SALVATORE DEL GAUDIO, Dr., Professor, Department of Romance Philology
and Comparative-Typological Linguistics, Institute of Philology,
Borys Hrinchenko Kyiv University
13B Tymoshenko St., Kyiv 04212, Ukraine
Humboldt Fellow, Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Greifswald, Germany
E-mail: s.delgaudio@kubg.edu.ua; sadega@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8441-749X

THE LOCAL DIALECT OF ZADERIÏVKA (CHERNIHIV REGION) IN THE EAST SLAVIC CONTEXT

The linguistic description of the local dialect of Zaderiïvka (former district of Ripky, region of Chernihiv) represents a minor segment of a larger research project devoted to the study of the local dialects spoken in the uttermost northwestern area of the region of Chernihiv. These dialects, according to a largely accepted classification, are attributed to the northeastern Ukrainian (or Polissian) dialectal territory and are more specifically known as "transitional from Ukrainian to Belarusian". Because of the predominantly descriptive character adopted in this paper, some theoretical implications and debatable issues will not be discussed here.

The most significant geo-historical facts about this rural village, in line with the dialectological practice and the methodology applied for the collection of data, are delineated in the introductory sections.

Central to this study is the description and analysis of the most substantial dialectal features of this local dialect. Their characteristics are examined considering the usual linguistic parameters: phonetic-phonology, derivation (to a minor extent), morphology, syntax, and lexis.

The fact that Zaderiïvka is reported (point number 65) in the *Atlas Ukraïns'koï Movy* [*Atlas of the Ukrainian Language*] favours comparison with other local varieties, and it is useful to identify recent trends and possible undergoing changes in the examined dialect. The dialectal data analyzed in this paper aim, on the one hand, to increase the already available factual material and, on the other, to foster further theoretical reflections about the origin of these border dialects.

Keywords: East Slavic dialectology, North Ukrainian (East Polissian) dialects, Zaderiïvka, local dialect, border dialects

1. INTRODUCTION

This article represents a minor segment of a more complete research project devoted to the study of those local dialects spoken in the furthermost northwestern part of the region of Chernihiv. These dialects, which, according to a largely ac-

cepted classification, are attributed to the northeastern Ukrainian (or Polissian) dialectal territory, are more specifically known as 'transitional from Ukrainian to Belarusian' (cf. Hancov, 1928; Zhylko, 1953 etc.). Due to the primarily descriptive character adopted in this paper, the theoretical implications and the debatable issues involved in the foregoing term will be omitted here.

In line with the dialectological tradition, we shall first outline the geohistorical facts typifying this rural village and the methodology applied to collect the dialectal data. The study, however, will focus on the description and analysis of the most relevant dialectal features. These aspects are going to be examined according to the usual linguistic subdivisions: phonetic-phonology, to a minor extent derivation, morphology, syntax and lexis.

Zaderiïvka [1] was founded in 1721. It is a small rural settlement in the former admnistrative district of Ripky within the region of Chernihiv. The village is situated 23 km north-west of Ripky (former district centre) and 60 km north-west of Chernihiv (regional and new administrative centre). Until the recent reform (2020), other surrounding rural communities were also subordinated to the rural council (U sil′s′ka rada) of Zaderiïvka [2]. The river Dnipro functions as a natural border separating Zaderiïvka from the adjacent district of Loeŭ (region of Homel′, Belarus′) [3]. The Ukrainian inhabited point is located at approximately the same latitude as Krupeiki (6,1 km south of the district centre Loeŭ [4]) where we also carried out some interviews. In the first volume of the Atlas of the Ukrainian Language (AUM, 1984), Zaderiïvka is reported under point number 65. This facilitates, as also stated in the introductory pages of the new Atlas of Eastern Polissian local dialects [5] (ASH, 2019, p. 5), further comparison and the individuation of recent tendencies in the investigated dialect.

The article is structured as follows: section 1 deals with applied research methods; section 2 describes the most evident phonetic-phonological features; section 3 exemplifies some derivational affixes; section 4 and 5 examines morphology and syntax; section 6 illustrates a few recurrent lexemes.

2. METHODS

The interviews in Zaderiïvka were carried out in late Spring 2018 with the support of a local school teacher who had been previously instructed on the aims of the audio recordings.

Informants were chosen according to the common dialectological parameters: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) local residence, 4) mobility, 5) level of school in-

---

[1] U *Задеріївка*; dial. [зад^ја'rɛіеṷцка / зад′а′реіеṷка]. The following abbreviations are used in this article: B — Belarusian, ESl — East Slavic, MoU — Modern (Standard) Ukrainian, P — Polish, R — Russian, U — Ukrainian.

[2] These were: Kam″ianka, Piznopaly, Plextiïvka and Suslivka. See rada.gov.ua, 2021.

[3] A hovercraft used to connect the two banks of the river in the Soviet period, and until the early 1990s.

[4] A map will be omitted here for brevity.

[5] We would like to point out that we got acquainted with this Atlas (ASH = Atlas skhidnopolis′kykh hovirok) only after completion of this contribution. Therefore, the data for comparison mainly refer to the AUM.

Table 1. **Informants' Characteristics**

№	Age	Sex	Residence	Mobility		Education / School Instruction
1	85	F	Zaderiïvka	Non-mobile		Non-complete elementary education (2 classes)
2	71	F	»	»	»	Middle education
3	75	F	»	»	»	Low-middle education
4	30 (atypical)	F	»	Local mobility		Higher education
5	77 (2011)	F	»	»	»	Non-complete elementary education (3 classes)

struction/education (cf. Table 1). The only exception was made by a fairly young female informant (30 years) who, notwithstanding her degree in Ukrainian philology, claimed to still have a good command of the local dialect which was spontaneously acquired from her grandparents. The age of the first four informants refers to the time when the interviews took place. Only a fifth additional informant was interviewed much earlier (2011) and, accordingly, her age refers to that period. Her dialectal speech has been included here for the sake of a more complete analysis [6]. The shortest interview was delivered by a female informant (N.3 in Table 1) whose local speech slightly shifted towards Russian especially with regard to a series of scientific terms (see lexis), when reporting about a Russian educational programme on TV about astronomy. As in most personal interviews, it was agreed with local informants that they would remain anonymous. The present mini-corpus, which also includes some personal field notes and additional fragments, consists of 1,500 word forms. Only a selection of the most representative textual fragments will be analyzed in the ensuing sections.

All the examples are chunks of oral speech. These have first been transliterated according to the Slavistic scientific transliteration and supplemented by a broad phonetic transcription (IPA) in square brackets. Next to it, in order to facilitate the Ukrainian reader, a Ukrainian dialectal (phonemic) transcription has been added; in all cases a major clarity was deemed to be essential, e.g., section on phonetic-phonological aspects. The sign of consonant palatalization is normally the IPA symbol [Cʲ]. In some specific cases, however, we have kept the apostrophe [C'] as a sign of palatalization instead of [ʲ] in order to highlight a subsequent [i] or the diphthong [ie]. Round brackets have been occasionally used to evidence a grammatical form and/or lexeme, especially when a phonetic/phonemic transcription was considered to be irrelevant for the understanding of the text. The frequency of particular word forms will be given in parentheses preceded by a plus and a number, e.g., (+ number). The

---

[6] This already phonemically transcribed text was kindly given me by the interviewer who, at the time, was a student of the Philological Department of the Chernihiv Taras Shevchenko Pedagogical University.

Table 2. **Frequency of Vowel Realizations**

Akannia		Jakannia		Etym /o/		ě and ē Reflexes	Historic /i/	
+150	−10	+3	∅	+25	∅	+60	+75	−6

abbreviations used in the phonetic and grammatical analysis mostly adhere to the Leipzig glossing rules system.

Geo-dialectal maps and other illustrative materials have been omitted for the sake of brevity.

3. PHONETIC-PHONOLOGICAL ASPECTS

3.1. Vocalism

Akannia [7], as expected, remains one of the most consistent features, for example: *holad* ['ɦolad / голад] m.nom/acc.sg 'hunger'; *malako* [malaˈko / малаˈко] n. nom/acc.sg 'milk'; *xoladna* ['xoladna / 'холадна] 'cold(ly)' adv (AUM, 1984, I, maps 71, 72, 73); starast' [sˈtarastʲ/ сˈтараст′] 'old age' (+2) f.nom.sg vs. *starost'* [sˈtarostʲ] withouth akannja (+1) and the preservation of the etymological [o] (AUM, 1984, I, map 64). According to certain interpretations which will be verified in a further stage of research, the akannja has to be considered as a mere Belarusian feature that penetrated the border dialects as a consequence of language contact (Zhylko, 1966, p. 154).

Jakannia (the parallel oucome of akannia) is sporadic (+3) in the recorded materials, for example: *tjaper* [tʲaˈpˑⁱer / т′аˈпˑⁱеp] 'now' adv. It should be pointed out that the AUM (1984, I, map 40), for the specific mapped settlement (No. 65), only reports the form without consonant palatalization [te] whereas the ASH (2019, map 43) reports the more common [tʲeˈper / т[ʲе] 'пеp].

Etymological /o/ for standard /i/ in accented position: *most* ['most / мост] 'bridge' m.nom.sg; *noč* ['not͡ʃ′ / 'ноч′] 'night' f.nom.sg; *stoh* ['stoɦ / 'стог] 'haystack' m.nom.sg. Unlike in the data mapped for the AUM (1984, I, map 58), no diphthongation was found. This result is only partially confirmed in the ASH (2019, map 65). The only exception was [viᵉn / віᵉн] 'he' (+1), cf. (AUM, 1984, I, map 62). The Atlas of East Polissian seems to exclude forms of the type [jon/йон] 'he' (also, see 4.8. pronouns).

Diphthong /ie/ for the etymological *ě <ѣ> and <*ē in stressed position [8], for example: *Riepki* [9] ['rʲiepkʲi / 'p′іепк′і] nom.pl place name; *xlieba* [xˈlʲieba / хˈл′іеба] m.gen.sg 'bread'; *pieč* ['pˈietʃ′/ 'п′ієч′] 'oven' f.nom.sg (cf. AUM, 1984, I, maps 5; 38). Also, not fully diphthongized outcomes (+3) were recorded: [vsiᵉ / всіᵉ] 'all'. As to the latter, the diphthong [wo / yo] was specifically fixed

---

[7] According to a largely accepted view, akannja is the result of South Belarusian influence on some North Ukrainian dialects. I shall return on this point separately. For a more detailed account of this phenomenon, see: Zhylko (1963, p. 23); Wexler (1977, pp. 79—85).

[8] Cf. Zhovtobrjukh et al., 1979, pp. 273—274.

[9] Riepki ['rʲiepkʲi] instead of Ripky is the pronunciation used in the entire district.

for Zaderiïva (AUM, 1984, I, map 62) whereas the Atlas of East Polissian also registers the monophthong [o] (ASH, 2019, map 71).

Maintenance of historic /i/ for standard Ukrainian /y/ [ɪ]: *bitva* ['bʲitva / 'бʹітва] 'battle' f.nom.sg; *pisali* [pʲi'salʲi / пʹі'салʹі] 3pl.pst.impf 'write'; *velikom* [ʋʲe'lʲikom / вʹе'лʹіком] inst.sg 'big, great' (AUM, 1984, I, map 20). The most frequent vowel occurrence is schematized in Table 2.

3.2. Consonantism

The consonantism presents the following features:

Outcome [kʹi / кʹi], [ɦʹi / гʹi], [xʹi] which is the combination of velar plosive [k] and/or fricative [ɦ], [x] + front vowel /i/, thus reflecting an older stage in the history of Ukrainian as an East Slavic language, for example: *bumahi* [bu'maɦʹi / бу'магʹi] f.nom/acc.pl 'paper'; *velikij* [ʋʲe'likʹiį̯ / вʹе'лʹікʹiį̯] m.nom/acc.pl.adj 'big' (Zhovtobrjukh et al., 1979, p. 249; AUM, 1984, I, map 21).

Various degrees of palatalization of consonants + front vowels, for example: *ide* [i'dje / i'дʹе] 3sg.pres 'go'; *Petro* [pʹet'ro / пʹет'ро] m.nom.sg 'Peter'; *žive* [ʒʲi'wʲe / ж'і'вʹе] 3sg.pres 'he/she lives'.

