THE ARCHAIC FEATURES OF EAST SLAVIC – UKRAINIAN DIALECTS

Tatiana Kołodyńska

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Lublin, Poland
ORCID: 0000-0003-1801-0509

Abstract. The article is devoted to the archaic quality of East Slavic-Ukrainian dialects occurring in the territory of Poland. The analysis of the dialect material includes selected archaic dialectal features of a homogeneous meaning that occur in the group of South--West Ukrainian dialects, e.g. in: Lemko, Nadsanie, Podlachian, Boyko, Transnistrian in the territory of Poland and Transcarpathian in the territory of Ukraine. The analysis of archaic phenomena was made on the basis of source materials: dictionaries, dialectological studies and self-excerpted dialectal material from the indigenous population of Ukrainian origin who were the carriers of the studied dialects.

The article presents some phonetic archaisms from the area of Ukrainian dialects both in Poland and in Ukraine, which constitute a systemic feature of these dialects, and evidence of the existence of ancient linguistic forms contained in specific language transmissions, functioning in the area for several centuries.

Attention is also drawn to sume lexical, and morphological archaisms, insourcing in the presented dialects as an individual, but also systemic linguistic phenomenon of ancient origin.

The presentation of selected phonetic, morphological and linguistic archaic features was carried out on the basis of available studies and materials in the field of Ukrainian dialectology, as well as our own records of dialects from the Nadsanie area, which consisted of tape recordings of residents of the region and handwritten notes. It was important to show archaisms as a feature that determines territorial and linguistic (dialect) continuity despite existing borders and political divisions. The historical context outlined indicates the socio-political conditions under which the Ukrainian-speaking community functioned, using various territorial dialects that exist today under different geopolitical conditions. The Ukrainian dialects in question at the modern stage of development function in a modified form, which involves numerous changes within the phonetic, morphological and lexical system. The number of the oldest dialect bearers, using dialects in archaic form, is also successively decreasing.

The presented examples of phonetic, morphological and lexical archaisms in various territorially diverse Ukrainian dialects confirm the existence of common developmental processes resulting from the internal development of East Slavic (Ukrainian) dialect systems, as well as indicate close territorial inter-dialect links.

Key words: Ukrainian dialects, archaisms, south-west, analysis.

For centuries, the territory of Poland has been an area where languages, dialects, cultures, religions as well as the West Slavic-Polish (Latin) and East Slavic-Ruthenian (Ukrainian) traditions permeate. Mutual international contacts as well as fights for border territories resulted in the shifting of state borders, but they did not manage to shift the living linguistic and dialectal legacy and their indigenous representatives living in the territories of north-eastern and south-eastern Poland. The presence of representatives of Ukrainian and Belarusian dialects is an irrefutable proof of the existence of East Slavic linguistic and dialectal heritage in Poland. While discussing the archaic nature of Ukrainian dialects, special attention should be paid to the territory and range of their occurrence, stages of development and the current state of the dialects. Research on the East Slavic dialects in this area should take into account historical and factual data, as well as an analysis of the East Slavic language system in diachronic and synchronous terms, as well as the influence of civilisation on changes and new phenomena occurring in dialects at the present stage of development. In this article, special attention is paid to the archaic features of South-West Ukrainian dialects occurring in the territory of Poland: Boyko, Lemko, Nadsanie, Transnistrian, Podlachian, and in Transcarpathian, located in the territory of Ukraine.

The presence of Ukrainian dialects within the borders of Poland is closely related to the history of folk names, which has been studied by various researchers – both Ukrainian and Polish. In the territory of Poland, the Ukrainian dialect of south-eastern Podlachia is currently used by the Ukrainian-speaking indigenous population. Historically, this area lying on both sides of the Cherven Cities on the left bank of the Bug, later part of the Włodawa County, has long been a place of permeating and intermingling of Polish and Ukrainian ethnic and linguistic elements[1]. In these lands, under certain political, administrative and religious conditions, mutual influences of the Polish and Ukrainian language systems took place. Ukrainian was spoken by the rural population, which for centuries constituted the dominant percentage of the inhabitants here. Such a linguistic situation existed in the lands located on both sides of the Włodawka at least from the 14th century, i.e. from the time, according to onomastic studies, of the first stage of settlement[2].

The area lying on the left bank of the Bug River from Uhrusk in the south to Jabłeczna in the north was inhabited in the 16th–17th centuries, as it can be concluded from the large number of tserkovs located in this zone, by

---

[1]   F. Czyżewski, *Fonetyka i fonologia gwar polskich i ukraińskich południowo-wschodniego Podlasia*, Lublin 1994, p. 11.

[2]   Cf. B. Czopek, *Nazwy miejscowe dawnej ziemi chełmskiej i bełskiej (w granicach dzisiejszego państwa polskiego)*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1988, p. 151; F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 12.

the Orthodox population[3]. Polish settlement extended to the south and east of this part of the area in some places, which is also indirectly indicated by local names, such as Wola (Wyryki - Wola 24) and Lach (<Lach 'Pole'). It is more likely, however, that only the Polish administration was here[4]. The earliest records of most of the villages in this area come from the 15th – 16th centuries; from 1564: Wołosza (point 25), Brus (26), Kołacze (29), Maszochin (41); from 1462, Hansk (34); from 1483 Ossow (35)[5]. In the 16th century, the town of Włodawa belonged to prince Kiejstut in the Kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia. The first information is the Ruthenian entry from 1502 for the name of the Volodave River, and the Polish one from 1540 *pisan w Włodawie*[6]. In turn, the name of the settlement Hanna (12), located in the north-east, appears for the first time in 1500 as Hana[7].

