

Andriy KOLESNYKOV

Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Ukrainian Language and Literature at Izmail State University of Humanities.

Author of 85 scientific papers.

He has been working at Izmail State University of Humanities since 2000.

Scientific interests: Slavic dialectology, theoretical morphology, areal linguistics, linguo-geography.

E-mail: akolesnykov2015@ukr.net

PROSPECTS OF INVESTIGATION OF THE UKRAINIAN-SPEAKING AREA OF SOUTHERN ODESA REGION: OBJECTS, METHODS, CLASSIFICATIONS

Analyzing the status of investigation of the Ukrainian Language in the Southern Odesa region, the author highlights the linguists' areas of work in this territory. In particular, he focuses on the less studied nowadays dialects of the newer formation, concentrating on the problem of importance of the Ukrainian Language investigation in multilingual spaces from the standpoint of national language politics, of the development of linguistic methodology according to the fullness of dialectal studies covering the Ukrainian lingual territory.

Key words: *The Ukrainian Language, dialect, resettlement dialectal microsystem, multilingual area, Odesa region.*

Odesa is a heterogeneous region in dialectal plane. There are observed ancient Podoljansky dialects of the Ukrainian language (northwestern districts of the region – Lyubashivsky, Podil'skiy, Anan'ivsky, Baltsky, Oknianskiy, Savransky, Kodymsky, Zakhariivsky) and genetically and dynamically heterogeneous new-lived steppe dialects living in the southern and western parts of the region. The most colorful area in the lingual plan is the Southern Bessarabia (*the Dniester and the Danube rivers – hereinafter – MDD*), since the Ukrainian-speaking component actively interacts with Russian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Gagauz and other dialects.

Ukrainian dialects of Odesa region have been the subject of linguistic research on numerous occasions. From the middle of the twentieth century, they have been studied by A. A. Moskalenko, V. P. Drozdovsky, A. M. Mukan, P. Yu. Grytsenko, V.P. Logvyn, and T.P. Zavorotna; and in the last quarter of the twentieth century – at the beginning of the XXI century – by P. Yu. Gritsenko, M.S. Delusto, A.O. Kolesnykov, O.I. Bondar and others.

The results of these studies presented first the descriptive works, characterizing micro-areas (*Grytsenko, 1980; Drozdovsky, 1962; Mukan, 1960*), separate dialects (*Delusto, 2010; Melnychuk, 1951*), and lexicographic materials (*Moskalenko, 1958; Bondar, 2011*). The additional materials to some dissertations (*Drozdovsky, 1962; Mukan, 1960; Zavorotna, 1967*) were small dictionaries of dialect vocabulary. Territorial variation of the Ukrainian language within the Odessa region found its linguo-geographic representation in the national atlas, e.g. (*AUM, 2001*), and in the regional Atlas of Ukrainian dialects of between the Dniester and the Danube (*Kolesnykov, 2016*). The study of the regional Ukrainian dialects is such, that, on the one hand, they cannot yet be considered fully studied (firstly, there have been largely investigated lexical-semantic and morphological levels of the linguistic structure, but not all the dialects of the area), and on the other hand, the achieved actualizes the need for deeper scientific research.

The importance of «live dialectal» and «folk colloquial» study of the national language is self-evident for any linguist. That is because any literary language is based on a dialect

and this genetic link applies not only to the moment of formation of a literary language, but also to its further development, and is based on the constant influence of dialect norms on the literary variant, and on the viability of the language as a whole. For as long as living dialects are alive, the national language is alive as well.

Axiomatic seem to be O. A. Potebnja's words that the testimony of a living dialectal language is the most important source for the study of language history, that, in general, the history of any particular language is the history of its dialects (*Bevzenko, 1991: 132; Moskalenko, 1962: 16*).

The urgency of the study of new-live and multilingual dialect habitats, which is the MDD, is increasing in view of the political aspects (language policy, geopolitics). Nowadays, in the rhetoric of the Ukrainian media around the language policy of Ukraine often say: «Those, who possess language, have the power», «Those who possess language, have the state».

This is a good idea, because it is clear that language is an important state-building and ethno-consolidating factor. The new Law of Ukraine «On ensuring the functioning of the Ukrainian language as a state language» sets the task of «ensuring the functioning of the state language as an instrument of unification of the Ukrainian society and serves a means of strengthening the state unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine, its independent statehood and national security» (paragraph 3); «development of the Ukrainian language to strengthen national identity, preserve national culture, traditions, customs, historical memory and ensure its functioning as a state building factor of the Ukrainian nation» (paragraph 5). Among these tasks, not least is the statement of the need to «establish the Ukrainian language as a language of interethnic communication» (paragraph 2), which is firstly relevant for polymorphic regions of Ukraine such as the MDG.

Undoubtedly, the statehood of a language implies the obligation to use it in official documents, in the bodies of law, public administration, the judiciary, in educational institutions, science, culture, etc. All this is true, but first, the prerequisite for the language to be fixed on a certain territory is its functioning as primary, basic spoken form. If so, there is reason to justify the administrative and political affiliation of the territory, the respective ethnic group – the native speaker of that language, by the national state,. In other words, preservation and development of a language in certain, especially potentially endangered territories of the state (such as multi-lingual regions of South Bessarabia) is the key to preserving these territories and developing the state.