Non-palatalized ('hard') affricate <c> [t͡s] (+8), especially + vowel at word end, for example: *da kanca* [kan't͡sa / кан'ца] m.gen.sg 'end' vs. U *kincja* [kin't͡sʲa]; *spadnica* [spad'nʲit͡sa / спад'нʹіца] f.nom.sg 'skirt' (AUM, 1984, I, map 112; ASH, 2019, maps 128, 129); also cf. Belarusian and Russian ≠ from standard Ukrainian.

Lack of prothetic [v] in words such as *ulica* ['ulʲica / 'улʹіца] 'street' (+3) with non-palatalized affricate (see above). It is interesting to observe that both the AUM and the new Atlas of East Polissian report for Zaderiïvka the form ['[в]улиц'а] (AUM, 1984, I, map 139; ASH, 2019, map 170).

Cekannja is sporadic (+2): *letic'* [lʲe'tʲicʲ / лʹе'тʹіцʹ] inf.impf 'fly'; *palieceli* [palʲie'cjelʲi / палʹʲе'цʹелʹі] 3pl.pst.perf 'they flew' (+3). The tendency towards a strong palatalization of [t, d] + front vowels are not directly mapped for this inhabited point but the Atlas of Ukrainian includes the isogloss [tᵗsʲ], [dᵈzʲ] to the surrounding territory (AUM, 1984, I, map 102). On the other hand, the new ASH does not map this outcome for Zaderiïvka (ASH, 2019, map 117).

The consonant [xʷ/ xv /] for standard /f/ is consistent all over the area (AUM 1984, I, maps 98, 99), for example: *Marxva* ['marxva / 'мархва] 'Marfa'; *praxvesor* [pra'xvʲesor / прах'в'есор] m.nom.sg 'professor'; *pa xvizike* [pa 'xʷizʲikʲe / па 'хвʹізʹікʹе] about-perf-physics-f.dat.sg.

Dispalatalization of /r/ + back vowel [ra, ru] of the type *burak* [10] [bu'rak] 'beetroot' m.nom.sg did not come up in the recorded texts. However, in the entire dialectal area both palatalized and non-palatalized variants are possible (AUM, 1984, I, map 79). There seems to be a predominance of the palatalized variant in some areas, perhaps a consequence of the advancing process of standardization. A schematization of the most common phonetic features can be visualized in Table 3.

---

[10] Compare: U *burjak* <буряк> vs. B *burak* <бурак>.

Table 3. **Typical Consonant Realizations**

Consonant Palatalization + /i/, /e/		Palatalization /r/ + back vowels		('hard') /c/ [t͡s]	Cekannja	[xv / xʷ] for /f/	Velar + i, e [к·i, g·i]
+90	−5	hard [г]: ∅	soft [г']: +3	+6	+2	+5	+5

Devoicing of /z/ > [s] in some verbal prefixes and at the word end (+3), probably due to assimilation: *posbiraly* [posbʲiˈralɪ / посб'і'рали] collect-3sg. pst.perf; *čeres* [ˈʧ·eres / 'ч·ерес] 'across, through'.

Syncope: two cases of internal consonant loss [d/д] (+2), for example: in *dvajuranyj brat* [dvaˈjuranɪ̝ brat / два'јураниῐ брат] 'cousin' m.nom.sg; *piisjat* [pʲiiˈsʲat / п'іі'с'ат] 'fifty'.

4. DERIVATION

The most recurrent affixal means are being reported below:

Diminutives (hypocorisms) and augumentatives: *-ečk-* (-ечк-), for example: *bumažečka* [buˈmaʒ-eʧk-a / бу'маж-ечк-а] 'little bit of paper' f.nom.sg is still well preserved (+5) in this and other villages of this dialectal area (AUM, 1984, I, map 178; ASH, 2019, map 178). Other recurrent diminutives are: the typical *-en'k-* [-еньк-] as in *čast-en'ka* [ʧasˌtʲenʲka / час'т'ен'ка] 'often' adv.dim; *-ik* (+1): *buslik* [ˈbuslʲik / 'бусл'ік] 'tiny, little stork' m.nom.sg or *bus'ka* [ˈbusʲka / 'бус'ка] (+5) for *busol* 'stork', also see: (AUM, 1984, I, map 177); *-čik-* (+3) *xlopčik* [xˈlopʧik / х'лопчік] 'little boy'; *-ačk-* (+5): *mamačka* [ˈmamaʧka / 'мамачка] 'mummy' f.nom.sg; *sabačka* [saˈbaʧka / са'бачка] 'dog' f./m.nom.sg etc.

These recordings have revealed a relatively large quantity of diminutives (hypocoristic forms).

Common verbal affixes:

Verbal prefixes: historical *ad-* (od-) (+3) for *vid-* as in *adbirajut* [ad-bʲiˈrajut / ад-б'i'райут] [11] take away-3pl.pres 'they take away' and its allophone *at-* (+1); *pra-* (пра-) (+3), for example: *pražyla* [pra-ʒɪˈla / пра-жи'ла] live-3sg.f.pst.perf 'she lived (for a period)'; the typical *pri-* [prʲi- / пр'i-] without the [j] <ï> and with the preservation of the etymological [i] (+5) as in *prišli* [prʲiˈʃlʲi / пр'i'шл'i] come-3pl.pst.perf 'they came'; *pa-* [па-] (+7), for example: *pajexala* [paˈjexala / па'јехала] go-3sg.pst.perf 'she went'. In the last example we also notice the outcome [ji > je], etc.; *pad-* [пад-] (+1): *padajt'i* [padaɪ̯ˈtʲi / падаῐ'т'i] come up-inf. (+2).

The verbal suffix of the past imperfective *-uva-* / *-ува-* (+2) coincides with standard Ukrainian, for example: *razkazuvala* tell-3sg.pst.impf 'she was telling'; also the suffix *-ava-* (+1) was noted, for example: *rysavaŭ* [rɪsaˈva[uɪ̯] / риса'ваῢ] draw-3sg.pst.impf 'he drew'. The ASH reports for Zaderiïvka only the latter (ASH, 2019, map 220) whereas the AUM indicates for the specific

---

[11] It should be noted that the ending is not palatalized as in Russian, although the declensional pattern is also Ukrainian.

inhabitated point as first variant *-ova-* but marks the entire dialectal area with *-ava-* as possible alternative (AUM, 1984, I, map 179); *pere-* [pʲerʲe-] (+3) as in *perejexali* [pʲerʲeˈjexalʲi / пʹерʹеʹйехалʹi] move-3pl.pst.perf, 'they moved'.

The infinitive ending is the usual *-t'* <-ть> (+5).

The verbal postfix (reflexive particle) *-sja* [-sʲa] <-ся> is usually realized as [-sʲa] for the past reflexive and in other morphophonological contexts (+7), for example: *atmučilasja* [atˈmuʧilasʲa / атʹмуч·ілас'а] 'suffer' 1sg.pst.perf with the typical dialectal (prepositional) prefix ad-/at- (also, cf. AUM, 1984, I, map 269). A case of assimilation can be noted in the realization of -ca [-t͡sa] (+5), (cf. Belarusian), for example: *učica* [uˈʧʲits:a / уʹчʹітца] 'learn, study' inf. impf (also, cf. AUM, 1984, I, map 266).

5. MORPHOLOGY

5.1. Adjectives

The adjectives (+33), as usual, display both short and long forms: ten adjectives have the long forms (+10). The feminine and neuter singular and the nominative plural are generally characterized by long forms [12], for example: *mama uže slabaja* [13] *bula* [ˈmama uˈʒe sˈlabaja buˈla / ʹмама сʹлабайа буʹла] mum-f.nom.sg-already-adv-weak-adj.f.nom.sg-be-3sg.pst.impf, 'mum was already weak'; *n'ehramotnaja* [nʲeɦiˈramotnaja / нʹегʹрамотнайа] 'illitterate' (+3) f.nom.sg; *čornyje dyry* [ˈʧornʲje ˈdɪrɪ / ʹчорнийе ʹдири] black-f.pl.nom. adj-hole-f.pl.nom, 'black holes'; *kalenki holyje* [kaˈlʲenkʲi ɦolɪje / каʹлʹенкʹі ʹголийе] knee-pl.nom-naked-pl.adj (AUM, 1984, I, maps 237, 238, 243). The feminine instrumental singular and the feminine accusative plural may also have the long form, maloju [14] f.sg.acc.

No comparatives and superlatives were recorded. However, our field notes and data from neighbouring villages show that these are often built by analytical means rather than only synthetically as reported in AUM (1984, I, maps 246, 247) and AHS (2019, maps 290, 291).

5.2. Adverbs

These are particularly numerous in the recorded texts (+170). Some of them may also function as conjunctions and fillers. The most typical and frequent adverbs are reported in Table 4.

Adverbs of manner: *dobre* [ˈdobre] 'well' (+2); the parallel *xarašo* as in Russian does not come up in these texts; *tak* 'so, thus' (+15 ESl). The form *poškom* [poʃˈkom / пошʹком] 'on foot' (+1) seems to be idiolectal.

Adverbs of degree (quantity): *bahatenna* 'much, a lot', for example: *a detej že bulo bahatenna* [a dʲeˈtʲeiɪ ʒe buˈlo baɦaˈtʲen:a / а дʹеʹтʹеĭ же буʹло

---

[12] See: Zhylko (1966, pp. 89—90); Bevzenko (1980, p. 202); Del Gaudio (2017, p. 68).
[13] Today the recommended form is *slabkyj* but *slabyj* is also possible (cf. SUM, 1978, 9, p. 340).
[14] Malaja, -oe, ije is a substantivized adjective used dialectally (and in some colloquial varieties) to indicate a fairly young (small) child, cf. Eng. *lad*, and similar.

Table 4: **Frequent Adverbs**

Adverbs of Place	Adverbs of Time
tam [tam] 'there' LOC. +26, East Slavic (ESl).	*tady* [ta'dɪ / та'д.и] 'then' +6 / *tadi* [ta'd.i / та'д.i] +2, B.
tut [tut] 'here' LOC. +12, ESl.	*patom* [pa'tom / па'том] 'afterwards' +8, R (ESl).
tudy [tu'dɪ / ту'ди] 'there' mov. +4, U, B.	*šče* [ʃʧe] 'still' +4 / [ʃʧʲe / шч·е] +1, U, B.
de 'where' +3, d'e ['dʲe / д'е] +2 U., B. vs. gde ['ɦdʲe / гд'е] +1, R.	kalis 'once (upon a time)' +3, B.
sjudy [sʲu'dɪ / с'у'ди] 'here' mov. U, B +3 vs. *sjuda* +1, R.	*t'eper'* [tʲe'pʲerʲ / т'е'п'ер'] 'now' +1 R; *t'eper* [tʲe'pʲer / т'е'п'ер] +1 dial. U; *tjaper* [tʲap·ʲer / т'а'п·iер] with jakannja +1 dial. (B).
dadomu 'homewards' +1, U, B.	ranʃe ['ran'ʃe / ран'ше] 'earlier' +2, R (coll. U).
skroz' [sk'rozʲ / ск'роз'] 'anywhere, everywhere' (+1) dial., cf. standard U *skriz'*.	*kali* [ka'lʲi /ка'л'i] + B., — U. + vs. *kada* [ka'da] R, prost.; *kalis'* [ka'lʲisʲ / ка'л'iс'] 'once, some time' (+5) + B, — U.
—	uže [u'ʒe] +10, U, R.

N o t: The attribution to a language in the scheme, rather than to another, is based on principles of phono-morphological similarity and, to a lesser extent, etymology. For example: *patom* is frequently used in several Ukrainian non-standard varieties throughout the country, this form is build up by po + *tomu* which are also Ukrainian derivational elements. Therefore, besides being a dialectal adverb and having the additional abbreviation "R" because of its formal coincidence with Russian and for a more direct perception, it can likewise be considered as a cross-regional East Slavic form since it is also found in southern Belarusian non-standard varieties.

