

## ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN LOANWORDS IN THE LITERARY LANGUAGE OF SUBCARPATHIAN RUSYNS

**István Udvari**

It is a proven fact that Hungarian-Slavic language interaction stretches till remote ages of 1,100 years to the period of the Hungarian conquest of homeland (see Zoltán 1996). Many researchers consider that still before this time, when Ugrians abode far outside of the Carpathian region, they had some language contacts with Slavs. Others, who evolve the theory of double-conquest of homeland, say that the Slavs of the Carpathian basin linguistically interacted with late Avars they consider as Ugrians (see Makkay 2004). As a result of such a multilateral Ugro-Slavic interaction a lot of Slavic elements have struck root in Hungarian dialects, as well as a plenty of Hungarian elements have in Slavic dialects. Regarding the literary languages, the situation is more intricate: Hungarian has a huge number of Slavic loanwords, while the occurrence of Hungarian loanwords in present-day Slavic literary languages is relatively not too frequent. This question asks for monographic research. It is obvious, however, that Slavic literary languages are based on dialects which were not in lively interaction with the Hungarian language or its dialects. Consider, for instance, the Ukrainian literary language based on the Kiev-Poltava dialect, or the Slovenian literary language based on the patois of Ljubljana area. In the course of forming of present-day Slavic literary languages their early versions available (such as Church Slavonic in the case of Serbian and Ukrainian, and biblical Czech, the ancestor of Slovak) made it possible to avoid using Hungarian elements, and – at certain phases – codificators of Slavic literary languages deliberately worked for that.

Even being constrained to my narrow subject, I certainly have to mention that over centuries, before present-day Slavic literary languages were born, a number of regional literary languages had existed and functioned based on certain Slavic dialects closely interacting with Hungarian. These Slavic dialects used the Hungarian orthography and also contained a considerable number of Hungarian loanwords. (On the Eastern Slovak literary language see Király 1953, Udvari 1990; on the Kajkavian



Croatian literary language see Hadrovics 1964, Lukács 2000, Király 2003, Udvari 2003, 2003/a; on the Gradišće Croatian literary language see Hadrovics 1974, Nyomárkay 1996.)

Already by our time the Rusyns of Bačka-Srem area (in Serbia and Croatia) took the road of making a distinct literary language, and the author of these lines has already drawn the Hungarian scholars' attention to Hungarian loanwords in this language (see Udvari 1982, Udvari 1985, Udvari 1997, MNy: 1982: 93–96; MNy 1988: 227–232; MNy 1995: 345–348; *Ethnographia* 1997: 343–357). During the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the Slovak Rusyns as well standardized their own literary language based on Zemplín dialect (see Magocsi 1996). From the standpoint of scholars investigating the history of the Hungarian-Slavic cultural and linguistic ties it is worth mentioning that in this case a spoken dialect of Eastern Slovakia's Rusyns, who maintained tough cultural, linguistic and economic contacts with Hungarians for centuries, has upgraded to a literary language, and the production by this language is remarkably convenient for studying the Hungarian-Slavic linguistic and ethnic interrelations. As for the origins of Hungarian lexical loanwords in the Rusyn literary language in Slovakia, it reveals, in part, Slovak mediation. An accurate estimate of the intermediary role of Slovak dialects asks, nevertheless, for a complete list of Hungarian elements in the Slovak language. This is why we look forward to the in-depth synthesis of this question, about two thousand pages in size, by Ferenc Gregor (see Gregor 1993). One can point to the fact that initiators of the Rusyn literary language in Slovakia, its improvers, normalizers, lexicographers did not subject the Hungarian loanwords to analysis (see Udvari 1996, 1996/a).

The last decade bears the marks of progress the Subcarpathian Rusyns have made in attempt to create their own literary language. Nevertheless, at present time a monographic study on Hungarian elements in literary production, dictionaries, grammars, and other books published in the Subcarpathian area in Rusyn vernacular is sadly lacking.

