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To the memory of l’avi en Toni

I. BASIC FACTS

Minorcan Catalan has an intriguing case of morpheme non-realization that is prosodically-driven and that cannot be accounted for allomorphically. Kinship appositional phrases are generally realized with the structure Es the-M.DEF.ART conco uncle en the-M.PERS.ART Jaume James (‘uncle James’) when the personal name starts with a consonant (1), but with the structure Es the-M.DEF.ART conco uncle Ò Angél (‘uncle Ángel’) when the personal name starts with a vowel (2). That is, the personal article en fails to surface when the personal name starts with a vowel. The same path, with non-realization of the personal article, is detected before feminine personal names (3).

Kinship appositional phrases in the Minorcan Catalan DP

(1) Masculine personal name starting with a consonant
es conco en [eskòŋkun] Toni / Jaume / Rafel / Pedro
the-M.DEF.ART uncle the-M.PERS.ART Tony, etc.
(‘uncle Tony’, ‘uncle James’, ‘uncle Raphael’, ‘uncle Peter’)
l’avi en [lāviŋ] Toni / Jaume / Rafel / Pedro
the-M.DEF.ART grandfather the-M.PERS.ART Toni, etc.

(2) Masculine personal name starting with a vowel
es conco Ò [eskòŋkud] Òngel / Ignasi / Enric
the-M.DEF.ART uncle Ò James, etc.
(‘uncle Ángel’, ‘uncle Ignasi’, ‘uncle Henry’) 
l’avi Ò [lāviŋd] Òngel / Ignasi / Enric
the-M.DEF.ART grandfather Ò Òngel, etc.
(‘grandfather Ángel’, ‘grandfather Ignasi’, ‘grandfather Henry’)

(3) Feminine personal name
sa tia [ststiaŋ] Catalina / Margarita / Amparo
the-F.DEF.ART aunt Ò Catalina, etc.
(‘aunt Catalina’, ‘aunt Margarita’, ‘aunt Amparo’)
s’àvia [s’āvjaŋ] Catalina / Margarita / Amparo
the-F.DEF.ART grandmother Ò Catalina, etc.
(‘grandmother Catalina’, ‘grandmother Margarita’, ‘grandmother Amparo’)

II. GOALS

- To identify the factors explaining the asymmetries between morpheme realization and morpheme non-realization in kinship appositional phrases in the Minorcan Catalan DP.
- To show that these asymmetries can be formalized straightforwardly within a parallel and global OT framework through the interaction of standard (morpho)prosodic constraints (McCarthy & Prince 1993, Selkirk 1996 / 2003; Prince & Smolensky 1993 / 2004) with morpheme realization constraints (see Selkirk 2001, Kurisu 2001, among others).
- To explore the nature and the typology of morpheme realization constraints, on the basis of Selkirk’s (2001) original proposal and the data taken into consideration.
III. Some Relevant Empirical Facts

A. To understand es conco vs. l’avi...

(5) Default definite article paradigm in Minorcan Catalan (called “article salat”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite article paradigm in Minocan Catalan (called “article salat”)</th>
<th>Definite article paradigm in Minocan Catalan (called “article salat”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>es /s/</td>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.sg. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.sg. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea /s+2/</td>
<td>[s] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es /s/</td>
<td>[s] animal ‘the animal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] animal ‘the animal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea /s+z/</td>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow windows’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow windows’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a V</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es /s+z/²</td>
<td>[zd] animals ‘the animals’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zd] animals ‘the animals’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article paradigm in other Catalan varieties (called “article literari”)</td>
<td>Definite article paradigm in other Catalan varieties (called “article literari”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite article paradigm in other Catalan varieties (called “article literari”)</th>
<th>Definite article paradigm in other Catalan varieties (called “article literari”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>es /s/</td>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.sg. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.sg. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea /s+2/</td>
<td>[s] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] boìnder ‘the bow window’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es /s/</td>
<td>[s] animal ‘the animal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] animal ‘the animal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea /s+z/</td>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow windows’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z] boìnder ‘the bow windows’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a V</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es /s+z/²</td>
<td>[zd] animals ‘the animals’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zd] animals ‘the animals’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
<td>F.pl. Def. Art. + noun starting with a C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. To (partially) understand es conco en Jaume vs. es conco Àngel

