

The Nature and Use of the Accentual Paradigm as Applied to Russian

Ronald Feldstein

1. Introduction: Definitions of Accentual Paradigms.

The concept of accentual paradigm has played a major role in accentual studies of stress and other prosodic phenomena in the Slavic languages. It has been productively used by such scholars of accentology as Stang (1957), Illič-Svityč (1963), Dybo (1962, 1981, etc.), Garde (1976: 19), and Zaliznjak (1967). There also has been an important modification of the concept of accentual paradigm, called the accentual subparadigm (Fedjanina 1976, Zaliznjak 1985). This paper intends to examine the precise definition of the accentual paradigm and subparadigm. It will be seen that the concept of subparadigm can be greatly expanded beyond the limited scope of accentual subparadigms which already exists. In addition, it can be shown that certain highly interesting accentual discoveries of linguists such as Roman Jakobson really stem from the implicit use of novel accentual paradigms. Our goal is to obtain more rigorous definitions of such subparadigms, with the ultimate goal of using them to illustrate new structural principles underlying the Russian stress system.

Let us start by examining some of the extant definitions for accentual paradigm which have been offered in the scholarly literature. A basic definition of the term was given by Illič-Svityč (1963: 4), who stated that "the term accentual paradigm implies the full set of accentual relations in different word-forms—a kind of accentual curve of the grammatical paradigm, which is characteristic of a defined group of words, which belong to any grammatical category." The term grammatical category can be exemplified by such categories as part of speech and/or stem-class for the purpose of this definition. Therefore, the accentual paradigm is the shared set of stresses possessed by a given set of words of a particular inflected category. Red'kin (1971: 6), using the alternative term "accentual curve" for accentual paradigm, explicitly adding the notion of part of speech, calls the accentual curve "the sum total of stresses of the word-forms of a certain set of words belonging to a given part of speech." The language of Red'kin's definition is so close to that of Illič-Svityč that it seems to be based upon it. Some scholars apparently considered the definition of the accentual

Journal of Slavic Linguistics 1(1): 44–60, 1993.

paradigm to have been such a simple and obvious matter that no special definition is given. For example, Stang (1957: 56) simply refers to three types of accent: "(a) constant root-stress; (b) constant end-stress; (c) mobile stress", without even defining the term accentual paradigm.

I would like to suggest that a two-stage procedure is implied in the establishment of accentual paradigms. The first step determines the individual accentual word-paradigm. Having established the accentual pattern of each individual lexical item, the next step implies the grouping of each of these individual patterns into invariant types, which are commonly known by such names as stem-stress, ending-stress, mobile, etc. Variations in the application of each of these two stages create the different types of accentual paradigms, which can serve different analytical purposes. As noted, in the first of the two stages, the individual lexeme's accentual paradigm is established. This process can be represented by a scheme such as that presented in Table 1 on the following page, in which the lexical and grammatical portions of the word can each be conceived of as complexes of features, where the features are separated into semantic features and two types of phonological features—segmental and prosodic. Each heading in Table 1 represents at least one feature; in the case of lexical features, of course, the features are assumed to be numerous and complex, while in the case of some grammatical categories, such as number, it is assumed that there is only one binary feature. The term **constant** under the category implies that for each separate paradigmatic listing there will be no variation in the feature specification of that morpheme or grammatical category. The term **variable** implies that within a single paradigmatic set the given feature or features will appear in all their possible differences. Thus, if the full stress paradigm of the word *golova* is considered, there is no variation in whatever lexical features, part of speech, and stem-class constitute this lexeme. However, number and case are variable, so that all possible features variations of case and number enter into the composition of this paradigm. The **variable** designation of the phonological portion of the lexical stem means that all phonological and allomorphic variations of stem shape—both segmental and prosodic, including such shapes as [*gəlavá, góləvu, gəlav'é*]—enter the accentual paradigm.

