

## HOW UNNATURAL AND EXCEPTIONAL CAN LANGUAGES BECOME?

Eulàlia Bonet (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Maria-Rosa Lloret (Universitat de Barcelona)

Joan Mascaró (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

*Goal:* We examine two apparently very similar processes of Catalan, n-deletion and r-deletion, which do not have a natural synchronic explanation and which have a considerable number of lexical exceptions. We examine several ways to account for this type of phenomena. We further examine how different the two processes are and whether they are attested in other languages.

### I. N/R DELETION IN CATALAN

(1) *n* deletes in word-final position after a stressed vowel

a. talibà	‘taliban’	b. talibans (pl.)	c. talibanet ‘taliban (dim.)’
ple	‘full’	plena (fem.)	plenitud ‘fullness’
comú	‘common’	comunes (fem. pl.)	comunal ‘communal’
		(cf. dens ‘dense’, densitat ‘density’)	

(2) *n* does not delete in word-final position after a stressless vowel

plàtan	‘banana’	misogin	‘misogynist’
examen	‘exam’	àton	‘unstressed’

(3) *r* deletes in word-final position after a stressed vowel, followed or not by the plural morph

a. clar	[klá]	‘clear’	b. [klás]	‘clear (pl.)’
paper	[pəpé]	‘paper’	[pəpés]	‘papers’
monestir	[munəstí]	‘monastery’	[munəstís]	‘monasteries’
			(cf. vers [bérs] ‘verse’)	
c. clara	‘clear (fem.)’			
paperàs	‘big paper’			
monestiret	‘small monastery’			

(4) *r* does not delete in word-final position after a stressless vowel

bàrbar	‘barbarian’	semàfor	‘traffic-light’
caràcter	‘character’	màrtir	‘martyr’

(5) a. Other word-final nasals never delete

gram	[grám]	‘gram’
engany	[əŋgáɲ]	‘deceit’

b. Other word-final consonants (glides, laterals and obstruents) never delete

pou	[pów]	‘well’	cabàs	[kəβás]	‘shopping bag’
remei	[rəméj]	‘remedy’	guix	[gíʃ]	‘chalk’
sal	[sál]	‘salt’	tap	[táp]	‘cork’
fonoll	[funólɫ]	‘fennel’	paquet	[pəkét]	‘parcel’

## (6) Summary

	<i>Final stressed <math>\sigma</math></i>		<i>Final unstressed <math>\sigma</math></i>	<i>Others</i>
	<i>singular</i>	<i>plural</i>		
<i>n</i>	comú<n>	comuns	examen(s)	comuna, dens
<i>r</i>	cla<r>	cla<r>s	semàfor(s)	clara, vers

## II. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION

- (7)  $Vn > \tilde{V}n > \tilde{V} > V$   
 seren > serēn > serē > serè  
 serens > serēns > serens

- (8)  $Vrs > Vss > Vs$   
 clars > class > clas (pl.) → (sg.) cla < clar  
 (cf. also BURSA > bossa ‘bag’; URSU > ós ‘bear’)

## III. QUESTIONS

- (9) a. Why do *n* and *r* delete, and not other consonants with a different manner? (i.e., why not stops, fricatives, laterals or glides?)  
 b. Why does *n* delete, and not other nasals with a different place (*m* or *ɲ*)?  
 c. Why does *n/r*-deletion occur only in word-final position?  
 d. Why does *r*-deletion occur also in plurals?  
 e. Why does *n/r*-deletion affect only oxytones?

- (10)
- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| p | t   | k |
| b | d   | g |
| f | s   | ʃ |
|   | z   | ʒ |
| m | <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">n</span> | ɲ |
|   | <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">r</span> |   |
| l | ʎ   |   |
|   | j   | w |

## IV. A FIRST OT APPROACH

- (11) Why does *n/r*-deletion occur only in word-final position? (=9c)

Possible answer: ONSET, I-CONTIGUITY » \*n, \*r

- (12) a. /déns/: [déns] ‘dense’

/déns/	ONSET	I-CONT	*n
☞ a. déns			*
b. dés		*!	

b. /nusjón/: [nusjón] ‘notion’

/nusjón/	ONSET	I-CONT	*n
a. nusjón			**!
☞ b. nusjó			*
c. usjó	*!		

