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1. Introduction

The discussion of dialectal, synonymous constructions is motivated by interest in the northwest perfect—grammatical units that are specifically used to express a state resulting from a previous action (Trubinskij 1984: 137–38). The category of perfect in modern Russian dialects includes combinations of short forms of the past participles of so-called active and passive voice and various tense forms of the verb *byt’* (to be):

(1) *(est’)* postavlen vs. *(est’)* vstavši
be.prs.3sg put.ppp.m.sg be.prs.3sg put.ppa.invar
‘is put’ vs. ‘is up’. [Constructed example]

(2) byl postavlen vs. byl vstavši
be.pst.3sg put.ppp.m.sg be.pst.3sg put.ppa.invar
‘was put’ vs. ‘was up’ [Constructed example]

(3) budet postavlen vs. budet vstavši
be.fut.3sg put.ppp.m.sg be.fut.3sg put.ppa.invar
‘will be put’ vs. ‘will be up’ (Kuz’mina & Nemčenko 1982: 409–10).

This paper discusses constructions with short forms of past participles of intransitive verbs, which are further referred to as participles in -(v)ši, e.g.

---

1 Translation into English: Andrey Reznikov (Black Hills State University).
(4) On ušedši
he.nom go.ppa.invar
‘He has gone’. [Constructed example]

and participial forms in -no/-to (-n/-t), e.g.

(5) U nego ujdeno
at him go.ppp.invar
‘He has gone’. [Constructed example]

These can be considered synonymous since they are made up from the same set of semantically similar though morphologically different components, taking their semantic, morphological, and syntactic characteristics into account (Zolotova 1982: 203–204).

2. Dialectal synonyms

While analysing dialectal synonyms, one has to take both the level of a local dialect system and the level of a dialect language into account. At the level of the dialect language, which is a “macro-system, that is, a system of systems” (Avanesov 1964: 10), predicative and non-predicative constructions are considered to mark dialectal differences (either contrasting or not); syntactic constructions that are used in the same subdialect and that are similar or close in meaning but have different grammatical composition are in a synonymous relationship.

The phenomenon of syntactic synonymy at the level of a concrete subdialect seems to be indisputable (Preobraženskaja 2002: 124). As for syntactic synonymy at the level of a dialect language, the synonymic rows seem to be formed only by contrasting dialect variants.

Thus, in Russian subdialects, opposing relations are created by impersonal one-member constructions and the form of the passive participle ending in -no, -to from intransitive verbs (u nego ujdeno), as well as by two-member personal constructions and the adverbial participle form of

---

2 The slash separates allomorphs (identical to the allomorphs of standard Russian).
3 Translations into English here and in the following are mine (NM). «…совокупность микросистем образует макросистему, или систему систем, которая характеризуется чертами, общими для макросистемы как целого и чертами, отличающими в пределах данной макросистемы одни микросистемы (или группы их) от других». 
intransitive verbs ending in -ši (on ušedši). According to linguistic geography, perfect partici- 
pial forms in -ši are widely used in the western zone of northern Russian and southern Russian subdialects, while per-
fect partici- 

At the same time, in the northwestern zone—“for Pskov, Novgorod, 

Strictly speaking, these partici- 

The object of our analysis is con- 

4 «…в той части севернорусских говоров, где регулярно употребляются кон- 
струкции типа у него уйдено, у меня выспанось, почти не отмечаются формы на 
-шы в предикативной функции».

5 «Хотелось бы только подчеркнуть обстоятельство, что семантическая проти-
воречивость данных форм в современных говорах, в том числе и веверо-
западных, последовательно не выдерживается—наблюдается тенденция сбли-
жения форм на -шы и на -л».

6 The term Zaonežje is applied to the Zaonežskij peninsula and nearby islands, includ-
gists (Ardentov 1955; Dolja 1962) and folklorists primarily interested in
the language (Gerd 1997). The Zaonežje peninsula, situated in the north-
ern part of Lake Onega, belongs to a zone where there is a borderline
between dialect constructions with predicative participles suffixed with
-n-, -t-, and participles ending in -ši (Kuz’mina 1993: 162) or perfect par-
ticipial forms (Trubinskij 1984: 179–86).

