(Non-)Realisation of Phonological Features and the Information Structure

Eugen Klein

University of Potsdam, eu.klein@web.de

The colloquial forms of Russian personal/reflexive pronouns exhibit quite different phonological and prosodic properties from their standard counterparts (cf. Zemskaja, 1973). The colloquial phonology affects the dative and the accusative forms of the 1st/2nd singular as well the reflexive pronouns. A quite number of examples can be found in Kitajgorodskaja & Rozanova (1999) and within the National corpus of Russian language (http://www.ruscorpora.ru/search-spoken.html).

The phenomenon was previously declared as truncation, which does not affect grammatical properties of the forms in question (Koester-Thoma & Zemskaja, 1995; Werkmann, 2007). In Klein (2010) an attempt was made to proof these claims within the theory of Lexical Phonology (Kiparsky 1982). The results were highly unsatisfying containing a range of difficulties. The major problem is the arbitrariness of the stated deletion rules resulting in over-generation. A further problem is the need to explain, why the deletion rules affect targets on subsegmental (palatalisation), segmental (intervocalic consonants), and prosodic level (stress). The presence/absence of stress results in an interaction with the Information Structure and influence in this way the syntactic distribution of colloquial pronominal forms.

The colloquial pronouns will be analyzed dissident form the idea of rule-based truncation, but as non-realisation of certain phonological features on different representational levels. Two points are addressed within the discussion: i) the interaction between the discourse structure and the realization of phonological features ii) the constraints put by the Information Structure on the syntactic distribution of the colloquial pronouns. The current proposal incorporate ideas from Autosegmental Phonology (Goldsmith, 1990) and Cognitive Phonology (Nesset, 2008). The phonological and information structural constrains will be captured within the framework of Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky, 2004).

References

[1] Goldsmith, John A. 1990. *Autosegmental and Metrical Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

[2] Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. From cyclic to Lexical Phonology. In van der Hulst, Harry & Norval Smith (eds.). *The Structure of Phonological Representations. Part I*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications, 131-175.

[3] Kitajgorodskaja, M. V. & N. N. Rozanova. 1999. *Reč moskvičej. Kommunikativno-kul'turologičeskij aspekt*. Moskva: Russkije slovari.

[4] Klein, Eugen. 2010. *Pronominale Kurzformen im Russischen* (= Shortened pronouns in Russian). Unpublished Magister's thesis. University of Göttingen, Slavonic Philology Department.

[5] Koester-Thoma, Soia & Elena A. Zemskaja (Hrsg.). 1995. *Russische Umgangssprache. Phonetik, Morphologie, Syntax, Wortbildung, Wortstellung, Lexik, Nomination, Sprachspiel*. Berlin: Lenz.

[6] Nesset, Tore. 2008. *Abstract Phonology in a Concrete Model. Cognitive Linguistics and the Morphology-Phonology Interface*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

[7] Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 2004. *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

[8] Werkmann, Valja. 2007. Zu Syntax und Informationsstruktur der russischen Personalpronomina. Ein Vergleich mit den deutschen Pronomina. In *Zeitschrift für Slavistik*, 52, 399-434.

[9] Zemskaja, Elena A. (red.). 1973. *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'*. Moskva: Nauka.