(13) Why does *n* delete, and not *m* or *ɲ*? (=9b)

a. Place markedness hierarchy (Prince and Smolensky 1993: §9.1.2):

\*Labial, \*Dorsal » \*Coronal

b. Phonetic grounding: Coronals have weaker cues than other places of articulation (Jun 1995, Flemming 1995):

- PRESERVE[F]: Preserve perceptual cues for input features (cf. MAX[F] in McCarthy and Prince 1999).

- Ranking: PRESERVE/Dorsal, PRESERVE/Labial » PRESERVE/Coronal

(14) a. /grám/: [grám] ‘gram’

/grám/	PRES/Lab	*m	*n	PRES/Cor
☞ a. grám		*		
b. grán	*!		*	
c. grá	*!			

b. /grán/: [grá] ‘pimple’

/grán/	PRES/Lab	*m	*n	PRES/Cor
a. grán			*!	
☞ b. grá				*

☛\* (15) Why do *n* and *r* delete, and not other consonants with a different manner? (i.e., why not stops, fricatives, laterals or glides?) (=9a)

a. Coda hierarchy ≠ Onset hierarchy (along the lines of Clements 1990):

\*Coda/obstruent » \*Coda/nasal » \*Coda/liquid » \*Coda/glide

\*Onset/glide » \*Onset/liquid » \*Onset/nasal » \*Onset/obstruent

b. Preserve/sibilant » Preserve/sonorant » Preserve/stop

c. Liquids other than *r* and glides could be excluded by assuming that they are articulatorily complex (with a secondary dorsal node) (cf. Kikuchi 2005).

☛\* (16) Why does *n/r*-deletion affect only oxytones? (=9e)

Prominent positions are usually more faithful to the input than non-prominent positions. (Cf. Bonet et al. 2004, contra Kikuchi 2002, 2005.)

## V. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSES

### V.1. Allomorphy

- (17) a. /plé/ in final position: [plé] ‘full (masc. sg.)’  
 /plén/ elsewhere: [plénə] (fem. sg.), [pléns] (masc. sg.), [plənitút] ‘fullness’, etc.
- b. /klá/ in final position and before plural s: [klá], [klás] ‘clear (masc. sg., pl.)’  
 /klár/ elsewhere: [klárə] (fem. sg.), [klərísim] ‘very clear’, etc. (Wheeler 2005)

### V.2. Crazy rules as parochial constraints

(18)

/nusjón/	*V <sub>n</sub> ##	*V <sub>r(+s)</sub> ##	MAX-C
a. nusjón	*!		
☞ b. nusjó			*
c. usjó			**!
/klár+s/			
d. klárs		*!	
☞ e. klás			*

### V.3. Crazy rules as local constraint conjunctions (Bonet et al 2004)

- The local conjunction of constraints C1 and C2 in domain D is violated if and only if both C1 and C2 are violated by the same instances of D (Smolensky 1995).

- (19) a. NONFINALITY&\*<sub>r</sub> (domain: PrWd)  
 b. NONFINALITY&\*<sub>n</sub> (domain: PrWd)  
 c. *Ranking*:  
 ONSET, I-CONT » NONFIN&\*<sub>r</sub> » J-CONT » NONFIN&\*<sub>n</sub> » MAX-C » \*<sub>r</sub>, \*<sub>n</sub>
- (20) NONFINALITY: The prosodic head of the word does not fall on the word-final syllable (“No Head of PrWd is final in PrWd”) (Prince and Smolensky 1993).
- (21) Why does *r*-deletion occur also in plurals? (=9d): JUNCTURE-CONTIGUITY  
 J(UNCTURE)-CONTIGUITY: If the elements in the input are contiguous across a morpheme boundary, their correspondents in the output must be contiguous. (Kikuchi 2002, 2005)  
 (Like I-CONTIGUITY but across morpheme boundaries; cf. Bonet and Lloret 1996)

