# ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ МОЛОДИХ НАУКОВЦІВ

**OKSANA LEBEDIVNA**, Ph.D. Candidate in Linguistics, Yukhymenko Family Doctoral School of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Department of Ukrainian Language
2 Hryhorii Skovoroda St., Kyiv 04655, Ukraine
E-mail: o.lebedivna@edu.ukma.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3254-0098

# DISPALATALIZATION OF COMMON SLAVIC *Rʲ IN UKRAINIAN: THE CASE OF FAMILY NAMES IN *-UK-* IN THE HUTSUL PARISH REGISTERS

Dispalatalization of the Common Slavic *r'* refers to a phonological innovation realized on broad Slavic territory in the 10th—13th century. In Ukrainian, it did not encompass the Carpathian region, e.g., the Hutsul dialect and its Kryvorivnia dialect in particular. I argue that the tendency toward intrasyllabic harmony serves as a requirement for a lack of dispalatalization of Common Slavic *r'* in the Kryvorivnia dialect. I reinterpret the concept of intrasyllabic harmony as first outlined by Roman Jakobson and further explored by George Y. Shevelov with respect to the tonality feature of flatness (rounded/unrounded) for Common Slavic and Hutsul: most of the Kryvorivnia consonants are palatalized before unrounded vowels and nonpalatalized before rounded vowels.

The earliest manifestations of the confusion between *r* and *r'* can be found in the Kryvorivnia parish register books going back to the 1770s. Historical changes in spelling may have three reasons: 1) the non-Carpathian origin of a registrar; 2) standardization of Ukrainian in accordance with Dnieper Ukrainian norms; 3) a lack of the morphonological value of a change.

*Keywords*: Common Slavic *rʲ*, Ukrainian, family names in *-uk-*, Kryvorivnia (Hutsul) dialect, intrasyllabic harmony, dispalatalization

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I investigate the reflexes of Common Slavic (CS) [1] *rʲ* [2] in family names (proper names) in *-uk-* in the Kryvorivnia parish registers from

---

---

1775—1944 in the southeastern area of the Hutsul dialect of Southwest Ukrainian (SWU) with respect to the dispalatalization of *r'*. Dispalatalization of the CS *\*r'* refers to a phonological innovation which took place in Slavic languages in the 10th—13th century (Shevelov, 1979, p. 192). In Ukrainian, it did not appear in the Carpathian region, including the Hutsul dialect and the Kryvorivnia dialect (Kr), which belongs to Hutsul (its southeastern part) and is spoken in a village of Kryvorivnia located on the Chornyi Cheremosh River.

Kr has largely preserved the original treatment of *r* and *r'* in word- and syllable-final position, especially when followed by a velar, e.g., Kr *ve*[rʲ]*xnu* (f.acc.sg) 'one on the top', *tepe*[rʲ] 'at present'. The palatal pronunciation is traced today in family names in *-uk-*, e.g., Kr *Šynkarjuk*, *Rybarjuk* (nom. sg), cf. Lat *Szynkariuk* (1775), *Rybariuk* (1777) Lib 1775 and the like (MoU *-ar-*; CS *\*-arjъ*: Melʹnychuk et al., 1966, p. 128) compared with the Standard Ukrainian use like MoU *Šynkaruk*, *Rybaruk*. In this respect, I argue that a tendency toward intrasyllabic harmony, first introduced for CS by Roman Jakobson, serves as a requirement for the preservation of Kr *r'* and dispalatalization of Kr *-r'uk-* along with some other processes. Based on Timberlake's (1978) understanding of the fourth palatalization of velars in terms of assimilation of features I assign the concept of intrasyllabic harmony to the tonality feature of flatness (rounding) for CS and southeastern Hutsul, that is, choice of a consonant allophone and a vowel of roughly the same tonality, i.e., high tonality consonant allophone (palatalized) with distinctive high tonality vowel (non-flat) and low tonality allophone (non-palatalized) with distinctive low tonality vowel (flat) (see Timberlake, 1978, p. 726); cf. *ÿ*[dʲɛˈtʲa] 'go' (2pl.pres) (MoU *idete*, CS *\*(j)iti* (inf) ESUM 2, pp. 320—321), [ˈvʲɪbʲˈɪu̯] 'beat, knock out' (3sg.pst) (MoU *vÿbÿ*u̯, CS *\*vy-*, *\*biti* ESUM 1, pp.186—187, 368) but [bu]*lo* 'be' (MoU *bulo* 3sg.n.past; CS *\*byti* < *būtei* 'be' (inf), ESUM 1, pp. 308—309). The reinterpretation of the term had factual and theoretical grounds which will not be detailed here as it is outside of the scope of this paper.

In this article, I apply comparative, structural, and descriptive methods. I particularly refer to a feature theory and the notion of relations of subordination represented by Andersen's (1973) understanding of a phoneme and phonological opposition. He treats phoneme as a complex of features (a syntagm) ascribed "phonemic 'feature values' — or, speaking traditionally, terms of phonological oppositions" (Andersen, 1973, p. 769). The term "ultimate

---

U — Ukrainian; SWU — Southwest Ukrainian; NU — North Ukrainian; SEU — Southeast Ukrainian; PU — Proto-Ukrainian; MoU — Modern Ukrainian; P — Polish; MoP — Modern Polish; CS — Common Slavic; LCS — Late Common Slavic; NS — North Slavic; OCS — Old Church Slavonic; ChSl — Church Slavonic; Lat — Latin script; Kr — the Kryvorivnia dialect. Including grammatical and phonological terms nom (nominative), gen (genitive), dat (dative), acc (accusative), inst (instrumental), impr (imperative), sg (singular), pl (plural), f (female), m (male), n (neuter), pst (past tense), pres (present tense), perf (perfective), impf (imperfective), adj (adjective), shrp (sharp), flt (flat), and grv (grave).

2   Where necessary to distinguish a data phonemic transcription and proper names and references, a scientific transliteration and non-scientific transliteration to meet the rules of journal *Ukraïnsʹka Mova*, respectively, will be used.

