Class 5: Antifaithfulness

To do for next time
- Start antifaithfulness/anticorrespondence assignment
- Read Alderete, Hayes

---

1.   Some problematic morphology

Chaha (data taken from McCarthy 1983—you'll see much more in the HW)

V! (masc. subject)	V! (fem. subject)	
gʲækʲæt	gʲækʲætʲ	'accompany'
nəmæd	nəmædʲ	'love'
nək'ət'	nək'ət'ʲ	'kick'

Not so bad—could be described as a floating feature (bundle).

Tohono O'odham (Fitzgerald & Fountain ms.)

imperfective	perfective	
ʔí:ɨ	ʔí:	'drinking'
ɲíid	ɲíi	'seeing'
ɲíok	ɲío	'speaking'
má:k	má:	'giving'
wúːɖ	wúː	'tying up'
ǰuɲ	ǰuː	'being a certain time of day or night'
híːnk	híːn	'barking'
ʂíːʂp	ʂíːʂ	'pinning'
híkčk	híkč	'cutting'
bídʂp	bídʂ	'painting object'
híhim	híhi	'walking (pl)'
híhink	híhin	'barking (pl)'
ɲíɲok	ɲíɲo	'speaking (pl)'
nákog	náko	'enduring'
síkon	síko	'hoeing'
čuːmun	čuːmu	'making object glow by removing ashes from its surface'
čɨʔun	čɨʔu	'picking up object one by one'
gólon	gólo	'raking'
híwa	híw	'rubbing against object'
gátwid	gátwi	'to shoot object'
moːto	moːt	'carrying on the head or in a vehicle'
čɨʔɨwid	čɨʔɨwi	'covering'

híhidòḍ	híhidò	'cooking (pl)'
bihiwig	bihiwi	'to coil oneself'
kahiobin	kahiobi̥	'to cross object'
hí:lig	hí:l	'hanging object to dry out'
mí:liw	mí:l	'arriving by running or driving'
ṣí:lin	ṣí:l	'straightening'
čɨːčɨg	čɨːč	'calling out name of object'
biačug	biač	'carrying object on serving plate'
bɨičug	bɨič	'carrying object'
ʔɨ pá:nčud	ʔɨ pá:nč	'to turn into bread'
číčwičùd	číčwič	'to make someone swim'
čípos̆id	čípos	'branding'
číʔis̆id	číʔis	'imitating sounds made by object'
báhĩ̥jid	báhĩ̥j	'to get object ready to be eaten'
gígos̆id	gígos	'feeding'
číkpanačùd	číkpanàč	'to make someone work'
čícwĩ̥jùːlid	čícwĩ̥jùːl	'to play for the benefit of someone'
gágtwidačùd	gágtwidàč	'to shoot at object for someone, plural'
čípos̆idačùd	čípos̆idač	'to make someone brand object'
báhĩ̥jidačùd	báhĩ̥jidač	'to make someone eat object'
číʔɨws̆id	číʔɨwɨ̀	'covering'
kahiobin	kahiobi̥	crossing object
bihiwig	bihiwi	'coiling oneself'
sihowin	sihowi	'rummaging into'
kiʔibin	kiʔibi̥	'nibbling at object'
kiʔiwin	kiʔiwi	'reducing object'
húhuʔid	húhuʔi	'chasing'
juːpin	juːpi̥	'disappearing'
kɨihin	kɨihi	'kicking object'
wɨgid	wɨgi̥	'lighting up'
hiomun	hiomu	'paring object'
bidhun	bidhu	'plastering object'
hɨhɨm	hɨhɨ	'laughing (pl)'
siːmun	siːmu	'hoeing object'
čuːhimun	čuːhimu	'crushing object with single blow'
ʔaʔappɨm	ʔaʔappɨ	'trying on a dress'
hugimun	hugimu	'breaking object with fingernails'
gíʔa	gía, *gíʔ	'grasping'

húʔa	húa	'raking together'
múʔa	múa	'killing (sg obj)'
wíʔa	wía	'leaving X'
híʔa	hía	'urinating'
gáʔi	gái	'grilling'
báʔa	bá:, *báʔ	'swallowing'
síʔi	sí:	'sucking'
dáʔa	dá:	'flying'
wíʔi	wí:	'staying'

o   What's the problem with describing this in terms of markedness and faithfulness constraints?