South of the Włodawka, as a result of post-war resettlement, a small percentage of people who knew the Ukrainian dialect remained. The largest number of people speaking the Ukrainian dialect is in the Wola Uhruska commune (there is an Orthodox church in Uhrusk), generally it can be stated that the Ukrainian dialects in this part of the studied area are dialects isolated from the influences of other Ukrainian dialects. They represent, as it were, the state from before 1939. When assessing the language contacts in this area, it can be stated, using the terminology proposed by E. Smułkowa[8], that we have examples of both linguistic accommodation and assimilation. Accommodation is based on the exchangeability (depending on the situation: official – home) of the Polish and Ukrainian dialect systems. This is the case in the northern part of the studied area. On the other hand, assimilation, understood as a deliberate choice (or necessity) of a part of the rural community to depart from the Ukrainian system and to use the Polish dialect instead, is observed south of the Włodawka. Examples of assimilation are now becoming common in the entire area of the occurrence of Ukrainian dialects in Poland among the middle generation. The result of accommodation is bilingualism, and of assimilation – monolingualism[9]. The degree of differentiation (distance) of the systems that come into linguistic contact, i.e. Ukrainian and Polish, in the studied area is the same as the one between the languages of the West

---

[3]   F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 12. See also: F. Czyżewski, *Atlas gwar polskich i ukraińskich okolic Włodawy*, Lublin 1986, p. XXVII m. C.

[4]   F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 12.

[5]   Cf. B. Czopek, op. cit., p. 158–205; F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 12.

[6]   Cf. S. Warchoł, *Nazwy miast Lubelszczyzny,* wyd. UMCS, Lublin 1964.

[7]   Cf. F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 12.; Rospond S., *Słownik etymologiczny miast i gmin PRL,* Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk-Łódź 1984. Wyd. Zakład Naukowy im. Ossolińskich.

[8]   Z. Smułkowa, *Zagadnienia polsko-białorusko-litewskiej interferencji językowej na ziemiach północno-wschodniej Polski,* wyd. ZPSS VII, 1988, p. 395-405.

[9]   Ibidem, p. 403.

Slavic and East Slavic groups. The following relationship is generally known: the closer the (genetic) similarity between the systems, the more active their interpenetration and the clearer the users' awareness of the features that differ between the two language systems[10], which often leads to linguistic substitutions and hyper-correctness. Both language systems (Ukrainian and Polish), used alternately by the inhabitants of the studied areas, are subject to mutual linguistic interference[11].

Descriptions of East Slavic-Ukrainian dialects analyze ranges of linguistic features, differences in relation to other dialects, or features common with other dialects, but above all, the genesis of individual elements of the system is indicated. It is generally known that dialects located on the periphery of the formation of a given language, such as Włodawa (according to F. Czyżewski, these are both Polish and Ukrainian dialects located in the former Włodawa County), Nadsanie, Lemko, Boyko, Podlachian dialects, are the result of both the proto-language evolution and the interference of a neighbouring language. Determining the genesis of the studied dialects, i.e. determining which of the elements of the described dialect system are the result of native development, and which of linguistic interference, is possible only with the use of the dialectological method[12]. Showing the genesis of individual elements of the dialectal system described can be realised using the aforementioned dialectological method, which, according to Karol Dejna, "using dialectographic data on the range and connections of dialectal features in old monuments and reconstructions of the original state obtained with the methods of comparative linguistics, as well as taking into account the physiographic, demographic, political and cultural data as well as the conditions of development of individual population groups, studies the diachronous processes of separating distinct dialects in certain parts of the ethno-linguistic territory […]"[13]. The adoption of this method will show whether, and to what extent, individual dialect features are the result of the evolution of a particular language, and to what extent – the interference of a coexisting one. The full application of this method is impossible in the case of the Włodawa and Nadsanie dialects, among others due to the lack of works devoted to the description of linguistic monuments in the vicinity of Włodawa[14] and the territory of Nadsanie. When examining the origin of East Slavic-Ukrainian dialects, and more specifically the ethnic

---

[10] Cf. В. Н. Чекман, *К социолингвистической характеристике польских говоров белорусско-литовского пограничия*, "Studia nad Polszczyzną Kresową" 1982, № 1, p. 132–138;
[11] F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 15–16.
[12] F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 16.
[13] K. Dejna, *Z metodologii badań gwar peryferyjnych i wyspowych*, "Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego" 1979, vol. XXV, p. 36; F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 18.
[14] F. Czyżewski, op. cit., p. 18.

area of Ukrainian dialects, and their archaic nature, it is worth mentioning the researchers who tried to determine their territorial range. We can find valuable information in the works of Mykhail Levchenko, in which he tries to determine the area where Ukrainian dialects can be found, and thus draws attention to the so-called Ukrainian displacement dialects, occurring outside the borders of Ukraine.

And so, one of the attempts to determine the territorial range took place in the "Kievlanin" Almanac, published in 1839 by Mykhailo Maksymovych, in which an article with information about the Ruthenian-Ukrainian population appeared. This work states, for example: "In the Lublin Governorate, Ruthenians constitute two thirds of the population in this area, in the Voronezh Governorate they live in the Pinsk county, in Galicia Ruthenians constitute a compact mass of the population east of the San River, and in Bukovina one third of the population. The researcher delineated the ethnic border in Hungary, where Ruthenians constituted a compact mass in several counties[15]. According to the scholar: "Ruthenians by origin and language constitute one tribe, but according to the place of residence they have different names"[16].