    The choice of "the nonmoraic sonorant /i̯/ and not the consonantal /j/" within the process of iotation ("the effect of a front glide on a preceding consonant") is based on Bethin 1993.

constituents" means that features like [±voiced], [±grave], [±consonantal], or [±vocalic] may define a phonemic segment, e.g., /k/, forming binary paradigm interpreted in relation to the presence of only one binary feature, e.g., [-voiced] implies the absence of [+voiced] (Andersen, 1973, p. 769). One of segment constituents denotes segment's tonality, while any constituent may show "a hypotactic syntagm constituted by terms of two tonality oppositions" (Andersen, 1973, pp. 769—770), e.g., in case of /p/, a phonological term low [+grv] would represent its "basic tonality" and a phonological term not heightened [-shrp] would attribute to the other tonality. A structural innovation arises if the decision of a language speaker is wrong about "its acoustic manifestations," a number of syntagm constituents, which can be superordinate and subordinate, and a type of a syntagm, that is, simultaneous or sequential (Andersen, 1973, p. 770). Scrutinizing phonetic features, I also focus on reanalyzing the phonological content of a morpheme. In Kr, the suffix *-uk-* is not characterized by reanalysis into *-juk-*, and the textual evidence from Kryvorivnia parish register books (not a dialect) tends to reduce its high tonality syntagm in high diffuse consonant (a reflex of CS *$r̦$) from heightened high tonality /rʲ/ and non-hightened high tonality /r/ to simply high tonality /r/ [3].

The article is structured as follows. In Sections 2—4, I argue that the overwhelming preservation of phonemic sharping of *r'* in Kr is a result of a lack of structural innovations determined by the phonetic sharping of consonants before [-flt, -grv] segment /e/ in the system. To demonstrate this, I include the sound formants extracted from tokens of Kr speakers and analyze them using the *Praat* program, which is a program for spectral analysis. As source material in terms of family names in *-uk-*, I use the parish register books extant from 1775—1944 which are the 19 earliest known written records in Kryvorivnia, i.e., Lib 1775, Lib 1784, Proth Miss, Lib 809, Lib 828, Lib 847, Lib 1868, Lib 839, Proth Ord, Lib 884, Proth 1894, Spons Par, Metr 906, Spys, Kn 1919, Lib Nat, Lib Cop, Mert 1940, and Kn 1942 [4]. In this article, Kryvorivnia records are first analysed within phonology and orthography as significant textual evidence of Kr reflexes of CS *$r̦$ and their dispalatalization regardless the particularities of the use in the dialect.

In compliance with the above hypothesis, in Section 2, I briefly discuss chronology, conditions, and effects of the phonemic opposition sharp vs. plain /r/ in CS, the phonetic aspects of the Kr consonantal sharping before [-flt] vowels, and reduction of palatal /rʲ/ in Ukrainian. In Section 3, I offer a short note on the chronology and origin of the suffix *-uk-* in U family names. The ambiguity of *r'* ~ *r* spellings in Kryvorivnia parish registers is tightly connected with the origin of the registrar, and a change by which the symbol of sharped *r'* merged with its nonsharped counterpart is viewed through lenses

---

[3] For tonality distinctions of diffuse consonants *t', p'* in Old Czech, see Andersen (1973, pp. 700—771).

[4] For the general information regarding the Kryvorivnia parish registers, see Zelenchuk, I., Zelenchuk, Ia., Rybaruk, O., & Rybaruk, I. (2012). Istorychna znakhidka na Hutsul'shchyni: Metrychni knyhy kryvorivnians'koï tserkvy Rizdva Presviatoï Bohorodytsi. *Ukraïnoznavstvo, 2,* 242—245.

of the all-Ukrainian (Dnieper) literary variety (Sections 4—4.2). All this allows me to examine a model of the orthographic change as opposed to the corresponding dialectal phenomenon and hypothesize that lack of reanalysis of a morpheme, i.e., change within a morpheme, results in levelling with another model.

## 2. PHONEME /rʲ/: CHRONOLOGY, CONDITIONS, AND EFFECTS

In Sections 2.1—2.3, I focus on the chronology, conditions, and effects of the phonological terms [+shrp] and [-grv] of CS */rʲ/, peculiarities of the Kr consonantal sharping before [-flt] vowels, and elimination of CS */rʲ/ in Ukrainian.

### 2.1. Palatalization of */r/ in CS

The relative chronology of palatalization of the etymological *r is usually established in connection with CS palatalizations of velars and consonants + *j*, i.e., 5th—8th century (Shevelov, 1964, p. 633). The first CS phonemic opposition in palatalization arose predominantly in the clusters liquid + *j* (*l : l', n : n', r : r'*) developing in the track of the first palatalization of velars and a change of other consonants + *j* (Shevelov, 1964, p. 488). For Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian, Slovenian, Shtokavian-based languages (Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin), Macedonian, and Bulgarian, the phonological opposition was threefold: *l : l', n : n', r : r', s : s', z : (z')*, e.g., OCS *konji* 'horse' (m.nom. pl) vs. *oni* 'those', *kъnęzь* 'king' (m.nom.sg) with [zʲ] vs. *blizь* 'near', OR *vol'ě* 'will' (f.gen.sg) vs. *silě* 'strength' (f.dat.sg) (Shevelov, 1964, pp. 488—489). Analyzing the evidence from Slavic languages and dialects, Shevelov (1964, pp. 489—502; 1979, p. 139) points out that CS has not known overall palatalization of consonants before front vowels, though it would be in perfect agreement with the tendency toward intrasyllabic harmony; Shevelov links palatalization directly with a shift of *ę toward 'a in PU in the mid-10th century at the latest, and places it prior to that change. In Southern dialects of Ukrainian, consonants retained sharpness in the environments before *i, *ě, *ę, *ь*, and applying Shevelov's (1964, p. 496) tools for Proto-Hutsul, phonetic sharpness before /e/ may be assumed as in Kr [lʲ]*an* vs. SWU *len*. Most likely in the development of overall sharpening before distinctively [-flt] vowels Hutsul went along with NU, which palatalized consonants before *i, *ě, *ę, *ь*, and *e (cf. Shevelov, 1964, pp. 496, 501).