Table 5. **Frequent Conjunctions**

Coordinating Conjunctions	Adversative Conjunctions	Subordinating Conjunctions
ESl: *i* 'and', +50 with its positional variant/ allomorph j <й>, +3; *da* +10; *ta* +3	ESl: a 'but', 'and yet' +40; dial. dak 'but, so' +20; ESl: *ž* (ж) 'and yet' +10	*šo* [ʃo / шо] 'that' +2; *jak* 'when' +5; bo 'because' +2; *šob* [ʃob / шоб] 'in order to' +2; *nače* [naʃ·e / нач·е] 'as if, as though'+1

бага'т'ен:а] but-conj-children-gen.pl-filler-be-3sg.pst-a lot-adv-quantity; pa-troxu 'little by little', +1; bahata 'much' +1 vs. the more archaic mnoha (многа) 'much' +1 (cf. Russian).

In one older female informant [15], the quantity adverb *tol'ki* ['tolʲk·i / 'тол'к·i] 'only' is rather consistent (+3).

Among the Russian-like adverbs we have the usual: *tože* ['toʒe / 'тоже] 'also, too' (+5); *naverna* [na'v·erna / на'в·ерна] (1) / *navernoje* [na'v·ernoje / на'в·ерноје] 'probably' (+1) which can also express modality; *vobščem*

---

[15] Number 5 in Table 1.

['vobʃʧ·em / 'вобшч·ем], *obščem and vooб̌šče* 'in general, on the whole' (+3); *pastajanna* 'constantly', always etc. (+1); *užasna* 'terribly' (+1); *dnjom* [16] 'in the daytime' (+1). It should be pointed out, however, that this and the neighbouring local dialects mainly use the forms analyzed above. Only for *vmeste* [w'mestʲe / ў'мʲестʲе] 'together' (+1) the parallel *razam* may occasionally occur.

5.3. Conjunctions

Conjunctions are largely represented in the recorded texts (+180). The most frequent conjunctions are illustrated in Table 5.

Dialectal conjunctions are: the adverbial conjunction *dak* 'thus/so' (which may also function as a filler) and da 'and', for example: *dak matka navarit' supu da postavit' vady, ješte* [dak 'matka na'var'itʲ 'supu da pos'tavʲitʲ va'dɪ, 'jeʃte / дак 'матка на'вар'іт' 'супу да пос'тав'іт' ва'ди / 'йешт'е] so-adv/conj-mum-f.nom.sg-cook-3sg.fut-soup-f.acc.sg-and-conj-put-3sg.fut-water-f.gen.sg-eat-2pl.impf 'so mum will cook the soup and put some water (and says): eat'. These conjunctions (*dak* and *da*) usually replace the standard Ukrainian *ale* and *ta* enjoying a widespread diffusion in most of the Polissian (north Ukrainian) dialect territory and in some of the southeastern Ukrainian dialects. The adversative *no* 'but', typical of central and eastern Polissian dialects, was recorded only once (cf. R vs. MoU and B *ale* 'but').

The disjunctive conjunction (also question particle: whether, if) in the analyzed texts is *ču/či* [ʧɪ, /ʧʲi] 'whether, or' as in standard Ukrainian, for example: *nu dumaju, paprobuju, jakyj l'od, ču kr'epkyj ču n'e* [nu 'dumaju, pap'robuju, jakɪɪ̯ lʲod, ʧɪ k'rʲepkɪɪ̯ ʧɪ nʲe / ну 'думайу, пап'робуйу, йа'киĭ л'од, чи к'р'епкиĭ чи н'е] well-interj-think-1sg.pres-try-1sg.fut.perf-which-ice-m.nom.sg-whether-conj-hard-m.sg.adj-or-conj-not-neg, 'well, I think, I will try which/what ice, whether (it is) hard or not'.

Subordinate clauses of time are often introduced by *jak* 'when', for example: *jak ja radilasja, dak bula ž maloju* [jak ja ra'dʲilasʲa, dak bu'la ʒ ma'loju / йак йа ра'д'іласʲа, дак бу'ла ж ма'лойу] when-conj-I-sg.pron-born-1sg.pst.impf-and/so-conj-be-3sg.pst-filler-little-f.inst.sg.adj, 'when I was born, and I was still little'.

Other typical subordinating conjunctions are: *nače* 'as if', 'as though' (comparative/modal clause); *bo* 'because', 'for'; *šob* 'in order to'; for example: *pomnil, nače xateй i padajti* [pomnil, naʧ·e xatʲeu̯ i padaii̯tʲi / 'помн'іл, 'нач·е ха'т'еў і пада'ĭт'і] rember-3sg.pst.impf-as if-conj-want-3sg.m.pst.impf-and-conj-come-inf.perf, 'he remembered as if he wanted to come up to (us)'; *pajexali ut'ekat' u kusty, bo šli ž n'emcy* [pa'jexalʲi ut'ekatʲ u kus'tɪ, bo ʃlʲi ʒ 'nʲemtsɪ / па'йехал'і ут'е'кат' у кус'ти, бо шл'і ж 'н'емци] go-pl.pst.perf-run-inf.perf-into-perf-bush-m.acc.pl-since-come-3pl.impf-German-m.nom.pl, 'we began to run into the bushes since the Germans were coming'; *da ja uže behala, šob valoŭ vadit'* [да йа ўже 'бʲегала, шоб ва'лоў ва'д'іт'] and-conj-1sg.nom-already-adv-run-1sg.f.pst.impf-in order to-conj-ox-m.acc.pl-lead-inf.impf, 'and I already ran (in order) to lead the oxen'.

---

[16] Also, cf. Belarusian.

5.4. Interjections and **particles** (function words) are largely used in colloquial and dialectal speech. All interjections and most particles present a generalized East Slavic character. Also for Zaderiïvka, the most frequent interjection (cf. filler) was *nu* 'well', 'so' etc. (+13). The negative particle for both "no" and "not" is the palatalized *n'e* [nʲe / нʹe] which may be subject to some phonic variation (+10). The only affirmative particle is *da* 'yes' (+10). A less frequent particle is *ot* 'here' (+1).

5.5. Nouns

The nouns in these texts are not particularly numerous (+310). The declension displays the following characteristics: the nominative and accusative singular and plural do not present significant variation from the standard (and East Slavic) pattern, except for the usual phonomorphological specificity of the local dialect(s), e.g., akannja, consonant palatalization [к·i], mantainance of the etymological [o], *ĕ (jat') and *e reflexes, alternation of -i and -y [ɪ] as plural endings, etc., cf. phonetic aspects.

Certain nouns tend to retain the Ukrainian (and Belarusian) grammatical gender, for example: *jak sabačka behaŭ sledam* [jak saˈbatʃka ˈbʲeɦau̯ sʲlʲedam / йак саˈбачка ˈбʹегаў сʹлʹедам] as-conj-dog-m.nom.sg.dim-run-3sg.m.pst.impf-after-adv, 'like a doggy ran after / followed', where *sabačka* is masculine, differently from Russian, and the agreement follows the Ukrainian (and Belarusian) pattern.

In the genitive singular of masculine nouns in consonant stems there is a slight prevalence of the ending -a (+8) over -u (+5). Overall, the distribution of the endings is conform to standard Ukrainian grammar, except for *raz-a* 'time' m.gen.sg (cf. numerals). A selection of the most frequent noun endings can be seen in Table 6.

The system behind this choice seems to partially depend on the following factors: a) degree of animacy of specific nouns; b) orientation on the grammatical gender associated with the language the noun formally coincides, for example: hoda year-m.gen.sg 'of the year' (cf. Belarusian, Russian).

A certain degree of oscillation in the use of the genitive endings can even be noticed in standard Ukrainian. The contemporary norms tends to opt for -u even for those nouns that historically used to display -a (Del Gaudio, 2015, p. 158).

The case marker of the genitive plural of masculine and neuter nouns with consonant stem display the ending *-oŭ* (*-oў* with non-syllabic -oй), for example: *valoŭ* [vaˈlou̯ / ваˈлоў] ox-m.gen.pl; *busloŭ* [busˈlou

Table 6. **Genitive Case Ending Distribution**

Ending-a	Ending-u
Apendicyta ≠ MoU -u	kraju = MoU
Busla = MoU -a	l'iesu = MoU
Hoda — n/a	luhu = MoU
Kanca = MoU -ja	popelu = MoU
Lojeva = MoU -a	—
Xl'ieba = MoU -a	—
Xlopčika = MoU -a	—

ṵ / бус'лоў] stork-m.gen.pl. This ending (+4) covers a rather large North Ukrainian dialectal area and it is shared by the neighbouring Belarusian and Russian dialects (AUM, 1984, I, map 202; DARJA, 1986, I, map 58), besides being normative in Belarusian (Biryla & Shuba, 1985, pp. 86—87). The ending -ev may also occur: m'es'ecev ['mʲesʲetseṵ / 'м'ес'ецев] month-m.gen.pl (+2). The genitive plural for *djen' 'day'* is dn'ej [dnʲeiṵ / дн'еĭ], cf. Russian.

The dative singular of masculine and neuter nouns has the typical ending -*u* <у> (+5), for example: *už takaja pa xarakteru* [uӡ ta'kaja pa xa'raktjeru / уж та'кайа па ха'ракт'еру] already-adv-such-f.nom.sg.pron.prep.dem-character-m.dat.sg. This dative ending is distinctive for central and eastern Polissian dialects (AUM, 1984, I, maps 194, 195, 196, 197; also, see Bevzenko, 1980, p. 202) and it is largely used in different Ukrainian spoken (and literary) varieties of central-northern Ukraine.

The locative singular of masculine nouns in consonant stem prevalently ends in [-ie] (+5) although [-i] may also occur (+1), for example: *v mahazin'e* [v maña'zʲinʲe / в мага'з'ін'ʲе] in-prep-shop-loc.sg; *na Zamhlaje* [na zamñ'laje / на замг'лайе] in-prep-Zamhlaj-place name-m.loc.sg 'in (the village of) Zamhlaj' (cf. Belarusian and Russian). Nouns in -*ik* (-*yk*), -*ok*, -*nik* ends in -*u* (+5), for example: *na Čumaku* [na Čuma'ku / на чума'ку] in-prep-ʧumak-place name-m.loc.sg 'in (the village of) Chumak'.

As for the affricate + vowel, especially at the word end, the AUM reports for Zaderiïvka the ending -cy [-tsɪ /-ци] which is also confirmed by the Atlas of eastern Polissian dialects (cf. AUM, 1984, I, map 204; AHS, 2019, map 246). Our data instead show the ending -e or -ie (+1), for example: *na solnce* [na 'solntse / на 'солнце] on-prep-sun-n.loc.sg. Some degree of variation is conceivable for the nearby mapped settlements and the entire "transitional" area.

The dative (+2) and locative (+6) singular of feminine nouns tendentially ends in -ᶦe / -e, for example: *behajut pa ul'ice* ['bʲeñajut pa 'ulʲitse / 'б'егайут па 'ул'іце] run-3pl.pres-on-prep-street-f.dat.sg, 'they run on the street'; *seli na xate, na kryše, patom na stoh s senam pereleteli* ['sʲelʲi na 'xatʲe, na k'ryʃe, pa'tom na s'toñ s 'sʲenam pʲerʲelʲe'tʲelʲi / 'с'ел'і на 'хат'е, на к'рише ха'д'іл'і па к'рише / па'том на с'тог с 'с'енам п'ер'ел'е'т'ел'і] sit-3pl.pst.perf-on-prep-cottage-f.loc.sg-on-prep-roof-f.loc.sg-after-conj-on-prep-stack-m.acc.sg-with-prep-hay-instr.sg-fly-3pl.pst.perf 'they sat on the cottage, on the roof. Then they flew over the haystack' (AUM, 1984, I, map 187).

In the instrumental singular of feminine nouns the ending -*aju* (-*oju*, -*eju*) prevails over the short -oj (+5 vs. +1), just as it occurs in some bordering Belarusian dialects (Zhylko, 1966, p. 155; Bevzenko, 1980, p. 205); for example: *dak jeny jurboju stanut* [17] [dak je'nɪ jur'boju s'tanut / дак йе'ни йур'бойу с'танут] and/so-adv/conj-they-3pl.nom.pron.pers-crowd-f.sg.inst-stay-3pl.fut.perf, 'and they will stay in crowd(s)/bevy'; *a Tatjana Nikolajevna* [18]...*bula učitelkoju* [a Tat'ʲjana Nʲiko'lajewna ...bu'la u'ʧitelkoju / а Тат''йана Н'іко'ла-

---

[17] The 3 sg and pl endings of the 3 person singular and plural sometimes are not palatalized (cf. Russian). However, this feature is considerably less frequent than the palatalized endings (cf. Ukrainian, Belarusian).