Otherwise, if the state recognizes that in a certain territory does not have a state language in a live spoken form (and the absence of the state language may be treated as lack of attention to it – AK), this could be an impetus for annexation, the search of the aggressors to separate the territory. If we even specifically look at the history of Southern Bessarabia, we will see that the ethno-linguistic component has always been present during its «transitions» to the jurisdiction of different states (where there is Russian language and ethnicity, there is Russian territory where Romanian language and ethnicity, there is Romanian territory). In this aspect, the need to study the Ukrainian language dialects in Southern Bessarabia, the constant attention to them directly correlates with the establishment (retention) in these territories of the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian statehood in general.

We also consider the prospect of the deeper study of those levels of linguistic structure of the Ukrainian areal dialects (phonetic, syntactic, phraseological), which were less studied in the previous stages of their study, the extension of objects of observation (attracting the speech that functions in the poly-componental lingual situation of micro-social group),

integration and updating of traditional research procedures (for example, combining, given the range's interference, the complexity of the linguistic situation, dialectological and sociolinguistic techniques, the use of dialect textual graphics in dialectological studies and guidelines to be complete and systematic description of dialects, receiving the comparison of statements obtained through observation and questionnaire method, etc).

A separate area of linguistic research in the area is the study of dialects in the aspect of linguistic / dialect interaction, the sociolinguistic situation in which they are developing, the analysis of their dialectical process. An interesting object within this area is the so-called newer formation (*Kolesnykov, 2015a*).

Studying Ukrainian dialects of the newer formation and their microhabitats, will make it possible to fill in the information gaps regarding the spatial variation of the Ukrainian language (given the current state of linguo-geographic reflection of the Ukrainian language, as Bolgrad, Artsyz, Reni, part of the Tarutyno district of the Odesa region may seem not Ukrainian in the lingual plane). It will improve the descriptive and linguistic geographical reflection of its habitats, including newcomers. It will help to concretize and specify the classification of Ukrainian language dialects (first of all, report) to introduce the existing classification of Ukrainian migrant dialects in general and newer dialects in particular); those related to the situation of linguistic and dialect contact.

Investigation of newly formed Ukrainian dialects is of practical importance. It consists in fixing and ordering new dialect and sociolinguistic empirical material, replenishing dialectology with practical experience of examining these dialects, refining information about the behavior of genetically different (Trans-Carpathian, West Polish, etc.) dialects in new interferential levels of their dialectal changes language structure (primarily phonetic, morphological, lexical). This, in turn, will be required when working out general theoretical problems of dialectology, studying the spatial variation of the Ukrainian language and its dynamics over time.

Working at the dissertation «Morphology of Ukrainian MDD dialects» (*Kolesnikov, 2015b*), we drew attention to specific Ukrainian idioms, which were called by the time of their formation. They were formed later than the other communicative microsystems of the area (in the 40's and 60's of the XX century), mostly in the place of the emptied German villages – «newly formed dialects», and tried to classify them, as those were Ukrainian dialects that had previously been ignored by dialectologists or were being studied as appropriate.

They are observed in the south of Odesa region in unequal (multicomponent, heterogeneous) sociolinguistic conditions. They are losing under the influence of these circumstances their genetic dialect, national traits, or undergoing reductions. In the following, we set out the task of studying this type of dialer more deeply, supplementing and refining linguistic information about them, and refining their classification. We have accomplished this task by working on projects, scientific topics of the Department of Ukrainian Language and Literature at IDGU, managing master's studies (*M. Parpulanska, O. Dvorochuk, O. Ropotyn, G. Haidut*) and conducting our own investigations (*Kolesnikov, 2019*). In the article we will not dwell in detail on the language features of dialects of the marked type (they are analyzed and partially reflected in the mentioned works), but will try to determine the value of these dialects as an object of linguistics, and specificity and features of the research procedures. In addition, we shall analyze the experience and criteria of them classifications, including extra-lingual.

Specific Ukrainian South Bessarabian dialects of the newer formation, which became the object of our study, constitute a rather large microhabitat, primarily in the Artsyz

district, which extends partly to Tarutynsky and Saratsky districts, and they form mosaic inclusions into the dialect micro-systems of mixed type of the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky and other regions.