In his work, the researcher mentioned such ethnic groups of Ukrainians as: "Hetmańcy – residents of the southern part of the Chernihiv governorate, Lithuanians – residents of the Chernihiv governorate north of the Desna River, Ukrainians of the Steppe – residents of the Poltava and Katerynoslav governorates, Ukrainians – residents of the Kiev governorate, which is called Ukraine, Polshchaky – inhabitants of the Podolian governorate, Polishtchuky – inhabitants of Polesia, Patłache – Ruthenians in Bessarabia and Bukovina, Pińchucy – inhabitants of the Pinsk county of the Grodno governorate, Ruthenians – inhabitants of the Lublin governorate, Ruthenians or Ruthenes – living in Galicia, Hutsuls – Ruthenians living in the Carpathians, Hutsuls, Łyshacy nad Łemacy – Ruthenians from Hungary [...], Boykos – inhabitants of the south-eastern part of Galicia, and Shlakhtyche – Ruthenians-Catholics in the Kiev, Volhynian and Podolian governorates"[17]. As it can be seen, in Ukrainian studies as a result of geographic and ethnographic research, the then borders of the ethnic territory were quite clearly delineated, and general conclusions were drawn about the ethno-linguistic area of the population groups inhabiting given territories. Such research introduced into the scientific circle information from almost the entire area and allowed to establish the names of linguistic-territorial and ethnic groups, at the same time

---

[15]   М. М. Левченко, *Мѣста жительства и мѣстныя названия Русиновъ в настоящиее время*, [in:] "Основа Южно-русскій литературно-учёный вѣстникъ", январь' – февраль' 1861, Петербург 1861, p. 263–264.

[16]   М. М. Левченко, op. cit., p. 263–264; Л. Фроляк, *Українські східностепові говірки Донеччини*, Дрогобич 2013, p. 13.

[17]   Ibidem.

establishing mutual interdependencies between them[18]. Contemporary scientific literature has repeatedly emphasised that "the first attempts to determine the spatial differentiation of Ukrainian linguistic continuity were often preceded by thorough studies of dialects, preparatory work for establishing an empirical base, which referred to the state of research and the use of cartographic method and delineating dialectal boundaries"[19]. Researchers claim that in the first classifications of dialects of the Ukrainian language (J. Hołowacki, M. Maksymowicz, O. Potebnia, P. Żytecki, O. Sobolewski, O. Szachmatow, A. Krymski, J. Ziłynski): "Specific boundaries were not delineated clearly, there were only presented generalised patterns of the division of the linguistic territory, a list of the dialectal division with their approximate territorial or territorial-administrative structure"[20].

Ukrainian researcher Jarosław Rudnyckyj in his *Narys ukrajins'koji dialektologii* of 1946 (published in the same year) in Augsburg, when asked: what factors determine the emergence of dialects and dialects, stated: "When we look down at the geographical space of a given language, we will see mountains, rivers, forests, steppes, swamps, lakes, etc on it. These geographical factors influenced the formation of the language (dialect) and their diversity.

In such a way, for example, inaccessible linguistic areas, such as Carpathian corners or Polesian marshes, retained many old (archaic) linguistic features, while easily accessible areas lost them and sooner became influenced by the literary (nationwide) language. In this way, e.g. the development *o, e* in closed syllables (§16.1) did not go towards *i*, i.e. to the level of development of the dialectal features of the Ukrainian Podolian, steppe and lowland areas in general, but it has stopped to this day in the Carpathians or Polesia at the level of the 12th century with later influences: with the sounds *u, ju* or diphthongs $\widehat{uo}, \widehat{uy}, \widehat{ye}, \widehat{yi}$, where e.g. Polesian $ku\widehat{o}ń, ku\widehat{y}ń, ku\widehat{i}ń$ corresponds to Ukrainian *кінь*, while the Carpathian form sounds *куń*, etc."[21]. Apart from the above-mentioned factors, according to the researcher, religious or economic and political conditions play a significant role in linguistic diversity. Religious, political and economic centres have always influenced the external environment and made their dialect or local dialect superior, expanding its influence and eliminating surrounding dialects. Under the influence of church singing, for example in the Hutsul region, *ˡSwiatyj ˡBoże* is sung, although the word *śwjetyj* or *sjetyj* is commonly used on everyday basis; analogically,

18　　Л. Фроляк, op. cit., p. 14.

19　　П. Гриценко, *Діалектна межа як ідеологема лінгвістичної географії*, [in:] *Słowa jak mosty nad wiekami*, Białystok 2003, p. 156; Л. Фроляк, op. cit., p. 14.

20　　С. Бевзенко, *Історія української мови*, Київ 1978, p. 128–144; Л. Фроляк, op. cit., p. 14–15.

21　　Я. Рудницький, *Нарис української діялектології*, Авґсбурґ 1946, p. 3.

under the influence of church pronunciation, the ending *-u* remained in some lexemes, e.g. ˡSława Iˡsusu Chrysˡtu, ˡPanu ˡBohu, ˡDuchu[22].

