I. West Slavic

A. Czech Quantity Paradigms:

Alternating QP	Constant QP
Short in Zero-form kráva (<AP A with zero Gpl)	**All long** brázda, soud (<AP B-long)
Long in Zero-form mráz (<AP A with zero Nsg) nůž, bůh, sůl (AP <B/C short with certain stem-final cons.)	**All short** hlava, prach (<AP C) bob/roh (<AP B/C short with certain stem-final cons.)

Note: kráva and some other nouns of this type can have variant shorts in Isg and DLIpl, but when this spreads to AP B nouns (e.g. *trouba*, *chvála*), the only alternating form is the zero Gpl.

B. Slovak Quantity Paradigms:

Alternating QP	Constant QP
Long in Zero-form krava, strana (<AP A/C-long with zero Gpl) osa, voda (<B-short/C-short with zero Gpl) kôň (<B-short with zero Nsg)	**All long** brázda, súd (<AP B-long) (implies long>short in long endings by Rhythmic Law)
	All short hrach, prach, roh (<AP A/C with zero Nsg)

Slovak reflexes of paradigms A/C:	Slovak reflexes of paradigm B:
Merged A/C paradigms with zero genitive plural: Alternation = long Gpl vs. other	AP B long subtype: constant long.
Merged A/C paradigms with zero nominative singular: all short with no quantitative alternation.	Short subtype: long zero-form vs. other.

C. Traces of Polish Reflexes of Quantity Paradigm

Reflexes of Alternating QP	Reflexes of Constant QP
Long reflex only in Zero-form **A. <Long AP A/C with certain stem-final consonants:** Zero Gpl: krowa~krów, głowa~głów księga~ksiąg, ręka~rąk Zero Nsg: mróz~mrozu, wróg~wroga **B. <Short AP B/C with certain stem-final consonants:** Zero Gpl siostra~sióstr, woda~wód Zero Nsg: nóż, bóg, sól	**All long** bruzda, sąd (<AP B-long) **All short** **A. (<Long AP A/C with certain stem-final consonants:)** Zero Gpl: sroka, strona Zero Nsg: groch, młot **B. <Short AP B/C with certain stem-final consonants:** Zero Gpl osa, kosa Zero Nsg: kot; rok, kość

Comments
Diachronic
1. It is generally recognized that the 3 major WSl languages retained length on neo-acute and pretonic syllables. This is seen in the continuation of length reflexes in AP B, e.g. P *trąba*/Cz *trouba*/Slk *trúba*. However, there is a problem in AP C, since pretonic length came down as short in this accentual paradigm, e.g. P *strona*, Cz and Slk *strana*. Many explanations have been offered, but I would say that this is due to the restriction of prosodic alternations to quantitatively opposing the zero form to other forms in West Slavic nominal paradigms. In other words, why do modern Czech *brázda* and *strana* have different root quantity. The short *strana* follows the stress of originally circumflex accusative form, *stranu*. The accentual alternation seen in Russian *сторона́, сто́рону* has been abandoned, in favor of opposing zero and non-zero forms. As shown in the initial table, each of the major WSl languages has developed a complex system of using quantity (or its reflexes, in Polish) as a redundant feature of forms with zero desinences, which occur in the Nsg and Gpl forms.

Synchronic
Czech and Slovak still oppose zero forms to non-zero by means of quantity, while Polish only has qualitative reflexes of quantity and has lost many of the original differences in zero forms. Slovak has extended the use of quantity in zero forms to a great extent and vowel length now appears in all Slovak zero Gpl forms. The main similarities and differences between Czech and Slovak can be summarized as follows:

Similarities
    A. Both Czech and Slovak have a quantity alternation, with the zero-form quantity opposed to that of the other paradigmatic forms.
    B. Both have a three-part structure with 3 quantitative paradigms (QP): long, short paradigm, and alternating, somewhat analogous to the stem-stress, end-stress, and mobile stress paradigms of stress languages.

Differences
    A. In Slovak paradigms with a quantitative alternation, the zero form is predictably long, whether it represents the Nsg (e.g. *kôň*) or Gpl (e.g. *kráv*).
    B. In Czech, the zero-form in a paradigm with quantity alternation has a redundant signal about whether the zero-form is Nsg (long, e.g. *mráz*) or Gpl (short, e.g. *krav*).

II. Russian.

Nsg	Npl
(Asg)	
Gsg	Gpl

Nsg -Ø	Npl -i
	Gpl Nonzero (-of/-ej)

Nsg -o	Npl -a
	Gpl -Ø

Nsg -a	Npl -i
	Gpl -Ø

стол (BB)

E* -Ø	E -i
E -a	E -of

зуб (CC)

I* -Ø	I -i
I -a	E -of

гвоздь (BC)

E* -Ø	I -i
E -a	E -ej

шаг (CB)

I* -Ø	E -i
I -a	E -of

Subtype 1

Nsg -Ø	Npl -a
	Gpl Nonzero (-of/-ej)

город (CC)

I* -Ø	E -a
I -a	E -of

Subtype 2

Nsg -Ø	Npl -i
	Gpl -Ø

сапожок (BB)

E* -Ø	P -i
E -a	P* -Ø

лицо (BB)

E -o	P -a
E -a	P* -Ø

слово (CC)

I -o	E -a
I -a	E* -Ø

вещество (BC)

E -o	E -a
E -a	E* -Ø

озеро (CB)

I -o	P -a
I -a	P* -Ø

Subtype 1

Nsg -o	Npl -i
	Gpl -Ø

плечо (BC)

E -o	I -i
E -a	E* -Ø

жена (BB)

E -a/-u	P -i
E -i	P* -Ø

голова (CC)

