

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PHONOLOGY
of the
DUKHOBOR DIALECT

by

ALEX PETER HARSHENIN

B.A. University of British Columbia, 1955

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department
of
Slavonic Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
September, 1960

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Slavonic Studies

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date September 16, 1960

ABSTRACT

This study endeavors to provide a descriptive analysis of the phonology of the Dukhobor Dialect and to introduce some of the main features of its inflectional system. The description is drawn against the background of standard Russian of which Dukhobor speech is unquestionably a dialect. Several older generation Dukhobors living in Grand Forks, British Columbia, served as the chief informants.

Following a brief introductory chapter regarding the geographical and linguistic contacts of the Dukhobors during their short history, the main body of the text deals with the phonology of their language. Each phoneme is described as articulated, established by minimal pairs and noteworthy variations from the Russian phonological pattern are given. The study is basically one of segmental phonemes.

The Dialect's phonemic inventory includes five stressed vowels /a, o, u, i, e/ and three unstressed vowels /a, u, i/. Only in unstressed positions are deviations from the Russian pattern evident. There is a tendency toward moderate jakanje. Thirty-five consonants comprise the remainder of the list of phonemes: /p, p', b, b', t, t', d, d', k, k', m, m', n, n', l, l', r, r', s, s', ss, z, z', š, šš, ž, žž, x, h, c, č, j, w, w', j/. The principal allophones are [ɨ, v, v', f, f', g, g', x', h']. A consideration of the behavior of phonemes in word contraction and cluster reduction is included. Wherever it is apparent, the influence of Canadian English is indicated.

A brief note on stress completes the main text and an appendix provides a short summary of substantive and verb inflections.

.....
.....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

With sincere gratitude the author acknowledges his indebtedness to the elderly Dukhobors who served as informants, to Peter P. Legebokoff, editor of Iskra, who permitted extensive browsing among the Paper's files, to Professors James O. St. Clair-Sobell and Alexander W. Wainman, and to my wife, Susan. Without the interest, cooperation, and assistance of the aforementioned, it would have been exceedingly difficult to bring this task to a satisfactory conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
<i>Errata</i>	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. A SELECTED HISTORY OF THE DUKHOBORS	7
III. VOWELS	17
A. Stressed Vowels	18
B. Unstressed Vowels	25
C. Elements of <u>Jakan'e</u>	40
IV. CONSONANTS	45
A. Plosive Consonants	50
B. Nasal Consonants	54
C. Lateral Consonants	55
C. Vibrant Consonants	57
E. Fricative Consonants	59
F. Affricate Consonants	66
G. Semivowels (Semiconsonants)	69
V. OTHER PHONOLOGICAL PHENOMENA	79
A. Contraction	79
B. Cluster Reduction	82
C. Stress	84
APPENDIX I NOUN, ADJECTIVE, AND VERB DESINENCES	87
II MEANINGS OF TERMS IN THE TABLES OF CHAPTER IV	99
LITERATURE CITED	106

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Vowels of the Dukhobor Dialect	18
2. Vowels in Stressed and Prestressed Position	29
3. Vowels in Prestress Position	33
4. Vowels in Other Unstressed Positions	39
5. Consonants of the Dukhobor Dialect	47
6. Basic Consonantal Contrasts -- Initial	48
7. Basic Consonantal Contrasts -- Final	49
8. Plosive Contrasts	51
9. Nasal Contrasts	55
10. Lateral Contrasts	56
11. Vibrant Contrasts	58
12. Fricative Contrasts	60
13. Affricate Contrasts	67
14. Semivowel Contrasts	70

ERRATA

Page

- 21 1st line: Change last word to /śurawno/.
- 26 7th line: After the word "unrounded," add the words "to--
non-high: high and rounded: unrounded".
- 32 4th line: Change /čukok/ to /čudok/.
- 26th line: Change the last expression to "her (a. ~ d. sg.)'".
- 35 21st line: Change the first expression to "(g. and d. sg.)".
- 36 25th line: Begin the 26th line with the section omitted:
- ii) After palatal consonants: /časawoj ~ čas; čajawát' ~
čaj; čudaká; čirnowátaj ~ čornaj; čirtawá ~ čort;
čižalo; čilavek; čirvíká ~ čerwi/ 'watchman ~ hour;
to drink tea ~ tea; fool (g. sg.); blackish ~ black;
devilish thing ~ devil; it's heavy; man; worm
(g. sg. ~ n. pl.)'
- /jaziká; jadavítnaja ~ jat; janware ~ jinware;
jubilej; (j)irusalím; (j)iđinal'íčnik; sjidíníca;
(j)isawúlaw/ 'tongue (g. sg.); poisonous ~ poison;
January (l. sg.); jubilee; Jerusalem; an independent
D.; to unite; D. surname'.
- 53 16th line: Expand the phrase /táx-ta/ to /táx-ta ~ tak/.
- 64 12th line: Change /šukín/ to /šúkin/.
- 90 4th line: Change "M3" to "M1".

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An interesting and controversial ethnic group of Slavic origin has been living in the Province of British Columbia for half a century. Numerous studies, investigations, and even three Royal Commissions (1912, 1948, 1955) have attempted to examine, interpret, and report on various social, economic, and religious aspects of their life. To our knowledge no one has yet investigated on linguistic grounds the language spoken by these "peculiar people", widely known as the Dukhobors.

A. Purpose.

At the outset this study purposed to investigate the general linguistic features of the Dukhobor language. After considerable data had been accumulated, however, it was decided to describe in this treatise the basic phonology of the Dialect alone and to include enough material by way of examples and a summary of inflections to indicate at least some of the fundamental features of its morphology and lexicology. Thus, the primary purpose of our study may be said to be an examination and analysis of the phonology of the Dukhobor Dialect as spoken in British Columbia.

B. Literature.

No literature on the speech of the Dukhobors in Canada is known to be extant. It is therefore assumed that no linguistic inquiry into the Dialect has been previously undertaken.

A brief two week study¹ of the folklore and speech of a dialect

1 I.S. Iľinskaja, "Nabljudeniia Nad Govorom Russkix Pereselencev v Zakavkaz'e", Materialy i Issledovaniia po Russkoj Dialektologii, ed. S.P. Obnorskij and others, Moscow and Leningrad, Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R., 1949, vol. I, pp. 265-279.

related to the Dukhobor Dialect in British Columbia was conducted in 1943 by Soviet investigators. Members of the University of Tbilisi visited for the first time certain Transcaucasian villages in which many of the Canadian Dukhobors once lived. Not all of the Dukhobors exiled to the Transcaucasus had subsequently emigrated to Canada and some of their descendants remain there to this day.

The observations in this rather cursory Soviet survey indicate both similarities and differences between the speech of the Russian settlers presently living in the Transcaucasus and those Dukhobors domiciled in Canada. In some instances minor variations which existed over fifty years ago between separate Russian-speaking villages in the Transcaucasian region have become more diverse since the emigration of many of the villagers to Canada. In addition, varied external philological influences have further alienated these two dialectal streams of Dukhobor speech (if one may at least postulate a theoretical earlier unity). Nevertheless, their similarities preponderantly outweigh their differences. But as in other comparisons between any given dialects of Russian, these "two streams" are best treated as separate dialects. A close comparison between them would constitute an independent study.

C. Sources.

In view of a complete lack of literature on our subject, it was inevitable that the necessary data be obtained by firsthand observation. As the Dialect varies somewhat from locality to locality and from one generation of speakers to another, some delimitation of informants was imperative. Therefore the study concentrated on the older generation of Dukhobors speaking the "purest" form of the Dialect and living in the vicinity of Grand Forks, British Columbia. Notations on other categories of Dukhobor speakers were not excluded although the study is not directly based

on them. Field trips were also conducted in the Brilliant and Krestova areas.

An important supplementary source of information regarding the Dialect was discovered in the office of the Editor of Iskra, a socio-religious weekly devoted to subjects pertaining to Dukhobor interests and affairs. An examination of scores of letters to the Editor substantiated most of the findings by the direct contact method. A few personal letters and other unpublished documents provided additional recorded material.

D. Procedure.

Philological data from the latter source was readily obtained by noting graphic errors made in the "Russian" writing attempted. Complete liberty in the selection and use of the material for the author's purpose was permitted. Data from the primary source was collected by simple aural perception and recorded, initially in Russian phonemic script and later in Dukhobor phonemic script as determined from a study of minimal contrasts. Senior members of the sect were contacted directly either by visitation to their places of residence, or on the street and at sundry meetings. Besides recording significant elements of individual speech and group conversations, talks, prayers, and hymns, the author made notations on informants' answers to specific questions, at times aided by the use of objects and pictures. No mechanical devices such as tape recorders were used in this investigation, although certain disk recordings of Dukhobor songs were auditioned.

F. Definitions.

The terms found in this description are by and large those terms conventional in elementary linguistics and Slavic Studies and therefore need no definition.

G. Abbreviations.

a.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
cf.	compare
ch.	chapter
d.	dative
D.	Dukhobor
D.D.	Dukhobor Dialect
etc.	and so forth
e.g.	for example
F.	feminine
ff.	following
f.	future
g.	genitive
i.e.	that is
imp.	imperative
impf.	imperfective
inf.	infinitive
i.	instrumental
intr.	intransitive
intro.	introduction
l.	locative
M.	masculine
N.	neuter
n.	nominative
No.	number
p.; pp.	page; pages
1p.; 2p.; 3p.	...	first person, etc.
pl.	plural

pf.	perfective
ps.	past
re.	regarding
rfl.	reflexive
R.	Russian
sec.	section
sg.	singular
t.	tense
tr.	transitive
vd.	voiced
vl.	voiceless
~	alternates, alternating with
:	contrasts, contrasting with

H. Transcription.

The transcription system employed in this treatise is the standard Latin transcription commonly used by scholars of the Russian language, with the following additional symbols: /w/ for the bilabial semivowel; /ss, šš, žž/ for the long counterparts of /s, š, ž/ respectively; and /j, h/ for the voiced counterparts of /č, x/ respectively. A raised comma indicates palatalization.

Phonemic slant lines are utilized for Dukhobor expressions throughout (except where phonetic square brackets indicate otherwise), yet the transcription system is not strictly phonemic. In order to depict more accurately the preferred pronunciation of Dukhobor terms, major allophones of consonants, for example, [f, f', v, v', g, g'], and of vowels, are deliberately included where applicable. For the same reason, before vowel /e/ the allophonic distinction of hard and soft consonants is retained.

Stress is indicated by the accute diacritic /' / which is excluded above stressed /o, e/ since these vowels occur only under strong stress making additional markings redundant.

I. Transliteration.

The transliteration system employed almost entirely in the footnotes and bibliography is identical to the one used by the Slavic Department of Harvard University. It too corresponds to other similar schemes currently used by scholars of Russian, though it differs slightly from those preferred by various libraries.

CHAPTER II

A SELECTED HISTORY² OF THE DUKHOBORS

Before the year 1785 the name "Dukhobors" was unknown. The term Duxoborci was then coined, it is said, by an Orthodox archbishop and intended to imply 'fighters against the Holy Spirit', but was accepted and retained by the sectarians in the meaning 'fighters by means of the Holy Spirit'.

The sect was so named because of its opposition to certain teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church and its priests, ikons, and formalisms. Being closely affiliated with the Church, the Russian Government was also resisted in respect to certain of its demands. The early Dukhobors explained away the doctrine of the Trinity by saying, "The Father is light, the Son, life, and the Holy Spirit, peace." To them, Christ in the New Testament was only the spirit of piety, purity, and so forth, who relived His life in every believer. Emphasis was placed on "Christ within" and the "inner light". All Dukhobors were sons of God in the same sense that Christ was and therefore had no need of the Scriptures or "outer word" or priests for guidance. True believers worshipped God "in spirit and in truth", eliminating the need for temples, sacraments, or church ceremonies. As all men were equal, and children of God do good willingly, no governments or authority were required, except, perhaps, for evildoers. It was wrong to go to war, carry arms, or take oaths. Adhering to such doctrines the Dukhobors opposed the church and the state.

2 In this brief chapter on the Dukhobors it is intended that there be provided enough of their history to indicate the nature of their faith and life, geographical movements and linguistic contacts inasmuch as these pertain to the study of their language.

Dukhobor doctrines spread throughout southern and central European Russia and adherents likely became as widely scattered. Claiming the support of official documents, one author³ names the following provinces in which Dukhoborism was found: Xarkov, Ekaterinoslav, Tambov, Xerson, Tavrida, Astraxan, Kursk, Voronož, Penzensk, Simbirsk, Saratov, Orenburg, and Rjazan in the south, and Moscow and Tver in central Russia. It might be added, however, that even in official reports Dukhobors have probably not been too carefully distinguished from other sectarians in the same general areas, the earlier history of Russian sects often being rather obscure. Be as it may, in the second half of the eighteenth century Dukhobors were most heavily concentrated in two provinces--in Ekaterinoslav, under the leader S. Kolesnikov, and in Tambov, under I. Pobirohin. The latter became leader of both colonies when Kolesnikov died in 1775.

Living prosperously in separate villages the number and influence of the Dukhobors increased and their presence came to be undesired by the authorities in these two heavily populated provinces. Under the rule of the less astute and less consistent Pobirohin, the welfare of the colonies became endangered under pressures from the Russian church and government. The application of some Dukhobor theories in settled living conditions was evidently embarrassing to the authorities and persecutions set in during the last decade of the eighteenth century. For many spokesmen of Dukhoborism, persecution invariably led to exile. Exiles resulted in the increase of Dukhobor contacts in new areas and formally recorded evidence admits that converts to the sect were made here and there in places of exile.

³ V.A. Suxorev, Istorija Duxoborcev, North Kildonan, Manitoba, Canada, J. Regehr, 1944, p. 12.

Again referring to official Russian government documents prepared by Novitsky, the aforementioned author names and lists a number of Dukhobors exiled at this time not only from the Ekaterinoslav and Tambov areas, but also individuals and groups judged and banished from the Don region to Viborg province. Severe judgments similarly occurred in Xarkov, Ekaterinoslav, Perekop, Alexandrov, and in the Kursk and Moscow provinces. From the villages Xoxlovka, Vebrovka, Kolomenskoe in Moscow province, three preachers of Dukhoborism were exiled to Benderi. (In Tver, Tambov, and Voronež, Dukhobors had been brought to trial and sentenced to the Azov citadel as early as 1762 and 1769, while certain members of the sect in Tavrida province had been persecuted in 1775.) In 1796 thirty-eight Dukhobors sent to Azov increased their numbers by fifteen through propagandization. A few families were exiled to Riga and Finland. In 1802 fifty-seven Dukhobors from Kol'sk were transferred to Archangelsk. An 1816 report regarding Dukhobors among the Cossacks stated that their persecution took the form of being denied lands, homes, jobs, and even the right to retain their children. Some of the latter group of sectarians were exiled to the Islands of Esel and Soloveckij⁴.

After the ascension of Alexander I to the Russian throne in 1801, a government commission favorable to the Dukhobors recommended that they emigrate from the thickly populated provinces in which they were settled. Accepting the report, the Czar ordered their settlement in the Milky Waters region in the province of Tavrida bordering on the Black Sea. Thus, the sect was given lands along a frontier harassed by Crimean Tatars but free from government and church interference.

4 Ibid., pp. 26-27.

During the next fifteen years Dukhobors from various parts of Russia including the Slobodo-Ukrainian and Kavkaz regions and from the many places of exile, including ninety families from Finland, migrated to the Milky Waters area. There, under their leader S. Kapustin, the Dukhobor colony abolished private property and land was held and tilled in common although later, private ownership of land was permitted. Also owned in common were the treasury and the granaries in each of the nine villages inhabited by the sectarians. The propagandist era ceased and one of isolation and subservience to the leader and his council of thirty elders and twelve apostles began. Through this ruling elite the colony paid its taxes and had its contacts with government officials. The colonists prospered and word of this prosperity reached the ears of other Russians who were attracted to the Dukhobor faith. All this led to suspicion of the sect and charges of proselitizing Orthodox Russians. Nevertheless, nothing serious developed and Dukhobors continued to live peacefully and prosperously until the third decade of the nineteenth century without being compelled to serve in the Russian.

Vasili Kalmikoff succeeded his father Kapustin as head of the sect but dissipated his life as a drunkard and died in 1832 at the age of forty. His son Illarion became leader at sixteen and followed his father into a dissipated life. Rumours of corruption and evil practices by the ruling circle of Dukhobors spread and in 1834 an investigation was ordered by Nicholas I. At the end of the investigation in 1839 the Czar decided to banish the self-ruling Dukhobors from the Milky Waters region to the wilderness of the Caucasus, already a place of exile. Those implicated in the scores of misdeeds were exiled in 1841, I. Kalmikoff among them. By 1846 well over 4000 Dukhobors were transported to the Transcaucasian provinces. Willing to accept Russian Orthodoxy once again, a few members of the sect remained in the Milky Waters area.

In the Transcaucusus bordered by Turkey, Persia, and the Black and Caspian Seas, the Dukhobors first settled in the Wet Mountains plateau. There they became herders of sheep, cattle, and horses. In the village of Gorelovka was built the Orphans' Home, which was always located in the government centre. Other Dukhobor villages established in the province of Tiflis were: Troickoe, Efremovka, Goreloe, Spasskoe, Orlovka, Bogdanovka, Radionovka, Tambovka, Baškičēt, Ormašen, and Karaklis. Dukhobors living in all but the last three villages above were called 'xolodenskie'. Later, some Dukhobors were induced to move to an area more suitable for the kinds of agriculture more familiar to them (namely, grain growing, fruit and vegetable gardening, and dairying), to an area formerly forbidden to them by the authorities. In this new area of Elizavetopol province, some two hundred miles southeast of the larger settlement, were established the villages of Slavjanka, Troickoe, and Kirilovka. Later still, after Kars was won from Turkey, the Dukhobors were invited to settle in that region as they had assisted the Russian government in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 by providing munitions transport. Consequently, the Dukhobor villages of Terpenie, Spasskoe, Kirilovka, Troickoe, Goreloe, and Petrovka were founded in Kars province. As is evident from a glance at a detailed map of the U.S.S.R. some of these villages exist to this day.

