

## Class 11: Basehood

### To do for next time

- Read Anttila
- Finish Hawaiian assignment (due Wednesday, May 12 in class)

Plan for today: Let's talk about Catalan, then go through (1) and (2), then hear from Nathan about Albright's theory of basehood, then talk about the split base.

### 1. What qualifies as a base? (in B-A correspondence)

Benua (1994): "The base is the independent word identified with the string that undergoes morphological derivation [i.e., it's up to the morphology]; in affixation, the base is the word identified with the string adjacent to the affix. [...] Often, the base is the word that is minimally less morphologically complex than the derived word, so that the base consists of a subset of the derived word's morphemes. But this kind of subset relation does not always hold. An obligatorily inflected word can serve as the base of another inflected word, and the base's inflection is neither morphologically nor phonologically present in the derived word."

Kager (1996): "a form that is compositionally related to the affixed word in a morphological and a semantic sense. (The meaning of the affixed form must contain all grammatical features of its base.) Moreover, the base is a free form, i.e. a word. This second criterion implies that a base is always an output itself."

So, in the Palestinian Arabic case, the reason there's no base *fihim* to protect the first vowel from deletion in *fhimna* 'we understood', is that there is no freestanding word with a subset of *fhimna*'s morphological features.

- Are these Polish data (Kraska –Szlenk 1995) a problem for Kager? (o → u / closed syllable)

'cow'	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Plural</i>
<i>Nom.</i>	kr[o].wa	kr[o].wy
<i>Gen.</i>	kr[o].wy	kr[u]w
<i>Dat.</i>	kr[o].wie	kr[o].wom
<i>Acc.</i>	kr[o].wę	kr[o].wy
<i>Inst.</i>	kr[o].wą	kr[o].wami
<i>Loc.</i>	kr[o].wie	kr[o].wach
<i>Voc.</i>	kr[o].wo	kr[o].wy
'cow'-diminutive	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Plural</i>
<i>Nom.</i>	kr[u]w.ka	kr[u]w.ki
<i>Gen.</i>	kr[u]w.ki	<b>kr[u].wek</b>
<i>Dat.</i>	kr[u]w.ce	kr[u]w.kom
<i>Acc.</i>	kr[u]w.ke	kr[u]w.ki
<i>Inst.</i>	kr[u]w.ka	kr[u]w.kami
<i>Loc.</i>	kr[u]w.ce	kr[u]w.kach

Benua proposes that the gen. pl. is derived from the nom. pl., but that morphological constraints prevent both suffixed from surfacing. (What's the other possible base for this form, and does that solve the problem?)

## 2. More examples from Benua—alternative explanations?

Portuguese (Rainier 1995):

<i>Singular</i>	<i>Sg.Diminutive</i>	<i>Plural</i>	<i>Pl.Diminutive</i>	
cão	cãozinho	cães	cãezinhos	'dog'
flor	florzinha	flores	florezinhas	'flower'

Cibemba (Hyman 1994):

<i>Root</i>	<i>Causative</i>	<i>Causative-Applicative</i>	
leep	leef- <sub>i</sub>	leef-es- <sub>i</sub>	be long/lengthen/lengthen for
lob	lof- <sub>i</sub>	lof-es- <sub>i</sub>	be extinct/exterminate/exterminate for
fiit	fiis- <sub>i</sub>	fiis-is- <sub>i</sub>	be dark/darken/darken for
lil	lis- <sub>i</sub>	lis-is- <sub>i</sub>	cry/make cry/make cry for

## 3. The split base

Steriade on French: 'liaison' can occur at a word-boundary hiatus:

<i>masc.</i>		<i>masc. liaison</i>	
nuvo maʁi	'new husband'	nuvɛl ami	'new friend'
bõ maʁi	'good husband'	bɔn ami	'good friend'
pœti maʁi	'small husband'	pœtit ami	'small friend'

Some of these forms are hard to derive by pure phonology:

/nuvo ami/	*VV	MAX-V	DEP-C	IDENT(Vfeatures)
nuvo ami	*!			
nuv ami		*!		
nuvot ami			*	
⊗ nuvɛl ami			*	*

