modern and people try to learn CSU as the modern language of Ukraine.” Interviewee #24 expressed a similar view, adding that “those who have moved into the villages have begun to forget [dialect]. The closer you get to a village or town center, the less people know and use dialect.”

Indeed, the physical movement of Hutsuls down from the mountains and into villages has often been linked to dialect attrition. In most recent cases, the migration of Hutsul youth out from the mountains has been motivated primarily by economic considerations: urban employment is a now a far more desirable and financially viable option than the difficult and unstable life of the isolated shepherd. However, the movement out of the mountains actually dates back earlier in the 20th century, even before the current push for modernization had reached the Hutsul lands. In this sense the migration that has directly impacted dialect knowledge and use can be traced back to Soviet-era policies and practices. Following World War II, a wave of arrests swept over Western Ukraine, resulting in thousands of inhabitants being sent off to penal colonies in Russia, far away from their networks of friends and relatives, and into a wholly foreign linguistic and cultural context. Several interviewees, who identified themselves as native speakers of Hutsul, noted that their own dialect competence declined greatly following their arrest and exile to Soviet labor camps: Interviewees #13 and #14 both claimed that they forgot how to speak in Hutsul while imprisoned in the camps. Interviewee #3, who also spent many years in a Russian labor camp, finished our interview by saying that, while she had tried to speak in Hutsul throughout our conversation, she now realized that in fact she had spoken very little dialect at all to me: she conceded that some of her pronunciation had been authentically Hutsul, but that all the words had come out in CSU, which she attributed to the trials in life that had for many years removed her from her native land.

While Interviewee #29 had never been arrested, she also attributed her perceived dialect deficiencies to Soviet-era policies: she noted that while her parents had always spoken in dialect,
people of her generation began to forget under the pressures of Soviet rule, mentioning the closure of churches as the primary catalyst of the social and linguistic disintegration of the time. Interviewee #8, who identified himself as a native Hutsul speaker, also made apologies for his current difficulty speaking in dialect, which he attributed to the fact that his place of employment during much of his life had promoted the use of Russian as the primary acceptable means of communication in Soviet Ukraine. In fact, during the interview, when he had tried to give examples of common Hutsul phrases still in wide use, he used numerous terms demonstrating a departure from traditional Hutsul phonological norms in favor of CSU-influenced pronunciation, resulting in a sort of “mixed-language” utterance. In addition, Interviewee #8 noted that his recent attempt to read the old Hutsul novel Dido Ivančik had ended in disappointment as he realized that he could understand very little of the language: he stated that it now seemed to him like a “foreign language,” one far removed from his current dialect competence. This statement seems to indicate two related phenomena of attrition: first, that the dialect has changed greatly since the early 20th century and second, that many Hutsuls today no longer maintain full linguistic competence in what they still consider to be their native dialect.

As a result of these social and political upheavals stemming from Soviet-era policy, the 20th century is marked by intergenerational decline in dialect knowledge and use. This was specifically noted by several interviewees (#12, #18, #19, #20, and #23), who mentioned a similar family trajectory of full dialect competence among their grandparents, decreased competence in their parents’ generation, and a continuing pattern of diminishment with each subsequent generation, including their own and that of their children (and, in some cases, grandchildren). Interviewee #18 was particularly detailed in describing her family’s linguistic dynamics, noting that her grandparents had spoken exclusively in Hutsul and, while she tries to speak some dialect with her parents, this is often limited to isolated token of local lexicon; her own children, however, speak only in CSU. Unlike Interviewee #8, Interviewee #20’s attempt to read Dido Ivančik was generally successful: he stated that he was able to read and understand much of the novel, but conceded that at least 20% of the words used were unfamiliar to him. While his parents were able to assist him with some of the unfamiliar words, he found that his grandparents were easily able to explain all of the unknown lexical items which had puzzled both him and his parents. He associated the novel’s language specifically with “his grandparents’ generation,” concluding that intergenerational atrophy—even in families which have actively sought to maintain Hutsul—has made it increasingly difficult for young people to even understand, much less speak, in dialect. In describing the current situation of dialect and its decline over the past century—including as a result of the Soviet linguistic legacy—Interviewee #23 surmised that “real Hutsul dialect as it was spoken 100 years ago no longer exists. What is spoken by people now in Hutsul villages is a mix of dialect and Ukrainian, often with a lot of

416 For example, he noted the common Hutsul greeting, “єк спали?”, which he articulated with a CSU substitution of ja < je, rendering the greeting as a mixed form utterance “як спали?”
417 He further admitted that his 12 year old daughter would not be able to understand anything in the novel, were she to attempt to read it.
Russianisms mixed in.”

5.4 Historical marginalization of Hutsuls

Accompanying Soviet-era policies destructive to their traditional occupations and networks was a correlate marginalization of Hutsul culture and identity. During the Soviet era, Hutsuls were often stereotyped not only as politically unreliable, but also backward, anachronistic peasants out of step with Soviet modernization.\textsuperscript{418} This image of the “wild Hutsul of the mountains” became so ingrained in popular consciousness, that it persisted even after the end of Soviet rule in Ukraine. Interviewee #2 spoke at length about the effects this kind of marginalization had on Hutsul identity, noting that as recently as 10-15 years ago, people were still ashamed to admit to be Hutsul and suffered from insecurity about their identity. This identity insecurity has in turn greatly informed the local dynamics of language ideology, with Hutsul, CSU, and Russian all claiming primary status at various points over the past 70 years. While the role of prestige\textsuperscript{419} as a catalyst to shift has been debated (e.g., Milroy and Milroy 1985), many researchers have acknowledged its influence in both shift and the interference that often precedes it vis-a-vis extensive bilingualism among the socioeconomically subordinate group (e.g. Thomason 2001). During the Soviet period Hutsul was particularly vulnerable as a low status dialect of what was nationally considered to be a low status language associated with a lack of education and sense of culture. While Russian was promoted as the prestige language throughout the Soviet Union as well as throughout much of Ukraine, Ukrainian was often locally prestigious in the western regions of the country, creating a clear line of linguistic bifurcation which often crowded out dialects. Several interviewees drew attention to the effects this had on both their sense of identity, as well as their linguistic habits. Interviewee #10 noted that following WWII many Hutsuls began speaking Russian, which was considered quite fashionable at the time, especially among ambition young people who sought to study at universities outside of the region. Interviewee #23 spoke at length about her experiences speaking dialect during the Soviet period, noting that societally dialect was mocked, censored, and labelled as anachronistic. When she and her friends spoke dialect at school, they were often laughed at by the teachers and administrators; as a result, when she started college she made the conscious decision to switch to CSU in an effort to fit and avoid further mockery. Interviewee #24 also recalled her experiences of being laughed at for speaking dialect at school during the Soviet period which she said led to most of her friends abandoning the dialect altogether, in favor of either Russian or CSU. Interviewee #13 stated that while she continued to speak the dialect as a child, she ultimately made the decision to switch to CSU as she wanted to speak “correctly.” She explained that people from (the western cultural center) Lviv were considered by many to be more cultured and, for this reason, they sometimes made fun of Hutsul speakers. She further recounted how, after

\textsuperscript{418} Even ostensibly “positive” images of Hutsuls were tainted with condescension, reducing the substance of their culture to colorful costumes and exoticized traditions.

\textsuperscript{419} Defined in terms of its ability to index socially desirable qualities.
adopting CSU and ridding her speech of dialectisms, she decided to also teach her Hutsul friends how to speak “correctly” so that they too “could be more cultured like people from Lviv.” She noted that she had always felt “second class” because of her Hutsul pronunciation and, although she still understands Hutsul, to this day prefers not to speak it.

While political domination and educational access are often mentioned as vehicles for the kind of status promotion incipient to interference and shift, mass media has also played an increasingly significant role. Kulyk 2006 in particular notes the importance of media “in the production of normality.” For Hutsulshchyna, the “production of normality” has mimicked larger language trends in Ukraine, where the baseline has been variably established by either standard Russian or CSU. The media dominance of these two standard languages has also contributed to local dialect interference and levelling, primarily through television, but increasingly through the internet as computer access has slowly risen in the region. The linguistic effects of media was noted by a few interviewees, most of whom pointed to the number of Russian words which have entered local speech through TV programming. Interviewee #20, for example, characterised the speech of his generation as marked by a relatively large number of Russian loanwords absorbed through broadcast media, both Soviet-era radio programs, and post-Soviet television, the latter a trend which has not abated in recent years. Interviewee #23 expressed a similar view, adding that, in her estimation, Hutsul has absorbed more Russian loanwords that has CSU as a result of a combination of media exposure and Soviet-era linguistic insecurity which had left the dialect vulnerable for many years. Interviewee #10 lamented the fact that local young people no longer read books because they have developed a preference for the internet and other forms of electronic media; in her opinion, the publication of Dido Ivančik and other classic works of Hutsul literature will, therefore, have no effect on dialect maintenance among youth. Instead she suggested that locally-produced media—particularly popular genres like the yellow press, blogs, and jokes—should be written in dialect; she felt would be the only way to engage young people and ultimately preserve Hutsul among the next generation for whom media has become increasingly influential part of their lives. However, currently all media—even that locally produced and targeted to a local audience—continues to be in Russian and/or CSU meaning that, for many young Hutsuls, there is little socially-mediated support for dialect replication available in culturally-accessible formats. Instead, media-driven models reinforce the levelling dynamics already manifest in most other areas of experience (education, jobs, inter-group communication).