During their Caucasian sojourn the Dukhobors were ruled until 1864 by Peter Kalmikoff, Illarion's son. Then until 1886 the sect thrived under the leadership of his wife, Lukerija. Again in a period of prosperity and peace their numbers increased. One set of figures⁵ states that their numbers about this time as totalling

5 A. Maude, A Peculiar People, The Doukhobors, New York, London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1904, p. 150.

21,000 with the following distribution: 12,000 under the Tiflis government, 4,000 under Elizavetopol and 5,500 under Kars. The various peoples who were neighbors to the Dukhobors in these regions were Turks, Tatars, Georgians, Armenians, Kurds, and Persians.

Into the midst of turmoil resulting from a schism in the sect following Lukerija's death, in 1887 a conscription order reached the Caucasus. The minority party under the guidance of Lukerija's brother Mixail Gubanov and A. Zubkov (who had managed to obtain control of the sect's "public" property, the Orphans' Home and to secure the good will of the authorities) decided to submit to conscription. The majority party of Dukhobors followed Peter Vasilivich Verigin (who had been in Lukerija's custody since 1880 and was her choice of successor) and refused to comply with the conscription order. Consequently, many of Verigin's followers of military age were compelled to serve in penal battalions. Their "czar, prophet, and Christ", Verigin himself, was condemned by the government and exiled to Archangelsk province for five years.

Receiving money and other support from his followers in the south, Verigin lived in his own house and wrote them letters of instruction. His anti-government propaganda and the general effect of his letters led to the extension of his term to fifteen years and to his transfer to Obdorsk, Siberia. Nevertheless, Verigin remained in contact with the sect through trusted messengers and advised the Dukhobors on all matters. The sectarians were ordered to live as ascetics, refraining from meat, tobacco, liquor, oaths, and even sex relations during the tribulation. A communistic life was advocated and a new name, "The Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood", was adopted.

Refusing to swear allegiance to Czar Nicholas II in 1894, Verigin sent the message that all weapons, guns, scimitars, swords, and knives

were to be burned on the eve of "Peter's Day", June 28 of the following year. When this event came to pass, reprisals descended. Many Dukhobors were severely flogged with whips by Cossacks. Several thousand Dukhobors were scattered among the Georgians and other tribes by the Tiflis government. A large number died of malnutrition, fever, and dysentery. Deliberate persecution continued in "disciplinary", penal battalions and in prisons to which young Dukhobors were sent.

During these trying times for the sect, Tolstoyan sympathizers and the Society of Friends in England sought to bring to public attention the plight of the persecuted and to encourage every assistance to them, even to the extent of supporting their migration to another country. Official Russian government permission to emigrate at their own expense was granted the Dukhobors in March, 1898. A party of 1126 left for the Isle of Crete in August of the same year. On January 24, 1899, after a month of sailing, the ship "Lake Huron" steamed into Halifax with some 2,000 Dukhobors aboard. A few days later the steamer "Lake Superior" brought a second party of 1974. In June arrived the third group which had previously been settled in Crete and was followed by a final shipload of about 2,000 Dukhobors. The total number of Dukhobors who came to Canada⁶ and settled in the province of Saskatchewan stood at 7363. Homestead lands were given to the sect near Yorkton, Thunder Hill, and Prince Albert.

In Canada⁷ persecution of the type suffered in Russia and forced resettlement were unknown. Nevertheless, divisions within the sect and geographical movement occurred through decisions of the sectarians themselves.

⁶ V. Snesarov, The Dukhobors in British Columbia, Vancouver, University of British Columbia, 1931, p. 16.

⁷ The history of the Dukhobors in Canada comprises a fairly-well documented installment of its own which cannot be related here. Therefore only a very restricted and generalized account of this story follows.

The appearance in Canada of their exalted leader, Peter "Lordly" Verigin, from his Siberian exile in 1902 did not prevent the sect from disunity. There soon arose a group of Independents who preferred to practice their own forms of Dukhoborism. In protest to many things, but especially the basic "materialism" of the sect, sprouted, almost spontaneously, the group known as the Sons of Freedom. The largest party, the Community Dukhobors, who in 1934 adopted the name "Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ", remained faithful to Verigin and his communal form of life until his death in a railway car explosion of unknown origin on October 28, 1924. Soon after, Peter "Čistjakov" Verigin, son of the deceased leader, came from the U.S.S.R. to guide the affairs of the Community until his own passing on February 11, 1939.

It is with the Freedomites and Community Dukhobors that the "true" spirit of the sect is claimed to have remained. Earlier, these two groups coexisted rather peacefully and were considered to be one, but such is the case no longer. The Sons of Freedom have radically demonstrated that they are a people apart, and in name now distinguish themselves as the "Union of Christian Communities and Brotherhood of Reformed Dukhobors". Of both the Community Dukhobors and Freedomites, the vast majority live in British Columbia, while Independent Dukhobors may be found almost anywhere in Western Canada.

Discovering that considerable difficulties faced the sect on the homestead lands in the prairies, Verigin had looked to British Columbia as the region where communal living would be greatly facilitated without subservience to the Crown. In 1909 the first pieces of land were purchased by the sect near Brilliant and at Grand Forks. More land was subsequently acquired in the Brilliant area. Settlements in Brilliant spread to Champion Creek, Glade, Pass Creek, and

Crescent Valley. By the autumn of 1912 some 5000 Dukhobors⁸ were living in the province. Although the communal form of life which had its "heyday" in "Lordly" Verigin's reign no longer exists, Dukhobors of all varieties and many of their descendents may yet be found living in the aforementioned areas of British Columbia.

A review of Dukhobor geographical movements and linguistic contacts reveals that the earlier members of the sect came from various provinces in Russia and spoke differing dialects of their national language. Extensive exiles introduced some of the Dukhobors to still other dialects of Russian. When settling in colonies as they first did in the Tambov region, a mixing and blending of the dialects spoken by them was inevitable. Dukhobor resettlement in Russia in the Milky Waters and later the Transcaucasian areas and similar resettlements in the Canadian prairies and then in British Columbia caused further regroupings of the sect. Each resettlement but the one in Saskatchewan was followed by a period of relative stability and must have produced additional subtle modifications and readjustments in their speech. In Canada the voluntary movements and further mixing of the sectarians also had its effect in blending and levelling dialectal variations. Unfortunately, no written records exist to indicate the nature of the speech in the various settlements and in separate villages. However, old-timers among them still remember a few of the peculiarities in the speech of some Dukhobors from given areas in the Transcaucasus.

Dukhobor movements and contacts also explain the evidence of certain external influences of foreign tongues on their language. The Milky Waters colonies were surrounded by Crimean Tatars and not-so-foreign Ukrainians. In the Transcaucasus many varied peoples,

⁸ J.F.C. Wright, Slava Bohu, The Story of the Dukhobors, New York and Toronto, Farrar and Rhinehart, Inc., 1940, p. 253.

but primarily Turks, Tatars, Georgians, and Armenians, were their neighbors. During exiles small numbers of Dukhobors met and lived with still other peoples such as the Yakuts in Siberia and the Finns. Some Finnish (Morvidian) and Gypsy elements actually joined the sect. In Canada, of course, apart from infrequent contacts with immigrants from continental Europe, most members of the sect experienced repeated contacts with speakers of English which has left a significant mark on the speech of all Dukhobors and has even supplanted the mother tongue in the speech of the younger generations.

CHAPTER III

VOWELS

The vowels herein described are oral resonant speech sounds produced by voice, a process whereby the air stream passing from the lungs through the larynx causes the vocal cords to vibrate. As shall be revealed later, the voicing process is also used in the production of certain consonants. Every vowel of the Dukhobor Dialect is described as it is articulated in its fullest form by the organs of speech which produce the contrasting features distinguishing each vocalic phoneme from every other.

By altering the shape and volume of the oral cavity or resonator, the chief organs participating in the formation of these vowels are the lips and tongue. Only one plane of contrast, namely, lip-rounding (labialization) or absence of the same (non-labialization) is operative for the lips; whereas, two planes of contrast, the vertical and horizontal, operate for the tongue. On the vertical plane, the height to which the tongue is raised in the mouth (low-mid-high) and on the horizontal plane, the most elevated part of the tongue (back-central-front) are to be noted.

Based on the above contrasting planes the following vowels are clearly discernible in the Dialect:

- A. Via participation of the lips.
 - 1. Labialized : o - u
 - 2. Unlabialized : a - e - i
- B. Via participation of the tongue.
 - 1. On the vertical plane.
 - a. Low : a
 - b. Mid : o - e
 - c. High : u - i

2. On the horizontal plane.

a. Back : o - u

b. Central : a

c. Front : e - i

Thus, the sum total of vowel phonemes is five.

Vowels of the Dukhobor Dialect

	front	central	back and labialized
high	i		u
mid	e		o
low	a		

Table 1

Basic forms or principal members of vowel phonemes are found under strong stress and are hereafter termed "stressed vowels", while the basic forms found under weak stress are termed "unstressed vowels". Phonetic contexts in which all the basic phonemes are realized are as follows: in isolation, in initial position but before hard consonants; and in addition, after hard but before hard consonants for the front vowels. All other phonetic environments create allophones or phonetic variants of the principal members.

A. Stressed Vowels.

The author contends that the vowels of the Dukhobor Dialect closely resemble those of contemporary standard Russian and even in

unstressed positions behave in much the same manner as Russian vowels. Limited and predictable variations from the Russian vowel pattern are evident in the Dialect and will be discussed in the section on unstressed vowels.

As in Russian, five stressed vowel phonemes are operative in the Dialect, specifically, /a, o, u, i, e/. Under stress the vowels are in a position of strength and receive their clearest and fullest articulation in terms of their intensity, duration, and quality. Consequently, phonemic distinctiveness is maximal in this position, the contrasting features being -- low: mid: high, and rounded: unrounded. When phonetically conditioned by the presence or absence of a preceding and/or following soft consonant, the vowels realize only allophonic distinctions on the horizontal plane -- back: central: front.

1. /a/.

Phoneme /a/ is a low (and more or less) central unrounded vowel. In its formation the lips are neutral and the tongue lies low in the mouth, which is open more widely than for the other Dukhobor vowels. The central part of the tongue is either minimally raised or not at all, a physiological phenomenon that makes it difficult to ascertain the exact position of this vowel on the horizontal plane.

For those familiar with Professor Daniel Jones' phonetic scheme of the "eight cardinal vowels", the vowel described above corresponds to the cardinal vowel [a] but is formed nearer the center of the mouth.

An important phonetic variant of /a/ is found in closed syllables following soft consonants -- when the tongue advances and rises from its basic position for /a/, creating an allophone closely resembling

the English phoneme /æ/ in words like "cat" and "nap". The use of this allophone enables the Dialect to assimilate effectively words adopted from Canadian English, such as /kʰat; kʰampa; mʰákin/ cf. /hrimʰákin/ 'bulldozer; camp; mackinaw coat; cf. (D. surname)'. Under the same phonetic conditions, especially when followed by a soft consonant, the two back vowels are similarly fronted (into the central region) with /o/ being simultaneously raised considerably more than /u/.

2. /o/.

Phoneme /o/ is a mid back rounded vowel. To form this vowel the lips move forward from their position for /a/ and become rounded, though less rounded than for /u/. The back part of the tongue moves up toward the soft palate to the mid area and the mouth closes somewhat, but not as fully as for /u/ or /i/.

The above vowel may be compared to the cardinal vowel [ɔ], with /o/ being slightly higher.

3. /u/.

Phoneme /u/ is a high back rounded vowel. The lips are protruded and rounded more fully, thus creating a smaller opening than for /o/. The back part of the tongue is raised toward the soft palate, higher than for /o/ -- almost approaching the height for /i/ -- and the mouth is more closed than for /o/.

Compared with cardinal vowel [u], the above vowel is articulated somewhat lower.

As a syllabic in the Dialect, /u/ occurs in considerably more varying contexts than its Russian counterpart. Here are a few words with /u/ in the Dialect but not in equivalent Russian words:

- a. In divers isolated words: /surop; čuřešňa; surownó;
buwála; sušet; užúm; nĕtu; utak/ 'syrup; cherries; all
the same; it used to be; neighbor; raisins; none; thus'.
- b. In substitution of /w/ initially before a consonant:
/užát'; uslúx; ušákaj; učará/ 'to take; aloud; every
kind of; yesterday'.
- c. In noun desinences: /na kańú; z horadu/ 'on horseback;
from town'.

4. /i/.

Phoneme /i/ is a high front unrounded vowel. The lips remain neutral and open, while the tongue is fronted and its central part raised toward the hard palate. The tongue is raised higher and the whole mouth is closed more than for the other vowels.

Vowel /i/ corresponds to the cardinal vowel [i], but is formed inconsiderably lower and further back.

It is worth noting that the phonetic variant of /i/ following hard consonants sounds quite different from its basic form, being an unrounded high back-central vowel. In describing contemporary literary Russian A. N. Gvozdev, a prominent Soviet writer in his field, classifies this variant as a separate phoneme⁹. However, since this form of /i/ occurs in both the Russian language and in the Dukhobor Dialect only following hard consonants in complete complementary distribution to its basic form which is found only after soft consonants, by the interpretation of a phoneme held in this thesis it must be considered simply as an allophone.

⁹ A.N. Gvozdev, Sovremennyj Russkij Literaturnyj Jazyk, Moskva, UCPEDGIZ, 1958, vol. I, pp. 11-12.

5. /e/.

Phoneme /e/ is a mid front unrounded vowel. In its formation the lips are neutral and open. The central part of the tongue is raised approximately to middle position in the front part of the mouth, but is less advanced than for /i/. Also, the mouth is more open than for /i/ though less open than for /a/.

Compared with the cardinal vowels, /e/ is just slightly higher and more advanced than cardinal vowel [ɛ].

Before /e/ Russian and Dukhobor paired consonants, with the questionable exception of /r/ in the Dialect, are in weak position and therefore only palatalized and unpaired hard consonants¹⁰ occur. In "unassimilated" words of foreign origin, however, it is possible to find unpalatalized consonants before this particular vowel. Since the vast majority of such words are "learned" terms, considerably more of them exist in contemporary Russian than in the Dukhobor Dialect for two principal reasons. First of all, any English words absorbed into the Dialect -- almost exclusively a spoken tongue -- are more readily assimilated than comparable foreign words adopted into Russian; and secondly, the "learned" speech of most Dukhobors today is neither their own Dialect nor Russian, but Canadian English. Consequently, not many terms in the Dialect have hard paired consonants before /e/ or its unstressed substitute phoneme /i/.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate the foregoing statements:

- a. Words partially assimilated in Russian¹¹ but totally assimilated in the Dukhobor Dialect: cf. R. /redáktar;

¹⁰ Also called "non-palatal" consonants.

¹¹ R.I. Avanesov, Ruskoe Literaturnoe Proiznošenie, Moskva, UCPEDGIZ, 1958, pp. 141-145.

šekúnda; tanel'; inergija ~ in'erǵija/ and D. /rídáktar;
 s'ikúnda; tunel'; in'erǵija/.

- b. Words partially unassimilated in the Dukhobor Dialect:
 /hotel' ~ hu'tel'; hamstet; haladej; nelsan ~ n'elsan;
 r'edija ~ rádijo; sejl; sent; setawát; čekawát/.

Note the apparent resistance of the various dentals or near-dentals to palatalization before /e/, but only in "foreign" terms. The above Dukhobor words are "unassimilated" strictly in the phonological sense, because lexically they are an inherent part of the Dialect.

As in Russian, a close variety of /e/ is heard when envired entirely by soft consonants as in the verb /im'eť/. This particular allophone is formed by advancing and raising the tongue to about midway between its positions for the basic forms of /e/ and /i/.

6. Phonetic contexts¹² in which the basic forms or principal members of stressed vowels are found. (Respective meanings follow minimal pairs and other examples. Stress is omitted unless differing from that indicated or implied in the headings.)

- a. For all the vowels -- initially, but not before soft consonants.

- 1) In isolation: /a, o, u, i, e/, each of the phonemes being exclamations or interjections and also names for the corresponding letters of the Russian alphabet.

¹² A modified version of Avanesov's classification is used here for Dukhobor vowels. See: R.I. Avanesov, Fonetika Sovremennogo Russkogo Literaturnogo Jazyka, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1956, p. 97.

- 2) In initial position before hard consonants: /ax: ox: ux: ix: ex; aš: uš; um: em; oča: uča; ada: idal/ 'various exclamations; till; ready; mind; letter "m"; Father (D. prayer); he teaches; hades (g. sg.); idol'.
- b. In addition, for non-front vowels -- after hard, but not before soft consonants: /na: no: nu; sat: sot: sut; kak: kok: kuk/ cf. /kik: kek/ 'here !; but !; well !; orchard; 100 (g. pl.); suit of clothes; how; coke; cook; cf. kick (re. liquor); cake'.
- c. In addition, for front vowels -- after soft, but not before soft consonants: /ni: ne; sil: sel; jim: jem/ 'neither...nor (emphatic); no !; powers (g. pl.); he sat down; to them; I eat'.
7. Phonetic contexts in which the major allophones or variants of principal members occur.
- a. For non-front vowels:
- 1) Initially or following hard, but before soft consonants: /ažija: ožira: ul'ja; maj: moj; mať: muť/ 'Asia; lake (one version); beehive; May; my (M. sg.); mother; muddiness'.
 - 2) After soft, but before soft consonants: /tata: toťa: tutu; pať/ 'sweetie; auntie; urinate! (all in baby-talk); five cf. e.g. in "b. 1)" below'.
 - 3) After soft, but not before soft consonants: /maja: majo: maju; mal: mol: mul; sol/ 'my (F.; N.; F. a. sg.); he crushed; he swept; mules (g. pl.); villages (g. pl.) cf. e.g., in "6. c." above'.

b. For front vowels:

- 1) Initially or following soft, but before soft consonants: /im̩a: ɛ̩ti; p̩it̩: p̩et̩/ 'name; these (rarer form); to drink; to sing'.
- 2) After hard, but before soft consonants: /žit̩: žeč̩: šes̩t̩; mit̩/ 'to live; to burn; six; to wash cf. e.g. "7. a." above'.
- 3) After hard, but not before soft consonants: /ti; dim; sir; žir; šer/ 'you (sg.); smoke; cheese; fat; share cf. "6. b." above'.

