

CONSTRAINTS ON PHONOLOGICAL INTERACTIONS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Lev A. Blumenfeld

September 2006

© Copyright by Lev A. Blumenfeld 2006
All rights reserved

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Paul Kiparsky) Principal Adviser

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Arto Anttila)

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(William Leben)

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Armin Mester)

Approved for the University Committee on Graduate Studies.

Abstract

Optimality Theory (OT) is committed to a view of phonology where significant generalizations are placed in the character of output structures. Markedness constraints state these surface preferences, and grammars are free to choose from a variety of paths (repair strategies) that enforce the output structures. OT faces systematic difficulties with cases where a given markedness constraint is observed to cause fewer repairs than predicted by the theory. This dissertation examines several cases of this type, termed 'too-many-solutions' problems. I argue that the difficulty faced by OT is due to the significant phonological generalizations being most insightfully stated not as output preferences, but preferences for input-output mappings. I argue for a new type of OT markedness constraint to handle such 'procedural' generalizations. Unlike traditional markedness constraints, these new constraints penalize dispreferred processes rather than output forms. The typology of interactions between prosodic and segmental properties provides the empirical evidence for the proposals. The asymmetry between, on the one hand, those phonological categories to which stress can be sensitive, and on the other, those properties which it can condition has posed an intractable too-many-solutions problem for standard OT. At the root of the difficulties, I argue, is the fact that the important generalization in the domain of prosody-segmental interactions is in the processes, not the outputs. The formal proposals are first developed with reference to this empirical domain. I propose a theory of procedural markedness constraints which refer to the direction of interaction between the relevant categories. These constraints penalize the candidates that involve typologically unobserved repair strategies in such a way that those candidates cannot be optimal. In the final part of the dissertation I apply the new theory of constraints to another problematic too-many-solutions case, the typology of vowel syncope and epenthesis. Here, too, the procedural markedness constraints become necessary to account for systematic gaps in the conditioning environments of the two processes.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude, first, to the members of my committee. Paul Kiparsky has contributed to every aspect of my work at Stanford, from the first days to the dissertation. His inspired approach to linguistics, appreciation of complex arguments and artful analyses, and personal generosity have left a deep impression on many generations of students, and I am not an exception.

Arto Anttila has supplied a healthy dose of discipline, skepticism, and rigor, when any of the three were lacking. His penetrating questions have greatly improved the quality of both the ideas and the writing of this thesis.

I am grateful to Will Leben's careful and detailed criticism of many aspects of my work, as well as warm encouragement in the matters of research and pedagogy.

Armin Mester, the external member of my committee, brought a fresh perspective, new questions, and new ideas to this project. I thank him for his meticulous and immensely helpful comments on the drafts of my thesis, and for the fruitful discussions on many topics in phonology.

The importance of the issues addressed in this thesis first became clear to me in a 'directed reading' with Edward Flemming, for whose intelligent criticism and guidance at the earliest stages of my graduate work I am immensely grateful.

Many people outside of my thesis committee have helped me in various ways. I am grateful to John Beavers, Paul de Lacy, Nilson Gabas, Maria Gouskova, Bruce Hayes, Philip Hofmeister, Larry Hyman, Junko Itô, for her encouragement and insightful criticism of this project, Florian Jaeger, Andrew Koontz-Garboden, Jaye Padgett, A.K. Polivanova, for her recent and not so recent wise advice and generosity, Donca Steriade, Judith Tonhauser, Nina Topintzi, Paul Smolensky, and audiences at CLS, Berkeley, Stanford, and Santa Cruz.

I also wish to thank my department for its support over the past five years. Stanford has provided an optimal setting, with the right amount of the right kind of supervision at the right time, an absolute minimum of bureaucratic hassles, and an atmosphere that mixed independence with cooperation in the right proportion. This means that I, and not my

teachers, must take full responsibility for my not knowing many things about linguistics, and for the errors and shortcomings of this thesis.

Finally, I owe a private debt of gratitude to my family and friends in the U.S., Russia, and Latvia. As Wisława Szymborska once said, the simplest words are the most serious.

Thank you. Cnacубo. Paldies.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Prosody-segmental interactions: the typology	6
1.0 Introduction	6
1.1 The facts	6
1.1.1 Bidirectional interactions	8
1.1.1.1 Quantity	9
1.1.1.2 Tone	11
1.1.1.3 Sonority	11
1.1.2 Unidirectional interactions	11
1.2 Too many solutions	15
1.3 Counterexamples	22
1.3.1 Stress and lenition in Karo	23
1.3.2 Onset-sensitive stress	29
Chapter 2. Previous approaches to too-many-solutions problems	31
2.0 Introduction	31
2.1 Targeted Constraints	32
2.2 Fixed rankings	40
2.3 P-Map	52
Chapter 3. Asymmetrical interactions and asymmetrical constraints	65
3.0 Introduction	65
3.1 Is the generalization synchronic?	66
3.2 Locus of the generalization	70
3.3 Procedural constraints and the typology of repairs	73
3.3.1 Process in OT	75
3.3.1.1 Correspondence between candidates that share an input	78
3.3.1.2 Stress shift	80
3.3.1.3 Designated state	81
3.3.1.4 Process	84
3.3.2 The Implicational Constraint Principle	85
3.3.3 Tudañca Spanish	91
3.3.4 Candidates that incur ✦ violations are perpetual losers	96
3.3.5 More than one implicational constraint	101
3.4 Bidirectional interactions	108
3.5 Grounding the constraints	111
3.5.1 Typological grounding	111
3.5.2 Psycholinguistic evidence	113
3.6 Sonority-driven stress	122
3.6.0 Introduction	122

3.6.1	Quantity or sonority?	124
3.6.2	Separating prominence from metrical structure	128
3.6.2.1	The dual system of Mari	129
3.6.2.2	Stress or prominence?	132
3.6.2.3	Factorial typology in standard OT	134
3.7	Some applications	142
Chapter 4	Syncope and epenthesis with procedural constraints	147
4.0	Introduction	147
4.0.0	Introduction	147
4.0.1	What is 'context' in OT?	149
4.0.2	Epenthesis and syncope: introduction	151
4.1	Epenthesis	152
4.1.1	Rule-based views and the typology of epenthesis	152
4.1.2	Non-observed epenthesis: metrical constraints	158
4.1.3	Too many solutions and implicational constraints: epenthesis	161
4.1.3.1	NON-FIN	161
4.1.3.2	*CLASH	163
4.1.3.3	*LAPSE	164
4.1.4	Analysis of attested cases of epenthesis	165
4.2	Syncope	166
4.2.1	Rule-based views of syncope	167
4.2.2	Syncope in OT	171
4.2.3	Case studies	174
4.2.3.1	Carib	174
4.2.3.2	Tonkawa	179
4.2.3.3	Lebanese Arabic	181
4.2.3.4	Archaic Latin	188
4.2.3.5	Yers in Old Russian	190
4.2.3.6	Southeastern Tepehuan	196
4.2.3.7	Hopi	202
4.2.3.8	Central Alaskan Yupik	211
4.2.3.9	Bedouin Hijazi Arabic	214
4.2.4	Syncope blocking conditions	217
Conclusion		219
References		220