Б**АЛТО-СЛАВЯНСКАЯ АКЦЕНТОЛОГИЯ**

Baltoslavenska akcentologija
Balto-Slavic Accentology

IWoBA VII

Материалы VII международного семинара
Referati VII međunarodnog skupa
Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop

Ronald F. Feldstein

Indiana University

Russian Stress and the Notion of Syncretism

I. Introduction

In recent studies of Russian syncretism, stress has often been ac-corded a secondary role. For example, in a 2004 paper on syncretism in distributed morphology, Müller stated his intention to focus on the "core system" and to "disregard ... stress patterns" [Müller 2004: 2]. This paper takes the position that one cannot "disregard" either the segmental or the prosodic features within the system of syncretism, since there is no syn-cretism if both features do not coincide. In the more recent 2005 study by Baerman et al, there is a limited discussion of Russian stress, primarily for the purpose of disqualifying the Nsg and Gsg forms *мéсто*, *мéста* as an instance of syncretism.

One of the main discussions of Russian stress and syncretism in [Baerman et al. 2005: 10], concerns the fact that although phonetic [mʲéstə] represents both Nsg *место* and Gsg *места*, the authors do not wish to consider it as syncretism, since it results from an automatic phonological rule. In their words, "the collapse of the genitive with the nominative/accusative is a superficial by-product of phonology and need not be reflected in a morphological analysis."

Actually, the issue of whether [mʲéstə] is one or two entities is not just an issue for syncretism, but for phonology and morphophonology in gen-eral. Theories may differ as to whether this single phonetic shape should receive two different higher level representations. Thus, a possible Mos-cow Phonological School transcription of /mʲésto/ vs. /mʲésta/ means two different shapes and no syncretism, but a Leningrad transcription of a sin-gle entity, such as /mʲésta/ in both cases, would leave the door open to considering them as syncretic. In other words, the question of whether [mʲéstə] represents syncretism should be viewed as dependent on the given phonological theory and not an objective fact, in and of itself.

Baerman compares the situation of [mʲéstə] to that of [vʲinó] and [vʲiná], in which there is neither phonetic nor phonemic syncretism. Obvi-ously, the phonological neutralization of /a/ and /o/ in post-tonic position is causing this situation. This suggests that it might be useful to consider a difference between **phonetic syncretism** and **morphophonemic syn-**

cretism (as in Table 1), which would differentiate these types. Thus, [v̓inó] and [v'iná] would have both phonetic and morphophonemic types, while [m'éstə] would be an example of phonetic, but not morphophonemic syncretism. This case illustrates the fact that stress must be considered, along with segmental features, in any study of Russian syncretism.

Table 1. Variable nature of phonetic, phonemic, morphophonemic syncretism.

Syncretic Pair	Phonetic	"Leningrad" Phonemic	"Moscow" Phonemic, Morphophonemic
ме́сто	[m'éstə]	/m'ésta/	/m'ésto/
ме́ста	[m'éstə]	/m'esta/	/m'ésta/
Syncretism	+	+	−
вино́	[v'inó]	/v'inó/	/v'inó/
вина́	[v'iná]	/v'iná/	/v'iná/
Syncretism	−	−	−

Baerman's concept of syncretism admits only the morphophonemic type, but an argument could be made for a listener's syncretism, which would reflect phonetic identity, similar to the "Leningrad" phoneme, as contrasted to the "Moscow" phoneme.

However, even if we ignore the notion of phonetic syncretism and restrict our attention to the generally accepted notion of morphological syncretism, stress plays an important role in the manifestation of syncretism in the Russian noun. This paper will propose a classification of these manifestations of syncretism, according to three criteria.

II. Classification of syncretism into three basic types

I intend to propose that there are three basic types of syncretism, with regard to their stress patterns. A brief characterization of these types will be given, followed by a more detailed presentation of specific examples.

A. Type I: Constant syncretism

Within an inflectional paradigm, such instances of syncretism apply without regard to the stress pattern, or accentual paradigm. For example, the locative and dative singular syncretism of the (usually feminine) "*a*-declension" occurs in all possible accentual environments, e.g. loca-

tive and dative *кни́ге, сестре́, голове́*. In other words, regardless of the accentual paradigm a word possesses, if it is in the "*a*-declension," it will have the locative and dative singular syncretism. Thus, this syncretism can even serve as a reliable definitional property of this inflectional type, since constant syncretism of Lsg and Dsg is always part of this morphological paradigm. It can be noted that segmental properties define the notion of the traditional morphological paradigm (e.g. Nsg -*a*, Asg -*u*, etc.), while accentual properties are considered mere subtypes of the given "declension," or morphological paradigm. Thus, it is said that the "*a*-declension" can have several different accentual types. However, in spite of this accentual variability, in the case of constant syncretism, all members of the paradigm share the same syncretisms.