In summing up the foregoing it may be stated that allophones of stressed vowel phonemes are formed in phonetic environments other than those conditioning the production of their basic forms. Palatalization (softness) preceding and/or following the non-front vowels, and non-palatalization (hardness) preceding and following, or non-palatalization preceding and palatalization following the front vowels results in the creation of allophones. All other phonetic contexts produce the basic forms of the phonemes.

Although allophonic details do not concern us in this treatise, it might be added that the back vowels are noticeably raised and fronted at the beginning, end, or whole of their articulation when environed by palatalization (as are the front vowels when totally environed by softness); and conversely, front vowels are correspondingly retracted when environed by non-palatalization.

B. Unstressed Vowels.

As in standard literary Russian, only three unstressed vowels /a, u, i/ are operative in the Dukhobor Dialect. The five stressed vowels may be said to be reduced, not only in number, but also in

intensity of articulation and in duration. As a result, the unstressed vowels differ from their stressed members both in quantity and quality yet are not sufficiently different nor distinctive enough to qualify as independent phonemes. For this reason they must be considered as "reduced" variants of the stressed vowels whose unconditioned distinctive powers have been reduced from -- low: mid: high and rounded: unrounded. Furthermore, in certain positions phonemic contrastiveness of unstressed vowels is reduced to -- rounded: unrounded.

It is the reduction of distinctive contrasts that results in the quantitative reduction of vowel phonemes. Thus, in unstressed positions no new vowel phonemes are introduced. But, on the contrary, following non-palatalization /o/ and /e/ concur with vowels /a/ and /i/ respectively; and following palatalization /a/, /o/, and /e/ concur with /i/, while /u/ and /i/ remain phonemically unchanged under all phonetic conditions.

This concurrence of weakly-stressed vowels effects the displacement of one established phoneme by another and may therefore be called phoneme alternation or substitution -- a feature of the language which also pertains to the consonants. Hence, one may conclude that unstressed Dukhobor (and Russian) vowels are in weak position inducing reduction and substitution of phonemes.

Immediately below are a few basic introductory examples of vowel substitution (and reduction) in prestress and poststress positions. These examples will be followed by a more completely illustrated analysis of unstressed vowels.

1. Phoneme /a/.

a. /sat ~ sadŭ ~ sadawotstwa ~ wísatka/.¹³

¹³ In this dissertation the sign "~" is used to indicate variant forms of the same word, different words containing the same root, and phoneme substitution.

b. /pʌt̚ ~ pʲitorka ~ pʲiti-l'etnʲij ~ nápit̚/.

2. Phoneme /o/.

a. /wodi ~ wadá ~ wadapát ~ wadaprawot ~ po-wadu/.

b. /l'ot ~ l'ichnik ~ l'idinája/.

3. Phoneme /u/.

a. /ruk ~ ruká ~ rukawá ~ wíručit̚/.

b. /túrmi ~ túrmá/.

4. Phoneme /i/.

a. /sin ~ siní ~ pásinak/.

b. /pílŋa ~ pílit̚ ~ wípílit̚/.

5. Phoneme /e/.

a. /šest̚ ~ šist̚i ~ šist̚i-l'etnʲij ~ ná-šist̚/.

b. /čela ~ čilá ~ čilawoj ~ wičilka/.

Although unstressed vowels are themselves allophones of the stressed members, for purposes of differentiation in the unstressed group, the "purest" forms of these weakly-stressed vowels in each specific unstressed position may be referred to as the basic forms of the phonemes in that particular position and other forms in the same position as their phonetic variants or allophones. However, for our purposes in this study these finer distinctions between members of an unstressed phoneme are unnecessary and will be largely ignored. For example, in our first major grouping of "basic forms" in prestress position the influence of palatalization following the vowels will be disregarded.

Reduction of unstressed vowels is least in initial and stress positions, but greatest in closed syllables of other prestress and poststress positions. It is in unstressed positions that the more significant differences between Dukhobor and Russian vowels become evident.

1. Unstressed vowels of the first degree.

a. Phonetic contexts in which the "basic forms" of unstressed vowels of the first prestress position occur.

- 1) For all three unstressed vowels -- initially:
 /apašt': upašt'; ušol: išol; akon: ikon; ašit': ušit;
 umet': imet'/ 'to fall off; to fall down; he went away;
 he walked; windows (g. pl.) cf. n. pl. /okni/; icon;
 to cover (e.g. a bldg.); to kill; to be able; to have'.
- 2) In addition, for the non-front vowels -- after
 unpalatalized consonants: /sadi: sudi; tapit': tupit';
 paxat'; lamat'/ 'orchards cf. n. sg. /sat/; court cases
 cf. n. sg. /sut/; to drown cf. he was drowning /top/;
 to dull; to plough cf. he ploughs /páša/; to break
 cf. wrecking bar /lom/.
- 3) In addition, for the front vowels -- after palatalized
 consonants: /l'iži ~ l'iža ~ l'aš; r'idi ~ r'at; p'iti ~
 p'at'; vizla ~ vos ~ vešt'; šilo ~ šoli; l'idnik ~ l'ot;
 p'iro ~ p'oruška ~ p'erja; d'ila ~ d'el; s'idi ~ s'el/
 'lick!; lie there! ~ he licks ~ lie down!; rows ~
 n. sg.; five (g. pl.) ~ n. sg.; she conveyed ~ he
 conveyed ~ to convey; village ~ n. pl.; ice-box ~
 ice; pen ~ feather (dim.) ~ feathers; doings ~ g. pl.;
 sit! ~ he sat down'.

In this last phonetic context allophones of unstressed /i/ ranging from [e] or [eⁱ] to [i^e] or [i] are sometimes heard in certain words, particularly before hard consonants, but these phonetic variants are still compatible with the system of ikane¹⁴ here established.

- b. Phonetic contexts in which important variants of unstressed vowels in prestress position are found.

Since after palatalization /a < á, o/ and /e/ are displaced by /i/ only two allophones of any consequence appear (palatalization following the vowel being discounted): one, fronted /u/ following palatalization -- a comparative rarity -- and the other, retracted /i/ following non-palatalization -- a more common occurrence.

- 1) The fronted back vowel -- after palatalized consonants:
/turma ~ túrmi; tuxwak; bírukow/ 'prison (n. sg. ~ n. pl.); mattress; D. surname'.
- 2) The retracted front vowel -- after unpalatalized consonants: /bikax ~ bik; pil'it' ~ pil'/ 'bulls (1. pl. ~ u. sg.); to raise dust ~ dust'.

The patterning of unstressed Dukhobor vowels of the first degree after unpalatalized and palatalized consonants is concisely illustrated by the following table.

Vowels in Stressed and Prestressed Positions

position	ff. consonants	vowels occurring
stressed	hard and soft	a o u i e
prestressed	unpalatalized	a a u i (i)
	palatalized	i i u i i

Table 2

¹⁴ See Gvozdev, op. cit., pp. 31-32; and R.I. Avanesov, Očerki Russkoj Dialektologii, UCPEDGIZ, 1949, vol. I., pp. 40-77.

Phoneme /i/ < /e/ following unpalatalized consonants would appear only occasionally following /r/ or certain other consonants in words adopted from Canadian English.

The foregoing vowel pattern almost completely coincides with that of standard literary Russian. At the base of the Dialect are the vocalic features of non-dissimilative akaŋe and ikaŋe. On this base, however, an investigator will also find fragmentary elements of jaŋaŋe. This latter linguistic feature is evident in phonetic contexts following unpaired soft consonants in the Dialect here described and more extensive traces of it may be found in certain individual pronunciations. The remaining sections on Dukhobor vowels will elaborate on jaŋaŋe by means of the many examples provided.

- c. Unstressed vowels in the first prestress position following unpaired hard and soft consonants.

In this section significant departure from the Russian pattern will be observed. The palatalization of consonants following vowels, disregarded above, cannot be discounted below as shall become clearly evident. Exceptions to the predominant patterns are marked with an asterisk.

1) After unpaired non-palatal consonants --

- a) but before unpalatalized consonants: /cap'at' ~ ssáp'liwat'; caluj; cana ~ ceŋa; cihan; *cirkow ~ cerkwa/ 'to fasten ~ to couple; kiss!; price ~ he values; gypsy; churches (g. pl. ~ n. sg.)'
- /šaha ~ šax; šaptat' ~ šopat; šurup; širokaj; šastoj ~ šest'/ 'step (g. sg. ~ n. sg.); to whisper ~ whispering; screw; wide; sixth ~ six'

/žara ~ žar; žana ~ žon; žalat; žaltet ~ žoltaj;
žaludak; žuka; žiwoj/ 'heat (two meanings); wife ~
(g. pl.); to desire; to yellow ~ yellow; stomach;
beetle (g. sg.); alive'

/ššaka ~ ššoki; ššanok ~ ššenica; ššipci; ššibat/
'cheek ~ (n. pl.); pup ~ she is whelping; pliers;
to resemble'.

- b) but before palatalized consonants: /carā ~ car;
*carit ~ cenā; cidit ~ cida; ciplonak; ciment/
'king (g. sg. ~ n. sg.); to value ~ he values;
to strain ~ he strains; chick; cement'

/šahī ~ šax; pšanica; šumet; čižil'ej ~ čižolaj;
lašidej ~ lašonak; šišti ~ šest/ 'steps ~ n. sg.;
wheat; to shout; heavier ~ heavy; horses (g. pl.)
~ pony; six (g. sg. ~ n. sg.)'

/žarēwnā ~ žāra; *žanīx ~ žon; žurica; *žil'et ~
žal; žir'et ~ žir; žiwom ~ žit; žil'eza; žišťánka ~
žest/ 'frying pan ~ he fries; suitor ~ wives
(g. pl.); to worry; to pity ~ pity; to grow fat ~
fat; we live ~ to live; iron; a piece of metal ~
sheet metal'

/*ššanica; raššir'at/ 'to whelp; to widen'.

- c) but before non-palatal consonants: /šišnacat ~
šet/ 'sixteen; six'.

Thus, in phonetic contexts a) and b) above, vowels /a, u, i/
occur.

2) After unpaired palatal consonants --

- a) but before unpalatalized consonants: /časi ~ čas; čarnow ~ čornaj; čartowka ~ čort; *čatiri ~ četwira; *učara; čukok; čisnok; čislo; vičira/ 'hours (n. sg.); (D. surname) ~ black; devil (F. ~ M.); four (two meanings); yesterday; a little; garlic; date; evenings'
- /jazik; japonci; jarmo ~ jormi; jabaca ~ jop; juraha; jida; pajizda ~ paježditi/ 'tongue; Japanese; yoke ~ n. pl.; to have sexual intercourse ~ M. p. t.; buttermilk; food; trains ~ to ride around'
- b) but before palatalized consonants: /čir'ti ~ čort ~ čer'ti; čir'henkaw ~ čornaj ~ čir'neš; čir'vej ~ čer'vi; čit'wortaj ~ četwirti/ 'to act devilishly ~ devil ~ n. pl.; (D. surname) ~ black ~ to blacken; worms (g. pl. ~ n. sg.); fourth ~ quarter'
- /zajivi ~ *zajavi; jin'wár; jiw'rej/ 'report!; January; Jew'
- /jiketka ~ jákit; jurit/ 'jacket; to drizzle'.
- c) but before non-palatal consonants: /čižolaj ~ tšška; čiši ~ čosana ~ češut; jižžáj ~ jeđa/ 'heavy (two meanings); comb! ~ combed ~ they comb; go riding! ~ he is riding'.
- d) but before palatal consonants: /jajco ~ jájci; ijo ~ jej/ 'testicle ~ n. pl.; her (a. sg.)'.

Thus, vowels /a, u, i/ occur in phonetic context a) above, while /u, i/ occur in the remaining contexts with /a/ appearing only sporadically.

The basic patterning of the Dukhobor vowels in prestress position following palatal and non-palatal consonants is summarized in the table below.

Vowels in Prestress Position

ff. consonants	bf. consonants	vowels occurring				
		a	o	u	i	e
non-palatal	unpalatalized	a	a	u	i	a
	palatalized	a	i(a)	u	i	i(a)
palatal	unpalatalized	a	a	u	i	i(a)
	palatalized	i	i	u	i	i
	non-palatal	i	i	u	i	i

Table 3

Evidence for vowel behaviour in contexts following non-palatal consonants but preceding both non-palatal and palatal consonants, and for vowels following palatals but preceding palatals is too incomplete to be included in the above table. Nevertheless, as revealed by the foregoing alignment of vowels, elements of akaŋe and jakaŋe have penetrated the unpaired consonants area considerably more thoroughly than in Russian. Discovering this fact your researcher felt that the whole system of ikaŋe would flounder upon it. But, happily, a statement in Avanesov's text on Russian Dialects saved the situation and restored order. Many Russian Dialects with ikaŋe do possess sundry deviations with respect to non-front vowels following non-palatals¹⁵ even where normally front vowels were expected.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 105. Among Avanesov's examples are such words as /šastoj/ and žalát/.

The latter deviation is noted whenever /e/ is substituted by /a/ after non-palatals and after the palatal /č/, which in such circumstances may be considered as at least partially hard. Such substitution is probably permitted in the Dialect because, firstly, there is partial loss of consonantal weakness before /e/, which after hard consonants in unstressed positions is a more retracted vowel more closely resembling unstressed /a/ than unstressed /i/ and ceasing to be a true front vowel; and secondly, because of the reenforcing strength of akane and jakane following unpaired consonants.

2. Unstressed vowels of the second degree.

In spite of even greater qualitative reduction in other prestress and poststress positions, especially in closed syllables, numerically the same vowel distinctiveness is maintained as in the first prestress position.

Initially in other prestress positions are recognized the phonemes /a, u, i/ having a quality corresponding to that of the same vowels initially in the first prestress position. Similarly in open end syllables are detected the clearest articulations of the same vowels in poststress position.

In closed syllables, particularly in poststress ones, qualitative reduction is maximal and phonemic distinctiveness minimal; and combined with qualitative variations, such significant vowel reduction sometimes creates difficulties in determining the differentiation between the weaker vowels, especially between [e] and [ɛ], the weakest unstressed allophones of /a/ and /i/ respectively. The former, [e], is a mid central vowel distinguished from [ɛ] primarily by a slightly lower articulation. Even in open end syllables following hard consonants these two phonetic variants are difficult to distinguish.

In closed syllables following palatalized consonants distinctiveness is reduced to /u, i/, except posttonically, where grammatical desinences, possibly supported by intrusive jakaŋe, sometimes interfere with what otherwise may be considered a regular pattern of vowel substitution in unstressed positions of the second degree and reintroduce the weaker allophone of /a/ or /i/. Likewise in closed syllables following palatal consonants all three vowels common to unstressed syllables may be heard under certain conditions.

Since finer distinctions exist between allophones of unstressed vowels of the second degree, and as such distinctions are unessential for our purposes, allophonic differentiation will be ignored in the following classification of these vowels.

a. Phonetic contexts for unstressed vowels of the second degree in open syllables.

- 1) Initially: /apustʲitʲ: upustʲitʲ: i-pustʲitʲ; adiwaʲtʲ: udiwaʲtʲ; izdiwáca/ 'to lower; to drop; and to release; to clothe; to thread; to mock'.
- 2) Finally: /míla: mílu: míli: míʎa: míʎu: míʎi; haroda: harodu: harodi: haroʎi/ 'she washed; soap (a. sg.); (g. sg.); he lathers; I lather; they washed; garden (n. and a. sg., n. pl., and l. sg.)'.

Thus, the three vowels /a, u, i/ occur in initial and final positions of open syllables. Prestress articulations of vowels in open syllables are less reduced and more distinct than poststress articulations.

b. Phonetic contexts for unstressed vowels of the second degree in closed syllables.

1) Pretonically.

a) Following hard consonants.

- i) After unpalatalized consonants: /praxadít:
 prixadít ~ prixadít; zaxadít; wixadít ~
 wíjđa; haradá ~ horat; hustatá ~ hústaj/ 'to
 pass; to come; to enter; to go out ~ he will
 go out; towns (n. pl. ~ n. sg.); thickness ~
 thick'.
- ii) After non-palatal consonants: /calawát; šar-
 latán; žanixá; žon; žaltawátaj ~ žoltaj; šur-
 jaká; širako; šiwiłí; ciłikom ~ celaj;
 širštinoj ~ šeršt; šižďisát ~ šest; žištinoj ~
 žest/ 'to kiss; deceiver; suitor ~ wives (g.
 pl.); yellowish ~ yellow; brother-in-law (g.
 sg.); widely; hustle!; wholly ~ whole; woollen ~
 wool; sixty ~ six; metallic ~ sheet metal'.

Again, the three vowels /a, i, u/ are operative in pretonic positions following hard consonants.

b) Following soft consonants.

- i) After palatalized consonants: /kínawát ~
 kánari; pítí-l'etńij ~ pat; tiplatá ~ topła;
 širatá ~ širati; tísnatá ~ tesna; víčirá ~
 večir; šińiná ~ šińički/ 'to can ~ cannery;
 five-year-old ~ five; warmth ~ it's warm;
 orphan ~ n. pl.; closeness ~ it's close;
 evenings ~ n. sg.; seeds ~ sunflower seeds'.