(6) Personal article paradigm in Catalan (and Spanish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal article paradigm in Catalan (and Spanish)</th>
<th>Personal article paradigm in Catalan (and Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most Catalan varieties</td>
<td>b) Minorcan Catalan (and other Balearic varieties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Valencian Catalan (and other W varieties)</td>
<td>d) Spanish (most varieties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Joan, l’Àngel</td>
<td>en Joan, n’Àngel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Maria, l’Àngela</td>
<td>la Maria, n’Àngela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n’Àngel</td>
<td>Maria, n’Àngela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en Joan, n’Àngel</td>
<td>Maria, n’Àngela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Maria, l’Àngela</td>
<td>Maria, l’Àngela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Maria, n’Àngela</td>
<td>Maria, N’Àngela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def. article ≠ Pers. article</td>
<td>Different forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def. article ≠ Pers. article</td>
<td>Def. article ≠ Pers. article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def. article ≠ Pers. article</td>
<td>Def. article ≠ Pers. article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Latin: IPSUM, IPSAM; IPSOS, IPSAS [See, among others, Colomina (2002: 545)]

EC = Eastern Catalan; WC: Western Catalan

Although...

(7) Mixt paradigm in Minorcan Catalan (also in Majorcan Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixt paradigm in Minorcan Catalan (also in Majorcan Catalan)</th>
<th>Mixt paradigm in Minorcan Catalan (also in Majorcan Catalan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>es, s’, sa, s’</td>
<td>default forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| el, la, els, les | specific contexts, such as...

- nouns designating unique entities:
  - el sol ‘the sun’, la lluna ‘the moon’, el món ‘the world’, la Terra ‘the earth’, el bon Jesús ‘the Good Man Jesus’, el papa ‘the pope’,
  - el Barça, el Madrid, el Manchester, el Paris Saint-Germain
- lexicalized expressions and the like:
  - a l’esquerra ‘to the left’, a la dreta ‘to the right’, a la fresca ‘in the cool air’, etc.
- the expression of the hours:
  - les dues ‘two o’clock’, les tres ‘three o’clock’, les quatre ‘four o’clock’, etc.
- nouns designating traditionally respected entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nouns designating traditionally respected entities</th>
<th>nouns designating traditionally respected entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l’avi ‘my grandfather’</td>
<td>Cf. s’avia ‘my grandmother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’amó ‘the farmer masc.’</td>
<td>Cf. sa madonna ‘the farmer fem.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[See, among others, Veny 1978 / 1982; Colomina 2002, Mascaro & Pons-Moll (ms.)]
C. More about the distribution \( \text{en} \) [before C] / \( \emptyset \) [before V] in kinship appositional phrases