### 2.2. The case of Kr numbering

In Kr, the phonemic feature [+shrp] would naturally reflect the original *r'* in the word- and syllable-final position, in particular when followed by a velar, e.g., *væč'i*[rʲ] 'evening' (m.nom.sg), *ɦo*[rʲ]*š'ok* 'pot' (m.nom.sg), *pace*[rʲ]*k'ÿ* 'clay coaster' (f.gen.sg) but also *pacerka* (f.nom.sg). The palatal articulation must be supplied by a principle toward intrasyllabic harmony operating in the

system and its consonant [+shrp] and original *e* [-flt] pattern manifestation, if not *z, c, s* (see Shevelov, 1964, pp. 496—497).

Kr consonant allophones are typically palatalized before the original [-flt] vowels: *\*e*: [dʲe] 'where' (MoU *de*; CS *\*kъ-de*, ESUM 2, p. 19); *\*i*: [prʲi]*znajsÿ* 'confess, admit' (2sg.impr) (MoU *prÿznajs'a*; CS *\*pri-*, ESUM 4, p. 568); *\*ĕ*: [lʲi]*sam'i* 'forest' (m.instr.pl) (MoU *l'isamÿ*; CS *\*lĕsъ* m.nom.sg, ESUM 3, pp. 265-266); *\*ь*: [dʲæ]*n'* 'day' (m.nom.sg) (MoU *den'*; CS *\*dьnь*, ESUM 2, p. 34) vs. [v⁽ʲ⁾e]*r'x'e* 'top' (m.acc.pl) (MoU *verxÿ*; CS *\*vʲrxъ* (m.nom.sg), ESUM 1, pp. 360-361; [vьr'xъ] Zhovtobriukh et al., 1979, p. 316); *\*ę*: [pʲʲi]*tna*[t͡sʲi]*k'* 'fifteen' (MoU *p''jatnadc'at'*; CS *\*pętь na desęte*, ESUM 4, p. 652). Applying the principle of intrasyllabic harmony, the Hutsul dialect apparently accomplished wide-ranging palatalization of consonants before front vowels and CS *\*l', \*n', \*r'* merged with *\*l', \*n', \*r'* of a later origin similar to the North Slavic group (widely, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, and Sorbian) (see Shevelov, 1964, pp. 489, 492).

## 2.3. Dispalatalization of CS *\*r̦* in U

The fact that Kr /rʲ/ (from CS *\*/rʲ/*) largely keeps its heightened high tonality is mostly determined by the operation of the tendency toward intrasyllabic harmony in this dialect. In Ukrainian, CS *\*/rj/* has lost its sharpness across the most territory but at a different time. While East and Central NU shows the dispalatalization of *\*r̦* in the 11th century at the latest, relative chronology for the elimination of *\*r̦* for most of the SWU dialects would be placed a few centuries later, that is, Volhynia by the mid-15th century, Podillia by the 16th century, and the Dniester area by 1600, and for SEU, that is, the later Dnieper-based standard, the 16th—17th century (Shevelov, 1979, pp. 192, 638; Zhov-tobriukh et al., 1979, pp. 316—318). Shevelov (1979, p. 192) argues that the elimination of /rʲ/ in the U dialects was caused by the fact that their phonemic systems were indifferent to either elimination or preservation of /rʲ/. The systems consisted of both the consonants with and the consonants without "the opposition in palatalization"; moreover, articulation of the sharp phoneme was complex, and it combined "the basic trilling articulation with the definitively non-trilling palatalizing movement of the tongue" (Shevelov, 1979, p. 192). A consonant *\*r̦ > r'* would eventually become an allophone of a phoneme /r/. The U systems with dispalatalazed *r* would be also characterized by plain consonants before reflexes of CS *\*e*.

## 3. SUFFIX *-UK-* IN UKRAINIAN

In U, family names derived from common nouns with the U suffix *-uk-* (*-juk-*) represent names of a son with respect to his father's first name, his profession, or any another attribute of his, e.g., MoU *bodnarčuk* 'son of a cooper' (m.nom.sg), *kuxarčuk* 'son of a cook' (m.nom.sg), *blyznjuk* 'son of a twin' (m.nom.sg), *cyhančuk* 'son of the Gypsy (*cyhan*)' (m.nom.sg); they are most common for SWU (Bevzenko, 1960, p. 118; Zhovtobriukh et al., 1980,

p. 111). In Middle SWU [5], forms in -*uk*- as family names appeared after the 15th century, probably in the 15th-16th century, though sporadic attestations can be found a century earlier, e.g., *Ÿvančukъ* (MoU *Ivanъ*) 1404, *Ivančukъ* 1404 (Bevzenko, 1960, p. 118; Melʹnychuk et al., 1966, p. 134; Zhovtobriukh et al., 1980, p. 111). A meaning of the suffix allows to assume -*uk*- derived from a root *uk-/uč-* as in *učyty* 'learn, study' (< CS \**učiti*; cf. U *nauka* 'learning, lesson, science'; "IE \**euk-/ouk-/ŭk-* 'learn, get accustomed to, trust'" ESUM 6, pp. 56—57), i.e., -*uk*- 'lower in rank, one who learns from his father or inherits his attribute'.

## 4. EVIDENCE FROM THE KR PARISH REGISTERS

The earliest manifestation of the Kr *r* ~ *r'* confusion in suffix -*uk*-, irrespective of accent in written records, goes back to the 1770s in the sporadic spelling Lat *Petruka* (gen.sg) (1775) vs. Lat *Chariuk* [6], *Szynkariuk* (nom.sg) (1775), *Chariuk* (nom.sg), *Petriuka* (gen.sg) (1776) and interchangeable spellings Lat *Chariuka* ~ *Charuka* (gen.sg) (1777) Lib 1775. In general, a merge of two phonemes in the process of dispalatalization results in hypercorrect spellings (Shevelov, 1979, p. 189). Textual evidence of hypercorrect spellings from the Kryvorivnia records tends to appear alongside the confusion of *r* and *r'*, e.g., Lat *Ribasiuka* (1775), *Ribenczuk* (1781) vs. Lat *Rybasiuk* (1776), *Rybenczuka* (1781) (MoU *rẏba*, CS \**ryba* 'fish', ESUM 5, p. 172) Lib 1775. The 1775—1944 Kryvorivnia parish registers show the final loss of -*r'uk* in 1871.

