The first dictionary of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians was published by Mikola M. Kočić, the first president of the Society for the Ruthenian Language and Literature (founded in 1970 in Novi Sad), seven decades after the publication of the first book in the Ruthenian language (Dr. Havrijil Kosteljnik, The Idilyc Wreath From my village, 1904; Идилски венєц З мойого валалу) and five decades after the publication of the first grammar (Dr. Havrijil Kosteljnik, Grammar of the Bačka-Srem Speech, 1923; Граматика бачваньско-сريمской бешеди) (Костельник 1975). The dictionary is entitled Handy Terminology Dictionary SerboCroatian-Ruthenian-Ukrainian (Приручни терминолоґийни словнїк сербскогрватско-русько-українски), published by the Newspaper Publishing Institution Ruske slovo from Novi Sad 40 years ago – in 1972.

The dictionary includes the most commonly used words of modern Ruthenian [Кочиш 1972: 5]. The entries of the vocabulary were based upon the lexical analysis of the material obtained from the weekly newspaper Ruske slovo (Руске слово; Ruthenian Word), the quarterly journal Švetlosc (Івєтлосц; Light) and textbooks for Ruthenian language teaching schools. Terms from science, art, culture, and mostly from the socio-political life of the Ruthenians were also included in the dictionary in the final phase. The author, who was fully aware that his first-born Ruthenian dictionary had shortcomings, wrote: „one can expect that in the near future it will be necessary to make corrections of several terms and/or their forms” [Кочиш 1972:7]. The greatest weakness of the vocabulary is not that the author's file included only about 14,000 Serbo-Croatian words, including the „dialectical and historical materialism” and „atheist” terms which belong to the past,
but it is the part of the Ruthenian vocabulary that was influenced by „lexical and morphological standard of the Ukrainian part of the dictionary since the author took for granted that the Ruthenian language was a dialect of Ukrainian. He attempted „to bring Ruthenian near to the Ukrainian literary language”. Mikola M. Kočiš neglected, on the one hand, activation of the genuine features of the Ruthenian language that has been activated in the Ruthenian lexicography by Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač [Рамач 2002: 572-577], and, on the other hand, original models of the Ruthenian / Rusyn variants of the Carpathian area that has been activated by Prof. Dr. Mihajlo Fejsa [see for ex. Фейса 2007б; Фейса 2009б].

Kočiš’s a priori lexicographic approach in the second half of the 20th century is quite understandable. It originates from the Soviet practice in the Carpathian area, which in 1953 led to the administrative closure of hundreds of Ruthenian schools. Such a policy prohibited the existence of the Ruthenians and their language and it was impossible for Kočiš to contact any Ruthenians in the Carpathians except those in Yugoslavia. He simply accepted the Ukrainian point of view and did not bother with the fact that in the Carpathian homeland more than 1,300 Ruthenian schools were transformed into Ukrainian schools administratively. The Greek Catholic church was outlawed. The Ruthenians / Rusyns in the Carpathian homeland were not even allowed to call themselves Ruthenians / Rusyns. With regard specifically to Slovakia, one scholar wrote: „As a result of such short-sighted linguistic practices and the abrupt and administrative manner in which Ukrainian was introduced – all carried out during the height of Stalinist repression – the Rusyn populace reacted by sending their children to Slovak schools in neighboring towns or by demanding Slovak instead of Ukrainian schools in their villages. This process of voluntary Slovakization spread rapidly during the 1960s. If in 1948, when the Communists came to power, there were 322 Rusyn schools with over 23,000 pupils, when Communist rule disappeared in late 1989 there were only 15 schools left with just 900 pupils, in which a few subjects were taught in Ukrainian. Thus, the Rusyn language question in Slovakia was ‘resolved’ as in the Soviet Transcarpathia by the adoption of Ukrainian. The cost, however, was national assimilation and decline by more than two-thirds the number of Rusyns willing to identify as Slovaks” [Magocsi 1996: 33]. Nothing like this happened to Yugoslavia’s Ruthenians (today mostly in Serbia and Croatia). While Stalin’s policy made the Carpatho-Rusyns disappear for four decades in the Carpathian homeland (today mostly in Slovakia, Ukraine and Poland), Tito’s policy enabled the Vojvodina-Srem Ruthenians both to exist and even to flourish.