But Steriade notes that these liaison forms are just like the feminine forms:

<i>masc.</i>	<i>masc. liaison</i>	<i>fem.</i>	
nuvo	nuvɛl	nuvɛl	'new'
bõ	bɔn	bɔn	'good'
pœti	pœtit	pœtit	'small'

She proposes that the principle of lexical conservatism is higher ranked than, say, IDENT(Vfeatures)-IO, or any markedness constraints that are violated by inserting [l] instead of default [t]:

Lex C]: There is a listed allomorph of  $\mu$  L( $\mu$ ) such that if there is an absolute final C in the T( $\mu$ ) [target], C has an absolute final, featurally identical correspondent C' in L( $\mu$ ).

/nuvo ami/	LEX C]	*VV	MAX-V	DEP-C	IDENT(Vfeatures)
nuvo ami		*!			
nuv ami	*!		*		
nuvot ami	*!			*	
☞ nuvel ami				*	*

This also explains why some words have no special liaison form:

<i>masc.</i>	<i>masc. liaison</i>	<i>fem.</i>	
ʒoli	ʒoli	ʒoli	‘new’

/ʒoli ami/	LEX C]	*VV	MAX-V	DEP-C	IDENT(Vfeatures)
☞ ʒoli ami		*			
ʒol ami	*!		*		
ʒolit ami	*!			*	

And why it's not the case that the feminine allomorph has to be adopted wholesale:

<i>masc.</i>	<i>masc. liaison</i>	<i>fem.</i>	
prɔʃẽ	prɔʃẽn ~ prɔʃɛn	prɔʃɛn	‘next’
divẽ	divẽn ~ divin	divin	‘divine’
so	sot ~ sɔt	sɔt	‘silly’

Lex  $\forall$ : There is a L( $\mu$ ), such that every segment in T( $\mu$ ) has a featurally identical correspondent in L( $\mu$ )

/divẽ ami/	LEX C]	*VV	IDENT(Vfeatures)	LEX $\forall$
divẽ ami		*!		
div ami	*!			
divẽt ami	*!			
☞ divẽn ami				*
☞ divin ami			*	

(Actually, Steriade does something a bit different from IDENT-IO—and there's lots more to the story...)

#### 4. More split base: Burzio 1998

Argues that Italian adjectives (in *-ivo*) and agentive nouns (in *-ore*) and are based on both the infinitive and the past participle:

	<i>Infinitive</i>	<i>Participle</i>	<i>-ore/-ivo derivative</i>	
<i>adapt</i>	adatt-áre	adatt-át-o	adatt-at-óre	} regular case, for each conjugation
<i>provide</i>	provved-ére	provved-út-o	provved-it-óre	
<i>sell</i>	vénd-ere	vend-út-o	vend-it-óre	
<i>mail</i>	sped-íre	sped-ít-o	sped-it-óre	
<i>compress</i>	comprím-ere	compres-s-o	compres-s-óre	} syncopated participles of -ére conjugation
<i>win</i>	vínc-ere	vín-t-o	vinc-it-óre	
<i>ascend</i>	ascénd-ere	ascé-s-o	ascen-s-óre	
<i>exceed</i>	eccéd-ere	ecced-út-o	ecces-s-ívo	} syncope in derivative only
<i>possess</i>	possed-ére	possed-út-o	posses-s-óre	
<i>aggress</i>	aggred-íre	aggred-ít-o	aggres-s-óre	

The analysis is complicated, but essentially Burzio argues that...

- Syncope in participles results from wanting to stress both the root vowel and the *-ut* vowel, for O-O faithfulness reasons (that's why it happens only in the *-ére* conjugation). This can force consonant deletions to avoid an illegal consonant cluster.
- Lexically variable syncope in derivatives only happens because both suffixes' vowels want to be stressed.
- Lexically variable "revoked syncope" (as in *vincitóre*) happens because the root's vowel and the suffix's vowel both want to be stressed, so a "buffer syllable" is inserted to allow both to be stressed without clash. The *it* is an unstressed allomorph of the participial suffix, and the *c* is recruited from the infinitive to preserve the coda status of the preceding *n*.
- *Ascensore* is a compromise in which the root vowel isn't kept stressed, but at least it's made heavy (by recruiting a segment from another allomorph).