Tentatively, the implication of the above-mentioned orthographic tradition may be threefold. We deal with the non-Hutsul origin of a registrar (Section 4.1), evidence of standardization in accordance with Dnieper U normalization (Section 4.2), or a lack of the morphonological value of a particular change (Section 4.3).

### 4.1. The non-Hutsul origin of a registrar

In 1818—1870 — or before the final loss of *r'* in orthography of family names evident from 1871 onward — parish register book spellings are limited to the confusion of -*ruk* and -*r'uk* in various handwritings. However, often it is difficult to find consistency between spellings of a single handwriting, e.g., a registrar coherent in -*ruk* in Latin script switches to Cyrillic -*rjukъ*, and once he switches back to Latin script, he uses -*ruk* again (see Proth 1818, Spons Par, Lib 1868). Being largely mixed with other handwritings in 1870 and disappearing in 1871, this handwriting may very well belong to a parish priest, Andrii Burachynsʹkyi (*Administrator Krzywor.* (1818—1819), *Parochus Krywor.*

---

[5] In this paper, I rely on the periodization of phonological development of U as suggested by Shevelov (1979, p. 40): Proto-U (until the mid-11th century), Old U (from the mid-11th century through the 14th century), Early Middle U (from the 15th century through the mid-16th century), Middle U (from the mid-16th century to the early 18th century), Late Middle U (the remainder of the 18th century), and MoU (from the very end of the 18th century on).

[6] *Xarjukъ*, with a word stem in *r'*, derives from a male name *Xarytonъ*; cf. *Xaryton* > *Xar'ko* in Luchyk 2014 (pp. 491—492).

(1820—1871) Lib 1784, Lib 809, Proth 1818, Lib 828, Lib 839, Lib 847, Lib 1868, Spons Par), who died on January 7, 1871 (Proth 1818).

Parish records dated 1818—1871 are written in Latin [7] and Cyrillic. Unlike the Latin spellings, Cyrillic orthography adheres to commonly used vernacular forms in -*r'uk* manifesting a linguistic difference: *Mogorjuku* (1850), *Mogorjukъ, Xarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ, Šynkarjukъ, Petrjukъ* (1851), *Xarjukъ, Šynkarjukъ, Sljusarjukъ, Zaxarjukъ* (1852), *Mogorjukъ, Xarjukъ, Šynkarjukъ* (1853), *Šynkarjuka, Xarjukъ* (1854), *Mogorjuka* (1855), *Xarjukъ, Šatrjuka, Šynkarjuka* (1856), *Xarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ* (1857), *Mogorjukъ, Xarjukъ, Sljusarjukъ* (1858), *Šynkarjukъ, Xarjukъ, Mogorjukъ, Sljusarjukъ* (1859), *Sljusarjuka, Šynkarjukъ, Mogorjukъ, Xarjukъ* (1860), *Mogorjukъ* [8], *Oprjukъ, Xarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ, Rybarjukъ, Šynkarjukъ, Petrjukъ* (1861), *Sumarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ, Šynkarjukъ* (1862), *Bodnarjukъ, Xarjukъ, Xarjuka, Mogorjukъ, Šynkarjukъ, Mogorjuka* (1863), *Šynkarjukъ, Šynkarjuka, Mogorjukъ, Petrjukъ* (1864), *Šynkarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ* (1865), *Xarjukъ, Sljusarjukъ* (1866), *Bodnarjukъ, Mogorjukъ, Xarjukъ* (1867), *Mogorjukъ, Šynkarjukъ, Zaxarjukъ, Petrjukъ, Xarjukъ, Bodnarjukъ, Sljusarjukъ* (1868), *Šynkarjukъ, Xarjukъ, Mogorjukъ, Bodnarjukъ, Sljusarjukъ* (1869), *Mogorjukъ* (1870). After 1868, -*rjuk* is sporadically reassessed by different handwritings as -*ruk*, e.g., *Bodnarukъ, Xarukъ* (1869) and *Mohorukъ* (1870). The forms that resulted from the handwriting shift can be interpreted in two ways. The use of Cyrillic was not a reason behind the introduction of the suffix -*rjuk* in the parish registers. In fact, not only the 1868—1870 records, but also records of the late 19th century show -*ruk*, not -*rjuk*. In the case of Burachyns′kyi's orthography, one may see a tendency toward assigning -*ruk*- and -*rjuk*- to Latin and Cyrillic script, respectively.

The inventory of the language of some books (cf. Proth Ord, Spons Par, and Lib 1868) encompasses a great amount of Church Slavonicisms and Russian borrowings, while vernacular elements are used sporadically: *zaključenie hoda* 'conclusion of the year' 1851 [9]; ChSl *dščerъ* 1851—1853, 1863—1868 vs. U *donъka* 'daughter' (f.nom.sg) 1866; *zemledělecъ* 'farmer' (m.nom.sg) 1863—1866, *zemledělcě* (m.nom.pl) 1866, *zemledělcў* (m.nom.pl) 1852, 1868, *zemledělcej* (m.gen.pl [10]) 1867; *sotrudnykъ* 'staff member' (m.nom.sg) 1863, 1866, 1867; *krestylъ y myropomazalъ* 'baptize and confirm' (3sg.m.perf.pst) 1866—1868; *věnčalъ* 'marry' (3sg.m.impf.pst) 1863—1868; *zoyzvolylъ, soyzvolylъ* 'care' (3sg.m.perf.pst) 1868; *pryxodnyka* 'priest' (m.gen.sg) 1865, *pryxodskaja* 'parish' (f.nom.sg.adj) 1853; *maja* 'May' (m.gen.sg) 1868 but *červcja* 'June' (m.gen.sg) 1864, 1867, *lypcja* 'July' (m.gen.sg) 1863, *ljutoho* 'February' (m.gen.sg)

---

[7] It is noteworthy that some Roman letters according to Polish orthography are used in this case, e.g., P *cz* stands for *č* and P *ch* stands for *x*, yet *c* before front vowels stands for *c*, not *č* as in MoP, e.g., *Prociuk*.