5.5 Hutsul cultural revival

While the Soviet era was characterized by the cultural marginalization of Hutsuls, this situation began to shift following Ukrainian independence and the national polemic surrounding the origin and essence of Ukrainian identity, particularly in distinction from Russian identity and Russian-influenced identity. It is perhaps in part because of their previous marginalization, that the Hutsuls began to be promoted by some as a mythologically authentic, “uncorrupted” symbol
of the true Ukrainian nation. Within the (non-Hutsul) Ukrainian revival discourse, the same qualities once eschewed--wildness, remoteness, superstitiousness, and anachronism, dressed up in exotic, colorful costumes--have now been elevated to the status of “authentic” (non-Soviet, non-Russian). As such, Hutsul culture--and, correspondingly, Hutsul identity--have also become more widely esteemed. This dramatic shift in the wider Ukrainian perception of Hutsuls and its effects on Hutsul identity (in)security is captured aptly in this humorous anecdote by the Hutsul writer and comedic performer, Mykola Savčuk:

If long ago travelers came to the village of Myšyna in Kolomyja region and asked “Are you Hutsuls?, the locals would hurry to answer, “No way! Go ask for Hutsuls in Kosiv!” And in Kosiv they would protest: “We’re not Hutsuls and never have been! You go to Žab’a and ask about those Hutsuls!” And in Žab’a they would point further up in the mountains and say, “The Hutsuls are somewhere up there.” And so you could wander around for a year and never meet a single Hutsul.

But now it’s just the opposite. In Verxovyna, even the Russians claim they are Hutsuls. And in Kosiv—all the more so. And a number of people in Kolomyja say that they too are Hutsuls. Therefore the authorities must immediately stop the spread of the Hutsul territory and mark Kolomyja as its farthest border. Otherwise Hutsulschyna will soon stretch as far as the Dniepr, and Ukraine will be confined to a small area near Peremyšel and Toronto. (2010: 7)

While clearly hyperbolic, this anecdote does describe the new status conferred (often by outsiders) to Hutsul identity and, more generally, culture. However, cultural revival and increased valuation do not necessarily translate into similar changes in linguistic status and function, even when that revival is embraced by insiders and outsiders alike. Indeed, the more visibility given to artifacts of Hutsul culture--most often music, folk costumes, woodwork, and embroidery--the more the dialect seems to atrophy under the linguistic weight of CSU in the endeavor to promote the Hutsuls to the wider Ukrainian audience. Schilling-Estes 2002 explains this as an issue of perceived permeability, or hardening, of the linguistic and nonlinguistic boundaries between speakers. This issue of permeability determines the interrelatedness of cultural appropriation and dialect maintenance. In her case study of the Lumbee and Smith Islanders--two historically isolated communities--she makes the following insightful observation on the interaction between cultural symbols and language in post-isolation.

420 Of particular note is Ruslana’s Hutsul-inspired Eurovision performance, in which she presents her vision of “Ukraine” to an international audience.
421 Significantly, the lines of dialect immediately betray the speaker’s identity as Hutsul. This line is rendered as: Та де! Ви в Косові питайтеся за гуцулами!
422 Also in Hutsul dialect: Ми не гуцулі і ніколи ними не були! Ви в Жьб’ю питайтеся за тих гуцулів!
423 Often with additional vested interest in the developing tourism industry.
Smith islanders, in contrast [to the Lumbee], do not have available to them the kinds of overt, readily-recognizable symbols of group membership that the Lumbee do; and so, if they hope to maintain their unique cultural identity against that of neighboring mainlanders, their best option is to harden their linguistic boundaries--in other words, to continue to increase their dialectalal distinctiveness. (2002: 80)

For the Hutsuls, particularly within the context of a cultural revival movement highlighting the most visible symbols of their heritage, this issue of permeability becomes significant. Specifically, processed and promoted cultural artifacts--embroidery, woodwork, dance, and elements of folk costumes--have become the primary mode of symbolizing and expressing Hutsul identity to both internal and external audiences. The result then is inverse to Schilling-Estes’s observations about the Smith Islanders: because enough distinct, easily-recognizable cultural symbols are already available, maintenance of a distinct dialect as a cultural marker becomes less necessary, or even culturally redundant. Importantly, this applies both to the manner of cultural replication among Hutsuls, as well as to cultural promotion directed toward Ukrainians outside of the group, for whom clear categories already exist based on stereotyping of previous exposure to (often fictionalized) folkloric images.

Group-internally (that is, among Hutsuls living within Hutsul communities), this cultural revival through the replication and promotion of visual symbols most frequently takes the form of ritualized wearing of folk shirts embroidered with distinctly Hutsul colors and patterns. Several interviewees noted that embroidered Hutsul shirts have become fashionable to wear on holidays, and particularly at weddings, even among the younger generation, and in distinct contrast to Soviet-era norms where such clothes were considered old-fashioned and outdated (Interviewees #5, #10, #22, #25). Interviewee #10 was particularly emphatic in her belief that the popularization of Hutsul folk costumes has been the primary vehicle for engendering respect for and ensuring the maintenance of traditional local culture among youth. In addition to the visual symbols of traditional embroidered shirts, music and dance have also served as important in-group symbols. Public play and display of folk instruments--particularly the trembita--has often served a metaphor for Hutsul identity as forged under the harsh conditions of mountain life. Interviewee #11 made particular mention of the annual Hutsul music festivals, which take place every summer in the Verxovyna region. These festivals--day-long celebrations highlighting traditional Hutsul instruments, dances, costumes, and food--serve not only to popularize folk

---

424 The importance of looking at other (non linguistic) cultural artifacts is also noted by Eckert who writes, “material style, particularly clothing and other forms of adornment, provide important clues to the study of linguistic style” (2008: 457).

425 Most recently, when a group of Hutsuls arrived in Kiev to support the Euromaidan protesters, they alighted the barricades carrying their trembitas, with which they serenaded the crowd from the man-made mountaintops.
customs and culture, but also function as important community-building events, where friends, family, and neighbors reunite in the context of cultural appreciation and preservation (Interviewee #11). However, in my experience attending several of these music festivals, I believe it is significant to note that among all of the ceremonial speeches by local community leaders, introductions of performances, and numerous toasts, it is exceedingly rare to hear a single word spoken in Hutsul dialect. Rather, the public nature of the event seems to trigger the use of CSU (as the public, official language), and the need for cultural connection and reconnection is fulfilled through acts of performance.

Many of the same symbols used by Hutsuls within their communities to solidify cultural identity and replication are also projected outward to audiences of (non-Hutsul) Ukrainians. For many Ukrainians, the image of the Hutsul was initially formed by Parajanov’s epic Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors with its mythology of a people left behind by civilization and still clinging stubbornly to ancient traditions, an image which has resonated with many modern Ukrainians seeking to redefine their own post-Soviet identities. Ruslana’s Eurovision performance based on the “simulation” and “essentialization” of Hutsul culture (Baker 2008) served to further mythologize the “Wild Dances” of the Hutsuls, accompanied by the lament of the trembita. It is through this paradigm that Hutsul cultural revivalists have projected the public image of their identity to larger, outside audiences. It is an image that is sometimes at odds with dialect maintenance, as can be observed in many local efforts to capitalize on the popularity of all things Hutsul among the growing number of tourists to the region. Throughout the region, “Hutsul” has essentially become a marketing brand. Local hotels, stores, cafes, and even bread factories all bear the name “Hutsul,” drawing on the popular image of something exotic, authentically local, and attractive to tourists. However, a tourist will not hear Hutsul dialect spoken at the Hutsul Hotel, as the administrators converse exclusively in CSU. Similarly, the craftsmen and shopkeepers selling “authentic Hutsul souvenirs” in Kosiv’s tourist district chat together throughout the day in CSU, and one can visit the famed Hutsul museum in Kolomyja and never once hear Hutsul spoken there. So while the overall public projection of Hutsul culture has expanded, and has clearly found an audience among outsiders, the marketing of visible cultural artifacts has not been accompanied by a similar public promotion of dialect as a vehicle Hutsul tradition as targeted to an outside audience. This seems to indicate an underlying Hutsul assumption that outsider audiences place higher value on physical elements representing local culture than by hearing the sounds of local speech. Yet there is evidence that such an assumption may be inaccurate.