Most of the newer Ukrainian dialects are currently observed in the Artsyz district. These are the dialects of the town of Arzis (Arzis, Peterwunsch), the villages of Veseluy Kut (Alecksüßwerth, Paris), Dolynivka (Gnadental), Nadezdivka (Hoffnungsfeld, Hoffnungstal), Vyshnjaky (Neu-Arzis), Novoselivka (Neu-Elft, Fere-Champenoise II), Myrnopillja (Friedenstal), Prjamobalka (Dennewitz), Sadove ((Alt-Elft, Fere-Champenoise And), Plots'k (Plotzk), Neptytsja (Teplitz). They are also available in Tarutynskiy district: Tarutine township (Tarutino), Beresine township (Beresina), Borodino township (Borodino), villages of Malyjaroslavets' II (Alt-Posttal), Vesela Dolyna (Klöstitz), Lujanka (Katzbach), Nove Tarutyne (Neu-Tarutyne), Plachynda (Josefsdorf); IN Tatarbunars'kyj district: the villages of Marazliivka (Maraslienfeld), Bazar'janka (Basyriamka), In Saratskiy region: Sarata township, the villages of. Svitlodolyns'ke (Lichtental), Nadezda (Eigenfeld), Pozivka (Rosenfeld), Blagodatne (Gnadenfeld), Belgorod-Dnestrovsky region: the villages of Dolynivka (Neu-Posttal), Sofiiivka (Sofiental), Semenivka (Seimeny), Romanivka (Romanowka), Shabo, in Kylijskiy region: v. Pomazany (Pomasan).

Ukrainian dialects of the newer formation differ from other Ukrainian dialects of the MDD by the time of formation (most of them were formed in the 40-60's of the 20th century in the former settlements of the so-called «Bessarabian Germans». In a short period (from September to November of 1940), they were evicted to German territories, including the lands of occupied Poland, according to the Soviet-German agreement of September 5, 1940. Nevertheless, there were other models of the formation of dialects of this type), the specificity of the resettlement of speakers and, as a consequence, the specific linguistic (sociolinguistic) and the dialect itself them) with the features of the dials (*Kolesnykov, 2015a: 12-13*).

The dialect microsystems of the newer formation are relatively stable, retaining linguistic and dialect features. This fact gives us an opportunity to distinguish dialects with different dominants, which, are characterized by unequal influence (the West Polis'ya relatively strong dialect – the village of Novoselivka, in Artsyz district, with the West Polis'ya less dominant dialect, the Gorky nunnery. The weak dominant is Vesely Kut, Vyshniaky of the Artsyz district; some dialects (e.g. with weak dominance), are being already developed according to the dynamic model of mixed dialect microsystems).

Among the newly formed dialects, we may see those, which retain Ukrainian linguistic dominance. They undergo dialectical reduction, and are developed on the pattern of mixed idioms (e.g. the village of Maloyaroslavets, in Tarutino District II, Sofiyivka, in Belgorod-Dnestrovsky District, Plock, in Artsyzsky District). However, there are also such dialects in which notable reduction is observed not only in dialect but also in linguistic features, as well as microsystems in which persistent idioms are not dominant, but still are persistent).

Even at the stage of selection and characterization of Ukrainian dialects of the newer formation of the southern Odesa region as an object of study (as well as in the further process of research), the linguist is asked why these new-age dialects have not become the object of traditional dialectology before? In the works of dialectologists, we find the answer, they say, «the dialectical process in them is not yet complete» (*Drozdovsky, 1962*). In fact, the dialectical process is a permanent phenomenon, which lasts constantly in all speeches and in all phases of their formation, development, and even in the phase of destruction. Then what discouraged the researchers from this important and interesting object? This is

probably the complexity of their study. These are the same difficulties as those that arise in describing and mapping newcomers in general, only in greater concentration. Their reason is the significant influence on the lingual being and the rapid dynamics of the idioms of the sociolinguistic factors of life and development of these dialects, which requires the philologists to involve sociolinguistic research procedures in dialectical studios, and, obviously, the Ukrainian dialectology of the twentieth century. Has not been ready yet.

Let us analyze in detail the Ukrainian dialects to the newer formation as an object of linguistics. Being in the south of Odeschyna, they are a separate type of new-life dialects of the Ukrainian language, differing from other dialectal and extra-lingual features. Unlike most of the dialects that form the basis of the South Bessarabian Ukrainian dialect array, functioning in an area of more than 200 years, these microsystems are formed much later – they are 78-60 and less years old.

The study of migratory dialects is a scientific problem of dialectology, since they are objectively complex in linguistic, sociolinguistic, genetic, dynamic and spatial terms. An important factor in the formation of all newer dialects is the interference, and mixing of different genetic traits (dialects of the same language and different languages). And this mixing determines the character of both individual dialects (eg, mixed, reductive microsystems), and whole habitats of migratory dialects, which can be found in dialects of different genesis and dynamic types, including mixed ones, through the bandage of dialect space.

Giving the prevalence of new-age dialects (the area of their habitat is a large part of the southeastern dialect of the Ukrainian language, in particular, the Slobozhany and Steppe dialects, as well as certain dialects of the southwestern dialect), this complicates the task of simply mapping dialectical Ukrainian) – this significantly complicates the task of mapping Ukrainian dialect space. It is known that Ukrainian linguists, while laying down the task of compiling the Atlas of the Ukrainian Language (AUM) planned 4 volumes of this work; to analyze their configuration, linguistically justified defining the boundaries of dialect groups and other units of dialectal membership and, thus, to map the real dialect division of the territory in resettlement dialects. There were published only 3 volumes, as the result of a survey of the migratory dialect space revealed lack of opposing, lack of area-relevant data to identify isoglosses. In particular those that would converge into strands, in order to analyze their configuration and linguistically justify the boundaries of dialect groups and other units, the maps showing dialect division of the territory, stressing the residence of migrants, so only 3 volumes were published. Thus, the task of mapping the new-life dialects of the Ukrainian language was actually «outsourced» to the atlases of the regional, and the national atlas did not solve the problems of their characterization and classification, leaving the «conditionality» and «approximation» of both the definition of the units of the new-life space and their boundaries. AUM's drafters have analyzed why this happened, thus effectively giving guidance to compilers of regional atlases and regional studies in general. In their view, in order to map the migratory space, firstly, it is necessary to explore their habitats using a descriptive method in order to identify new area-relevant dialect traits that would allow juxtaposition of old-time dialects and, secondly, to create and use a questionnaire into which these locally relevant dialect features would be embedded. However, for the sake of comparability of data in the national atlas, the questionnaire decided to leave the old, oriented to the old-fashioned area.