To establish syntactic synonyms in a local dialectal system, we fol-
low M.N. Preobraženskaja’s method by moving from “concrete semantic-
syntactical situation to the means of its expression, that is, to a pattern”
(Preobraženskaja 2002: 124) in our analysis. 7

3. The n/t-perfect constructions in the modern subdialect
In the modern subdialect of the village of Kuzaranda, 8 among the par-
ticipial constructions from intransitive verbs, one can single out an of-
ten used impersonal construction with -no, -to, -nos’, -tos’, with a clearly
identified meaning of result, e.g.:

(6) dak smotrju: dva volka; uže k ètim vorotam sxoženo
    Pratt see.1sg two wolves already to these gates go.ppp.invar
    [The prints show that wolves have appeared] 9 ‘And I see: [two
wolves] have gone to this gate’.

(7) Bylo ustroeno-s’ na rabotu,
    be.pst.n.sg get.ppp.invar-refl on job
    potom rassčitalsja, što ležal v bol’nice dak
    [In order to pay back the debt, one first needs to find a job] ‘I had
a job, then I paid for being treated in the hospital’.

(8) Menja-ko dolgo ot sjuda ne vypuskali,
    I.acc.-prt long from here not let.pst.3pl

The island Kiži, situated in the northern part of Onega Lake.

7 A semantic-syntactic situation is defined by M.N. Preobraženskaja as the “combi-
ation of logical and event-type phenomena” (Preobraženskaja 2002: 124). «…за кон-
кретными семантико-синтаксическими ситуациями в системе языка могут
закрепляться определенные структурные схемы синтаксических конструк-
ций — моделей».

8 The conclusions are made based on dialectological field trips conducted by the Petros-
заводск State University during 2007–2008 to the village of Kuzaranda.

9 The context of the following utterance is provided in the brackets.
although already and be.pst.n exit.ppp.invar on pension
[About the difficulties for a villager to obtain residential registration in the city] ‘For a long time they didn’t let me go, though I had retired on a pension’.

(9) Ved’ i rabotano¹⁰ na raznyx: na silose i na senose
PRT and work.ppp.invar on different on siloing and on harvesting
[About hay harvesting] ‘And (we, they) have agricultural work: siloing and harvesting’.

In impersonal constructions of this type, the subject of the action is usually expressed by the determinant with u + genitive case of the pronoun or animate noun, devoid of the meaning of possessiveness, and expressing a pure agent:

(10) [Kak raz Andrjuša byl s Tanej,]
PRT PRT Andrjuša was with Tanja
da i u syna, kažetsja, priexano
PRT and at son seem.prs.3sg arrive.ppp.invar
‘Just there were Andrjuša with Tanja and their son seems to have already come’ [the son came earlier than Andrjuša with Tanja’].

(11) [Kogda už vsë, s lagerja prišla,]
when already all from camp came
u étogo ženeno-s’
at this marry.ppp.invar-refl
‘When I returned home from the prison this one was already married’.

(12) U nix teper’ v Tolvuju uexano,
at them now to Tolvuja go.ppp.invar

¹⁰ The participle rabotano ‘(has) worked’ is formed from the ipfv. atelic verb rabotat’ ‘work’. But here it has to be understood in the sense of its prefixed derivative otrabotano, from the pfv. telic verb otrabotat’ ‘finish one’s work’ or ‘work for a certain period of service’ (according to standard Russian). Provided this interpretation is correct, this might raise the question as to whether perfectivising prefixation is less advanced in this dialect than in standard Russian.
[dak s Tolvui priežžali na každyj prazdnik]  
PRT with Tolvuja came on every holiday  
‘Now they have gone to Tolvuja and every holiday they come here from Tolvuja’.

It is no coincidence that some researchers interpret this form as analogous to the subject in the Nominative case—component of the predication base (cf. Filin 1948: 41; Trubinskij 1984: 149).

Still, one needs to pay attention to the fact that $u +$ genitive case in the local dialect system analysed does not lose its general Russian meaning. Possessive meaning of the prepositional-nominal construction is clearly seen in sentences with coinages ending in -nost’, motivated by reflexive verbs:

(13) $u$ nee vyučenost’ na buxgaltera  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{at her training.} \\
\text{bookkeeper}
\end{tabular}  
‘She has been trained as a bookkeeper’.

(14) [a tut vyxodit, čto] $u$ nix razojdenost’  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{but here comes that}
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{divorce.}
\end{tabular}  
‘And it appeared that they were divorced’.