It is a truly difficult philological problem to investigate Hungarian loanwords functioning in literary languages. Opponents of making Rusyn literary language out of regional diffusion are strongly arguing against the frequent using of Hungarian elements by those who write in Rusyn literary language. From the standpoint of linguistics, this sort of reasoning is quite unacceptable. Every Hungarian lexical loanword known to me from editions

in Rusyn, without a single exception, proves to be a basic vocabulary item of Rusyn dialects shaped in the course of history (on the Hungarian elements in Rusyn dialects see Rieger 2004: 61–62). What is more, one can assert that further destiny of the Hungarian loanwords depends on the destiny of the Rusyn dialects themselves. If the Rusyn dialects upgrade to literary level, it is quite natural that the Hungarian loanwords will survive. But if normalizers begin to eliminate Hungarian loanwords from the Rusyn literary language, its dialectic basis, of course, will come loose. Thus, one can say that the destiny of Rusyn dialects and the destiny of their Hungarian loanwords are obviously interrelated. As one can see in the case of the Rusyn literary language in Bačka-Srem area and also in Slovakia, the widespread Hungarian loanwords have continued their functioning as elements of literary language since Rusyn dialects developed to literary level (see MNY 1993: 77–81, Udvari 1997/a, Udvari 1997/b, Udvari 2000). On the grounds of the publications by the Subcarpathian Rusyns known to me at present day – dictionaries, belles-lettres, publicism – I can assert that the normalizers of literary Rusyn (writers, poets, grammaticists, lexicographers) do not conceal the linguistic evidence of our common historical past.

Manuscript dictionaries and vocabularies of Subcarpathian Rusyn vernacular are known from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The present article had already been written when a comprehensive work on the Rusyn language from Opole (Poland) fell into my hands bringing nearly a complete data base on Rusyn dictionaries (see Magocsi 2004: 430–449). A Rusyn-Hungarian dictionary relied on the oldest and widespread *u*-dialects of foothills was compiled by László Csopey and appeared in print in 1883 (Csopey 1883). Antal Hodinka assumed the very same dialects as a basis for his famous Hlaholnytsia (a full set of Rusyn verbs) compiled in 1922 (see Hodinka 1991). The lexicographical approach of Csopey and Hodinka was followed by Stefan Popovich (Popovich 1999). Some lexicographers, as Jurij Chori, Mykhajlo Almashij, Dymytrij Pop, head for phonetics and vocabulary of *ü*-dialects, although they don't want to disable an opportunity for those who articulate *o* in new closed syllable as *u*. (On the Rusyn dialects see Kercha: 2004 144–146).

I would like to use one dictionary published in Uzhgorod in 2001 (see Almashij–Pop 2001) as an example to illustrate the aforesaid assertions. The dictionary in question was reviewed by Igor Kercha (Kercha 2002) in

comparison with other ones. In his critical essay he calls to notice: "The present short comparison suggests a definite idea to us: it is impossible to get Rusyn culture off the ground and develop it to the higher level, if we tear it away from the roots, from the achievements reached by our ancestors and from the cultures of the neighbouring peoples we interacted with in the course of many centuries." It seems to me that these words are of importance as regards to the development of the Rusyn language as well.

The trilingual dictionary, published by the Dukhnovich Society and the Cyril and Methodius Society, counts about 7,000 entries. As it says in the authors' preface, all of the words brought out are widespread both in the spoken and in the literary Rusyn language of the Subcarpathian area. The dictionary is meant for researchers, translators, university students, as well as Rusyn and Ukrainian intellectuals. The declared reason of its compilation was to distinguish the literary Rusyn language from Ukrainian and to prove its linguistic independence. The authors consider literary Rusyn to be undoubtedly able to convey a present-day person's feelings and ideas in every detail. They define Rusyn dialects as a main source of enrichment of the Rusyn literary language and reject taking over from other Slavic languages. The dictionary is based on the dialects of the river basins of Borzhava, Uh and Latorica as well as the former county of Maramorosh (Máramaros in Hungarian). It also gathers prose or poetry by Rusyn writers, moreover Dzendzelivskyj's linguistic atlas and the data of the major Rusyn dictionaries are used. The dictionary in question was made up as a differential one, and it is only words which are lacking in Ukrainian and Russian and are still widespread in Subcarpathian Rusyn that were brought out.

The present article, devoted to Professor Ferenc Pusztai, does not allow me to have the space to present the whole of Hungarian lexical borrowings of the trilingual dictionary. Still I think the introduction of the Rusyn words beginning with the letters *a*, *б*, *т*, *ф* will be sufficient to illustrate my assertion that of all literary languages of neighbouring peoples it is only Rusyn that is based on the dialects strongly tied with the Hungarian language and its dialects, and this fact is reflected in lexicography. The dictionary in question is also the evidence of Hungarian impact upon phonetics and word-formation. Phonemes *т* and *ф* that are originally infrequent in native Rusyn, reveal themselves in the growth of frequency due to their occurrence in the Hungarian borrowings. One can conceive, along with other things, that it is due to linguistic contacts that the

-*ui*, -*oui* formants of Hungarian loanwords indicating mainly a profession or a person of a certain occupation gradually gained an abstract meaning under the influence of Hungarian, and became an element of the Rusyn word-formation system (see Káprály 2002). And now it is time to go on to our illustrations!