Among the difficulties of describing and mapping of newer dialects, there have been the objective ones that cannot be eliminated, as it is harder to stop the correction based on approaches and research procedures. Firstly, it is the sociolinguistic complexity of these

habitats related, in particular, to the situation of linguistic contact, individual and social poly-linguism and poly-dialectology, linguistic investigation of dialectisms under such conditions as were observed in the 20th century, gave no place to dialectology or sociolinguistics and linguistics in general. With regard to the latter, W. Weinreich rightly noted that poly-linguism is a phenomenon not only significant, but also quite common and ordinary, but linguistics is generally regarded as monolingual as a rule, and polymorphism as something exceptional, and for such an «extremely idealized view» reasons. The first of these is the temptation to extrapolate the experience of individual European and American states, which, over a short period of history, approached, with relative success, the conscious goal of fully standardizing language as a symbol and instrument of their national existence. Another reason is that structural linguistics in the early stages of its development required the assumption of the synchronicity and qualitative homogeneity of linguistic texts as objects of description. However, neither the cultural-geographical partitions nor the temporal methodological guidelines, due to the immaturity of science, should obscure from us the fact that millions of people, perhaps the majority, master to a certain extent two or more language systems and are able to use them depending on the communicative situation (*Weinreich, 1972*). In our opinion, this problem can still be partially solved in the case of modern linguistics awareness of the real typicality of poly-linguism, the adoption of this thesis as an axiom, which will cause the gradual withdrawal of poly-lingual areas from the «guardianship» only sociolinguistics and as a consequence – integration of linguistic including dialectological and sociolinguistic.

Another objective factor that has caused and still causes difficulties in describing and mapping migrations, especially of the newer formation, is the nature of their manifestation in space and time. The fluency and mosaic character of these dialects do not allow to use accessible and consistent treatment, and to illustrate their areal distribution. And in the process of mapping significantly complicate the use of isoglosses and analysis of atomic. The rapidity of the dynamics of these dialects in time, due to the situation of intense and multicomponent language / dialect contact, spatial parameters of speech and speech contacts, makes them a complex dialectical object. And the traditional integration of dialectology with comparative-historical linguistics does not solve this complexity, since the classical comparative-historical method is aimed primarily at the past, at reconstruction, blocking its potential for the analysis of modern dynamic processes, forecasting the development of language.

A more complex genetic, dynamic and socio-lingual character, the specificity of location in space, distinguishes both, the newer formations, as migratory dialectal micro-systems, and the forthcoming formations of dialects. Most importantly, why dialectologists overlooked these speeches is the state of their dialectical process. VP Drozdovsky, stated that in the 60's of the twentieth century. While exploring the area of the Bessarabian Alps, there were many Ukrainian dialects in the Artsyz district, including those operating in former German settlements. However, despite the geographical occurrence of these dialects in the area of the survey, the scientist bypassed their attention, because, they say, «the dialectical process in them is still ongoing» (*Drozdovsky, 1962*). It is difficult to agree with this statement, since, as we have already noted, the dialectical process «continues» in all dialects. Then why did he refuse to study these microsystems? In our opinion, because these speeches were in a stage of development to which dialectical methods were not at all customized at the time, but which all migratory speeches had passed. It is because of the marked stage of the development of dialect microsystems, and that it is important to study the talk of the newer formation, their study would make it possible to understand the

dialectological character of all the migratory dialects, the patterns of their development. What is it about the stage of development of squirrels? In our opinion, this is the phase when there are no speeches (in their usual sense), and there are separate, genetically not always homogeneous, idolaters of speakers of a certain locality, who are also often characterized by poly-linguism and poly-dialectism. The heterogeneity of the idiocy of such settlements may concern different parts of the society that create a communicative environment (families, working class, school class, etc.), and in particular – of different generations, ages of speakers. Even within the same family, spouses are often representatives of different genetic dialect types of the same language, or even native speakers of different languages. There may be different models here, and we encountered many of them during dialectical research. For example, a mother can be a native speaker of the local dialect, and a father – the Middle Polish'je, then, what kind of dialect will their child have? She will probably choose her mother's or father's linguistic model, and possibly the model of the dominant or more prestigious idiom in the local society (Ukrainian literary language, Russian variant, Bulgarian or Romanian dialect, South Bessarabian dialect type of Ukrainian, etc.). Depending on sociolinguistic factors, this child may choose different patterns of linguistic behavior that may change throughout her life. For example, it may be that a child will use multiple idioms, switching codes depending on the communicative situation, and then, with age, select only one code and not switch more. It is clear that the dynamics of the newly created speech, its genetic and dynamic nature, in general, existence will depend on the linguistic evolution of all speakers of the analyzed local society.