Examples (10) and (11) are recorded in the speech of the native residents of Kuzaranda (cf. standard Russian: $u$ nas byla dogovorennost’ ‘we had an agreement’: prep. + pronoun in gen., copula in he plural, substantive in nom.). Maybe this is a form of participial nouns, registered exclusively in Zaonežje (Markova 1987: 172)? At the same time, as is the case with participial constructions, in accordance with the determinant $u +$ genitive case, a form of the dative case of the subject in the single example ending in -ost’ was registered:

(15) Mne ($≈ u$ menja) propisanost’ $u$ detej,  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{at me} \\
\text{registration.}
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{children}
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{but on summer come.}
\end{tabular}
[Regarding the fact that the mother has her residential registration at her children’s home] ‘I’m registered with my children, but I come here in the summer’.

Thus, we cannot exclude some sort of hypercorrection on the basis of phonetic similarities as being the motive behind the appearance of such forms.

Alongside the quasi-possessive\textsuperscript{11} participial perfect, two-member participial constructions with the nominative case of the subject of the action have been registered in the ratio 10 (\textit{u+gen} and \textit{-no/to}): 4 (\textit{nom} and \textit{-no/to}). This includes sentences without agreement between the main constituents, e.g.:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(16) \textit{Serjožka tože bylo padeno s ètogo pričala} \\
Serjožka also be.pst.n.sg fall.ppp.invar from this quay
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘Serjožka had fallen from this quay too’.

as well as with agreement, e.g.:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(17) \textit{èta Katja s goroda priexana} \\
this Katja from town come.ppp.f.sg
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘This is Katja who has come from the town’.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(18) \textit{dak v gorod potom ja byla s”exana,} \\
prt to town then I be.pst.sg.f go.ppp.f \\
[rabotala ot rybokombinata] \\
worked at fish-factory
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

[a woman speaking:] ‘I had gone to the town, I worked at a fish factory’;

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(19) \textit{Nu ja sama ne zapisana-s’ byla} \\
prt l.nom myself not register.ppp.f.sg-refl be.pst.f.sg
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘I haven’t registered my marriage’.

In Kuzaranda materials from various time periods, there are examples attested where the reflexive marker (-sja/s’) of the participles of feminine and masculine gender, in plural form, coordinate with the subject, cf. \textsuperscript{11} \textit{U} + genitive case does not show the possessor of the result of the action; see detailed discussion: Markova 1987: 173.
vyuče-n-a-s’ (train-PPP.F.SG-REFL), uexa-n (leave-PPP.SG.M), raspisa-n-y-s’ (marry-PPP.PL-REFL). Due to morphonological reasons, the forms of the masculine gender reflexive verbs are impossible, cf.: uexa-n (leave-PPP.SG.M), but žene-no-s’ (marry-PPP.N-REFL). In our material, there are no examples with animate nouns of the neuter gender, as found in folklore expression where it is difficult to talk about agreement due to the frequency of the invariable forms ending in -no, -to:

(20) otkuda čudišče naexano
    from-where monster.NOM.N.SG come.PPP.INVAR=N.SG
    ‘Where did the monster come from?’

A pure agent in the function of the subject clearly indicates the voice-neutrality of the participle, which is passive in its form but not in its meaning. The fact that these forms do not mark the passive (or related voice constructions) is confirmed by the fact that they occur with nominatival subjects in evidently active clauses. This happens even with participles of transitive verbs, e.g.:

(21) Ja kupleno odekolon, kupila
    I.NOM buy.PPP.INVAR eau-de-Cologne.ACC.SG buy.PST.F.SG
    ‘I have bought eau-de-Cologne, I bought’.12

In the records from Kuzaranda, no/to-perfects with the subject of the action in the dative case were also found:

(22) mne privyknuto
    I.DAT accustom.PPP.INVAR
    ‘I got accustomed to this’.

Sentences with the dative seem to be geographically limited to Zaonežje and, semantically, to the synonymic series: privyknuto, považeno, opovaženo ‘to be accustomed to, to be used to’ (Markova 1987: 170–71). More describing the result than the event, the participial form in this construction is semantically close to predicative adverbs, expressing the state of the subject and regularly complemented by the infinitive:

12 Note the repetition of the lexeme in its standard Russian form.
(23) čeloveku svojstveno ošibat’sja
man.DAT peculiar.ADV err.INF
‘To err is human’.