[18] It is interesting to note that the patronymic follows in this case the Russian model.

йеῩна буʹла уʹчʹітелкойу] but-conj-Tatjana-f.nom.sg-be-3sg.pst-teacher-f.
inst.sg, 'and/but Tatiana Nikolaievna... was a teacher'.

The Atlas of Ukrainian reports for the entire territory only the ending -oju
when the stress is on the last syllable and -aju when the stress is not on the last
syllable specifically for Zaderiïvka (AUM, 1984, I, maps 183, 184, 185, 186).
Our recordings show more variation: *-oju* (+3) prevails over the short ending
-oj (+1) and *-aju* (+1) without stress on the last syllable. A more precise dif-
ferentiation is made in the ASH (2019, maps 225, 226a, 227) when a fricative
precedes the stressed syllable.

The instrumental singular of masculine nouns confirms the generic en-
ding -om without stress on the last syllable, for example: *kartopli iz kraxmalom*
[karˈtoplʲi iz kraxˈmalom / карʹтоплʹі із крахʹмалом] potato-f.nom.pl-with-
prep-starch-m.inst.sg 'potatoes with starch' (AUM, 1984, I, maps 199; 202).
The same ending can be found under stress after [ts / ц], for example: *rabyla
v mahazine še pradavcom* [raˈbɪla v maɦaˈzʲinʲe ʃe pradawˈtsom / раʹбила в
магаʹзʹінʹе ше прадаῩʹцом] work-3sg.f.pst.impf-in-prep-shop-m.loc.sg-also-
adv-seller-m.inst.sg, 'I also worked in a shop as a seller'. This specific case is
reported neither in the AUM nor in the ASH.

The endings of the locative and instrumental plural do not deviate from
a generalized east Slavic type, except for some morphophonemic peculiari-
ties, e.g., [-ami vs. -amɪ]. The vocative is not a productive category in these
dialects.

5.6. Numerals

The numerals (+30) tendentially reflect the local dialect(s). The unit *adnu*
[adˈnu] one-acc.sg.fem. is characterized by the typical akannja as in Belaru-
sian and adjacent Russian dialects (AUM, 1984, I, map 248; DABM, 1963,
map 1; DARJA, 1986, I, map 33). It should be pointed out, however, that
for many of the mapped settlements of this area the first option is given with-
out akannja, although the dialectal area is included within the main isogloss
separating the zones with akannja from those without it. Among the cardinals
we can note, probably idiolectal, *štyry* [ʃˈtɪrɪ / шʹтири] four-num.card (+1),
for example: *štyry hody pražyla i vsjo* [ʃˈtɪrɪ ˈɦodɪ praʒɪˈla i ˈʍsʲo [19] / шʹтири
ʹгоди пражиʹла і Ῡсʹо] four-num-year-m.nom.pl-live-1sg.f.pst.pst-and-conj-
pron.indf, 'four years I lived (there) and that's it'. According to the data of
the Atlas of the Ukrainian language (AUM, 1984, I, map 249), the form štyry
seems to be more typical of central Polissian rather than eastern Polissian.
Moreover, for the mapped settlement of Zaderiïvka, *čotyry* [tʃoˈtɪrɪ / чоʹтири]
'four' num.card is reported (ibid.).

The Ukrainian [i] < *ě is generally replaced by [ʹe] or [ie], for example: *i
sjudy na Zamhlaje dvadcjat' s'em hod* [i sʲuˈdy na Zamɦˈlaje dˈvatsʲatʲ ˈsʲem ɦod /
і сʹуʹди на Замгʹлайе дʹвадцʹатʹ сʹем год] and-conj-here-adv-in-prep-Zam-

---

[19] /ʍ/ is an allophone of /ʋ/ in the syllable onset before voiceless consonants, in free variation with a
vowel [u]. Voiced [w] before voiced consonants.

hlaj-m.loc.sg-twenty seven-num.card-year-m.gen.pl, 'and here in Zamhlaj (I lived) twenty seven years'.

Ordinals follow the same morphological pattern as the adjectives, e.g. *druhaja* [dru'ɦaja] 'second' with the long form of feminine adjectives in *-aja* (+3). The genitive singular of masculine and neuter shows the ending *-aha* [-aɦa] with akannja (+10), for example: *tut žyli do p'iisjat pervaha hoda* [tut ʒɪ'lʲi da pʲii'sʲat 'pʲervaɦa 'ɦoda / тут жи'л'і да п'іі'с'ат 'п'ервого 'года] here-adv-live-3pl.pst-until-prep-fifty-num-first-gen.sg-year-m.gen.sg, 'we lived here until the year 1951'.

The locative singular ends in *-am* (+6), for example: *(na)radil'ilasja ja v tysjača d'ev'etsot sorak šostam hadu* [(na)'radʲilʲilasʲa ja v 'tysʲatʃa dʲevʲet'sot 'sorak 'ʃostam ɦa'du / (на)ра'д'ілас'а йа в 'тис'ача д'ев'ет'сот 'сорак 'шостам га'ду] be born-3sg.f.pst-I-in-prep-one thousand-num-ninehundred-num-fourty-num-six-num.ord.loc.sg-year-m.loc, 'I was born in the year 1946'.

5.7. Prepositions

Primary, non-derivative prepositions display a minimal degree of variation in Slavic languages, especially in East Slavic (Bevzenko et al., 1978, p. 417). In these textual fragments 130 prepositions were recorded but only a small number display a specific dialectal usage.

Dialectal specific are the more archaic: *k* <к> 'to, toward' + dat, for example: *k kamu u xatu*? to-prep.pron.inter.dat-in-prep-cottage/home-f.acc.sg, 'to whom (to go) in the cottage/house?'; *a tol'ki k rodičam* [a 'tolʲk·i k 'rodʲitʃam / а 'тол'к·і к 'род'іч'ам] and-conj-only-adv-to-prep-relative-m.dat.pl, 'and only to the relatives' (Bevzenko, 1980, p. 202; DABM, 1963, map 217); *at* 'from' + gen (+2); *da* 'until, upto' + gen (+3); *pri* [prʲi] 'by, close' etc. + loc (+2), for example: *tam bula xata pri savetskoj vlasti* [tam bu'la 'xata prʲi sa'vʲetskoi̯ vlasti / там бу'ла 'хата пр'і са'в'еткої w'lastʲi / ў'ласт'і] there-adv-be-3sg.pst-house/cottage-f.nom.sg-by-prep-Soviet-f.loc.sg.adj rule/authority-f.loc.sg, 'there was a cottage during the Soviet rule'; *s* <с> 'with, from' + inst, gen (+2). Except for k, all the above mentioned prepositions are characterized by the usual phono-morphological features: akannja, alternation of voiceless [s] vs. voiced [z], [i] vs. [ɪ] or vs. [o], e.g. *skroz'* ['скроз'] 'anywhere, everywhere' cf. MoU *skriz'*; for example: *dak ja skroz' vymetala u jeje smet'ja* [dak ja 'skrozʲ vɪmʲi'e'tala u jeje smʲet':a / дак йа 'скроз' вим'і'етала у йейе см'е'т':а] so-adv/cong-I-1sg.pron.nom-sweep-out-3sg.pst.impf-by-prep-her-f.gen.pron-litter-n.acc.sg, 'so/then I used to sweep out litter (rubbish) everywhere at her place'. Other frequent prepositions are: *u* <у> 'in' (+30); *pa* (+4), *iz* (+5); *na* (+30). The spatial prepositions *da* 'until, up to, towards' + gen; *pa* 'on, over, by, according to' etc. + dat, loc, because of the akannja, formally coincide with Standard Belarusian.

Among the frequently used spatial prepositions indicating provenance there are: *z* <з> 'from, of' + gen and its variant *iz* <із> 'from, of' + gen. Their selection seems to be partially governed by the same rules of euphony and speech pauses as in standard Ukrainian. However dialectal speech tends to be less rigid in the selection of one form instead of another.

Similarly, movement from one place, provenance or belonging is usually expressed by *od/ot/ad* 'from' + gen. The Atlas of the Ukrainian Language only marked the more archaic *od*, and its variant *ad* with akannja, instead of *vid* for the whole dialectal area (AUM, 1984, I, map 269). It is likewise interesting to note that vid/od etc. were the only prepositions to have been mapped separately in the first volume of the AUM (1984).

The preposition *z* <з> 'with, together with' + inst, as in standard Ukrainian, is used alongside *s* <с> 'with, together with' + inst (cf. Russian). Also for the texts recorded in Zaderiïvka both prepositions have an equal distribution: 6 occurrences for each form; for example: *vyjdu z druhaj xaty* come out-1sg.fut.perf-from-prep-other-adj.gen.f.sg-cottage/house-gen.f.sg, 'I will come out from the other house' vs. *s toj apalonky* 'from that ice hole'[20]. Whether the voiceless [s] <с> can be regarded as a relict or as a consequence of Belarusian and/or Russian influence, it is difficult to say. Cf. Old Rusian (Old Church Slavonic) *съ* < **sъ* (Fasmer, 1987, III, pp. 539—540).

The typical Ukrainian alternation v [ʋ] <в> (+30) / u [w, u̯] <у> (+20) 'in, by' + accusative or locative, depending on the phono-morphological context (euphony), is also reflected in these dialects (also see Shevelov, 1979, p. 299).

The Russian-like *posle* ['poslʲe] 'after, past' + gen (+1) always replaces the Ukrainian *pislja*, for example: *posle vainy* ['poslʲe vai̯nɪ / 'послʲе ваĭни] 'after the war'. This can also be explained by the retention of the etymological [o] in these dialects.

Location or proximity, especially among the older speakers, is generally conveyed by the preposition *lja* <ля> 'beside, at, by, past, near etc.' + gen (+2), for example: *lja d'er'eva* [lʲa dʲer.eva / лʲа дʲер.ева] near-prep-tree-gen. sg 'near / close to the tree'. This kind of prepositional phrase replaces the standard Ukrainian *bilja* + gen.

5.8. Pronouns

The pronominal category (+150 forms) is well represented for this dialect. Dialect specific pronouns are:

the nominative of 3 personal singular and plural: *jana* (яна) [ja'na / йа'на] she-3sg.nom (+2); *jon* [jon / йон] he-3sg.nom (+5); *jeny* (єни) [jenɪ / йени] they-3pl.nom (+3), for example: *jeny ždut'* they-3pl.pron-wait-3pl.pres, 'they wait'. The feminine, neuter and the plural of the nominative has not been reported in the consulted Atlases. The above-mentioned pronominal forms are shared by the adjacent south-western Belarusian dialects spoken in the region of Homel' (cf. DABM, 1963, map 133) and, with some variation, by the western group of south Russian dialects[21]. Moreover, some of the above-mentioned forms belong to the Belarusian standard; compare: Bel. *ёn* 'he',

---

[20] The preposition s <с> + the instrumental of the 1 personal pronoun is reported in the AUM (1984, I, map 270).

[21] Cf. Russian: *zapadnaja gruppa* (Rus. западная группа). This subgroup of South Russian dialects is indicated in the Atlas of the Russian Language (DARJA, 1986, I, map IV) under number 7.

jana 'she', *jano* 'it' etc. (Biryla & Shuba, 1985, p. 144). vs. standard Ukrainian with a prothetic [v] *vin* 'he', *vona* 'she', *vono* 'it'.

Noteworthy is the consistent use use of *vana* [vaˈna] she-3sg.nom (+4) only in one female informant [22], although she also used *jana* (+1). It was observed that *vana* often occurs in the speech of the middle-older generations (60+). The Atlas of the Ukrainian language reported for Zaderiïvka *vuon* [ˈwɔn / ˈвᵘон] 'he' m.nom.sg, with a more archaic diphthongation and, of course, a prothetic <v> (AUM, 1984, I, map 62). However, as already pointed out, the forms of the type *jon* are spread across the uppermost northen Ukrainian dialects: from Mefodifka [23] in the northeastern part of the region of Sumy, all along the northern portion of the region of Chernihiv and down to the Chornobylʹ area on the right bank of the river Prypʺjatʹ (central Polissian).