A researcher-linguist, if finding himself in such a local linguistic environment, states the fact of existing, and even of the dominant role of the Ukrainian language. He sees the uniqueness of the lingual phenomenon, and feels the need to describe it, study it, but calls such a form of the Ukrainian language, on the base of which an easy dialectological study will certainly be not possible. Difficulties arise already at the stage of determining the terms for the designation of the object (talk or no talk, and then what?), the designation of the model of mixing idioms and attitudes of speakers to the norms (surzhik, common language), and problems of studying idiolect, values of individual linguistic behavior are actualized (social and communicative factors) as a component of the linguistic evolution of the individual and, in turn, as a factor in the development of speech. All this mandates a revision, a change in the established research procedures of dialectology, which have not yet allowed linguists to focus on such an interesting object as the talk of the newer formation.

For the first time, distinguishing the newer formation speeches as a separate type, we firstly drew our attention to the microhabitats of the artichokes of the Artsyz district of the Odessa region, since they, despite the Ukrainian language of their carriers, did not become the object of study of some of their predecessors, and they differ among them. other South Bessarabian many dialect traits (retaining, on the one hand, genetic West Polish and Trans-Carpathian traits, and on the other, without accepting the integrative traits of South Bessarabian dialects), intense dynamics, a kind of socio-lingual their conditions of existence, type of settlements, which moved speaker (former German village), character areal distribution (relative compactness location forms a nearly continuous micro-areal). However, if we take as a basis a classification factor such as the time of formation of dialects (extra-lingual but relevant for the classification of migratory dialects), then dialect microsystems of the Artsyz district is only one of the varieties of dialects of the newer formation of the south of Odesa.

Studying the place of new formed Ukrainian dialects, and comparing them with the other Southern Bessarabian dialects, steppe dialects and general Ukrainian dialects,

conducting the second scientific study (analyzing the history of the study of dialects of this type and critically overestimating the methodology of the study, conducting expeditions and collecting material at different levels of linguistic structure of the Ukrainian dialects of newer formation), we concluded that their classification may have something different (compared to the information represented in our monograph 2015). Due to the fact, that the analyzed dialectical process has not yet led to the formation of solid dialectal micro-arrays, sometimes even the dialect as such in its usual dialectical understanding (as a communicative system limited by one, more rarely – by several closely spaced settlements) is not observed. In contrast, settlements have the appearance of conglomerate, and present sets of multilingual speakers with very dynamic linguistic behavior. This process is influenced by many extralinguistic, socio-lingual and proper dialect factors should recognize that tier classification studied dialects, which share some reason the division will be inconclusive and are generally unlikely. Instead, the division of dialects by different criteria will make them more convincing.

Space and time are indispensable conditions for the existence of a communication system, which leaves an imprint on it in different periods of its development. The temporal parameter of being a newer formation is characterized by intense variability, which has a predetermined dependence on multicomponent linguistic and dialect contacts, as well as the spatial distribution of dialects in the new habitat. The spatial dimension of being idioms determines the intensity and number of factors influencing them, and therefore their dynamics over time. Compact (in the Artsyz district) and dispersed (e.g. in the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district) location of newer formation dialects are represented in the area. The former contributes generally to the preservation of linguistic and dialect features, the latter mainly to reduction, but it depends on the linguistic and dialectal environment.

The classification of migratory dialects, at least until they have reached the stage of formation of a relatively even dialect array and the formation of new dialect members on this basis, in our opinion, should be based on their genetic and dynamic characteristics.

Genetically, the dialects of the newer formation of the range are represented by various, almost all, Ukrainian dialects (Podil'sky, Trans-Carpathian, Boykivs'ky, Hutsuls'ky, Lemkivs'ky, Nadians'ky, etc.) of all kinds, which are identified at the level of individual linguistic features of dialect. There are still people (mostly older people) who speak these dialects in the different settlements where there are newer Ukrainian dialects. However, not all maternal dialects are preserved equally. Their preservation depends on the course of the speech forming process, the peculiarities of the relocation of speakers (voluntary / forced, organized / spontaneous, compact / dispersed, etc.), i.e. on the dynamic type of speech being formed (see the following division criterion). The newer formation of genetic components, preserved in the Southern Bessarabian formations revealed the West Polis'ye (villages of Vesely Kut, Myrnopillya, Novoselivka, Vyshniaky, Prymobalka, in Artsyz district), Trans-Carpathian (Prymobalka and Myrnopillya), the village of «Banatsany» in Tatarbunarsky district, Svitodolinske, Rozivka, Blagodatne in Sarata district, Dolynivka, Shabo in Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district, Pomazany of Kyliya district, Bukovyna-Podilskyi (Nadezhda in Sarata district, Plachinda in Tarutyno district). The following dialectic genetic types are less conserved, less dialectic, or the following dialectic genetic types are reduced: the Nesyansky – Merry Valley of the Tarutyno district and the East Polis'jan – Semenivka of the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district, Plock of the Artsyz district. Among these types, invasive (e.g. Trans-Carpathian, East Polish, etc.) and aboriginal dialects, formed in the area (South Bessarabia), or already present in the MDD at

the time of newer formation (Bukovyno-Podil'sky) and formed, as the result of inner-areal migration.