At the same time, in order to express the state resulting from the adaptation, two-member and one-member constructions with the usual (for this subdialect) way of expressing the agent—u + genitive case are used in the subdialect:

(24) ja byla privyknuta
I.NOM be.PST.F.SG get-acquainted.PPP.F.SG
‘I have already got accustomed’.

(25) u menja privyknuto bylo plavat’
at me get accustomed.PPP.INVAR be.PST.N.SG swim.INF
‘I have already got accustomed to swimming’.

It is important that, when the agent is not explicitly mentioned, it is still implicitly present and can be inferred from the context or situation, cf.:

(26) [Tože uže skoro malenkij budet —] ženeno-s’
Also already soon small be.FUT3SG marry.PPP.INVAR-REFL
‘There will also be a child—[the son] has married’.

(27) [Žonka rabotat tože] vyučeno-s’
wife.NOM.F.SG work.PRS.3SG also train.PPP.INVAR-REFL
and work.PRS.3SG also
‘The wife works also, [she] has a qualification and works’.

The implicit agent can be indefinite:

(28) a tože privyknuto v derevne duraka valjat’
but also get-acquainted.PPP.INVAR in village fool around
do armii—da pit’ da vsë
until army and drink and everything

13 Sporadically, examples with an inanimate subject in participial constructions have been registered: u cvetov sovsem zasoxnuto (Kuzaranda).
'Also in the village they have got accustomed to fooling around till serving in the army—to drink and so on'.

Impersonal constructions can be coordinated with clauses in which the subjects are either elliptic or zeroed (i.e. with so-called “indefinite-personal” clauses).\(^{14}\) Incidentally, in the constructions where the subject is not expressed, similar to incomplete constructions, forms ending in -los’ appear, which correspond in this subdialect to the forms in -no, -nos’, cf.:

\[(29) \text{U menja kassirom rabotala dak,} \]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{at me cachier.ins.sg work.pst.f.sg prt} \\
i \text{tak uexalo-s’ tuda} \\
\text{and prt leave.pst.n-refl there}
\end{array}
\]

‘I worked as a cashier, and so I have gone there’.

\[(30) A \text{èto Alëšen’ka, murman'čan, a teper'} \]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{prt this Aljošen’ka.nom Murmansk-people.gen.pl but now} \\
uže ženelo-s’ i devočka bol’šaja \\
\text{already marry.pst.act.n.sg-refl and girl.nom tall.nom}
\end{array}
\]

‘It’s Aljošen’ka from Murmansk, now he has married, and the daughter has grown up’.

As we can see, constructions with forms ending in -los’ from reflexive and non-reflexive verbs (uexat’ ‘to go away’, ženit’sja ‘to marry’) correlate with one-member and two-member perfect clauses. It is essential to note that the forms with the verbal suffix, not being quasi-passive, retain their perfect (resultative) meaning.

Historical observations of how constructions with participles ending in -no, -to, -nos’, -tos’, derived from intransitive verbs, function in Onega subdialects allow us to conclude that these constructions have been developing from one-member to two-member clauses, i.e. from impersonal to personal (Markova 1987: 173).

Impersonal participial constructions, with various forms of determinants, as well as two-member constructions, functioning in the same subdialect, are, in our opinion, different patterns connected by the “same semantic-syntactic situation” (Preobraženskaja 2002: 124), i.e. they are

\[^{14}\text{Unfortunately, at present, we do not have examples from authentic speech at hand.}\]
semantically identical. Consequently, they can be qualified as syntactic synonyms:

\[(31) \text{u nego priexano} = \text{on priexano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at him} & \quad \text{come.ppp.invar} = \text{he.nom.sg come.ppp.invar} \\
& = \text{on priexan;} \\
& = \text{he.nom.sg come.ppp.nom.sg}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He has come’.

\[(32) \text{u menja privyknuto} = \text{mne privyknuto} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at me} & \quad \text{get-used.ppp.invar} = \text{i.dat get-used.ppp.invar} \\
& = \text{ja privyknuta} \\
& = \text{i.nom.sg get-used.ppp.nom.f.sg}
\end{align*}
\]
‘I got used to’.