Another Ukrainian dialectologist and researcher – Josyp Dzendzeliwski pointed to the phonetic phenomena occurring in Ukrainian dialects, such as the occurrence of the so-called narrowed vowel [o], which is characterised by a close articulation of this sound to a labial high [u], known as ukanye. In Ukrainian dialects positional narrowing of vowels [o] > [u] or its intermediate variant [o̭], sometimes [ů] or only [u] as a result of assimilation and the influence of labialised consonants is characterised by researchers as, quotation: "Quite old, in relics of literature from the fourteenth century, widely manifested, and single examples already appear in Old Russian monuments from the eleventh century"[23]. Making the pronunciation of the unstressed [o] resemble [u] as a result of increasing its labialisation and a higher degree of tongue elevation occur primarily in ancient Ukrainian dialects: in some Transnistrian (bordering with Poland and also found in the territory of Poland), Bukovyna, Podolian, Nadsanie (the area of south-eastern Poland and the strip of western Ukraine), in some Volhynian dialects of the south-west dialect as well as in the north-Volynian-Polesian[24] from where, it is believed, ukanye made its way to the south-eastern dialects. Fedir Żyłko states similarly: "The sound series of the phoneme |o| in unstressed syllables, in some dialects is closer to the narrow variants *o* to *u*, or *u* to *o*, so it is closer to the sound series of high vowel [u] or blends with it completely, e.g. *bo̭ˡro̭da (bůˡrůda), ko̭rowa (kůrowa)*".

The researcher believes that this feature occurs sporadically or is lexicalised in some south-eastern dialects, where it was transferred along with the resettlement of the population from the south-western regions of Ukraine[25] which should be considered a dialectal innovation[26]. When describing Ukrainian dialects, it is necessary to mention Nadsanie dialects, which are also present today within the borders of Poland, e.g. in the eastern part of the Podkarpackie Voivodeship and in the western voivodships of Ukraine.

Maria Przepiórska in the 1930s stated:

"The language of the Ukrainian (Nadsanie) dialects is significantly different from the Ukrainian literary language, so for people who do not know it, it seems to be a mixture of Ukrainian-Polish words, non-contemporary (speech) and even 'twisted', so it is difficult for non-natives to understand it. The specificity and uniqueness of this language (dialect) results from its archaic elements that have

---

[22]   Ibidem, p. 4.
[23]   Й. Дзендзелівський, *Лексика українських говорів Закарпатської області*, „Наукові Записки", vol. XXVI, iss. 2, Ужгород 1957, p. 21; Л. Фроляк, op. cit., p. 230–231.
[24]   *Атлас української мови*, vol. I: *Полісся, Середня Наддніпрянщина і суміжні землі*, ed. I. Матвіяс, Київ 1984, p. 55–79.
[25]   Ф. Жилко, *Нариси з діалектології української мови*, Київ 1966, p. 42.
[26]   Л. Фроляк, op.cit., p. 231.

survived on the borderlands of Ukrainian lands and from some borrowings taken from the Polish language. In the base, however, the Nadsanie dialects stem from the same root as other Ukrainian dialects[27].

When delineating the borders of the Nadsanie dialects, M. Przepiórska took into account the most important phonetic features, which she classified as archaic, such as: 1) the preservation of an archaic vowel *i* in words such as: *xu'diti, di'tina, ma'ɫina* 'Ukr. ходити, дитина, малина'. On the basis of her own dialectological research, she stated: "I was lucky to establish that the forms of the *di'tina, 'd'êtri* type consistently occur in the centre of the Przemyśl and Jarosław counties, as well as in the Biłgoraj county and in the Chełm region, but they are already disappearing in the eastern and northern parts of the Mościska county and in the southern part of the Przemyśl county. It is also absent from all the dialects of Dobromil county that I know. It would seem that this archaic phenomenon (type: *di'tina, 'd'êrvu*), supported by the vicinity of Polish dialects, should intensify and extend the range of occurrence in the West Slavic-Polish direction. Meanwhile, the area where this phenomenon persists in the west shrinks to a narrow strip along the bank of the San and unexpectedly disappears in the westernmost dialects of the Przemyśl county. And so, it is no longer present in the following places: Pawłokoma, Siedliska, Poręby, Jabłonica, Wara, Łubna".

The researcher also points to other archaic features of the Nadsanie dialects, such as:

– ukanye, e.g. *du'rôha* 'Ukr. *mu'ɫitva* 'Ukr. молитва', *suruku'vyį* 'Ukr. сороковий', *wuɫu'čыti* 'Ukr. волочити', *wuru'b'êc* 'Ukr. горобець', *'žыtu* (-о) Ukr. жито';

– pronunciation of *ky, gy, xy* connections as: *k'î, g'î (h'î) x'î*, which also occurs in the dialects under study, e.g. *'k'îdaįu* 'Ukr. кидаю', *'rôk'î* 'Ukr. роки', *'sk'îra* 'Ukr. сокира', *hri'x'î* 'Ukr. гріхи', *'x'îtryį* 'Ukr. хитрий', *'h'înu* 'Ukr. гину'. Analogous archaic soft pronunciation of Proto-Slavic continuants is also noted in representatives of Ukrainian Podlachian dialects, e.g. *'x'îtryį, 'h'înu, 'k'îdaįu, 'k'înu, ve'l'ik'î, vôr'ôh'î*.

To this day, in the Ukrainian dialects of Nadsanie there have been preserved forms with the characteristic transition of Proto-Slavic *a* into *'ê*, which also occurs consistently in archaic Hutsul dialects, where the same transition *a> ' ê* is preserved in forms such as: *źêt', 'św̥įêtu, 'ž'êba, 'š'êpka, č'ês*. In the Nadsanie dialects and other south-west Ukrainian dialects, e.g. in Lemko and Boyko (with the exception of Podlachian) occurring in the territory of Poland, archaic forms of the past tense have also been preserved: *'įîchaɫisti*

[27]   М. Пшеп'юрська-Овчаренко, *Мова українціів Надсяння*, [in:] *Ярославщина і За-сяння* 1031–1947, Наукове Товариство ім. Шевченка, "Український Архів", vol. XLII, Нью-Йорк – Париж – Сидней – Торонто 1986, p. 289.

