

(Anti)optimal paradigms of o-stems in West Slavic (with the concentration on Czech)

Problem: Kavitskaya (2002) dealt typologically with compensatory lengthening (CL) but concerning West Slavic material, she relied almost exclusively on Timberlake (1983). In my article I do not discuss the "listener-oriented CL" by Kavitskaya but I concentrate on the problem of irregularity and subsequent levelling of masculine o-stems which underwent CL and I put them into a broader paradigmatic schema. As generally accepted since the pioneering work of Stang (1957), Proto-Slavic nouns were distributed in accentual paradigms APa **dŷmь*-**dŷma* (barytona) APb **stolь*, *stolá* (oxytona), APc **bôgь*-**bôga*. CL should operate in zero forms (here Nsg) in APb and APc differently in Slavic dialects. Timberlake (1983:212) claims that CL in Czech is notoriously complex and there are counterexamples for every possible generalisation. According to him, former APc show CL before sonorants and voiced fricatives (*bŭh*, *dŭl*, *hnŭj*, *dŭm*) and not before voiced stops and voiceless obstruents (*rod*, *med*, *brod*, *most*, *nos*, *rok*, *bok*). There are counterexamples like Silesian *ruh*, *zvun*, *rud*, *luj* (which may be of Polish influence, although Central and Southern Czech also reflect *luj*), but also Western Czech area (Roudnice, Rakovník) *rŭh*, Old Czech *rój*, large areas of Czech and Moravian territory have short *loj*. Former APb o-stems should be prolonged no matter what consonant was before the final yer - *stŭl*, *kŭň*, *nŭž*, *dvŭr* but *bok*, *koš*, *roj*. However, Old Czech records *kóš*, South-Western Czech dialects *kŭš*, *rŭj*. Contrary to Timberlake, I do not see those differences as a proof that CL developed under in APb across any consonant and in APc only before sonorants and voiced fricatives. It does not explain why we have doublets in Old Czech:APc - *blesk/blésk*, *kyj/kýj*, *rov/róv*, *roh/róh*, *věk/viek*. In my opinion, we must also take into account quantity difference in APa, where no CL could not operate - standard Czech and Czech dialects *mák*, *mráz*, *hrách*, *pláč*, but *mak*, *hrach*, *pláč* (Morava) and *jíh*, *plouh*, *kráj* (South-Western Czech dialects). I do not agree with the deus-ex-machina explanation of analogical development which solves nothing. The situation becomes complicated when we start to observe how o-stems behave in paradigms. Then, we cannot understand the difference Nsg-Gsg *stŭl*-*stolu* but *kŭl*-*kŭlu*, although both words with almost the same syllabic structure belonged to APb and underwent CL in Nsg. Again, the explanation due to analogy is purely ad hoc because it is not comprehensible why the same analogy could not operate in *dvŭr*, *nŭž*, *kŭň* > Gsg***dvŭru*, ***nŭže*, ***kŭně*. The similar "differently generalised" situation is in Slovak, where we have *stól*-*stola*, *kól*-*kola* but *bôb*-*bôbu* but in Czech *bob*-*bobu*. The same principle can be observed in Upper Sorbian where the situation is complicated by the fact that APb masculines containing root yers also undergo CL and merge with other words of similar type, e.g. *són*-*sona* "dream", *móch*-*mocha* "moss" like *nós*-*nosa* "nose". While I accept Timberlake's explanation that so called CL spread throughout East-West subzone (from Slovak to Upper-Sorbian) with various restrictions depending on quality of root consonant and former accentual paradigms, the irregular distribution and various "analogical" levellings lead me to the result that those o-stems are actually distributed in quantitative paradigms (QPs). I accept Feldstein's idea that the distribution of length in West Slavic is conditioned by vowel/zero alternations in paradigms. When APb underwent leftward stress shift **stolь*, *stolá* > **stolь*, *stolá*, the distinctive features in Nsg initial syllables started to overflow (**dŷmь* x **stolь* x **bôgь*) and caused the change of prosodic system. Czech interpreted APa and APb as long (*klín*, *býk*), APc remained short or were prolonged depending on pre-final yer consonant (*vŭz*). So APa and APb merged and were quantitatively opposed to APc. On the other hand, Slovak interpreted APa and APc as short (*klin*, *bok*) and prolonged APb (*býk*), so APa and APc merged quantitatively and were opposed to APb. This scenario operated for o-stems as well as a-stems (both formerly disyllabic). Feldstein (2007) showed that West-Slavic a-stems and o-stems are distributed in QPs. The distribution depends on the root length and the key cases are Nsg-Gsg for o-stems and Nsg-Gpl for a-stems. Feldstein distinguished two basic

