

The Emergence of the Unmarked and Template-Mapping in Russian Truncation

Julia Bordeaux
juliabordeaux78@yahoo.com
University of Texas, Austin

In this paper, I define the prosodic template for the truncation pattern found in Russian hypocoristics and propose a constraint-based analysis demonstrating that Russian truncation instantiates the Emergence of the Unmarked – TETU (McCarthy and Prince 1994) at the prosodic level. I posit a binary foot with initial prominence, this type of unmarked template resulting from the interaction between prosodic considerations on the one hand and syllabic well-formedness on the other. I continue to discuss the effects of TETU by analyzing the regularities of mapping melodic information to the template as resulting from a competing relationship between Base-Trunc faithfulness and markedness effects emerging in the truncated form. Previous treatments of specifically Russian hypocoristic formation, valuable for their richness of data and exhaustiveness of generalizations of observed patterns, approach the phenomenon from a purely descriptive or a quantitative perspective (cf Stankiewicz 1957, Soglasnova 2003).

For obvious practical considerations, the plethora of Russian hypocoristics is restricted to what I designate as the main pattern for the purposes of this analysis. As we move from prosodic to syllabic to segmental phenomena, an increasing degree of variation is observed in the data.

I. The prosodic template: Trunc = F(σ σ), a left-headed disyllabic foot, which adheres to the size of the unmarked prosodic word (PrWd). Can foot structure be imposed on base names? For an overwhelming majority of names, weight-sensitive trochaic stress may be posited: (LL), (H) are built at the right edge: a.lek.(sej), mi.xa.(il), bo.(ris), ro.di.(on), va.(dim), o.(leg), l'u.(bovj), ka.te.(ri.na), zi.na.(i.da) ¹. In a number of forms, however, the trochee appears to be quantity-insensitive: (pa.vel), (ja.kov), (vik.tor). It quickly becomes clear that no consistent generalization can be drawn, at least not for consonant-final masculine forms. In truncated forms, however, a firm prosodic generalization is possible, since we only find the (LL) foot (found in feminine base forms), e.g. (ka.t'a) < ka.te.ri.na, (va.s'a) < va.si.lij, (mi. | a) < mi.xa.il. In trunks, (H) feet are excluded per syllabic well-formedness: codas are not permitted. What is interesting is that FtBin is satisfied for both mora *and* syllable: (LL) feet found in the trunc are binary under both syllabic and moraic analyses: we end up with two heterosyllabic moras. This clear example of TETU is interpreted in OT as follows:

Faith I-O >> FtBin (μ , σ), T=PrWd >> Faith O-O.

II. Mapping to the template: syllabic structure (Base → Trunc)

There is a considerable degree of variation in the mapping of segmental information to the prosodic template in this case. While codas are systematically null and complex onsets are mostly avoided, one aspect of Russian trunc syllables complicates their status with respect to the unmarked core syllable: onsetless syllables are common. Some necessary rankings include:

*Coda >> Max (BT) vi.t'a < vik.tor, o.l'a < ol'.ga, va.n'a > i.van

¹ -ij final names do not receive final stress, a generalization that holds for all Russian polysyllables that end in -ij. A form like dmitrij would be prosodized as follows: (dmi.trij)

*Complex Onset > > Max(BT): mi.t^ja/di.ma < dmi.trij, vo.va < vla.di.mir

DEP-BT(seg) > > ONSET: o.l^ja > ol^j.ga BUT *lo. l^ja : partially motivates the virtual absence of reduplication in Russian hypocoristic formation

III. Mapping to the template: autosegmental information

A significant, albeit expected, degree of variation is found in the patterns of copying segments from the bases to the template of the truncated forms.

Onset1: O1 of the base corresponds to O1 of the trunc (Anchor-Left is highly ranked), whether it is a word-initial: d^jo.n^ja < d^je.nis, or the leftmost, first available onset: l^jo.ʃ a < a.lek.sej. Consonants may change their syllabic constituency: a coda can become an onset: va.n^ja < i.van

Nucleus1: N1 is normally faithful to N1 of the base, e.g. o.l^ja < ol^j.ga. It must be noted that it is not necessarily the stressed vowel of the base that is copied to the trunc: the Foothead status is not preserved from the base to the trunc, e.g. ma.ʃa < ma.ri.ja. If the base is vowel-initial and has more than two syllables, the nucleus of the adjacent syllable to the right is used: fi.sa < an.fi.sa

Onset2: 1). Coronal consonants in the base surface as palatalized in the trunc: ko.l^ja < ni.ko.laj; p^je.t^ja < p^jot(ə)r; a.n^ja < an.na 2). [s], due to its phonetic and phonological proximity to both [s^j] and [ʃ], can surface as either one of those segments, crucially both [+high]: va.s^ja < va.si.lij; l^jo.ʃ a < a.lek.sej; 3). Consonants that are excluded from the palatalization contrast, default to [ʃ]: mi.ʃ a < mi.xa.il (*x^j); ja.ʃ a < ja.kov (*k^j); 4). Labial consonants tend to surface as unpalatalized: st^jo.pa] < ste.pan; l^ju.ba < l^ju.bov^j; di.ma < dmi.trij, with [+lab, +high] viewed as a marked co-occurrence of features. In some cases, labial consonants default to [ʃ]: pa.ʃ a < pa.vel, analyzed here as agreement in continuance as a necessary condition for ʃ-substitution.

Nucleus2: N2 is the back low unstressed [a], featurally the most unmarked vowel in the inventory.

The template for the main pattern of Russian hypocoristic formation, **F(σ σ)**, along with the template for the syllabic structure - **(O)N.ON** - and filling in of featural information are analyzed here as manifesting a number of effects of the Emergence of the Unmarked. The attested forms are motivated by way of OT constraint interaction, which is able to account rather elegantly for the variability present in this less than systematic mapping to a systematic template.

References

- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince. 1994. "The emergence of the unmarked. Optimality in prosodic morphology." Mercè González, ed., *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society 24*, GLSA, Amherst, MA, 333-379
- Soglasnova, Svetlana. 2003. *Russian Hypocoristic Formation: A Quantitative Approach*. [PhD thesis]. University of Chicago.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1957. "The Expression of Affection in Russian proper names." *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 196-210