



Stress Restrictions in Russian Nominal Derivation

Ronald F. Feldstein

The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Winter, 1984), 502-510.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0037-6752%28198424%291%3A28%3A4%3C502%3ASRIRND%3E2.0.CO%3B2-B>

The Slavic and East European Journal is currently published by American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aatseel.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STRESS RESTRICTIONS IN RUSSIAN NOMINAL DERIVATION

Ronald F. Feldstein, Indiana University

I. The basic units of non-derived noun stress.

This paper is an attempt to establish certain regular properties of stress placement in suffixal derived nouns of Russian. Recent work on the stress of derived nouns¹ has concentrated largely on listing the accentual properties of a substantial inventory of suffixes. Using much of the data that has been gathered, this paper will focus on generalizing the somewhat unsystematic body of facts at our disposal.

My starting point for approaching the stress system of derived nouns is the stress system which applies to all Russian words regardless of derivational status, which I introduced in my 1980 paper "On the Definition of Russian Stress Paradigms."² In that paper I followed the already established practice of classifying the stress of inflected words in terms of a double letter designation, such as *AA*, *BB*, etc., where each letter refers to the stress pattern in one of its two major parts, which I shall refer to as SUBPARADIGMS. For example, the two noun subparadigms are singular and plural, the verbal ones are non-past and past, and the adjectival ones are short-form and long-form. Within the stress system of Russian inflected words, including the nouns, I attempted to reduce all stress variation to three basic types of subparadigmatic stress, which means that the stress of any Russian noun should be representable as a two-letter sequence drawn from the three letters *A*, *B*, and *C*, where each letter of the two-letter sequence refers to a specific property of one of the word's two subparadigms. The tripartite scheme is based on the fact that for each declensional class of noun, both singular and plural display a three-way opposition of stress types. Significantly, the three types are not identically manifested in all morphological classes, but we can derive the actual surface manifestations based on the morphological information, while still maintaining the notion of only three basic types.

Let us now review these three basic stress types which are found in the subparadigms of the Russian noun, as shown in table 1.

Type *A*: #_____ + ...#Type *B*: #....._ + ...#Type *C*: #_..... + ...#

- = permitted stress placement
 ... = stress placement not permitted
 # = word boundary
 + = morpheme boundary

TABLE I.

The three basic stress patterns used in Russian subparadigms (both derived and non-derived).

Type *A* admits stress on any stem syllable, but excludes desinential stress. Type *A* is unique among the three stress types in its requirement that both subparadigms must have the identical, immobile stress placement, so that in reality it is paradigmatic, rather than subparadigmatic. Thus, type *A* only enters into the combination called *AA*. Type *B* is defined by stress permitted on either side of the stem-desinence boundary (either stem-final or desinence-initial), but nowhere else. Type *C* is defined by stress which is permitted only on the initial syllable of the stem or the desinence.³ Types *B* and *C* can either occur within both subparadigms (i.e. the entire paradigm) of a given word (i.e. types *BB*, *CC*) or there can be a combination of type *B* in one subparadigm and type *C* in the other (i.e. *B* singular and *C* plural or *C* singular and *B* plural, represented as *BC*, *CB*, respectively).

This scheme differs from several other paradigmatic stress systems due to the fact that our definitions are in terms of basic types which have variable surface realizations. Thus, both types *B* and *C* can be realized by desinential stress, but only *B* and not *C*, can have pre-desinential stress; conversely, type *C* and not *B* can have stem-initial stress (in words which do not neutralize the contrast of initial and pre-desinential). In order to discover the correct stress patterns it is necessary to observe words with stems longer than one syllable, so that initial and pre-desinential stress are distinct.⁴ E.g. the forms *rúku*, acc. sing., and *slúgi*, nom. plur., tell us nothing about this difference, but the forms *gólovu*, acc. sing., *kolbásy*, nom. plur., clearly show the distinction of initial and pre-desinential.⁵