The possibility of constant and variable indications will permit these categories to be manipulated in many ways in creating accentual paradigms other than the full ones seen in Table 1. Thus, we see that by holding the lexical meaning, part of speech, and often stem-class constant through all possible changes of grammatical form, we obtain

Table 1: Full Accentual Paradigms

A. Generalized for All Parts of Speech.					
	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem/Gender Class Features	Grammatical Desinence Features		
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable		
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable		
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable		
B. Specific Parts of Speech.					
1. Noun					
	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/Gender Features	Case Features	Number Feature	
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Variable	
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	
2. Verb					
	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Mood Features	Tense Feature	Number Feature	Person ~ Gender Feature
Semantic:	Constant	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
3. Adjective					
	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Attribution Features	Gender Feature	Number Feature	Case Features
Semantic:	Constant	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

the full accentual paradigm. The reason for holding lexeme, part of speech and stem-class constant is that these features are common to every single member of the lexical paradigm. Of course, those categories which are not commonly specified for all members of the paradigm, such as number, are not held constant. After having formally established the potential accentual paradigm of every individual lexical item, the second step is then to unite the identical accentual patterns of individual lexical items into groups, by allowing the lexical meaning of stems to vary, but maintaining such categories as part of speech and stem-type as constants. However, it must be observed that the second-stage process of grouping the individual accentual paradigms of lexical items into a small number of patterns is not at all an obvious procedure.

Very different sorts of accentual paradigms have been proposed for such languages as Russian, even though there may be full agreement as to the particular accentual paradigm of each lexical item. The difference lies in criteria such as the following:

1) Once the accentual paradigm of every potential lexical item in all of its grammatical forms is established, the subsequent process of grouping implies the recognition of certain accentual representations as identical and others as different. Different solutions can arise from many differential determinations in this process. For example, one solution may call for the division of all stressed words into only **two** types—stem-stressed and desinence-stressed, while another may specify the **four** types known as stem-initial, stem-medial, stem-final, and desinential.

2) Some analyses may attempt to establish accentual groups which can uniformly be applied across as many grammatical categories as possible, while others may set up separate systems for each stem-class or part of speech. Red'kin's 1971 accentological system of Russian exemplifies a system which stays quite close to surface forms and presents rather unrelated definitions for the accentual types in various grammatical categories. His system uses the letters A, B, C, D with additional subscripts to represent four basic accentual classes. However, there are unrelated definitions for the three major inflected parts of speech: nouns are defined in terms of their stem or desinential stress in the dative singular and plural; adjectives are defined in terms of stem, desinential, and mobile, and use only three of the four types A, B, and C; while verbs observe the four-way distinction of A, B, C, D, based on stem or desinential stress in the present and past tenses. However, suffixal stress is confused with ending stress, and such patterns as

tolknët/tolknúla, *nesët/neslá*, and *igráet/igrála* are all said to represent "class C: final stress in both present and past tense" (Red'kin 1971: 118).

Garde's 1978 accentual system of Russian can be said to represent the opposite of Red'kin's in terms of the grouping process, since Garde's invariant categories apply in the broadest possible way—to all morphemes of the language—while in Red'kin's system it is not always clear what a type C or type D noun has accentually in common with a verb or adjective of the identically labeled accentual class. Garde's method is based on his particular view of what constitutes an accentual paradigm, defined by the author (1976: 19) as "the set of words whose stems are characterized by identical accentual properties." While Garde's system succeeds in establishing unitary accentual properties for root morphemes, unfortunately, it fails to establish consistent accentual markings for many of the most important desinences in Russian inflection, such as the plural desinences of nouns and all of the verbal present tense endings other than the first person singular. As an example of Garde's inconsistent desinential markings, we can cite all of the instances of dual desinential stress features in his tables of nouns (1978: 374) and verbs (1978: 377). Thus, virtually all of the plural desinences have double markings. For example, while the "weak" marking for the nominative plural desinence (*d*) works for nouns with constant stem-stress (*doróga*) or constant desinence-stress (*konurá*), it does not generate the correct stress for nouns which are end-stressed in the singular, but stem-final stressed in the plural, such as Garde's own example *sirotá*. Thus, the class of nouns represented by *sirotá* must utilize a desinence with another stress mark, 'D (pre-stressing desinential). This is due to the fact that the weak *d* type either allows a dominant root mark to determine stress (as in *doróga*) or specifies retraction to the word-initial syllable (as in the nominative plural *gólovy*), but it cannot yield the correct stress in combination with a T' (post-stressing) root, as in the case of *sirotá*, prompting Garde's decision to mark the desinence with a variable stress feature.