[8] Records written in 1861—1864 show often instances of ь instead of ъ (Proth 1818, Spons Par); cf. *Prokopъ Zelenčukъ, Danyljukъ* vs. *Romanjukъ, Pavljukъ* 1863 Spons Par in the same page.

[9] Not all the dates will be represented here.

[10] A decision of a registrar (supposedly Andrii Burachyns′kyi) regarding the grammatical model of ChSl *zemledělecej* (m.gen.sg) was wrong. He reassessed the form *zemledělecъ* (m.nom.sg) as ChSl *konъ* (m.nom. sg) — *konej* 'horse' (m.gen.pl) ignoring parallel U forms, e.g., *kravec'* (m.nom.sg) — *kravciv* 'tailor' (m.gen.pl). Most likely, he was not familiar with ChSl and Russian very well and definitely interpreted them as foreign languages.

1851—53, 1865, 1868 Spons Par, Lib 1868. While on the contrary, other books (cf. Proth 1818) are permeated with local elements: *parubokъ* ‘guy’ (m.nom.sg), *pokrytkovъ* ‘dishonored, unwed mother’ (f.inst.sg), *děvkovъ* ‘girl’ (f.inst.sg), mae ‘have’ (3sg.m.impf.pres) 1850—1868 Proth 1818.

A brief comment on the origin of a native dialect of the priest Andrii Burachyns′kyi, not least, responsible for the Kryvorivnia records dated 1818-1870 is needed to explain the orthographic confusion of -*rjuk* and -*ruk*. Moving to a new area, with new dialectal environments, registrars from other areas usually “submitted themselves to the local linguistic tradition without completely giving up features of their original dialect and the language of their education” (Shevelov, 1979, p. 152). The family name *Buračyns′kyj* is earmarked by -*ra*- (*burak*) revealing its origin from those SWU dialects that knew the dispalatalization of *r’* followed by *a* before the so-called dialectal umlaut *a > e*. Such area cuts across Volhynia and Podillia and is demarcated by a line Rava-Ru′ka — Kam″ianka-Buz′ka — Ternopil′ — Kam″ianec′-Podil′s′kyi — Mohyliv-Podil′s′kyi in Western Ukraine (Shevelov, 1979, p. 637). The Sniatyn region, where Andrii Burachyns′kyi was born in 1793 (Lib Mort 839; Arsenych, 2004, p. 26), represents no sequential original *r’ ~ r* opposition. This dialect sporadically underwent loss of sharpness of CS *rj̧ in some environments, e.g., Sniatyn *pys*[ar] ‘scriptor’ (m.nom.sg), *kos*[ar] ‘haymaker’ (m.nom.sg) vs. *pys*[arʲ], *kos*[arʲ] Herm No 247 (MoU -*ar*-; CS -\*arjь (<\*-arje- <\*-arj̧o-): Mel′nychuk et al., 1966, p. 128); *bu*[rʲa] ‘storm’ (f.nom.sg) Herm No 243 (MoU *bur’a*; CS *\*buriti* inf ‘bother, disturb; entangle in, enmesh’ ESUM 1, pp. 300—301); *po*[rʲa]*dnyj*, *po*[rʲe]*dnyᵉj* ‘respectable, decent’ (m.nom.sg) Herm No 241 (MoU *r’ad*; CS *\*rędъ*, ESUM 5, pp. 153—154); *bu*[ra]*k* ‘beetroot’ (m.nom.sg) Herm No 245 (MoU *bur’ak*; P *burak*; from Middle Latin or Italian through Polish, ESUM 1, pp. 305—306); [ra]*tuvaty* ‘rescue, save’ (inf) vs. [rʲa]*tuvaty* Herm No 242 (MoU *r’atuvaty*; P *ratować*; from German through Polish, ESUM 5, pp. 156—157).

Taking into account several cases of orthographic transition from Latin to Cyrillic and vice versa in 1818—1870, one can assume there were some reasons for the Cyrillic predilection for spellings with -[rʲ]*uk* in 1850—1870. Phonetically, -[rʲ]*uk* was a common pronunciation in Kr, and one can only surmise how it intersected with a dialect of a registrar and prevailing orthographic tradition. One should remember in this respect the enactment of Ruthenian (Ukrainian) as an official language in Galicia for a short period in the 1850s (Danylenko, 2010, p. 21), as well as the activity of Iakiv Holovats′kyi, a Russophile linguist at that time and Burachyns′kyi’s son-in-law. Even more so, one needs to take into consideration first Galician publications based on the local SWU vernacular, such as *Zoria Halycka* in 1848—1849 (see Zoria 48, Zoria 49) and the like, and Ukrainian dictionaries, such as the *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slavischen Sprachen Österreichs: Deutsch-ruthenische Geparat-Ausgabe* (Wyslobocki, 1851) [11]; *Pochatokъ do Ulozhenia Terminolohiï Botanycheskoï Ruskoi* (1852) by

---

[11] Moser (2017—2018, p. 93) quite fairly defines the linguistic ‘outfit’ of this dictionary as ChSl, although permeated with “borrowings from Russian”, and subsequently with little relevance of the vernacular.

Ivan Havryshkevych and *Imena Kraievykh Rostyn i Botanichnyi Slovaretsь* (1852) by Mykhailo Petrushevych (Symonenko, 2014, p. 28).

