

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Overview of Morphological Models .....	9
1.3 Theoretical Framework .....	15
1.3.1 Optimality Theory .....	15
1.3.2 Correspondence Theory .....	18
1.3.3 Sympathy Theory .....	21
1.4 Organization .....	24
<b>Chapter 2 Deriving Nonconcatenative Morphology</b> .....	<b>27</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	27
2.2 Anti-Faithfulness Effects .....	29
2.3 Characterizing "Realize Morpheme" .....	37
2.4 Emergence of Nonconcatenative Morphology .....	56
2.5 Against Anti-Faithfulness Theory .....	67
2.6 Summary .....	76
<b>Chapter 3 Truncatory Morphology</b> .....	<b>79</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	79
3.2 Subtractive Morphology .....	81
3.2.1 Koasati .....	83
3.2.2 Lardil .....	100
3.2.3 Icelandic .....	110
3.2.4 Hessian German .....	117
3.2.5 Summary .....	123
3.3 Templatic Truncation .....	124
3.4 Summary .....	133
<b>Chapter 4 Optimality of Nonconcatenative Allomorphs</b> .....	<b>135</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	135
4.2 Nonconcatenative Allomorphs as Word Optimization .....	137
4.3 The Continuative in Upriver Halkomelem .....	142
4.3.1 Facts and Descriptive Generalization .....	143
4.3.2 Analysis .....	145

4.3.3	Urbanczyk (1998).....	152
4.4	The Actual Aspect in Saanich .....	156
4.4.1	Facts and Descriptive Generalization.....	157
4.4.2	Analysis .....	159
4.4.3	Montler (1989) and Stonham (1994).....	164
4.5	The Incomplete Phase in Rotuman.....	167
4.5.1	Facts and Descriptive Generalization.....	169
4.5.2	Analysis .....	172
4.5.3	McCarthy (2000c) .....	180
4.6	Summary .....	189
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Double Morphemic Exponence as Morphological Opacity .....</b>	<b>191</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	191
5.2	Morphological Opacity and Sympathy Theory .....	193
5.3	Dominant Affix Effects in Japanese.....	207
5.3.1	Facts and Descriptive Generalization.....	207
5.3.2	Analysis .....	209
5.4	The Impersonal Formation in Chaha.....	214
5.4.1	Facts and Descriptive Generalization.....	214
5.4.2	Morphemic Representation of the Impersonal .....	216
5.4.3	Selector Constraint Revisited .....	222
5.4.4	Analysis .....	227
5.5	Affixation-Reduplication Interactions in Tagalog .....	231
5.5.1	Multiple Functions of Affixation and Reduplication .....	231
5.5.2	Emergence of the Unmarked in Reduplication .....	236
5.6	Phonological Polarity .....	245
5.7	Theoretical Predictions.....	249
5.8	Summary .....	259
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>261</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>273</b>

## **Abstract**

### The Phonology of Morpheme Realization

Kazutaka Kurisu

This dissertation addresses the question of how various types of morpheme realization are to be coherently explained within the framework of Optimality Theory (Prince and Smolensky 1993). Paying close attention to a-templatic nonconcatenative morphological processes such as subtractive morphology and umlaut, I develop a formal theory dubbed "Realizational Morphology Theory (RMT)".

The most important claim of this dissertation is that a **REALIZE MORPHEME (RM)** constraint plays a central role in a comprehensive and principled understanding of realizational morphology. In nonconcatenative morphology, its interactions with faithfulness constraints are of crucial importance. A second important proposal is the relativization of faithfulness constraints with respect to morphosyntactic categories. Given these two proposals, I demonstrate that the entire range of a-templatic nonconcatenative morphology is obtained through the ranking **RM » Faith**.

RMT not only covers morpheme realization in general but also has a number of desirable theoretical consequences. First, various descriptive devices such as zero morphs and floating features can be dispensed with, therefore simplifying the theory of morphology. Second, RMT is restrictive, eliminating unlikely morphological constructions. Especially, RMT eliminates the possibility of two simultaneous stem modifications. This argument is couched in terms of harmonic bounding (Prince and Smolensky 1993:176-178). This restrictiveness plays an important role in a critical evaluation of anti-faithfulness theory (Alderete 1999) since the latter predicts the existence of cases where a single morpheme receives more than one stem change.