The same situation applies to all present-tense forms of the verb, except for the first person singular, of those verbs which have present tense mobility in Russian, such as *kolotít'* (see Garde 1978: 379). The numerous verbs of this type receive present tense endings which are marked with the pre-stressing strong feature 'D, while the stem-stressed verbs (e.g., *gotóvit'*) and the end-stressed verbs (e.g., *govorít'*) must be said to take the regular strong ending D. These cases vitiate Garde's central position that "from the accentual properties of all morphemes one can deduce the stress placement in all forms of all words with the application of five simple rules" (1978: 367). The simple rules do not cover the many instances in which a particular desinence changes its feature due to the mark of the preceding morpheme.

In essence, Garde's system copes best with nouns and verbs which manifest uniform behavior in singular and plural, or first person singular and other present forms, respectively. Once words with rather different behavior across these categories are considered, Garde's system of uniform morpheme markings must be abandoned for grammatical desinences. As Zaliznjak (1985: 37) pointed out, Garde's system cannot successfully cope with many desinential morphemes of Russian, since "Garde... is forced to attribute an inconsistent marking to the desinence *-am* (and others similar to it), without strict rules governing this inconsistency." In fact, Garde himself stated (1978: 372) that "sometimes the distribution of the two variants is not governed by strict rules." Furthermore, limiting the goal of analysis to the establishment of an accentual representation for each individual morpheme makes it impossible to view numerous paradigmatic patterns of systematic importance in the context of the interrelation of stem and desinence, although Garde's method is a potentially excellent device for establishing accentual morphophonemic representations.

2. Variations in Setting up Accentual Subparadigms

Since two basic processes are involved in the ultimate grouping of lexemes into stress classes, and since each process can have many variations, there is a double complication, which depends upon 1) the scope of the paradigm used, and 2) the method of assigning invariant definitions to the categories obtained. In the remainder of this paper I would like to concentrate on the process that defines the accentual paradigm by means of holding particular semantic and phonological features constant.

2.1. Grammatical Accentual Subparadigms (lexical meaning = constant; grammatical meaning = partially variable)

First let us consider the possible variations in setting up the accentual paradigm for any given lexical item. As noted, the full accentual paradigm represents the sum total of stresses in the grammatical forms in which the given lexical stem occurs. This type of paradigm indicates the stem's stress behavior across all of its possible grammatical categories. However, it has often proved useful to concentrate upon the role of stress in a more limited domain. This goal has given rise to the accentual subparadigm, perhaps first devised by Leonard Bloomfield in his 1945 textbook of Russian. As Zaliznjak (1985: 14) notes, "from an accentual point of view it is useful to divide

many morphological paradigms into parts, which can be called *subparadigms*."

2.1.1. Two Accentual Subparadigms

Each part of speech has been given particular divisions into such subparadigms, although not all scholars have agreed on the nature of these divisions. Table 2, on pages 52–53, demonstrates some of the formal differences in the establishment of accentual subparadigms as compared to full paradigms. As seen in Table 2, the technique of establishing subparadigms differs from that of full paradigms in that, in addition to the invariable features of the lexeme, such as lexical meaning, part of speech, and stem-class, a feature of the variable grammatical meanings may also be held constant. For example, the noun's subparadigms (represented in part A of Table 2) have been divided by grammatical number into singular and plural subparadigms by Fedjanina (1976: 20). Of course, separating the full paradigm into two subunits of number emphasizes the role of stress in case opposition. Zaliznjak (1985: 14) has divided the noun into unequal subparadigms, opposing the second locative singular to the rest of the full paradigm. This somewhat unusual split presents certain difficulties in the analysis of Zaliznjak's principle of division, tentatively set up in section A.2 of Table 2, where non-locative₂ forms are separated from all other case forms on the basis of a hypothetical feature.