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(9)} & \quad \text{+C} \quad [\text{M. Pers. Name}] & \text{+V} \quad [\text{M. Pers. Name}] \\
& \quad a. \text{ es } \text{conco} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[kòŋkùn]} \quad \text{Toni} & \quad \text{*es } \text{conco n’Ernest} & \quad \text{es } \text{conco} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{kòŋkù]\text{ (E)Ernest}} \\
& \quad \text{es } \text{conco} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[kòŋkùn]} \quad \text{Rafel} & \quad \text{*es } \text{conco n’Àngel} & \quad \text{es } \text{conco} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{kòŋkù]\text{ Àngel}} \\
& \quad \text{es } \text{conco} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[kòŋkùm]} \quad \text{Pedro} & \quad \text{*es } \text{conco n’Ignasi} & \quad \text{es } \text{conco} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{kòŋkù]\text{ Ignasi}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘uncle Toni, etc.’} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘uncle Ernest, etc.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{b. } \text{l’avi} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[ài]vïn} \quad \text{Toni} & \quad \quad \text{‘l’avi n’Ernest} & \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{ài}] \text{ (E)Ernest}} \\
& \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[ài]vïn} \quad \text{Rafel} & \quad \quad \text{*l’avi n’Àngel} & \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{ài}] \text{ Àngel}} \\
& \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[ài]vïn} \quad \text{Joan} & \quad \quad \text{*l’avi n’Enric} & \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{ài}] \text{ Enric}} \\
& \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[ài]vïn} \quad \text{Pedro} & \quad \quad \text{*l’avi n’Ignasi} & \quad \text{l’avi} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{ài}] \text{ Ignasi}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘grandfather Toni, etc.’} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘grandfather Ernest, etc.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{c. } \text{l’amo} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[àmun]} \quad \text{Toni} & \quad \quad \text{‘l’amo n’Ernest} & \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{àmun}] \text{ (E)Ernest}} \\
& \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[àmun]} \quad \text{Rafel} & \quad \quad \text{*l’amo n’Àngel} & \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{àmun}] \text{ Àngel}} \\
& \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[àmun]} \quad \text{Joan} & \quad \quad \text{*l’amo n’Enric} & \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{àmun}] \text{ Enric}} \\
& \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{[àmun]} \quad \text{Pedro} & \quad \quad \text{*l’amo n’Ignasi} & \quad \text{l’amo} \quad \emptyset \quad [\text{àmun}] \text{ Ignasi}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘farmer Toni’} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘farmer Ernest, etc.’}
\end{align*}
\]

D. More about \( \emptyset \) [before F. Pers. Name]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(10)} & \quad \text{+[F. Pers. Name]} \\
& \quad \text{*sa tia na Catalina} & \quad \text{sa tia} \quad \emptyset \quad [sotsò\emptyset]\text{ Catalina}} \\
& \quad \text{*sa tia na Trini} & \quad \text{sa tia} \quad \emptyset \quad [sotsò\emptyset]\text{ Trini}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘aunt Catalina, Trini, etc.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{*s’àvia na Catalina} & \quad \text{s’àvia} \quad \emptyset \quad [sàvijsò\emptyset]\text{ Catalina}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{*s’àvia na Trini} & \quad \text{s’àvia} \quad \emptyset \quad [sàvijsò\emptyset]\text{ Trini}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{‘grandmother Catalina / Trini, etc.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In Minorcan Catalan, nasals assimilate in place of articulation to the following consonant when the intersyllabic sonority is decreasing or the same; otherwise, they undergo total assimilation (see Pons-Moll 2011).

E. Other analogous cases

\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{[kàl`m]} \quad \text{Bosch} & \quad \text{\*càla na Blanca} & \quad \text{càla} \quad \emptyset \quad [kàl`\emptyset]\text{ Blanca}} \\
& \quad \text{[kàl`m]} \quad \text{Blanes} & \quad \text{\*càla na Mitjana} & \quad \text{càla} \quad \emptyset \quad [kàl`\emptyset]\text{ Mitjana}} \\
& \quad \text{[kàl`m]} \quad \text{Brut} & \quad \text{\*càla na Rotja} & \quad \text{càla} \quad \emptyset \quad [kàl`\emptyset]\text{ Rotja}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Bosch/Blanes/Brut cove’)  
(‘Blanca/Mitjana/Rotja cove’)

IV. Theoretical background


\[
\rightarrow \text{a. Constraints on prosodic domination} \\
\rightarrow \text{b. Constraints on alignment of constituent edges} (\text{McCarthy & Prince 1993})
\]

