Lexical Specification of Stød and Non-Stød

The Non-Stød Model (Basbøll 2003, 2005, 2008, fthc.), an explicit and detailed model covering both phonological and grammatical aspects of the distribution of Danish stød (cf. Hansen 1943, Fischer-Jørgensen 1989), can be summarized so:

1) Stød (a laryngeal syllabic rhyme prosody, see Basbøll 2005: 82-87, 265-292, 318-321, Grønnum & Basbøll 2007, fthc.) is a signal for bimoraic syllables, located in the second mora. What must be accounted for, then, is the absence of stød in bimoraic syllables: “Non-Stød” (whereas nearly all other treatments try to give rules for the occurrence of stød).

2) Non-Stød can be a property of lexical items (Lexical Non-Stød), e.g. in native words like ven (without stød, but stød in def. ven?nen where ‘?’ symbolizes stød), or in French loans like balkon (without stød, but stød in def. balkon?en). In the native-like vocabulary, Lexical Non-Stød is the marked situation, whereas it is general in the non-native-like vocabulary (fig. 1).

3) Non-Stød also depends on word structure (with different positions for suffixes representing different degrees of integration with the stem): Word Structure Non-Stød (or Morphological Non-Stød), which only applies in the native-like part of the vocabulary (this is outside the scope of the present paper).

4) The relevant division for the stød system (2 vs. 3) is that between native-like, incl. German (Hän?del), Latin (in?sula) and Greek (androgy?n) loans, and non-native-like incl. English (Clinton, pl. Clinton?er with stød) and French loans and foreign names etc. Notice the productive stød-additions in the non-native-like words.

The focus of the talk is 2): Lexical Non-Stød. There are two mechanisms involved: extra-prosodicity (cf. Kristoffersen 2000), i.e. a non-syllabic segment that is word-final (including the position before a word-internal compound boundary) is not taken into account when building up the syllabic-moraic structure; and the marking of the second mora as non-stød. Both mechanisms apply all-over, and no statements of explicit ordering are needed (logically, extra-prosodicity takes priority since bimoricity does not “exist before” the building up of syllabic-moraic structure). The model predicts a large number of specific stød-alternations when suffixes are added. It also follows from the Non-Stød Model that if a bimoraic syllable is specified as either stød or non-stød (located in the second mora), this syllable cannot be involved in morphological stød-alternations, apart from the phonological condition that mora-drop (as a consequence of stress reduction) can lead to stød-drop. Such predictions from the Non-Stød Model will be checked in the paper.

Stød and Non-Stød will, finally, be considered in a comparative Scandinavian context, with a view to the distribution of tonal accents in Swedish and Norwegian. A crucial notion here is markedness (which I take in a Praguian sense). According to the Non-Stød Model, stød is marked phonetically and phonologically, but non-stød is marked lexically and grammatically (morphologically). The latter point
agrees with the markedness of Accent 2 in Central Swedish according to Roll et al. (2011), whereas the approach of Wetterlin 2010 presents a challenge to be confronted.
FIGURE 1. Bipartition of the Danish vocabulary with respect to stød-principles.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native-like vocabulary</td>
<td>marked</td>
<td>unmarked</td>
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