To further illustrate this stress system, let us observe how types *A*, *B*, and *C* are realized in the two most important noun declensions—the zero-declension (traditionally called MASCULINE) and the *a*-declension (traditionally called FEMININE). Type *A* does not have to be dealt with, since it always represents fixed stem stress in the whole paradigm. In the singular of the zero-declension, outside type *A*, we have an opposition of constant initial stress to constant desinential stress (e.g. *kólokol*, *tétere*v**, *vólos* vs. *jazyk(á)*, *petux(á)*, *kočan(á)*).⁶ Note that cases such as *kólokol* are not

included in type *A* since the singular and plural stress do not agree. Thus, in the singular of the zero-declension, type *C* is realized by initial stress, but type *B* has desinential stress. Even though desinential stress is ambiguous in and of itself, and can be found in both *B* and *C* types, we can assign the desinential stress of *jazýk*, *petúx*, *kočán* to type *B*, since within the identical morphological category it is opposed to the NON-ambiguous initial stress of such cases as *kólokol*. In the plural of zero-declension nouns, type *B* also has constant desinential stress, but type *C* has an alternation between initial and desinential (e.g. *vólosy*, *volosám*). A *B* singular can go with a *C* plural, as in *gvozď*, just as a *C* singular can go with a *B* plural, e.g. *kólokol*.

In the *a*-declension, type *C* is also realized as an alternation between initial and desinential, occurring in both singular and plural (e.g. *golová*). Type *B* has desinential stress in the singular (e.g. *kolbasá*), but in the plural it has pre-desinential stress (e.g. *kolbásy*). Examples of several other nouns belonging to the basic stress types are represented in table 2.

Type	EXAMPLES		
	zero-declension	a-declension	o-declension
AA	rak	lípa	jábloko
BB	jazýk	kolbasá	čisló
CC	vólos	golová	móre
BC	gvozď	gubá	očkó
CB	kólokol	vodá	ózero

TABLE 2.

Full set of subparadigmatic stress combinations for the Russian noun.

The following conclusions can be drawn from this stress system:

1. Types *B* and *C*, i.e. those lacking constant stem-stress, can be combined within the two subparadigms of a word.

2. As shown in table 3, only one type of stress realization—stem-medial—is completely unambiguous as to type (i.e. type *A*). All other positions experience some degree of neutralization: stem-initial occurs in types *A* and *C*; stem-final (or pre-desinential) is found in types *A* and *B*; desinential is found in types *B* and *C*, as exemplified by the pairs: *žávoronok* (type *A*)/*kólokol* (singular type *C*), *lopáty* (type *A*)/*kolbásy* (plural type *B*), and *osá* (singular type *B*)/*ruká* (singular type *C*). These ambiguities mainly apply to word-forms in isolation. When actual subparadigmatic wholes are considered, there are generally no ambiguities within any single morphological category.

As we can see, the stem-medial position (number 2) possesses certain specific characteristics. It is the only position not subject to any neutralization among the *A*, *B*, and *C* stress types (always realizing type *A*), and it also undergoes the greatest structural modification (from position 2 to positions 2a, 2b, 2c) when a suffix is used to derive another word. Perhaps these unique properties are linked to the stem-medial position's innermost placement within the word—the farthest from the word boundary of all possible positions.

Various studies, especially those of Red'kin and Straková, have established many of the distributional rules for the stress of Russian derived words. Using this information, I hope to show that the above outlined system of *A*, *B*, and *C* stress types can add an important dimension to what is now known about the derived stress system. All derivative suffixes can be divided into two basic types, depending on whether all bases act the same with the given suffix or not. Type I⁷ is the more distinctive type of suffix, since immobile stem-stressed bases (our type *A*) simply retain their constant stem-stress when used with them, while the bases with stress other than constant stem-stress (our types *B* and *C*) receive either presuffixal, suffixal, or desinential stress, depending on the given suffix. In the case of the less distinctive suffixes of type II,⁸ there is no difference between bases of type *A*, *B*, or *C*, although the given suffix determines whether the resulting derived noun will have presuffixal, suffixal, or desinential stress.

