

On the Problem of Syntactic Synonyms in a Local Dialect System

Nina V. Markova

1. Introduction¹

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-*),² 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),³ 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 participial forms in *-ši* are widely used in the western zone of northern Russian and southern Russian subdialects, while perfect participial forms in *-no*, *-to* are mostly attested in northeastern territories (Kuz'mina 1993: 136, 162). I. B. Kuz'mina (1993: 151) writes that, "in those northern Russian subdialects where the constructions *u nego ujdeno* ('he has gone'), *u menja vyspanos* ('I have slept my fill') are regularly used, very few forms ending in *-ši* have been registered in predicative function."⁴

At the same time, in the northwestern zone—"for Pskov, Novgorod, Ladogo-Tixvin and some Onega subdialects, the coexistence of forms ending in *-ši* with forms with suffixes *-n-*, *-t-* is quite typical" (Kuz'mina 1993: 162).

Strictly speaking, these participial constructions, due to the perfect meaning of predicates, turn out to be non-opposing with respect to general Russian sentences with the past formed by *l*-forms (e.g., *on ušël* 'he went away'). Still, the form of the past tense of Russian verbs (in the absence of special perfect forms in the verbal system of modern standard Russian) is not limited by its general past meaning, but also expresses a perfect meaning. For a long time, researchers have noticed that the dialectal constructions with *n/t*-participles and the general Russian past with the *l*-form are semantically similar (cf., for example, Trubinskij 1984: 179–85), in particular, that "the semantic opposition of the said forms in modern subdialects, including northwest subdialects, is not maintained, and there is a tendency for the forms with *-ši* and the forms with *-l* to become similar"⁵ (Kuz'mina 1993: 155).

The object of our analysis is constructions with short forms of past participles of active and passive voice, with the latter being voice-neutral, in the subdialect of the village of Kuzaranda, one of the subdialects of Zaonežje,⁶ which presents immense research interest for both dialectolo-

4 «...в той части севернорусских говоров, где регулярно употребляются конструкции типа *у него уйдено*, *у меня vyspanos*, почти не отмечаются формы на *-ши* в предикативной функции».

5 «Хотелось бы только подчеркнуть обстоятельство, что семантическая противопоставленность данных форм в современных говорах, в том числе и веверозападных, последовательно не выдерживается—наблюдается тенденция сближения форм на *-ши* и на *-л*».

6 The term Zaonežje is applied to the Zaonežskij peninsula and nearby islands, includ-

gists (Arđentov 1955; Dolja 1962) and folklorists primarily interested in the language (Gerd 1997). The Zaonežje peninsula, situated in the northern 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 participial forms (Trubinskij 1984: 179–86).

To establish syntactic synonyms in a local dialectal system, we follow 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 participial constructions from intransitive verbs, one can single out an often 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 soženo*
 PRT 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 got 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

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

7 A semantic-syntactic situation is defined by M.N. Preobraženskaja as the "combination of logical and event-type phenomena" (Preobraženskaja 2002: 124). «...за конкретными семантико-синтаксическими ситуациями в системе языка могут закрепляться определенные структурные схемы синтаксических конструкций—моделей».

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

9 The context of the following utterance is provided in the brackets.

xot' uže i bylo vyjdeno na pensiju
 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 vsě, s lagerja prišla,*
 when already all from camp came
u ètogo 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 priezžali 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 predicative 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 vyučenosť* na buxgaltera
 at her training.NOUN.NOM.F.SG on bookkeeper
 ‘She has been trained as a bookkeeper’.

(14) [*a tut vyxodit, čto*] *u nix razojdenost'*
 but here comes that at them divorce.NOUN.NOM.F.SG
 ‘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 the 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*,
 I.DAT (≈ at me) registration.NOUN.NOM.F.SG at children
 [*a na leto priezžaju*]
 but on summer come.1SG

[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-possessive¹¹ participial perfect, two-member participial constructions with the nominative case of the subject of the action have been registered in the ratio 10 (*u+GEN* and *-no/to*): 4 (*NOM* and *-no/to*). This includes sentences without agreement between the main constituents, e.g.:

- (16) *Serjožka tože bylo padeno s ètogo pričala*
 Serjožka also be.PST.N.SG fall.PPP.INVAR from this quay
 'Serjožka had fallen from this quay too'.

as well as with agreement, e.g.:

- (17) *èta Katja s goroda priexana*
 thisKatja from town come.PPP.F.SG
 'This is Katja who has come from the town'.
- (18) *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
 [a woman speaking:] 'I had gone to the town, I worked at a fish factory';
- (19) *Nu ja sama ne zapisana-s' byla*
 PRT I.NOM myself not register.PPP.F.SG-REFL be.PST.F.SG
 '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.

¹¹ *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 morphological 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 nominative 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 svojstvenno 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-accustomed.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.FUT.3SG 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
i rabotat' tože
 and work.PRS.3SG also
 'The wife works also, [she] has a qualification and works'.

The implicit agent can be indefinite:¹³

- (28) *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

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) *U menja kassiom rabotala dak,*
 at me cashier.INS.SG work.PST.F.SG PRT
i tak uexalo-s’ tuda
 and PRT leave.PST.N-REFL there
 ‘I worked as a cashier, and so I have gone there’.

- (30) *A èto Aljošen’ka, murman’čan, a teper’*
 PRT this Aljošen’ka.NOM Murmansk-people.GEN.PL but now
uže ženelo-s’ i devočka bol’saja
 already marry.PST.ACT.N.SG-REFL and girl.NOM tall.NOM
 ‘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 Unfortunately, at present, we do not have examples from authentic speech at hand.

semantically identical. Consequently, they can be qualified as syntactic synonyms:

- (31) *u nego priexano = on priexano*
 at him come.PPP.INVAR = he.NOM.SG come.PPP.INVAR
 = *on priexan;*
 = he.NOM.SG come.PPP.NOM.SG
 ‘He has come’.