Several interviewees recounted the experience of friends and family members who travelled to Kyiv or other faraway cities, and who elicited great interest from the people they encountered. Significantly, many of these encounters included numerous questions about—and great interest in—the Hutsul dialect. One interviewee (#15) who is currently studying at a university in Kyiv spoke at length about how others there perceive her as a Hutsul. She
mentioned that the most frequent request made of her is to say various words and phrases in dialect. She noted that most people ask her to speak for them in dialect, and a number of them make an effort to learn to phrases she says for them. In addition, when some of her friends from Kyiv came to visit her in Verxovyna during the summer break, they made an effort to speak to her family using dialect forms. Yet, she stated that she herself endeavors to speak only “correct Ukrainian,” indicating a deep divide between the way outsiders view dialect as a cultural expression, and the way some young Hutsuls perceive its current indexicality and utility. Indeed, outsiders sometimes express greater interest in dialect than Hutsuls expect and, in some cases, this outsider interest can even motivate Hutsuls to (re)learn their own traditions, as they begin to observe the high value placed on their culture by other Ukrainians. Interviewee #11 recounted how he once travelled to Kyiv and noticed that people there viewed his Hutsul identity with admiration: he felt that his Hutsul mannerisms were valued by the people he encountered in Kyiv, and this inspired him to reflect on the question of what makes Hutsuls different from other Ukrainians. As he searched for the roots of his identity, he began learning Hutsul folk songs, an activity reinforced by the positive attention he received from others, as he noted that people in Kyiv really loved hearing him sing the old songs of the mountains.

While recent revivalist efforts have clearly found an audience both locally and throughout Ukraine, its effects of dialect retention have generally been fairly weak. To some degree, this is the result of Hutsul assumptions--likely formed in the years of historical marginalization--that their dialect is less valued than other, material aspects of their culture. In addition, the Hutsul dialect--at least in its old form--differs significantly enough from CSU that inter-group communication can be hindered, a fact which has necessitated accommodation when targeting outsiders as potential “consumers” of Hutsul cultural artifacts, including audiences of musical and dance performances and tourists visiting the region in need of lodging, food, and souvenirs. However, the extent of accommodation may in fact be a lost opportunity: many (non) Hutsul Ukrainians are clearly quite interested in hearing the Hutsul dialect, even if it represents more of a linguistic curiosity to them, rather than a viable form of communication. Nevertheless, the dialect attrition triggered through cultural revival seems more Hutsul-driven, rather than externally-imposed.

5.6 Economic transformation and social mobility

Throughout the post-independence period, Ukraine has often become an ideological battleground, where theories of language, politics, economics, and religion are hotly debated and often left without the kind of definitive consensus necessary for sustained stability. For the Hutsuls, debates surrounding economic revitalization are of particularly vital importance: for much of their history, local economic vulnerability has been intrinsically linked to cultural and linguistic vulnerability. Hutsulschyna—where the traditional occupations are farming and herding on the polonyna—remains one of the poorest, lowest educated, and least developed
regions in Ukraine. The economic reality accompanying recent socioeconomic modernization has caused many people to abandon their traditional occupations and rural villages in exchange for urban areas offering greater economic opportunities within the emerging commerce and service-based economic system. Commenting on the current state of the traditional Hutsul lifestyle, D. Vatamanjuk, the head of the Verxovyna-based “Tovarystvo Hutsulshchyna” states:

But all of this [traditional lifestyle] is in decline: livestock production, planting in ecologically sound conditions is similarly undervalued, as is the high quality folk art produced by local craftsmen. Therefore the Hutsul can not survive in the mountains (2006: 89).

This decline in traditional occupations and lifestyle, accompanied by the need for an educated populace to implement the kind of economic and policy reforms necessary to revitalize the region, has unsurprisingly affected the mode and manner by which people communicate with each other, as well as the effort to expand communicative competence to areas far beyond their local environs and networks. The accompanying desire for upward mobility has provided one of the strongest incentives for dialect abandonment among young Hutsuls living under the mercurial conditions inherent in the processes of economic modernization and sociopolitical integration with mainland Ukraine.

The effects of upward mobility on dialect maintenance have been well-studied. In particular, changing realities of employment, including the shift from agriculture to a service economy, can trigger changes in both the manner in which people communicate with one another, as well as with whom they tend to communicate (Milroy: 2004). Further, in addition to a retreat down from the mountain and into more centralized, urban areas with somewhat greater employment options, many Hutsuls are leaving the region altogether in search of expanded educational opportunities and more viable professions. A Hutsul seeking maximum social advancement must, therefore, accomplish two tasks: first, he must speak the way people in an urban environment are expected to speak, in “correct” Ukraine, and second, he must move out of the mountain and into a more urban environment, possibly one located in a more prosperous

---

426 Chambers 2002, for example, presents a very detailed and convincing argument for the mechanism by which social and occupational mobility almost always have a levelling effect on dialects. Labov 2001 thoroughly dissects the social dynamics of mobility and language, while Hill 1999 describes shift as a result of the desire for increased access to resources, or what she calls a “distributive strategy,” by which resource insecurity is the primary motivation for dialect change and shift, more immediate than intensity of contact, relative size of populations, and power dynamics. Heller 2006 also alludes to this notion when he writes, “Cultural meaning, in terms of the substantive understanding of identities and social relations (what it means to belong to specific groups, to engage in specific language practices), is understood to flow from political economic relations.”

427 Particularly in the tourism industry which requires frequent inter-group communication with visitors from other parts of the country and abroad.

428 There are no colleges or universities in Hutsulshchyna; the closest regional institute of higher education is located in the city of Ivano-Frankivsk.

429 As Interviewee #10 notes, “You can’t find work if you don’t know the literary language [CSU], even in Hutsul villages. Someone who speaks only dialect won’t be able to get a job.”
region of the country. The cumulative result of increased migrations—whether motivated by access to higher education or by expanded employment opportunities—is both the breakdown of the social bonds that had previously structured the community along close kinship ties, as well as increased opportunities for the encroachment of outside influence that had been previously held at bay by conditions of relative isolation.

5.7 The decline of Hutsul social networks and the role of migration

Social network analysis was first pioneered in the 1960s and 1970s by social anthropologists seeking a theoretical framework for describing social relationships within a community. This framework was then adopted by linguistic variationists as a means of modelling the interrelationship between social bonds and language behavior. Among the best-known linguistic research employing and expanding upon the social network model are works by James Milroy and Lesley Milroy, who have often focused on the effects of interpersonal relationships on language choice, and Penny Eckert, who has described linguistic variation as a socially-determined and directed practice. To use Milroy and Milroy’s basic dichotomy, social networks can be described as either loose-knit (characterized by members who have many network ties, but whose relationships tend to be more casual and distant), or close-knit (characterized by far fewer established social relationships, but ones which tend to include frequent contact, and a more deeper sense of kin- or friendship). Whether a community can be generally described as loose-knit or close-knit has important implications for the language practices of that community, particularly when the issues at stake are language maintenance, change, and potentially shift. Milroy and Milroy have observed that when an individual has primarily close-knit ties to his community, he has a greater tendency to adhere to the vernacular norms of that community; in other words, the nature of a community member’s social relationships can exert a strong influence favoring dialect maintenance (1985). As they write, “a close-knit network has an intrinsic capacity to function as a norm-enforcement mechanism, to the extent that it operates in opposition to larger scale institutional and standardising pressures” (1985: 359). In this way, a close-knit network can effectively minimize or even prevent external pressures toward dialect levelling and loss. Bunin Benor’s work has further confirmed these findings as she notes that members of close-knit networks tend to demonstrate the use of far more distinctive linguistic features than those with looser network ties, or those with a greater number of ties outside of the primary community (2010).