In the following list, as a rule, I give a catchword at the beginning of an entry for the words of Hungarian origin. If the Hungarian borrowing under review appears in the entry as a synonym and so is not located alphabetically, I put the catchword into brackets. E.g., (башта) торонь < Hung. *torony* 'tower'. If the derivative originates from the Rusyn basis, I do not consider it to be a Hungarian borrowing. Only if I can not find the basic word, I enter the derivative in my list. The following Hungarian loanwords have been brought into dictionaries, literary pieces from vernacular dialects. And the vocabulary of the Rusyn dialects can be compared to corresponding forms of Hungarian dialects (see Lizanec 1976).

авадь < Hung. *avagy* 'or'; син. вадь < Hung. *vagy* 'or'; адьув < Hung. *ágyú* 'cannon'; акац < Hung. *akác(fa)* 'acacia'; алдомаш < Hung. *áldomás* 'alms'; андьол < Hung. *angyal* 'angel'; анталак < Hung. *antalag* 'small barrel'; аршув < Hung. *ásó* 'spade'; багнийт < Hung. *bajnét* 'bayonet'; баров < Hung. *bagó* 'chewing tobacco, tobacco dregs in pipe'; бадор ~ бадора < Hung. *bádor* 'tin'; бадораш < Hung. *bádogos* 'tinman'; бай < Hung. *báj* 'witchery, sorcery'; балта < Hung. *balta* 'axe'; банда < Hung. (*cigány*)*banda* '(Gipsy music) band'; бановати < Hung. *bán* 'be sorry'; баня < Hung. *bánya* 'quarry, open-cast mine'; баняс < Hung. *bányász* 'stonemason, miner'; барнастый < Hung. *barna* 'swarthy'; баршун < Hung. *bársony* 'velvet'; батром < Hung. *bátran* 'without taking risks'; бачі < Hung. *bácsi* 'uncle'; (башта) торонь < Hung. *torony* 'tower'; бендюх < Hung. *bendő* 'paunch'; бестетовати < Hung. *biztat* 'persuade, induce'; бетанга < Hung. *bitang(ember)* 'scraper, trouble-maker'; бетежный < Hung. *beteg* 'ill'; бетлегемы < Hung. *betlehem* 'mummers'; бетюг < Hung. *betegség* 'illness'; бетярь < Hung. *betyár* 'dare-devil'; бивный < Hung. *bő* 'loose-fitting'; бизовати < Hung. (*meg*)*bíz* 'trust'; бизувный < Hung. *bizony(os)* '(self-)assured'; бирув < Hung. *bíró* 'village headman'; бировати < Hung. *bír* 'be able'; бичаловати < Hung. *becsül* 'estimate, to assess the damage'; (біглязь) вошолув < Hung. *vasaló* 'smoothing-iron'; (біглязь) тиглязь < Hung. *téglázó* 'smoothing-iron';

