

### Class 9: More issues in process application: multisite optionality

#### To do

- Project: We'll see some more good project topics today and Thursday, so keep looking around. Meet with me by the end of next week about a topic.
- Homework on last week's material due tomorrow
- Homework on this week's material will be posted tonight; due next Friday
- Study questions on Anderson excerpt; online quiz on CCLE that goes with them (I'll put it up tonight)

#### 1. Loose end #1 from Tuesday: one type of self-counterfeeding that's really common is morphological truncation

- In Lardil (which you read about in Prince & Smolensky 1993, based on Hale 1973), /pulumunitami/ → pulumunitam (FREE-V) → [pulumunita] (CODACOND)
  - but this doesn't cause any further deletion
  - See Round 2011, though—there's more it
- Tohono O'odham (variety of O'odham, Uto-Aztecan language from Arizona and Sonora with about 9,600 speakers; Lewis 2009). Data here are from Fitzgerald 2002:

<i>imperfective</i>	<i>perfective</i>	
míɖ	mí:	'running'
ǰún	ǰú:	'being a certain time of day or night'
hím	hí:	'walking'
húg	hú:	'eating object'
nóɖ	nó:	'bending object'
ǰíɲ	ǰí:	'waking up'
wúɖ	wú:	'tying object with rope'
ʂí:sp	ʂí:s	'pinning'
híkčk	híkč	'cutting'
bídʂp	bídʂ	'painting object'
híhim	híhi	'walking (pl)'
híhink	híhin	'barking (pl)'
ǰíŋok	ǰíŋo	'speaking (pl)'

- Let's compare basic SPE and OT analyses.
- Wolf 2011 discusses a similar example from Chemehuevi (also Uto-Aztecan) and cites (p. 106) several more truncation cases that would make good **term paper topics** (where not already reanalyzed by Kaplan): Catalan, Hidatsa, Karok, Latvian, Lithuanian, Odawa, Ponapean, Woleaian.

## 2. Loose end #2: true directionality?

- We saw cases where directional rule application could get us self-feeding vs. self-counterfeeding, self-bleeding vs. self-counterbleeding.
- But there are also some cases where it really seems to be about direction
- Tone sandhi in **Tianjin**, a northern dialect of Mandarin. (Milliken et al. 1997, Chen 2000; see also Kuang 2008)

<i>the tones</i>	tone A	21 or 11	L	[descriptions disagree]
	tone B	45 or 55	H	
	tone C	13, 213, or 24	LH	
	tone D	53	HL	

### basic rules

AA → CA	bing <sup>L</sup> gao <sup>L</sup>	→	bing <sup>LH</sup> gao <sup>L</sup>	‘ice cream’
CC → BC	shui <sup>LH</sup> guo <sup>LH</sup>	→	shui <sup>H</sup> guo <sup>LH</sup>	‘fruit’
DD → AD	si <sup>HL</sup> lu <sup>HL</sup>	→	si <sup>L</sup> lu <sup>HL</sup>	‘bus route #4’
DA → BA	da <sup>HL</sup> jie <sup>L</sup>	→	da <sup>H</sup> jie <sup>L</sup>	‘street’

- Why *these* rules? Who knows! Tone sandhi tends to be pretty arbitrary synchronically. See Mortensen 2006 for a framework in which to analyze tone sandhi.
- You see the problem: what about /AAA/? /DDD/? /DDA/? /CCC/? /CAA/? /ADD/? /DAA/?

For /DDD/ it depends on the syntactic structure (say Milliken et al.; Chen says always BAD):

[[su<sup>HL</sup> liao<sup>HL</sup>] bu<sup>HL</sup>] → AAD (L.L.HL) ‘plastic cloth’ (how to prevent \*CAD?)  
 [shang<sup>HL</sup> [yi<sup>HL</sup> yuan<sup>HL</sup>]] → DAD (HL.L.HL) ‘House of Lords’ (\*BAD?)

/AAA/: [[ Xi<sup>L</sup> guan<sup>L</sup> ] Jie<sup>L</sup>] → ACA (L.LH.L) ‘Xiguan Street’, not \*CCA or \*BCA  
 [ kai<sup>L</sup> [fei<sup>L</sup>:ji<sup>L</sup>]] → ACA (L.LH.L) ‘fly an airplane’

/DDA/: [[si<sup>HL</sup>:ji<sup>HL</sup>] qing<sup>L</sup>] → ABA (L.H.L) ‘evergreen’  
 [zuo<sup>HL</sup> [dian<sup>HL</sup> che<sup>L</sup>]] → ABA (L.H.L), not \*DBA ‘take a tram’

[ran out of time to type full data]

/CCC/ → BBC (LH.LH.LH → H.H.LH)  
 /CAA/ → BCA (LH.L.L → H.LH.L)  
 /ADD/ → CAD (L.HL.HL → LH.L.HL)  
 /DAA/ → DCA (HL.L.L → HL.LH.L)

- We’ll leave some of this as a paradox—there’s an extensive literature you can check out, though.