According to Selkirk’s (1996 / 2003: page 10 [ms.]) proposal, the “set of constraints governing the interface between morphosyntactic and prosodic structure makes no reference to functional categories at all. Rather, it is only lexical categories and their phrasal projections which would figure in the statement of morphosyntactic constraints on prosodic structure.” (See also Selkirk 1984.)
(13) Prosodically-driven morpheme non-realization (Selkirk 2001)

a. → Circumstances in which phonology may influence the morphosyntax of the sentence
   — Those where the phonological constraint ranking may force the non-realization (interpreted as deletion) of a function word, and which are only possible if that deletion is recoverable (see Pesetsky 1998).
   — Those in which the phonological constraint ranking may force the non-realization of the whole sentence containing the function word, leading to a late “crashing” of the derivation, and which are triggered when the deletion of the word is not recoverable.

b. → Involved principle (external to the constraint hierarchy)

   → “The principle of Recoverability checks the output of Eval” (Selkirk 2001: 261).
   → “Types of Non-realization and Recoverability

     i. The non-realization of a in a phonologically illicit configuration. When the optimal output candidate S’ corresponding to a specific input S contains a violation of Realize(a), and the absence of a in the output S’ does not incur a Recoverability violation, then a is simply not realized. [Most of the cases identified in the literature correspond to this situation, see Kurisu 2001; for Catalan, see Bonet et al., who analyze a segmentally-driven case subject to prenominal and postnominal concord asymmetry in NEC.]

     ii. The non-realization of a sentence with a in a phonologically illicit configuration. When the optimal output candidate S’ corresponding to a specific input S contains a violation of Realize(a), and the absence of a in the output does incur a Recoverability violation, then neither the optimal output S’ nor any other output candidate with the same input S is realized (“The derivation crashes”).” (p. 261)

V. PROPOSAL AND ANALYSIS

— Since the morphosyntactic structure in (1) and (2) is identical, the answer to this asymmetric behavior might be in the phonology.

— According to our proposal, the asymmetric behavior depicted in (1) and (2)→(3) is mainly driven by the constraint Align(PWd, L; Lex, L) (see 14a), which expresses the preference for prosodic words to be left-aligned with lexical categories and which therefore excludes intervening functional categories.

— Whereas it is possible to satisfy this constraint without challenging Catalan basic syllabification constraints (i.e. *C.V) when the personal name starts with a consonant (i.e. *[ks.kön.kun.])pwo ([tsw.m2])pwo), it is not when the personal name starts with a vowel (i.e. *[(ks.kön.kun.])pwo, ((kən.zək])pwo).

— The interaction of this constraint with right-alignment requirements between the prosodic word and the lexical category also explains the patterns found in feminine names.

— The effects of this constraint, on the other hand, are inhibited by the need to realize phonologically a morpheme when its carried information is not recoverable. This explains its realization when occurring outside the kinship appositional phrase, where no local antecedent is available (see Pesetsky 1998).

— The discrepant behavior in relation to morpheme realization, depending on its (un)recoverable carried information, advocates splitting the constraints demanding morpheme-realization into two categories (see 14b and 14c). In our proposal, both are assumed to be part of the constraint hierarchy.

(14) Relevant basic constraints

a. Morphoprosodic constraint

   Align(PWd, L; Lex, L): Assign one violation mark for every prosodic word which is not left-aligned with a lexical category (see McCarthy & Prince 1993, Selkirk 1996/2003)

   [From Generalized Alignment constraints; see the appendix]

b. Constraints on morpheme realization

   MAX-Morpheme: For every token φ of the feature F, assign a violation mark if φ is in the morphosyntactic structure and has no correspondent in the phonological structure. (Adapted from Wolf 2008) [Constraint variously termed: Realize-Morpheme; see Kurisu 2001, Selkirk 2001; Morpheme Exponent, etc.]

   MAX-Morpheme(Unrecoverable): For every token φ of the feature F, assign a violation mark if φ is in the morphosyntactic structure and has no correspondent in the phonological structure and its carried morphosyntactic information cannot be recovered (Adapted from Wolf 2008, Selkirk 2001, after Pesetsky 1998).