Two decades after 1989 and the fall of Communist rule it is clear that the Carpatho-Rusyns were never completely wiped out from their homeland. Today, the governments of Slovakia, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Serbia,
and Croatia recognize Carpatho-Rusyns as a national minority. In Hungary, there are today 52 communities in which Rusyns have their own minority self-government. In Romania, the Rusyns have their own deputy representing specifically Rusyn cultural and civic interests in the National Parliament in Bucharest [Magocsi 2006: 109]. Only the Government of Ukraine persists in not recognizing them as a national minority. According to official data from the latest census there are 10,000 Ruthenians / Rusyns, but the Ukrainian authorities, in accordance with the Stalinist theory and practice, officially, still consider them to be a „subethnicum” of Ukrainian nation and the Ruthenian / Rusyn language as a „dialect” of the Ukrainian language. An effort is being made to change the Ukrainian policy towards Ruthenians / Rusyns for the following census in 2013.

Today, the Ruthenians of the Republic of Serbia, particularly in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, are recognized officially as a distinct national minority with their own literary language. The Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, and the Slovak Republic have also acknowledged Rusyns as a distinct national / ethnic minority. All this means that the Rusyns / Ruthenians of Serbia’s Vojvodina are not alone as they were in the Kočiš’s time. After 1989, the Carpatho-Rusyns have obviously risen like Phoenix out of ashes and consequently the Rusyn question has not been resolved in the Stalinist manner. All the mentioned countries have recorded Rusyns in their most recent census reports: in Slovakia – 55,000; in Serbia – 16,000; in United States – 12,500; Croatia – 2,300; Poland – 5,900; Hungary – 1,100; Czech Republic – 1,100; Romania – 200. According to official data there are 10,000 Rusyns in Ukraine but they are officially considered Ukrainians.

Ten World Congresses of Rusyns / Rusnaks / Lemkoes have played an important role in bringing Carpatho-Rusyns together, despite their separation by the borders of several countries. The first Rusyn World Congress was held in Slovakia in 1991, the second in Poland (1993), the third in Yugoslavia (1995), the fourth in Hungary (1997), the fifth in Ukraine (1999), the sixth in the Czech Republic (2001), the seventh in Slovakia (2003), the eighth in Poland (2005), the ninth in Romania (2007), the tenth in Serbia and Croatia (2009 and the eleventh in Hungary (2011). Apart from the World Congress of Rusyns / Rusnaks / Lemkos there is the Congress of the Rusyn Language. Established at the initiative of Prof. Dr. Paul Robert Magocsi, the first language congress took place in 1992 in Bardejovské Kúpelie (Slovakia), the second in 1999 in Prešov (Slovakia), the third in 2007 in Cracow (Poland), and the fourth one will take place in Serbia in 2012. The representative of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians and the member of the Inter-regional Committee for Codification of the Rusyn Language is the author of this paper. Thanks to the Rusyn Language Congress, cooperation between educational
institutions of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians and corresponding educational institutions in Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Croatia and Canada have been firmly established by the first decade of the twenty-first century. The changes in Central and Eastern Europe have obviously brought the rebirth of a cultural identity among Carpathian Ruthenians / Rusyns. Mutual awareness and closer contacts between the Vojvodinian Ruthenians and their brethren in the Carpathian homeland – a process initiated in 1989 – will in the future continue to assist all Carpatho-Rusyns in their ongoing struggle to survive as a distinct national community.

One of the constitution’s noteworthy provisions is the right granted to members of national minorities freely to establish and maintain relations with legal subjects who may be resident in foreign states, but with whom they share some collective, cultural, linguistic or religious similarities. The Vojvodinian Ruthenians have many opportunities for joint projects with other Ruthenians / Rusyns which have taken various forms. For example, several significant publications were released: an anthology of poetry from all Ruthenian communities Rusyn Poems (Русинський / руски писнї, 1997), edited by Natalija Dudaš; a bilingual English-Rusyn phrasebook Let’s Speak English and Rusyn / Bešedujme po ruski i po anglijski, by Paul Robert Magocsi and Mihajlo Fejsa (1998); even the first Ruthenian encyclopedia in English Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture, edited by Paul Robert Magocsi and Ivan Pop (2002).