If we direct our attention to the degree of permissible stress variation between words which use a given derivational suffix, we see that the maximal opposition is between bases which have constant stem-stress (type *A*) and those which have any other sort of stress (types *B* and *C*). This shows that the non-derived opposition of types *B* and *C* is completely neutralized upon derivation. In the case of type I suffixes, the merged *B/C* type has a derivational stress opposed to derivatives of type *A* bases, but all three base types are neutralized when used with type II suffixes.

Even when nouns are derived from *B* and *C* bases, which quite often have stress mobility in their non-derived forms, the derived word receives immobile stress. This important fact was observed by Kuryłowicz,⁹ who stated that “the basic principle of stress in Russian declension and conjugation is as follows: non-derived words have mobile and immobile stress, but derived words have only immobile stress,” although exceptions to this rule do exist. A possible reason for this pattern could lie in the fact that in suffixed derivatives there is less need for mobility, since the potential number of stress placements (i.e. syllables) is greater, due to the extra suffixal syllable(s); in addition, there is often a tendency to distinguish derived from non-derived by formal means.

The fact that *B* and *C* bases (i.e. those lacking immobile stem-stress) are always merged in derivation should be connected to their behavior in non-

derived use, where types *B* and *C* can be freely combined within the two subparadigms of a single word, while type *A* is separate. Since the two subparadigms of one word can combine *B* and *C* stress types, there can be no single basic *B* or *C* stress representative in the case of such mixed paradigms (either *BC* or *CB*); therefore, it seems natural that *B* and *C* bases merge upon derivation, where the derived stress pattern is related to the non-derived type.

The specific choice of presuffixal, suffixal, or desinential stress by the merged *B/C* bases in all types of suffixal derivation of nouns can be shown to be not at all haphazard. Before demonstrating this, let us first define these syllables with more precision. The location of the presuffixal (or root-final) syllable is clear, as is that of the desinential syllable, which refers to the first syllable of the desinence. However, the notion of suffixal syllable is somewhat imprecise. Of course, in the case of monosyllabic suffixes, any potential stress placement within the suffix is neutralized. In suffixes with two or more syllables, however, we can discern a definite pattern of stress placement. In the great majority of cases, the stress falls on a suffixal syllable other than the suffix-final (predesinential) syllable, usually the first suffixal syllable.

Of the 18 stressed polysyllabic suffixes catalogued by Red'kin,¹⁰ 15 lack suffix-final stress, 2 have both suffix-final and suffix non-final variants, and only one occurs strictly as suffix-final. In Straková's inventory of suffixes,¹¹ there are 41 stressed polysyllabic suffixes listed, of which 37 have only non-final suffixal stress, 2 have both suffix-final and suffix non-final variants, and one has only suffix-final stress.

Examples of non-final suffixal stress, which we are claiming to be the normal, expected type, include such cases as *-ávic(a)* (*krasávica*), *-ácij(a)* (*ratifikácija*), *-óvič* (*popóvič*), *-čánin* (*gor'kovčánin*), *-ilišče* (*xranilišče*), *-énij(e)* (*tvorénie*), etc. The small number of deviant cases—i.e. polysyllabic suffixes with suffix-final stress—can be divided into two categories, as follows:

1. The borrowed suffix *-ionér*, which appears in such words as *milicionér*, is the only instance of a polysyllabic suffix with invariable suffix-final stress listed in the above cited works of Red'kin and Straková. The exceptional nature of this suffix's constant suffix-final stress can be traced to its French origin *-ionnaire*¹² and its probable status even now as not fully assimilated.

2. Two enlarged suffixes with *-ov-* as the first element have variable stress, with suffix non-final stress in certain meanings, but suffix-final stress in others. These include *-ovin(a)* (*štukóvina*, but *meškovína*) and *-ovišč(e)* (*čudóvišče*, but *kornevišče*). The stress of the isolated enlarged suffix *-ovízna*, found only in the word *dorogovízna*, seems to be derived from its antonym *deševízna*, where the latter case includes *-ev-* as part of the root, which was reinterpreted as a suffixal element in *dorogovízna*. In general, the case of

enlarged suffixes in *-ov-* is the major instance of suffixal stress which deviates from our postulated scheme. Perhaps a special boundary following *-ov-* could be posited in the eventual solution of this problem. In any case, it is clear that suffixal stress is predominantly not on the suffix-final syllable in suffixes of more than one syllable.