- (32) *u menja privyknuto = mne privyknuto*
 at me get-used.PPP.INVAR = I.DAT get-used.PPP.INVAR
 = *ja privyknuta*
 = I.NOM.SG get-used.PPP.NOM.F.SG
 ‘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 priexadši* (‘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) *Ozero zamerzši bylo počti*
 lake.NOM.N.SG froze.PPA.INVAR be.PST.N.SG almost
 ‘The lake was almost frozen’.

- (34) [*zdes' odin domik est'*]
 here one house is
i vot sarajka vnizu upavši
 and PRT shed.NOM.SG below fall-apart.PPA.INVAR
 ‘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,¹⁵ 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 spirtu 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 vsě
 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 ničego 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, various people from the administration’.
- (42) *S Petrozavodska bylo očën’ 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 jaranše tut žila,*] *tože priežžali ni po odin god,*
 when I earlier here lived also come.PST.3PL not for one year
no sil'no mnogo narodu stol'ko ne naežžalo,
 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

= *ja* *privyknuta* = *ja* *privykši*
 = I.NOM.F.SG get-used.PPP.NOM.SG.F = I.NOM.SG get-used.PPA.INVAR
 'I got used to'.

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 ujdeno*. 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).¹⁷

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», экономичными языковыми средствами, без дополнительных смысловых наслоений и модификаций. [...] основная модель синонимического ряда должна быть именно изосемической».

Subject—animate noun		Participles ending in -ši from intransitive verbs	Participles with suffixes -n-, -t- from intransitive verbs	Intransitive/transitive verb in passive/active voice past tense <i>Standard Russian Subdialect</i>
Components of predicative base	Nominative Case	<i>On privykši; Molodica je priexamši</i>	<i>On privyknuto; My fotografirovanos'; on privyknut; vnuki vyjdeny zamuž</i>	<i>on privyk; my prišli; my fotografirovalis'</i>
	Genitive case	<i>Narodu naexavši</i>	<i>Sjudy narodu-to ponaexano bylo (Medv.)**</i>	<i>Naexalo narodu; Mužikov xodit</i>
Determinants	U + genitive case.	<i>U staruxi bylo uexači v gorod (Medv.)***</i>	<i>U nego vyučenos'; u nejo priexano</i>	<i>U kota nažmurilos' (Pud.)***</i>
	Dative case	-	<i>Nam privyknuto</i>	<i>Nam prišlos' privyknut'</i>
	Instrumental case	-	<i>Mnoj tuda perejdeno*</i>	<i>Nami obsuždalsja vopros</i>
Subject is not expressed: it is determined by the context or refers to indefinite persons		<i>So mnogix gorodov bylo naexavši</i>	<i>V tom dome uexano davno</i>	<i>Ran'se kak na svad'box plakali; Ženelos'</i>

Asterisk * refers to records from the twentieth century:

* from Kuzaranda

** from a nearby area (Medvežegorskij district)

*** very rare cases recorded in an adjacent area (Pudožskij district)

References

- Avanesov, R.I., 1964, "Vvedenie," *Russkaja dialektologija*, eds. R.I. Avanesov & V.G. Orlova, Moscow, pp. 3–28.
- Ardentov, B.P., 1955, "K izučeniju zaonežskogo dialekta," *Učenyje zapiski Kišinevskogo universiteta* 10, pp. 73–88.
- Dolja, T.G., 1969, "Sintaksičeskie osobennosti govorov Zaonež'ja Karelskoj ASSR," *Lingvističeskij sbornik* 1, pp. 54–65.
- Gerd, A.S. (1997): "Jazyk pričitanij Severnogo kraja," *Pričitanija Severnogo kraja, sobrannye Barsovym* 2, ed. A.S. Gerd, St Petersburg, pp. 603–17.

- Kuz'mina I.B. & E.V. Nemčenko, 1982, "Istorija pričastij," *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: morfologija, glagol*, eds. R.I. Avanesov & V.V. Ivanov, Moscow, pp. 280–411.
- Kuz'mina, I.B., 1993, *Sintaksis russkix govorov v lingvogeografičeskom aspekte*, Moscow.
- Markova, N.V., 1987, "K voprosu o konstrukcijax s pričastnymi formami, obrazovannymi ot osnovy neperexodnyx glagolov s pomošč'ju suffiksov *-n-*, *-t-*, v onežskix govorax," *Russkie dialekty: lingvističeskij aspect*, eds. R.I. Avanesov & O.N. Moraxovskaja, Moscow, pp. 167–73.
- Markova, N.V., 2008, "Glagol'nyje konstrukcii s roditel'nyim padežom ob"ekta i sub"ekta v onežskix govorax," *Severnorusskie govory: mežvuzovskij sbornik* 9, ed. A.S. Gerd, St. Peterburg, pp. 146–55.
- Preobraženskaja, M., 2002, "O nekotoryx problemax issledovanija sintaksisa dialektного russkogo jazyka," *Avanesovskij sbornik: k 100-letiju so dnja roždenija R.I. Avanesova*, ed. N.N. Pšeničnova, Moscow, pp. 118–24.
- Trubinskij, V.I., 1984, *Očerki russkogo dialektного sintaksisa*, Leningrad.
- Zolotova, G.A., 1982, *Kommunikativnye aspekty russkogo sintaksisa*, Moscow.