(15) Basic constraint hierarchy in Minorcan Catalan

MAX-Morpheme(Unrecoverable) >> Align(PWd, L; Lex, L) >> MAX-Morpheme
--- Isolated constructions of PERSONAL ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME

(16) en Jaume, n’Àngel, na Catalina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>es conco Àngel</th>
<th>Max-Morph (Unrec)</th>
<th>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</th>
<th>Max-Morph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. /n#ząw/ M.PERS.ART Jaume</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. (nasząw,ma2)Pw0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (ząw,ma2)Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. /n#ząw/ M.PERS.ART Àngel</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. ([nàŋ,ʒàl])Pw0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ([ŋàŋ,ʒàl])Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. /n+3#kɔtaльн+s/ F.PERS.ART Catalina</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. ([n+kɔtaльн,li,na])Pw0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ([kɔtaльн,li,na])Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important interim remarks:**
- Ranking argument: Max-Morph(Som.Where) > ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L)
- The effects of ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L) are inhibited by Max-Morph(Unrec)
- "A syntactic unit with semantic content must be pronounced (=realized) unless it has a sufficiently local antecedent" (Pesetsky 1998, apud Selkirk 2011)

--- Kinship appositional phrases: es conco en Jaume vs. es conco ØÀngel / sa tia ØÀngel

(17) es conco en Jaume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/s#konzk+u#s#n#ząw/ M.DEF.ART conco M.PERS.ART Jaume</th>
<th>Max-Morph (Unrec)</th>
<th>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</th>
<th>Max-Morph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (sokonzku,za2)Pw0, (ząw,ma2)Pw0, (ząw,ma2)Pw0</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. (szokonzku,za2)Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (szokonzku,za2)Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. (szokonzku,za2)Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the vocalic contact created in candidate c, see 22.

**Important interim remarks:**
- Note that all candidates incur at least one violation of ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L), since the DEF.ART es ([sɔ]) or sa [sɔ], see below) intervenes between the PWD and the lexical category in all cases.
- Although we do not consider candidates with non-realization of this functional morpheme, they would be discarded by Max-Morph(Unrec). [Recall: "A syntactic unit with semantic content must be pronounced (=realized) unless it has a sufficiently local antecedent" (Pesetsky 1998, apud Selkirk 2011)]

--- Isolated constructions of PERSONAL ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME

(18) es conco Àngel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/s#konzk+u#s#n#ząw/ M.DEF.ART conco M.PERS.ART Àngel</th>
<th>Max-Morph (Unrec)</th>
<th>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</th>
<th>Max-Morph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (sokonzku,za2)Pw0</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. (szokonzku,za2)Pw0</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For the logical additional candidate ([sokonzku,za2]Pw0, ([ŋàŋ,ʒàl])Pw0, see 20.)

**Important interim remarks:**
- Ranking argument: ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L) > Max-Morph
- Additional ranking argument: ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L) > ONSET

--- Isolated constructions of PERSONAL ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME

(19) sa tia Catalina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/s#tia+u#s#kɔtaльн+s/ F.DEF.ART. tia F.PERS.ART Catalina</th>
<th>Max-Morph (Unrec)</th>
<th>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</th>
<th>Max-Morph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (stia,li,na)Pw0</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
<td>ALIGN (PWD, Lex, L)</td>
<td>Max-Morph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (stia,li,na)Pw0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important interim remarks:**
- Ranking argument: ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L) > Max-Morph
- Alternative prosodifications satisfying ALIGN(PWD, Lex, L)

--- Isolated constructions of PERSONAL ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME

(20) why not: ([sokonzku,za2]Pw0, ([ŋàŋ,ʒàl])Pw0, like ([sokonzku,za2]Pw0, ([ząw,ma2]Pw0

--- Isolated constructions of PERSONAL ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME
(21) Why not: ((sa.ti.a))ₚₚₒ ((na)ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ \\
((so.ti.a)ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ \\
| /ALIGN \\
| (PWd, Lex, L) \\
| /ALIGN \\
| (PWd, Lex, R) \\
| \ /max-