E -a	I -i
I -u	
E -i	E* -Ø

губа (BC)

E -a/-u	I -i
E -i	E* -Ø

вода (CB)

E -a	P -i
I -u	
E -i	P* -Ø

Subtype 1

Nsg -a	Npl -i
	Gpl Nonzero (-ej)

праща (BB)

E -a/-u	E -i
E -i	E -ej

Anomalous/Irregular

тамада

E -a/-u	E -i
E -i	E* -Ø

Nsg Zero List

стол (BB)

E*	E
-Ø	-i
E	E
-a	-of

зуб (CC)

I*	I
-Ø	-i
I	E
-a	-of

город (CC)

I*	E
-Ø	-a
I	E
-a	-of

гвоздь (BC)

E*	I
-Ø	-i
E	E
-a	-ej

шаг (CB)

I*	E
-Ø	-i
I	E
-a	-of

сапожок (BB)

E*	P
-Ø	-i
E	P*
-a	-Ø

Gpl Zero List

лицо (BB)

E	P
-o	-a
E	P*
-a	-Ø

слово (CC)

I	E
-o	-a
I	E*
-a	-Ø

вещество (BC)

E	E
-o	-a
E	E*
-a	-Ø

плечо (BC)

E	I
-o	-i
E	E*
-a	-Ø

озеро (CB)

I	P
-o	-a
I	P*
-a	-Ø

жена (BB)

E	P
-a/-u	-i
E	P*
-i	-Ø

голова (CC)

E	I
-a	-i
I	
-u	
E	E*
-i	-Ø

губа (BC)

E	I
-a/-u	-i
E	E*
-i	-Ø

вода (CB)

E	P
-a	-i
I	
-u	
E	P*
-i	-Ø

сапожок (BB)

E*	P
-Ø	-i
E	P*
-a	-Ø

черта (anom)

E	E
-a/-u	-i
E	E*
-i	-Ø

I. In Russian, there is a correlation between stress pattern and zero form, as follows:

1. Nsg zero:

Two types of singular stress patterns are found with a Nsg zero: either constant singular end-stress or constant singular initial stress, but no predesinential stress or case mobility (excluding the second locative). Based on the above chart, the two patterns can be exemplified by the singulars of стол, колокол.

E* стол-Ǿ	
E стол-а́	

I´ колокол-Ø	
I колокол-а	

2. Gpl zero:

Three plural stress patterns generally correspond to Gpl zero: predesinential in the entire plural, or a paradigmatic opposition of Gpl end-stress to initial-stress, either in the Npl (example B) or in the entire singular (example C).

A.

	P´ колба́с-ы
	P* колба́с-Ø

B.

	I´ голов-ы
	E* голов- Ǿ

C.

I´ слов-о	E слов-а́
I´ слов-а	E* слов- Ǿ

The zero Gpl can be found in entirely end-stressed paradigms, but these mostly consist of foreign loan words (e.g. тамада). Native Russian words with this stress pattern have mostly taken on predesinential stress in the plural (e.g. колбаса, жена, etc.), which is why predesinential stress is the most characteristic feature of the zero Gpl.

This leads to the following general conclusions about the stress of Russian nouns with the zero-ending.
1. A zero form (Nsg or Gpl) can have stress on either the stem or the zero ending.
2. Other than constant stem stress throughout the paradigm, all stresses are either initial (I), predesinential (P), or desinential (E).
When I, P, and E stresses occur on zero forms, they redundantly signal the Nsg or Gpl, as follows:
a. A predesinential stress on a zero form implies Gpl (колба́с); i.e. predesinential does not occur in the Nsg.
b. An initial stress on zero must be a Nsg (ко́локол); i.e. initial stress does not occur in the Gpl.
c. An end-stress is ambiguous, in that it can occur on either zero form: Nsg or Gpl (stol-Ǿ or golov-Ǿ); the entire stress pattern must be considered, in order to predict whether an end-stress belongs to a Nsg or Gpl. Nsg end-stress occurs only when the entire singular has end-stress. Gpl end-stress occurs when this end-stress alternates with an initial stress elsewhere in the paradigm, either in the entire singular (e.g. сло́во, сло́в), or in the Npl (e.g. го́ловы, голо́в).
d. Two very restricted groups of words can combine a zero Gpl with end-stress in the entire paradigm, a set of borrowed -a nouns (e.g. тамада́) and a groups of neuters with certain specific suffixes, e.g. -stvo (вещество́). The vast majority of Russian words with a zero Gpl have changed plural end-stress to predesinential.

Stated another way, a predesinential zero form can only be Gpl. An initial zero form can only be Nsg.
An end-stressed zero must be Gpl if it is part of a mobile subparadigm. However, if an end-stressed zero form is part of an immobile end-stressed subparadigm, it is Nsg in its usual manifestation, but Gpl if marked as a loan word or a neuter with a particular suffix.

Why can WSl can oppose zero forms to the rest of the paradigm? I.e. WSl can have an individual feature only in the Gpl, opposing GPl to all other paradigmatic forms. Furthermore, why does WSl eliminate other types of prosodic alternation (such as old *stornà/*stôrnǫ, Russian сторона́/сто́рону)? Conversely, ESl/Russian does not oppose the zero form to all others, but retains other prosodic alternations.

The answer lies in the difference between the West Slavic system of distinctive quantity and the East Slavic system of distinctive stress. In a stress system, the stress of the zero form is defined by the pattern of other members of the subparadigm, since a monosyllable alone, such as **стол** cannot have distinctive stress. Thus, while the surface stresses of голо́в, and колба́с are the same, the other paradigmatic members define the structural pattern (колба́сы vs. голова́ми). At the same time, older stress patterns are retained.   *feldstei@indiana.edu*