All this had an effect on codifying processes of the Ruthenian / Rusyn language in Slovakia, Poland, Ukraine and Hungary as well. Efforts of the Interregional Committee for Codification of the Rusyn Language were crowned by publishing the scholarly monograph Rusyn Language (Русиньский язык), edited by Paul Robert Magocsi (2004). The monograph was published by the Institute of Polish Philology at the University of Opole as the fourteenth one in the widely known series Modern History of Slavonic Languages (Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich). The monograph is of great importance for the status of the Ruthenian language as the fourteenth and the youngest Slavonic language. After the publication of the book any further dialectizing, that dominated in the second half of the last century, is completely unfounded. Considering the fact that the traditional Ruthenian / Rusyn linguistic areal is divided by international borders, it was decided to analyze separately language developments in each of the Ruthenian-inhabited regions: the Transcarpathian District in Ukraine, the Prešov Region in Slovakia, the Lemko Region in Poland, a few isolated settlements in northeastern Hungary, the Vojvodina in Serbia, and North America (Canada and the United States) [Magocsi 2004: 470]
As far as Vojvodinian Ruthenians are concerned we can say that they were lucky since they did not experience the policy of the Soviet Union. Bačka-Srem Ruthenians kept their schools and continued to develop. The Society for the Ruthenian Language and Literature began the work on the formation of the first card file of the Ruthenian language in the second half of the 1970s.

The Department of Ruthenian Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad began as a Lectureship for the Ruthenian Language, which was established in 1972. In 1981 it became the Department for the Ruthenian Language and Literature. The project that concerned the formation of the first card file of the Ruthenian language was transferred from the Society for the Ruthenian Language and Literature to the newly established, professional institution.

In the period from 1980 to 1981 another project was accomplished. 15 five-language (Serbian-Hungarian-Romanian-Slovak-Ruthenian) dictionaries were published:

1. School Dictionary of Food Processing;
2. School Dictionary for Cultural-Artistic Professions;
4. School Dictionary for Metal Industry Professions;
5. School Dictionary for Tourist and Hotel Management Professions;
7. School Dictionary for Economic and Trade Field;
8. School Dictionary of Agriculture;
10. School Dictionary of Law;
11. School Dictionary of Medicine;
12. School Dictionary for Chemical and Technological Field;

Serbian-Hungarian-Romanian-Slovak-Ruthenian dictionaries were necessary for different professions because Serbian, Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak and Ruthenian languages became official languages of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina in the mid seventies.

The eighties were marked by Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač’s lexicographic works: Ruthenian lexicon (Руска лексика; Рамач 1983) and Phrasal Dictionary: Serbo-Croatian-Ruthenian (Фразеолошки речник: српскохрватско-русински; Рамач 1987). The phrasal dictionary is particularly important since it is the first and the only one of its kind. It preserves Ruthenian phraseology which, if it had not been published in this book under the editorship of Prof. Dr. Jovan Kašić, would have
largely been left to oblivion. It is extremely useful for translators, teachers, journalists and for all those who read Ruthenian literary works. Both the lexemes and the phraseologisms from these two lexicographic works were incorporated in the first card file of the Ruthenian language.

The work on the Serbian-Ruthenian Dictionary lasted two decades. The most prominent Serbian lexicographer, academician Mitar Pešikan, was consulted in the initial phase. When the project was transferred to the newly established Department for the Ruthenian Language and Literature at the University of Novi Sad in 1981 professors Julijan Ramač and Mihajlo Fejsa included the first generations of students of the study group in forming the lexicographic card file of the Ruthenian language. Since the lexicographic research presented a priority of all priorities phonological, morphological, syntactic and other kinds of research were neglected. We can say that the students of the first generations of the Department of Ruthenian Studies were in a way victims of the project. The two professors of the Department who simply could not do all the work alone consciously directed them to language investigations, namely to cultural-linguistic ones. Even the topics of the first diploma works were in connection with the main goals of the lexicographic project, for example: Ruthenian clothes, house, customs, food, religion, proverbs, making of wagons etc. Well-organized and coordinated work between students and professors brought the Ruthenian national minority in Serbia / Vojvodina the first and only lexicographic catalogue of lexemes of the Ruthenian language. The Ruthenians living in the Carpathian area – in Slovakia, Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Romania – Croatia and other countries do not have a similar one.

Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač said several times that a two-way dictionary should have been made at the beginning of the 20th century, in the times of national awakening, when the first cultural organization of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians, the Ruthenian Popular Educational Society (1919), was founded and when Dr. Havrijil Kosteljnik published the first grammar of the Ruthenian language (Граматика бачваньско-рускей бешеди, 1923; see Костельник 1975), but at those times “20,000 Ruthenians did not have intellectual strength the other European peoples had, and our dictionaries had to be late” [Хома-Цветкович 2010: 47-48]. The team consisted of Professor Ramač, Professor Fejsa and MA Helena Medeši, from the Translation Service of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. The manuscript was prepared for the 250th anniversary of the Ruthenian settlement in Bačka. The first volume of the Serbian-Ruthenian Dictionary (Сербско-руски словник) was printed in 1995, and the second volume – in a few years, in 1997.
At the end of the 1990s, immediately after the release of the second volume of the Serbian-Ruthenian Dictionary, the Department for the Ruthenian Language and Literature initiated activities for compilation of the Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary which had from the very beginning been conceived as the second phase of the overall project. The lexicographic card file made for Serbian entries in the Serbian-Ruthenian Dictionary was given to new generations of students of the Department to make another catalogue but this time with Ruthenian entries in the first place. At the same time, Professor Ramač’s team (extended to Dr. Oksana Timko-Ditko from Zagreb) supplemented the card file with vernacular vocabulary and vocabulary extracted from the works of famous Ruthenian writers. Words from modern literary works and magazines were also included in the card file.

The Year 2010 was a historic year for the Ruthenian national community in Vojvodina / Serbia. This was the year when the long-awaited Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary (Руско-сербски словник / Русинско-српски речник), the first one of its kind, came into being (Рамач, 2010). Editor-in-chief, Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač, prepared the letters from A to Є, Prof. Dr. Mihašlo Fejsa prepared the letters from Ж to Н, M.A. Helena Međesi prepared the letters from O to P and Prof. Dr. Oksana Timko-Ditko prepared the letters from С to Я. The reviewers were Prof. Dr. Aleksander D. Duličenko from Tartu (Estonia) and Prof. Dr. Bogoljub Stanković from Belgrade. Publishers were the Faculty of Philosophy – the Department of Ruthenian Studies and the Institute for Culture of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians. Forty people were included in composing the first and so far the only lexicographic card file of the Ruthenian language, ten people processed the cards and four linguists finalized this great lexicographic project by preparing the manuscript. The importance of the project is even greater if we bear in mind that the Vojvodinian Ruthenians present the smallest national minority out of those whose language is the official one in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. According to the last 2002 census there are 15,626 members of the Ruthenian national minority in Vojvodina, representing 0.77 % of the population of Vojvodina and 15,905 members in the Republic of Serbia, representing 0.2 % of the population of Serbia [Фејца 2010a:190]. Many more numerous peoples do not have such a dictionary. It is an undisputed fact that the Dictionary is a capital work of Ruthenian and Serbian lexicographies.

Compared with the previous two-volume dictionary the Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary is one volume shorter. Partly because the authors feared that a two-volume dictionary, expanded with new entries, would be even more voluminous, and in global and domestic economic crisis it would be difficult to publish such a dictionary, and partly because of the prevailing opinion that it was necessary to
include Ruthenian words in the dictionary. It was considered that professional terms from various fields, which are basically internationalisms, were not particularly important in this case. Hence, technical, botanical and other terms were not included in the manuscript; the authors paid more attention to the words from the vernacular. It was imperative not to lose those words that are specific for the Ruthenian language. Whole attention was given to the words related to the life of Ruthenians in the past although some of them are slowly being forgotten and replaced spontaneously with the nearest equivalent from the Serbian language. For example: бабракча (Serb. пипав посао, Engl. tedious job), байлаговац (Serb. бактати се, Engl. work on with difficulty), висобачиц (Serb. изгрдити, испсовати; Engl. scold, repremand), кухтариц (Serb. претурати, претраживати; Engl. rummage through, search through), опаскудзиц (Serb. оскрнавити, покварити; Engl. spoil, dishonour), стирмиц (Serb. претурати, претраживати; Engl. rummage through, search through), опаскудзиц (Serb. оскрнавити, покварити; Engl. spoil, dishonour), стирмиц (Serb. дреждати; Engl. resell, speculate on the stock market) (Хома-Цветкович, 2010: 49). The dictionary consists of 70,000 entries.

The Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary is descriptive, bilingual and translative. The authors devoted a lot of time to define semantic structure of polysemous words. Words with multiple meanings have several Serbian equivalents and each of the meanings is regularly illustrated with a few examples. The noun хижа, which has equivalents кућа and соба in the Serbian language (respectively house and room in English language), is illustrated with twelve examples (for example ~ до хладку, Serb. кућа у хладу, Engl. house in the shade; предња ~, Serb. предња соба, Engl. front room). The noun спреводзка also has two equivalents in the Serbian language – превара и лаж (Engl. fraud, deceit and lie, falsehood).

Because of the numerous illustrations of polysemous lexemes the Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary is suitable not only for comparative and contrastive linguistic research but also for broader investigations pertaining to Ruthenian culture. It is interesting, for example, to notice that there is a developed semantic field of hygiene, and a few verbs that convey different actions in relation to washing exist in the Ruthenian language. Thus, пере се и коса, и зуби, и одело, и суђе... in the Serbian language, or, in other words, the verb прати is almost exclusive for the use in these situations in Serbian, whereas there are several verbs to convey the same hygienic actions in Ruthenian: умивац руки и твар, змивац власи, чухац зуби, райбац шмати, орайбовац дакого (као старатељ), помивац судзину, вимивац / виплоковац (Serb. испирањем чистити од примеса, испирати). We observe a number of verbs in English too; the verb wash (hands, face, hair, laundry) prevails, but there are verbs rinse (dishes, wash), brush (teeth), gargle (one’s throat), pan (gold) as well. On the other hand, there are not enough Ruthenian adjectives
to convey all the nuances that are expressed by Serbian adjectives. This is particularly noticeable in the adjectives that create semantic fields of beautiful and terrible. For a woman who is лепа / згодна / љупка / дивна ... и прелепа, предивна (beautiful / pretty / lovely / wonderful ... and most beautiful, most wonderful) there exist only adjectives красна / шумна ... и прекраснa in Ruthenian; in order to fill the gaps in the semantic fields Ruthenian speakers simply borrow the Serbian equivalents and because of that, nowadays, even writers and proofreaders are in a dilemma whether to treat the adjectives згодна and любка as a part of standardized lexicon, or as a part of colloquial lexicon.

The authors paid special attention to interlingual homonymy, that is to identification of so-called “false friends” – the words that are in the Ruthenian and Serbian languages equal or nearly equal in shape, by sound, but different in meaning. The goal was to eliminate false associations that arise when translating certain lexemes from one language to another. Let us give a few examples of “false friends” for this occasion. The Ruthenian noun пок has three equivalents in Serbian: година (Engl. year), годиште (Engl. age group, generation) and год (Engl. ring on a tree); according to interlingual homonymy (or “false friendship”) the Serbian noun година (Engl. year) equals the Ruthenian noun годзина, but its meaning is different - час, сат (Engl. hour, clock). The Ruthenian verb топиц does not equal the Serbian verb топити, but the Serbian verb ложити (Engl. start a fire, heat); the synonym for топити in Serbian is отапати, and its Ruthenian equivalent is пущац (Engl. melt, dissolve). The Ruthenian noun облак (window) does not correspond to the Serbian noun облак (cloud), but to the Serbian noun прозор (window). The Ruthenian noun образ (icon) does not correspond to the Serbian noun образ (cheek) since it is its “false friend”, and its “true friend” is икона; the Ruthenian noun лицо (cheek) also has a “false friend”, since its translation equivalent in Serbian is лиц (Ruthen. твар, Engl. face) but the mentioned noun образ (cheek). The Ruthenian adverb просто has four Serbian equivalents, of which two are “false friends” and two are “true friends”: право (straight, directly), усправно (vertically, uprightly), просто, грубо (rudely, cruelly) and просто, једноставно (simply). Недеља is only недеља as one of the days of the week (Saturday), and тидзень is недеља as seven days from Saturday midnight to Sunday midnight (week).

The Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary is by all means a highly significant and useful product of the project that lasted three decades. It is useful for translators, journalists, teachers and Slavists. It will certainly help all those who want to improve their Ruthenian. This capital bilingual lexicographic work places Ruthenian in a higher place in the Slavonic and world philology. The dictionary is a kind of mine for comparative lexicological research. Apart from this the dictionary is of
particular importance for the preservation of the Ruthenian national identity in Vojvodina.