B. Type II: Variable syncretism

In the case of variable syncretism, the words of a particular declension (which is defined only by segmental desinences) have different manifestations of the given syncretism, depending on the accentual paradigm. For example, the genitive singular and nominative plural forms of the *a*-declension (for details, see [Jakobson 1984]) are syncretic when the accentual paradigm has constant stem-stress (to be referred to as Type A stress), but are **not** syncretic in the case of several other accentual patterns, such as singular end-stress and plural predesinential (which I shall refer to as "Type B stress", cf. [Feldstein 2006 and 2007]). For example, *ла́мпы* (Gsg and Npl) manifests the syncretism, but the grammatically identical pair, *колбасы́* (Gsg) vs. *колба́сы* (Npl), are not syncretic. Actually, one could be more precise and specify that this pair is **segmentally syncretic**, but not **prosodically syncretic**. Thus, a difference between the segmental and prosodic values of syncretism is the most salient property of the type I am refer to as variable syncretism.

C. "Non-standard" paradigmatic syncretism

Prosodic factors can create yet a third syncretic situation. In several instances, small sets of Russian nouns belong to declensional paradigms which can only occur in a restricted accentual environment. Therefore, syncretic relationships which occur in these paradigms may well involve forms which can only belong to a single accentual paradigm. For example, the usual "zero-noun" paradigm has a single locative form for general prepositional usage and for a specific type of location. However, an accentually restricted set of words, which otherwise belong to this para-

digm, splits the locative case into two forms, known as locative-1 and locative-2, with desinences that differ both segmentally and prosodically. For example, a zero-noun with constant stem-stress (and usually with constant end-stress) can only have a single locative, which might be viewed as a syncretic manifestation of locative-1 and locative-2; for example, the noun form in о *заво́де* is syncretic with that of на *заво́де*. However, many nouns with mobile stress (paradigm C) manifest this mobility in the singular, having a locative-2 form with stressed *-ú*, as opposed to locative-1 with unstressed *-e*: о *сне́ге* vs. в *снегу́*, i.e. lacking syncretism.

III. Type 1 syncretism

Type 1 syncretism can be illustrated in the following table:

Table 2. Type 1 syncretism: shared segmental endings with possible differences of accentual paradigm (AP), but no syncretic differences between accentual types. In order to indicate that there could be both unity and diversity in the syncretic sets of these patterns, it will be useful to indicate **segmental syncretism** separately from **prosodic syncretism**. Of course, both features must show a plus-sign, in the case of true syncretism.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
кни́ге Lsg/Dsg	A	+	+
жене́ Lsg/Dsg	B	+	+
голове́ Lsg/Dsg	C	+	+

Differences of accentual paradigm can be ignored when there are no accentual differences between the grammatical forms in a syncretic pair. This applies to a-noun Lsg/Dsg, as shown above, and also the following syncretic sets:

1. Zero-noun (masculine morphological paradigm): Nsg/Asg (*сто́л*), Asg/Gsg (*челове́ка*), Npl/Apl (*столы́*), Apl/Gpl (*волко́в*).

2. *o*-noun (neuter morphological paradigm): Nsg/Asg (*сло́во*), Npl/Apl (*слова́*), (Apl/Gpl (*ли́ц*)).

3. *a*-noun (feminine morphological paradigm): Npl/Apl (*ру́ки*), Apl/Gpl (*жён*).

IV. Type 2 syncretism

As noted above, type 2 syncretism displays a difference of syncretism in the different accentual paradigms.

Table 3. Type 2 syncretism: shared segmental endings with possible differences of accentual paradigm (AP), and with syncretic differences between accentual types.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
кни́ги Gsg/Npl	A	+	+
жены́ Gsg / *жёны* Npl	B	+	−
головы́ Gsg /*го́ловы* Npl	C	+	−
пра́вила Gsg/Npl	A	+	+
села́ Gsg / *сёла* Npl	B	+	−
зе́ркала Gsg / *зеркала́* Npl	C	+	−

Type 2 syncretism occurs in the Gsg/Npl syncretic pair, in which accentual paradigm A (constant stem-stress) displays syncretism, but types B and C most often do not, since one of the two forms has end-stress and the other does not. This is the usual pattern for o-noun morphological neuters and a-noun morphological feminines. Neuter *o*-stem examples, analogous to the feminine examples above, are: *пра́вила* Gsg/Npl; *село́* Gsg/*сёла* Npl; and *зе́ркала* Gsg/*зеркала́* Npl.