Historically, Hutsul communities have been characterized by almost all of the traits considered typical for close-knit communities: they were geographically isolated, with minimal

---

430 Eckert uses the term “community of practice” to describe the social unit of analysis.
431 While widely used, the social network model of language behavior does have its critics. Patrick 2001 stresses the limitations of the speech community model in terms of identifying correlation and indexicality resulting from the frequent heterogeneity found among members.
mobility, organized largely along kinship lines. Milroy 2004 further notes that, "such networks also flourish in low-status communities (both rural and urban) in the absence of social and geographical mobility and are important in fostering the solidarity ethos associated with the long-terms survival of socially disfavored languages and dialects." Schilling-Estes 2002 describes Isolated communities as most often typified by close network ties which in turn leads to linguistic conservatism (including preservation of archaisms) and greater homogeneity. Indeed, the long history of the Hutsul dialect’s survival is a testament to the strength of social and cultural ties linking together speakers within the construct of a unified identity based on both shared kin and shared experiences. For many years, the strength of these ties were the primary support mechanism for the continued replication and maintenance of localized linguistic norms, despite subtle encroachments upon the community’s physical and social isolation from mainland Ukraine. However, following the arrests, deportations, and church closures in the wake of World War II, coupled with an aggressive push for centralized and standardized education for children, the close-knit networks began to break down. Yet, the greater threat to network ties has come in recent years as a direct result of modernization and integration with Ukraine: modernization has led to increased desire for social mobility, often accompanied by geographical mobility and migration from the region, while integration has led to stronger identification with other Ukrainians, as well as more porous borders through which people regularly travel as tourists, and even settlers, creating unprecedented levels of sustained interaction with outsiders. What was once a classic close-knit network is now rapidly transforming into a prototypical loose-knit community, with members moving back and forth through relationships and social groups while developing a greater number of ties with peoples from far beyond the community’s traditional physical and social borders. The linguistic implication of this loosening of a (previously) close-knit network is vulnerability to linguistic change and ultimately shift, resulting from a reduction in the norm-enforcing pressure characteristic of close-knit ties (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 367) and the disappearance of “the social and cognitive prerequisites for supporting highly localized norms” (Milroy 2002: 10). In terms of the effects of urbanization on the network, Milroy 2004 describes:

The change in social structure associated with rural to urban migration involves a move from an 'insulated' network consisting largely of kinsfolk and neighbors to an 'integrated' urban network where links are less multiplex but contracted in a wider range of social contexts. The linguistic counterpart of this change is increasing dialect diffuseness...Networks constituted chiefly of strong ties function as a mechanism to support minority languages, resisting institutional pressures to language shift, but when these networks weaken, language shift was likely to take place.

Indeed, through the combined influences of urbanization, modernization, expanded access to education, and ultimately motivation for migration, Hutsul network ties have become
increasingly diffuse and, at times, rather unstable. This diffusion inhibits the replication of localized language norms, while at the same time leaving the remaining dialect vulnerable to influence in the form of convergence. The accompanying increased mobility, leading to increased migration both to and from the region, shapes Hutsuls’ communicative environment by drawing them into contact with a greater number of CSU speakers with whom they form often weak, uniplex ties (relative to the dense, multiplex ties once more characteristic of their community). As this happens, the dual nature of Hutsul ethnic identity--at once both Hutsul and Ukrainian--is further diffused by expanded association with those identifying by only the Ukrainian ethnic identity. Croft 2003 makes a clear distinction here, noting that "a focused society is one that is tight-knit and has a strong sense of social identity, in particular of its distinctness from other groups. A diffuse society is loose-knit and has a more open attitude to influences (and immigrants) from another society. (p. 7)” In Croft’s analysis, the linguistic phenomenon of convergence is most closely associated with a diffuse society, as Hutsulshchyna must now be defined based both on attitudes towards identity, as well as inward and outward regional mobility.

This current trend of migration out of the region has been motivated primarily by a desire for increased access to educational or professional opportunities. This point was raised by several interviewees many of whom noted its detrimental effect both to language and community. Interviewee #16 discussed her daughter, who moved to Xmel'nyč'kyj several years ago in search of work. Once settled in her new city, the daughter married a local resident and is now raising her own children outside of the Hutsul community. Interviewee #16 mentioned that her daughter has tried to pass down Hutsul cultural knowledge to her children, but when they visit Verxovyna they are unable speak to her in dialect, as she had always imagined her grandchildren someday doing. Interviewee #12 raised the issue of Hutsul women emigrating abroad in search of work (usually as nannies and housekeepers), often leaving behind their husbands and children. She noted that when this happens, the husbands often start drinking and tend to withdraw from public life and participation in the local community, as women are more commonly the driving force in preservation of community-based traditions and, without that driving force, men lose motivation to maintain social integration. In her opinion, this has led to an overall breakdown in the replication and maintenance of local culture. This interviewee also believes that most young people who move to Kyiv or other cities for college education will stay there upon graduation as so few suitable jobs would be available for them should they return to Hutsulshchyna, where is there a severe shortage of skilled employment accompanied by unreasonably low wages. The only interviewee to provide a counter view to the opinion that migration is a threat to Hutsul linguistic and cultural integrity was Interviewee #11 who stated that economic migration from the region has been vastly overstated and, when it does occur, is only temporary and therefore has very little effect on Hutsul communities or local traditions. This view was rejected by several interviewees, including Interviewee #12 who estimated that

432 Including Interviewee #15, herself a young Hutsul who has moved away to attend college in Kyiv.
approximately 40% of Hutsuls who leave the region never return to settle in their native villages or town, as the opportunity disparity between Hutsulshchyna and other more prosperous regions of Ukraine is so marked; there is simply little motivation to return. There do not seem to be any statistics available indicating the true number of Hutsuls who have left the region over the past decade, nor of those who have left permanently vs. those who ultimately returned. However, there is clearly a perception among many Hutsuls that the number of economic emigrants is high enough to be of significance and that many of those leave only return to the region for short vacations, not to re-settle.

When Hutsuls who have migrated from the region return to Hutsulshchyna, often to visit local family and friends, many interviewees noted that something in the ways they talk and carry themselves had changed. The experience of living outside of the region for an extended period of time had, in the view of many, made them somehow different, even if they sometimes struggled to define what exactly that difference was. The most marked differences seem to have occurred during the Soviet era, when young men were conscripted into the army and sent to other regions of the Soviet Union to serve their two obligatory years: Interviewee #23 noted that, because Russian was language of the Soviet Army, Hutsuls who served often returned to the region speaking in mixture of Ukrainian and Russian and seemed wholly unable to ever rid their language of Russian influence. At the same time, this interviewee also recounted the story of a friend of her father’s who had lived in Moscow for over 30 years. When he returned to visit Hutsulshchyna, he was still able to speak such “perfect dialect,” with no discernable Russian influence, that her father cried, as this example of dialect preservation was so deeply meaningful to him. Both Interviewees #5 and #25 also noted the prevalence of Russian influence in the speech of Hutsul migrants who return to the community, even in the post-Soviet era: Interviewee #5 particularly mentioned the large Russian vocabularies with which migrants return, but did not notice much significant grammatical influence. In addition to a distinctly Russian lexical influence, Interviewee #25 also stated that Hutsuls who return from living in the Eastern part of the country no longer socialize in the same way as local Hutsuls; in her opinion, they are less talkative, less inclined to stop and chat with friends and neighbors, and generally more shut off from others. Interviewee #6 shared this view and observed that when Hutsul move abroad or to other regions of Ukraine, upon their return they:

...speak differently and behave differently. It affects the way they speak, they don’t socialize as much. Hutsuls tend to be very chatty: when they meet by chance on the street, they will stand and talk for 10 to 15 minutes. They like to converse with everyone they meet. But Hutsuls who have lived outside of the area come back less chatty, less interested in spontaneous conversation on the street. I think this habit of talking on the street comes from living in the mountains: meetings with others were rare and welcome opportunities because socializing was usually limited to the family members with whom you lived on your land in
the mountains. Meetings with other people took place less frequently, either in church or during a trip to the village center, so people would always stop and chat for a while to find out the news. Hutsuls who have moved to urban areas no longer feel that need to socialize at every opportunity.

As Milroy and Milroy note, mobility and migration are closely linked to the formation of weak network ties and dissolution of previously close knit network. These conditions in turn create the necessary social context for language change, including contact-induced incursions (1985). In their analysis, “innovations are normally transmitted from one group to another by persons who have weak ties to both groups...in situations of mobility or social instability, where the proportion of weak links in a community is consequently high, linguistic change is likely to be rapid” (1985: 380). These conditions of economic instability and the resulting issue of social and geographical mobility have contributed to the Hutsul dialect’s continued vulnerability, by means of both the transfer of close, locally-based ties to weak, farther-flung ties, and the influx of linguistic innovations carried by speakers who have spent significant time in a very different linguistic environment. In the case of the latter, these migrants living outside of the region often begin to lose their own dialect knowledge through a “lack the extensive and regular input needed to maintain localized norms” (Milroy 2004). Upon their return to Hutsulshchyna, they often speak a version of the dialect that has been heavily influenced by either Russian or CSU norms, innovations which they then may spread into the local environment. It is possible that, for Hutsuls, the spread of innovative forms vis-a-vis economic migrants might be mitigated if, as several interviewees noted, such migrants socially withdraw and become less inclined to converse with others upon their return to the region.