(-t'ê), *ˈi̯îxałismu (-o)*, *ˈi̯îchałistʹê*, *ruˈbʹîlʹi̯êm (-i̯im)*, *ˈznałam*, while in Podlachian dialects this meaning is expressed by the following forms: *my ˈdalʹy* 'daliśmy (we gave)', *my roˈbʹylʹy* 'zrobiliśmy (we did)', *my ˈznalʹy* 'znaliśmy (we knew)'. The following forms of the past tense are archaic in Ukrainian dialects: *ftiük* 'Ukr. втік', *liüch* 'Ukr. ліг'[28], *ńüs*, *prыˈńüs* 'Ukr. приніс', *wi̯üs* 'Ukr. віз', with the labialised variant [ü], which can only be noted in the Ukrainian-speaking periphery – in archaic Transcarpathian and Hutsul dialects in Ukraine and Lemko dialects in Poland. A peculiar archaic form is, among others, the word *ˈt'ütka* with the rarely occurring labial variant [ü] and *mi̯üt* 'Ukr. мед., Pol. miód (honey)', *mńüd ‖ müt*[29]. This phonetic phenomenon has an old origin, indicating that in the archaic peripheral Ukrainian dialects the articulation of the diphthongic pronunciation [ű] has not yet changed into a monophthongic vowel *i* or *e*, as is the case in Ukrainian and other Ukrainian dialects located in the centre of the Ukrainian dialectal area. Pronunciation similar to the literary variant can be heard in other peripheral Ukrainian dialects occurring in Poland: Nadsanie, Boyko, Transnistrian, with the commonly occurring form: *med, mi̯ît ‖ mńît* (Nads.), *mit ‖ mid* (Boyko)[30] and the archaic diphthongic pronunciation i̯e in the word *mi̯ed* which can be heard today in Ukrainian Podlachian dialects in Poland.

Diphthongic – archaic pronunciation appearing in the place of the continuant *o has been preserved in the Transcarpathian dialects in Ukraine, e.g. in the word *wüˈ(t)čym*, in which the development process of *o* towards *i* has not ended yet. In other peripheral South-West Ukrainian dialects, e.g. in the Nadsanie and Transnistrian dialects, where the development of Proto-Slavic *o> it took place, a common form in these dialects is *witˈčym*, which sounds identical in Ukrainian.

The archaic sound [ű] also appears in the Transcarpathian dialects, among others, in the genitive endings of plural masculine nouns: – *üv: otˈcüv*, *ˈńańüv*, against the general Ukrainian *otˈciv* 'ojców (fathers)' (<Proto-Slavic *ovъ). The diphthongic pronunciation with the labialised [ü] also occurs in other lexemes of the type: *neˈrüdnyi̯* - 'Ukr. нерідний', *ˈt'ütka* 'Ukr. тітка'[31]. An identical sound is recorded in the peripheral Ukrainian dialects of Nadsanie in the territory of Poland, among others, in some 3-pers. singular verb forms part. praet., e.g.: *ńüs* 'Ukr. ніс, Pol. niósł (he carried)', *prыˈńüs* 'Ukr. приніс, Pol. przyniółł (he brought)', *wi̯üs ‖ wi̯üz* 'Ukr. віз, Pol. wiózł (he was transporting)', *zawˈi̯üs* 'Ukr. завіз, Pol. zawiózł (he transported)'. Despite the close

28   М. Пшеп'юрська-Овчаренко, op. cit., p. 290.

29   Й. Дзендзелівський, *Лінгвістичний Атлас українських народних говорів Закарпатської області УРСР. Лексика*, vol. 3, Ужгород 1993, p. 297.

30   М. Онишкевич, *Словник бойківських говірок*, vol. I, Київ 1984, p. 442.

31   Й. Дзендзелівський, *Лексика українських говорів Закарпатської області*, "Наукові Записки", vol. XXVI, iss. 2, Ужгород 1957, p. 7, 9.

proximity of the surrounding Polish dialects and the Polish language, the pho-
netic variant [ü] has been preserved as a phonetic archaic feature in the speech
of the oldest generation of respondents.

In the North Ukrainian Podlachian dialects, the archaic – diphthongic pro-
nunciation of $\widehat{uo}$ in place of the Proto-Slavic *e is noted, for example: *l'$\widehat{uo}$x*
'Ukr. ліг', *ń$\widehat{uo}$s* 'Ukr. ніс; *pry^ł ń$\widehat{uo}$s* 'Ukr. приніс', *za^{ł}ń$\widehat{uo}$s* 'Ukr. заніс', *py-
ir$\widehat{uo}$x* 'Ukr. пиріг', *py^{ł}r$\widehat{uo}$x* 'Ukr. поріг'. It is a phenomenon characteristic
only of these dialects and preserved to this day.

In Ukrainian peripheral dialects occurring in Poland and Ukraine, e.g. in
the dialects of Nadsanie, Boyko, Lemko and Transcarpathian, after the la-
bial consonants there has also been preserved the archaic pronunciation of
the Proto-Slavic. *i as *i*, for example: *di^{ł}tyna* (Boyko) ‖ *di^{ł}tina* (Nadsanie)
'Ukr. дитина, Pol. dziecko, dziecina (child, baby)', *vi^{ł}no* (Boyko) ‖ *vi^{ł}nô*
(Nadsanie) 'Ukr. вино, Pol. wino (wine)', *^{ł}vino* (Boyko) ‖ *^{ł}vi͡nu, ^{ł}vi͡înu* (Nad-
sanie) 'Ukr. віно, Pol. wiano (dowry)', *vi^{ł}no͡iko* (Boyko) ‖ *vi͡i^{ł}nô͡iko, vii^{ł}nô͡iku*
(Nadsanie) 'Ukr. віночок, Pol. wianeczek (wreath)'[32]. The pronunciation of
the Proto-Slavic *i in the form of *i* without the softening of the preceding con-
sonants is a kind of dialectal archaism, vividly preserved at the present stage
of functioning of the dialects.