The separation between segmental and prosodic types of syncretism can be useful in differentiating between types one and two above, in that type one syncretism always has both segmental syncretism and a prosodic mark with the same plus sign, while type two does not have a full identity of plus signs; such identity occurs only in a subset of accentual paradigms. In another subset of accentual paradigms, the segmental syncretism agrees and has a plus sign, but prosodic syncretism does not exist and is marked as minus. Thus, there are three possibilities: two plus signs, in the case of full syncretism; two minus signs, when syncretism is absent; and a plus and a minus when there is a purely accentual opposition. A fourth possibility — minus and plus — seems less useful and would mean that the stress agrees, but the ending is different.

Jakobson, using the examples *но́чь, ло́шадь, крова́ть* [Jakobson 1984: 138], treated zero-noun feminines as having only one type of syncretism for the Gsg and Npl, regardless of accentual paradigm. This would fall into the category of our type one syncretism, shown above in Table 2. However, Zaliznjak [Zaliznjak 1965: 156] and others cite several other zero-noun feminines, which have two styles of pronunciation: a more formal one, in which the Gsg/Lsg/Dsg are all syncretic with the NApl, and a more colloquial style, in which the GLD/sg can have end-

stressed variants, in opposition to the (initial) stem-stress in the NApl. These nouns include *ось*, *грудь*, *печь*, *степь*, *цепь*. Significantly, this supports Jakobson's thesis that the pure stress opposition between Gsg and Npl is being extended in the zero-noun class of feminine nouns. However, since one set of such nouns (e.g. *лошадь*) still must maintain full syncretism, this is a type 2 situation of syncretism, in which some paradigmatic forms have full syncretism and others have only segmental syncretism, lacking prosodic identity in the given forms. This has been depicted in Table 4.

Table 4. Variable situation of zero-noun feminines. Based on style 1, the syncretism is of type 2 (variable, depending on stress), but all other forms (as cited by Jakobson) indicate type 1 syncretism, i.e. the same, regardless of stress.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
Style 1 *óси, пéчи, грýди* GLDsg/NApl	C	+	+
Style 2 *осú, печú, грудú* GLDsg	B sg		
óси, пéчи, грýди NApl	C pl	+	–
мы́сли GLDsg/NApl	A	+	+
лóшади GLDsg/NApl	C	+	+

V. Type 3 syncretism.

The third, and last type of syncretism in this classification, represents a situation in which there is not a full identity between all of the segmental desinences of a given paradigm. Although one might normally expect words with different sets of endings to belong to different paradigms, it often happens that certain endings are restricted to small accentual subsets, and it is usual to consider these paradigms as belonging to the larger type. For example, Zaliznjak introduces the concept of "narrow paradigm" ("суженная парадигма") [Zaliznjak 1965: 133], in order to be able to state that at least a certain paradigmatic subset is identical, in spite of some deviating cases, such as the second genitive (G2), second locative (L2), and paucal (count form, P). Thus, there is a choice, in the case of type 3 syncretism. One must either recognize tiny, atomistic paradigms (see [Isačenko 1965: 106], on the need to avoid "atomistic" paradigms),

with membership limited by accent, or have a larger paradigm, in which certain accentual types have a different type of syncretism than other members. Thus, it can be said that there is a trade-off between a broader, less atomistic paradigm and a more complex situation of syncretism. Accepting the concept of broader, more inclusive paradigms implies that the intraparadigmatic relations will be more complex. Interestingly, if paradigms could be viewed as less inclusive and more narrow, having only uniform sets of segmental desinences, the entire category of our type 3 syncretism would be eliminated, and syncretism would be confined to types 1 and 2. In fact, this may be the most important aspect of this classification: there is a sliding scale of syncretism, with the number of syncretic types being inversely proportional to the number of narrow paradigms recognized.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 illustrate this relationship for three "secondary" forms (вторичные, in Zaliznjak's terminology): L2 -*ú*, L2 -*í*, and the count form (P, for paucal).