### 5. Split base in Hebrew truncated imperatives: Bat-El 1999/2002

	Masculine			Feminine		
	Future	TI	<i>Normative Imperative</i>	Future	TI	<i>Normative Imperative</i>
‘to close’	ti-sgor	sgor	<i>sgor</i>	ti-sgeri	sgeri	<i>sigri</i>
‘to cut’	ti-gzor	gzor	<i>gzor</i>	ti-gzeri	gzeri	<i>gizri</i>
‘to remember’	ti-zkor	zkor	<i>zxor</i>	ti-zkeri	zkeri	<i>zixri</i>
‘to hurry’	ti-zdarez	zdarez	<i>hi-zdarez</i>	ti-zdarzi	zdarzi	<i>hi-zdarzi</i>
‘to approach’	ti-t-karev	tkarev	<i>hi-t-karev</i>	ti-t-karvi	tkarvi	<i>hi-t-karvi</i>
‘to undress’	ti-t-paʃet	tpaʃet		ti-t-paʃti	tpaʃti	
‘to dress’	ti-t-labeʃ	tlabeʃ		ti-t-labʃi	tlabʃi	
‘to saw’	ti-tfor	tfor	<i>tfor</i>	ti-tferi	tferi	<i>tifri</i>
‘to guard’	ti-ʃmor	ʃmor				
‘to write’	ti-xtov	xtov		ti-xtevi	xtevi	
‘to open’	ti-ftax	ftax	<i>ptax</i>	ti-ftexi	ftexi	<i>pitxi</i>
‘to run away’	ti-vrax	vrax	<i>brax</i>	ti-vrexí	vrexí	<i>birxi</i>
‘to swear’	ti-ʃava	tʃava	<i>hi-ʃava</i>	ti-ʃav(?)i	tʃavi	<i>hi-ʃav?i</i>
‘to clear’	te-fane	tfane	<i>pane</i>	te-fane	tfani	<i>pani</i>
‘to turn’	te-sovev	tsovev	<i>sovev</i>	te-sovevi	tsovevi	<i>sovevi</i>
‘to tell’	te-saper	tsaper	<i>saper</i>	te-sapri	tsapri	<i>sapir</i>
‘to enter’	ti-kanes	tkanes	<i>hi-kanes</i>	ti-kansi	tkansi	<i>hi-kansi</i>
‘to refuse’	te-sarev	tsarev	<i>sarev</i>	te-sarvi	tsarvi	<i>sarvi</i>
‘to search’	te-xapes	txapes				
‘to raise’	te-gadel	tgadel	<i>gadel</i>	te-gadli	tgadli	<i>gadli</i>
‘to take’	ti-kax	kax	<i>kax</i>	ti-kxi	kxi	
‘to approach’	ti-gaʃ	gaʃ	<i>gaʃ</i>	ti-gʃi	gʃi	
‘to give’	ti-ten	ten	<i>ten</i>	ti-tni	tni	
‘to sit’	te-ʃev	ʃev	<i>ʃev</i>	te-ʃvi	ʃvi	
‘to get up’	ta-kum	kum	<i>kum</i>	ta-kúmi	kúmi	
‘to run’	ta-ruts	ruts	<i>ruts</i>	ta-rútsi	rútsi	
‘to put down’	ta-sim	sim	<i>sim</i>	ta-sími	sími	
‘to bite’	ti-nʃax	tinʃax	<i>neʃax</i>			
‘to breath’	ti-nʃom	tinʃom	<i>neʃom</i>			
‘to find’	ti-mtsa	timtsa	<i>metsa</i>			
‘to erase’	ti-mxak	timxak				
‘to dress’	ti-lbaʃ	tilbaʃ				
‘to learn’	ti-lmad	tilmad				
‘to dance’	ti-rkod	tirkod				
‘to write’	ti-rʃom	tirʃom				
‘to descend’	te-red	red	<i>red</i>	te-rdí	rédi	<i>redí</i>
‘to go away’	te-lex	lex		te-lxí	léxi	<i>lexí</i>

