Jakobson's Generalization in Russian: Sonorant Transparency, Feature Theory, and the Architecture of Assimilation Bert Vaux and Yury Makarov, Cambridge University

This talk reexamines a long-standing controversy in phonology: how Russian sonorants behave with respect to voicing assimilation, and how this behavior should be modeled. While there is broad agreement that obstruents adopt the voicing of a following obstruent (e.g. $/z-k/ \rightarrow [sk]$, $/s-g/ \rightarrow [zg]$), the behavior of sonorants remains disputed.

One tradition—traceable to Halle (1959) and attributed by him (p.c.) to Jakobson (who in 1956 made the claim specifically for /v/)—holds that sonorants are *transparent*: they neither undergo assimilation nor block the leftward spread of [voice] in obstruent–sonorant–obstruent sequences (e.g. /z-mk/ \rightarrow [smk], /s-mg/ \rightarrow [zmg]). This view, adopted by Coats & Harshenin 1971, Hayes 1984, Kiparsky 1985, Sugimoto 1992, Steriade 1995, Calabrese 1995, Es'kova 2011:154, Raimy 2011, Nelson & Baković 2024, and most recently Dedova and Krasnova 2024, has been influential in debates over contrast and underspecification, laryngeal representation, and locality.

Others (e.g. Zaliznjak 1975, Shapiro 1993, Robblee & Burton 1997, Kavitskaya 1999) claim that sonorants are *opaque*, blocking assimilation (e.g. /z-mk/ \rightarrow [zmk], /s-mg/ \rightarrow [smg]). A third position—advanced by Padgett 2002, Scheer 2008, Kulikov 2013, Reiss 2017, and Iosad 2018—holds that sonorants are *undergoers* of voicing assimilation (e.g., /z-mk/ \rightarrow [smk], /s-mg/ \rightarrow [zmg]; cf. descriptive examples such as /okt^jabr^j-skij/ 'October-adj' \rightarrow [\land kt^jápr $_{\circ}$ jski] (Avanesov 1956:170), /kontrfors/ 'buttress' \rightarrow [kontr $_{\circ}$ fórs] (Jones & Ward 1969:190), /iz mx-a/ 'from moss' \rightarrow [ismxa] (Shevoroshkin 1971)). Recent proponents, including Padgett, Kulikov, Reiss, and Iosad, maintain that these sonorant voicing alternations are purely *phonetic* and require no phonological explanation.

Why such divergence concerning the basic facts of Russian voicing assimilation? We identify several factors: lack of attention to regional and generational variation; very small speaker samples (several < 5); pooling across heterogeneous systems; reliance on armchair judgments or purely acoustic evidence; and differences in perceptual cue weighting.

We address these issues by presenting new phonetic data from a controlled elicitation study of relevant sequences of Russian obstruents and sonorants, recorded from speakers of varied ages and regions. By isolating individual nanosystems rather than averaging across speakers, we uncover a striking range of patterns—including rare dissimilatory systems—complementing the surprising variations reported by Drage (1968) and Kulikov (2013). The results show that transparency exists for some speakers and contexts, and cannot be dismissed as either illusory or purely phonetic. We moreover integrate articulatory evidence from Lyskawa et al. (2017) for Polish and neurolinguistic data from Schluter et al. (2017) for Russian, both suggesting that the feature responsible for voicelessness in these languages is phonologically active. We argue for a binary [±stiff vocal folds] specification (Halle & Stevens 1971), which

affords advantages in capturing Russian-specific facts (edge-/r/ devoicing, invariance of /f/, voicing dissimilation) and cross-linguistic patterns (voicelessness dissimilation in Bakairi, Bena, Ekegusii, Embu; symmetric voicing dissimilation in Moro; polarity effects in Chontal).

We conclude that these findings challenge models excluding [-voice] via underspecification and those requiring strict adjacency for feature spreading. We propose a fully specified, binary, articulatorily grounded feature system combined with a Search-and-Copy mechanism (Nevins 2010; Samuels 2011; Suhairi 2022), yielding a formally explicit and typologically plausible account of Russian voicing assimilation rules for both obstruents and sonorants.