біжалма < Hung. *birsalma* 'quince'; бізонь < Hung. *bizony* 'of course'; біка < Hung. *bika* 'bull'; (більовча) жебаловка < Hung. *zsebbevaló* 'handkerchief'; більчув < Hung. *bölcső* 'cradle'; бімбов < Hung. *bimbó* 'booby, young lout'; бімбовка < Hung. *bimbó* 'bud'; бловдер < Hung. *blóder* 'oven'; бовташ < Hung. *boltos* 'salesman'; бовт < Hung. *bolt* 'shop'; борар < Hung. *bogár* '(flying) beetle'; борач < Hung. *pogácsa* 'flat cake'; боровц < Hung. *bohóc* 'buffoon, naughty boy'; борпийда < Hung. *bokréta* 'bunch of flowers (mainly as bridegroom's decoration)'; бойта < Hung. *bojt* 'tassel, fringe'; боканча < Hung. *bakancs* 'boot'; бокор < Hung. *bokor* 'raft'; син. дараб < Hung. *darab* 'raft'; бокс < Hung. *boksz* 'shoe polish'; болондгаз < Hung. *bolondház* 'mental hospital'; бомбушка < Hung. *gombostű* 'safety pin'; бороцква < Hung. *barack* 'apricot'; син. тенгерка < Hung. *tengeri barack* 'small apricot'; босорканя < Hung. *boszorkány* 'witch'; бочкора < Hung. *bocskor* 'bast shoe'; бочкур < Hung. *bocskor* 'bast shoe'; (бричка) кочіга, кочія < Hung. *kocsi* 'carriage'; (брифташка) буділарош < Hung. *bugyelláris* 'purse'; (брифташка) тапловка < Hung. *tapló(gomba)* 'purse'; (брындак) чалеборар < Hung. *cserebogár* 'cockchafer'; (брытванка) тепша < Hung. *tepsi* 'baking tray'; будюговы < Hung. *bugyogó* 'knickers'; буйдош < Hung. *bujdosó* 'vagabond'; (буля) крумпля < Hung. *krumpli* 'potato'; бунков < Hung. *bunkó* 'sledge-hammer'; букфенс < Hung. *bukfenc* 'somersault'; бурбіль < Hung. *borbély* 'barber'; буркут < Hung. *borkút* 'mineral spring'; бутор < Hung. *bútor* 'furniture'; газда < Hung. *gazda* 'master, owner'; галиба < Hung. *galiba* 'misfortune'; ганч < Hung. *gáncs* 'defect'; галлірь < Hung. *gallér* 'collar'; гарадіча < Hung. *garádics* 'footstep'; гарічка < Hung. *karika* 'circle, ring'; (гате) фіріс < Hung. *fűrész* 'power-saw bench'; гати < Hung. *gatyá* 'pants'; син. Надраги < Hung. *nadrág* 'trousers'; син. пачмаги < Hung. *pacsmag* 'trousers'; (гвер) пушка < Hung. *puska* 'rifle'; геренда < Hung. *gerenda* 'beam'; гершли < Hung. *gersli* 'pearl-barley'; гестиня < Hung. *gesztenye* 'chestnut'; гимбиць < Hung. *gömböc* 'paunch'; говрош < Hung. *kórus* 'gallery (in church)'; гомбатися < Hung. *gombos* 'play buttons'; син. нірьоватися < Hung. *nyer* 'win, benefit'; гомбін < Hung. *kombiné* 'combinations'; гомбіця < Hung. *gomb* 'button'; горджоля < Hung. *korcsolya* 'skate'; син. корчоля < Hung. *korcsolya* 'skate'; гріз < Hung. *gríz* 'semolina'; гуля < Hung. *gulya* 'herd of cattle'; гынглявий < Hung. *gyenge* 'weak, flabby'; файта < Hung. *fajta* 'kind, sort'; фалаток < Hung. *falat* 'part, piece'; фалка < Hung. *falka* 'flock (of birds)'; (фандел)

лабошка < Hung. *lábos* 'frying pan', лангошка < Hung. *lángos(sütő)* 'frying pan'; палачінтовка < Hung. *palacsintasütő* 'frying pan'; палачінтош < Hung. *palacsintasütő* 'frying pan'; фарадний < Hung. *fáradt* 'all-in, tired'; фарадшар < Hung. *fáradtság* 'tiredness'; фатт'ув < Hung. *fattyú* 'guy, bloke'; син. легінь < Hung. *legény* 'lad'; феделка < Hung. *fedél* 'cooking pot lid'; федивка < Hung. *fedő* 'cooking pot lid'; фесша метати < Hung. *fejest ugrik* 'dive headfirst'; фелелльовати < Hung. *felel* 'be responsible, guarantee'; фершлор < Hung. *ferslóg* 'big chest'; фийдер < Hung. *féder* 'spring'; фийк < Hung. *fék* 'brake'; фийса < Hung. *fejsze* 'axe'; фійовка < Hung. *fiók* 'drawer'; фінанц < Hung. *finánc* 'revenue inspector'; фінджа < Hung. *findzsa* 'cup'; фіп'іс < Hung. *fűrész* 'power-saw bench'; фіп'іспор < Hung. *fűrészpor* 'sawdust'; фораш < Hung. *fogas* 'rack, hall-tree'; фодра < Hung. *fodor* 'frill, flounce'; фоп'річа < Hung. *forgató* 'door-handle'; фоп'ріта < Hung. *forgató* 'door-handle'; фоп'ріт'ув < Hung. *forgató* 'door-handle'; фоталка < Hung. *fatál* 'wooden dish'; (фурма) мінта < Hung. *minta* 'pattern, sample'.