paradigms: the alternating one (Czech *kráva-krav*, Slovak *krava-kráv*, Czech *vůz-vozu*) and the constant one (Czech *bříza-bříz*, Czech *hrob-hrobu*). I modified Feldsteins QPs and showed the distribution of Czech and Slovak a-stems in the following paradigms: alternating QPA1_(zero short) and two constant QPC1_(zero long) and QPC2_(zero short). I also suggested that the synchronic distribution of those substantives can be solved by the conception of optimal and anti-optimal paradigms.

Proposed solution: In the present article I concentrate on the problem of Czech o-stems in the broader West Slavic context. I argue that the process of emergence of new prosodic features (loss of intonation contrast, fixing of stress, rise of new quantitative differences) and further redistribution of substantive to quantitative paradigms can be solved by Stratal OT. On the stem level the process is characterised by resyllabification of the structure CV(V).CV_{yer} to CVC.V_{yer}. Then, leftward stress shift, loss of H tone followed with subsequent tendency to create bisyllabic threemoraic domain. The relevant interacting constraints are ParseSyll, NoCoda a Ft-Bin. Bisyllabic domain emerges due to the interaction of constraints Head-Bin, Stress-to-Weight and Max- $\mu(\sigma)$. The domain is also responsible for "compensatory lengthening" with CodaCond constraint responsible for root lengthening before certain consonants. The word level is characterised by the distribution of o-stems of all former accentual paradigms into quantitative paradigms which are either optimal or anti-optimal.

I argue that the final paradigms are created due to the interaction of optimal paradigms OP_{zeroshort} (bok-boku) OP_{zerolong} (býk-býka) and anti-optimal paradigms \neg OP_{zerolong} (vůz-vozu). This explains the anomalous quantitative development of e.g. former APa (dým-dýmu, mráz-mrazu, čas-času) and apparent lack of analogy in nůž-nože in contrast to kůl-kůlu. I do this analysis for Czech (including certain dialects), Slovak and Upper Sorbian.

References

- Bethin, C.Y. 1998. *Slavic Prosody. Language change and phonological theory*. Cambridge.
- Bethin, C.Y. 2003. *Metrical quantity in Czech: Evidence from hypocoristics*. FASL 11: The Amherst meeting (ed. Browne W. et al, Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials, , 63-82.
- Feldstein, R.F. .1978. *On compensatory and neo-acute lengthening in the dialects of Slavic.*, International Review of Slavic Linguistics 3, 355-398.
- Feldstein, R.F. 2007. *Nominal prosodic paradigms and their synchronic reflexes in West Slavic.*, Proceedings from IWoBA 3 in Leiden, tbp.
- Frazier, M. 2006. *Accent in Proto-Indo-European athematic nouns - Antifaithfulness in inflectional paradigms*. MA thesis, University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill 2006.
- Kavitskaya, D. 2002. *Compensatory lengthening: Phonetics, Phonology, Diachrony*. Routledge.
- Kiparsky, P. *Compensatory lengthening*. www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/
- McCarthy, J.J. 2005. *Optimal paradigms*. in Paradigms in phonological theory. (ed. Down, L.J., Hall, T.A., Raffelsiefen, R.). Oxford University Press , 170-210.
- Sukač, R. 2008. *AQOPs – a paradigmatic bridge (From accentual to quantitative and optimal paradigms in Czech)*. Czech in Formal Grammar 12.-14. February 2009. tbp.
- Stang, Ch. *Slavonic accentuation.*, Universitetsforlaget. Oslo.
- Timberlake, A. 1983a. *Compensatory lengthening in Slavic. I: Conditions and dialect geography*. in From Los Angeles to Kiev. (eds. D. Worth, V. Markov). Slavica, Columbus, Ohio.