

RULES ORDERING AND EVOLUTION OF PHONEMIC SYSTEMS

E. VASILIU*

1. We shall give a brief characterisation of the consonantism of dialects spoken in the points 219, 228, 250 and 260 of ALR.

- (a) The primary dental oral stops [*t*, *d*] are represented by the affricates [*č*, *đ*] (phonetic transcription of ALR) in the points 250 and 260.
- (b) The primary dental oral stops [*t*, *d*] are represented by the palatal stops [*k*, *g*] in the points 219 and 228.
- (c) The primary palatal stops [*k*, *g*] are represented in 219, 228, 250, 260 by the affricates [*č*, *đ*] (phonetic notation of ALR).
- (d) The primary affricates [*č*, *đ*] are represented in 219, 228, 250, 260 by [*ʃ*¹, *ʒ*] which are distinct from the primary non-palatal [*ʃ*, *ʒ*].

In contradistinction to the literary dialect and the other dacoromanian dialects, the phonemic systems of the dialects above referred to are characterized by:

- (α) the absence of primary palatal stops [*k*, *g*] (points 219, 228, 250, 260) as a consequence of (c);
- (β) the absence of primary affricates [*č*, *đ*] (points 219, 228, 250, 260) as a consequence of (d);
- (γ) a secondary set of affricates [*č*₂, *đ*₂]¹ (in 250, 260) as a consequence of (a);
- (δ) a secondary set of affricates [*č*₂, *đ*₂] and a secondary set of palatal stops [*k*₂, *g*₂] (points 219, 228) as a consequence of (c) and (b), respectively.

2. In terms of a transformational phonology in Halle's 1964 form, the dialects mentioned under 1. may be described by supplementing the set of rules which are common for all the dacoromanian dialects with some phonetic rules accounting for the characterization given by (a)—(d) (see Vasiliu, 1967a, b) namely

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (1) & [\check{c}, \check{d}] \rightarrow [ʃ^1, ʒ] \\
 (2) & [t, d] \rightarrow [k, g] \\
 (3) & [k, g] \rightarrow [\check{c}, \check{d}]
 \end{array}
 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [e] \\ [g] \\ [t] \\ [j] \\ [j] \end{array} \right.$$

* University of Bucharest.

¹ The phonetic distinction between [*č*, *đ*] and [*č*₂, *đ*₂] is not phonologically relevant and therefore we do not mention the distinction in our phonemic representation.

Rule (1) must be applied first, in order to keep the difference between the secondary affricates [\hat{c}_2, \hat{g}_2] and the primary ones.

In 250, 260, rule (2) has to be ordered *before* (3), as well as in 219, 228, rule (2) has to be ordered *after* (3).

3. We shall try now to answer the following question: how this different ordering of rules has to be historically interpreted?

In 250, 260, the palatalized [t, d] was acoustically identified with primary [k, g] so that both series fell into the domain of rule (3). That means rule (3) was *acquired* after the palatalization of [t, d].

In 219, 228, the confusion between [k, g] and [\hat{c}, \hat{g}] is earlier than the palatalization of [t, d] and then the palatalized [t, d] remain distinct from [\hat{c}, \hat{g}].

We could now establish the subsequent hypothesis:

The area represented by 250, 260, 219, 228 belonged at an earlier stage to the larger area, where [t, d] were palatalized in the form [k, g]. This first assumption is confirmed by the fact that 250, 260 make an isolated area (with [\hat{c}, \hat{g}] palatalization of [t, d]) within the area where [t, d] are consistently palatalized in the form [k, g]. Earlier than the palatalization in 219, 228, was the change (c), expressed by rule (3). In this way, 219 and 228 made a distinct sub-area (with palatalized [t, d] distinct from [\hat{c}, \hat{g}]) within 250, 260, 219 and 228.

The pronunciation [\hat{c}, \hat{g}] of every [k, g] was 'imported' by the dialect 250, 260 in a later stage from the dialect 219, 228. For in 250, 260 the speakers had the same sound perception of palatalized [t, d] and of primary [k, g], when the new pronunciation (from 219, 228) was adopted, the merger of palatalized [t, d] and the primary [k, g] into [\hat{c}, \hat{g}] was quite normal.

The case above discussed gives an example of one of the possible concrete evolutive interpretations of the purely formal concept of different ordering of the same rules.

REFERENCES

- Halle, 1964 = M. Halle, *Phonology in Generative Grammar*, in J. A. Fodor & J. J. Katz, *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, Englewood Cliffs, N.Y. Prentice Hall, pp. 334—352.
- Vasiliu, 1967a = E. Vasiliu, *Transformational vs. Biunique Phonemic Typology*, in *Phonologie der Gegenwart*, Vorträge und Diskussionen anlässlich der Internationalen Phonologie-Tagung in Wien, 30. VIII.—3. IX. 1966, Graz—Wien—Köln, 1967, pp. 254—261.
- Vasiliu, 1967b = E. Vasiliu, *Considérations typologiques sur la phonologie transformationnelle des dialectes dacoroumains*, in *Cahiers de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, vol. IV, 1967, pp. 253—260.