## 4.2. The influence of Dnieper Ukrainian

One of the possible explanations for the *-ruk* trend in the parish registers is the general tendency toward levelling the SWU vernacular with SEU as reflected in the language of Taras Shevchenko's (1814—1861) literary texts; they combined the use of historical and geographical elements, e.g., "archaisms and Church Slavonicisms" and "accessible dialects," mainly SEU vernacular (Shevelov, 1993; Danylenko, 2016, p. 380; also, Tymoshenko, 2013). The famous Ukrainian periodical *Osnova* (January 1861 through October 1862) cultivated literary norm previously represented in Shevchenko's texts and served as an arena in elaborating the scientific and journalistic style and standardizing U for all the Ukrainian-speaking territories, including Galicia and Bukovyna (Huzar, 1992, pp. 6—12; Rehushevs′kyi, 1994, pp. 39—45). Contacts between the Ukrainians in Galicia and Russian-ruled Ukraine became more active from the 1850s onward, especially in 1853 and later in 1860s—1880s when Panteleimon Kulish, "the first professional Ukrainian writer and journalist, as well as an innovative normalizer of written Ukrainian," visited Galicia (Danylenko, 2016, p. xi). After the Valuev Circular had limited the scope of Ukrainian language publications to *belles-lettres* in 1863, book publishing in U became more active in Galicia, and the Dnieper vernacular standard was impacted by local Galician varieties (Shevelov, 1993). Supported by Kulish both financially and intellectually, the periodical *Pravda* (April 1867 through 1870) began to appear in Lviv in 1867. Covering topics from Austro-Hungarian-ruled and Russian-ruled Ukraine, *Pravda's* editorial policy advocated an idea of one Ukrainian nation (cf. Skurzewska, 2014, p. 19). Its first issue presented literary texts from both parts of Ukraine, including Dnieper Ukrainian texts by Taras Shevchenko, Marko Vovchok, Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Kostomarov, and Oleksandr Konys′kyi. The Kryvorivnia parish priests Iosyp Burachyns′kyi (1871—1893) and Oleksii Volians′kyi (1893—1923) consistently reflected in writing the dispalatalization of *r'* in family names ending in *-r'uk*. Obviously, Oleksii Volians′kyi read such Ukrainian publications (see Pan′kova & Starkov, 2009), and, supposedly, his father-in-law Iosyp Burachyns′kyi was familiar with them as well.

## 4.3. Grammatical context

The aforementioned extralinguistic and sociolinguistic criteria provide, however, no definitive answer to the question of the origin of the total elimination of the *-r'uk* from the registrar's orthography. In phonology, operation of *r'* before [+flt] *u* would not follow intrasyllabic harmony (cf. Bethin, 1998, p. 37), cf. *b', p', m'* before *u* in *Jakibjukъ, Prokipjuka, Maksymjuk* Spys. The loss of sharping in *-r'uk-* in Kryvorivnia records resulted in [-shrp] *r* before phonemically /flt/ vowel *u*, and, as a matter of fact, fell into a pattern of

intrasyllabic harmony. The direction of motivation for adjustment within this syllable was from vowel [*ü > u*] to consonant [*r' > r*] with a complex basic articulation. While overlapping with a native dialect of a writer, the suffix *-uk-* was not grammatized into *-juk-*, to use Andersen's term [12] as reinterpreted toward morphonology (see Section 1). This means that a change affected an onset of a syllable, not nucleus and coda (the suffix *-uk-*): as in forms with labials: *rybar' > Lat Rybariuk > Rybaruk* vs. *Maksymъ > Cyr Maksymjukъ*, with *-juk-*. The reversed model with a change in a suffix may be observed in *'a > 'e* in *-ak-*: Po[tʲ]*ak* > Po[tʲ]*ek* (Cyr *Potьekъ* 1864—1865, Lat *Potiek* 1869, 1909, 1938, Cyr *Potjek* 1927, 1940—1944), *Maru*[sʲ]*ak* > *Maru*[sʲ]*ek* (Cyr *Marusьekъ* 1860, 1867, Lat *Marusiek* 1872, 1885—1887, 1894, 1897, 1899, 1900—1903, 1907, 1911, 1914, 1930, Cyr *Marusjek* 1902, 1921, 1922, 1925, 1927, 1941—1942, 1944), *Kreču*[nʲ]*ak* > *Kreču*[nʲ]*ek* (Cyr *Krečunjek* 1927, Lat *Kreczuniek* 1929), *Maku*[rʲ]*ak* > *Maku*[rʲ]*ek* (Lat *Makuriek* 1894, 1906, 1908, 1917) Lib 839, Lib 884, Spons Par, Metr 906, Kn 1942, Metr 1940, cf. Spys. What is important, in contrast to *-rjuk-*, the suffix *-ek-* appears in texts of the Kryvorivnia parish register books up to the 1940s, though sporadically reflected as *-ak-* in Cyr *Potjak* 1851—1853, Lat *Potiak* (1803, 1820—1849, 1854, 1875), *Potiaka* (1818) Lib 1775, Mort 884, Proth Par 1818, Lib Sp, Metr 906 and the like. These facts lead to the conclusion that *-rjuk-* > *-ruk-* did not undergo reanalysis of a morpheme, while the *-ak-* > *-ek-* change was grammatized.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

As discussed in Sections 2—4, CS *\*r'* (< *\*rị*) lost its phonological sharpness in dialects in which overall sharpening of consonants before original *\*e* was eliminated, e.g., in NU. Kr largely maintains phonetic sharpness of consonants followed by *\*e* and sharpness of original *\*rị* in general names and (sporadically) in family names in *-uk-*. The latter contradicts the tendency toward intrasyllabic harmony.

The goal of this study has been to show not only how a dialectal phenomenon is reflected in written records but also how an innovation evidenced in records can be independent of the vernacular use yet supplemented by a general trend which is supposedly in effect in the dialect along with some other processes. Parish register spellings of 1775—1944 attest to the ambiguity of *-r'uk* and *-ruk* until 1870 and the plain *-ruk* as part of the grammar of a registrar from 1871 onward, that is, the final reduction of a two-constituent tonality syntagm *r'* (from CS *\*rị*) to one-constituent syntagm *r*. The direction of motivation in the sequence was from a vowel to consonant, which conforms to intrasyllabic harmony operating in Kr, and the change was supplemented by the fact that *-uk* was not grammatized. The case of *-ak-* > *-ek-* in Kryvorivnia parish registers shows the opposite: reanalysis

---

[12] See Andersen (2006a; 2006b).

of a morpheme and preservation of the vernacular articulation despite the non-Hutsul origin of the registrar and spelling normalization in accordance with Dnieper U. Chronology of the dispalatalization of *r'* in family names can be established, however, to a certain approximation due to the lack of some Kryvorivnia parish register books, including all records before 1775 and some records during 1775—1944, though each year in the 1775—1944 period is represented.