"The Soviet Ukraine rejoicing its great socialist achievements and steadily going to the bright alps of communism" was eager that everyone mastered the Ukrainian literary language, improved their standard of speech and got rid of vernacular words. It was in particular pertinent to the Transcarpathian Oblast with its diversity of dialects "torn away from the rest of the Ukrainian lands over the ages". In terms of the Ukrainian literary language and its application in practice, it was required to eliminate the peculiarities of Subcarpathian Rusyn vernacular. With that purpose, the Ukrainian philologist from Uzhgorod Josyp Dzendzelivskyj published a small manual for the teachers of the Transcarpathian Oblast aimed at overcoming the use of the local semantic vernacularisms (Dzendzelivskyj 1958). Its title in word-for-word translation is "*Practical Vocabulary of the Transcarpathian Semantic Dialectisms. Study Aids for the Teachers of the Transcarpathia*". According to the vocabulary, it is not advisable to use a number of Rusyn words, among which Hungarian loanwords are also to be found. For example, instead of *акац* it is correct to say *акація*; in place of *бай – байка*; one ought to avoid using the word *банда* in the sense of 'band, a group of musicians who play popular music'; one may use the word *баня* in the sense of 'cupola', but keep off the meaning 'quarry, mine'; one should not use the word *баяння* in the sense of 'sorcery, witchcraft'; one

must avoid using the word *бoвm* for a 'shop', the word *зpyшкa* for an 'electric light bulb' (see Dzendzelivskyj 1958). In the opinion of those who stand upon linguistic independence of the Subcarpathian Rusyn language, the above-mentioned Hungarian loanwords and words of other origin similar to them, qualified by some of the Ukrainian philologists as dialectisms, are the organic part of Rusyn vocabulary, and so can be used without any discrimination. The further evidence of such an opinion is that these words turn up in the dictionary analyzed which has been a source of my illustrative list of borrowings. It likewise corroborates once more the well-known thesis that language processes can hardly be controlled by forcible means.

#### REFERENCE INDEX

- Almashij–Pop 2001** – Михайло Алмашій – Димитрій Поп – О. Димитрій (Сидор): Русинсько-українсько-руський словарь. Ужгород.
- Chori** – Юрій Чорі: Словарь русинского языка. Ужгород. Том 1 А–Д, 2001–2002. Том 2 Е–Й, 2003–2004. Том 3 К–Н, 2004–2005.
- Csopey 1883** – Csopey László: Rutén-magyar szótár, Budapest // Ласлов Чопей: Русько-мадярський словарь. Будапешт.
- Dzendzelivskyj 1958** – Й. О. Дзензелівський: Практичний словник семантичних діалектизмів Закарпаття. На допомогу вчителям Закарпатської області. Ужгород.
- Gregor 1993** – Gregor Ferenc: A szlovák nyelv magyar elemeiből. Mutatványfüzet. Budapest.
- Hadrovics 1964** – Hadrovics László: Kajkavische Literatur. Wiesbaden.
- Hadrovics 1974** – Hadrovics László: Schriftum und Sprache der burgenländischen Kroaten im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Budapest.
- Hodinka 1991** – Антоній Годинка: Глаголниця. Сбірка всіх глаголів пудкарпатсько-русинського языка. // Hodinka Antal: Ruszin-magyar ígetár. Nyíregyháza.
- Káprály 2002** – Михаил Капраль: Венгерский суффикс *-as (-ás)* в карпаторусинских текстах. *Studia Slavica Hung.* 47/1–2. 73–85.
- Kercha 2002** – Игорь Керча: "Он упал собі из неба". Русин XII. Пряшів. № 1. 10–11.
- Kercha 2004** – Игорь Керча: Пудкарпатська Русь. Літературний язык. In: Magocsi 2004: 115–146.
- Király 1953** – Király Péter: A keletiszlovák nyelvjárás nyomtatott emlékei. Budapest.
- Király 2003** – Király Péter: A kelet-európai helyesírások és irodalmi nyelvek alakulása. A budai Egyetemi Nyomda kiadványainak tanulságai 1777–1848. *Dimensiones Culturales et Urbanales Regni Hungariae* 3. Nyíregyháza.
- Lizanec 1976** – П.Н. Лизанец: Венгерские заимствования в украинских говорах Закарпаття. Будапешт.
- Lukács 2000** – Lukács István: Dramatizált kaj-horvát Mária siralom Erdélyből, 1626. Budapest.