4. The -(v)ši-perfect constructions in the modern subdialect

In our subdialect, the n/t-perfect construction with an explicit subject of the action is semantically identical to constructions of the type on priexa-

\[dši \quad (‘he has come’). \] Both are characterized as being in transition from syntactic to morphological units (for more details cf. Kuz’mina 1993: 148–49). It is important to note the functional identity of these participial forms. One has to keep in mind that the forms ending in -ši, unlike participles with the suffix n/t, do not characterize the actions of animate subjects alone; however, this does not make their lexical range much greater, in our opinion, cf.:

\[(33) \text{Ozero zameržši bylo počti} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lake.nom.n.sg} & \quad \text{froze.ppa.inv ar be.pst.n.sg almost} \\
& = \text{‘The lake was almost frozen’}.
\end{align*}
\]

\[(34) [\text{zdes’ odin domik est’}] \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{here one house is} \\
& = \text{i vot sarajka vnizu upavši} \\
& = \text{and prt shed.nom.sg below fall-apart.ppa.invar}
\end{align*}
\]
‘There is a little house here and a shed there fell apart’.
Both perfect participial constructions turn out to be mutually replaceable in the subdialect of concern. Thus, the following synonymous constructions have been found in the speech of one informant, a peasant widow:

(35) [Vot objazatel’no večer pridet, nado exat’]

PRT for sure evening come.FUT.3SG necessary drive.INF

Tak u menja bylo privyknuto
so at me be.PST.N.SG get-accustomed.PPP.INVAR

[The informant’s narrative is about her life] ‘Just when the evening comes, it’s necessary to go’ [to fish on the lake], so I have already become accustomed’.

(36) A tak ja k spiritu ne privykši

But so I.nom to alcohol not get-accustomed.PPA.INVAR

‘But, I haven’t got accustomed to alcohol’.

Example (28), repeated here as (37) for convenience, turns out to be synonymous with (38). The topic of both examples is young people and the absence of a proper upbringing in the family:

(37)a tože privyknuto v derevne duraka valjat’

but also get-accustomed.PPP.INVAR in village fool around
do armii—da pit’ da vsë

until army and drink and everything

‘Also in the village they have got accustomed to fooling around till serving in the army—to drink and so on’.

(38) oni že ne privykši v svoix sem’jax:

They PRT not get-accustomed.PPA.INVAR in refl.adj families

[roditeli ne mogut ničega sprašivat’]

Parents not can nothing ask

‘They haven’t got accustomed in their families: parents cannot say anything’.

15 M.S. Doroxova is one of 15 of our informants—native residents of the village of Kuzaranda—a woman about 80 years old.
Except for two-member clauses with nominative subject, e.g. (39), there are rare constructions with a genitive subject found in our materials, e.g. (40).

(39) *U menja brat byl priexadši,*
   at me brother.NOM.M.SG be.PST.M come.PPA.INVAR
   [dak ja tuda xodila na pominki]
   PRT I.NOM there went to funeral
   ‘My brother has come to me, and I went to the funeral feast’.

Compare also an example with a genitival subject (Markova 2009: 146–55): 16

(40) *Eščë otkuda-to ponaexavši narodu s*
   else from-somewhere come.PPA.INVAR people.GEN.SG from
   drugix rajonov
   other regions
   ‘(Several) people have come from other regions’.

Implicit, non-referential subjects are also attested with this type of perfect:

(41) *[Nu v obščem mnogo narodu bylo,]*
   PRT in general many people was
   so mnogix gorodov bylo naexavši,
   from many towns be.PST.N.SG come.PPA.INVAR
   načal’stvo vsjakoe
   administration various
   ‘There were many people, [they] had come from many towns, vari-
   ous people from the administration’.

(42) *S Petrozavodska bylo očen’mnogo priexadši:*
   from Petrozavodsk be.PST.N.SG very many come.PPA.INVAR
   ‘Many <people> have come from Petrozavodsk’.

---

16 This predicate also takes the genitive subject in standard Russian: *naexalo narodu* ‘People (GEN.SG) came (PST.N.SG)’.
As regards the semantic and syntactical properties, the verbal construction can be considered synonymous with the -(v)ši-perfect above:

(43) [kogda ja ran’še tut źila,] tože priezzali ni po odin god, when I earlier here lived also came.pst.3pl not for one year
no sil’no mnogo narodu stol’ko ne naežalo, but very many people so not come.pst.n.sg
tol’ko načal’stvo, naedet neskol’ko mašin only administration come.fut.3sg some cars
‘When I lived here before there were also those who came for several years, but there were not that many people who came, only the administration was up there and then with some cars’.