The Ukrainian *vin* he-3sg.nom was recorded only once by a young dialectal speaker (informant 4). This could have been probably due to interference from standard Ukrainian or hypercorrection. However, it was already noted that speakers of the younger generations (15—34 years) demonstrate a greater degree of dialectal leveling towards the standards spoken in the region. This variation was confirmed by the above-mentioned young female informant (№ 4) who used in the same oral text: *jon* (+3) alongside *on* (+2) and the above-mentioned *vin* (+1). On the other hand, a phonic variation of *vin* [віᵉн] (+1) with a tendency towards diphthongation was recorded by an older female speaker (informant 5).

In the oblique cases of the personal pronouns we can note: the typical *jaɦo* [jaˈɦo / йаˈго] he-3sg.m.gen/acc (+5) 'his, him' which in the AUM it is preceded by a preposition (AUM, 1984, I, map 226), for example: *v jaho bula nožka perebitaja* [v jaˈɦo buˈla ˈnoʒka pʲerʲeˈbʲitaʲa / в йаˈго буˈла ˈножка пʹерʹеˈбʹітайа] by-prep-he-3sg.m.gen-be-3sg.pst.impf-foot-f.nom.sg-injured-adj.partic.f.nom.sg, 'he had an injured foot/leg'. The Russian-like *jeho* 'he' acc was also recorded (+2), (cf. ASH, 2019, map 272).

The accusative feminine of third person singular: *jaje* [jaˈje / йаˈйе] 'her' (+3) neatly prevails over *jiji* (+1), for example: *dak ja jaje u torbu saberaju* [dak ja jaˈje u ˈtorbu sabjeˈraju / дак йа йаˈйе у ˈторбу сабʹеˈрайу] so-adv-I-sg.nom-it-3sg.pron.f.acc.sg-in-prep-bag-f.acc.sg-take-1sg.pres, 'so I take it in the bag'. In this case the mapping of ASH (2019, map 273) reports a wider range of varieties and it is more precise than the previous charting of the AUM (1984, I, map 227). Both *jamu* [jaˈmu / йаˈму] he-3sg.dat 'to him' (+2) and *jemu* [jeˈmu / йеˈму] he-2sg.dat 'to him' (+2) (cf. Russian), were recorded for the dative masculine singular. The latter form was used when the speaker was reporting about a Russian programme on physics (astronomy). This word form has not been mapped in the Atlases.

---

[22] This text refers to the informant n. 5 whose recording was indirectly acquired.

[23] It has been renamed Mefedivka (Мефедівка) since 2009. Before the administrative reform of 2020, it belonged to the district of Seredyna-Buda (cf. U. Середино-Будський район). In the AUM is reported under point 15. The village of Stara Huta (Стара Гута) is excluded from this isogloss (cf. point 14, AUM, 1984, I, map 62).

The genitive and the accusative singular of first person personal pronouns consistently have: *m'enie* [mˑⁱenʲi̯e / мˑⁱен'ĭе] me-1sg.acc (+10), for example: *i tjahajut' menie za sumky* [i tʲaˈhajutʲ mˑⁱenʲi̯e za ˈsumkɪ / і т'а'гайут' м'ⁱе'н'іе за 'сумки] and-conj-pull-3pl.prs.impf-me-1sg.acc-by-prep-bag-acc.pl.f, 'they pull me by the bags'. These two cases are not covered in both AUM and ASH. However, the Russian-like *menia* [mje'nja м'е'н'іа] also comes up (+4), for example: *i po miru xadila, menia vadila matka* [i po ˈmʲiru xaˈdʲila, mʲe'nʲa vaˈdʲila ˈmatka / і по м'іру ха'д'іла, м'е'н'іа ва'д'іла 'матка] and-conj-through/around-prep-world-dat.sg.m-go-3sg.pst.impf-me-pron.acc-lead-3sg.pst.impf-mum-f.nom.sg, 'I went around the world, my mum led me'.

The first person singular of dative personal pronouns has *minʲe* [mʲi'nʲⁱe / м'і'н'іе] 'to me' (+3), for example: *matka nasbiraje kartopli, a tady minie ž dast'* ['matka nasbʲi'raje kar'toplʲi, a ta'dy mʲi'nʲⁱe ž 'dastʲ / 'матка насб'і'райе кар'топл'і, а та'ди м'і'н'ⁱе ж даст'] mum-f.nom.sg-collect-3sg.pres-potato-f.acc.pl-and-conj-then-adv-me-dat.filler.emphat-give-3sg.fut.perf, 'mum picks up the potatoes and then she will give (them) to me'. The AUM for the mapped settlement of Zaderiïvka gives for the first person dative pronoun the option: *m'eni* [mʲe'nʲi / м'е'н'і] me-dat (AUM, 1984, map 224) whereas the more recent ASH (2019, map 270) more consistently reflects the local variation.

The instrumental feminine singular has the parallel *mnoju* [m'noju] me-ins.sg.fem (+1) and *mnoj* [m'noi̯] me-f.inst.sg (+1), for example: *a matka ž pozadu jd'e za mnoju tože [...], a za mnoj hanjalis'* [a 'matka ʒ po'zadu i̯'dʲe zo m'noju 'toʒe..., a za m'noj ɦa'nʲalʲisʲ / а 'матка ж по'заду ĭд'е зо м'нойу 'тоже ...а за мноĭ га'н'ал'іс'] and-but-conj-mum-f.nom.sg.intens-from behind-adv-go-3sg.pres-with-prep-me-f.inst.sg-also-adv[...]-and-but-conj-after/behind-prep-me-f.inst.sg, 'and my mum also goes (went) with me (followed me) from behind, and they chased me (ran after me)'.

For the dative singular of the second person we have: *tabe* [ta'bʲⁱe / та'б'ⁱе] you (thee) dat.sg (+1). For the genitive singular *u t'abe* [u tʲa'bʲⁱe / у т'а'б'ⁱе] by-prep-you/thee-2sg.gen 'by you' (+1) was recorded. The first option of dative singular given in the AUM for Zaderiïvka is *tobie* [to'bʲⁱe / то'б'іе] you (thee) dat.sg (AUM, 1984, I, map 225). The genitive is not reported at all. However, the recorded form is included within the main isogloss separating the uttermost northern part of Polissian dialects from the rest of the dialectal territory (ibid.). Worth underlining once again is that the personal pronouns in oblique cases may present some trifling degrees of variations within the entire dialectal territory between Belarus' and the Russian Federation as recently confirmed by the ASH (2019, map 271). Similar realizations of the genitive, dative, locative and instrumental singular of personal pronouns can be found in the adjacent southwestern Russian dialects (DARJA, 1989, II, map 60) and, to a certain extent, in standard Belarusian (Biryla & Shuba, 1985, p. 143).

As usual, pronouns in the oblique cases preceded by prepositions drop the prothetic consonant [n] <н>, for example: *u jeji* [u je'ji / йе'йи] by-prep-her-3sg.gen, for example: *ta j hody byli u jeji uže* [ta j 'ɦodɪ 'bɪlʲi u jeji u'ʒe / та

й 'годи 'бил′і у йейі ўже] and/but-conj-and-conj-year-nom.pl.m-be-3pl.pst -by-prep- her-3sg.gen.f-already-adv, 'and/but she already had (many) years'.

The genitive singular of the third person personal feminine somewhat diverges from that specifically mapped for Zaderiïvka (AUM, 1984, I, map 227). It should be noted that similar oblique forms, for example: *u jeje* [je′je / йе′йе] by-prep-her-f.gen.sg etc., cover all the area around Novozybkov, Starodub in the Russian Federation and extend along the western border of the Homel' region (DARJA, 1989, II, maps 65, 66, 67). The DAMB (1963, map 132) only maps the instrumental singular of feminine personal pronouns without preposition for the neighbouring areas. Some degree of variation can be noted among the various local settlements. However, it is worth remembering that the use of personal pronouns without the prothetic element is normative in standard Belarusian. Finally, a prothetic [j] preceding the genitive/accusative of the third person personal pronouns remains a stable feature (+2) also for Zaderiïvka: *za jix* gen.pl (cf. Zhylko, 1966, p. 155).

The only recorded reflexive pronoun of third person is *s′ebje* [sʲe'bʲie / с′е'б′іе] himself/itself-3sg.acc, for example: *a patom pal′ietiŭ i n′edal′iečka zviŭ s′ebje hn′ezdo* [a pa'tom palʲe't′iụ i nʲeda'lʲetʃka zvʲiụ sʲe'bʲe ɦnʲez'do / а па'том пал′е'т′іў і н′еда'л′ечка зв′іў с′е'б′е гн′ез'до] and/but-conj-fly away-3sg.pst. perf-and-conj-not far-adv.dim-procure/make-3sg.pst.perf-nest-n.acc.sg, 'and after that he flew away and made himself a nest not too far'. The dative *sabe* 'self' [sa'bje / са'б′е] oneself-dat does not come up in the audio recordings but it was noted down only once (AUM, 1984, I, map 225). Overall, the reflexive pronoun 'oneself' tends to coincide either with neighbouring Belarusian dialects or with standard Belarusian (cf. Biryla & Shuba, 1985, p. 143).

The possessive pronouns are not numerous (+10). The most frequent are: *maja* my-f.nom (+2); *maje* my-n.nom (+1); *svaje* nom.pl 'his, one's own' (+2). These word forms have not been mapped in the consulted Atlases. The possessive pronouns, primarily because of the akannja, tendentially coincide with Belarusian (cf. *maje* (мае); *svaju* (сваю) etc. It should be pointed out that the genitive singular of *naša* ['naʃa] our-1sg.f ends in -ej [-ei̯] as in Russian, for example: *vozle* [24] *našej xaty* ['vozlʲe 'naʃei̯ 'xatɪ / 'возл′е 'нашеі̯ 'хати] near/ by-prep-our-poss.pron.f.gen-dwelling/house-f.gen.sg, 'near our cottage'.

Frequent demonstrative pronouns are: *ce* ['tse / 'це] dem.n.nom.sg 'this' (+5); *toj* m.nom 'that' (+2) which may take over the function of a determiner (definite article), for example: *adbirajut toj xlieb* [adbjirajut toi̯ xl'ieb] take away-3pl.pres-that-dem.pron.m.acc.sg-bread-m.acc.sg, 'they take away that bread' [25]. The Atlas of Ukrainian for the specific point reports the more archaic and almost disappearing *seje* ['seje / 'сейе] 'this' (AUM, 1984, I, map 231); the same outcome is confirmed by the Atlas of eastern Polissian (ASH, 2019, map 277).

---

[24] The preposition *vozle* is quite productive in these local dialects often replacing the more typical "lja" (cf. prepositions).

[25] According to Zhylko (1966, pp. 87—88) such demonstratives may also take over the function of articles in dialectal speech. This point, however, deserves a closer examination.

Most feminine and neuter (distal) demonstratives present the long forms both in the nominative and in the oblique cases: *taja* that-nom.f (+1); *toje* that-n.nom (+1); *tyje* ['tɪje] those-nom/acc.pl (+2); *mujeju* [тиˈjeйy / ти'йейу] that-dem.f.inst.sg (+1), for example: *z kartopleju tyjeju* with-prep.-potato-instr.fem.sg.-that-dem.inst.sg (+1),'with this/that potato'; *do teji* [26] ['teji / 'тейй] to-prep-that-f.gen.sg. The above-mentioned demonstratives, with some degree of variation depending on the inhabited point and/or speaker, are a marker of local (old) dialectal speech (AUM, 1984, I, maps 233, 234, 235, 236). Some of them may be viewed as archaic or literary forms of 19th century writers. Similar forms are also found in the contiguous Belarusian dialects (DABM, 1963, maps 134, 135, 136, 137, 138) and they are widespread along a large territorial belt of Southwestern Russian dialects (DARJA, 1989, II, maps 69, 70, 71, 75).

The emphatic demonstratives are: *ocije* [o'ts'ije / о'ц'ийе] these-pron.m.nom. pl (+1) vs. *oci* [o'tsʲi / оц'i] these-dem.nom.pl (+1); *oce* this-dem.n.nom.sg (+1); *otoj* [otoiֶ / отоӣ] dem.m.nom 'that'(+1), etc. The AUM (1984, I, map 231) reports for Zaderiïvka the neuter singular *oceje* [o'tseje o'цейе] these-dem. nom.pl whereas the Atlas of eastern Polissian gives a whole array of pronominal forms without distinction between neutral and emphatic pronouns. Moreover the mapped ['sʲeje / 'с'ейе] seems to have a rare occurrence. However, this statement deserves further empirical evidence.