5.8 The role of children and young adults in language change


1. Children begin language development by imitating the forms modelled to them by female caretakers
2. Formal/informal dimension: children associate formal speech with instruction and punishment, information speech with intimacy and fun
3. Children learn that non-standard speech is associated with lower social status
4. Children rebel and use non-standard language to express non-conformity to institutional practices
5. Changes diffuse into the wider community by those who adopted linguistic symbols of non-conformity
As this list enumerates, children—and childhood language acquisition—play a crucial role in language transmission, a role with often determines the degree to which languages are maintained, changed, or lost. While this list is generally applicable to a variety of language contexts, it is particularly helpful in examining the case of Hutsul. Each point—or principle—in the list closely coincides with local language dynamics, including the tendency of language to be transmitted by older women to grandchildren (principle 1), the emergence of the school vs. home dichotomy (principle 2), the issue of upward mobility (principle 3), the use of dialect as ingroup slang (principle 4).

When the language of the home and the language of school are at odds, the resulting tension—and its ultimate resolution—is of critical importance in determining the manner, speed, and extent of relative language maintenance vs. relative language loss. In “the Ethan Experiment,” Chambers describes a child of Eastern European immigrants in an English speaking community. Most striking about his articulation of English is that his phonological inventory precisely mirrored that of the local community, rather than being shaped by his parents’ accented, non-native variety; indeed, his local native English is entirely bereft of any foreign interference at all, despite having been raised by non-native speakers. Chambers attributes this to an “innate accent filter” which is able to screen out socially marked, localized features in favor of preferred community norms. The implications of this reach well beyond the family, and into the larger language environment, whereby any stigmatized traits would be passed through the “accent filter” and ultimately eliminated in favor of standardized traits, in a process that is closely related to dialect/language convergence. As she explains, “in the Ethan Experience, we seem to have discovered a device which allows individuals to disengage themselves from certain eccentric or at least diversionary communities of practice that fall within their worlds, presumably in order to allow them to participate fully in the communities that will play more integral roles in forming their identities” (p. 123). Such an innate filter could be expected to facilitate the process of dialect shift among children as they enter school, become aware of stigmatization of non-standard speech (Labov’s principle 4), and align their speech more closely with the standard language (in the case of Hutsuls, also the dominant language of upward mobility, CSU).

Fellin’s 2002 study of the Nones dialect, spoken in the Revo community of Italy, sheds further light on the dynamics of home language vs. school language among children whose native dialect is a local variety of the national standardized language taught in schools. She noticed that were indications of a generational divide in terms of language ideology, with relatively older parents advocating a switch to Italian within the home environment in order to better support their children’s school-based acquisition of the standard language, while relatively younger parents typically advocated a home language vs. school language dichotomy in which maintenance of the Nones dialect in private contexts would better integrate children

433 With the sole exception of principle 5, which seems less applicable to the Hutsul case currently.
into the local community. The Hutsul situation does bear some resemblance to that of Nones in terms of parental ambivalence towards use of the dialect as a home language of child-caretaker interaction (Labov’s principle 1). Interviewees had mixed reactions to the question of whether home-based dialect use was a benefit or a detriment to their children’s linguistic and social development for precisely the same reasons that Fellin’s Nones informants differed on the issue. While several interviewees stated that they try to speak to their children in dialect in order to foster better integration and respect for the community (Interviewees #5, #16, #20, and #22 particularly emphasized the dialect’s role in intergenerational communication and cultural connection), others stated that they did not want to hinder their children’s acquisition of CSU by introducing dialect to them at a young age. Interviewee #14 was particularly adamant in his view that early, home-based dialect proficiency would disadvantage children once they started school. While he said it might be acceptable for children to learn dialect later in life in order to connect with their cultural heritage, he would far prefer his grandchildren to be proficient in CSU, even if that meant forgetting dialect altogether.

In her Revo study, Fellin further observed a clear pattern of codeswitching among both parents and teachers who would shift from Italian to Nones specifically in contexts of discipline and the assertion of adult authority. As she writes, “Nones is used to mark a shift in footing, to intensify effect and index authority signaling the seriousness of the speakers’ intent.” (2002: 49). The result is that the local dialect has begun to index explicit links to community membership and the adherence to social norms of behavior, which ultimately bolsters the position of the dialect in the community. As Fellin further notes, “typically, as children got older, they tended to use the dialect more and more and shifted to it altogether by the time they were nine or ten” (p. 51). The overall dynamics within Hutsul schools, however, tend to be rather different from those of the Nones case study, with patterns of stigmatization informing the dialect’s restricted use within educational environments. Interviewee #7, a Ukrainian language and literature teacher at a boarding school in Verxovyna, offered unique insights into the question of language dynamics among Hutsul children in local schools. The children with whom she primarily works live high up in the mountains; they travel to Verxovyna each week to both study and live at the school, returning back to their homes only for the weekends and school vacations. As residents of the mountains, they typically arrive at school fluent only in dialect, with little standard language competence. According to her experience, when they arrive at school in the first grade, they initially experience great difficulty in acquiring CSU. As she explains:

When they start school, they write the way they speak and teachers must continually correct them. Even by the 5th grade, they still use a lot of dialect words, spelling, and grammar in their compositions and they often need a lot of tutoring; but after 5th grade things usually start to even out, and it becomes easier.
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434 He was particularly concerned by the challenges Hutsul-speaking schoolchildren make in the written language, stating their writing tends to have far more errors than their CSU-speaking peers.
for them to use standard Ukrainian. Although even then there are usually still a few dialectalisms. By the 8th grade, they can usually write well in correct Ukrainian, that is the goal. And by the time their writing begins to conform to standard Ukrainian, so does their speech: they begin to speak noticeably more standard Ukrainian with their peers, than they do dialect.

Interviewee #7 was particularly emphatic about two related aspects of language in the Husul school environment: teachers work hard to ensure that their students learn to write in standard Ukrainian with as few dialectalisms as possible and, as children begin to conform to expectation of CSU use, they extend that use to communication with peers, such that two native Hutsul-speaking children will, over time, begin to interact solely in CSU while at school. Interviewee #12 similarly noted that young Hutsuls no longer speak dialect even among themselves. Chambers’s “Ethan Experiment” gives clear indication that peer group is often more influential than family in determining linguistic outcomes, a view supported by Milroy and Milroy 1985 and further elaborated in Milroy 2002, who notes that children become more peer-oriented than home-oriented as they grow older. In the Hutsul case, then, the school plays one of the primary roles in promoting CSU at the expense of the local dialect. Through both stigmatization and correction, school are instrumental in encouraging conformation to the standard, even in casual contact among peers. This follows the same pattern already illustrated above of CSU becoming the sole code considered appropriate for public speech, and Hutsul being relegated to private language status.

While #7 was the only educator among my interviewees, many others also held strong views about the role of dialect in schools. Interviewee #29 said that she believed that there was already a plan in place to offer the Hutsul dialect as an elective at local schools. The only other interviewee to express a similar belief was #25 who stated that she had heard that the city was planning to offer dialect courses once a week to Hutsul children in order to preserve the dialect among youth; both Interviewees #10 and #23 were unfamiliar with any such plans, but stated that would be very happy if the Hutsul dialect were taught to children who could then learn “authentic” Hutsul as it was spoken by their grandparents. While there is has been no confirmation that local schools will be offering courses in the Hutsul dialect any time soon, these interviewee statements do reflect an important attitude: the desire and hope for dialect maintenance in the face of clear threats from an educational environment strongly promoting the standard.

Further, acknowledging that schools can have a potent effect on children’s dialect maintenance or loss, a Verxovyna school teacher named Oksana Stefjuk recently created and published a book entitled “The Hutsul Children’s Alphabet (Rosbalt.ru 09/06/12). With the
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435 “The child's orientation to the peer group is crucial in determining whether he or she adopts a new dialect feature, as opposed to maintaining the sometimes distinctively different norms of the family" (Milroy 2002: 10).
assistance of her 3rd and 4th grade students, Ms. Stefjuk compiled and illustrated numerous words and definitions of common Hutsul lexical items, as well as poetry and proverbs in Hutsul dialect. In creating this volume, Stefjuk described her hope that the “Alphabet” would help preserve the dialect among the younger generation, who are quickly forgetting the language of their parents. At the time that this article was published, there were plans to distribute “Hutsul Children’s Alphabet” to local schools in Bukovyna. While it is uncertain how and to what extent such a dictionary will be used in Hutsul schools, its publication speaks to significant local desire for Hutsul children to maintain connections to their culture with language as one of the primary conduits. Although a children's picture dictionary clearly cannot preserve the full linguistic system and grammatical elaboration of the dialect, its promotion of Hutsul lexicon, poems, and proverbs is highly symbolic of the role dialect has played in the cultural history of the region.