5. Conclusion
Our analysis shows that it is much rarer for participial forms in -ši to be used by the residents of Kuzaranda (there are 5 cases of constructions with participles in -(v)ši to every 10 cases of constructions with participles in -n-, -t- ); not every informant uses them. Still, the overall ratio of the competing forms in the Kuzaranda subdialect has not changed since the middle of the twentieth century (Trubinskij 1983: 183). Thus, the following system of syntactic synonyms exists in the subdialect analysed:

(44) u nego priexano = on priexano
    at him come.ppp.invar = he.nom.sg come.ppp.invar
    = on priexavši
    = he.nom.sg come.ppa.invar
‘He has come’.

(45) vsex priexano = vse priexavši
    all.gen come.ppp.invar = all.nom.sg come.ppa.invar
    = vsex priexavši
    = all.gen come.ppa.invar
‘All have come’.

(46) u menja privyknuto = mne privyknuto
    at me get-used.ppp.invar = I.dat get-used.ppp.invar
The main pattern that is central to the category of perfect in the local subdialect system in the village of Kuzaranda is, in our opinion, the participial construction *u nego uđeno*. Still, the dominant position, in terms of semantic range and frequency of use, is occupied by the general Russian construction *on ušel* (60 cases of intransitive verbal constructions to 3 participle forms). Thus, the synonymic series is dominated by an “isosemic”—major—pattern, which reflects the “corresponding relations of extralinguistic activity by the most direct, economic language means, without additional language layers of modifications” (Zolotova 1982: 211).

The two-member verbal construction is the major factor behind the role of two-member clauses with participles suffixed -n-, -t- and derived from intransitive verbs increasing in the modern subdialect. At the same time, we should not underestimate the influence of semantically identical two-member constructions with participles in -ši, which typically have an agent and are still used in the subdialect.

It is worth mentioning that, in the local subdialect analysed, nearly all known forms dealing with expressing the category of perfect are registered; this fact makes it possible to identify synonymy not only at the level of one subdialect, but also at the level of the dialect language in general.

Taking into account the form of expressing the agent and its absence, synonymous perfect participial construction-patterns, as well as their general Russian and dialect parallels with the forms of the past tense of intransitive verbs, can be presented in the following table:

17 «Основная модель должна отображать соответствующие отношения внеязыковой действительности наиболее «прямыми», экономическими языковыми средствами, без дополнительных смысловых наслоений и модификаций. […] основная модель синонимического ряда должна быть именно изосемической». 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects—animate noun</th>
<th>Participles ending in -ši from intransitive verbs</th>
<th>Participles with suffixes -n-, -t- from intransitive verbs</th>
<th>Intransitive/transitive verb in passive/active voice past tense Standard Russian Subdialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components of predicative base</td>
<td>Nominative Case</td>
<td>On privyši; Molodica je priexamši</td>
<td>On privyknuto; My fotografirovanos'; on privyknut; vnuki výjdeny zamuž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive Case</td>
<td>Narodu naexavši</td>
<td>Sjudy narodu-to ponaexano bylo (Medv.)**</td>
<td>Naexalo narodu; Mužikov xodit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinants</td>
<td>U + genitive case.</td>
<td>U staruxi bylo uexači v gorod (Medv.)***</td>
<td>U nego vyučenos'; u nejo priexano U kota nažmurilos’ (Pud.)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative Case</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nam privyknuto</td>
<td>Nam prišlos’ privyknut’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Case</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mnoj tuda perejdeno*</td>
<td>Nami obsuždalsja vopros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject is not expressed: it is determined by the context or refers to indefinite persons</td>
<td>So mnogix gorodov bylo naexavši</td>
<td>V tom dome uexano davno</td>
<td>Ran’še kak na svad’bax plakali; Ženelos’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisk * refers to records from the twentieth century:
* from Kuzaranda
** from a nearby area (Medvežegorskiy district)
*** very rare cases recorded in an adjacent area (Pudožskij district)
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