The organization of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter 1 is a general introduction, mapping out the overall goals in the context of previous works. Chapter 2 is devoted to the development of RMT. The remaining chapters are devoted to exemplification of RMT and to its further theoretical development. In chapter 3, I discuss morphological truncation. Chapter 4 discusses complementary distribution of nonconcatenative allomorphs, and in chapter 5, I examine constraint interactions resulting in two simultaneous phonological realizations of a single morpheme. Finally, chapter 6 summarizes the main results of this dissertation.

## **Acknowledgments**

A number of people have contributed to my completion of this dissertation at various stages. First of all, I express my deep gratitude to my dissertation committee: Armin Mester, Junko Itô and Jaye Padgett.

Armin Mester was one of the best advisors for me that I could imagine. He showed his strong interest in this dissertation from the beginning to the end. His challenging criticisms and insightful comments always inspired me. He gave me a number of invaluable suggestions to make the analysis shaper and solid. I believe that this dissertation would never have been here without his constant advising and encouragement.

Junko Itô has been a heroine of phonology for me. The first phonology paper that I read was her work on Japanese prosodic minimality. I remember that I was deeply impressed and started to get into phonology. It was really lucky for me that I had her as one of my committee members. Her comments were always large scaled and reminded me of the position of my dissertation within a large context.

Jaye Padgett has a very sharp eye to look at phonology. His comments and polite criticisms always got to the heart of my dissertation. His constant attitude to seek deeper explanations behind phonology has had tremendous influence on me throughout my graduate years at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Besides my dissertation committee members, a number of people deserve special thanks. During my years at the University of California, Santa Cruz, other faculty members helped me in numerous dimensions: class instruction, paper writing, collaboration through an instructor-TA/RA relation and so forth. Various interactions with the faculty members were precious experiences for me to establish myself as a professional linguist. I express my deep gratitude to the department to foster such an

active environment. I would like to thank in particular Judith Aissen, Donka Farkas and Jim McCloskey.

Among my fellows, Adam Ussishkin deserves special thanks. We were both writing a dissertation during the summer in 2000. We regularly met and exchanged comments. He generously spent much time on reading my drafts and giving me invaluable comments. Nathan Sanders shared some research interest with me. Occasional informal discussion with him was very useful in developing various ideas. Rodrigo Gutierrez and Dylan Herrick have been both good listeners and friends.

Reflecting on the past five years, the former and present graduate students as well as visiting scholars have played an important role to me both in and outside linguistics. Listing just a few, they include Chris Gunlogson, Ryuji Harada, Takeru Honma, Daniel Karvonen, Motoko Katayama, Chris Kennedy, Brian Lindsey, Suzanne Lyon, Jason Merchant, Line Mikkelsen, Davina Ramirez, Philip Spaelti, Anne Sturgeon, Kunitoshi Takahashi, Emily Urban, Rachel Walker and Andy Wedel. Jennifer Smith, a visiting assistant professor, was also a good listener.

Some non-linguists also made a contribution to the successful completion of this dissertation. Among others, I would like to express my special thanks to Connie Creel, Ashley Hardisty and Tanya Honig for great administrative assistance as well as Paul Sosbee for his technical assistance for computers.

I benefited enormously from discussion with people outside the department as well. Among others, I thank John Alderete, Outi Bat-El and Paul Smolensky for listening to my ideas when they visited the University of California, Santa Cruz. I benefited indirectly from conversation with Stuart Davis, Paul Kiparsky, Larry Hyman and Peter Sells as well. Thanks to Haruka Fukazawa for her friendship.

Various portions of this dissertation were delivered at the following linguistics conferences: Asian GLOW at Nanzan University (1999), Phonology Forum at Tokyo Metropolitan University (1999), the sixth meeting of the Phonological Society of Japan at Chiba University (2000), and WECOL at the California State University, Fresno (2000). I would like to thank those people who gave me invaluable feedback on these occasions.

Finally, but most of all, I need to express my deepest gratitude to my parents: Akinori and Takami Kurisu. They constantly gave me tremendous moral support and love. I hereby express my sincere gratitude to them for their generous understanding, support and love. This dissertation is dedicated to you.