Table 5. Type 3 syncretism: Secondary segmental endings exist for restricted accentual sets, which differ in terms of segmental and/or prosodic syncretism. Locatives 1/2 in the zero-noun masculine paradigm are illustrated below.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
заво́де L1sg /L2sg	A	+	+
столе́ L1sg/L2sg	B	+	+
(*о*) *посте́* L1sg / (*на*) *посту́* L2sg	B	−	+
во́лке L1sg/L2sg	C	+	+
(*о*) *бе́реге* L1sg / (*на*) *берегу́* L2sg	C	−	−

Table 6. Type 3 syncretism for zero-noun feminines.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
мы́сли L1sg/L2sg	A	+	+
Style 1			
(о) *гру́ди* L1 / (в) *груди́* L2	C	+	−
Style 2			
груди́ L1sg/L2sg	B	+	+
(*о*) *те́ни* L1sg / (*в*) *тени́* L2sg	C	+	−

Table 7. Type 3 syncretism for the count form (paucal).

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
завода Gsg/P	A	+	+
стола́ Gsg/P	B	+	+
бе́рега Gsg/P	C	+	+
ша́га Gsg / *шага́* P	C	+	−

The existence of the L2 form in stressed -*ú*, especially for the small number of such nouns in accentual paradigm B (e.g. *горб*, *плот*, *полк*, *пост*, *пруд*, *скит*, *штифт*, cf. [Zaliznjak 1965: 286]), creates a new situation of syncretism, involving the case pair L2/Dsg, as follows:

Table 8. Type 3 syncretism of zero-noun masculine L2/Dsg.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
заво́де (L1/)L2 / *заво́ду* Dsg	A	−	+
посту́ L2/Dsg	B	+	+
берегу́ L2 / *бе́регу* Dsg	C	+	−

In the case of the second genitive (G2) of the zero-noun masculine paradigm, this restricted set of words is syncretic with the Dsg. However, G2/Dsg syncretism appears to be rather independent of the accentual paradigm, and can occur under various types of stress (e.g. *наро́ду* (A), *чайку́* (B), *хо́лоду* (C)), in contrast to some of the other types of syncretism, that are rare or absent in certain accentual paradigms.

A relationship of variable syncretism also exists for zero-noun masculines which have the non-standard Npl ending -*á* (*колокола́*) or Gpl -Ø (*зу́бок*), and o-noun neuters with the Npl -*i* (*я́блоки*, *очки́*) or non-zero genitive plural (*очко́в*), i.e. masculines with non-masculine endings and neuters with non-neuter endings. Accentually motivated desinences can also be seen in the *a*-noun feminine paradigm, in which end-stressed nouns with stems ending in soft (palatalized) and husher consonants use the non-zero -*ej* ending, rather than zero (e.g. *каланча́*, *каланче́й*). When one gender appears to borrow from another, there is often an accentual restriction. However, the use of a non-zero Gpl, instead of the expected zero, has a minimal impact on syncretism, since the -*ov* or -*ej* endings do not coincide with other desinences. The use of non-standard Npl -*a* and -*i*,

however, does affect syncretism, due to the possible coincidence with the Gsg ending. Some of these relationships can be seen in the following table.

Table 9. Type 3 syncretism of zero-noun masculine Gsg/Npl

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
завóда Gsg / *завóды* Npl	A	−	+
профéссора / *профессорá*	A sg / B pl	+	−
столá Gsg / *столы́* Npl	B	−	+
рукавá Gsg/Npl	B	+	+
вóлка Gsg / *вóлки* Npl	C	−	+
бéрега Gsg / *берегá* Npl	C	+	−
сáда Gsg / *сады́* Npl	C sg / B pl	−	−
коня́ Gsg / *кóни* Npl	B sg / C pl	−	−

The patterns are very varied, but virtually all masculines with the Npl *-a* desinence lack prosodic syncretism (except for *рукáв* and *обшлáг*). Again, if all of these heterogeneous cases are considered to be in the same paradigm, then the syncretic situation becomes very complex. The alternative, to split the above list into two or more paradigms, would simplify the syncretic pattern in each such paradigm. A similar situation would occur for neuters that use the Npl *-i* ending.

It often happens that a small group of words, which might be called a microparadigm, has its own system of accent-based syncretism. Such is the case for neuter o-nouns, which have stem-final consonant *-k-*, as seen in the following table.

Table 10.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
я́блока Gsg / *я́блоки* Npl	A	−	+
очкá Gsg / *очки́* Npl	B	−	+
вóйска, óблака Gsg *войскá, облакá* Npl	C	+	−

The variable use of zero and non-zero in the Gpl as noted above, has direct links to accentual paradigms. However, it often becomes more complex, due to many lexical idiosyncrasies. In general terms, the realization of accentual paradigm B depends on the zero or non-zero status of

the Gpl.; a zero Gpl predicts a predesinential B plural, while a non-zero B predicts an end-stressed plural B accentual paradigm. A plural C paradigm is based on the nominative ending, so the Gpl ending can be either zero or non-zero with the same stress pattern (see [Feldstein 2007] for details). This can be illustrated for two masculine noun types with zero Gpl: *зубо́к* (AP B) and *во́лос* (AP C), in comparison to several other nouns of the same paradigm. A potential syncretism between Nsg and Gpl results, but is avoided by accentual opposition.