Luo

singular	*plural*	
bat	bed-e	'arm'
luθ	luð-e	'walking stick'
čogo	čok-e	'bone'
owadu	owet-e	'brother'

o   What's the problem here?

We could maybe describe this (and the Tohono O'odham above) with a 'Be Different' constraint that requires the plural to be different from the singular
o   But how would the grammar ensure that the difference is realized in the right way—ideas?

Japanese (Alderete's (1), (2))
        (1) *Typical root-suffix interaction in Japanese*
                /yóm-tára/   → [yón-dara]   'if he reads'
                /yob-tára/   → [yon-dára]   'if he calls'
        (2) *Dominant suffix in Japanese*
        a. *Root + dominant accented suffix*
                /adá-ppó$_{Dom}$-i/   → [ada-ppó-i]   'coquettish'
                /kaze-ppó$_{Dom}$-i/ → [kaze-ppó-i]   'sniffily'
        b. *Root + dominant unaccented suffix*
                /kóobe-kko$_{Dom}$/   → [koobe-kko]   'native of Kobe'
                /edo-kko$_{Dom}$/   → [edo-kko]   'native of Tokyo'

o   Descriptively, what are the patterns here?

(2b) especially is hard to explain: the affix doesn't add anything (sometimes it actually takes away), and the derived form isn't necessarily different from the base.

2. Alderete's basic proposal

For every correspondence constraint, there is a binary ¬OO-CORR constraint (Base-Output in all the cases in his paper).

> ¬BO-MAX: There exists at least one Base segment that lacks an Output correspondent

o   How could we explain Tohono O'odham truncation?
o   How could we explain Japanese dominant suffixes? (And what about (1)?)

3. Some predictions of Alderetian Antifaithfulness

Can you see why the following are predicted?

o   It's always the base that mutates (if it were otherwise, would we be able to tell that it was antifaithfulness?).

o   No root-triggered dominance (show what Pseudo-Japanese case would look like). This wouldn't be true if ¬IO-CORR were allowed (can you see why?).

o   Grammar dependence: when there is a choice about how to satisfy the ¬OO-CORR constraint, the language's default emerges (Japanese DEP>>CULMINATIVITY, for example). (It would be nice if we had more cases where there was robust evidence from elsewhere about what the default *is*…)

4. Comparison to positional faithfulness

If derivational affixes are the morphological heads of words, perhaps we've got positional faithfulness to heads (works for Japanese (2a)).

Does this work for Japanese (2b)?

Alderete also argues that dominant affixes aren't always inflectional, and derivational affixes aren't always dominant, so this wouldn't explain every case of affix dominance.

5. Comparison to co-phonologies

Recall Inkelas & Zoll approach to reduplication as double generation with a different co-phonology applying to each copy. What if dominant unaccented affixes trigger a de-accenting co-phonology? (let's see what the ranking might look like)

Alderete's arguments against
- Doesn't rule out stem dominance.
- Doesn't get grammar-dependence (no restrictions in the theory as it stands on how co-phonologies may differ from each other).

6. A further wrinkle: locality

In some cases, the antifaithfulness constraint needs to be satisfied close to the dominant affix (with a mora, syllable, or foot). Alderete handles this with constraint conjunction:

Japanese post-accenting *ma-*

	Base	/ma´ + yonaká/	[¬OO-DEP(accent) & ANCHOR-L(Stem, PrWd)]σ	OO-DEP (accent)	ALIGN-R (accent)
a	yonaká	ma-[yo]naká	*!		
b	yonaká	ma-[yo]náka	*!	*	*
☞ *c*	yonaká	ma-[yó]naka		*	**

7. Application to reduplication

o Can we get *shmolts-shmolts now??

8. Implications

o How much of this could we do in containment? (Keep in mind that Antifaithfulness is always O-O.)
o Lexical categories: how many ¬OO-Corr constraint classes can there be for affixes to choose from? Just two (dominant/recessive), or more?

9. If we have time, let's talk about the Tagalog assignment.