(stress is final unless otherwise marked)

Bat-El's account:

- The colloquial imperative is subject to, in Alderete's terms,  $\neg$ MAX (she calls it TRUNCATION), but it doesn't want to violate ONSET or \*CCC:

ti+zkor	ONSET	*CCC	$\neg$ MAX	MAX
tizkor			*!	
izkor	*!			*
tzkor		*!		*
☞ zkor				**
kor				***!

- Why [ti-kanes] > [tkanes]?
- Why the fricatives in [ftax], [vrax]? (normally, spirantization is V\_\_)

As for [kax], Bat-El proposes that corresponding stressed syllables must be identical:

ti+kax	ONSET	*CCC	$\neg$ MAX	FAITH-σ	MAX
tikax			*!		
ikax	*!				*
tkax				*!	*
☞ kax					**
ax					***!

- What about [ti-kxí] > [kxí] and [ti-t.fór] > [tfór]?
- Any ideas for [ti-mxak] > [ti-mxak] and its ilk? What would be some good rival candidates?

This makes [te-rdí] > [rédi] a problem:

te+rdi	SONORITY SEQUENCING	DEP-V	ONSET	*CCC	$\neg$ MAX	MAX
terdi					*	
erdi			*!			*
trdi				*!		*
rdi	*!					**
⊗ redi		*!				**

Bat-El proposes that this feminine imperative is under “paradigmatic pressure” from the masculine to exist. Under the split-base approach, I'd maybe prefer to say that the vowel isn't truly epenthetic, since it has a correspondent in the masculine.

Irregular verbs: lose their 1st consonant (usu. *j*, *n*, *l*)

Some have a TI and some don't:

	Masculine			
	Past	Future	TI	Normative Imperative
'to give'	natan	t-iten	ten	ten
'to approach'	nigaʃ	t-igaʃ	gaʃ	gaʃ
'to take'	lakax	t-ikax	kax	kax
'to travel'	nasa	t-isa	sa	sa
'to descend'	jarad	t-ered	red	red
'to go out'	jatsa	t-etse	tse	tse
'to sit'	jaʃav	t-eʃev	ʃev	ʃev
'to sleep'	jaʃan	t-iʃan	<b>tiʃan</b>	jeʃan
'to inherit'	jaraʃ	t-iraʃ	<b>tiraʃ</b>	
'to suck'	janak	t-inak	<b>tinak</b>	
'to create'	jatsar	t-itsor	<b>titsor</b>	
'to spit'	jarak	t-irak	<b>tirak</b>	jerak

Bat-El proposes that the missing consonant wants to correspond to the first vowel in the future, which would then belong to the stem. But only in the third group is the correspondence a good one (some IDENT-type constraint allows no consonants to alternate with *i* except *j*):

ti-rák j <sub>1</sub> arák	ID(hi-C/V)	ONSET	MAXstem	¬MAX	FAITH-σ	MAX
☞ ti <sub>1</sub> rák				*		
i <sub>1</sub> rák		*!				*
trák			*!		*	*
rák			*!			**

In the other groups, the correspondence is so bad that the vowel deletes:

te-réd j <sub>1</sub> arád	ID(hi C/V)	ONSET	MAXstem	¬MAX	FAITH-σ	MAX
te <sub>1</sub> réd	*!			*		
e <sub>1</sub> réd	*!	*!				*
tréd			*		*!	*
☞ réd			*			**

- How exactly do we evaluate MAXstem—what ensures that there's a violation in the truncated candidates?

- Is this really split basehood, or are we seeing a chain of derivation (does anything rule that out)?

Bat-El makes a similar argument for B-III forms like [t-azkir] > [tazkir], where the [a] belongs to the stem because it corresponds to the first vowel of the past [h-izkir].

“The unexpected number of syllables in the future base activates reference to the past form.” (p. 673)