- Magocsi 1996** – Magocsi Paul Robert: *A New Slavic Language Is Born. The Rusyn Literary Language of Slovakia*. New York.
- Magocsi 2004** – Magocsi Paul Robert: *Русинський язык*. Opole.
- Makkay 2004** – Makkay János: *Korai szláv kölcsönszavaink keltezési kérdései és a honfoglalás*. Budapest.
- Nyomárkay 1996** – Nyomárkay István: *Sprachhistorisches Wörterbuch des Burgenland-kroatischen*. Budapest – Eisenstadt.
- Popovich 1999** – Стефан Попович: *Порунальний русинсько-мадярсько-русько-український словарчик*. // *Ruszin–magyar–orosz–ukrán összehasonlító zsebszótár*. Будапешт.
- Rieger 2004** – Януш Піреп: *Становиско і зріжницювання русинських діалектів в Карпатах*. In: Magocsi 2004: 39–66.
- Udvari 1982** – Udvari István: *Adalékok a bács-szerémi ruszin nyelv magyar jövevényszavai alaktani meghonosodásának kérdéséhez*. *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Nyíregyháziensis* 9/E. Nyíregyháza. 33–49.
- Udvari 1985** – Udvari István: *A bács-szerémi ruszin nyelv magyar jövevényszavainak fonetikai meghonosodása*. *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Nyíregyháziensis* 10/E. Nyíregyháza. 61–83.
- Udvari 1990** – Udvari István: *A keletiszlovák irodalmi nyelv ismeretlen kéziratok emléke 1778-ból*. (Magyar helyesírású keletiszlovák nyelvjárási emlék Mária Terézia korából.) *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Nyíregyháziensis* 12/c. Nyelvészeti Közlemények. Nyíregyháza. 352–382.
- Udvari 1996** – Udvari István: *Szlovákiai ruszin kiadványok lexikai hungarizmusai*. In: Lévai Béla (ed.): *A magyar honfoglalás és a szlávok*. Debreceni Szlavisztikai Füzetek 3. Debrecen. 21–40.
- Udvari 1996/a** – Udvari István: *A ruszin–magyar együttélés tükröződése Vaszil Petrovaj: Ruszinok c. regényében*. In: Katona Judit – Viga Gyula (ed.): *Az interetnikus kapcsolatok kutatásának újabb eredményei*. (Az 1995-ben megrendezett konferencia anyaga.) Miskolc. 311–318.
- Udvari 1997** – Udvari István: *A bács-szerémi ruszin nyelv lexikai hungarizmusai kutatásának története*. *Studia Ukrainica et Rusinica Nyíregyháziensis* 5. Nyíregyháza. 100–110.
- Udvari 1997/a** – Udvari István: *Egy ruszin verseskötet magyar lexikai elemei*. In: Mihalovics Árpád – Máté Éva (ed.): *Könyv Dezső Lászlónak*. Nyíregyháza. 255–267.
- Udvari 1997/b** – Udvari István: *A ruszin (kárpátukrán)–magyar együttélés nyelvi tükröződése Dmitro Keselya: Hoszundragosi c. művében*. In: Kiss Gábor – Zaicz Gábor (ed.): *Szavak – nevek – szótárak*. Írások Kiss Lajos 75. születésnapjára. Budapest. 423–436.
- Udvari 2003** – Udvari István: *A Mária Terézia-féle úrbérrendezés forrásai magyarországi délszláv népek nyelvén I*. *Nyomtatványok. Dimensiones Culturales et Urbanales Regni Hungariae* 2. Nyíregyháza.
- Udvari 2003/a** – Udvari István: *A Mária Terézia-féle úrbérrendezés forrásai magyarországi délszláv népek nyelvén II. Bács vármegyei szerb és bunyevác jobbágyságok úrbéri bevallásai*. *Dimensiones Culturales et Urbanales Regni Hungariae* 4. Nyíregyháza.
- Zoltán 1996** – Zoltán András: *A magyar–szláv érintkezések kezdetei és fázisai*. *Életünk*. Budapest. 1996. № 6–7. 634–648.