There are two types of newly formed dialects by dynamic criterion: stable and reductive. Taking into account the specificity of the analyzed dialects, their attribution to one type or another is to some extent conditional and rather reflects a changing dynamic trend. Taking into account lingual and dialectal heterogeneity of the South Bessarabian range, the stability, or reductiveness of the dialects can be related to both: their linguistic and dialectal affiliation. Persistent dialects that retain maternal linguistic features, (e.g. the village of Sofiyivka, in Belgorod-Dnistrovsky district) stable dialect features (e.g. the village of Novoselivka, in Artsyz district), are reductive in relation to stable dialect features (e.g. stable in terms of preservation of mother tongue features in the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district), reductive to parent language dialect features (e.g. the village of Nadezhdivka, in Artsyz district). According to our observations, if a dialect is stable with respect to maternal dialect features, it usually retains linguistic features, but if it is reductive in relation to maternal linguistic features, then it is the same with respect to dialects.

When determining the dynamic type of a newly formed dialect, the local socio-linguistic conditions of its functioning (number of languages and dialects available in the settlement) are updated again. It is clear that the poly-lingual state of the settlement is a factor that contributes to the qualification of new-formation dialects as reductive (this applies to most towns and cities of the region: Artsyz, Tarutyne, Berezyne, Sarata, Borodino). Still, there are cases when within a village different languages and dialects are observed; instead, the status of idioms is indicative of their stability (e.g. preservation of the Trans-Carpathian maternal dialect in the poly-lingual and poly-dialect situation of Prjamobalka, in Artsyz district), and such stability may be quite long in time. E.g. a Ukrainian dialect of the Slobozhansk area has been preserved, regardless of its more than 200 years of contact with the Russian accent within a village of Oleksandrivka, in Tarutyno district).

The combination of genetic and dynamic criteria makes it possible to distinguish types of dialects as the most represented models, which will vividly and concisely represent the expression of differentiated marked criteria of traits. Here they are contrasted first of all as: a) relatively stable dialects, with the conservation of genetic dialect types; b) resistant to linguistic features of speech developed by the model of mixed dialect (they can be differentiated at the next level of separation by the nature of the conservation / reduction in them of different dialect constituents, or the dominance in them of a particular phrase); c) reductive in linguistic and dialect features of speech (the villages of Nadezhdivka and Dolynivka, in Artsyz district, the villages of Luzhanka and Maloyaroslavets I, in Tarutyno district).

The West-Polis'ky dialect, which influenced the formation of the entire dialectal array of the newer formation of the Artsyz district, is represented as the dominant component in the majority of Ukrainian dialects of this administrative entity. The dialectic process in microsystems now allows to determine its state of formation as potentially mono-generous, with the respect of dialects only, e.g. in the villages of Mirnopillya and Novoselivka. Regarding the preservation of the mother Trans Carpathian dialect, the tendency of mono-geneity can be mentioned only in one (but dominant) dialect of poly-dialectic and polymorphic village of Prjamobalka, in Artsyz district.

A separate genetically dynamic type is the mixed-dialect of newer formations. It are formed by mixing dialects within the same language: 1) in equal proportions, or 2) with the predominance of features of a particular adverb. Such a juxtaposition is conditional and

reflects rather the changing tendencies of dynamics over time, but in the MDD, there is a widespread definite dominance of the dialect features of the south-western dialect, as well as the western (Western-Polis'ky) dialects of the northern dialect, for example, in the village of Teplytsja, in Artsyz district and Sofiyivka, in Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district. This dominance is also explicit in the dialects where we have noticed the preference for certain invasive dialect types, such as the West Polis'ya, with the dynamics of interference of the dialects, e.g. Vesely Kut, Pryamobalka, in Artsyz district (the dialect of Ukrainians is not from Trans-Carpathia), and mixed with the presence of invasive ones (Nove Tarutyne, in Tarutynsky district, Romanivka, in Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district), and of native constituents, including Plachinda, in Tarutyno district, Nadezhda, in Sarata district, Raylyanka, in Tatarbunar district), and Middle-Dnieper (Tsarychanka). It is known that the last maternal dialect has a transitional character between the southeastern and southwestern dialects. The features of the southwestern dialect are also frequent in the dialects of the newer formation with the dominance of the native and maternal Southern Bessarabian dialectal type (villages of Marazliyivka, Rozivka, Svitodolinske, Bazaryanka, Blagodatne, Dolynivka, Shabo, Pomazany). The very type was noted in the middle of the twentieth century by VP Drozdovsky and AM Mukan, who distinguished it as a «transitional» form from south-eastern to south-western «on the south-eastern dialectal basis» (*Drozdovsky, 1962; Mukan, 1960: 60*). Thus, the rumors of the newer formation do not violate the general tendencies of development of the South Bessarabian habitat of the Ukrainian language.