MAX- \\
Morph \\
(Unrec) \\
MAX- \\
Morph \\

| a. ((sa.ti.a))ₚₚₒ ((na.ko.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ **!** | * | * | *(!)
| b. ((so.ti.a))ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ * | * | * | *
| c. ((so.ti.a))ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ * | * | *! | *
| d. ((sa.ti.a))ₚₚₒ ((na))ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ **(!) | *(!) | *

Important interim remarks:

- Activity of the constraint: ALIGN(PWd, Lex, R)/₁σ: Assign one violation for every syllable intervening between the right edge of the Prosodic Word and the right edge of the Lexical Category.
- ALIGN(PWd, Lex, R)/₁σ is violated by ((so.ti.a)ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ, but it is not by ((sa.ko.ku.nu.ₚₚₒ ((jaₚₚₒ ma)ₚₚₒ. (While the former implies an intervening syllable, the latter does not.)
- ALIGN(PWd, Lex, R), on the contrary, is violated by both prosodifications.
- The specific ranking ALIGN(PWd, Lex, R) /₁σ >> MAX-Morph >> ALIGN(PWd, Lex, R) (not completely illustrated in the preceding tableau) explains why ((sa.ti.a)ₚₚₒ ((ka.ta.li.na))ₚₚₒ is not a possible prosodification in Minorcan Catalan, whereas it is ((sa.ko.ku.nu.ₚₚₒ ((jaₚₚₒ ma)ₚₚₒ)

- Additional circumstances: vocalic contacts

- Note the difference between:

  *caldo acido* /kald+u#asid/ [kαl.du.asit] → vowel preservation
  ‘acid soup’ (= coneco _Angel_ [koₚₚₒ ku.an.zₚₚₒ])

  *caldo antico* /kald+u#ontig/ [kαl.du.nₚₚₒ.tik] → vowel deletion
  ‘old soup’ (= coneco _Ernest_ [koₚₚₒ ku.nu.nu.zₚₚₒ])

  *caldo horrores* /kald+u#urcₚₚₒ+oz/ [kαl.du.ru.roz] → vowel deletion
  ‘terrible soup’ (= coneco _Ulari_ [koₚₚₒ ku.la ri])

(22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/#konk+u#n#n#n#n#n#n#n#n</th>
<th>PROSOD-DRIVEN MORPHEME NON-REALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAX-Morph (Unrec)</strong></td>
<td>ALIGN (PWd, Lex, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((na.nu.zₚₚₒ)ₚₚₒ <strong>!</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b. ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((nₚₚₒ.zₚₚₒ)ₚₚₒ | * | * | *
| c. ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((nₚₚₒ.zₚₚₒ)ₚₚₒ | * | *! | *
| d. ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((nₚₚₒ)ₚₚₒ | * | * | *

— Activity of the markedness constraint(s):

*[VV₁-stress]: Assign one violation mark for every sequence of contiguous identical unstressed vowels (Prince & Smolensky 1993; for Catalan, see Campmany 2008). [This one would be relevant for cases such as es coneco Ulari (from Eulari), es conuc[u]ₚₚₒ [uₚₚₒ lari] (shortened form)]

*V[IV₂-stress]: Assign one violation mark for every sequence of contiguous unstressed vowels, one of them being a schwa (Prince & Smolensky 1993; for Catalan, see Campmany 2008). [1/2 = schwa] [Responsible for: caldo antic [kαl.du.nₚₚₒ tik], porta oberta [pₚₚₒ tu.jer.tɔ]]. (Shortened form)]

VI. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSES

a) External allomorphy

— An external allomorphic account based on the double lexical representation /konku/ – /konku/ (after a conceivable diachronic process of agglutination of coneco + en) is not feasible: it is not possible to derive the selection of /konku:/ before a word starting with a vowel, given the constraint ONSET. One would expect, indeed, the selection of the alternative allomorph (i.e. /konku/), which would entail the satisfaction of ONSET, through resyllabification (cf. *es.con.co. nₚₚₒ An.gel*), but this is not the case.