LEGEND

**ESUM 5** — Mel′nychuk, O. S., Bilodid, I. K., Kolomiiets′, V. T., Tkachenko, O. B., Boldyriev, R. V., Lukinova, T. B., Pivtorak, H. P. ... Shamota, A. M. (Eds.). (1982—2012). *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukraïns'koï movy* (Vols. 1—7). Kyiv (in Ukrainian).

**Herm** — Herman, K. F. (1995). *Atlas ukraïns'kykh hovirok Pivnichnoï Bukovyny. Fonetyka, fonolohiia*. Chernivtsi: Chas (in Ukrainian).

**Kn 1919** — Knyha opovidyi tserkvy Kryvorivni z Bystretsem i Rikoiu vid 1/1 1919 roku (Vol. 3) (in Ukrainian).

**Kn 1942** — Knyha opovidyi tserkvy z Kryvorivni z Berezhnytseiu vid 1/5 1942 roku (Vol. 4) (in Ukrainian).

**Lib 1775** — Liber Natorum [1775—7$\tilde{8}$9] Copulatorum [1775—7$\tilde{8}$9] et Mortuorum [776—7$\tilde{8}$8]. Krzyworównia (Vol. 1) (in Ukrainian, Polish, & Latin).

**Lib 1784** — Liber Copulatorum [1784—1850] Natorum [1784—1809] ac Mortuorum [1784—1838]. Krzyworównia (in Ukrainian, Latin, & Polish).

**Lib 809** — Liber Natorum [maia] 8$\tilde{0}$9—8$\tilde{2}$8 [maia] (Vol. 3) (in Ukrainian, Latin, & Polish).

**Lib 828** — Liber Natorum 11/5 8$\tilde{2}$8 8$\tilde{4}$6. [Kryoriwnia] (Vol. 4) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib 847** — Liber Natorum [Ecclesia?] gr. cath. Krzyworównia [ot] 8$\tilde{4}$7 [do] — 8$\tilde{6}$7 (Vol. 5) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib 1868** — Liber Natorŭm Ecclesiae gr. cath. Kryworowniae 1868 — 22/9 1906 (Vol. 6) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib 839** — Liber Mortuorum Ecclesio Krzyworówniaensis 8$\tilde{3}$9 до 8$\tilde{8}$4 (Vol. 3) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib 884** — Liber Mortuorum 8$\tilde{8}$4—. Ecclesia parochialis in Kryworównia (Vol. 4) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib Cop** — Liber Copulatorum pro Ecclesia filiali in Bereżnica ad Krzyworównia. Ab Anno D: MCMXXIV (1924) (Vol. 1) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Lib Nat** — Liber Natorum pro Ecclesia filiali in Bereżnica ad Krzyworównia [Kryvorivnia]. Ab Anno D: MCMXXIV [1924] (Vol. 1) (in Ukrainian, Latin, & Polish).

**Metr 906** — Metryka narodzhenykh tserkvy v Kryvorivny vid 28/9 906— (Vol. 7) (in Ukrainian, Latin, & Polish).

**Metr 1940** — Metryka pomershykh tserkvy Kryvorivni z Berezhnytseiu vid 1/1 1940 r. (Vol. 5) (in Ukrainian).

**Pravda** — Lukashevych, L. (Ed.). (1867). *Pravda. Pys'mo Naukove i Literaturne, 1* (in Ukrainian).

**Proth 1818** — Prothocollon Banno cum 1818—1894 (in Ukrainian, Polish, & Latin).

**Proth Miss** — Prothocollon Missarum Fundationalum. Kryworównia (Vol. 2) (in German, Polish, Latin, & Ukrainian).

**Proth Ord** — Prothocollon Ordinarium Scolasticarum. [Kryworównia] (in Polish, German, Latin, & Ukrainian).

**Spons Par** — Liber Sponsorŭm Parochiae Krzyworownia ab 851 [8$\tilde{5}$1] 1/1 — 1903 10/2 (Vol. 3) (in Ukrainian & Latin).

**Spys** — Spys parokhyian tserkvy v Kryvorivni. Rik zalozhennia 1900 (Vol. 1: A—O, Vol. 2: P—Ia) (in Ukrainian).

**Zoria 48** — Paventskyi, L. (Ed.). (1848). *Zoria Halytska, 1* (in Ukrainian).

**Zoria 49** — Paventskyi, L. (Ed.). (1849). *Zoria Halytska, 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 100—104* (in Ukrainian).

# REFERENCES

Andersen, H. (1973). Abductive and deductive change. *Language, 49*(4), 765—793.

Andersen, H. (2006a). Grammation, regrammation, and degrammation. Tense loss in Russian. *Diachronica, 23*(2), 231—258.

Andersen, H. (2006b). Periphrastic futures in Slavic. Divergence and convergence. In K. Eksell & T. Vinther (Ed.), *Change in Verbal Systems. Issues in Explanation* (pp. 9—45).

Arsenych, P. (2004). *Sviashchenychyi rid Burachyns'kykh*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Nova Zoria (in Ukrainian).

Bethin, C. Y. (1993). The glide [i̯] / [j] in Late Common Slavic. In R. Maguire & A. Timberlake (Eds.), *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists, Bratislava, August-September 1993. Literature. Linguistics. Poetics* (pp. 230—250). Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Bethin, C. Y. (1998). *Slavic Prosody: Language Change and Phonological Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Bevzenko, S. P. (1960). *Istorychna morfolohiia ukraïns'koï movy*. Uzhhorod: Zarakpats'ke oblasne vydavnytstvo (in Ukrainian).