- (22) *comú* /kumún/: [kumú] (sg.), [kumúns] (pl.) ‘common’

/kumún(+s)/	J-CONT	NONFIN&* <sub>n</sub>	MAX-C	NONFIN	* <sub>n</sub>
a. kumún		*!		*	*
☞ b. kumú			*	*	
☞ c. kumúns		*		*	*
d. kumús	*!		*	*	

(23) *examen* /əgzámən/: [əgzámən] (sg.), [əgzáməns] (pl.) ‘exam’

/əgzámən(+s)/	J-CONT	NONFIN&*n	MAX-C	NONFIN	*n
☞ a. əgzámən					*
b. əgzámə			*!		
☞ c. əgzáməns					*
d. əgzáməs	*!		*		

(24) *clar* /klár/: [klá] (sg.), [klás] (pl.) ‘clear’

/klár(+s)/	NONFIN&*r	J-CONT	MAX-C	NONFIN	*r
a. klár	*!			*	*
☞ b. klá			*	*	
c. klárs	*!			*	*
☞ d. klás		*	*	*	

(25) *semàfor* /səmáfur/: [səmáfur] (sg.), [səmáfurs] (pl.) ‘traffic-light’

/səmáfur(+s)/	NONFIN&*r	J-CONT	MAX-C	NONFIN	*r
☞ a. sëmáfur					*
b. sëmáfu			*!		
☞ c. sëmáfurs					*
d. sëmáfus		*!	*		

## VI. TREATMENT OF LEXICAL EXCEPTIONS

(26) Lexical exceptions

Ramon	‘Raymond’	car	‘expensive’
arran	‘close’	motor	‘engine’
nen	‘child’	futur	‘future’
tobogan	‘slide’	emir	‘emir’

(27) Exceptionality encoded in the representation of certain segments (Bonet &amp; Lloret 1996, Inkelas et al. 1996):

/R/ (floating segment): dolor /dulóR/: [duló] ‘pain’

/r/ (anchored segment): motor /mutóR/: [mutór] ‘motor’

(28) Cophonologies (Anttila 2002; Orgun 1996, Inkelas 1998)

Unique ranking of all non-conjoined constraints, but:

- n/r deletion: presence of constraint conjunction
- n/r maintenance: absence of constraint conjunction

(29) *clar* /klár/: [klá] ‘clear’

/klár/	NONFIN&*r	J-CONT	MAX-C	NONFIN	*r
a. klár	*!			*	*
☞ b. klá			*	*	

(30) *car* /kár/: [kár] ‘expensive’

/kár/	J-CONT	MAX-C	NONFIN	*r
☞ a. kár			*	*
b. ká		*!	*	

**VII. VARIATION**

(31) Free variation

a. *n*-deletion: no variationb. *r*-deletion: some limited variation: *anterior* [əntərjó] ~ [əntərjór] ‘anterior’

(32) Generational variation

a. *n*-deletion: no variationb. *r*-deletion: some limited variation (maintenance > deletion): *actor* ‘actor’, *sincer* ‘sincere’

(33) Geographical variation

a. *n*-deletion: no variationb. *r*-deletion: gradual variation (Valencian Catalan: no deletion; *Central Catalan*: deletion only in oxytones, many lexical exceptions; Northern Central Catalan: deletion in oxytones and paroxytones, fewer lexical exceptions; Balearic Catalan: almost categorical deletion in oxytones and paroxytones)

(34) Type frequency (cf. Bybee 2001)

<i>Central Catalan</i>	n	r
deletion (all kinds of words)	95%	60%
deletion (monosyllables)	67%	65%

(35) a. *n*-codas (complexity 3) are worse than *r*-codas (complexity 2); cf. Clements (1990).

b. Minimal word effects?