An important archaic phonetic feature, occurring in the Transcarpathian
dialects in Ukraine and the Lemko and Nadsanie dialects in Poland, is the pres-
ence of a back-tongue phonetic variant [ы] (a vowel classified as back high
with moderate tongue elevation), occurring mostly in the speech of the oldest
generation of respondents. This feature is one of the most important archaic
elements of the dialectal phonetics of the South-West Ukrainian dialect. Con-
sidered by many researchers, incl. Jan Ziłyński, J. Pańkewycz, M. Przepiórska
to be an archaism, apparently preserved in ancient Ukrainian peripheral dia-
lects. The recently recorded (late 20th century) examples with the variant [ы]
in the Ukrainian Nadsanie and Transcarpathian dialects allow to consider this
phonetic feature as systemic, e.g.:

– *ы* (back row, high): *bыk* 'Ukr. бик', *^{ł}bыty* (Transcaprathian) ‖ *^{ł}bыti* (Nad-
sanie) 'Ukr. бути', *sыr* 'Ukr. сир', *^{ł}dôbrыm* 'Ukr. добрим', *^{ł}kôsы* 'Ukr. коси',
^{ł}rыbы 'Ukr. риби', *^{ł}snôrы* 'Ukr. снопи', *^{ł}tыždiń* 'Ukr. тиждень', *sы^{ł}ny*
'ukr. сини', *^{ł}vôdы* 'Ukr. води', *^{ł}wôłы* 'Ukr. воли', *vы ^{ł}soky͡i* (Transcaprathian)
‖ *vы^{ł}sok'i͡i* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. високий'.

A common archaic phonetic feature in southwestern Ukrainian dialects is
the labialised pronunciation of the back-central [ы] denoted by [ω]. It appears
in different parts of speech: nouns, verbs, pronouns, e.g.: *bωv* (Transcaprathi-
an) ‖ *bωł* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. був', *^{ł}ɫ ampω* 'Ukr. лампи', *^{ł}rωbω* 'Ukr. риби',
sω^{ł}nω 'Ukr. сини', *ru^{ł}bôtω* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. роботи', *^{ł}šωło* (Transcarpathian) ‖

[32]   М. Онишкевич, *Словник бойківських говірок, т. I-II, Київ 1984,* op. cit.,p. 129-130.

ˈšωłu (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. szyło', *tω* (Nadsanie), 'Ukr. ти', *wωxoˈdyty* (Transcarpathian) || *wωxuˈditi* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. Виходити', *ž̑ωto* (Transcarpathian) || *ˡž̑ωtu* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. жито'[33].

An archaic phenomenon in the studied West Ukrainian peripheral dialects is the occurrence of complex forms of the past tense Perfectum in 1, 2 singular and 1, 2, 3 plural, e.g.: *xoˈdyl̬iêm* (Transnistrian, Lemko) || *xuˈdil̬iim* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. я ходив', *kaˈzalyzˈme* (Transcarpathian, Lemko) || *kaˈzalismo* (Transnistrian) || *kaˈzalismu* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. ми казали', *roˈbyłyzme* (Transcarpathian)' || *roˈbyłys(z)me* (Lemko), *roˈbyłysmo* (Transnistrian) || *ruˈbˈiłismo* || *-smu* (Nadsanie), 'ми робили' (Ukrainian).

Elements of old complex verb forms preserved in dialects are still commonly used by the oldest and younger carriers of the dialects to this day. This phenomenon is consistently present in the Lemko, Nadsanie, Transnistrian and Ukrainian dialects of south-eastern Podlachia, despite the direct influence of the Polish language. It is true that some researchers consider this dialect feature to be sustained by the influence of the Polish language, however, the dialectal isogloss characteristic of this phenomenon in Ukraine and Poland speaks more in favour of the archaic nature of this phenomenon, systemically arising in Proto-Slavic and East Slavic contexts.

When examining archaic Ukrainian peripheral dialects – referred to as ancient by Ukrainian dialectologists, it can be concluded that the preserved archaic features occurring within the West Ukrainian dialect are caused by its development on East Slavic and local (territorial) grounds. The centuries-old systemic development of East Slavic features in the analysed dialects based on the proto-Slavic system plays a fundamental role. The occurrence of archaic features in the aforementioned dialects is also maintained by the factors of development within the dialect.

In the archaic dialects of the South-West Ukrainian dialect: Transcarpathian (the South Carpathian region of Uzhgorod), Lemko, Nadsanie and Boyko, one can observe the common phenomenon of the lack of epenthetic *l-* in the forms of passive adjectival participles. Commonly occurring in the speech of the oldest dialect-speakers are the following forms:

zˈrobenyi̯ (Trascarpathian) || *ˡzrôbinyi̯* (Nadsanie) 'Ukrainian зроблений, Pol. zrobiony (done)', *ˡwukormenyi̯* (Trascarpathian) || *ˡwykorminyi̯* (Nadsanie) 'Ukr. викормлений', Pol. 'wykarmiony (fed)'. This phenomenon, according to the researcher of the Transcarpathian dialects – P. Czuczka, penetrated into the Transcarpathian dialects from the West Slavic languages, or more precisely from the Slovak language, as a relatively new phenomenon, but on the other hand, it should be stated that it bears the features of the old process, as exam-

---

[33]   I. Пагіря, *Система голосних у говірках північно – західної Мукачівщини*, "Наукові Записки", vol. XXVI, iss. 2, Ужгород 1957, p. 87–88.

ples of words without epenthetic l appear in Transylvanian souvenirs from the 15th-16th centuries. Thus, the archaic nature is to some extent intertwined with the innovative nature of this phenomenon[34].