Danylenko, A. (2010). The Ukrainian Bible and the Valuev Circular of July 18, 1863. *Acta Slavica Iaponica, 28*, 1—21.

Danylenko, A. (2016). *From the Bible to Shakespeare. Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819—1897) and the formation of Literary Ukrainian*. Boston: Academic Studies Press.

Huzar, O. (1992). Movni pytannia na storinkakh zhurnalu "Osnova." *Kul'tura Slova, 43*, 6—12 (in Ukrainian).

Luchyk, V. V. (2014). *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk toponimiv Ukraïny. 3700 heohrafichnykh nazv*. Kyiv: Akademiia (in Ukrainian).

Mel'nychuk, O. S., Bahmut, A. I., Kolomiiets', V. T., Krytenko, A. P., Lukinova, T. B., Nikulin, H. I., Romanova, N. P., Tkachenko, O. B. (1966). *Vstup do porivnial'no-istorychnoho vyvchennia slov"ians'kykh mov*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Moser, M. (2017—2018). The fate of the "Ruthenian or Little Russian" (Ukrainian) language in Austrian Galicia (1772—1867). *Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 35*(1—4), 87—104.

Pan'kova, S., & Starkov, V. (2009). Lysty Oleksiia Volians'koho do Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho za 1902—1927 roky. *Ukraïns'kyi Arkheohrafichnyi Shchorichnyk, 13/14*(16/17), 555—618 (in Ukrainian).

Rehushevs'kyi, Ie. S. (1994). Teoretychna borot'ba navkolo pytan' rozvytku ukraïns'koï literaturnoï movy v 60-kh rokakh XIX st. i vidobrazhennia ïï na storinkakh "Osnovy." *Movoznavstvo, 6*, 39—45 (in Ukrainian).

Sherekh, Y. (1949). *Halychyna u formuvanni novoï ukraïns'koï literaturnoï movy*. Munich: Ukraïns'kyi vil'nyi universytet (in Ukrainian).

Shevelov, G. Y. (1964). *A prehistory of Slavic: The historical phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.

Shevelov, G. Y. (1979). *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.

Shevelov, G. Y. (1993). Standard Ukrainian. In D. Husar Struk (Ed.), *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine* [*Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (Vol. 5: St—Z)].

Skurzewska, A. (2016). *Omelian Patrycki i językoznawstwo preskrypcyjne w Galicji w II połowie XIX wieku*. Cracow: Scriptum (in Polish).

Symonenko, L. O. (2014). Ukraïns'ka terminohrafiia: Stan i perspektyvy. *Movoznavstvo, 4*, 28—35 (in Ukrainian).

Timberlake, A. (1978). K istorii zadnenebnyx fonem v severnoslavianskix iazykax. In Henrik Birnbaum (Ed.), *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists, Zagreb and Ljubljana, September 3—9, 1978* (Vol. 1: Linguistics and Poetics, pp. 699—726). Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.

Tymoshenko, P. D. (2013). *Studiï nad movoiu Tarasa Shevchenka*. Kyiv: KMM (in Ukrainian).

Wyslobocki, J. (Ed.). (1851). *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slavischen Sprachen Österreichs. Deutsch-ruthenische Geparat-Ausgabe*. Vienna: Kaiserlich-Кцniglichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei (in German and Ukrainian).

Zelenchuk, I., Zelenchuk, Ia., Rybaruk, O., & Rybaruk, I. (2012). Istorychna znakhidka na Hutsul′shchyni: Metrychni knyhy kryvorivnians′koï tserkvy Rizdva Presviatoï Bohorodytsi. *Ukraïnoznavstvo, 2,* 242—245 (in Ukrainian).

Zhovtobriukh, M. A., Rusanivs′kyi, V. M., & Skliarenko, V. H. (1979). *Istoriia ukraïns'koï movy. Fonetyka.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukrainian).

Zhovtobriukh, M. A., Volokh, O. T., Samiilenko, S. P., & Slyn′ko, I. I. (1980). *Istorychna hramatyka ukraïns'koï movy.* Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola (in Ukrainian).

*О. Я. Лебедівна*, аспірантка Докторської школи імені родини Юхименків
Національного університету «Києво-Могилянська академія»,
кафедра української мови
вул. Григорія Сковороди, 2, м. Київ, 04655
E-mail: o.lebedivna@edu.ukma.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3254-0098

## ДИСПАЛАТАЛІЗАЦІЯ ПРАСЛОВ'ЯНСЬКОГО *RĴ В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ МОВІ: *CASUS* ПРІЗВИЩ НА -*UK*- У ГУЦУЛЬСЬКИХ ЦЕРКОВНИХ МЕТРИЧНИХ КНИГАХ

Диспалаталізація псл. *r'* належить до фонологічних явищ, які відбулися на широкій слов'янській території в X—XIII ст. В українській мові явище диспалаталізації *r'* оминуло карпатський регіон, зокрема криворівнянську говірку гуцульського говору. Ця стаття висуває тезу про те, що тенденція до внутрісскладової гармонії слугувала умовою для браку диспалаталізації *r'* у криворівнянській говірці. Поняття внутрісскладової гармонії (як її вперше окреслив Роман Якобсон та пізніше розвинув Юрій Шевельов) переосмислено в цій статті відповідно до тональної ознаки бемольності (огублений / неогублений) для праслов'янської мови та гуцульського говору: більшість криворівнянських приголосних палаталізовані перед неогубленими голосними та непалаталізовані перед огубленими голосними.

У метричних книгах церкви Різдва Пресвятої Богородиці села Криворівня найраніші свідчення поплутування *r* і *r'* датовані 1770-ми роками. Зміни в написанні цих форм можна пояснити трьома чинниками: 1) походженням писаря з некарпатського мовного регіону; 2) стандартизацією української мови здебільшого за середньонаддніпрянською мовною нормою; 3) браком морфонологічної вартості зміни.

*Ключові слова*: праслов'янський *rĵ*, українська мова, прізвища на -*uk*-, криворівнянська говірка гуцульського говору, внутрісскладова гармонія, диспалаталізація