Slavic verbal prefixes are divided into two groups: lexical prefixes (LP) and superlexical prefixes (SP); e.g., Svenonius (2004) among others. My aim is to show that although both LPs and SPs are homonymous (the former form a superset of the latter), they display different phonological behaviour in Czech which can be derived from their different position in the morpho-syntactic tree. I argue that only LPs, which form constituents with their roots, are targets of templatic morphology that affects their quantity.

Czech verbal prefixes show V~VV alternations. According to Scheer (2001) the distribution of the length in prefixed words depends on whether or not they contain a verbal stem derived by a theme suffix. Verbs as well as stem-nominals show short prefixes. Root-nominals, on the other hand, lack a theme suffix: the root is immediately followed by a particular nominalizing suffix, including nominalizing zero; these structures have long prefixes (1). Furthermore Scheer argues that prefix lengthening in root-nominals is of templatic nature.

(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>infinitive</th>
<th>stem-nominal</th>
<th>root-nominal</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>za-mot-āt-t</td>
<td>za-mot-āth-ní</td>
<td>zá-mot-ek</td>
<td>to wrap, involution, cocoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za-sah-ovāt-t</td>
<td>za-sah-ováth-ní</td>
<td>zá-sah-Ø</td>
<td>to interfere, interference, hit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za-stav-čšt-t</td>
<td>za-stav-čšt-ní</td>
<td>zá-stav-ba</td>
<td>to build up, building up, built-up area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Templates are traditionally assumed to be a characteristic feature of the Afro-Asiatic language families. However, they have been identified in Indo-European languages as well: for example in German (Bendjaballah & Haiden 2003), Portuguese (Brandão de Carvalho 2004) and also in Czech where they control distribution of vowel quantity in certain morpho-syntactic domains. In root-nominals the template scopes over the prefix and the root and restricts a total amount of vocalic items inside this domain to three. This is the reason why prefixes in root-nominals lengthen when they merge with short roots. In (2a) the morpho-syntactic structure of the root-nominal ná-lep-k-a ‘sticker’ matches the morpho-syntactic structure of the template: the prefix-root constituent occurs in the context of the nominal suffix -ka. The short prefix na- plus the short root √lep weigh two morae. However, the template requires three morae; this is the reason why the prefix lengthens, i.e. becomes bi-moraic. By contrast, when the same prefix merges with a long root, it does not lengthen (2b).

(2)

V V VV V

b. [[prefix-root 3µ]n] ↔ [[na-ráž 3µ]ka] 
V VV

Scheer’s templatic analysis makes a number of predictions concerning the morpho-syntactic structure of prefixed words which Scheer does not mention. The first prediction that I explore is that in root-nominals where the template is active, the prefix and the root form a single morpho-syntactic constituent. The second prediction of Scheer’s analysis concerns denominal verbs. Although Scheer (2001:40) claims that “prefixal length never occurs in verbal items”, his templatic analysis in fact predicts that verbs with long prefixes can exist.

I show that the prefix-root constituency follows directly from the fact that root-nominals can be prefixed only with LPs. In (3a) Svenonius’ decomposition of the verbal complex is
depicted: LP originates in a R(esult) P(hrase), c-commanded by a VP where a verbal root is introduced; higher projections, namely a vP and AspP then host a theme suffix and a SP respectively. From this structure a prefix theme dependency arises when the presence of a SP supposes the presence of a theme; LPs, on the other hand, are theme-independent. A consequence of this is that root-nominals lacking theme suffixes can be prefixed only with LPs. (3b) shows the structure of a root-nominal: the movement of the complex verbal head, made of the verbal root and the LP, to the little \( n^o \) derives a structure to which the template is associated. As a consequence, a root-nominal with a long prefix is derived. The template is thus activated automatically whenever a complex verbal head made of an LP and a root adjoins to a little \( n^o \). From this two things follow. First, the template is activated only when the structure in (3b) is present within a given word. This is the reason why stem-nominals do not show long prefixes: the complex verbal head in question is not adjoined to a little \( n^o \), but to a little \( v^o \) where a stem-building theme suffix is spelled out (3c). And vice versa, whenever the tree in (3b) is embedded within a word structure, the template is triggered. This is the reason why denominal verbs like nálepkovat ‘to put stickers on’ can display long prefixes (4).

(3) a. verbal complex  
\[
\text{AspP} \\
\text{SP} \rightarrow \text{Asp}^o \\
\text{theme} \rightarrow \text{v}^o \\
\text{root} \rightarrow \text{V}^o \\
\text{LP} \rightarrow \text{R} \\
\text{DP} 
\]

b. root-nominal  
\[
\text{3}^\mu \leftarrow \text{V}^o \\
\text{R}^o \rightarrow \text{V}^o \\
/\text{na}/_2^\mu \\
/\text{lep}/_1^\mu 
\]

c. stem-nominal  
\[
\text{v}^o \\
\text{n}^o \\
/\text{na}/ \\
/\text{lep}/ 
\]

(4)  
\[
\text{v}^o \\
\text{n}^o \\
/\text{ova}/ \\
/\text{k}/ \\
/\text{na}/_2^\mu \\
/\text{lep}/_1^\mu 
\]
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