Some of the archaic features presented in the studied dialects undoubtedly prove that they belong to the South-West Ukrainian dialect, despite the fact that these dialects are currently separated by a state border and are located both in Poland and in Western Ukraine. Due to their homogeneous East Slavic linguistic (dialect) structure, shaped over many centuries, these dialects have common archaic and systemic phonetic, morphological and lexical features.

Interstate borders, social changes and migrations of people did not hinder the development and existence of archaic features in the analysed Ukrainian dialects over the centuries. The analysed features of South-West Ukrainian dialect systems occurring in Poland and Ukraine were shaped on the basis of the Proto-Slavic and East Slavic development, which historically functioned in this area and isolated dialectal features of the local Ukrainian indigenous community during the centuries of development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altas ukraïns'koï movi. 1984. Vol. I: *Polìssâ, Serednâ Naddnìprânŝina ì sumìžnì zemlì*. Ed. Ì. Matvìâs. Kïïv: Akademìâ Nauk Ukraïns′koï RSR, Ìnstitut movoznavstva ìm. O. O. Potebnì. [Алтас української мови. 1984. *Т. І: Полісся, Середня Наддніпрянщина і суміжні землі*. Ред. І. Матвіяс. Київ: Академія Наук Української РСР, Інститут мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні].

Atlas ukraïns'koï movi. 1988. Vol. II: *Volin', Naddnìstrânŝina, Zakarpattâ ì sumìžnì zemlì*. Ed. Â. Zakrevs′ka. Kïïv: "Naukova dumka" [*Атлас української мови. 1988. Т. ІI: Волинь, Наддністрянщина, Закарпаття і суміжні землі*. Ред. Я. Закревська. Київ: "Наукова думка"].

Bevzenko Stepan. 1978. *Ìstorìâ ukraïns'koï movi*. Kïïv: "Naukova Dumka" [Бевзенко Степан. 1978. *Історія української мови*. Київ: "Наукова Думка"].

Čekman Valerij. 1982. *K sociolingvističeskoj harakteristike pol'skih govorov belorussko-litovsko-go pograničiâ*. "Studia nad Polszczyzną Kresową" № 1: 132–138 [Чекман Валерий. 1982. *К социолингвистической характеристике польских говоров белорусско-литовского пограничия*. "Studia nad Polszczyzną Kresową" № 1: 132–138].

Čučka Pavlo. 1957. *Fonetičnì zmìni v pìvdennnokarpats'kih govìrkah okolicì Užgoroda*. "Naukovì Zapiski" vol. XXVI, iss. 2: 55–76 [Чучка Павло. 1957. *Фонетичні зміни в південннокарпатських говірках околиці Ужгорода*. "Наукові Записки" т. XXVI, вип. 2: 55–76].

Czopek Barbara. 1988. *Nazwy miejscowe dawnej ziemi chełmskiej i bełskiej (w granicach dzisiejszego państwa polskiego)*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź: Ossolineum.

---

[34]   П. Чучка, *Фонетичні зміни в південннокарпатських говірках околиці Ужгорода,* Наукові записки, vol. XXVI, iss. 2, Ужгород 1957, p. 66.

Czyżewski Feliks. 1986. *Atlas gwar polskich i ukraińskich okolic Włodawy*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Czyżewski Feliks. 1994. *Fonetyka i fonologia gwar polskich i ukraińskich południowo-wschodniego Podlasia*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Dejna Karol. 1979. *Z metodologii badań gwar peryferyjnych i wyspowych*. "Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego" vol. XXV: 35–40.

Dzendzelivs′kij Josip. 1957. *Leksika ukraïns′kih govorìv Zakarpats′koï oblastì*. "Naukovì Zapiski" vol. XXVI, iss. 2: 3–36 [Дзендзелівський Йосип. 1957. *Лексика українських говорів Закарпатської області*. "Наукові Записки" vol. XXVI, iss. 2: 3–36].

Dzendzelivs′kij Josip. 1958, 1960, 1993. *Lìngvìstičnìj Atlas ukraïns′kih narodnih govorìv Zakarpats′koï oblastì URRSR. Leksika*. "Naukovì zapiski Užgorods′kogo deržavnogo unìvrsitetu" vol. 1, 2, 3 [Дзендзелівський Йосип. 1958, 1960, 1993. *Лінгвістичний Атлас українських народних говорів Закарпатської області УРРСР. Лексика*. "Наукові записки Ужгородського державного унівреитету" vol. 1, 2, 3].

Dzendzelivs′kij Josip. 1965. *Konspekt lekcìj z kursu ukraïns′koï dìalektologìï*. Vol. 1: *Fonetika*. Užgorod: Naukove tovaristvo ìm. T. Ševčenka u L′vovi, Užgorods′kij Deržavnij Unìversitet, Ìntitut Karpatistiki [Дзендзелівський Йосип. 1965. *Конспект лекцій з курсу української діалектології*. Vol. 1: *Фонетика*. Ужгород: Наукове товариство ім. Т. Шевченка у Львові, Ужгородський Державний Університет, Інтитут Карпатистики].