In the indefinite pronouns the long (non contracted) forms prevail over the short (standard) ones in most cases: *takaja* such-indef.f.nom.sg (+4) vs. *taka* (+2); *takuju* such-indef/adj.f.acc.sg (+2); *takoje* such-indef.pron./ adj.n.acc.sg (+2), for example: *a takoje ozero zdaravennoje bulo* [а та'койе 'оз'еро здара'в'ен:ойе бу'ло] but/and-such-indef.n.nom.sg-lake-n.nom.sg-big/huge-adj.nom.sg-be-3pst.impf, 'and there was such a huge lake' vs. *takje* [tak'ʲe / та'к'ʲе] (+1); *takije* [ta'k'ije / та'к'ийе] such-f.nom/acc.pl (+1), for example: *torbi takije* ['торб'і та'к'ийе] bag-f.nom/acc.pl-such-indef.nom./acc. pl, 'such bags' (also, see: Bevzenko, 1980, p. 202). The indefinites have been not mapped in the already mentioned Atlases.

The indefinite pronoun *jakis'* 'some, a certain' (+4) shows little variation from Ukrainian, except for its phonetic realization: the maintainance of the etymological [i] instead of [ɪ]. The Russian-like adjective and indefinite pronoun *každyj* each, everyone etc. was recorded only once.

The interrogative pronoun *xto* who-nom just as the indefinite interrogative *xtos'* [x'tosj] 'someone', at least in their nominative forms, concide with Ukrainian. The oblique cases, due to akannja, approximate to Belarusian. The interrogative pronoun *šo* [ʃo / шо] 'what' [27] with some minimal variations is dotted along the Belarusian and Russian dialectal areas, and it is even plotted in some points of central and north-eastern Russian dialects (DARJA, 1986, I, map 86).

---

[26] The Atlas of eastern Polissian gives a different outcome for this settlement (cf. ASH, 2019, map 280).
[27] Also see: conjunctions.

A certain degree of Ukrainian and Russian influence can be detected in the pronominal use. Nevertheless, the characteristic dialectal pronouns of the Belarusian type are still well preserved in older informants' speech.

5.9. Verbal system

Two hundred and fifty (+250) verbal forms were recorded. The auxiliary *buty* be-inf. remains Ukrainian in all conjugation and moods (+30): *buv* [buṷ / буў] be-3sg.pst.impf.m 'he was', *bulo* [bu'lo / бу'ло] be-3sg.pst.impf.n 'it was', *bulà* [bu'la / бу'ла] be-3sg.pst.impf.f 'she was', *bulì* [bu'l.i бу'лі] be-3pl.pst.impf 'they were'. The form *budet* ['budʲet / 'буд'ет] be-3sg.fut only occurs in one 'Russian' phraseme: *dak kanca kraju nje budet* (дак канца краю нє будєт) 'there will be no end to it' (cf. BTFS, 2021).

The patterns of the present and past tenses (indicative mood) of first and second conjugations are relatively close to standard Ukrainian and, to a certain extent, Belarusian. The local particularities in the present tense are:

• the third person singular of the present tense of I conjugation besides the ending -e/-je (AUM, 1984, I, map 258) as in standard Ukrainian, presents a typical palatalization of the consonant + front vowels, for example: *žyve* [ʒɪ'vʲie / жи'в'iе] live-3sg (+3); id'e [i'dʲe / i'д'e] go-3sg (+2), for example: *starast' id'e, starast'* (старасть iдє, старасть!) 'Old age advances, old age!' etc.

• In the third person singular and plural of the present tense of I and II conjugation the palatalized suffixal endings -yt' (-ить) [-ɪtʲ / -ит'], -ut'/-jut' <-уть/-ють>, and -at'/jat' < -ать/-ять> (AUM 1984, I, map 261) as in standard Ukrainian, prevail over the non-palatalized endings: for example: *ždut'* [ʒ'dutʲ / ж'дут'] wait-3pl.prs. (+10) vs. *behajut* [б·еɡајут] run-3pl.ipfv., (+5), for example: *poky u druhu xatu zajdut', jeny ždut'* [pokɪ u d'ruɦu 'xatu zaṷ'dutʲ, je'ny ʒ'dutʲ / 'поки у д'ругу 'хату заĭдут'/ а йе'ни ждут'] until-adv/prep-in-prep-other-adj.f.acc.sg-home-f. acc.sg-enter-3pl.fut.perf-and-conj-they-3pl. pron.nom-wait-pl.pres, 'until they will go in the other household, they wait'. The already mentioned case of 3 person singular with cekannja was fixed: *letic'* [lʲie'titsʲ / л'е'т'іц'] fly-3sg.pres 'he flies'.

• The first person plural of the present tense generally ends in consonant -*m* (< мъ) without the final vowel <o> (+2) as in *dumajem* think-pl.pres 'we think'. This can be regarded as a cross-dialectal feature (Zhylko, 1966, p. 98). Short forms with the consonantal endings alongside the standard full form: -*mo* may be used in parallel in colloquial Ukrainian and in literary works (often with a stylistic function; Cf. Marchuk (1977, p. 161). They are also reported in many dictionaries as being 'normative'. The first person plural (I conjugation) shows the outcome [om] as in *živ·om* [ʒ'iv·om / ж'iв·ом] 'we live' (+2), instead of the expected [em] see: AUM (1984, I, map 260). A second specificity concerns the palatalization of the first consonant in the verbal stem and [i] instead of [ɪ] <y>, cf. Standard Ukrainian: *čytajemo*, *žyvemo*.

• The 2 person plural also shows the typical palatalization in the combination C' + [i] as in *bač·it'e* [batʃ·itʲie / бач·iт'е] 'you see'.

• The infinitive (+10) has the affixal ending -t' <-ть> for the infinitive in vowel stems for standard Ukrainian -ty <-ти>, for example: *žit'* [ʒitʲ] live-inf (AUM, 1984, I, map 250). This and other local dialects preserve the ending -ti <-ті> for the infinitive in consonant stem and the word stress on the last syllable as in *pektì* 'to bake' and in some other cases: *sest'i* [ˈsʲestʲi / сʲестʲi] inf. perf 'to sit down'; *jest'i* inf.impf 'to eat'; *bač'it'i* [ˈbaʧʲitʲi / баʧʲитʲi], cf. AUM (1984, I, map 251)[28]. Infinitival endings with cekannja were not reported in our recordings but they might sporadically occur.

The future tense of imperfective verbs in most of left bank Polissian dialects (and all along the dialectal belt extending towards the Belarusian territory) are built analytically: buty aux.inf 'be' + infinitive, for example: *bud'eš znat'* [ˈbudʲeˈ zˈnatʲ / ˈбудʲеш знатʲ] 'you will know' (cf. Žylko, 1966, p. 101; AUM, 1984, I, map 263).

The verb *razkazuvat'* 'to tell' (+4) always replaces *rozpovidaty*, for example: *razkazuvav* [razˈkazuvaṷ / розˈказуваў] 3sg.pst.impf 'he told/narrated'; the verb *ždat'* 'to wait', largely found in literature, is the only known form (SUM, 1971, II, p. 516). The recommended standard equivalent *čekaty* is extraneous to large central and eastern dialectal areas. The compound imperative *padaždi* [падажˈді] 'wait' may formally coincide with Russian or with other Belarusian dialects because of the prefix *pad-* with akannja instead of Ukrainian *pid-*. The average Ukrainian speaker, especially of western Ukrainian varieties, may perceive these forms as Russianisms or as the result of Ukrainian-Russian hybridization but they are to be ascribed to Ukrainian (SUM, 1975, VI, p. 475). Other typical verbs are: *pamahaty* 'to help' (+1); *ponjav* [ˈponʲaṷ / ˈпонʲаў] 'I understood' or, in the sense, 'did you understand? have you got it?'; the latter always replaces the Ukrainian *zrozumiv* (or the B *zrazumiev*); the often mentioned *rabiť* 'to work' or *rabotat'* replace the standard *pracjuvaty* (cf. R *rabotat'*; B *pracavac'*).

5.9.1. Modality

Assumption (possibility, epistemic modality), "it may / can be", perhaps", also for Zaderiïvka, just as for the entire dialectal area, and colloquial Ukrainian, is conveyed by *može* or, by its apocopated (elision) adverbial *mo'* [ˈmo], for example: *nu my dumajem, može prapav kudy, može šo z nym stalosja* [nu mi[ɪ] ˈdumajem, ˈmoʒe praˈpav kuˈdɪ, ˈmoʒe ʃo z nɪm sʲˈtalosʲa / ну ми ˈдумайем, ˈможе праˈпаў куˈди, ˈможе шо з ним сʲˈталосʲа] well-interj-we-1pl-think-1pl.pres-maybe/possibly-mod-disappear-3sg.pst.perf-maybe/possibly-mod-something-indef-with-prep-he-3sg.m.dat-happen-3sg.m.pst.perf, 'well, we think that he probably disappeared (got lost) somewhere, perhaps something happened to him'.

---

[28] It is worth pointing out that the dialectal dichotomy essentially reflects the Ukrainian literary tradition where both affixal endings: 1) the (long infinitival form) -ty and 2) the (short infinitival form) -t' are acceptable as witnessed in many 19th and early 20th centuries Ukrainian writers and their literary works, e.g. Kvitka-Osnov″iankenko, Nechui-Levyts′kyi, etc. The short infinitives often play a specific functional-stylistic role, thus characterizying certain literary and colloquial styles. Cf. Marchuk (1977, pp. 145—147). In the documents of the second half of the17th c. from Left Bank Ukraine both infinitive forms are found without stylistic differentiation. (ibid.; also, see Samoilenko, 1971, p. 26).

Necessity is rendered either by the predicative *nada* ['nada / 'нада] 'it is necessary', 'one must/should' or by its parallel *treba*, often realized as [tr'ieba]) + verb or noun. The form *nada* is more frequently used than *treba* in the recorded texts: 3 vs. 1, for example: *nada bulo* ['nada bu'lo] 'it was necessary'.

Prohibition is generally expressed by both the Ukrainian-like *n'e možna* [nje 'moʒna] 'it is impossible, not allowed' (+1) and/or the Russian-like predicative *n'el'ʒja* [nʲelʲ'zʲa / н'ел'з'а] (+1) with some idiolectal and local variations. Yet, if a more categorical/emphatic prohibition is implied, then *n'el'ʒja* seems to prevail, for example: *i nel'ʒja bulo karovu dajit'* [i nˑelʲ'zʲa bu'lo ka'rovu d'ajiтʲ / і н'ел"з'а бу'ло ка'рову д'аіт'] and-conj-impossible-pred-cow-f.acc.sg-milk-inf.impf, 'and it was impossible to milk the cow'.

The predicative *nema(je)* [nʲe'ma] 'there is (are) not..., not any', with different degrees of palatalization of the C + V, is the usual form also for this local dialect (+4), for example: *a tam n'e kartapliny ničoho niema* [a tam nʲe kartap'lɪnɪ nʲi'ʧoha nʲe'ma / а там н'е картап'л'іни н'і'чога н'е'ма] but-conj-there-adv-not-neg-potato-nom.pl-nothing/anything-pron-there is not-pred, 'and/but there is no potatoes, nothing is there'.

6. SYNTACTIC CHARACTERISTICS

The local dialectal syntax presents the typical characteristics of spontaneous, colloquial speech. There is a large use of discourse markers (adverbs, conjunctions, particles). The most common are: *dak* 'so, thus, then' (+30), *šo* 'that, what' (+10) as in *tak (dak) šo* 'so that' (+5), *nu* 'well' (+15), the emphatic *ž(e)* (+20), etc.

In most recorded fragments one notes short, simple sentences (utterances) and, mainly, paratactic constructions. Hypotaxis is tendentially more limited. Therefore, the use of coordinating conjunctions tend to prevail over the subordinating conjunctions.

As usual, the most typical subordinators are: *šo* [29] 'that'; *bo* 'because, for, since'. The former generally introduces an objective clause, while the latter a causal clause (cf. standard U. *bo, oskil'ky* (оскільки), *tomu ščo* (тому що) etc.