Parallel with the work on the capital dictionaries described the Society for the Ruthenian Language, Literature and Culture worked on two terminological dictionaries. Dictionary of Medical Terminology – Serbian-Latin-Ruthenian (Словник медицинской терминологии – сербско-латинско-руски) was published in 2006; the authors are Irina Papuga, Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač, Prof. Dr. Mihajlo Fejsa and M.A. Helena Međeši (Папуґа 2006). Dictionary of Plant and Environmental Protection – Serbian-Ruthenian-Latin-English (Словник заштити рошлїнох и животного стредку – сербско-руско-латинско-английски) was published in 2010; the author is Prof. Dr. Radmila Šovljanski (Шовлянски 2010).

At this point the Department of Ruthenian Studies is bringing to an end two lexicographic projects. Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač is bringing to an end the Dictionary of Ruthenian Vernacular (Словник руского народного язика), on the basis of the previous two Serbian-Ruthenian card files, and Prof. Dr. Mihajlo Fejsa – new Orthographical Dictionary of the Ruthenian Language (Правописни словник руского язика), the second one in the history of the Ruthenian national minority. More than forty years have passed since publishing the first, in certain segments already obsolete orthography rule-book The Orthography of the Ruthenian Language by Mikola M. Коčиш (Кочиш 1971).

Professor Fejsa has also started work on the English-Ruthenian Dictionary (Английско-руски словник) and the Ruthenian-English Dictionary (Руско-английски словник). He has assembled a team of young researchers, mainly students at the master studies of the Department who are aware that it is necessary for a modern Ruthenian to use three languages: the first language of global communication (English), the state language (Serbian) and the mother tongue (Ruthenian). It is to be noted that the young researchers treat the Ruthenian / Rusyn language as the youngest, fourteenth Slavonic language.

The so-called international conditions are favourable too. Serbia ratified the most important international documents that ensure the existence of the Ruthenian minority (for ex. the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages – 2005 and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities – 2001). According to the first periodical Report of the Committee of Experts on the Implementation of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (accepted on 12 September 2008) to which the Republic of Serbia is obliged, having accepted the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in 2001, the Ruthenian language has been given special protection under Part III of the Charter (together with Albanian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, Romani, Romanian, Slovak, and Ukrainian).
In the Overview of the Situation of Regional and Minority Languages, paragraph V, the Report states: „The level of protection of Ruthenian is high, which is reflected by its official status in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, in municipalities and courts. In education, Ruthenian benefits from good teaching materials, a growing number of pupils, and the only Ruthenian school worldwide. Deficits exist regarding the availability of television and radio programmes in Ruthenian in all areas where Ruthenian is used” (see the website of the Ministry for Human and Minorities Rights – www.humanrights.gov.rs).

In the new Europe without borders, the Rusyns / Ruthenians expect to be one of the distinct peoples numbering possibly up to several hundreds of thousands of members. The mutual contacts among all Carpatho-Rusyns will certainly have positive effects on raising their awareness of national identity. Such contacts will also be very useful in promoting intellectual, cultural, personal and linguistic relations.
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Summary
Four decades of lexicography of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians

The paper presents the description of the four decades long lexicographic work in the Ruthenian national community in Vojvodina / Serbia. The Ruthenian Society for Language and Literature started the work systematically, following the propositions given by Dr. Mitar Pešikan from the Institute of the Serbian Language at the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Art. In 1981 the project was taken over by the Department of the Ruthenian Language and Literature at the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad.

After publishing the bilingual Serbian-Ruthenian Dictionary (Српско-русински речник / Сербско-руски словник) in two volumes (the first volume in 1995; the second volume in 1997), the Julijan Ramač’s team started a new project – Ruthenian-Serbian Dictionary (Русинско-српски речник / Руско-сербски словник). In about ten years the team that consisted of Prof. Dr. Julijan Ramač, Prof. Dr. Mihajlo Fejsa, Dr. Oksana Timko-Ditko and M.A. Helena Međeši succeeded in accomplishing the project sponsored by the Ministry of Science. The result is a voluminous bilingual dictionary published by the Institute for Culture of the Vojvodinian Ruthenians and the Department of the Ruthenian Studies in 2010.
Vojvodina’s Ruthenians lexicography has by all means been placed on the highest level among Ruthenian lexicographies.
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