The dynamics of Ukrainian MDDs of the newer formation should be considered in the aspect of dialectical unity of two opposite tendencies of development of any idioms (formation, on the one hand, of a solid dialect array, and on the other, of new linguistic differences). The catalyst for these processes is language contact and changes in the spatial location of idioms. An important factor in the dynamics of dialects is the tendency to produce a solid dialect array, which is found in the phenomena of dialect mixing and reduction of the corresponding genetic types of dialects. Distinctive carriers of the tendency to preserve maternal traits are idioms with new genetically dynamic characteristics of monogenetic and stability. In situations where potentially persistent dialects with distinct dialect traits occur in linguistic contact, they may: a) be absorbed by the aboriginal range (reduction of invasive type) or other invasive contact, b) assimilate the aboriginal environment (reduction of aboriginal type), c) both contact dialect systems can maintain stability; d) contact idioms, can begin to form new idioms.

The process of absorption of their own maternal dialectic elements by the new ones is influenced by the analyzed dialects under the influence of new conditions of living of dialect microsystems (South Bessarabian dialect and polyphony). The object of such an assimilation process is the dialectal types of the Ukrainian language of the area, but it can also be traced to the genetic types that still show resistance. Maintaining the stability of idioms for a relatively long time creates favorable conditions for the transformation of genetic dialect traits, the development of speech innovations in speech.

If the process of dialect innovations formation – the new ones, absent in maternal (and aboriginal, if any) dialects – concerns to a greater extent the Ukrainian dialects of the MDD of the main formation, then the transformation of the dialect traits due to the contact with the native is more observed in the dialects of the newer formation.

In order to better understanding of this process, it is worth mentioning the dialectologists' observations of the Ukrainian South Bessarabian dialects of the typical variety (basic formation) made in the 1960's. By that time, the already widespread and now specific linguistic and sub-ethnic self-assessments of local Ukrainian-speaking residents as

non-Ukrainians, «*hahliv*», had already been formed. The last micro-ethnonym in the area is not an abusive egzo-ethnonym (as in many other ancient regions of Ukraine), but is an emotionally neutral endo-ethnonym (self-name). For example, A. M. Mukan quotes the following on dialect broadcasting: *ми не^u україїнці / ми хах'ли / ми не^lкажимо ко'гут / а^lп'ивен'* (v. Desantne, in Kyliya district); *у нас хах'л'ац'кий розго'вор / і не^e рус'кий і не^e ук'райінс'кий / не^u розбе'реш // го'вор'ат' по^lрад'ів'і по-ук'райінс'кі^u і ни пон'і'май* (v. Broska, in Izmail district); *у^lКамієно-По'дол'с'к'і гу'берн'ійі су'с'ім и'наче разго'вар'уйут' // от у нас по-хах'л'ац'кі^u с'вита / а у йіх чига'йіна // во'ни^lкажут' почи'кай / потри'май / це поди'р'жи / а почи'кай / обож'ди* (v. Safjanu, in Izmail district) (Mukan, 1960: 19). V.P. Logvin demonstrated examples of dialectal speech and self-esteem of the speakers of mixed dialectal micro-systems in Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district (villages of Monashi, Stara Tsarichanka, Cherkessy) in the light of contacts that mono-geneous dialect and the south-western (Bukovyna and Podillya dialect) dialectal core in the village of Ryalyanka which «... believe that they are not real Ukrainians, but they call Ukrainians the residents of Rylyanka village: *йа'к'і ми окра'йінці'і / ми хах'ли / окра'йінці'і це рай'ки / йак'бе ми окра'йінці'і / то ми гово'рили б так йак рай'ки / ку'гут, 'вуйко, 'майста'р'ішчий, най жи'ве, май пот'рима'у / а ми ни^lкажим так*» (Logvin, 1959: 12). We supplemented such information, fixing a widespread assessment of new migrants (primarily from Western Ukraine, as well as some other ancient regions and carriers of the literary standard) as (*алешників*) *aleshniks*, because local (Bessarabian) Ukrainians do not use a counterpart *але*, but only use (*но, ну, та*) but, well, yes. The ethnonym of (*алешники*) *aleshniki* is formed by a model similar to the model of creation of ethnonyms of *лемки* (because they say *лем*), *бойки* (because they say *бойе*). In this context, it becomes clear why many of the linguistic features of new-form idiom dialectics, in particular those that conform to the literary standard and are often not relevant in the maternal range, become, through the prism of MDD linguistic contacts, the area-relevant dialect features.

The lexemes, like *'вуйко, ку'гут, 'файно, най жи'ве, 'майста'р'ішчий*, marking various South-Western Ukrainian dialects, stress the facts that match a literary model, such as: *ко'лод'аз', почи'кай, потри'май, але* and the like. They are perceived by local Ukrainians as dialectal, not native, as the language speakers say: *за'вез'ан'і*, that is why they become *new areal relevant features*.