Thus, after soft consonants the vowels /a, u, i/ occur but following palatalized consonants /a, o, e/ are substituted by /i/,

whereas, following palatals only /o, e/ are replaced by /i/. In other words, after palatalized consonants are found the two vowels /u, i/, while after palatal consonants all three unstressed vowels occur.

2) Posttonically.

a) Following hard consonants.

- i) After unpalatalized consonants: /wikapaj: wíkupaj; wíruhal: wírihal; wímit' ~ wímat' ~ mit' ~ moj; nosam/ 'dig out!; bathe! (both pf. sg.); he scolded; he burped (both pf. sg.); to wash out (pf. ~ impf. ~ imp. sg.); nose (i. sg.)'.
- ii) After non-palatal consonants: /dwácat' ~ dwáciť; pťicam ~ pťicami ~ pťicimí; kúšat'; xarošaj; wíšal ~ išol; swebžaj ~ swebžiji; jožica; kašil'/'twenty; birds (d.~i.pl.); to taste; good; he went out ~ he walked; fresh; it bristles; cough'.

Hence, the three vowels /a, u, i/ occur following hard consonants with the distinction between the allophones of /a/ and /i/ being more or less negligible, particularly before softness in non-desinencial closed syllables.

b) Following soft consonants.

- i) After palatalized consonants: /žárut'; žárím; kámñim ~ kámñiam; kámñiw ~ kámñiaw; báníj; síñij ~ haluboj; kol'iš; wívis ~ wos/ 'they fry; we fry; rock (i. sg.); (g. pl.); bath-house (i. sg.); blue; you chop cf. you take

/b'iroš/; he conveyed (pf. ~ impf.).

- ii) After palatal consonants: /pláčam: pláčim:
pláčut'; wímačut': wímačit'; túčij; haráčij;
dočik/ 'weeping (i. sg.); we weep; to weep;
they weep; to wet (3p. pl.); (inf.); cloud
(i. sg.); hot cf. big /bal'šoj/; daughters
(g. pl.)'

/rojam: rojim; pamojut'; pamojim: pamojam ~
pamojim'i; sarájaw ~ sarájiw/ 'swarm (i. sg.);
we dig; they will wash (pf.); (lp. pl);
slops (d. ~ i. pl.); barns (g. pl.)'.

Thus, after soft consonants the two high vowels /u, i/ are stabilized while a rather unstable resurgent /a/ occasionally occurs as a kind of oristic signalling of substantive desinences. The vowel /a/ appears more readily after the palatal than after the palatalized consonants. As can be deduced from a comparison of the two foregoing groups of examples, /a/ and /i/ following palatals are even phonemically distinctive before hard consonants but only in grammatical desinences.

The table below summarizes the occurrence of the unstressed vowels of the second degree.

Vowels in Other Unstressed Positions

ff. consonants	position	vowels occurring				
		a	o	u	i	e
unpalatalized	prestressed	a	a	u	i	i
	poststressed	a	a	u	i	i
palatalized	prestressed	i	i	u	i	i
	poststressed	i(a)	i(a)	u	i	i
non-palatal	prestressed	a	a	u	i	i
	poststressed	a(i)	a(i)	u	i	i
palatal	prestressed	a(i)	i(a)	u	i	i
	poststressed	a(i)	i(a)	u	i	i

Table 4

As Table 4 illustrates, alternate vowel forms appear in certain contexts. A word about these alternate forms follows.

1. Posttonically after palatalized consonants /a/ reappears in grammatical desinences of substantives, e.g., /kamŋim ~ kamŋam; kamŋimi ~ kamŋami/.

2. Posttonically after non-palatals /i/ alternates with /a/ < /a, o/ before soft consonants as in the terms /dwácat' ~ dwacit'; swěžiji ~ swěžaji/.

3. Pretonically after palatals /a/ is replaced by /i/ before softness as in /u-jin'war'e/, and conversely, /i/ < /o/ may be replaced by /a/ before hardness as in /čarnawátaj/.

4. Posttonically after palatals /a/ is infrequently changed to /i/ before softness as in /pamojamⁱ ~ pamojimⁱ/. The non-substitutions of /a/ < /o/ by /i/ may occur before hardness as in /sarájam cf. sarájiw ~ sarájaw/. The influence of grammatical morphemes is apparent in both cases.

Here again one must confess that the whole picture of vowels in unstressed positions of the second degree would be further elucidated by a more exhaustive study of the phonology of the Dialect.

Having established itself in unstressed positions following unpaired soft consonants and finding support in individual and scattered group pronunciations of the Dialect, jakaŋe at times extends its influence even into the area of positions following paired soft consonants. Notations regarding this linguistic phenomenon are made in the next section.

C. Elements of Jakaŋe.

In the preceding sections on Dukhobor vowels in unstressed positions it was demonstrated that akaŋe is more widespread in the Dukhobor Dialect than in standard Russian. It was also noted that elements of jakaŋe are evident in the Dukhobor language whose predominant features are non-dissimilative akaŋe and ikaŋe. These basic features illustrated above at length have been overwhelmingly substantiated by all the sources examined. Now something more ought to be said regarding the presence of jakaŋe in the Dialect.

The kinds of jakaŋe observed in the Dialect may be classified into two general types -- intrusive moderate jakaŋe and strong jakaŋe found in the speech of a minority of Dukhobors. This classification is based on the ideolects of a limited but representative group of informants and is supplemented by secondary sources.

1. Intrusive moderate jakaŋe.

Intrusive jakaŋe of the moderate type occurring now and then in speech whose basic feature is ikaŋe is supported by jakaŋe common in the Dialect following unpaired palatal consonants and in grammatical desinences. Thus, the variety of jakaŋe found in ordinary words like /časí; čartowka; učará; jazík; jarmo; kámŋam; pamojam/ is also found in more fixed types of terms like surnames and pronouns as in /čarnow; jawo; čawo; majamú/ and is extended to similar types even in pretonic positions following palatalized consonants, for example, /čišťakow; u-ŋawo; k-ŋamú; ušawo/. In ordinary words intrusive moderate jakaŋe may also occur in positions after soft consonants which, like palatal /č/, tend to exhibit certain characteristics of hard consonants. Only one such palatalized consonant was noted, specifically /rʲ/, but in view of the examples just given and the fact that dental-alveolar consonants in neologisms tend to remain unpalatalized before /e/, the whole lot of consonants formed in the dental-alveolar area are suspect of having characteristics similar to those of /rʲ/ and thus encouraging jakaŋe where ikaŋe is the norm. Therefore it is not surprising at times to hear /radí; hľazú; ťipeřača/ where /rídí; hľižú; ťipeřiča/ are anticipated. Nor is it surprising to hear the alternating forms /ďirží ~ ďerží ~ ďarží; sílo ~ šelo ~ šalo; miškí ~ mšákámi/ under the same circumstances. The intrusive and sporadic nature of this type of jakaŋe therefore is revealed in a few words and in alternating ikaŋe ~ jakaŋe forms. Moderate jakaŋe as an exclusive prevalent form was not observed although it may exist in the Dialect.

2. Strong jakaŋe.

Strong jakaŋe of undetermined quality was noted in the ideolects of two particular individuals (who were aware of the fact that their speech was different) whose ancestors were said to have come from the Tombov region and in the speech of certain Dukhobors called

'xalođinskaji'. Usually 'tambowskaji' informants spoke with strong jakaŋe so that regardless of whether hard or soft consonants followed the unstressed vowel in question, a distinct /a/ was heard in place of /a, o, e/ as illustrated by the following.

- a. After soft and before hard consonants: /śalo; iŋaná; paŋarlá; śastrá; náśú; vádá; náxáj; wasná; jažžáj; mástáx/ 'village; names; she died; sister; I carry; misfortune; let be!; spring; go (riding) (imp. sg.); places (g. pl.)'.
- b. After soft but before soft consonants: /raŋáti; hŋ'adá; náśí; váhí; paŋok; zaŋonaja; zamačájut/ 'boys; considering; carry! (sg.); run! (sg.); stump; yellow (M. sg.); they notice'.

A third middle-aged person interviewed whose parents were 'tambowskiji' but who had not been living with them for quite some time spoke with slightly "weakened" jakaŋe.

As already mentioned, the second group of Dukhobors speaking with rather strong jakaŋe are the 'xalođinskaji'. Exceedingly few of these were met in the Grand Forks area on which the study is based but several were found in the Brilliant and Krestova areas. Examples recorded do not essentially differ in jakaŋe type from those of the 'tambowskaji': /hŋ'ažú; paŋadora; vádrom; śalo; śmatána; paŋtro; priŋazlá; braxát; tŋalo; taklo; hŋ'adi; đatáčij; vári; śemđisat; ašanú/.

Older Dukhobors born in Russia still remember some of the dialectal differences they encountered when thrust together during and following their exodus from the Transcaucasus. On more than one occasion the writer was informed that 'xalođinskaji hawaŋíli na ja'. The label 'tambowskaji' seems to refer to Dukhobors once living in the Transcaucasian village of Tambovka which is only one of the group

of villages in Tiflis province called "Xolodenskie"¹⁶. On such inadequate evidence, however, it must not be assumed that strong jakanje did in fact characterize all the 'xoloďinskaji' villages. Other comments regarding earlier differences included the statement: 'Bohdánawskaji hawaríli pa xaxlácki', which may be interpreted to mean "the inhabitants of the village Bohdanovka spoke more like Ukrainians".

The speech of the 'l'isaveckaji' Dukhobors, being indistinguishable from that of the 'karaxánskaji', stands in contrast to the aforementioned types. 'l'isaveckaji' refers to the Dukhobors once living in Elizavetopol province. It may be safely argued that the Dukhobor Dialect described in this treatise is by and large the present day speech of the latter two groups of Dukhobors and the Dialect which most Dukhobors seem to consider as their "standard" native language.

The more significant phonological differences discovered among the Dukhobors with respect to vocalism have now been discussed. Considerable levelling of earlier dialectal differences must have occurred during the days of the closely-knit communal living in British Columbia and especially in the Grand Forks area where almost all the Dukhobor villages and enterprises have been virtually within sight of each other. Two additional early groups of sectarians mentioned by informants but not located in research ought to be noted in this connection. 'Radijonawskaji' Dukhobors, presumably from the village Radionovka, were one of these groups supposedly having peculiarities of speech that no one could adequately describe. At least three individuals classifiable in this group were visited but nothing which could be considered extraordinary was discovered. Members of the second group, 'dubowskaji', were said to have spoken like 'mardví', and although two informants divulged their descent from this Finno-Ugric race, neither were any phonological differences noticed in their Dukhobor speech.

¹⁶ See Chapter II.

A fair example of phonological levelling of the kind which must have occurred repeatedly in other Dukhobor communities following periods of resettlement is provided by a family living in Grand Forks. Forsaking the more isolated and restricted type of agricultural life in the prairies during the last World War, this particular family moved to British Columbia. Apparently at that time all members of the family spoke with pronounced jakaŋe. However, after some fifteen years of closer contact with other Dukhobors, only the mother, who stayed at home most of the time spoke with distinct jakaŋe. She described her usual form of speech as the language of her parents but could readily reduce the strength of her jakaŋe by concentrating on her words. Working for several years now with other Dukhobors at the local sawmill, the father spoke with only slight jakaŋe. Upon enquiring about the noticeable difference between his speech and that of his spouse, he confided that he was compelled to speak as others do because of the constant teasing he received from fellow employees and other Dukhobors about his peculiar speech habits. The Dukhobor speech of their young businessman son, whenever he used it, corresponded even more closely than his father's to the speech of the surrounding Dukhobor community.

CHAPTER IV

CONSONANTS

The consonants herein described are speech sounds which are produced by the passage of air from the lungs, accompanied or unaccompanied by voice and palatalization, and in the production of which there is either a complete closure or a constriction of the air stream. The consonants are described as articulated by the speech organs which produce the contrasting features distinguishing one consonantal sound from another.

Consonants are formed by the participation, in creating constrictions or closures, of an active articulator (lower lip or various parts of the tongue) and a passive area of articulation (upper lip, teeth, alveolar ridge, parts of the palate) which mutually produce the various consonantal sounds. Thus, contrastive distinctions of consonants are conditioned by the speech organs in five ways on five planes:

1. manner¹⁷ of articulation
2. place of articulation
3. participation or non-participation of voice
4. presence or absence of palatalization
5. presence or absence of length.

The first category given shall be utilized as a basic division of classification.

In the first contrastive category there are clearly discernible seven groupings of consonants contrasting according to the manner of formation: stop, nasal, lateral, vibrant, fricative, affricate, and

17 As used in category 1., the word "manner" will automatically exclude the other categories.

semivowel. The second category presents six contrasting groups of consonants conditioned by their point of articulation in the oral cavity: bilabial, dental, alveolar, palato-alveolar, palatal, and velar. In the third category the vibration of the vocal chords as the air stream passes through them produces voice and creates contrasts in the nonsonant class of consonants. The fourth category renders contrasts when the tongue approaches or contacts the central palatal region of the oral cavity creating an "i-like" articulation and thereby producing palatalized consonants. And in the final category the articulation of a consonant is prolonged (in duration) in contrast to its commonly shorter form. These five distinctive categories are more fully elaborated upon individually in the discussion of each consonantal group. As shall become evident, every contrasting plane noted above is not contrastive in each case.

Following the table illustrating the sum of Dukhobor consonants and the tables of minimal pairs for all plain consonants, each class of consonants established by the first category above will be considered and members of each class described.

Consonants of the Dukhobor Dialect

Contrasting planes		bilabial		dental		alveolar		palato-alveolar	palatal		velar	
		h.	s.	h.	s.	h.	s.	h.	s.	s.	h.	s.
plosive	vl.	p	p'	t	t'						k	k'
	vd.	b	b'	d	d'							
nasal		m	m'	n	n'							
lateral				l	l'							
vibrant						r	r'					
fricative	vl.					s:ss	s'	š:šš			x	
	vd.					z	z'	ž:žž			h	
affricate	vl.					c		č				
	vd.							č				
semivowel		w	w'						j			

Table 5

The two tables immediately following provide minimal pairs contrasting the basic consonantal categories both initially and finally, but contrasting all the plain consonants in the Dialect initially only. In subsequent discussions of each fundamental category of consonants the remaining phonemic contrasts within each class will be provided by additional minimal pairs.

Basic Consonantal Contrasts

I. Initial contrasts.

plosive	/p	pap	pas		pop	pot	
	t	tap	tas	tam	top	tot	
	k	kap	kas		kop	kot	karú
nasal	m	map		mam			
	n		nas	nam		not	nahú narú
lateral	l	lap			lop	lot	
vibrant	r	rap	ras	ram		rot	
fricative	s		sas	sam		sot	sáru sarú
	š	šap			šop		šáru šahú
	x	xap			xop	xot	
affricate	c	cap			cop		carú/
	č	čap	čas		čop		
semivowel	w		was	wam	wop	wot	
	j	jap		jam	jop	jot	

Table 6

The last column contains varied minimal pairs essential to the completion of the series of initial consonantal contrasts.

For the meanings of terms in Table 6 and subsequent tables in this chapter see Appendix II.

II. Final contrasts.

plosive	/p	pap	wop	dop	l'ip
	t		wot		
	k				kuk
nasal	m			dom	
	n	pan	won	don	
lateral	l	pal	wol		l'il
vibrant	r	par	wor		kur
fricative	s	pas	wos		
	š		woš	doš	l'iš
	x		wox	dox	
affricate	c				l'ic
	č			doč	kuč/
semivowel	w		wow		
	j	paj	woj	doj	

Table 7

In Table 7 there is an attempt to contrast only the most basic categories and not every plain consonant. The second column of minimal pairs is redundant but reenforcing, while the fourth column provides final contrasts for the lateral and vibrant classes with the affricate class of consonants.

A. Plosive Consonants.

Plosive consonants are produced by a complete oral closure and a concomitant velic closure. The articulator stops the air stream at some contact point of articulation behind which the air is compressed and then released orally with a slight explosion.

As determined¹⁸ by the place of articulation three distinct groupings of plosives exist in the Dukhobor Dialect: bilabial, dental, and velar. Accordingly the oral closure is effected by the lower lip contacting the upper lip for the bilabials, by the upper front part of the tongue pressing against the base of the upper teeth including the lower portion of the alveolar ridge for the dentals, and by the back part of the tongue contacting the soft palate for the velars. The accompanying velic closure operative in the production of all but the nasal consonants is made by elevating the rear portion of the soft palate (velum) to contact the pharynx.

The three plain consonants representing the basic plosive subdivisions are /p, t, k/ respectively: labial, dental, and velar. With the exception of the velars, two of the above plosive groupings are further distinguished by the participation of voice creating the contrasts /p, b, t, d/, and by the presence of palatalization significantly increasing the plosive contrasts to /p, p', b, b', t, t', d, d', k, k'/. Thus, in the Dukhobor Dialect ten plosive phonemes are found and maintained in all except weak positions for consonants. These plosive contrasts are illustrated in the following table.

¹⁸ Where there was doubt regarding the details of the actual articulation of any consonant, reference was made to Avanesov's description of Russian consonants.

Plosive Contrasts

I. Initial contrasts.

Contrasting planes	bilabial	dental	velar
place	pas	tas	kas
voice	pop:bop	tom:dom	--
palatalization vl.	pil:pil	tok:tok	kaš:kaš
vd.	bil:vil	don:don	--

II. Final contrasts.

Contrasting planes	bilabial	dental	velar
place	rap	rat	rak
palatalization vl.	cep:cep'	žit:žit'	--

Table 8

1. Loss of voice.

Voiced plosives are in weak position before nonsonant voiceless consonants and zero. (Actually the same maxim applies to all paired voiced consonants¹⁹.) As a general rule, voiced plosives are substituted by their voiceless counterparts in the aforementioned positions and, consequently, no final voiceless: voiced contrasts appear in the above table. Thus, the word /babf/ 'kidney beans' becomes /bop/ before a zero desinence. Likewise, the word /bába/ 'a woman' becomes /bápká/ 'an old woman' when the voiced plosive occurs before a voiceless consonant. Sporadic non-substitution¹⁹ of voiced plosives in final position also occurs.