These fragments can clearly illustrate the different use of subordinators and discourse markers: *dak baba naša kazala n'e kladiet' tudy, bo na perexresnoj daroze ljudej pavešali, dak n'e nada* [dak 'baba 'naʃa 'kazala nʲe kla'dietʲ tu'dɪ, bo na pˑerʲe'xrʲesnoj dar'ozʲˑe lʲu'dʲej pa'veʃalʲi, dak nʲe 'nada / дак 'баба 'наша 'казала н'е кла'діет' ту'ди, бо на п'ер'е'хр'есној да'роз'е л'уд'ей па'вешал'і, дак н'е 'нада] so-adv-our-adj.poss.nom.sg.f-say-3sg.f.pst.impf-not-neg-lay-2sg.imp-there-adv since-conj.sub-on-prep-cross-adj-road-f.loc.sg-people-gen.pl-hang-3pl.pst.impf so/then- adv/conj-not-neg-need/necessary, 'so our grandma said don't lay there since they used to hang people on the cross-roads, therefore don't do it'.

---

[29] This form is also a typical marker of non-standard Ukrainian varieties, including the so called Ukrainian-Russian mix "Surzhyk".

Temporal or time clauses are often introduced by *jak* in the sense of *koly* 'when'; other time adverbials are: *kalis'* 'once'; *jak tol'ki* 'as soon as', for example: *jak tol'ki pad pervaje dereva budeš sypat'* [jak 'tol'k·i pad p·ervaje dʲereva budʲeʃ sıpatʲ / jak 'тол'к.i пад п·ервaje дʹерева буд′еш сипат′] as soon as-conj.time -under-prep-first-num.ord.acc.sg-tree-n.acc.sg-be-aux.2sg-strew-inf.ipfv, 'as soon as you will strew / pour under the first tree', etc.

Interrogative questions in this just as in neighbouring local dialects, besides intonation and question words, are expressed by means of the particle (also conjunction) *či/čy* [ʧ·i/ʧı] Q. 'whether, if' which are sentence-initial (+3); cf. MoU (Press & Pugh, 2005, p. 291), В *ci* (ці) and P *czy*. Here, the interrogative particle *čy*, (formally identical with standard Ukrainian), occupies the first position in the sentence, immediately followed by the subject, in contrast with Russian where the first element is the verb, thus having a different word order. Therefore, dialect interrogative sentences adopt a word order type: Q + sbj + V, for example: *čy v·i na velike?* Q-you. 2sg.nom -bike-f.ins.sg 'are you by bike?' [30]

Conditional clauses are generally introduced by the following conjunctions: *jak* 'how/when'; *kali* [ka'l'i] 'if/when'; *jesli* 'if'. A condition is most often expressed by the time conjunction *kali* in traditional dialectal speech of this area, for example: *kali bud'e vremja, pakažu rabotu* [ka'l'i 'budʲe w'remja, paka'ʒu ra'botu] cf. В *kali*, U *koly*.

A subjunctive-conditional clause is usually conveyed by the conjunction *jakby* [jak'bı] 'if, if only'. This wish or a hypothetic condition may be either fulfilled or may not, for example: *jakby u mine bula b mašyna* [jak'bı u m·ie'n'ie bu'la b ma'ʃına / йак'би у м·iен''ie бу'ла б ма'шина] if-conj-by-prep-me-gen.sg-be-3sg.pst-car-nom.sg 'if I had a car'.

A comparative clause may be also introduced by the above mentioned *jak* (+5) and *nače* (+1) 'as if, as though' as in standard Ukrainian; for example: *i jon stal takym ručnym, buй jak damašnij pitomec u nas* [i jon s'tal ta'kım ruʧ'nım, buu̯ jak da'maʃn'iį pi'tomʲets u nas / i йон стал та'ким руч'ним/ буў/ йак да'машн'iï п′i'том'ец у нас] and-conj-become-3sg.pst.perf-such-indf-tame-adj.indf-be-3sg.pst-as-conj-domestic-adj.nom-foster-child-nom-by-prep-we-1pl.gen 'he became so (such) tame, he was just like a domestic foster child at home'.

Final (purpose) clauses are generally introduced by *šob* (+5) 'in order to, so that' as in most non-standard varieties of Ukrainian, including URMS, for example: *ja uže behala, šob valoй vadit'* [ja uʒe 'bʲeɦala, ʃob va'lou̯ va'dʲitʲ / да йа ўже 'б′егала, шоб ва'лоў ва'д′iт′] I-1sg-already-adv-run-3sg.f.pst.ipfv-in order-purp-ox-acc.pl-lead-inf.impf, 'I already ran (in order) to lead the oxen'.

A consecutive clause is often expressed by *tak šo* (так шо) 'so that' (+1) as in all east Slavic languages or be the already mentioned *dak* (дак) 'therefore, in consequence'.

---

[30] The Ukrainian-like syntactic construction also characterizes some basic Ukrainian-Russian mixed varieties (cf. Surzhyk prototype; Del Gaudio, 2010, p. 167).

A direct question is often introduced by *čaho* [ʧˑaˈho / ча'го] 'why', cf. colloquial Ukrainian / *čoho* (чого) and Russian *čego* (чего), for example: *a čaˈho ž vien u vas*? [a ʧˑaˈho ʒ vieⁿ u vas? / а ча'го ж віеⁿ у вас?] and-conj-why-q + interj-he-3sg.nom-by-prep-you-2pl.gen, 'and why (then) is he at your place?'.

The possessive construction (Be-type): *u mˈenⁱe* (*je*) / (jest') [u mˈienˈⁱe (je)] by-prep-me-gen-be-3sg + nom. 'I have' with some morphophonological variation of the personal pronouns (see: pronouns) is the only construction used dialectally (+5), for example: *u mˈenˈⁱe še brat mˈenšyj jest'* [u mˈieˈnⁱe ʃe bˈrat ˈmⁱenⁱʃiⁱ jestⁱ / у м'ен'е ше брат 'м'ен'шиї йест] by-prep-me-gen. sg-still-adv-young-adj.comp-be-3sg, 'I still have got a younger brother'. The parallel and normative Ukrainian construction ('habere' type): *maty*-aux-have + acc is mainly extraneous to this dialectal area. In the collected material, the BE-construction type was recorded 5 times vs. zero occurrence of the have + acc type. The same pattern occurs in the past and in negative sentences, for example: *u mˈenˈe buly husi* [u mⁱeˈnⁱe buˈlı ˈɦusi / у м·їен·е бу'ли 'гусі] by-prep-me-gen.sg-be-3sg.pst-goose-pl, 'I had geese'.

6.1. Other typical constructions

The usual syntactic agreement of numerals essentially coincides with standard Ukrainian and Belarusian: the cardinal 2, 3, and 4 + the nominative plural, for example: *štyry hody* 'four years'; *dvadcjat' dva kilometry* [dˈvatsⁱatⁱ dva kⁱiˈlomⁱetrı / д'вадц'ат' два к'і'лом'етри] twenty two-num.card-kilometre-nom.pl.m 'twenty two kilometres' (AUM, 1984, I, maps 274, 275; DABM, 1963, maps 206, 207, 208). An exception to this pattern is made by some recurrent constructions (set phrases): *dva* + raza (derived from the old dual) two-num.card-time-gen.sg.m 'two times'; *d'nej može try* [dˈnⁱei̯ ˈmoʒe trı / д'н'еї 'може три] day-gen.pl-maybe-mod-three-num.card 'maybe three days' (cf. Russian). This type of constructions is well-rooted in many non-standard varieties of Ukrainian, including "Surzhyk".

Collective numeric constructions follow a generalized East Slavic pattern: *pril'et'elo četvera busloŭ* [prılⁱeˈtⁱela ˈʧˑetvⁱera busloų̯ / пріл'е'т'ело 'четв'ера бус'лоў] fly-3sg.pst.perf-four-coll-stork-m.gen.pl, 'four storks flew in'.

The noun sabaka 'dog' agrees twice with a masculine verb as in Ukrainian and Belarusian and once with the feminine as in Russian: *sabaka zahavkala* [saˈbaka zaˈɦawkala / са'бака за'гавкала] vs *sabaka zahavkaŭ* [saˈbaka zaˈhaų̯ kaų̯ / сабака за'гаўкаў] 'the dog barked'.

Adverbial means expressed by the prepositional phrase na + ins as in standard Russian rather than the instrumental simplex of the noun, compare: *na mašynie* [na maˈʃınⁱⁱe / на ма'шин^rе] prep-car-f.loc.sg 'by car' instead of *mašynoju* car-f.inst.sg However, it is worth remembering that the tendency of recommending the instrumental simplex in most adverbial constructions (e.g. mean, instrument, way etc.) has become typical of the latest prescriptive recommendations of academic circles, for example: *piši postoju, vajberom, skajpom* 'write by post (mail), viber, skype' etc.

7. LEXICAL FEATURES

The dialect of Zaderiïvka shares with all the related local dialects and, more at large, with all northeastern Ukrainian standard and non-standard varieties the same (or at least very similar) word stock. The most common nouns (+310 units) will be classified into five lexical-semantic fields [31]: 1) names of kinship; 2) rural and local lexis; 3) archaisms and denominations of disappearing professions; 4) alleged and real Belarusianisms; 5) alleged and real Russianisms.

7.1. Kinship terms: *matka* 'mother' (+7) prevails over its parallel *mama* (+3). The form *matka* is idiosyncratic of older dialectal speakers: many dictionaries define it as a dialectal word (SUM, 1973, IV, p. 651).

Other recurrent kinship terms are: *bat'ka* (+5) 'father' and the variant *bat'ko* without akannja (+1); *papa* 'dad' (+2), *vnuk* [w'nuk / ў'нук] 'grandson' (+2); *anuka* 'granddaughter' (+2); *brat* (+3) 'brother'; *d'et'i* ['dʲetʲi / 'дʹетʹі] 'children' (+1); *mužčina* [mu'ʒʧ·ina / му'жч·іна] 'man' (+1); *pop* 'priest' (+1) with the etymological [o]; *dievka* ['dʲiewka / 'дʹіеўка] 'girl, maid' (+1) along with the parallel (Russian) *d'evočka* ['dʲevoʧka / 'дʹевочка] (+1); the typical East Slavic colloquial *baba* (+3) 'old woman' or 'grandmother' which may also take over a derogatory connotation.

The few phrasemes found in the text may coincide with Ukrainian spoken and literary varieties: *poideš zamuž* [p'oidʲeʃ 'zamuʒ / п'оідʹеш 'замуж] 'you will get married' (+1).

As noted, names of kinship do not substantial vary across Slavic and, especially, East Slavic standard and non-standard varieties.

7.2. Rural and local lexis: *akop* 'trench, entrenchment' (+1) with akannja and etymological [o]; *harod* [ɦa'rod] 'vegetable garden' (+2) with akannja; *hod* 'year' (Hrinchenko, 1997, 1, pp. 296—297; SUM, 1971, 2, p. 102; Lysenko, 1974, p. 114) [32]; *kartoplja* 'potato' (+4) as in standard Ukrainian. According to other field data, the parallel form *kartoška* [kar'toʃka / кар'тошка] is also possible (AUM 1984, I, map 312); *kon'* [konʲ / конʹ] 'horse' (+1) with the typical etymological [o]; *karova* [ka'rova / ка'рова] 'cow' (+2) with akannja; *byk* ['bɪk / 'бик] 'bull' (+1); *val* 'ox' (+1), cf. U. vil; *matuzka* [ma'tuzka / ма'тузка] 'cord' (+1); *kufajka* [ku'faĭka / ку'файка] 'sweater, quilted coat' (+1), cf. U *fufajka*; *busol* 'stork' (+5), in other Ukrainian varieties: *busel, leleka* etc. (cf. AUM, 1984, I, map 324); *suslo* 'must', 'wort' (+1); *duplo* 'hollow' (+1); *s'mettja* [smʲetʲ:a / смʹе'т:а] 'litter, rubish' (+2); *xvojnik* [xvojnʲik / хвойнʹік] 'bush/Ephedra'(+1); *pervyj* ['pʲervyj / 'пʹервий] 'first' (+3); *plot* 'fence'(+1); *v'enik* ['vʲenʲik / 'вʹенʹік] 'groom'(+1); *kraxmal* 'starch or amylum'(+1); *hn'ez'do* [ɦnʲez'do / гнʹез'до] 'nest' (+1); *koržyk* ['korʒɪk / 'коржик]'dry biscuit' (+1); *ljada* [lʲa'da / лʹа'да] 'meadow' (+1); *stoh* [s'toɦ / с'тог] 'stack' (+1) with etymological [o]; *kublo* [kub'lo / куб'ло] 'nest' (+1), cf. AUM (1984, I, map 325).