The adjective has generally been divided on the basis of the attributive and non-attributive subparadigms, i.e., long-form vs. short-form adjectives, which emphasizes the number/gender opposition in the short forms and the number/gender/case opposition in the long forms; the comparative and superlative degrees have been explicitly excluded from the inflectional paradigm, and relegated to the area of word-formation by Zaliznjak (1985: 14).

There have been important differences in the establishment of verbal accentual subparadigms, represented in part B of Table 2. Fedjanina's two verbal subparadigms are based on the indicative finite forms of the non-past and past tenses (1975: 183), which emphasize the role of stress in the person/number opposition of the non-past and the number/gender opposition of the past. These two subparadigms comprise less than a full paradigm, referred to by Fedjanina as a "narrowed paradigm (*sužennaja paradigma*). Zaliznjak's verbal subparadigms group the non-past indicative with the imperative mood and the past indicative with the infinitive (1985: 14), as two larger

subparadigms. Although one of Zaliznjak's verbal subparadigms contains non-past tenses and the other the past tense, since the infinitive is grouped with the past and the imperative with the non-past, there seems to be no semantic invariant to either group. The only common denominators for each of these two subparadigms is the Jakobsonian segmental criterion of consonantal or vocalic endings, as shown in Table 2, section B.2, which suggests that Zaliznjak incorrectly labels these subparadigms as "present" and "preterite" subparadigms, and that they are based more on phonological criteria than on the criterion of grammatical meaning. If so, they really belong in Table 3, rather than Table 2, since the third type is specifically set aside for accentual paradigms which are based upon constant phonological features.

2.1.2. More Than 2 Subparadigms per Full Paradigm (Holding Constant a Category with More Than One Binary Feature)

Virtually all subparadigms have been assumed to consist of two units which comprise a full paradigm. This is clear in Fedjanina's use of the term *poluparadigma* to refer to the subparadigm. This usually results from the fact that a grammatical category with a single binary feature is held constant to produce the subparadigms, such that the positive specification of the feature (such as grammatical number) yields one subparadigm, while the negative marking yields the second subparadigm. We have seen that even Zaliznjak's less conventional subparadigms still break the full paradigm into two parts. I would like to suggest that there might be a place for subparadigms which are not limited to two per full paradigm. This type of paradigm would depend on holding constant a grammatical category which contains more than one semantic feature, such as that of case. If a category such as number—with only a single feature—is held constant, the usual pattern of two subparadigms will be obtained, as illustrated previously. However, an example of six subparadigms per full paradigm can be constructed for the noun if the case features are held constant while the number feature varies, as shown in Table 2, section D.1. What information can such subparadigms give us? Based on the six such subparadigms of this type for the two major noun stem-types which permit accentual mobility of both case and number (e.g., Ø-nouns *volk, bog, lebed'* and a-nouns *ruka, golova, storona*), as represented in Table 2, section D.2, we can see that this type of subparadigm enables us to focus on the role of stress in the implementation of the number

Table 2: Subparadigms in which a feature in one grammatical category is held constant, while others are variable

A. Noun

1. Fedjanina: 2 subparadigms of number

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/Gender Features	Case Features	Number Feature
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Constant
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

2. Zaliznjak: 2 (unequal) subparadigms based on second locative: one for (+loc₂) (*Predložnyj*₂) and another for (-loc₂)

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/Gender Features	Case and Number Features	
			Loc ₂	Non-Loc ₂
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Constant*	Constant*
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

B. Verb

1. Fedjanina: 2 subparadigms of tense (narrowed full paradigm)

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Tense Features	Number Feature	Person ~ Gender Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

2. Zaliznjak: 2 paradigms "present" (present/imperative) vs. "preterite" (past/infinitive)

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Tense Features	Number Feature	Person ~ Gender Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Variable
Segmental phonological:	Variable	Constant -C or -V	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

* Assuming there is a constant semantic feature which opposes the Loc₂ to the other cases.