¹⁹ See p. 76.

2. Loss of soft labials.

The minimal pair /cep: cep̚/ is probably the last stronghold of contrasting soft labials in final position. Only the older generations of Dukhobors recall the word /cep/ in its earlier meaning of 'flail', an instrument long since replaced by divers threshing machines and combines. For the majority of speakers of the Dialect then, the terms /cep ~ cep̚/ convey the same meaning 'a big chain' with /cepka/ 'a chain' and /cepačka/ 'a little chain' being the most common semantic alternants. In all other instances observed only unpalatalized labials were found before zero: /sip; s̑tep; sem; wošim; ná-zim; l'ubow; brow; hatow/ 'pour!; steppe; seven; eight; onto the ground; love; brow; ready'. An obvious conclusion to be drawn from such evidence is the fact that labials in the Dialect appear as hard consonants in final position.

3. The soft velar plosive.

A sound evidently old in the Dialect but newly acquired as a phoneme is /k̚/. Its phonemic status is established by a widely used minimal pair /káša: k̚áša/ (see Table 7), the latter member being an Anglicism, and is supported by the adoption of other English terms (at least in the ideolect of some Dukhobors) but also by common Dukhobor words.

Examples in which the soft velar plosive phoneme occurs may be divided into the two categories represented by the above minimal pair.

- a. Anglicisms: /kat: k̚at; kuk: k̚uk; k̚ampa; k̚anda; slak̚án/ 'apricot (rare in sg.); bulldozer (common); cook; cucumber (rare); camp; candy; Slocan'.

- b. Dukhoborisms: /tkot'; tikot'; pikot'; wánka ~ wánku; táńka; tol'ka; kojka; cf. kis; kisa/ 'it weaves; flows; bakes; Ivan (dim. n. ~ a. sg.); Tanya (dim.); just; bed; cf. (a repetitive cat-calling expression); cat (in baby talk)'.

As our examples illustrate, /k/ is not an infrequent phoneme in the Dialect and may be found before all the non-front vowels. In addition, at least one root /kis-/ possesses a hard velar plosive before the high front vowel /i/ after the pattern of other paired consonants which may appear either hard or soft before this vowel. It should be noted, however, that no final hard-soft contrasts were located for the phonemic pair under discussion and no other velar consonants are similarly paired.

Yet another inescapable observation from the above examples is the progressive assimilation of /k/ in contrast to its behavior in Russian. Also in contrast to literary Russian is the regular dissimilation of /k/ before the dental plosive as in /xto ~ kawo; táx-ta; tráxtar; doxtar/ 'who (n. ~ a. sg.); thus; tractor; doctor'.

4. The voiced velar plosive.

The question arises whether the voiced counterpart of the plain velar plosive is ever heard. It is, but exclusively in words of English origin, although it may also appear where /k/ has become voiced by contiguous assimilation as in the phrase /g-horadu/. In toponymics and other substantives encountered in Canada even senior speakers of the Dialect sometimes pronounce [g] as, for example: /gran xork; kasilgár; Henigaraw; garáž ~ garáĵ; gubirmén; gráwal; negati; igzámin; dígar/ 'Grand Forks (one version); Castlegar; Henniger (surname); garage; government; gravel; negatives; examination; potato digger'. Of course, one should not be surprised to hear a

distinct voiced velar fricative replacing the plosive in some of the above words as pronounced by older folk.

There is no question as to whether /h/ is a phoneme (see section on fricatives) and its preference over [g] in earlier "borrowings" from the English is illustrated by two closely related terms /has; hálan/ 'gasoline; gallon', which are much more commonly used than their alternate forms, /gas; gálan/. In later "borrowings", as exemplified in the preceding paragraph, the plosive is evidently preferred. However, no minimal pairs were encountered to establish [g] as a phoneme and consequently it must be considered an allophone of /h/, the principal member²⁰. Frequently [g] freely alternates with [h] as in the place name /hran xork ~ gran xork/. No unpalatalized: palatalized phonemic contrasts of velars other than the plosives appear to exist.

B. Nasal Consonants.

Like the plosives, the nasals are produced by a complete oral closure, but unlike all other consonants, nasals lack an accompanying velic closure (i.e., the soft palate is lowered). Consequently the pent-up air behind the articulator is released through the nasal cavity, the whole mouth and nose area acting as a resonator.

In the Dialect two nasal groupings are clearly discernible, a bilabial and a dental. These nasals are voiced sounds or sonants and therefore possess only one additional feature of distinctiveness, namely, palatalization. This second plane of contrast increases the nasal phonemes from two /m, n/ to four /m, m', n, n'/. (See table below).

20 The term "principal member" is here used as described in: Daniel Jones, The Phoneme, Its Nature and Use, Cambridge, Hefner and Sons, 1950, p. 8.

Nasal Contrasts

Contrasting planes	I Initial		II Final	
	bilabial	dental	bilabial	dental
place	mox	nox	dom	don
palatalization	mať:mať	nos:nos	—	won:wonʹ

Table 9

Notations.

1. As explained in the notations regarding plosives, labials are in the final process of losing their unpalatalized: palatalized contrast-distinction before zero. Hence, no contrasts between hard and soft bilabial nasals occur in final position.

2. In two Dukhobor Christian names the bilabial nasal was found in the place of the Russian dental nasal: /mʲikolka ~ mʲikola ~ mʲikaláj; mʲikʲit/ 'Nick, Nicholas; Nikita'.

C. Lateral Consonants.

Positionally related to the dentals, the laterals are sonants formed by the tip of the tongue pressing against the upper teeth and alveolar ridge thereby stopping the air passage in the centre and forcing the air to escape orally along one or both sides of the tongue which is lowered and separated from the teeth and gums.

Since voice is non-distinctive in sonants, only two laterals exist in the Dialect. In phonemic opposition to the plain consonant is its palatalized counterpart creating the pair /l, lʲ/.

Lateral Contrasts

		I Initial	II Final
Contrasting plane			
palatalization	lot:ʎot		pił:pił'

Table 10

When comparing certain Dukhobor words with equivalent terms in Russian (and at least in two instances, in English), the lateral consonant would occasionally supplant other consonants in various ways.

1. Sound change with the Russian vibrant liquid.
 - a. Replacing /r/: /abʎikos; kaʎidor; ʎihistrácija ~ ʎihis-trowka/ 'apricot; corridor; registration' cf. /farmál'/ 'farmer'.
 - b. Replaced by /r/: /apirsína/ 'orange'.
2. Sound change with other Russian consonants.
 - a. /j/: /muraʎel'/ 'ant'; cf. /rejca/ cf. R. /ʎel's/ 'rail'.
 - b. /v/: /slaboda, slabodnaj, slabodnik/ 'freedom, free, a Sons of Freedom'.
 - c. /n/: /kalakon/ 'bell'.
3. Sound change with Russian consonants in conjunction with truncations.

The contraction /doʃil'/, equating Russian /da ʃix por/, is exceedingly common. By analogy other similar forms apparently have

been created: /pa'el'/ alternating with /pa'á/ and /at'el'; attel'/, alternating with /at-kúda; at-túda/ respectively.

4. Sound change with zero.

a. The Dukhobor surname /padavílníkaw/ is always pronounced with the liquid consonant and always written without it in both Russian and English forms.

b. Another instance of a deliberate omission of the liquid consonant is in the Dukhobor equivalent of the Russian possessive adjective /kozij/ which in the Dialect is normally /kaz'ínaj/. When it came to using this adjective in the term "goat's milk", however, two men of about middle age (one of whom actually kept two goats at Krestova!) declared that those who used the expression /kaz'ínaja malako/ were in error (this included both parents of the goat owner!) because it suggested a biological impossibility. The only correct form was /kaz'ínaja malako/ both affirmed!

D. Vibrant Consonants.

The vibrant is a sonant formed when the tip of the tongue bends upward and touches the alveolar ridge in a rapid succession of several taps as the air stream forces the tongue to vibrate or trill while the velum remains raised.

As in the nasal and lateral sonant classifications, palatalization alone operates in the production of another phoneme to contrast with the plain consonant with the resulting pair being /r, r'/.

Vibrant Contrasts

		I Initial	II Final
Contrasting plane			
palatalization	rat:r ^ʔ at		par:par ^ʔ

Table 11

In the pronunciation of many speakers of the Dialect there is a tendency for the vibrant to be partially or totally unpalatalized where the palatalized consonant may be expected. This phenomenon was noted in both neologisms and older Dukhobor terms of Slavic origin and indicates a hardening characteristic of the phoneme in question. Examples illustrating the aforementioned feature are here given:

1. In neologisms including place names: /trejl; kresan lej^k; resturán ~ rasturán; rindawá^ʔ ~ řenda/ 'Trail; Christina Lake; restaurant; rent (inf. and noun)'.
 2. In older terms: /ridá; ribro; rišít^ʔ; prišlá; príďa; presnaj; drimá^ʔ; retka; prežďi; xristíján; xreštík; kristowaja ~ xristowaja/ 'row (g. sg.); rib; to decide; came (F. ps. t.); will come (M. 3p.); flat-tasting; to doze; rarely; before (adv.); Christian; cross (dim); Krestova'.

It will be observed that /r/ can appear hard even before the front vowel /e/, normally a weak position for Dukhobor paired consonants. But it should be remembered that in neologisms dental consonants²¹ also occur unpalatalized before /e/, strengthening the position of the vibrant in this respect.

21 See notes regarding /e/, pp. 22-23.

E. Fricative Consonants.

In the formation of fricatives the articulator narrows the oral cavity at some point to the extent that the passing air stream rubs against the sides of the constricted area thereby creating a rubbing or fricative sound.

As determined by their place of articulation, three groups of fricatives are to be found in the Dukhobor Dialect: alveolar, palato-alveolar, and velar. For the alveolar plain fricative the constriction causing friction is made by the tip and upper front part of the tongue approaching the base of the upper teeth and the teeth ridge while the tongue's sides contact the side teeth. The palato-alveolar fricative consonant is formed by the same kind of constriction, except that the tongue is slightly retracted and grooved with its tip somewhat raised. To create the constricted area for the velar fricative the back part of the tongue approaches the soft palate. In the manner described for each are formed three basic phonemes /s, š, x/.

All three fricative groupings are further distinguished by the participation of voice, doubling their phonemic inventory to /s, z, š, ž, x, h/. Palatalization of the first pair creates two other phonemes in the alveolar group /s, s̟, z, z̟/.

Interestingly enough there emerges exclusively among the fricatives a fifth contrasting plane -- length. In the palato-alveolar group the feature of length yields a long phoneme contrasting with the shorter plain consonant /š, šš/. Both phonemes are definitely non-palatal. Following Table 12 an attempt will be made to show that there is sufficient evidence for also recognizing the Dukhobor alveolar voiceless and palato-alveolar voiced long consonants as phonemes.

Fricative Contrasts

I. Initial contrasts.

Contrasting planes		alveolar	palato-alveolar	velar
place		sot	ššot	xot
		sut	šut	xut
voice		sat:zat	šar:žar	xor:hor
palatalization vl.		sok:šok	--	--
	vd.	*aziwáca: *ažiwáca	--	--
length	vl.	sal:ssal	*píša:píšša	--
	vd.	--	*žar:žžar	--

II. Final contrasts.

Contrasting planes		alveolar	palato-alveolar	velar
place		wos	woš	wox
		dus	duš	dux
palatalization		l'es:l'es'	--	--

Table 12

Notations.

1. Minimal pairs in Table 12 marked with an asterisk.

The minimal pairs /aziwáca: ažiwáca; pīša: pīšša/ are obviously not contrasted initially as no satisfactory examples of initial opposition for /z, ž; š, šš/ were found. However, in the speech of those influenced by jakaně such a contrast does exist for the first pair of phonemes in the words /zaťok: žaťok/ 'penetrated by rain (M. p. t.); son-in-law (dim.)'.

The minimal pair /žar': žžar'/ are not genuine in the same sense as the other pairs, but are included in the Table to complete the picture for fricatives. (For more information regarding /žž/ see below.)

2. The labio-dental fricatives.

If one recalls the sum of Russian fricatives, a phonemic grouping conspicuous by its absence from the above two tables is that of the labio-dentals. While in Russian the labio-dental class has four phonemes contrasting via voice and palatalization, in the Dukhobor Dialect these same sounds operate in an allophonic capacity only with the voiced members predominating in occurrence.

a. [v, v'].

Although both members of the voiced labio-dental fricative pair may be heard before any vowel in the Dialect, the unpalatized member is infrequently found before non-front vowels, whereas the palatalized allophone is more frequently used but before front vowels. Instead of [v] before non-front vowels, in consonant clusters, and in final position is usually heard the bilabial semi-vowel [w] whose palatalized counterpart also occurs before front vowels.

In addition to the aforementioned occurrences, [w] appears as the non-syllabic alternant of the vowel /u/ and as a prothetic sound before the labialized vowels. Due to the bilabial semivowel's considerably more common usage, [w] is to be designated as the principal member of the phoneme and [v] as the subsidiary member. In close conformity with the common distribution of these two consonants in the Dialect, our phonemic transcription system uses /w, w̥/ before non-front vowels including the allophone [ɨ], and [v̥] before front vowels. It should be understood, however, that in the Dialect itself [w̥] may also be pronounced in place of [v̥] and conversely, [v] in place of [w].

The preferential selection of the two consonants as observed may be illustrated by the following series of examples:

- 1) Consonant before vowel: /was: wás; wos: wós; wus; wíslal; vísna; ves; verik/.
- 2) Consonant in cluster before vowel: /swáxa; swázanaj; swoj; swos; šwíža; swíšnul; čirwíki; swečka/.
- 3) Consonant following vowel: /trawá; tráwka; práwda; karowu; diwčonka; řew/.

b. [f, f̥].

The voiceless labio-dental fricative pair is likewise found in the Dialect, but only as allophones of /x, xw/ and almost exclusively in words of English derivation. Dukhobors who are more literate in both Canadian English and standard Russian will tend to use [f, f̥] more often than those less literate which includes most of those in the older generations. Between the various speakers of the Dialect and even in the speech of the same individuals some of the alternations exemplified below occur.

- 1) Dukhobor terms via English: /friʃ ~ xriʃ; alfa ~ alxwá; fáрма ~ xwárma; fáńic ~ xwáńic; forman ~ xworman; xúta; fíńišawát ~ xwíńišáwat; frejt ~ xrejt ~ fřejt; kafej ~ kaxwej/ 'refrigerator; alfalfa; farm; fence; foreman; foot; to be finishing (re. carpentry); freight; cafe'.
- 2) Dukhobor terms via Russian: /xwábrika; xwantál; tuxwák; xworma; hramaxon ~ hramaxwon; xwodar; xront; xunt; xudámint; xrúxta; júxta/ 'factory; irrigation ditch; mattress; form; gramophone; Fred; front; pound; foundation (re. carpentry; fruit; fine leather' /tixlís; xwílíp; xwítíl; xiwrál'; xwe; xweda; laxwet; štrax/ 'Tiflis; Philip; wick; February; letter of R. alphabet; Fred; hayrack; a fine'.

Even in the latter group of "terms via Russian", sometimes [f, f'] are pronounced instead of /x, x', xw, xw'/ which are unquestionably the predominant choice.

A careful examination of the foregoing terms reveals the general patterns of occurrence for the velar fricative in place of the labiodental fricative. Indications are that /x/ occurs before the labialized vowel /u/ -- the bilabial semivowel evidently being absorbed -- and may appear before the less labialized vowel /o/, while /xw, xw', xw'/ occur before the front vowels and /o/. In addition, /x/ appears without the accompanying semivowel before other consonants which seem to supplant /w/.

3. The alveolar and palato-alveolar fricatives.

It would be sheer negligence not to comment and elaborate upon the phonemes formed by the extraordinary contrasting plane of length functioning among the fricatives.

That the phonemes /š, šš/ are established by this kind of contrast is indisputable. But although words in which these particular sounds are found in initial position abound, no actual initial contrasts forming minimal pairs seem to be available, except of the type /šitʰ: ššitʰ/ which involve morpheme prefixation. Medially, however, these phonemes find support in other contrasting pairs such as /čáša: čášša/ 'abig bowl; more often'. In final position contrasts are unlikely as there is a strong tendency to shorten the long phoneme and thus to force the coincidence of the two consonants. Therefore in the substantive /doš/ 'rain', the length and voice features become evident only in oblique cases and derivatives, as for instance in the words /dažžá; dožžik/. In the Dukhobor words /borš; išo; šukín; šakolda; šalaktát/ 'borsch; yet; (D. surname); doorhandle; to tickle', the length feature -- present in the same Russian words -- is nonexistent even in declined or conjugated forms.

Voiced counterparts to /š, šš/, that is /ž, žž/, are similarly distinguished by length, but unfortunately minimal pairs have not been encountered to establish them as separate phonemes according to our definition. Nevertheless, a number of near-minimal pairs have been traced, for example, /dáža: dažžá; wosi: woši: wožži; drožži; žeč: žžeč/ 'even; rain (g. sg.); wasps; lice; reins; yeast; to burn (impf. and pf.)'. Such proximate distinctiveness²² is evidence enough for this investigator to include /žž/ among the phonemes of the Dialect. Further investigation of Dukhobor phonology will likely substantiate this stand. The problem of finding adequate examples of phonemic opposition here results largely from the marginal character of the distinctive feature of length. Numerically, at least, other planes of contrast are exceedingly more frequent.