References

- Avanesov, R. I. (1956). Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
- Calabrese, A. (1995). A constraint-based theory of phonological markedness and simplification procedures. Linguistic Inquiry, 26, 373–463.
- Coats, H. S., & Harshenin, G. (1971). Voicing assimilation in Russian. *Slavic and East European Journal*, 15(2), 203–213.
- Dedova, O. and M. Krasnova. 2024. Realizatsija gluxosti/zvonkosti shumnyx soglasnyx pered interkonsonantnymi sonornymi i [v] (Realization of voicelessness/voicing of obstruents before interconsonantal sonorants and [v]). Lomonosov Philology Journal 9.4:45–57.
- Drage, C. (1968). Some Data on Modern Moscow Pronunciation. The Slavonic and East European Review 46.107:353-382.

Es'kova

- Es'kova, N. 2011. K voprosu o svoĭstvakh sonornykh soglasnykh v russkom iazyke [On the properties of sonorant consonants in the Russian language]. *Izbrannye raboty po rusistike: fonologiia, morfonologiia, morfologiia, orfografiia, leksikografiia.* Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 153–157.
- Halle, M. (1959). The sound pattern of Russian. The Hague: Mouton.
- Halle, M., & Stevens, K. N. (1971). A note on laryngeal features. *Quarterly Progress Report, Research Laboratory of Electronics*, 101, 198–213.
- Hayes, B. (1984). The phonetics and phonology of Russian voicing assimilation. In M. Aronoff & R. Oehrle (Eds.), *Language Sound Structure* (pp. 318–328). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1978). Mutual assimilation of Russian voiced and voiceless consonants. *Studia Linguistica*, 32(2), 107–110.
- Kiparsky, P. (1985). Some consequences of Lexical Phonology *Yearbook*, 2, 85–138.
- Kulikov, V. (2013). Voicing contrast in consonant clusters: evidence against sonorant transparency to voice assimilation in Russian. *Phonology*, *30*(3), 423-452.
- Lyskawa, P., Idsardi, W., Avery, P., Purnell, T., Raimy, E., & Salmons, J. (2017). Laryngeal realism and Polish voicing. Paper presented at the 47th Poznań Linguistics Meeting.

- Nelson, S., & Baković, E. (2024). Underspecification Without Underspecified Representations. *Proceedings of the Society for Computation in Linguistics (SCiL)*, 352-356.
- Padgett, J. (2002). Russian voicing assimilation, final devoicing, and the problem of [v]. *Natural language and linguistic theory*.
- Raimy, E., Bendjaballah, S., Tifrit, A., & Voeltzel, L. (2021). Privativity and ternary phonological behavior. *Perspectives on Element Theory*, *143*, 65-107.
- Burton, M. W., & Robblee, K. E. (1997). A phonetic analysis of voicing assimilation in Russian. *Journal of phonetics*, *25*(2), 97-114.
- Schluter, K. T., Politzer-Ahles, S., Al Kaabi, M., & Almeida, D. (2017). Laryngeal features are phonetically abstract: mismatch negativity evidence from Arabic, English, and Russian. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 746.
- Shapiro, M. (1993). Russian non-distinctive voicing: A stocktaking. *Russian Linguistics*, 17(1), 1–14.
- Sugimoto, T. (1992). *A constraint-based approach to Russian voicing assimilation*. Michigan State University.
- Steriade, D. (1995). Underspecification and markedness. In J. Goldsmith (Ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory* (pp. 114–174). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zaliznjak, A. 1975. Razmyshlenija po povodu 'jazv' A. A. Reformatskogo [Reflections on Reformatskij's Linguistics]. Problemnaja gruppa po eksperimental'noj i prikladnoj lingvistike Instituta russkogo jazyka AN SSSR: predvaritel'nye publikatsij 71:13-23.