C. Adjective

	Lexical/Part-of-speech Features	Attribution Feature	Gender Feature	Number Feature	Case Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

D. Subparadigms exceeding 2 per full paradigm

1. 6 subparadigms of case

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/Gender Features	Case Features	Number Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Constant	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

2. Examples

		<i>Ø-noun</i>	<i>a-noun</i>
Nominative	Sing.	vólk	ruká
	Pl.	vólki	rúki
Accusative	Sing.	vólka	rúku
	Pl.	volkóv	rúki
Genitive	Sing.	vólka	rukí
	Pl.	volkóv	ruk-Ø
Locative	Sing.	vólke	ruké
	Pl.	volkák	rukák
Dative	Sing.	vólku	ruké
	Pl.	volkám	rukám
Instrumental	Sing.	vólkom	rukój
	Pl.	volkámi	rukámi

opposition. It turns out that these stem types are in complementary distribution for this opposition, since mobile \emptyset -nouns use stress to oppose number in all cases except the nominative, while mobile *a*-nouns oppose number by means of stress in the nominative case, but no others. This relationship comes to the fore when we consider six case subparadigms.

2.2. Constant Segmental and/or Prosodic Phonological Features

In contrast to the grammatical accentual subparadigms, in which the unifying feature is a grammatical meaning, such as number, the second type represents a phonological accentual paradigm, in which segmental and prosodic phonological features are held constant.

2.2.1. Isolated Opposed Stress Forms in Subparadigms

Let us now return to a further consideration of the subparadigms which we have identified as those used by Fedjanina: two number subparadigms for the noun, two tense subparadigms for the verb, and two attributional subparadigms for the adjective. If we further limit our attention only to those subparadigms which have accentual mobility *within* these subparadigms, we find an interesting pattern: each such subparadigm has precisely one isolated deviating stress opposed to all of the others. Furthermore, the deviating stress has a segmental phonological value which seems not to be arbitrary, but is correlated to its grammatical paradigm. Before giving the details of this pattern, let us attempt to show how these particular subparadigms can be obtained by our use of constants and variables. This suggested scheme is presented in Table 3, section A.1, on the following page. Essentially, in addition to all of the constants which go into the Fedjanina's subparadigms, such as the constants of singular and plural number in the noun, we also hold the phonological prosodic features of stem-stress and ending stress constant, producing two sub-subparadigms. The resulting pattern (Table 3, section A.2) shows that there is a definite structure to the segmental phonology of all desinences which stand out prosodically within their subparadigms: in the noun these desinences all turn out to consist of high vowels, although all possible variations of the features stressed/unstressed and rounded/unrounded occur; in the verb, the invariant property of these prosodically isolated endings is stress, where verb forms with the category of person have stressed rounded vowels, and verb forms with the category of gender have stressed non-high vowels. Non-indicative

Table 3: Subparadigms with Constant Phonological Features

A. Constant Prosodic Features: sub-subparadigms
of isolated deviating stresses

1. Noun

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Tense Features	Number Features	Person ~ Gender Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Constant	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Constant ±stressed			

2. Resulting subparadigms: nouns, verbs, and adjectives:

Noun singular:	Ø-nouns: -ú vs. other desinences (<i>v sadú</i>) Fem. Ø-nouns: -í vs. other desinences (<i>v tení</i>) a-nouns: -ú vs. other desinences (<i>gólovu</i>) o-nouns: no such mobility
Noun Plural:	All classes: -í vs. other desinences (<i>vólki, gólovy, pléči</i>)
Verbal Non-past:	-ú vs. other desinences (<i>prošú</i>)
Verbal Past:	-á vs. other desinences (<i>žilá</i>)
(Verbal Imperative:	-í as only overt desinence with variant zero.
Verbal Infinitive:	-tí as only overt vocalic desinence with variant in zero.)
Predicative adjective:	-á vs. other desinences (<i>molodá</i>)
Attributive adjective:	No such mobility.

B. Constant Segmental Features.

Noun (subparadigm of identical segmental desinences; cf. Jakobson; also connection to quantitative feature of case/number).

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/Gender Features	Case Features	Number Features
Semantic:	Constant	Constant	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Constant /i/, /a/, etc.	
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable	Variable	Variable	Variable

isolated desinences (of the imperative and infinitive) are single in number but unopposed in their subparadigms, and they have the invariant of an unrounded high vowel, which is stressed when non-zero in mobile paradigms. Attributive adjectives are opposed to nouns and verbs by the fact that no such mobility or opposed prosodic desinences occur at all. As to predicative adjectives, they pattern exactly as verbs which have the category of gender, which is not surprising in view of their special predicative role and their general similarities to verbs, which have often been pointed out.