²² Ibid., pp. 39-40. Among D. Jones' secondary methods of determining phonemes is one regarding "words containing the sounds in situations of sufficient similarity" and Trager and Bloch's word series, e.g., /dažžá: damá; dáma: dáža/.

The peripheral nature of the length feature is perhaps best illustrated in the alveolar fricative category. In the term /ssatʃ/, one of the two words noted in the Dialect, is realized the long phoneme /ss/ which finds an immediate initial contrast with /s/ in the pairs derived from the given infinitive and the word /sála/. The fact that this extremely limited appearance of a consonant in the root of a word is able to be contrasted at all is a marvel indeed! Of course, alongside /šš, žž/ the appearance of the long or "double" consonant /ss/ at points of morpheme suture lends support to the acceptance of the long phoneme.

An additional minimal pair based on the same roots and near-minimal pairs are among the following: /sála: ssála; sat: ssatʃ: šatʃ; ssíššik; seč: sseč; pása: pássa; klása: klássa/ 'fat; urinated (F. p. t.); orchard; to urinate; sit!; spy; to thrash (impf. and pf.); a pass (g. sg.); to graze (rfl.); class; to place oneself'.

Digressing from the Dialect to Russian in connection with long consonants, the author wishes to assert that there would appear to be substantially enough evidence to recognize at least the long alveolar fricative /ss/ as a phoneme of standard Russian regardless of the consonant's marginal character. Synchronically considered, the words /ssora; ssúda/ 'quarrel; loan', juxtaposed with the terms /sora; súda/ 'weeds (g. sg.); judgment (g. sg.)', form suitable minimal pairs to establish the phoneme /ss/. Add to these the inconsiderable semantic differentiation between /mása: mássa/ 'mass (re. people); mass (re. money)' and what the writer has been informed to be common colloquial Russian for 'to urinate', that is, /ssatʃ/ with its potential for distinctive contrasts and there are more distinctive pairs for /s, ss/ in Russian than in the Dukhobor Dialect!

Now what about the feature of length in the palato-alveolar fricative group? Soviet scholars state that the Russian phonemes

/šš, žž/ are frequently pronounced hard²³ and the latter may even be acceptably substituted by /žž/ in contemporary Russian²⁴. Such a statement is actually an admission that in the standard speech of many literate Russians, the distinctive feature of palatalization is lost and the feature of length assumes contrastive powers. Why is this feasible? Long hard /šš; žž; ss/ are already operating at morpheme sutures²⁴ and /ss/ is contrasting with /s/. Why should not this contrasting plane of length be permitted to extend its influence to the neighboring fricatives? Its influence is now being felt in the fricative class of consonants and its study as a plane of phonemic contrast in Russian warrants further investigation.

4. The velar fricatives.

The velar fricatives have just one phonemic contrast based on voicing but several allophones. With considerable regularity the allophones [x, ɣ] occur before the non-front vowels and hard consonants while their palatalized counterparts [xʲ, ɣʲ] occur before front vowels and certain soft consonants.

F. Affricate Consonants.

In their articulation affricate consonants are a complete blend of certain plosive and homorganic fricatives. An affricative begins as the plosive formed at the same point but the release of the pent-up air behind the point of oral closure is more gradual (rather than a sudden unstopping as for plosives) and, as a result of a slower separation of the articulatory organs, a corresponding fricative is heard in the latter stage of the affricate's formation. Thus, a

23 V. Vinogradov, et al., eds., Grammatika Russkogo Jazyka, Moscow, 1952-54, vol. I, pp. 51-52. In this official volume is upheld the view that /šš, žž/ are not obligatory as phonemes since [šš] alternates with [šč] and [žž] with [žč] in literary Russian.

24 A.H. Gvozdev, op. cit., pp. 16, 71-72.

closure blending into a following constriction creates an affricate.

On the position plane two groupings of affricates are distinct in the Dialect: alveolar and palato-alveolar. The alveolar affricate is formed by the front section of the tongue stopping the air stream at the base of the upper teeth and alveolar ridge, then releasing the air as for the alveolar fricative. In the same manner the palato-alveolar affricate is produced slightly further back on the alveolar ridge with the central part of the tongue simultaneously approaching the hard palate. The two phonemes thus created are /c, č/, the first being non-palatal and the second palatal -- softness here being non-distinctive. The palato-alveolar plain affricate is further contrasted with a voiced counterpart thereby making another phonemic pair /č, ʃ/.

Affricate Contrasts

Contrasting planes	I Initial		II Final	
	alveolar	palato- alveolar	alveolar	palato- alveolar
place	cop	čop	spic	spič
voice	--	čox:ʃox	--	--

Table 13

Notations.

1. Supplementary minimal and near-minimal pairs for /c, č/ include: /cap: čap; ustreca: ustreča; udáca: udáča/ 'onomatopoetic term for clutching with claws; chop; to meet; a meeting; to succeed; good fortune'.

2. Loss of the plosive element, etc.

A phenomenon noted in connection with the alveolar affricate is the occasional loss of either its plosive or fricative element, the former being the most common. For the most part this affricate remains intact but at times the above reduction occurs. For example, in the words /cihán; caná; sonca; scapít; francús; kl'áca; udáca/ 'beggar; price; sun; to join; Frenchman; to swear; it will succeed', the plosive element is sometimes absent, and in the last two examples a long /ss/ replaces /c/, an interesting assimilation at a morpheme boundary. On the other hand, in the words /t'witok, t'wést/ 'flower; to bloom' and derivatives, the fricative element is absent, except in the measure to which it is present in the accompanying semivowel.

A case in which the plosive element is lost in the palato-alveolar fricative due to simplification before another consonant, specifically a dental plosive, is /što/ whose genitive and dative forms restore the full affricate, /čawo, čamú/.

In the adjectival and adverbial forms of at least one root palatalized /t'/ is fricated and becomes palatal /č/ as in /čižolaj, čižalo/ 'heavy, heavily' contrasting with /t'ázast'/ 'weight'. Compared with Russian /xoť/, in the Dukhobor term /xuč/, the soft dental plosive has evidently undergone a similar change, which is phonemic (cf. /t'isát': čisát'/ 'to split; to comb').

3. The apparent hardening of /č/.

Sometimes the patterning of unstressed vowels following palatal consonants seem to suggest that /č/ was at least partially hard. For example, even in speech characterized by ikaŋe, in a few words like /čatíri; učará/ the vowel /e/ becomes /a/, but only in prestress position -- just as when it appears after non-palatal but before hard consonants.

The apparent partial hardness of /č/ is also evident in its lack of power to palatalize a following velar. As pointed out earlier, the velar plosive is readily palatalized by a preceding soft consonant including jod: /lářka < lářa; wánka < wána; dátka; hájka (cf.) hájda; skamejka (cf.) skamejička/ 'Larry; John; uncle; nut cf. cattle call; bench cf. (dim)'. Note that in the latter two pairs of examples a non-velar consonant remains hard after jod whereas the velar becomes palatalized; and also, that the same velar, soft after /j/, remains hard after /č/. Unpalatalized /k/ occurs regularly following /č/: /táčka; dočka; řečka; svěčka/ 'wheelbarrow; daughter; river; candle'. The same type of non-palatal behavior would presumably apply to /j/.

4. The voiced palato-alveolar affricate.

Drawn from Dialect neologisms minimal pairs for /č, ĵ/ are abundant: /čok: ĵok; čap: ĵap; čip: ĵip/. In spite of this, /ĵ/, like /č/ is not a "new" phoneme in the language. Many examples which are not more recent "borrowings" or Anglicisms testify to this fact: /ĵoha; wanĵow; maĵára; ĵurít; ĵinĵír; pinĵák; inĵiher; ĵaránka/ 'switch; (D. surname); semen; to trickle; figs; jacket; engineer; deer'.

It is worth noting that in the three terms just preceding the last word, Dukhobor /ĵ/ equates with Russian /ž/. The final Dialect term was probably acquired during their stay in the Transcaucasian region since the Georgian word for "antelope" is "dzheirani".

G. Semivowels (Semiconsonants).

The semivowels are fricative-like sonants produced by a momentary constriction of the air stream at some point in the oral cavity. The velum being raised, the air passes out through the mouth rubbing against the sides of the constricted area.

In the Dialect under consideration two semivowel consonantal groupings are found, namely /w, j/, the first being bilabial or labio-velar and the second, palatal. To form the bilabial semivowel the lower lip approaches the upper lip and both are fronted and slightly rounded while concomitantly the back part of the tongue is raised to a vowel /j/ position. However, before unrounded vowels the lips appear somewhat spread for /w/. The palatal semivowel is produced by means of the central part of the tongue being raised towards the hard palate. Whereas the latter phoneme is palatal, the former is unpalatalized and by way of palatalization finds opposing contrast in /w/.

Semivowel Contrasts

Contrasting planes	I Initial		II Final	
	bilabial	palatal	bilabial	palatal
place	wot	jot	l'ew	l'ej
palatalization	wos:wos	—	—	—

Table 14

Notations.

1. The bilabial semivowel.

a. Generalities regarding /w/.

As noted earlier in the discussion of fricatives, /w/ is the principal member of the /w-v/ family of sounds and as such occurs most frequently before non-front vowels and before front vowels when in a consonantal cluster. What has been said earlier on this subject will not be repeated here.

Some Dukhobors are aware of the fact that their pronunciation of the Russian "v" sound is more like the English "w" and use the latter symbol in writing their names in English script. The following Dukhobor surnames were copied directly from The West Kootenay Telephone Directory for 1959: Sopow, Oglow, Poznikow, Wishlow, Cheveldeaw, Wlasoff, Woykin, Sophonow, Popow cf. Papove, Popoff; Moroso, Makorto, Chernenko, Waselenko; Cheveldave. Of course, more Dukhobor surnames are written with the "-off" ending (in conformance with the spelling used by the Canadian Immigration authorities in recording names of Dukhobor immigrants) than with "-ow", but the above forms serve to illustrate attempts at representing the bilabial semivowel as it is pronounced finally and initially.

Of considerable interest in this section is the function of this bilabial as a legitimate semivowel. Its alternation between non-syllabic /w/ and syllabic /u/ is often observed under certain phonetic conditions. An attempt to analyze this fluctuating behavior of the semivowel is made below. While this is being done it ought to be noted that /w/ does not become voiceless in the same contexts as other voiced paired consonants nor does it assimilate voiceless consonants. In this respect and in its palatalizing effect on contingent unpaired hard consonants it behaves as the sonants.

b. Occurrences of /w ~ u/ alternation.

- 1) Non-syllabication if preceding or following a vowel:
 /wadá; wosk; wíras; vint; vera; nawčíl; rowna;
 nawrát; dewka; i-wsó; nawsíhdá;

sxwatíl; twordaj; swoj; raswet; čirwíki; dejstwawať;
 ní w-nás; ní w-wás;

al'íwa; láwačka; parawoj; browi; zavet; pastáv; krow;
 naríw; l'ew/.

- 2) Syllabication if preceding a consonant either initially or after another consonant: /upašć; u-padwál; ubok; uwol'u; uverx; ukús; unís; uměšći; ušo; ušihdá; udowka; u-nás; u-wás; učíl;
- ur'ema ~ wr'ema ~ vr'ema; urođi; wr'ot; ul'ila; u(w)lašt ~ wlašt; bil u-nas; won uzál ušo; jeđim uměšći/.

This distribution of the /w ~ u/ alternation would hold true for the vast majority of the speakers of the Dialect. Only before the liquid consonants does there appear to be some incompleteness of the alternation, probably because of the semivowel's close affinity to these oral sonants.

c. The semivowel /w/ as a hiatus breaker.

The semivowel in question acts as a kind of hiatus breaker between two non-front vowels, if one of them is labialized. Although the evidence is incomplete, a few examples of this phenomenon were noted: /nawúka; pawúk; awúl; nawúšník; zá-wuxu; u-wuhlú; uw-a'bedn'ij ~ na-a'bet; uw-akno ~ b'ila w-akno/ 'learning; spider; Caucasian village; ear-muffs; by the ear; in the corner; in the dining room ~ for dinner; into the window ~ she hit on the window'.

d. The semivowel /w/ as a prothetic sound.

In a few Dukhobor terms /w/ can appear prothetically before the stressed labialized vowels: /won ~ aná; wožira; wostraw; wostraj; wokni ~ akno; wosi ~ asá; wúxi ~ uxá; wítram; wúskaj; wúhal/ 'he ~ she; lake; island; sharp; windows ~ n. sg.; wasps ~ wasp; ears ~ ear; in the morning; narrow; corner'.

In some of the foregoing words prothetic /w/ is a permanent fixture in the pronunciation of all speakers encountered.

- e. The appearance of /u/ from /w/ in connection with contractions.

Occasionally the contraction of the semivowel and a non-front vowel results in the formation of /u/ as illustrated by examples: /uták < wot tak; utáxta < wot tak to; utút < wot tut; wutorník < wawtorník/ 'thus; thus; right here; Tuesday'.

- f. Not a single instance of /w/ substituting for the liquid /l/ was observed.

2. The palatal semivowel.

The extent to which jod behaves like the bilabial semivowel has not been thoroughly examined. It is apparently found in much the same phonetic contexts as /w/ but its existence and behavior is not complicated by the presence of major allophones corresponding to [v, v̥]. A minimum of examples will be given below to reveal some of the similarities of /j/ to /w/ in terms of what has been said regarding the latter.

- a. Occurrences of /j ~ i/ alternation.

As /w/ is associated with the non-front vowels, so /j/ is related to the front vowels. /j/ occasionally alternates with the high front vowel even as /w/ alternates with the high back vowel. Such alternation occurs under essentially the same phonetic conditions as those stated for the bilabial semivowel: /idú ~ ja jdú ~ ujdú; itít ~ pajtít ~ razajtíta; iđe ~ ti jđe ~ won iđe; imđe ~ dalá (j)mđe ~ dal imđe; i tí ~ nu j tí/ 'I go (on foot) ~ I will go away; to walk ~ pf. ~ to disperse; where? ~ where are you? ~ where is he?; to me ~ she gave me ~ give me; and you ~ well, and you'. As for /w/, the terms "syllabication, non-syllabication" are equally applicable for jod.

b. The semivowel /j/ as a prothetic sound.

Three words found in the Dialect have a prothetic /i/ which becomes /j/ or disappears altogether: /imr̥e(cf.) dalá jm̥r̥e ~ dalá mr̥e; iʃol (cf.) pa daroški jʃol; jeʃli(cf.) iʃli ták/. Jod, or more accurately, /i/, may be considered a prothetic here only in contrast to the same words in Russian. Also in contrast to standard Russian, Dukhobor oblique case forms of the pronoun /an̥i/ all retain jod: /jix; jim/, whereas in Russian /j/ is frequently omitted.

The example /jeʃli ~ iʃli/ illustrates the type of alternation found in /asá ~ wosi; uxá ~ wuxi/ wherein the semivowel disappears (in the case of /w/ when labialization ceases) or is absorbed by its alternant phoneme, the respective high vowel. Another Dukhobor sample patterning in the same manner is /ijo ~ jej/ 'she (a. ~ d.)'. But in view of the Russian forms in both of which /j/ is retained, in this last example jod cannot be considered prothetic in the same sense.

H. Remarks Regarding Dukhobor Consonants As a Whole.

The consideration of specific consonants has been completed. For this purpose the contrasting plane of the manner of articulation has been utilized as a basic category. The sub-categories -- place of articulation, voicing, palatalization, and length -- were used accordingly and all the consonants have been examined in separate sections. Therefore before entering upon a further consideration of the categories most descriptive of Dukhobor consonants, namely, voice and palatalization, let us glance at them again as a sum total in the light of their basic category.

1. A tabulation of Dukhobor consonants according to their manner of articulation.

		total
plosives	/p, p', b, b', t, t', d, d', k, k'/	10
nasals	/m, m', n, n'/	4
laterals	/l, l'/	2
vibrants	/r, r'/	2
fricatives	/s, ss, s', z, z', š, šš, ž, žž, x, h/	11
affricates	/c, č, ĵ/	3
semivowels	/w, w', j/	3
		—
grand total		35

If the phoneme /žž/ be permitted to stand on the grounds on which it was established, the Dukhobor Dialect has exactly thirty-five consonantal phonemes — just one more than standard Russian²⁵; but if /k'/ is recognized as a phoneme of Russian, the total is identical. The numerical difference is less important than the differing inventory. Using Avanesov's total and distribution as an acceptable account of Russian consonants, Dukhobor lacks the following Russian phonemes /g, f, f', v, v', šš, žž/ but possesses /k', h, ss, šš, žž, ĵ, w, w'/ which are absent in Russian.

2. The grouping of Dukhobor consonants according to voiceless: voiced opposition presents a series worth considering.

The series of voiceless: voiced contrasts includes:

/p, b; p', b'; t, d; t', d'; s, z; s', z'; š, ž; šš, žž; x, h; č, ĵ/.

Thus, the voiceless: voiced series consists of ten pairs —

²⁵ Thirty-four is Avanesov's total excluding /k'/ in Fonetika, p. 134.

four plosive, five fricative, and one affricate. The remainder of Dukhobor consonants unpaired on this plane of contrast consists of eleven sonants /m, m', n, n', l, l', r, r', w, w', j/, two velars /k, k'/, and an affricate /c/.

In essentially the same manner as the equivalent Russian series²⁶, before vowels and sonants the voiceless: voiced contrasts are in their strongest positions of distinction. That is to say, they can maintain their voicelessness or voice irrespective of the following vowel or consonant.

Weak positions of distinction for consonants paired in this series are positions before nonsonant voiced consonants for voiceless consonants and before nonsonant voiceless consonants and zero for voiced consonants. Thus, in the given weak positions voiceless consonants tend to become voiced and vice versa.