*Now some optionality issues when there are multiple targets...*

Cases taken from Kaplan 2011, Riggle & Wilson 2005, Vaux 2008—good sources for term-paper topics. See those papers for various approaches to multi-site optionality.

### 3. Warao: global optionality

Language isolate of Venezuela, Guyana, and Suriname; 28,100 speakers [Lewis 2009]. From Osborn 1966.

- Little raw data, but Osborn is very definite about the generalization:
 

“/p/ has allophones [p b]. The voiced allophone [b] is heard more frequently than the voiceless [p] in most words. In every word, except for a few words noted below, alternation between [b] and [p] is presumably possible, since many alternations of this order have been heard. Thus in /paro+parera/ *weak*, both the initial and medial phoneme /p/ is heard as [b] generally, and as [p] infrequently. In words like the one cited, with two or more occurrences of /p/, **the allophones are consistently [b] or [p] for each utterance of the word**. If the first occurrence of /p/ in the word is [b], the following occurrence(s) will be [b]. If the first occurrence is [p], the following occurrence(s) will be [p]. The following are examples of words with two occurrences of /p/: *poto+poto soft*, *apaupute he will put them*, *kapa+kapa kind of banana*.” (p. 109)
- I.e., [paro-parera] ~ [baro-barera], but not \*[paro-barera] or \*[baro-parera].
- Also, for a non-reduplicative case, [hapisapa] ~ [habisaba] ‘other side’
- How might we try to capture this variation in OT? SPE?

As discussed by Riggle & Wilson, Kaplan, it would be nice to have more than two non-reduplicated words...

### 4. A better global case, from Kaplan 2012

- Eastern Andalusian metaphony (vowel harmony).
- Word-final /s/ laxifies preceding V, then usually deletes
  - on the face of it, looks like counterbleeding, but Kaplan cites Jiménez & Lloret’s analysis as reassociation of [spread glottis] from /s/ to V.

<i>mes</i>	mé	‘month’
<i>tos</i>	tó	‘cough’
<i>mis</i>	mí	‘my (pl.)’
<i>tus</i>	tú	‘your (pl.)’

- Laxness spreads to preceding stressed V, if non-high:
  - lejos* lého ‘far’
  - tesis* tési ‘thesis’
- If other Vs intervene, they participate too, all-or-none:
  - treboles* tréβole ~ tréβole ‘clovers’
  - cómetelos* kómetelo ~ kómetelo ‘eat them (for you)!’
- Similarly, non-high Vs before the stress can laxify, all-or-none:
  - cotillones* kotizóne ~ kotizóne ‘cotillions’
  - monederos* monedéro ~ monedéro ‘purses’
- Finally, the pretonic Vs lax only if the post-tonic ones do:
  - recógelos* rekóhelo ~ rekóhelo ~ rekóhelo ‘pick them’

## 5. Local optionality—also hard to find good cases (besides French; see below)

- Vaux report, for English *marketability*:
  - [maɪkət<sup>h</sup>əbɪlət<sup>h</sup>i] ~ [maɪkərəbɪləri] ~ [maɪkət<sup>h</sup>əbɪləri] ~ [maɪkərəbɪlət<sup>h</sup>i]
- Can any of our ideas for SPE+variation get this? OT+variation ideas?

## 6. Vata: iterative optionality

*Ethnologue* classifies as dialect of Lakota Dida, a Niger-Congo language of Côte d’Ivoire with 98,8000 speakers. Data taken from Kaplan 2009; originally from Kaye 1982.

- The language has ATR harmony: [+ATR]: [i, u, e, o, ʌ] [−ATR]: [ɪ, ʊ, ɛ, ɔ, a]
- [+ATR] optionally spreads to the final syllable of a preceding word:
  - /ò nɪ sáká pɪ/ → ó nɪ sáká pɪ ~ ó nɪ sákʌ pɪ ‘he didn’t cook rice’
  - - - + → - - - + ~ - - - + +
- If all the words are monosyllabic, this is potentially self-feeding. There are various options, all possible...
  - /ò ká zā pī/ → ó ká zā pī ~ ó ká zʌ pī ~ ó kʌ zʌ pī ~ ó kʌ zʌ pī ‘he will cook food’
  - - - + → - - - + ~ - - + + ~ - + + + ~ - + + +
- Can we get this one?

## 7. Hypercorrection in Dominican Spanish: unique-target optionality

(Vaux calls this “Basic Optionality”)

Dialect of the Indo-European language from Spain with 328 million speakers worldwide. Data from Bradley 2006. See there for original data sources, esp. Núñez-Cedeño 1994, which I didn't get a chance to consult. If you fancy this as a term-paper topic, check out Bullock & Toribio 2010.