2.2.2. Constant Segmental Features

Jakobson (1984: 138) observed that the primary phonological means of opposing the genitive singular and nominative plural desinences of the noun is the use of the stress feature. I would like to suggest that this statement implies the use of yet another type of paradigm, which can be classified according to the parameters we have thus far established. As shown in Table 3, part B, if the various segmental phonological features of the case and number categories are held constant, a separate subparadigm will be defined for each ending which corresponds to a single phonological shape within each stem-class. For example, the *a*-nouns will have an *i*-desinence paradigm, consisting of the genitive singular and nominative plural forms, and one sub-group of \emptyset -nouns will have an *a*-desinence paradigm, also consisting of genitive singular and nominative plural. We then see, as observed by Jakobson, that each such two-member subparadigm will either have full phonological identity, or else will exhibit stress mobility of the type *rukí/rúki, góroda/gorodá*.

Jakobson's subparadigms of phonologically identical desinences are not the only possible use of holding the segmental features constant. Other possible applications include the analysis of the accent pattern of differing allomorphic shapes of stems, such as the fact that in the verbal non-past, consonant mutation is often linked with stress mobility, in such cases of double distinctions as *prošú/prósiš'*. In addition, there is a link between desinence length and the stress feature, seen in the fact that when the number opposition is singled out, as in Table 2, part D, the stem-class predicts whether the mobile stress will fall on relatively shorter or larger surface desinences: in \emptyset -nouns, ending stress is favored by the longer desinences (e.g., *vólka/volkóv, kóst'ju/kostjámí*); in *a*-nouns stem-stress is favored by the polyphonemic or larger desinences (*žené/žěnax, kolbasój/kolbásamí*);

while in the neuter *o*-nouns there is no such predictability (both *slóvu/slovám* and *selú/sělam* equally occur).

2.3. Less Than Full Constants in the Lexical Portion

Thus far we have seen that accentual paradigms and subparadigms can be based upon holding a variety of features constant. Our examples of holding lexical meaning constant have all been cases where the entire meaning of the lexeme is considered as a whole, which has served to define the individual accentual paradigm of each separate word.

Recent work by Zaliznjak (1985: 22–29 and 1989: 148–163) has shown that stress is often correlated with individual features of lexical meaning. In the noun, more familiar words tend to be stem-stressed, while less familiar words tend to be ending-stressed in the plural (Zaliznjak contrasts *žánry* to *bliný, supý*). Other semantic features affecting stress, according to Zaliznjak, are abstractness, designation of containers, and countability. In the adjective, the qualitative or relational feature is closely linked to stress type. As shown in Table 4, part A, on the following page, I would suggest that these divisions also create accentual subparadigms, but instead of the **grammatical** portions of the word being broken down into their feature constituents, with one feature declared constant for the purposes of establishing the accentual paradigm, as in Table 2, in this case one semantic feature of the lexical stem is taken as constant. Thus, the positive specification of that feature defines one subparadigm, while the negative specification defines the other. At the same time, grammatical features such as number may be fully variable in this type of accentual paradigm, although, according to Zaliznjak's conclusions about familiar and non-familiar lexical items, the accentual correlation occurs only in the plural, which means that the number category must also be held constant for a useful accentual paradigm to emerge. Therefore, in this type of analysis, one or more semantic features of the lexical portion must be held constant, while grammatical categories such as number are optionally constant or variable.

Zaliznjak's correlation of certain semantic features with accentual features has led us to a scheme in which certain lexical features are held constant so that particular lexical classes can be singled out for their accentual behavior.

Within the category of accentual paradigms that allow lexical meaning to be variable, we should also mention the obvious set of

Table 4: Subparadigms with some variability of lexical meaning features. Outline summary of accentual paradigm types.