Thus, the Ukrainian MDD dialects of the newer formation resist the process of forming a solid dialect space of the area. They still differ in linguistic features and dominant dialect types from the typical dialects of the main formation, but their own, somewhat different from the idioms of the main formation of the South Bessarabian type, development trends do not violate the general trends in the dynamics of the Ukrainian dialects of the MDD area.

To conclude the said above, the process of replenishing the South Bessarabian territorial variety of the Ukrainian language with new dialect types is still ongoing. For example, the events in the Donbas caused the temporary displacement of representatives of the Slobozhany and East-Ukrainian dialects of the Ukrainian language in the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky district (Sergiyivka settlement). It is significant that against the background of relatively low social assessment of their dialects by native speakers of the southeastern dialect as a whole (as opposed to respectful attitude towards their own dialects of speakers of the southwestern dialect), in the situation of contact with Ukrainian South Bessarabian dialects, native speakers more correct, Ukrainian». We hope for the return of the forced migrants of a new wave to their native lands, the restoration of their respective maternal

habitats, we do not exclude that these dialects will also leave an imprint on the MDD language palette.

Thus, the Ukrainian dialect of the newer MDD formation is a separate complex object of linguistic research. Its study is related to solving various complex aspects of Ukrainian linguistics: What is speech, how to analyze the language of cities and towns? What is surzhyk? How to study these phenomena and idioms? Should we study them (Ukrainian dialects of the newer formation) within the framework of dialectology (because they are primarily dialects), the history of the language (because they exhibit rapid dynamics in time) or socio-linguistics (since their existence is caused by poly-linguistic phenomena, linguistic contact, complex socio-linguistic situation), whether to go through the integration, and the combination of research procedures. All these problems need to be solved, and these are related to updating of methods and approaches, revision of traditions, overcoming of some outdated patterns of linguistics, which is urgent for Ukrainian science and the state as a whole.

Atlas ukraïnskoi movy. V 3 t. T. 3. Slobozhanshchyna, Donechchyna i sumizhni zemli. Kyiv, 2001. T. 3. 266 s.

Bevzenko S. P. Istoriiia ukraïnskoho movoznavstva. Istoriiia vvyvchennia ukraïnskoi movy. Kyiv, 1991. 231 s.

Vajnrakh U. Odniojazychie i mnogojazychie. *Novoe v lingvistike*. Jazykovye kontakty. Moskva. 1972. Vyp. 6. C. 25-60.

Gricenko P. E. Genezis i semanticheskaja struktura sel'skohozjajstvennoj leksiki ukraïnskih zapadnostepnyh govovorov : avtoref. diss. na soiskanie nauchn. stepeni kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.02. Kiev, 1980. 27 s.

Deliuosto M. S. Hramatyka hovirky u svitli tekstu : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.01 / Natsionalnyi pedahohichni universytet im. M. P. Drahomanova. Kyiv, 2010. 235 s.

Drozdovskiy V. P. Ukraïnski hovirky Bessarabskoho Prymor'ia (na materialy obstezhennia Saratskoho, Tatarbunarskoho ta Bilhorod-Dnistrovskoho raioniv Odeskoi oblasti) : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 661 / Kyivskiy derzhavnyi universytet im. T. H. Shevchenka. Kyiv, 1962. 473 s.

Zavorotna T. P. Leksyka ukraïnskykh naddunaiskykh hovirok : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 661 / Uzhhorodskiy derzhavnyi universytet. Uzhhorod, 1967. 333 s.

Kolesnykov A. O. Atlas ukraïnskykh hovirok mezhyrichchia Dnistra i Dunaiu. Izmail, 2016. 168 s.

Kolesnykov A. O. Morfolohiia ukraïnskykh pivdenobesarabskykh hovirok: heneza i dynamika. Izmail, 2015. 676 s.

Kolesnykov A. O. Morfolohiia ukraïnskykh hovirok mezhyrichchia Dnistra i Dunaiu: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia d-ra filol. nauk : 10.02.01. Kyiv, 2015. 38 s.

Kolesnykov A. O. Ukraïnski reduktivni hovirky Odeschyny: stan, problemy i perspektyvy doslidzhennia. *Movoznavchyi visnyk*. 2019. Vyp. 26. S. 68–73.

Lohvyn V. P. Osoblyvosti vymovy holosnykh u hovirkakh nyzhnogo pravoberezhnogo Podnistrovia. *Naukovi zapysky Odeskoho pedinstytutu*. 1959. T. XXIII. S. 12-25.

Melnichuk O. S. Pivdenopodilska hovirka s. Pysarivky (Kodymskoho r-nu Odeskoi obl.). *Dialektolohichni biuleten*. 1951. Vyp. III. S. 44-68.

Moskalenko A. A. Slovnyk dialektyzmiv ukraïnskykh hovirok Odeskoi oblasti. Odesa, 1958. 78 s.

Moskalenko A. A. Narys istorii ukraïnskoi dialektolohii. Odesa, 1962. 126 s.

Mukan A. M. Ukraïnski naddunaiski hovirky. Fonetyko-hramatychni osoblyvosti : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 661 / Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni. Kyiv, 1960. 291 s.

Slovnyk ukraïnskykh hovoriv Odeschyny / hol. redaktor O. I. Bondar. Odesa, 2011. 223 s.