Examples illustrating consonantal substitution in the foregoing weak positions:

- a. Unvoicing of voiced consonants before zero: /bap ~ bába;
hot ~ hoda; šax ~ šahnúl; l'es ~ l'ezla; maš ~ máža/
'woman (g. pl. ~ n. sg.); year (n. ~ g. sg.); step (noun ~
M. ps. t.); crawled (M. and F.); smear! ~ he smears'.
- b. Unvoicing of voiced consonants before voiceless consonants:
/waloda ~ walot'ka; knížak ~ kníška; pat-xátu ~ pad-rečku;
ap-stol ~ ab-úhal ~ ab-dom/ 'Walter; book (g. pl. ~ n. sg.);
under the house ~ down the river bank; against the table ~
corner ~ building'.
- c. Voicing of voiceless consonants before paired voiced
consonants: /zdox; ad-bát'ki; k-aknú ~ g-domu/ 'he died;

26 Ibid., p. 162.

from father; toward the window ~ home'.

It will be observed that voicing and unvoicing may occur at both morpheme sutures and word borders.

Contrary to the regular substitution of phonemes as described above, there is evidently somewhat of a tendency to retain voiced consonants before zero wherever a semantic clash threatens to confuse meaning. Hence, /roz/ 'roses (g. pl.)' may be heard instead of the expected /ros/ because the latter also means 'he grew'. Similarly /woz; plod; sud/ 'load; produce; court' may replace /wos; plot; sut/, since the latter may also mean 'wasps; raft; suit of clothes' respectively. The extensiveness of final voiceless: voiced contrasts of consonants does not seem to be great. It is likely purely peripheral and rather limited. On the other hand, the Dialect as spoken by the younger generations of Dukhobors may be embracing more of such contrasts quite prevalent in the English language which is increasingly better known to them. However, since Ukrainian²⁷ retains at least partial voice in final consonants, this feature may have been in force in the South Russian Dialect for some time.

3. The grouping of Dukhobor consonants according to unpalatalized: palatalized opposition is also of interest here.

The series of unpalatalized: palatalized contrasts includes:

/p, p'; b, b'; t, t'; d, d'; k, k'; s, s'; z, z'; m, m'; n, n'; l, l'; r, r'; w, w'/.

In this series are twelve pairs -- five plosive, two fricative, two nasal, one lateral, one vibrant, and one semivowel. The last

27 R.G.A. De Bray, Guide to the Slavonic Languages, Dent and Sons, London, 1951, p. 76.

five pairs are sonants. The remainder of the consonants, unpaired on this plane of contrast, consists of six fricatives /š, ž, šš, žž, x, h/, three affricates /c, č, ĵ/, and a semivowel /j/. The only completely unpaired consonants on the voiceless: voiced and hard: soft planes are /c, j/, the former being voiceless and non-palatal, and the latter, voiced and palatal.

Strong positions of distinction for hard: soft contrasts include the following: for all consonants but the velars and labials, before all vowels except /e/, and before zero. Other possible positions of strength need additional examination.

Positions of weakness for consonants paired in this series include the position preceding the vowel /e/²⁸, and for the velar consonants also before /i/; for most of the consonants, before paired soft consonants; and for labials also word finally. In such weak positions phonemic contrastiveness on the hard: soft plane fails to materialize.

As our examination of Dukhobor consonants reveals, Dukhobor consonants do not differ greatly from those of Russian. The differences which do exist may be said to be minor. Three consonantal forms which characterize the Dialect and contrast strongly enough with the consonants of standard Russian to be conspicuous are the voiced affricate and fricative /ĵ, h/ and the semivowels /w, w̃/. To these may be added the phonemes /x, xw/ and their various combinations appearing in place of Russian /f, f̃/. But here we are introducing the use and distribution of phonemes, factors which further alienate the two languages. The same analogy would apply to the differences between Dukhobor and Russian vowels.

Morphological, syntactical, and lexical factors tend to widen the gap even more between the two languages. Unfortunately all these factors cannot be included in this paper. However, the major grammatical inflections are appended to the main text.

²⁸ With few exceptions -- see notes regarding vowel /e/ and consonant /r/.

CHAPTER V

OTHER PHONOLOGICAL PHENOMENA

This brief chapter does not pretend to complete the investigation of the phonology of the Dukhobor Dialect. It is merely an "addendum" to the preceding two chapters. The reason for its inclusion is the conviction that something ought to be said regarding stress as well as the important features of contraction and cluster-breaking which to some extent characterize the Dialect. The latter phenomenon will be considered first.

A. Contraction.

The contraction, syncopation, or truncation of sounds is well known in ordinary colloquial speech. Since the Dukhobor Dialect is primarily a spoken language, contractions of various kinds are common and are not distinguished from uncontracted forms by the speakers of the Dialect. Contractions may vary from minute ones, such as the loss of some feature of a single phoneme, to more extensive ones in which several phonemes may be eclipsed.

1. Contraction within a phoneme.

Because length of some description is essential before any contraction can occur, in the Dialect only the long fricative consonants and affricates have anything to truncate.

a. Some long fricatives lose their length feature either only before zero as in the word /doš ~ dažžá/ 'rain (n. ~ g. sg.)', or permanently in almost any position as in the terms /šúkin; išo; borš/ '(D. surname); more; borsch'. Comparable Russian words retain the long consonants.

b. Length in affricates is of a different nature -- the blend of a plosive and fricative. One of the elements of this compound may be lost and a simplified consonant remain. Loss of the plosive element is often evident in words like /sonca; capl'át/ 'sun; to grasp' and the complete loss of the fricative element in the related terms /t'witok; t'west/ 'flower; to bloom'.

2. Contraction within a word.

A contraction within a given word may involve one or more phonemes in either initial, medial, or final position. A truncated particle following a word may be attached to the end of that word even as in the English term "wouldn't". In the examples which follow, contracted terms appearing without alternations or their full forms illustrate contractions in the Dialect in contrast to corresponding terms in standard Russian.

- a. Contraction of a single phoneme: /uš < uže; wíhrat' < wí-ihrat'; pirdawát' < pírídawát' (cf.) pírxađít'; poxrani ~ paxaron; pamládel ~ maladoj; ně < n'et; sičás; kadá; tadá; praťí ~ praťíwnaj; padimát'; pojas ~ pajizdá/ 'already; to win; to transmit cf. to pass; funeral; he looks younger ~ young; no; now; when; then; against (prep. ~ adj.); to lift; train (n. sg. ~ pl.)'.
- b. Truncation of particles: /xtos' < xto-ta; kadás' < kadá-ta; kudíś' < kudí-ta; iďes' < iďe-ta; táxta < tak-ta; isl'ip < jesl'i-ba; tip < ti-ba (cf.) wip; bútta < bút-ta-ba; kudáš' < kudá-ža ~ kudíś' < kudí-ža; tudáš' < tudá-ža/ 'someone; sometime; somewhere (direction); somewhere; thus; if; you should (sg.) cf. (pl.); as if; whence; thence'.

3. Contraction involving two or more words: /uták < wot tak; utáxta < wot tak-ta; utút < wot tut; uteta < wot jeta; wotan < wot won; wonan < wot won; doši ~ došil' < da šix por; netša < net išo/ 'thus; thus; here; this; here he is; there he is; yet; not yet'.

4. Contractions in specific parts of speech.

Nouns: /strúmint < instrument; salařej; ramatís < rumatízam; il'ektrika/ 'instrument; celery; rheumatism; electricity'.

Pronouns: /mawo < majawo; twawo < twajawo; swawo < swajawo/ 'my; your; one's own'.

Numerals: /pídšát; šizďšát; šišnácat'; đwinosta; tíšša < tíšiča; šimoj ~ šamoj/ 'fifty; sixty; sixteen; ninety; thousand; seventh'.

Verbs: /moža (cf.) maňot'; paďedat' < pa-aďedat'; pirdajom < piriďat'/ 'he may cf. he can; to dine (pf.); to transmit'.

Adverbs: /atkel' < at kúda; attel' < at túda; čut' < čudok/ 'from whence; from thence; a little'.

Prepositions: /okl < okala; dl'e < podl'i; z-domu < is-domu; prat'i/ 'by; near; from home; against'.

5. Contraction in neologisms.

The phenomenon of contraction even enters the area of new terms in the Dialect: /alxwá; hran xork; l'ejmaš; šekša/ 'alfalfa; Grand Forks; laying mash; section'.

6. Contractions in Christian names.

Comparing Dukhobor given names with equivalent Russian names

one would assume that most Dukhobor names are contractions or diminutives of their Russian counterparts. Some Dukhobors feel that the name by which a grown man or woman is daily called is the fullest possible "Russian" form.

Here are a few "formal" names of adults together with their longer forms, which have been forgotten by some Dukhobors: /máša < maríja; lúša < lukeríja; xwēna < xwidosíja; pol'a < palaheja; nášta < anastásíja; wáša < vasíl' (cf. R. vasíli'j); mīša < mīxájla ~ mīxajíl/.

A certain Dukhobor pensioner (oddly enough, a Freedomite) confided to me that when negotiating for his wife's pension, he was asked by a government agent for his wife's Christian name. He could supply no other name than /hrúna/. This name was apparently inadequate for searching the records regarding her entry date into Canada, homestead settlement, and other facts required as she had no legal identification, birth certificate, citizenship papers, or anything of the sort. After an extensive investigation of official records in Regina, they found her full maiden name and the little pensioner learned for the first time in his life that her "real" name was, as he put it, /ahraferna/!

B. Cluster Reduction.

Cluster breaking may be considered as a tendency in opposition to contraction since to simplify a consonant cluster in the former, vowels are added instead of consonants and/or vowels being truncated. In cluster reduction, therefore, words are lengthened by the addition of phonemes rather than being shortened by the elimination of phonemes. Nevertheless, the subconscious intent and end result of both processes is the same -- simplification of the articulation of a word.

Each of the vowels may be used for cluster reduction.

1. /a/: /wawtorńik ~ wutorńik; akromi; smisal; malan'já; samaro-
dina; pasalom; haladát; ata-wsawo < at-usawo; zawsihdá ~
usihdá/ 'Tuesday; besides; idea; lightning; currants; psalm;
to hunger; from all; always'.
2. /o/: /lop ~ lobam; rot ~ rota; woš ~ woši; l'ot ~ l'odu; l'on ~
l'onu/ 'forehead (n. ~ i. sg.); mouth (n. ~ g. sg.); fleas
(g. ~ n. pl.); ice (n. ~ g. sg.); flax (n. ~ g. sg.)'.
3. /u/: /unúk; u'vex; udwoja; uslúx/ 'nephew; upwards; twice;
aloud'.
4. /i/: /iržá; ide < ihde; imne; žizni ~ žizni; karábil' ~
karabl'i; mšil' ~ mšl'i; išla ~ išol/ 'rust; where; to me;
life (n. ~ g. sg.); ship (n. sg. ~ pl.); thought (n. sg. ~
pl.); went (F. ~ M. ps. t.)'.
5. /e/: /l'ew ~ l'ewa ~ l'ewu/ 'lion (n. ~ g. ~ d. sg.)'.

The type of cluster breaking illustrated here by the vowel /u/ was described earlier in the section on semivowels.

As may be expected in connection with this phenomenon, in the Dialect full-vowelling is even more widespread than in Russian.

Notations on the reduction of consonantal clusters could quite naturally lead into a discussion of the clustering of consonants in all possible positions. Unfortunately, consonantal clustering and syllabification in the Dialect is another area of study which must remain incomplete for the present. Only some of the more conspicuous clustering variations from the Russian pattern were noted as partially related above. It can be safely assumed, however, that a close and thorough comparison of Dukhobor and Russian consonantal clustering would reveal considerably more variations of various kinds.

C. Stress.

Word stress in the Dukhobor Dialect plays the same role as stress in Russian. In both languages stress is a phonemic suprasegmental feature in that it alone may distinguish a pair of words having identical phonemes (segments) in the same order. In addition, the stress is dynamic in that it distinguishes a stressed syllable from the remainder of the word by a more forceful, sharper, and evidently longer articulation of that syllable. (See the notes regarding vowels). Furthermore, the stress is free and not fixed to any one syllable as in Polish or Czech.

Little is to be gained by a thorough comparison of the similarities between Dukhobor and Russian stress behavior and patterns. Of greater importance are some of the differences noted between the two languages in certain isolated terms and in some paradigms. But first, a note about the distinctive power of stress which places it in the same general phonological category as the phonemes.

1. How does stress distinguish words?

Stress distinguishes expressions in the following ways:

- a. Meaning from non-meaning: /míla (cf.) milá; akno (cf.) ákna/ 'soap vs. non-meaning; window vs. non-meaning'.
- b. Meaning from meaning or two like forms of different words:
 /pára: pará; horat: harot; bábi: babí; múkí; píla: pílá/
 'a pair; it's time; town; garden; women; kidney beans; tortures; flour (F. g. sg.); she drank; saw'.
- c. Two forms of the same word: /atkútatʔ; atkutát/ 'to open (pf. and impf.)'.

As illustrated above, in both Dukhobor and Russian the function of stress is the same. However, the word for word or paradigm for paradigm use of stress occasionally varies between the two languages. There follow examples in which such differences were observed.

2. Stress differences between the Dialect and Russian.

a. In isolated words.

Nouns: /atrubá; slučáj; dššna; rajduhá; kalakon; řemín; pátká; izwoska; ššávil/ 'bran; occurrence; gum; rainbow; bell; belt; heel; quick lime; sorrel'.

Verbs: /vidát; vidál; píšu; xoču; ní-bilo; danál; načál/ 'to see; he saw; I write; I want; there was not; he annoyed (pf.); he began'.

Numerals: /ađinácat; čitirnácat/ 'eleven; fourteen'.

Adjectives: /đikoj; šilskoj; zađátaj; balnoj/ 'wild; pertaining to a village; busy; ill'.

Adverbs: /ťomna; ťopla; xaladno; ľorka; višilo/ 'darkly; warmly; coldly; lightly; cheerfully'.

Prepositions: /pašľá; pratí/ 'after; against'.

b. In paradigms.

Noun: /wor ~ warí; wožira ~ wožiri/ 'thief (n. sg. ~ pl); lake (n. sg. ~ pl.)'.

Verb: /šutít ~ šutú ~ šutíš ~ šutát; xoťet ~ xačú (xoču) ~ xočiš ~ xočim; mahú ~ maľoš (cf.) možu ~ možiš/

'to joke (inf. ~ lp. ~ 2p. sg.); to desire (lp. ~ 2p. sg. ~ lp. pl.); I can ~ you can cf. I may ~ you may'

/dańál ~ dańála ~ dańáli; padńál ~ padńála; bral ~ brála;
 píl ~ píla; hnal ~ hnála; snálsa ~ snálas' ~ snális/
 'annoyed (M. ~ F. ~ pl.); lifted (M. ~ F.); took (M. ~ F.); drank (M. ~ F.); chased (M. ~ F.); removed self (M. ~ F. ~ pl.)'.

The latter group of verb forms in the past tense most lucidly demonstrates the apparent tendency of Dukhobor paradigms when they differ in stress patterning from the Russian. If it were not for the overabundance of examples with vacillating stress in accordance with Russian patterns, one would be tempted to conclude that columnar stress was characteristic of the Dukhobor Dialect.

APPENDIX I

NOUN, ADJECTIVE, AND VERB DESINENCES

0.1. Phonologically defined allomorphs not covered by the following statement will be explained by additional phonological statements.

All phonological changes applicable to phonemes are also applicable to morphemes, although in their pronunciation oft repeated desinences tend to resist phonological pressures to change them. Therefore, wherever possible, only the morphemes found under stress will be provided and their unstressed variants may be determined from phonological data in the main text.

0.2. Morphologically defined allomorphs will be explained by appropriate statements after each listing of desinences.

0.3. For the sake of brevity only desinences will be given and examples will be kept to a bare minimum.

1.0. Substantives.

Dukhobor substantives are inflected for gender, number, and case.

1.1. Nouns excluding surnames.

1.11. Feminine declension.

1.111. Paradigms.

singular

-a ~ -#	'n.'
-u ~ -#	'a.'
-e ~ -i	'g.'

-e	'l., d.'
-oj ~ -ju ~ -u	'i.'
plural	
-i	'n.'
-i ~ -# ~ -ej	'a.'
-# ~ -ej ~ -iw	'g.'
-ax	'l.'
-am	'd.'
-am̐i ~ -m̐i	'i.'

1.112. General statements.

In the nominative singular case most feminine nouns (hereafter labelled class F1 nouns) end in /-a/, but some (hereafter called F2 nouns) end in /-#/ following a soft consonant. Examples are: /dočka, hará, žiml'á; noč, lošať, krow/ 'daughter, mountain, land; night, horse, blood'.

In the accusative singular, class F1 nouns end in /-u/ and F2 nouns in /-#/.

In the genitive singular, F1 nouns end in /-e/ or /-i/ and F2 nouns in /-e/.

In the instrumental singular, class F1 nouns end in /-oj/, while F2 nouns end in /-ju/ and in some cases simply in /-u/.

In the accusative plural, inanimate F1 and F2 nouns end in /-i/, animate F1 nouns in /-#/ , and animate F2 nouns in /-ej/.

In the genitive plural, F1 nouns end in /-#/ although F1 noun stems ending in a soft consonant may also take /-iw/, and F2 nouns end in /-ej/.

In the instrumental plural, F1 and F2 nouns end in /-ami/ although F2 nouns in which the first syllable of the desinence is unstressed may also end in /-mi/.

1.12. Masculine declension.

1.121. Paradigms.

singular	
-# ~ -a ~ -o	'n.'
-# ~ -a ~ -u	'a.'
-a ~ -u ~ -e ~ -i	'g.'
-u ~ -e	'l.'
-om ~ -oj	'i.'
plural	
-i ~ -a	'n.'
-i ~ -ej ~ -ow ~ -#	'a.'
-ow ~ -ej ~ -#	'g.'
-ax	'l.'
-am	'd.'
-ami	'i.'