The strong tendency to avoid both predesinential stress and mobility in Russian nominal derivation presents an interesting dilemma for the nouns of the *a*-declension. In the plural of non-derived *a*-nouns, predesinential stress regularly appears when the singular has desinential stress in the *BB* type: e.g. nom. plur. *kolbásy*. This produces a regular mobility of singular and plural stress. As noted, mobility is definitely uncharacteristic of derived formations, yet certain derivational suffixes require desinential stress in all singular forms. What then do Russian derived *a*-nouns do when derived with a suffix which requires desinential stress? Do they violate the regular rule of predesinential plural stress or do they violate Kuryłowicz's "basic principle" which forbids derivational mobility? It turns out that such nouns semantically resist pluralization of *any* sort, since *a*-declension derivatives with desinential stress are mostly abstract nouns (e.g. in *-in(á)* and *-ot(á)* with no plurals), such as *tišíná*, *tolščíná*, *guščíná*, *temnotá*, *tošnotá*. In hypos-tatized usage—with a secondary concrete meaning and loss of derivational status¹³—there is the regular non-derived treatment with predesinential stress in the plural (e.g. *ostrotá*, nom. sing., *ostróty*, nom. plur.).

Consequently, three positions of potential stress placement are generally avoided by merged *B/C* bases upon derivation (and retention of derived status):

1. Position 1, stem-initial.
2. Position 2a, root-medial.
3. Position 3, predesinential.

While word-initial and root-medial positions are used only for derivatives from type *A* bases, there is a general tendency to avoid predesinential stress in derivation, as we have noted.

The usual and permitted positions of stress placement in derivatives from *B/C* bases are:

1. Position 2b, root-final.
2. Position 2c, suffix non-final.
3. Position 4, desinential.

Let us now observe that both the set of excluded and permitted stress positions each has important features shared in common. The excluded stress positions, initial, root-medial, and predesinential, are all distinctive stress domains, which serve to define the differences between non-derived types *B* and *C*; as well as types *B* and *C* taken together, in opposition to type *A*. Initial stress is the mark of type *C*, in opposition to type *B*; root-medial is the mark of type *A*, in opposition to both *B* and *C*; and predesinential stress is the mark of type *B*, in opposition to type *C*, as shown in table 3 above.

On the other hand, the permitted stress placements for *B/C* merged bases in nominal derivation—root-final, suffix non-final, and desinential—are precisely those positions which are not used to distinctively oppose types *B* and *C* in the non-derived stress paradigms. Neither presuffixal nor suffixal positions even exist as such in non-derived words, while desinential stress is notable as the single type in which types *B* and *C* have their opposition neutralized even in non-derived use. Thus, the distinctive stress properties used to oppose non-derived types *B* and *C* resist implementation in the derived system, where types *B* and *C* are totally merged, rather than opposed. It is as if these distinctions (i.e. initial vs. pre-desinential placement) can only serve to separate the *B* and *C* types, since they suspend their use where *B* and *C* opposition is completely absent, in the system of nominal derivation.

In conclusion, we can state that the system of Russian stress paradigms stands on the borderline of having binary and ternary distinctions. Although there are three basic types of subparadigmatic stress in non-derived use, the two types which lack constant stem-stress tend to merge and combine in a variety of ways, producing an even higher level opposition between constant stem-stress, the statistically predominant type, and all others. These latter types, which we have termed *B* and *C*, manifest a complex pattern of opposition and neutralization, a pattern which can be fully appreciated only when the derived and non-derived systems are confronted.