5.9 “Hutsul Surzhyk”

While several interviewees noted that peer interaction among Hutsul youth is increasingly taking place in CSU, there was also occasional mention of another code being used among young people for in-group communication. This code is a mixed-language form combining elements of Hutsul and CSU, or what Interviewee #28 referred to as “Hutsul surzhyk.” This same interviewee described “Hutsul surzhyk” as approximately 50% Hutsul and 50% CSU, and stated that it has become a very common way for young people in Hutsul’schina to communicate with one another. This view was shared by Interviewees #10 and #12, the former of whom stated that, “among youth, ‘pure’ dialect no longer exists. It is like surzhyk, but it becomes more diluted [by CSU influence] with each generation.” In her work on code-switching behavior and its role in language attrition, Myers-Scotton noted that unmarked codeswitching most often “takes place in casual, ingroup interactions between peers who positively evaluate for their own identification both the identities indexed by the two (or more) codes involved in CS.” (1993: 213). In this sense, the manner of codeswitching involved in the production of “Hutsul surzhyk” can solidify the shared sense of dual identity—both Hutsul and Ukrainian—felt by most members of the younger generation raised entirely in the post-Soviet era of independence and revival, both national and local. As this hybrid code indexes local identity, it also promotes a sense of ingroup membership among its speakers.

However, because this hybrid places Hutsul in a heavily CSU-mediated linguistic context, the mixed form can act as a catalyst to dialect change, ultimately accelerating the process of convergence discussed in previous chapters. Thomason and Kaufman speak directly to this issue in their analysis of the intergenerational replication of Yiddish which over time has become so heavily influenced by English, that for many speakers it no longer exists in an unadulterated form (1988). The Yiddish-English hybrid that has emerged has ultimately led to
overall attrition in the use of Yiddish as with each subsequent generation, a phenomenon the authors claim as typical of mixed speech forms, with the expected result that "the group's original language was not ultimately passed on as a coherent set of interrelated lexical and grammatical structures" (1988: 40).

From the emergence of “Hutsul surzhyk” is can be concluded that, for some members of the younger generation, the Hutsul dialect continues to fulfill a communicative function as well as occupy a symbolic position in culture, even when merged with CSU, creating a new form symbolizing both a dual identity and in-group membership. Two interviewees--#10 and #19--even took this idea a step further and characterized the use of Hutsul among young as a kind of slang. While this could perhaps be interpreted as correlating with Labov’s principle 4, an alternative explanation is local solidarity, a phenomenon largely supported through other symbols promoting cultural revival. Rather than simply a rebellion against the norms of CSU, it quite likely also constitutes a symbolic embrace of cultural heritage. Interviewee #19 in particular mentioned that her children generally do try to speak “proper” CSU, but use Hutsul lexical items on occasion when speaking informally to peers. Interviewee #10 mentioned that her children sometimes use dialect to “show off” for tourists, as an expression of local pride and uniqueness. However, such limited uses of dialectal lexicon isolated from grammatical context will likely fail to support meaningful dialect maintenance on a larger scale. The best case scenario might be that such uses of Hutsul, like “The Hutsul Children’s Dictionary,” can help preserve cultural links and symbols through some minimal maintenance of the most salient, locally-relevant lexical items.

5.10 Interlopers and inter-group communication

As patterns of cross migration become typical of the post-isolation conditions of Hutsulshchyna, a greater number of Hutsul speakers are coming into sustained, close contact with speakers of other Ukrainian dialects, most commonly CSU. As discussed above, this often results from Hutsul migrations out of the region; however, arguably more significant is the influx of non-Hutsuls into the region. As their previous isolation has given way to increased geographical accessibility to the region through the development of train and bus routes, a large number of outsiders have been able to travel to region. In some cases, these visitors come only as short-term tourists; in other cases, however, these visitors choose to settle permanently in the region, often marrying and raising their children locally. These outsiders--or, as Chambers refers to them, interlopers--often act as catalysts to linguistic change as inter-group communication strategies--including local accommodation--are necessitated. This increased need to communicate with non-group members is intrinsically linked to the economic changes in the region discussed above, namely the shift from an insular agricultural society to an integrated service economy based largely on the hopes for development of the tourist industry, a sphere squarely placed on the need
to communicate with speakers from outside of the region. The links between economic changes, networks, and inter-group communication was summarized well by Gumperz in his description of a German-Slovenian bilingual community:

[Po]or and socially stigmatized farming communities had traditionally been embedded in classic close-knit networks of mutual support which linked them in many capacities--as co-workers, neighbors, and friends who socialized together within the boundaries of their community. However, such behaviors changed as the economy shifted from a dependence on subsistence farming to a primarily service economy...Farmers sold produce to incomers and to factories rather than dealing with other local farmers; farm buildings were converted into tourist accommodation for the many visitors entering the area...As many day to day interactions came to be with urban outsiders, villagers lost their reliance on the local support network. (1982)

In many ways, Gumperz’s description mirrors the current situation in Hutsulshchyna: economic development has had a direct impact on both how and with whom one must be linguistically prepared to interact, particularly as communicative competence becomes the cornerstone of a rapidly growing tourist industry seeking to convince potential visitors--from both other regions of Ukraine and abroad--of the accessibility and modernization of the region.

The phenomenon of linguistic change resulting from newcomers to a community was described in detail by both Milroy 2002 and Chambers 2002, who discusses the effects of those "who move into a region and bring with them lexical variants that differ from the ones in their new home area" (p. 124). In this scenario, Chambers identifies the primary threat to be “interloper forms” which begin replacing local terms in a two step process: first, the interloper form becomes a doublet for a local lexical item and, second, local children acquire both terms but fail to recognize the interloper form as externally marked. In this way, “foreign” vocabulary begins to infiltrate the local dialect system which may then go through additional phonological, morphological, or syntactic changes triggered by the lexical shifts. Chambers’s observations are further supported by those of Schilling-Estes who described the effects of outsider lexical incursions into post-isolated dialects (2002). According to her work, outsider forms, including variant usage norms, often lead to simplification in the receiving dialect’s morphophonemic system. As she explains, "this simplification stems from both cognitive and social factors: speakers in high-contact communities come into contact with so many different usage norms that it becomes impossible to assign functions (whether linguistic or social) to all of them, and so formerly meaningful variation is interpreted as free variation" (p. 76). According to Schilling-Estes, over time, it becomes difficult for the local community to transmit formerly meaningful variation to young language learners which further obscures variation cross-generationally and ultimately contributes to levelling.
While several interviewees mentioned the effects of outsiders on the local community, Interviewee #21 was particularly emphatic about their influence on language and communication. According to him, the high number of outsiders who have settled in the region have diluted local culture, due in large part by the need for locals to address and respond to them in CSU. Interviewee #21 also mentioned the residual effect this has on intra-group communication. He noted that many of the newcomers to the region work in schools and the local administration which has made CSU the primary medium of communication in all civic affairs. This, in turn, means that “literary Ukrainian” now sets the tone for most local communication, even between Hutsuls.

5.11 Accommodation and codeswitching

Interactions with both long-term settlers and short-term tourists require the communicative strategies of accommodation and code-switching which can trigger linguistic change in terms of both structural convergence and attrition. While such strategies represent the “management of symbolic resources in fulfilling interactional goals” (Fellin 2002: 55), they have also been assessed as the primary means of dialect mixture (Trudgill 1986) as well as the main mechanism for diffusing change throughout and across social networks (Labov 2002). Speakers’ willingness to accommodate interlocutors, therefore, plays a critical role in both convergence and attrition.

The social conditions necessitating inter-group communication are accompanied by the dual identity embraced by many Hutsuls (as discussed above): this dual identity provides the psychological context which readily allows accommodation, even when that accommodation begins to encroach on the language environment once inhabited by the local dialect. As Schneider writes:

[In] accommodation, individuals approach each other’s speech behavior by adopting select forms heard in their environment, thus increasing the set of shared features. It is a process of linguistic approximation with the social goal of signaling solidarity by diminishing symbolic distance; it contributes to group formation and group cohesiveness. Identity, in contrast, represents an individual stance with respect to the social structures of one’s environment, an attitude that also contributes to group formation and group delimitation through establishing
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436 Notably, Interviewee #21 is a self-identified Hutsul who is himself married to an outsider.
437 The essence of these strategies are perhaps best captured by Thomason’s use of the term code alternation, which she defines as “the use of two (or more) languages by the same speaker. But unlike code-switching, code alternation does not occur in the same conversation with the same speaker. Instead bilinguals use one of their languages in one set of environments and the other languages in a completely different set of environments” (2001: 136). This is certainly a typical trait of Hutsul language habits; however, code-switching is also frequently observed and manifested as “Hutsul surzhyk” in its most extreme form.
and “us vs. them” construct of human alignments and through establishing relationships of similarity or difference. (2008:264)

It is this figmentary line between “us” and “them” that has become increasingly blurry in the post-Soviet era, as Hutsuls continue to closely align themselves with the greater Ukrainian ethnos, an alignment that has only been fortified by recent political events carving out a clearer dichotomy of “us” Ukrainians vs. “them” Russians where Hutsul allegiance is entirely unquestionable. When Bunin Benor discusses this relationship between identity, accommodation, and the viability of ethnolect maintenance, she notes much the same tendencies for speakers to “temper their use of distinctive features when they speak to non-group members” and poses the questions, “how many distinctive features must be present for a given stretch of speech to be considered part of the ethnolect rather than the standard?” (2010: 166). She answers this at least in part by differentiating between stylistic shifts and true shifts between different codes or dialects: some styles of speech tend to contain a greater number of distinctive features than others, allowing speakers to move between different inventories depending on the language skills of their interlocutors. This is particularly true when the code in question is a dialect of the standard, characterized by a relatively high degree of mutual intelligibility and therefore necessitating only minor shifts to accommodate the needs of non-group members, rather than a more radical shift of an entire linguistic system as is often the case in code-switching in bilingual contexts.