— One could give, of course, lexical priority to the allomorph /konku/ and rank the constraint PRIORITY above ONSET (see Mascareño 2007, Bonet et al. 2007 for this kind of approach applied to other Catalan data), but this way it would be impossible to derive ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((jaₚₚₒ ma)ₚₚₒ, with the selection of the non-prioritized allomorph.

— Note that under this perspective ALIGN(PWd, Lex, L) has nothing to say, since a prosodification such as ((sa.ko.ku.ₚₚₒ ((naₚₚₒ.zₚₚₒ)ₚₚₒ would satisfy this constraint, in that [n] is part of a Lexical Category. (But: es coneco Jaumés; *es coneco Jaumés.)

— An independent approach would be necessary, on the other hand, to account for the feminine cases, losing therefore strength in the analysis.
b) Alternative morphoprosodic alignment constraints?

— Interaction of the constraint ALIGN(EN, R, PWd, R) (which states “Assign one violation mark for every instance of en that is not right-aligned with the Prosodic Word”) with the rest of constraints proposed in this talk.

Remarks & problems:

— Similar account, within a different framework, is found in Zec & Inkelas (1990) for Hausa.
— Ad hoc constraint to account just for these data, as opposed to the one we propose (i.e. ALIGN(PWd, Lex, L), which is drawn from Generalized Alignment and which prevents from making explicit reference to functional elements; see Selkirk 1996/2003, and above).
— Counter-intuitive explanation, in that we would expect the opposite behavior for proclisis, with alignment to the left edge of the PWd.

— Interaction of the constraint ALIGN(R-PWd, Noun-L) (which states that the left edge of the personal noun must be aligned with the right edge of the preceding Prosodic Word) with the rest of constraints proposed in this paper.

Remarks:

— Similar effects and motivations than ALIGN(PWd, Lex, L).
— What we obtain with this constraint (and also with ALIGN(PWd, Lex, L)) is that the personal article is prosodically grouped with the preceding material (i.e. es conco), constituting a monolithic prosodic word preceding the one integrated by the personal name (as in [[es.kóp.ku]]pwa [[fázw.má]]pwa), and not with the following material (as in “[[es.kóp.ku]]pwa [[nán.35l]]pwa). That is, the prosodic word constituted by the personal name is free of clitic material.

VII. Conclusions, theoretical implications and further issues

— A parallel and a global OT approach is powerful enough to account for the data under consideration, without the introduction of ad hoc stipulations or sophisticated refinements.
— It can be claimed that phonology (expressed through a specific constraint hierarchy that places prosodic and morpheme realizational constraints at the same level) “can act as a filter of some morphosyntactic constructions, without the need to make assumptions about whether syntactic constraints must in general dominate phonological constraints (Golston 1996), or whether phonological constraints may in principle dominate syntactic constraints (Zec & Inkelas 1990)” (See Selkirk 2001: 269).

— Beyond the behavior depicted in (2), it is possible to find alternative morphosyntactic constructions: n’Àngel, es conco, es conco, n’Àngel, etc. The question raised, still to be explored in depth, is how the constraint Max-Morph(unrec) interacts with the rest of constraints and which additional mechanism is necessary to decide between morpheme realization and a “crash” in the derivation and the subsequent generation of an alternative morphosyntactic construction. (See the discussion between hard and soft constraints in Orgun & Sprouse 1999.)
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**Appendix**

**The Word Alignment Constraints (WdCon)**

(i) ALIGN(Lex, L; PWd, L) (= WdConL)

(ii) ALIGN(Lex, R; PWd, R) (= WdConR)

**The Prosodic Word Alignment Constraints (PWdCon)**

(i) ALIGN(PWd, L; Lex, L) (= PWdConL)

(ii) ALIGN(PWd, R; Lex, R) (= PWdConR)

(Selkirk 1996 / 2003: 10 [ms.])
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McCarthy & Prince (1993: 2 [ms.])