A. Lexical meaning separated into features: one or more held constant, and others variable (cf. Zaliznjak, 1977, 1985 and 1989)

	Lexical/Part-of-Speech Feature			Stem-Class/ Gender Features	Case Features	Number Features
	± a	± b	± c			
Semantic:	Const.	Var.	Var.	Constant	Variable	Variable
Segmental Phonological:	Var.	Var.	Var.	Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Var.	Var.	Var.	Variable	Variable	Variable

B. Full variability of lexical features/constant grammatical features.

	Lexical Features	Part-of-Speech Features	Stem-Class/ Gender Features	Case Features	Number Feature
Semantic:	Variable	Constant			
Segmental Phonological:	Variable		Variable	Variable	Variable
Prosodic Phonological:	Variable		Variable	Variable	Variable

forms which results from the analyst's desire to contrast comparable forms from the paradigms of a large number of individual words. In this sense, we must distinguish between accentual oppositions within a single word-paradigm, which may be viewed as morphophonemic (such as *rúkí* vs. *rúki*), as compared to accentual oppositions in the identical morphological environment of two word-paradigms (e.g. *múka* vs. *muká*). The accentual opposition of grammatical meanings alone has often been termed an **alternation**, rather than an opposition, while the similar accentual opposition of only lexical meaning has been called an opposition. The single word-paradigm is defined as presented above (cf. Table 1), and is mostly based upon holding the lexical meaning fully constant, while grammatical meanings are

variable. The paradigm which corresponds to accentual oppositions such as *múka* vs. *muká* is based upon a scheme found in Table 4, part B, which is distinguished by the fact that lexical meaning is fully variable, while grammatical categories are all constant. This paradigm determines the phonemic potential to oppose lexical items, which ideally should be compared in the same morphological environment, to avoid the possibility of morphological influence on the stress.

The distinction we have made between the word-paradigm and the paradigmatic set which compares all lexemes in a fixed morphological environment corresponds to a distinction made by Schallert (1988: 336) in a paper on fixed and mobile stress in Balkan Slavic, where an "intra-paradigmatic" accentual opposition is said to occur "within the domain" of an accentual paradigm, while a "cross-paradigmatic" type is based on what Schallert views as the relation between two accentual paradigms. This terminology is based upon the usual practice of only referring to traditional full accentual paradigms—or to accentual subparadigms of the Fedjanina type—as real accentual paradigms. Our object in this paper has been to suggest that since an accentual paradigm is really just a set of linked accentual, segmental, and semantic features, there is really a large continuum of such paradigms to serve different analytical purposes, depending upon whether these accentual, segmental, and semantic features are taken as constant or variable within the paradigm under consideration.

References

- Bloomfield, Leonard and Luba Petrov. (1945) *Spoken Russian. Book two*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dybo, V. A. (1962). "O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole". *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6: 3–27.
- Dybo, V. A. (1981) *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Fedjanina, N. A. (1976) *Udarenie v sovremennom russkom jazyke*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- Garde, Paul. (1976) *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*. Paris: Institute d'Études Slaves, v. 1.
- _____. (1978) "Modèle de description de l'accent russe". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 73(1): 369–400.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M. (1963) *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Moscow: Nauka.

- Jakobson, Roman O. (1984) "The relationship between genitive and plural in the declension of Russian nouns". Roman Jakobson. *Russian and Slavic grammar: Studies 1931–1981*. The Hague: Mouton, 135–40.
- Red'kin, V. A. (1971) *Akcentologija sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Prosveščenie.
- Schallert, Joseph. (1988) "Fixed and mobile stress in the Balkan Slavic verb: Synchrony". Alexander M. Schenker, ed. *American contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 363–383.
- Stang, Christian S. (1957) *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos H. Aschehoug & Co.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. (1967) *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. (1985) *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. 1989. "O nekotoryx svjazjax meždu značeniem i udareniem u russkix prilagatel'nyx". A. A. Zaliznjak et al., eds. *Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie. Prosodija*. Moscow: Nauka, 148–63.

Dept. of Slavic Languages
Indiana University
Ballantine 502
Bloomington, IN 47405
Feldstei@Indiana.EDU

Received: 22 April 1992
Revised: 30 August 1992