NOTES

- 1 For example, the studies of Vitalij A. Red'kin, *Akcentologija sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka* (M.: Prosveščenie, 1971), 45–58; Nina A. Fedjanina, *Udarenie v sovremenom russkom jazyke* (M.: Russkij jazyk, 1976), 76–78, 103–5, 114, 133–34; Vlasta Straková, *Ruský přízvuk v přehledech a komentářích* (Prague: SPN, 1978), 61–170; and Vladimir V. Lopatin, "Akcentologičeskíe problémy sinxronnogo slovoobrazovanija v sovremennom russkom jazyke," 174–97, in S. B. Bernštejn, ed., *Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie* (M.: Nauka, 1981).
- 2 Ronald F. Feldstein, "On the Definition of Russian Stress Paradigms," *General Linguistics* 20, No. 3 (1980), 123–39.
- 3 Our claim that type *B* stress is distinctively pre-desinential and type *C* is distinctively initial, while desinential stress is a neutralization of *B* and *C* types, comes from the fact that within the subparadigms of a given morphological category we commonly find instances of initial vs. desinential (e.g. *kólokola*, gen. sing. vs. *stolá*, gen. sing.), initial vs. pre-desinential (*gólovy*, nom. plur. vs. *kolbásy*, nom. plur.), and pre-desinential vs. desinential (*ozěra*, nom. plur. vs. *morjá*, nom. plur.), in which initial and pre-desinential stress can be identified as realizations of differing *C* and *B* stress types, respectively, but desinential stress must be recognized as realizing sometimes *C* (in opposition to *B* pre-desinential) and sometimes *B* (in opposition to *C* initial). This is well in accord with the fact that the two types of mobility within a subparadigm either involve initial ~ desinential (e.g. *gólovu* ~ *golová*), assigned to type *C*; or pre-desinential ~ desinential (e.g. *prinósiš'* ~ *prinošú*), a

- strictly verbal type assigned to type *B*. In each case the distinctive mark of the type of mobility is found in those forms without desinential stress.
- 4 Lopatin, 181.
 - 5 When the isolated forms *rúki* and *slúgi* are compared, they seem identical in terms of stress. However, this neutralization disappears in the oblique forms of the plural; thus, the end-stress of *rukáx, rukám, rúkami*, is opposed to the constant stem-final stress of the plural forms *slúgax, slúgam, slúgami*. In paradigmatic terms, *rúki* participates in the initial desinential alternation in the plural (type *C*), while *slúgi* is pre-desinential throughout the plural (type *B*). For additional discussion of the notion PREDESINENTIAL, see Ju. R. Kurilovič (J. Kuryłowicz), "Sistema russkogo udarenija," 438, in his *Očerki po lingvistike* (M.: Inostrannaja literatura, 1962); Horace G. Lunt, "On the Study of Slavic Accentuation," *Word* 19 (1963), 96–97; Morris Halle, "A Note on the Accentual Pattern of the Russian Nominal Declension," 171, in R. Jakobson and S. Kawamoto, eds., *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics* (Tokyo: TEC, 1970); and Herbert S. Coats, *Stress Assignment in Russian*. Volume I: Inflection (Edmonton: Linguistic Research, 1976), 1.
 - 6 In cases such as *jazyk, jazyká*, we are assuming constant end-stress, in spite of the surface stem-final stress in *jazyk*, due to the zero-ending which cannot bear the stress. The morphophonemic transcription *jazyk-ŕ* accounts for this fact. For further details see Ronald F. Feldstein, "On Stress and the Vowel-Zero Alternation in Russian," *Russian Language Journal* 33, No. 115 (1979), 31–32.
 - 7 Red'kin, 48.
 - 8 Red'kin, 52.
 - 9 Kurilovič, 441.
 - 10 Red'kin, 50, 54–55.
 - 11 Straková, 63–64, 69.
 - 12 Viktor V. Vinogradov, *Russkij jazyk: Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove*, 2nd ed. (M.: Vysšaja škola, 1972), 92.
 - 13 Michael Shapiro, "Laws, Latitudes, and Limitations of Stress: Russian Derived Substantives," *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 10, No. 2 (1966), 196; and Vera L. Voroncova, *Russkoe literaturnoe udarenie 18–20 vv.: Formy slovoizmenenija* (M.: Nauka, 1979), 56–57.