The situation with Hutsul, however, is somewhat more problematic than with other dialects: while Hutsul is generally classified as a dialect of Ukrainian, many CSU speakers evaluate the intelligibility of Hutsul as very low, at times even incomprehensible for the uninitiated, such as tourists to the region who have not spent an extended period of time in the local language environment. The resulting problematic nature of inter-group communication was a topic raised by several interviewees, including Interviewee #23, who noted that, on those occasions when she spoke Hutsul to a non-local, her interlocutor was almost entirely unable to understand her; as a result, she now consciously adopts a strategy of accommodation--shifting to CSU--when interacting with non-group members. Interviewee #10, who works in the tourism industry and often leads excursions for visitors to the region, has developed a fine-tuned strategy for codeswitching in her work, balancing the issue of intelligibility with the desire of tourists to experience local culture. While she generally addresses tourist groups in either CSU, she makes a point of including key dialectal terms, which her clients generally find very interesting; however, she emphasized that she carefully selects the terms she uses to ensure that they will be comprehensible to a CSU-speaking audience, and avoids those terms which might be too obscure. Interviewee #25 uses a similar strategy by speaking primarily in CSU to non-group members, due to Hutsul’s low cross-group intelligibility; however, she occasionally code-switches to Hutsul when she feels that a certain local term in not fully translatable, or when translation would cause a loss of nuance or connotation. Interviewee #5 also spoke at length
about the norms of public discourse, noting the unofficial “rules” of inter-group engagement in her work as a docent at a local literary museum frequented by both locals and tourists:

Whichever language someone addresses you in, you use. Yes, it is a kind of accommodation. Now, however, Hutsul is heard very rarely in public, usually literary Ukrainian is used, sometimes Russian. But whichever language a person uses, you answer in the same. That is the usual way.

While the manner of accommodation described by Interviewee #5 is based primarily on the concept of social politeness, the issue of social indexicality also frequently conditions the use of the standard over dialect. Interviewee #12, for example, mentioned that many locals who have converted their cottages into bed and breakfasts for tourists address their clients exclusively in CSU, both in order to facilitate communication and to demonstrate their professionalism. By shifting to CSU, Hutsuls who work with non-local clients endeavor to project the image of an educated, competent businessperson who will adhere to the professional standards and expectations of the urbanized middle-class.

Xrušč makes an interesting observation of Hutsul behavior recasting public image in a (relatively) urbanized environment:

People who don't often visit the central towns wear nicer clothes and shoes when they go there and experience a positive rise in emotion, a type of euphoria. Observations show that they are more reserved and that they behave themselves with obviously greater self-importance in public places, without bustling or hurrying, and carry on conversations with local residents on moral, ethical, and sociopolitical topics with pronounced dignity. (2009: 179)

According to her research, Hutsuls from the smaller villagers often exhibit a situational change in mannerisms upon leaving their local environment and entering a social situation connotating greater status, particularly within an urban environment. This change includes “dressing up,” both literally and figuratively, by wearing nicer clothes and comporting themselves with greater dignity and airs, as they perceive the social context to warrant. Not only does this “putting on airs” extend to the topics with which they engage when conversing, but also eventuates “talking up” in terms of the linguistic choices they make. Interviewee #27 mentioned that, for many Hutsuls, talking to non-group members always involves talking up, speaking in “pure” CSU to the best of their abilities. Further, as Interviewee #10 described:

Young people from the mountains who come down to the villages always try to speak in the literary language to show that they are educated. More and more people are coming down these days--sometimes to shop and sometimes for work,
as traditional professions are no longer sustainable in many cases. They try to show that they are as well educated as others, as worthy as others, by speaking the literary language. The more education a person receives, the better they can speak the literary language, so people come down to the villages and try to show their worthiness by speaking correctly.

While code-switching and accommodation are strategies most often used when speaking to non-group members, Interviewee #10’s observations—as well as those by Xrušč—indicate that these strategies, predicated on the dynamics of social valuation, are also sometimes used within the Husul community as a means by which to index those qualities which speakers seek to project. This strategy hinges upon local ideologies; as Eckert writes, “[i]deology is at the center of stylistic practice: one way or another, every stylistic move is the result of an interpretation of the social world and of the meanings of elements within it, as well as a positioning of the stylizer to that world (2008: 456). In this way, speakers seeking to index higher status, greater articulative competence, and erudition, shift to CSU as the code by which to project the desired image to their interlocutors.

In addition to short-term tourists, there is some long-term migration to the region involving the integration of settlers from other regions of Ukraine. The necessity of inter-group communication strategies is particularly acute in these cases, especially when migrants intermarry with members of the local Hutsul population and begin to raise children in mixed-dialect households. According to interviewees, in such cases of intermarriage, CSU is almost without exception the default primary home language. There were indeed several interviewees who were themselves members of a “mixed” family. Interviewees #8, #21, and #25, who are married to non-Hutsuls, all stated that they speak exclusively in CSU in the home, with Interviewee #25 specifically mentioning this as a cause of dialect loss among children. Interviewee #23, whose daughter is married to a non-Hutsul, also brought up this point regarding dialect attrition among children of mixed marriages:

Not all [Hutsul] young people can still speak dialect. In part, this is because of school, and in part it is because of frequent intermarriage. My grandson can not speak dialect at all because his father is from Vinnycja, so they speak Russian at home, and then he speaks the Ukrainian literary language at school. There is no place in his life for dialect; he has little access to it, and neither opportunity nor motivation to use it.

As economic conditions continue to motivate both short-term and long-term cross migration patterns, the frequency and intensity of inter-group communication continues to
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438 Less common, but also possible, is the adoption of Russian at the home language. See, for example, the commentary from Interviewee #23.
increase dramatically, necessitating linguistic negotiation that most often favors the use of CSU over dialect. The effects of code-switching and accommodation on marginalized languages and dialects are well-documented. Thomason 2001, for example, states that there is abundant evidence that code-switching leads to interference and, in the case of code-alternation, there is often clear correlation to language death (pp. 132-139). In terms structural convergence, clearly demonstrated in previous chapters to be taking place in Hutsul, Thomason explains that “bilingual speakers who engage in ‘negotiation’ adjust features of their language’s structure (A) to approximate those of another language (B). They make no errors, and the result is convergence” (2001: 143). In other words, current Hutsul language behavior is strongly tied to the internal changes taking place in the dialect, as well as to its continued atrophy in use.

In part, the readiness to yield in negotiation is predicated upon the close identification many Hutsuls feel toward other Ukrainians. As Andersen writes, "it may be primarily an attitudinal shift from endocentric to exocentric which changes the course of development of a local dialect when it becomes part of a wider socio-spatial grouping and not just the opening up of new avenues of interdialectical communication" (1988: 74-75). Although economic expedience does play a prominent role in language choice, the shift likely would not be as fully possible were it not for these attitudinal underpinnings fostering identification with a larger ethnos. With the increase in inter-group contact, the boundaries between Hutsul and Ukrainian are becoming increasingly permeable. In the opinion of Hinskens, Auer, and Kerswill, it is precisely this permeability between groups that allows incursions leading to linguistic convergence (2005: 7).