1.122. General statements.

In the nominative singular case, most nouns (hereafter labelled class M1 nouns) end in /-#/ , some given names and common nouns (hereafter called class M2 nouns) referring to male humans end in /-a/ , and a very few nouns (hereafter labelled class M3 nouns) consisting of male given names and the word for 'child' end in /-o/ . Examples include: /burák, saráj, koň; děduška, peťka, sluhá; dítě, pitro/ 'beet, barn, horse; grandfather, Peter (dim.), servant; child; Peter'. The desinences of M2 nouns completely coincide with those of animate F1 nouns discussed above and therefore will not be noted below.

In the accusative singular, inanimate M1 nouns end in /-#/ , and animate M1 and M3 nouns in /-a/ .

In the genitive singular, M1 and M3 nouns end in /-a/ although M3 nouns representing substances capable of subdivision may also take /-u/ .

In the locative singular, inanimate M1 nouns end in /-u/ or /-e/ while animate M1 and M3 nouns take /-u/ .

In the instrumental singular, M1 and M3 nouns end in /-om/ .

In the nominative plural, with the exception of a few nouns ending in /-a/ which must be stressed, all nouns end in /-i/ .

In the genitive plural, animate M1 and M3 noun stems ending in a soft consonant take /-ej/ , and the remaining M1 nouns end in /-ow/ .

1.13. "Neuter" declension.

A vestigial neuter gender category continues a fragmentary existence in the Dialect but, as a rule, "neuter" nouns with unstressed and stressed endings (except in the nominative, accusative and genitive cases) are usually declined as inanimate F1 nouns, although the latter may also be declined as inanimate M1 nouns (except in the nominative and accusative). A few examples are: /akno, sílo; stáda, sabráñja/ 'window; village; herd, meeting'. No neologisms in the neuter gender were observed.

1.2. Surnames.

1.21. Feminine declension.

1.211. Paradigms.

singular

-a	'n.'
-u	'a.'
-aj	'g., l., d., i.'

plural

-i	'n.'
-ax ~ -ix	'a., g., l.'
-am ~ -im	'd.'
-am̐i ~ -im̐i	'i.'

1.212. Statement.

In the non-nominative plural cases the respective allomorphs are in free fluctuation. E.g., /padmaŕowax ~ padmaŕowix/.

1.22. Masculine declension.

1.221. Paradigms.

singular

-#	'n.'
-a ~ -awa	'a., g.'
-am ~ -im	'l., i.'
-amu ~ -u	'd.'

The plural paradigm of the masculine declension coincides with that of the feminine paradigm.

1.222. General statements.

In the accusative and genitive singular cases, surnames ending in /-ow-/ take /-a/, while those ending in /-in-/ take /-awa/ or /-a/. E.g., /wanjowa; márk̐inawa ~ márk̐ina/.

In the locative and instrumental singular cases, /-am/ and /-im/ occur in free fluctuation, although in the locative the former allomorph is used for surnames ending in /-ow-/.

In the dative singular, surnames ending in /-ow-/ and in /-in-/ take /-amu/ while the latter type may also take /-u/.

2.0. Adjectives.

Dukhobor adjectives are inflected for gender, number, and case and must agree in all three with the nouns they modify.

2.1. Feminine declension.

2.11. Paradigms.

singular	
-aja	'n.'
-uju ~ -aju	'a.'
-oj	'g., l., d., i.'
plural	
-ija ~ -aji	'n.'
-ija ~ -ix ~ -ax	'a.'
-ix ~ -ax	'g., l.'
-im ~ -am	'd.'
-imi ~ -ami	'i.'

2.12. Statements.

In the accusative singular case, adjectives with stressed desinences take /-uju/ while adjectives having unstressed desinences and stems ending in a hard consonant, take /-aju/ more frequently than /-uju/.

In the nominative plural, adjectives with stressed desinences take /-ija/ while those having unstressed desinences and stems ending in a hard consonant, take /-aji/.

In the accusative plural, adjectives with stressed desinences modifying an animate noun take /-ix/, or /-ix/ ~ /-ax/ if desinences are unstressed, while all other adjectives end in /-ija/ or /-aji/ in accordance with their nominative plural.

In the genitive, locative, dative, and instrumental plural cases, the alternate /-ax, -am, -ami/ allomorphs respectively occur in free fluctuation in adjectives having unstressed desinences and stems ending in a hard consonant.

2.2. Masculine declension.

2.21. Paradigms.

singular	
-oj	'n.'
-oj ~ -owa	'a.'
-owa	'g.'
-om ~ -im	'l.'
-omu	'd.'
-im ~ -am	'i.'

The plural paradigm of this declension coincides with the plural feminine paradigm.

2.22. Statements.

In the accusative singular case adjectives modifying animate nouns take /-owa/ and all others take /-oj/.

In the locative singular both allomorphs occur in free fluctuation even in stressed desinences.

In the instrumental singular, only adjectives having unstressed desinences and stems ending in a hard consonant end in either /-im/ or /-am/. Stressed desinences always end in /-im/.

2.3. "Neuter" declension.

"Neuter" adjectival endings are far less common than "neuter" nouns and practically non-existent. Even neuter nouns with stressed desinences are most frequently modified by adjectives in the feminine paradigms although the old non-feminine genitive singular does recur. This may be illustrated by the following examples: /bal'sája akno, bal'sowa akná; kazl'ínuju malako, kazl'inawa malaká; bal'soja čela/ 'big window (n., g. sg.); goat's milk (a., g. sg.); great thing'.

3.0. Verbs.

Dukhobor verbs are inflected for person, number, and tense.

3.1. Present tense conjugation.

3.11. Paradigms.

singular	
-u	'1p.'
-oš ~ -iš	'2p.'
-ot' ~ -it' ~ -a	'3p.'
plural	
-om ~ -im	'1p.'
-ota ~ ita	'2p.'
-ut ~ -at'	'3p.'

3.12. Statements.

Two classes of verbs exist in the Dialect and will be hereafter

referred to as class V1 and class V2. Class V1 takes the desinences /-u, -oš, -ot', -om, -ota, -ut'/ while class V2 takes /-u, -iš, -it' ~ -a, -im, -ita, -at' ~ -ut'/. The verbs /něst', dělāt', pakawát'; hlídāt'/ 'to carry, to do, to pack; to look' are infinitive forms illustrating both classes.

In the third person singular and plural, V2 verbs with stressed desinences end in /-it'/ and /-at'/ respectively, but V2 verbs with unstressed desinences end in /-a/ alternating infrequently with /-it'/ and in /-ut'/ respectively. Compare /žhoť/ and /hlídít'; vída ~ vídít'/ 'he burns (it); he looks; he sees'.

3.2. Past tense conjugation.

In past tense forms person distinction lapses and one for gender occurs in the singular.

3.21. Paradigms.

	singular	
-# ~ -l-#		'M. (all persons)'
-l-a		'F. (all persons)'
	plural	
-l'-i		'(all genders and persons)'

3.22. Statements.

The derivational morpheme /-l-/ is absent when it would occur after another consonant and not be followed by a vowel. E.g., /ňos, nislá/ 'he carried; she carried'.

In addition, /-l-/ is palatalized by the plural formant /-i/.

3.3. Future tense conjugation.

Depending on the aspect of the verb the future tense is formed in two ways.

3.31. Future tense paradigm < verb in the perfective aspect.

Verbs in the perfective aspect take present tense endings to form the future tense. Examine /sažhú, sažhoť/ 'I shall burn (it); he will burn (it)'.

3.32. Future tense paradigm < verb in the imperfective aspect.

Verbs in the imperfective aspect use the present tense conjugation of the verb 'to be' plus the infinitive of the verb in question to form the future tense. For example, note /búdu vídát', búďa vídát'/ 'I shall see; he will see'.

3.4. Imperative conjugation.

In two general imperative forms the tense is present or future by implication depending on whether the aspect is imperfective or perfective respectively. Only the second person is used in imperatives.

3.41. Paradigms.

singular	plural
-i ~ -#	-iťa ~ -#

3.42. Statements.

In the singular and plural forms of the imperative, stressed desinences end in /-i/ and /-iťa/ while unstressed desinences end in /-#/ and /-ťa/ respectively. Compare /hl'ídí, hl'ídíťa/ and /pakúj, pakújťa/ 'look! (sg., pl.); pack! (sg., pl)'.

A third imperative type includes the speaker of the command. Its form is simply the first person plural of either a perfective

or imperfective verb. An example is /pajdom/ 'let's go'.

Other miscellaneous imperative types also exist.

3.5. Reflexive verb.

Reflexive verbs possess all the common tense and imperative conjugations of regular verbs.

3.51. Present tense conjugation.

3.511. Paradigms.

singular	
-u-sa ~ -u-s	'1p.'
-os-sa ~ -os-si ~ is-sa ~ -is-si	'2p.'
-ot-sa ~ -it-sa	'3p.'
plural	
-om-sa ~ -om-si ~ -im-sa ~ -im-si	'1p.'
-oti-sa ~ -oti-s ~ -iti-sa ~ -iti-s	'2p.'
-ut-sa ~ -at-sa	'3p.'

3.512. Statements.

The reflexive desinences above consist of the present tense ending of V1 or V2 verbs plus the reflexive particle /-sa ~ -si ~ -s ~ -sa/. Some of the present tense and reflexive suffixes undergo phonological changes. Compare /umuwajitsa; umuwajimsa ~ umuwajimsi/ 'he washes himself; we wash ourselves'.

In the first person singular and second person plural, the reflexive particle allomorphs /-sa/ and /-s/ freely fluctuate in both verb classes.

In the second person singular the final consonant of the present tense endings of both verb classes is completely assimilated to the consonant in the reflexive particle. Allomorphs of the particle freely fluctuate between /-sa/ and /-si/. This latter fluctuation also occurs in the first person plural.

In the third person singular and plural, the conjunction of the two soft consonants of the present tense and reflexive suffix respectively results in the consonantal cluster /-ts-/ which is hard only as /c/.

3.52. Past tense conjugation.

Past reflexive desinences consist of the regular past tense forms plus the reflexive particle.

3.521. Statements.

To the masculine past tense suffixes /-l-#/ either form of the reflexive particle /-si ~ -sa/ may be attached although the first form is preferred.

To the feminine and plural past tense suffixes, either /-sa/ or /-s/ may be attached, as illustrated by /umuwáliša ~ umuwáliš/ 'they were washing themselves'.

3.53. Future and imperative paradigms.

Future and imperative desinences are formed in a manner closely corresponding to the formation of the present and past tense forms.

APPENDIX II

MEANINGS OF TERMS IN THE TABLES

OF CHAPTER IV

1.0. Table 6.

pap	...	dad! cf. /pápa; papáša/
tap	...	a strongly contracted form of /jenta-ba/
kap	...	an onomatopoetic term describing water dripping
map	...	a map
lap	...	paws (g. pl.)
rap	...	a slave
šap	...	a shop
xap	...	an onomatopoetic term describing a sudden pouncing upon
cap	...	an onomatopoetic term describing a sudden clutching with claws
čap	...	chop (feed)
jap	...	a contraction of /já-ba/ 'I would....'
pas	...	a railroad worker's pass
tas	...	tub
kas	...	treasuries (g. pl.)
nas	...	we (g.-a. pl.)
ras	...	once
sas	...	sauce
čas	...	hour
was	...	you (g.-a. pl.)
tam	...	there
mam	...	mother! cf. /máma; mámka; mamáša/
nam	...	we (d. pl.)

ram	...	window frames (g. pl.)
sam	...	self
wam	...	you (d. pl.)
jam	...	hole (g. pl.)
pop	...	priest
top	...	he was drowning
kop	...	an onomatopoetic term describing digging
lop	...	forehead
šop	...	an onomatopoetic term describing whispering
xop	...	an onomatopoetic term describing a sudden pouncing upon
cop	...	an onomatopoetic term describing a sudden clutching with claws
čop	...	plug for a pipe or barrel
wop	...	a signal for stopping
jop	...	he had sexual intercourse
pot	...	sweat
tot	...	the learned alternant form of /jentaj/
kot	...	tomcat
not	...	musical note
lot	...	a lot (of land)
rot	...	mouth
sot	...	one hundred (g. pl.)
xot	...	movement
wot	...	here!
jot	...	iodine
karí	...	I humble (tr.)
nahú	...	foot (a. sg.)
narí	...	animal burrow (a. sg.)
sáru	...	(a. sg. of a F. given name)
sarí	...	I scatter dust

šáru	...	sphere (d. sg.)
šahí	...	footstep (d. sg.)
carí	...	czar (d. sg.)

2.0. Table 7.

pap	...	dad!
pan	...	gentleman of leisure
pal	...	the anglicised version of the given name /pawlo/
par	...	steam
pas	...	a railroad worker's pass
paj	...	pie
wop	...	a signal for stopping
wot	...	here!
won	...	he; there!
wol	...	ox
wor	...	thief
wos	...	load
woš	...	lice (g. sg.)
wox	...	an exclamation
wow	...	an alternant form of /wop/
woj	...	a command to cry; an exclamation
dop	...	strong medicine
dom	...	a building for meetings
don	...	Don; bottom (g. pl.)
doš	...	rain
dox	...	it (M.) was dying
doč	...	daughter!
doj	...	milking
l'ip	...	it (M.) used to stick
kuk	...	a cook

l'il	...	he poured
kur	...	chickens (g. pl.)
l'iš	...	an expression implying the meaning 'only'
l'ic	...	faces (g. pl.)
kuč	...	piles (g. pl.)

3.0. Table 8.

3.1. Initial contrasts.

pas	...	a railroad worker's pass
pop	...	priest
bop	...	kidney bean
pil	...	blaze
p'il	...	he drank
bil	...	he was
ḃil	...	he beat
tas	...	tub
tom	...	volume
dom	...	home, building
tok	...	threshing floor
t'ok	...	it (M.) leaked
don	...	Don; bottom (g. pl.)
ḋon	...	days (g. pl.)
kas	...	treasuries (g. pl.)
kaš	...	cereals (g. pl.)
k'aš	...	cash

3.2. Final contrasts.

rap	...	slave
cep	...	flail
cep'	...	a large chain

rat	...	glad (from /ja rat/ 'I'm glad')
žit	...	rye (grain)
žit'	...	to live
rak	...	crab; cancer

4.0. Table 9.

mox	...	moss; he was able
mat	...	mother
mat'	...	to crush
nox	...	foot (g. pl.)
nos	...	nose
nos	...	he carried
dom	...	house, building
don	...	Don; bottom (g. pl.)
won	...	he; there!
won'	...	smell

5.0. Table 10.

lot	...	a lot (of land)
lot	...	ice
pil	...	a blaze
pil'	...	dust

6.0. Table 11.

rat	...	glad (from /ja rat/ 'I'm glad')
rat	...	a row
par	...	a pair (g. pl.)
par'	...	steam! (sg. imp.)

7.0. Table 12.

7.1. Initial contrasts.

sot	...	one hundred (g. pl.)
sut	...	a suit
sat	...	orchard
zat	...	back
sok	...	juice
šok	...	he thrashed
aziwáca	..	to answer
ažiwáca	..	to yawn
sal	...	fat (g. pl.)
ssal	...	he urinated
ššot	...	bill; account
šut	...	a chute
šar	...	sphere
žar	...	heat
píša	...	he writes
píšša	...	food
žarʹ	...	cook! (impf. sg. imp.)
žžarʹ	...	cook! (pf. sg. imp.)
xot	...	motion
xut	...	feet (g. pl.)
xor	...	choir
hor	...	mountains (g. pl.)

7.2. Final contrasts.

wos	...	wasps (g. pl.)
dus	...	ace
ʹes	...	he crawled; forest
ʹeš	...	crawl! (sg. imp.)
woš	...	lice (g. pl.)

duš	...	soul (g. pl.)
wox	...	an exclamation
dux	...	spirit

8.0. Table 13.

cop	...	an onomatopoetic term describing a sudden clutching with claws
čop	...	plug for a pipe or barrel
čox	...	a sneezing spell
řox	...	swithes (g. pl.)
špic	...	spokes (g. pl.)
špič	...	a speech

9.0. Table 14.

wot	...	here!
wos	...	a load
wos	...	he conveyed
jot	...	iodine
řew	...	lion
řej	...	pour! (sg. imp.)

LITERATURE CITED

- Avanesov, R. I. Fonetika Sovremennogo Russkogo Literaturnogo Jazyka. Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1956.
- Avanesov, R. I. Očerki Russkoj Dialektologii. Moscow, UČPEDGIZ, 1949.
- Avanesov, R. I. Russkoe Literaturnoe Proiznošenie. Moscow, UČPEDGIZ, 1958.
- De Bray, R. G. A. Guide to the Slavonic Languages. London, Dent and Sons, 1951.
- Gvozdev, A. N. Sovremennyj Russkij Literaturnyj Jazyk. Moscow, UČPEDGIZ, 1958, vol. I.
- Il'inskaja, I. S. "Nabljudenija Nad Govorom Russkix Pereselencev v Zakavkaz'e. "Materialy i Issledovanija po Russkoj Dialektologii, ed. S. P. Obnorskij and others, Moscow and Leningrad, Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R., 1949, vol. I.
- Jones, Daniel. The Phoneme, Its Nature and Use. Cambridge, Heffner and Sons, 1950.
- Maude, A. A Peculiar People, The Doukhobors. New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1904.
- Snesarov, V. The Dukhobors in British Columbia. Vancouver, University of British Columbia, 1931.
- Suxorev, V.A. Istorija Duxoborcev. North Kildonan, Manitoba, Canada, J. Regehr, 1944.
- Vinogradov, V., ed. and others. Grammatika Russkogo Jazyka. Moscow, 1952-54, vol. I.
- Wright, J. F. C. Slava Bohu, The Story of the Dukhobors. New York and Toronto, Farrar and Rhinehart, Inc., 1940.