---

[31] Only the nominative form will be given.
[32] For further details about this and other dialectisms, see Danylenko (1999, p. 233).

7.3. Archaisms and historic lexemes: *jazyk* [ja'zık / ja'зик] 'language' (+1) (cf. SUM, 1980, 11, p. 627); *zaslanka* [za'slanka / за'сланка] 'convicted, deportee' (+1); *kalxoz* 'collective farm, kolkhoz' (U. *kolhosp* / колгосп).

7.4. Alleged and real Belarusianisms: Belarusian-like lexemes, in our recordings, concern a series of adverbials and pronouns (cf. section on morphology) and some common vocabulary: the above mentioned *matka* 'mother' (Lysenko, 1974, p. 124); *(a)harod* 'vegetable garden' (+2) and few other nouns with clear-cut akannja (see: table above); B dial. *ulica* ['ulʲica / 'улʼіца] (+2); *paйsotn'i* [paйsotnʲi / паўсотн'і] num.pl. 'half a hundred' (+1) etc.

The attribution of lexemes, in particular nouns, which formally coincide with their Belarusian equivalents or whose phonetic realization is very close to Belarusian standard and non-standard varieties may depend on the criteria adopted. It is understood that the persistent dialect contact, especially in the Soviet period when there was practically no border control, plays a fundamental role.

7.5. Alleged and real Russianisms: the number of presumed and/or actual Russian lexemes is generally relevant. This influence may affect different speech levels and word classes. The most common nouns concern everyday and technical vocabulary: *bel'o* [b'e'lʲo / б'е'лʼо] 'bed linen, sheets' (+1); *l'od* [lʲod /лʼод] 'ice' (+1); *vadapravod* 'water pipe' (+1); *pitomec* [p'i'tomʲec / п'і'томʼец] 'foster-child' (in the specific context: 'domestic animal'); *vaprosy* [vap'rosı / вап'роси] 'questions' (+1) (the Ukrainian "pytannja" may also be heard); *planirovka* 'layout' (+1); *zv'ozdy* [z'v·ozdı / зв·озди] 'stars' (+1); *kryša* 'roof' (+2); the above mentioned *d'evočka* (+1) etc.

The cardinal points (cardinal directions) as usual follow the Church Slavonic / Russian terminology: *vastok* 'east' (+3). Word-stock of Church Slavonic origin includes many ecclesiastical designations and state of mind, for example: *stradanije* 'suffering' (+1) and similar.

As for the case of Belarusian influence, a certain degree of formal resemblance may also depend on the historical-typological characteristics of these local dialects and the uninterrupted language interaction with Russian varieties.

8. CONCLUSION

This paper adds a further piece of research to a larger study on the specificity of East Polissian border dialects evaluated in a broader East Slavic language context. Despite the mainly descriptive approach of this article, there are some points which favour further theoretical reflection and deserve additional empirical verification.

The foregoing survey has confirmed that older speakers preserve most of those distinctive features traditionally assigned to the dialectal territory situated across the Ukrainian-Belarusian and, one could add, Russian border areas. Some of the isoglosses characterizing Zaderiïvka and neighbouring

local dialects are chiefly manifest at the phonetic-phonological and morpho-syntactic levels.

The similarity with Belarusian varieties can be explained according to three, often overlapping, factors:

a) the intrinsic structure of these border dialects; b) the presence of language relicts testifying the extension of the Belarusian language territory on the Ukrainian side of the political border (Karskii, 1903); c) the existence of an originally larger and more homogeneous language area coinciding with former political-administrative partition of the East Slavia (see Del Gaudio, 2018, p. 82).

The lexis, as known, is a less rigid language segment and therefore more liable to external influence. In this case, the standard languages spoken in this region, in particular Ukrainian and Russian, tend to affect scientific-technical, legal and, to a certain extent, everyday vocabulary. It should be repeated, however, that a relatively high percentage of (contemporary) standard Ukrainian lexemes are tendentially peripheral to these local dialects and, more in general, to the central and eastern Polissian language area. When in standard Ukrainian there are doublets or a wider synonymic choice, the specific dialectal form frequently overlaps with Belarusian and/or Russian vocabulary. Russian (and its varieties), as often reiterated, has been functioning as the principal *lingua franca* in these border areas for over a century.

LEGEND

ASH — Marieiev, D. A. (2019). *Atlas skhidnopolisʹkykh hovirok*. Kyiv: Instytut Ukraïnsʹkoï Movy NAN (in Ukrainian).

AUM — Matviias, I. H., Zakrevsʹka, Ia. V., & Zalesʹkyi, A. M. (Eds.). (1984—2001). *Atlas ukraïnsʹkoï movy*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

BTFS — *Bolʹshoi tolkovo-fraseologicheskii slovarʹ Mikhelʹsona*. https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/michelson_new/4391/%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%BD%D1%86%D0%B0 (in Russian).

DABM — Avanesau, R. I. (Ed.). (1963). *Dyialektalahichny atlas belaruskai movy*. Minsk: Vydavetstva Akademi Navuk BSSR (in Belarussian).

DARJA — Bromlei, S. V. (Ed.). (1989). *Dialektologicheskii atlas russkogo iazyka*. Centr evropeiskoi chasti SSSR (Vol. 2: Morfologiia). Moscow: Nauka (in Russian).

SUM — Biloshtan, A. P., Boiko, M. F., Hradova, V. P., Kolesnyk, H. M., Petrovsʹka, O. P., Iurchuk, L. A., & Dotsenko, P. P. (Eds.). (1971). *Slovnyk ukraïnsʹkoï movy* (Vols. 1—11). Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

REFERENCES

Bevzenko, S. F., Hryshchenko, A. P., Lukinova, T. B., Nimchuk, V. V., Rusanivsʹkyi, V. M., & Samiilenko, S. P. (1978). *Istoriia ukraïnsʹkon movy: Morfolohiia*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Bevzenko, S. F. (1980). *Ukraïnsʹka dialektolohiia*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola (in Ukrainian).

Biryla, M. V., & Shuba, P. P. (1985). *Belaruskaia hramatyka u dzviukh chastkakh*. Minsk: Navuka i tekhnika (in Belarusian).

Danylenko, A. (1999). Shche raz pro vysokyi stylʹ u Potebnevim perekladi "Odisseï". *Wiener Slawistisches Jahrbuch, 45*, 231—250 (in Ukrainian).

Del Gaudio, S. (2010). *On the nature of suržyk: a double perspective*. München — Berlin — Wien: Otto Sagner.

Del Gaudio, S. (2015). Linguistic ideology and language changes in contemporary Ukrainian grammar and lexis. *Die Welt der Slaven, 50,* 145—165.

Del Gaudio, S. (2017). *An introduction to Ukrainian dialectology.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Del Gaudio, S. (2018). Between three languages, dialects and forms of mixed speech: Language and dialect contacts in Ukrainian-Belarusian transitional area. In L. Salmon, G. Ziffer Giorgio, & M. G. Ferro (Eds.), *Contributi italiani al XVI Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Belgrado, 20—27 agosto 2018)* (pp. 79—93). Firenze: FUP.

Fasmer, M. (1986—1987). *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka* (Vols. 1—4). Moscow: Progress (in Russian).

Hancov, V. M. (1928). Dialektni mezhi na Chernihivshchyni. In M. Hrushevs'kyi (Ed.), *Zapysky Ukraïns'koho Naukovoho Tovarystva v Kyïvi. Zbirnyk. Chernihiv i pivnichne Livoberezhzhia* (pp. 262—280). Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukraïny (in Ukrainian).

Hrinchenko, B. D. (1996—1997). *Slovar' ukraïns'koï movy* (Vols. 1—4). Kyiv: Dovira (Original work published 1907—1909) (in Ukrainian).

Karskii, E. F. (1903). *Bělorussy* (Vol. 1: Vvedenie v izuchenie iazyka i narodnoi Slovesnosti). Warsaw: Tipografiia Varshavskago Uchebnago Okruga (in Russian).

Lysenko, P. S. (1974). *Slovnyk polis'kykh hovoriv.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Marchuk, N. I. (1977). Diieslivni formy ukraïns'koï literaturnoï movy v ïx zv''iazkakh z narodnymy hovoramy. In M. A. Zhovtobriukh (Ed.), *Ukraïns'ka literaturna mova v ïï vzaiemodiï z terytorial'nymy dialektamy* (pp. 144—166). Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Press, I., & Pugh, S. (2005). *Ukrainian: A comprehensive grammar.* London — New York: Routledge.

Rada.gov.ua (2021). http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/z7503/A005?rf7571=40991 (in Ukrainian).

Samoilenko, L. A. (1971). *Sistema slovoizmeneniia v pamiatnikakh ukrainskoi delovoi pis'mennosti levoberezhnoi Ukrainy vtoroi poloviny XVII v.* [Dissertation summary for the Candidate of Philological Sciences degree, Odes'kyi Derzhavnyi Universytet] (in Russian).

Shevelov, G. Y. (1979). *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.

Wexler, P. (1977). *A historical phonology of the Belorussian language.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.

Zhovtobriukh, M. A., Rusanivs'kyi, V. M., & Skliarenko, V. H. (1979). *Istoriia ukraïns'koï movy. Fonetyka.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Zhylko, F. T. (1953). Perekhidni hovirky vid ukraïns'koï do bilorus'koï movy v pivnichno-zakhidnykh raionakh Chernihivshchyny. *Dialektolohichnyi Biuleten', 4,* 7—20 (in Ukrainian).

Zhylko, F. T. (1966a). *Fonolohichni osoblyvosti ukraïns'koï movy v porivnianni z inshymy slov''ians'kymy.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Zhylko, F. T. (1966b). *Narysy z dialektolohiï ukraïns'koï movy.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Сальваторе дель Ґаудіо, доктор філософії, професор кафедри романської філології
та порівняльно-типологічного мовознавства, Інститут філології,
Київський університет ім. Бориса Грінченка
вул. Тимошенка, 13 Б, м. Київ, 04212
Стипендіат фонду фон Гумбольдта, Інститут славістики,
Грейфсвальдський університет, Німеччина
E-mail: s.delgaudio@kubg.edu.ua; sadega@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8441-749X

ГОВІРКА С. ЗАДЕРІЇВКИ (ЧЕРНІГІВЩИНА) У СХІДНОСЛОВ'ЯНСЬКОМУ КОНТЕКСТІ

Лінгвістичний опис говірки с. Задеріївки колишнього Ріпкинського району Чернігівської області заповнює невеликий сегмент ґрунтовного дослідження, присвяченого вивченню місцевих говірок, якими розмовляють жителі крайньої північно-західної частини Чернігівщини. Ці говірки, відповідно до загальноприйнятої класифікації, належать до північно-східного (або східно-поліського) діалектного масиву і також відомі як «перехідні з української до білоруської мови». Через переважно описовий характер цієї розвідки, деякі теоретичні й дискусійні питання залишаймо поза увагою.

У вступних розділах викладено найголовніші геоісторичні факти про село й застосовану методологію для збору діалектних даних. Дослідження зосереджено на описі суттєвих діалектних особливостей. Аналіз здійснено на основі звичайних лінгвістичних рівнів: фонетико-фонологічного, меншою мірою словотвірного, морфологічного, синтаксичного і лексичного.

Факт, що с. Задеріївка скартографовано в *Атласі української мови* (населений пункт 65), сприяє подальшому порівнянню з іншими місцевими варіантами та є важливим чинником для виявлення більш сучасних тенденцій та можливих латентних змін у досліджуваному ареалі.

Мета дослідження полягає у збільшені вже наявних фактичних матеріалів і, водночас, у сприянні подальших теоретичних міркувань про характеристику й походження пограничних діалектів.

Ключові слова: східнослов'янська діалектологія, північноукраїнські (східно-поліські) говори, Задеріївка, говірка, пограничні діалекти