Between Dialectal Backing and the Tendency Towards Intrasyllabic Harmony Constraint: The Case of the Kryvorivnja Dialect

Oksana Lebedivna (National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, University of Edinburgh)

In this paper, I discuss *dialectal backing* in the Southwestern dialect of Ukrainian spoken in Kryvorivnja, and its interaction with the Common Slavic tendency towards intrasyllabic harmony. *Dialectal backing* refers to the correspondence of *t', d' > k', g'* in Slavic dialects (where the apostrophe-diacritic indicates palatalization), that is, a change in which *t', d'* became pronounced farther to the back of the vocal tract (Sławski 1962; Shevelov 1979; cf. Stieber 1956; Kuraszkiewicz 1963). Most Southwest Ukrainian dialects render *t', d'* close to *k', g'*, respectively. In Hutsul, this change regularly occurs before *i, e* (< *ě, e, 'a, o*) and *l', m', n'* and word-finally, as in the data in (1) in comparison with Standard Ukrainian (henceforth StU).

(1)	***g'ido***	'grandfather', m.nom.sg	StU *d'ido*
	***g**lja*	'for'	StU *dl'a* (Shevelov 1979: 689)
Kr	*s*[**k**^{j}e]*ɦn'it*	'pull away, pull off', 2pl.imp	StU *st'aɦn'it'*

This *dialectal backing* is part of the phonology of Kryvorivnja Ukrainian (Kr), one of the Hutsul dialects of Southwest Ukrainian, along with [k^{j}]~[t^{j}]-reflexes of the late fourth palatalization of velars (4pal). The 4pal is a historical change that turned Common Slavic (CS) **gy, *ky, *xy* into *g'i, k'i, x'i* in the North Slavic languages, particularly in Ukrainian (Flier 2007, 2018). However, unlike the first regressive palatalization of velars (Shevelov 1964: 261), its output was not palatal fricatives due to later phonological changes in the system. I argue that fluctuations between [t^{j}] and [k^{j}], and between [d^{j}] and [g^{j}] served as a requirement for the first velar palatalization in CS, in particular, **k' > č', *g' > (ǯ'), ž'*; cf. Southwest Ukrainian *č'* (< CS **k̂i, *t̂i*) and (*ǯ'*), *ž'* (< CS **ĝi, *d̂i*).

With this perspective, I consider the CS tendency towards intrasyllabic harmony (TTIH) as first introduced for CS by Roman Jakobson (1971; cf. Shevelov 1964; Bethin 1998) as a 'bridge' between CS and Kr. I conceive that the CS TTIH is a constraint with respect to the distinctive tonality feature of flatness, i.e., "high tonality" (that is: palatalized) consonant allophones arose before a vowel "with distinctive high tonality" (that is: non-flat vowels) and low-tonality (non-palatalized) allophones arose before vowels with distinctive low tonality (that is: flat vowels) (cf. Timberlake 1978: 726; Honeybone 2019a, 2019b). I apply Honeybone's (2019a, 2019b) approach to phonotactic constraints to the TTIH constraint and reinterpret the latter as part of a speaker's phonological knowledge. CS vowel tonality changed due to the nonmoraic /i̯/ and /u̯/, the latter somewhat sporadically. In Kr, the TTIH is active and consonants are largely palatalized before unrounded vowels and non-palatalized before rounded vowels.

An examination of tokens from 6 speakers in *Praat* shows that both Kr 4pal reflexes and cases of *dialectal backing* are mainly [t^{j}] (heard in a burst phase) and [k^{j}] (heard in a word), both before non-flat vowels, e.g., *d'iw*[t^{j}ɛ] 'girl' nom.f.pl, rather than *d'iw*[k^{j}ɛ], and [t^{j}]*imuju* 'remember' 1sg.pres was realized as [k^{j}imuju]. These demonstrate a small difference between the F_2 of [t^{j}] (< /k^{j}/) and the F_2 of [k^{j}] (< /t^{j}/). Conceivably, a palatal velar fluctuating between [k^{j}], [g^{j}] and [t^{j}], [d^{j}] may be the prerequisite for the CS first velar palatalization. I argue that, supported by the TTIH constraint, this resulted in the reinterpretation of [k^{j}], [g^{j}] as allophones of /t^{j}/, /d^{j}/ followed by an inventory of new palatal consonants, that is, *č'* and (*ǯ'*), *ž'*.