Table 11. Nsg/Gpl syncretism in zero-noun masculines.

Syncretic Pair	AP	Segmental Syncretism	Prosodic Syncretism
заво́д, сто́л, во́лк Nsg *заво́дов, столо́в, волко́в* Gpl	A, B, C	–	+, +, –
грузи́н Nsg/Gpl	A	+	+
зубо́к Nsg / *зу́бок* Gpl	B	+	–
во́лос Nsg / *воло́с* Gpl	C	+	–

VI. AP C alternations as redundant signals of syncretism

It is also noteworthy that all of the accentual paradigm C nominal alternations have some connection to syncretism and can be viewed as redundant syncretic signals. These alternations are:

1. The *-ú* L2 ending of zero-noun masculines (*берегу́*), vs. all other singular forms.

2. The *-u* Asg ending of a-noun feminines (*го́лову*), vs. all other singular forms.

3. The *-í* L2 ending of zero-noun feminines (*тени́*), vs. all other singular forms.

4. The *-i* Npl or NApl ending (*го́ловы*), vs. all other plural forms.

Table 12. AP C alternations which also relate to syncretism.

N	*бе́рег*	*голова́*	*те́нь*	N	*го́ловы*	
A		*го́лову*		A		
G	*бе́рега*	*головы́*		G	*голо́в* (golov-*ø*)	
L	*бе́реге*		*те́ни*	L	*голова́х*	
D	*бе́регу*	*голове́*		D	*голова́м*	
L2	*берегу́*		*тени́*			
I	*бе́регом*	*голово́й*	*те́нью*	I	*голова́ми*	

In the case of the L2 forms, the rare and marked non-syncretism of L2 is redundantly signaled by the stress, which stands out from all others in the singular. In the Asg form, the non-syncretism of the accusative case stands out with the only stem-initial stress in the singular. Lastly, the Npl *-i* desinence is the only plural desinence within its paradigm that has a dual syncretic potential, able to be non-syncretic with Gsg and syncretic with Apl. One may wonder why the Npl *-a* ending does not have this alternation (other than prescriptive *крыльца*, which does not occur as such in actual usage). The situation is really more complex; besides the factor of syncretism, low vowel (*-a*) direct cases are all end-stressed in AP C, while non-low direct cases are never end-stressed. Thus, the AP C stress alternations appear to be a combination of redundant marking of syncretism, with certain phonological restrictions.

VII. Conclusion

This paper has presented a three-way classification of Russian syncretism, based on whether a syncretic difference exists among the various accentual types or whether there is no such difference (types 1 and 2). Paradigms which have accentually variable syncretism within the subset of secondary and/or non-standard endings can be said to have type 3 syncretism, which is based on the use of morphological paradigms with certain non-uniform desinences. Lastly, we have pointed out that AP C accentual alternations can serve as a device for signaling syncretism or non-syncretism within both singular and plural number subparadigms.

References

Baerman et al. 2005 — *Baerman M.*, *Brown D.*, *Corbett G.* The Syntax-Morphology Interface. A Study of Syncretism. Cambridge, 2005.

Feldstein 2006 — *Feldstein R. F.* Accentual Base Forms of Russian Nouns and Their Relation to Nominative and Genitive Endings // Studia Caroliensia: Papers in Linguistics and Folklore in Honor of Charles E. Gribble. Bloomington, 2006. P. 105–115.

Feldstein 2007 — *Feldstein R. F.* Russian phonological desinences as a conditioning factor in accentual paradigms // Tones and Theories: Proceedings from the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2007. P. 185–197.

Isačenko 1965 — *Исаченко А. В.* Грамматический строй русского языка в сопоставлении с словацким. Bratislava, 1965.

Jakobson 1984 — *Jakobson R. O.* Genitive and Plural in the Declension of Russian Nouns. Russian and Slavic Grammar. Berlin, 1984.

Müller 2004 — *Müller G.* A Distributed Morphology Approach to Syncretism in Russian Noun Inflection // *Arnaudova O.*, *Browne W.*, *Rivero M. L.*, *Stojanovic D.* (eds.), Proceedings of FASL, 2004, 12.

Zaliznjak 1965 — *Зализняк А. А.* Русское именное словоизменение. Москва, 1965.

Ronald F. Feldstein: feldstei@indiana.edu