5.12 Maintenance or loss? Future prospects

The picture that emerges from both informant perspectives, as well as from grammatical analysis and situational observation of Hutsul dialect attitudes and behaviors, is far from optimistic in terms of potential dialect revival and long-term maintenance. Tulloch 2006 describes a scenario quite reflective of the current Hutsul experience:

Distinct dialects emerge and are perpetuated when groups are kept separated, by geographical, social, political, cultural, or economic boundaries. As the boundaries break down, through industrialisation, urbanisation, establishment of heterogeneous neighbourhoods, intermarriage, expanded opportunities for higher education, spread of mass media, improved transportation leading to increased travel, etc., so too may the characteristic dialectical forms. (272)

This underlying assumption for Tulloch is that socioeconomic dynamics--many of which are clearly relevant to the Hutsuls today--both undermine the local dialect’s structure as well as marginalize its public use, and her conclusion follows that “dialect death can occur through
changes to the dialect itself or through changes to its status and use” (2006: 272).

In her study, Fellin 2002 notes that dialect revival is a function of “its members’ explicit language ideologies and the implicit ones surfacing in their practices in the area of child language socialization, a crucial site of language transmission and indicator of a code’s vitality” (46). If this is indeed true, the outlook for Hutsul—where children seem to be losing dialect at a very rapid rate—is also not very positive. As described above, it is first and foremost among children and young people that the dialect is most quickly losing its relevance. In the observations of Interviewee #25, “Very few people in Verxovyna know dialect today, it is being forgotten. In the past, almost everyone spoke the dialect here, but the number has decreased with each generation, and now almost no one speaks Hutsul here anymore.” The clear pattern of attrition among the younger generation, for whom CSU is crucial in acquiring education and employment, is among the key threats to the dialect’s future, particularly as people increasingly move out of the mountain polonyna and into centralized towns and cities in search of economically viable professions. This phenomenon also correlates with the observation of Thomason and Kaufman that language death occurs when “the dominant language is the main language for all but the oldest members, and the original language is not used regularly by the least fluent speakers for any purpose, except perhaps for an occasional phrase or word thrown into conversation in the dominant language.” (1988: 103). When dialect is used at all by the younger members of society, it is precisely through occasional and often restricted code-switching, comprised of several high-frequency lexical items in an otherwise CSU-context (Interviewee #29).

Another, and closely related, factor adversely affecting the dialect’s maintenance is its increasing geographic restrictions whereby the primary speakers are those who still inhabit the relatively isolated mountain areas. In general, these tend to be members of the older generation who still participate in the traditional lifestyle of herding and farming. Describing the linguistic ecology of dialects in France, Auer writes that, "Despite some recent trends to recover the dialects, they are only used (on a dialect/regiolect continuum) by older people in some rural areas....What is left are regional traces of the former dialects in the vernacular, which are stronger in the countryside than in the cities, and more accentuated among male, less mobile, less educated and older speakers” (2005). Several interviewees characterized the current situation with Hutsul as largely marginalized to the extreme periphery of the mountains and its elderly inhabitants. Interviewee #28 notes that “real speakers” of the dialect are at least 80 years of age and, even then, there are few left, a view echoed by Interviewee #23. While Interviewee #1 expressed the general hope and belief that the dialect will ultimately survive, it was with the caveat that this could only occur “high up in the mountains,” a view also held by Interviewee #10 who noted that, “dialect is best preserved high in the mountains, not in centralized villages; even then, the children from the mountains attend school in the villages, and so adopt the literary language over time.” This combination of increasingly elderly speakers and a highly restricted
Despite the pessimism over the dialect’s vitality and continued use by future generations, there is a general pride among Hutsuls in both their culture and their dialect. Tulloch 2006 describes the salient ideologies which can counteract attrition and motivate revival and maintenance. Among these are the perceived symbolic and practical links to the past highly valued in conservative dialects, as well as the dialect’s ability to index in-group identity (271). Certainly many speakers of Hutsul do value both the dialect’s history as well as its ability to demarcate local identity, even if that local identity is often mediated by its widely perceived links to the larger national identity. Indeed, part of the “language mythology” of Hutsul is constructed upon the notion of the dialect’s historical authenticity as an archaic form of Ukrainian spoken by the ancestors of all modern-day Ukrainians. As Interviewee #28 rather poetically contrived, “It is by a miracle that the dialect once spoken on the banks of the Dnieper has been preserved in the Carpathians and we value this highly.” However, this statement was followed by the prediction that, “in 20 to 30 years, it may be gone.” Indeed, numerous interviewees expressed hope for the dialect’s continued use, however struggled to find justification for that hope. Instead, they often cited other symbols of local cultural revival, such as the re-discovery of folk rituals and the renewed interest in traditional clothing and handicrafts. Often mentioned was the role of folk songs as a vehicle for dialect preservation, noting that even CSU-speaking young people generally demonstrated interest in and knowledge of traditional Hutsul spivanky. However, as Auer has observed, "In the final state before loss, the attitudes towards the now almost extinct base dialect are usually positive again, and folkloristic attempts at rescuing the dialect may set in--usually without success" (2005). It is precisely “folkloristic attempts” at revival that seem most currently typical of Hutsul maintenance aspirations. Almost all interviewees explicitly expressed hopes that the dialect would survive the current stages attrition, and most interviewees expressed high valuation of the dialect's cultural importance. Attitudes toward the dialect are, for the most part, currently fairly positive, even if tempered by the reality of CSU’s dominant position and necessity. In the words of Interviewee #4, “If we forget where we're from, if we forget our language, we will be lost.” Interviewee #11 also astutely noted that the recent publication of books and dictionaries won’t preserve the dialect; instead, economic conditions must first change so that people do not leave the region. This, he stated, would preserve the dialect: if the economy improves, then culture--including dialect--will be strengthened. Unfortunately, if dialect maintenance in Hutsulschyna is--at least in part--an economic question, the grounds for optimism are not bolstered. The current strategies for economic revitalization of the region hinge almost entirely on the development of the tourism industry, an economic sphere predicted on interlopers and inter-group communication. Such strategies threaten to further undermine, rather than support, the dialect’s continued use among the local inhabitants.
5.13 Hutsul compared to Carpatho-Rusyn and Lemko

In many ways, the Carpatho-Rusyn dialects face challenges similar to those faced by Hutsul. In addition to being typologically proximate, their speakers have historically endured sociopolitical marginalization, and the regions where they are spoken have suffered economic decline against the backdrop of modernization.

In 1995, Rieger conducted a thorough study of the sociolinguistic situation of Lemkos in Poland; what he observed in the Lemko community corresponds closely to the Hutsul situation of today. As he described at the time:

The Lemko dialect is limited to the family circle and neighborhood contacts. In villages where the number of Lemkos is significant the dialect is used also in the street for public contacts...Standard Polish is used in all public contacts. The Lemkos attend Polish schools, and the greater part of them, especially the younger generation, can write only Standard Polish. Children, teenagers and people up to 40 years speak Standard Polish as the Poles do. (135-136)

In addition, in similarity to Hutsul, Rieger mentioned the increasing number of “mixed” Lemko-Polish marriages and noted that standard Polish always prevails in such families. He also noted the effect of contact-induced change on the speech of young Lemkos which “exhibits much more frequent loans due to their contacts with Poles and the necessity of an abstract vocabulary” (1995: 138).

In recent years, however, revival strategies have been enthusiastically implemented for these Carpathian dialects, at least those spoken outside of Ukraine. One factor that has been crucial to revival efforts has been official recognition of the dialect, often promoted in status to “language.” This has been possible, however, only for those Rusyn communities located outside of Ukraine; within Ukraine, all Carpathian codes are considered dialects of Ukrainian and therefore subject to no special recognition or protection under minority language laws. Official recognition--particularly in Slovakia and in Poland for the Rusyn dialect Lemko--has enabled the creation of schools providing children with a primary education in Rusyn, as well as the expansion of books and periodicals published in the local Rusyn variant. These programs are

---

439 There are four regional variants of the Rusyn literary language: Lemko Rusyn in Poland, Slovakian Rusyn in the Presov Region of Slovakia, Transcarpathian or Subcarpathian Rusyn in Ukraine, and Vojvodinian or Bachka-Srem Rusyn in Serbia.
440 Efforts at dialect maintenance have been weakest among Rusyn communities in Ukraine. As Kushko writes, "The social function of the Transcarpathian variant is very limited, in large part because Rusyns do not have official status as a distinct national minority in Ukraine. Publications consist mostly of a few volumes of poetry, a few school textbooks, and some newspapers" (2007: 124).
441 Rusyn has been recognized as a minority language in Slovakia since 1995.
442 Lemko Rusyn in Poland has the status of an official minority language.
aimed at both increased use and a corresponding increase in status for Rusyn. In addition, recent steps taken toward codification of the standard dialects are expected to counteract the kinds of contact-induced change currently taking place in Hutsul. It is not yet known what results these revival efforts will ultimately have on the long-term maintenance of Rusyn, but the strategies are being implemented with vigor by the current Rusyn activists, including Magocsi, Kushko, and Vanko, among others.

443 Currently, each country has its own standardized variant of Rusyn.
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