**VIII. HOW GENERAL ARE THESE PHENOMENA?**(36) *n*-deletion:

a. Quite generally related to historical vowel nasalization (e.g., Italian dialects, Occitan)

b. Some cases of free variation (e.g., some Italian dialects: [mã] ~ [ma] ‘hand’; Rohlfs 1999)

(37) *r*-deletion:a. In Gascon Occitan and in some Italian and English dialects, quite general (e.g., Ligurian *kö* ‘heart’)b. More often, limited to specific suffixes (e.g., Southern Brazilian, Northern Italian: infinitives; Milanese: *-er*, *-or* suffixes).

## REFERENCES

- Anttila, Arto (2002). Morphologically conditioned phonological alternations. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20: 1-42.
- Bonet, Eulàlia and Maria-Rosa Lloret (1996). Variació dialectal i optimitat: epèntesi en el grup clíctic. Talk given at the *6th Colloquium on Generative Grammar*, València, March, 27-29 1996.
- Bonet, Eulàlia, Maria-Rosa Lloret and Joan Mascaró (2004). Crazy rules and markedness in Optimality Theory. Talk given at the Workshop on Markedness in Phonology, GLOW 27, Thessaloniki, April 18-21, 2004.
- Bybee, Joan (2001). *Phonology and Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clements, George N. (1990). The role of the sonority cycle in core syllabification. In: John Kingston and Mary Beckman (eds.), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology I: Between the Grammar and Physics of Speech*, 283-333. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flemming, Edward (1995). *Auditory Features in Phonology*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.
- Inkelas, Sharon (1998). The theoretical status of morphologically conditioned phonology: a case study of dominance effects. In: Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1997*, 121-155. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Inkelas, Sharon, Orhan Orgun, and Cheryl Zoll (1997). The implications of lexical exceptions for the nature of grammar. In: I. Roca (ed.), *Derivations and Constraints in Phonology*, 393-418. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jun, Jongho (1995). Place assimilation as the result of conflicting perceptual and articulatory constraints. *WCCFL* 14: 221-237.
- Kenstowicz, Michael (1994). Syllabification in Chukchee: A constraints-based analysis. In: A. Davidson, N. Maier, G. Silva and W. S. Yan (eds.), *Proceedings of the Formal Linguistics Society of Mid America* 4, 160-181. Department of Linguistics, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Kikuchi, Seiichiro (2002). Positional Markedness in Catalan Word-Final Deletion. Handout *125th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, Tohoku Gakuin University, November, 3-4 2002.
- (2005). Relativised Contiguity and Word-Final Deletion in Catalan, *On'in Kenkyu [Phonological Studies]* 8: 25-32.
- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince (1999). Faithfulness and Identity in Prosodic Morphology. In: René Kager, Harry van der Hulst and Wim Zonneveld (eds.), *The Prosody-Morphology Interface*, 218-309. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orgun, Orhan (1996). *Sign-Based Morphology and Phonology with special attention to Optimality Theory*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. [ROA-171.]
- Prince, Alan and Paul Smolensky (1993). Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ. Report RUCCS TR-2 [ROA #537-0802].
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1999). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Smolensky, Paul (1995). On the internal structure of the constraint component *Con* of UG. Handout of a talk given at the University of California, Los Angeles, April 7, 1995. [ROA-86.]
- Wheeler, Max W. (2005). *The Phonology of Catalan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (in press).

Eulàlia Bonet: [eulalia.bonet@uab.es](mailto:eulalia.bonet@uab.es)

Maria-Rosa Lloret: [mrosa.lloret@ub.edu](mailto:mrosa.lloret@ub.edu)

Joan Mascaró: [joan.mascaro@uab.es](mailto:joan.mascaro@uab.es)