- /s/ typically absent in a syllable coda:

<i>Popular Dominican Spanish</i>	<i>Conservative Spanish</i>	
se.co	se.co	‘dry’
ca.so	ca.so	‘case’
e.tú.pi.do	es.tú.pi.do	‘stupid’
do	dos	‘two’ (p. 3)

- Hypercorrection can insert a coda [s] (in the “hablar fisno” speech style):<sup>1</sup>

<i>Dominican fisno</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	
in.vis.tado	in.vi.ta.do	‘guest’
co.mos	co.mo	‘like’
e.tús.pi.do	es.tú.pi.do	‘stupid’
de.des	des.de	‘since’ (p. 4)

- And there can be variation of where the [s] is inserted:

<i>Dominican fisno</i>	<i>Conservative</i>
as.bo.ga.do ~ a.bos.ga.do ~ a.bo.gasdo ~ a.bo.ga.dos	a.bo.ga.do ‘lawyer’ (p. 4)

- But, apparently there can only be one inserted s:<sup>2</sup> \*as.bo.ga.dos, etc.
- This claim is not really documented or discussed in the literature. Bradley cites personal communication with Núñez-Cedeño, the main describer of the phenomenon.
- Any ideas, for each theory?

<sup>1</sup> though not before an otherwise intervocalic tap or trill, which would be phonotactically illegal, and not if it would create a closed penult in a word with antepenultimate stress.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 24 for discussion of an apparent counterexample given by Harris.

## 8. Optionality and self-bleeding: French schwa-deletion

Indo-European language from France and surroundings with 67.8 million speakers worldwide.

- There's a big literature on this; Dell 1970<sup>3</sup> is a good place to start.
- /ə/ optionally deletes, except when it would create a bad consonant cluster.

/suvəniR/	→	[suvəniR] ~ [suvniR]	'to remember'
/pasəRa/	→	[pasəRa] ~ [pasRa]	'will pass'
/parvəniR/	→	[parvəniR] *[parvniR]	'to reach' ([RV] bad coda, [vni] bad onset)
/sufləRa/	→	[sufləRa] *[sufləRa]	'will blow' ([VflRV] unsyllabifiable)
/ãri dəve partir/	→	[ãri dəve partir] ~ [ãri dve partir]	'Henri had to go'
/ʒak dəve partir/	→	[ʒak dəve partir] *[ʒak dve partir]	'Jacques had to go' ([kdv])

- What does basic SPE predict for this form (pretend the rule is obligatory): /ty dəvəne/ 'you were becoming'
- Actual result is (supposedly) [ty dəvəne] ~ [ty dvəne]<sup>4</sup> ~ [ty dəvne], but \*[ty dvne]—discuss.

## 9. If time—Anderson 1974's solution

- Find all segments eligible for the rule and circle them.
- For each circled segment, underline the smallest environment that lets the segment meet the rule's structural description.
- If the rule is optional, you may uncircle some of the eligible segments and de-underline their environments.
- If any circled segment is contained in some other circled segment's underlined environment, uncircle (and de-underline the environments of) as few segments as possible to get rid of these overlaps.
- Now apply the rule simultaneously to the remaining circled segments.

(Of course, circling and underlining themselves have no theoretical status—this is just a convenient way to say “identify targets and environments”)

- What does Anderson's proposal predict for French /ty vudre kə sə kə lə bədo/<sup>5</sup> 'you would like that what the beadle...'?

<sup>3</sup> Dell, François (1970). *Les règles phonologiques tardives et la morphologie dérivationnelle du français*. MIT dissertation.

<sup>4</sup> Some speakers have said they don't like this one...

<sup>5</sup> I got this from an online appendix to David Odden's *Introducing Phonology* (2005: Cambridge UP): [www.ling.ohio-state.edu/~odden/IntroducingPhonology/Theory%20Discussion.html](http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/~odden/IntroducingPhonology/Theory%20Discussion.html)

- Does Anderson's proposal help with the non-optional cases we saw Klamath? Kikuyu? Tianjin?

<b>Next time:</b> Process interaction—beyond (counter){f,bl}eeding
--

### References

- Bradley, Travis. 2006. Spanish rhotics and Dominican hypercorrect /s/. *Probus* 18(1). 1–33.
- Bullock, Barbara E & Almeida Jacqueline Toribio. 2010. Correcting the record on Dominican [s]-hypercorrection. *Romance Linguistics 2009: selected papers from the 39th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, 15–24. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kaplan, Aaron F. 2011. Variation Through Markedness Suppression. *Phonology* 28(03). 331–370. doi:10.1017/S0952675711000200.
- Kaye, Jonathan. 1982. Harmony processes in Vata.. In Harry Van der Hulst & Norval Smith (eds.), *The structure of phonological representations*, vol. II, 385–452. Foris.
- Núñez-Cedeño, Rafael. 1994. The alterability of Spanish geminates and its effects on the Uniform Applicability Condition. *Probus* 6. 23–41.
- Osborn, Henry A. 1966. Warao I: Phonology and Morphophonemics. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32(2). 108–123.
- Riggle, Jason & Colin Wilson. 2005. Local optionality.. In Leah Bateman & Cherlon Ussery (eds.), *NELS* 35.
- Vaux, Bert. 2008. Why the phonological component must be serial and rule-based.. In Bert Vaux & Andrew Nevins (eds.), *Rules, constraints, and phonological phenomena*. Oxford University Press.