Frolâk Lûbov. 2013. *Ukraïns′kì shìdnostepovì govìrki Doneččini*. Drogobič: "Posvìt" [Фроляк Любов. 2013. *Українські східностепові говірки Донеччини*. Дрогобич: "Посвіт"].

Gricenko Pavlo. 2003. *Dìalektna meža âk ìdeologema lìngvìstičnoï geografìï*. In: *Słowa jak mosty nad wiekami*. Ed. U. Sokólska, P. Wróblewski. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku: 155–157 [Гриценко Павло. 2003. *Діалектна межа як ідеологема лінгвістичної географії*. In: *Słowa jak mosty nad wiekami*. Ed. U. Sokólska, P. Wróblewski. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku: 15–157].

Kołodyńska Tatiana. 2016. *Ukraińska gwara Kalnikowa, Część I. Fonetyka i morfologia*. Lublin: "Ars Libri".

Levčenko Mihajlo. 1861. *Města žitel′stva i městnyâ nazvaniâ Rusinov″ v nastoâŝiee vremâ*. "Osnova Úžno-russkij literaturno-učěnyj věctnik″". Ânvar′ – fevral′. Peterburg: 263–266 [Левченко Михайло. 1861. *Мѣста жительства и мѣстныя названия Русиновъ в настоящее время*. "Основа Южно-русскій литературно-учёный вѣстникъ". Январь' – февраль'. Петербург: 263–266].

Maksimovič Mihail. 1839. *Istoriâ drevněj russkoj slovesnosti*. soč. *Mihaila Maksimoviča*. Vol. 1. Kiev [Максимович Михаил. 1839. *История древнѣй русской словесности*. соч. *Михаила Максимовича*. Vol. 1. Киевъ].

Oniškevič Mihajlo. 1984. *Slovnik bojkìvs′kih govìrok. Častina Perša*. Kiïv: "Naukova Dumka" [Онишкевич Михайло. 1984. *Словник бойківських говірок. Частина Перша*. Київ: "Наукова Думка"].

Pagìrâ I. 1957. *Sistema golosnih u govìrkah pìvnìčno – zahìdnoï Mukačìvšini*. "Naukovì Zapiski" vol. XXVI, iss. 2: 77–92 [Пагіря І. 1957. *Система голосних у говірках північно – західної Мукачівщини*. "Наукові Записки" vol. XXVI, iss. 2: 77–92].

Pšep`ûrs′ka-Ovčarenko Marìâ. 1986. *Mova ukraïncìv Nadsânnâ*. In: *Âroslavŝina i Zasânnnâ 1031–1947*. "Ukraïns′kij Arhìv" vol. XLII: 289–293 [Пшеп'юрська-

Овчаренко Марія. 1986. *Мова українцнів Надсянння*. In: *Ярославщина і Засянння 1031–1947*. "Український Архів" vol. XLII: 289–293].

Rudnic′kij Âroslav. 1946. *Naris ukraïns′koï dìâlektologiï*. Avgsburg [Рудницький Ярослав. 1946. *Нарис української діялектології*. Авгсбург].

Smułkowa Elżbieta. 1988. *Zagadnienia polsko-białorusko-litewskiej interferencji językowej na ziemiach północno-wschodniej Polski*. ZPSS VII: 395–405.

Žilko Fedot. 1955. *Narisi z dìalektologìï ukraïns′koï movi*. Kiïv: "Radâns′ka škola" [Жилко Федот. 1955. *Нариси з діалектології української мови*. Київ: "Радянська школа"].

Ziłyński Jan. 1932. *Opis fonetyczny języka ukraińskiego*. In: "Prace Komisji Językowej" № 19.

ARCHAIZMY W GWARACH WSCHODNIOSŁOWIAŃSKICH – UKRAIŃSKICH

Streszczenie: Artykuł poświęcony jest opisowi wybarnych cech archaicznych w gwarach dialektu południowo-zachodnioukraińskiego, które wystepują na Ukrainie oraz w południowo-wschodniej części Polski. Opisane zostały przede wszystkim niektóre archaizmy fonetyczne oraz morfologiczne, które istnieją w badanych gwarach pomimo dzielącej je granicy państwowej. Gwary ukraińskie występujące na terenie Polski: bojkowskie, łemkowskie i nadsańskie określane mianem gwar peryferyjnych zachowują wiele cech dawnych i z tego względu w ukraińskiej dialektologii noszą miano starożytnych.

Słowa kluczowe: gwary ukraińskie, archaizmy, dialekt południowo-zachodnioukraiński, analiza.

АРХАЇЗМИ У СХІДНОСЛОВЯНСЬКИХ – УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ГОВІРКАХ

Стаття присвячена аналізу архачних особливостей у піівденно-західних говірках ротитторії України та південно-східних регіонах Польщі.

У статті подано приклади фонетичних та морфологгічних архаїзмів, які виступають так вУкраїніі, як у Польщі. Державний кордон між двома країнами – це лише політично-адміністративна межа, що не впливає на появу архаїчниих мовних явищ. У Польщі виступають між іншими: бойківські, лемківські, надсянські, наддністрянські та підляські говірки. Зберігають вони найбільш суттєві архаїчні риси, що характеризують старожитні периферійні говірки. Аналіз підтвердив генетичну спорідненість форм, фонетичні відмінності, та однорідну діалектну структуру.

Ключові слова: південно – західноукраїнський діалект, архаїзми, українські говірки.