

Influence of Russian on the Stress Patterns of the East Sloboda dialect of Ukrainian

Iryna Osadcha
University of Toronto

The stress systems of both Ukrainian and Russian languages are characterized by lexical stress. Unlike analyses of Russian (Standard Russian/StR) stress, generative analyses of Standard Ukrainian (StU) stress are few (e.g. Butska 2002, Yanovich & Steriade 2013), and accounts of the dialectal variation of stress patterns in Ukrainian stress are rare (e.g. Bethin 1998). Here I propose an original analysis of the stress of the East Sloboda Ukrainian (ESU) dialect using data from Kobyrnka (2012). The historic Sloboda region (modern Eastern Ukraine) borders Russia so there is extensive language contact with the speakers of Southern Russian (SR) dialects.

I will analyze the stress patterns of ESU using bracketed grid representations as proposed by Idsardi (1992), Halle & Idsardi (1995) in their analysis of StR stress. In both StU and StR there are accented, post-accenting and unaccented stems. However, Idsardi's (1992) analysis cannot account for StU and ESU stress patterns which act differently in singular and plural paradigms: **i.** accented in SG, post-accenting in PL; **ii.** post-accenting in SG, accented in PL; **iii.** stress falls on different syllables of the stem in SG and PL. I call the stems having these patterns *shifting stems*. Unlike in StR, shifting stems are very common in both StU and ESU, especially those of type **i**.

Some stems belong to type **i** in both StU and ESU:

(1) StU and ESU: NOM SG *báb-a* - NOM PL *bab-ý* (cf. StR NOM SG *báb-a* - NOM PL *báb-y*).

However, some stems that belong to type **i** in StU don't shift the stress to the suffix in PL in ESU, e.g. *xáta* 'house':

(2) a) StU: NOM SG *xát-a* - NOM PL *xat-ý*, INSTR PL *xat-úmy*;

b) ESU: NOM SG *xát-a* - NOM PL *xát-y*, INSTR PL *xát-amy*.

I propose that shifting stems are marked differently in the lexicon and introduce the notion of the Shifting rule (version (a) accounts for types **i** and **ii**, version (b) accounts for type **iii**):

(3) **Shifting rule** Shifting rule (restricted to shifting stems when a plural ending is present):

a) Move a left parenthesis minimally to start a foot on an adjacent morpheme: (^Sx x > x x(^S or x x(^S > x (^Sx; **b)** Move a left parenthesis one constituent to the right: (^Sx x > x (^Sx.

I propose that while in STU *xát-a* 'house' is a shifting stem, in ESU it is not:

(4) StU (a,b) and ESU (c,d) *xát-a* 'house', NOM PL suffix -y (unaccented)

	a. NOM SG <i>xát-a</i>	b. NOM PL <i>xat-ý</i>	c. NOM SG <i>xát-a</i>	d. NOM PL <i>xát-y</i>
Line 2	x	x	x	x
Line 1	(x	(x	(x	(x
Shifting (a)	N/A	x(^S x)	N/A	N/A
Line 0	(^S x x)	(^S x x)	(x x)	(x x)
	xat+a	xat+ y	xat+a	xat+ y

In both (4a) and (4c), stem *xat-* behaves like an accented stem: besides the default right parenthesis that merely marks a word boundary, it gets a left parenthesis to the left of the first element due to the lexical Edge marking of the stem; the same element is projected to Line 1 and to Line 2 due to the Edge Parameters (as defined by Idsardi 1992: 110), resulting in the desired form *xát-a*. To derive NOM PL, in StU (4b) we apply the Shifting rule (as in 3a) at Line 0: it moves the left parenthesis from its initial position to the right edge of the stem in order to start the foot on the suffix. The second element is projected to Line 1 and to Line 2, which results in the desired NOM PL form *xat-ý*. In ESU, however, the NOM PL form is *xát-y* (4d). I propose that unlike in StU, where *xát-* is treated as a shifting stem, in ESU *xát-* is treated as an accented stem due to the influence of SR dialects.

I presented an original analysis of ESU stress patterns. I propose that both shifting stems and the Shifting rule are part of ESU grammar, as introducing them allows us to derive the

patterns of type **i** (and **ii**). However, due to the influence of the neighbouring SR dialects, some stems which are treated as shifting in StU are treated as accented in ESU.

References: **Bethin 1998** *Slavic Prosody: Language Change and Phonological Theory*. **Butska 2002** *Faithful Stress in Paradigms: Nominal Inflection in Ukrainian and Russian*. Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers. **Idsardi 1992** *The Computation of Prosody*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT. **Halle & Idsardi 1995** “General Properties of Stress and Metrical Structure”. In Goldsmith (ed.), *A Handbook of Phonological Theory*. **Kobyrynka 2012** “Tendenciji naholoshennya v Sxidoslobozhans’kyx hovirkax”. In *Linguistyka* 1 (25), vol. 1, pp. 108-114. **Steriade & Yanovich 2013** “Accentual allomorphs in East Slavic: an argument for inflection dependence”, in *Understanding Allomorphy*, eds. Eulalia Bonet et al.