Being (slightly) stronger:

Lexical stress in Moses Columbian Salish

Strength in Grammar
November 11th, 2017

Eva Zimmermann
Leipzig University

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

Main Claim

- the assumption of **Gradient Symbolic Representations** predicts the lexical stress system in Moses Columbia Salish as competition between elements with different degrees of activity

- the complexity of the lexical stress pattern in Moses Columbia Salish can not follow as competition in a system that only allows a binary distinction into strong-weak

- such a representational account correctly predicts that elements with different activity behave **exceptional for more than one process**

1. Gradient Symbolic Representations

2. Case study: Moses Columbia Salish Stress
2.1 Data: Lexical stress in MCS
2.2 Analysis based on gradient activity
2.3 Further evidence: Vowel deletion asymmetries

3. Summary and Conclusion

Gradient Symbolic Representations

Background: Gradient Symbolic Representation

(=GSR; Smolensky and Goldrick, 2016; Rosen, 2016)

- symbols in a linguistic representation can have **different degrees of presence** or numerical activities
- this can predict **lexical exceptions**: elements in the underlying representation of a morpheme can be exceptionally weak
- assumption modifying the original GSR-account: output elements can be weakly active as well (Zimmermann, 2017*a*,*b*; Faust, 2017; Nformi and Worbs, 2017): GSRO

  (no explicit argument for this assumption in the MCS analysis)

Gradient Symbolic Representations and HG

- any **change in activity is a faithfulness violation**
- every marked structure M violates a markedness constraint by the number that equals M's activity
- grammatical computation inside **Harmonic Grammar**
  (Legendre et al., 1990; Potts et al., 2010)

(1)

$b_1a_1t_1$-$p_{0.5}$		*CC]$_\sigma$ 3	Dep 2	Max 1	
a.	$b_1a_1t_1p_{0.5}$	-0.5			-1.5
☞ b.	$b_1a_1t_1$			-0.5	-0.5
c.	$b_1a_1p_{0.5}$			-1	-1
d.	$b_1a_1t_1ə_1p_{0.5}$		-1		-2
e.	$b_1a_1t_1p_1$	-1	-0.5		-4

Gradience in the output: Predicted typology of exceptions

Underlying	Phon.	Output	e.g.
1. Exceptional repair: Weak element not realized			
$A_1 + B_{0.6}$ $A_1 + B_1$	*AB	A_1 A_1B_1	Nuuchahnulth unstable C's (Kim, 2003)
2. Exceptional repair: Weak element realized			
$A_1\ B_{0.6} + A_1$ $A_1\ B_{0.6} + C_1$	*AA	$A_1\ B_{0.6}A_1$ A_1C_1	Catalan exceptional u-realization (Bonet et al., 2007)
3. Exceptional non-trigger: Weak element not repaired			
$A_1 + B_{0.6}$ $A_1 + B_1$	*AB	$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ A_1C_1	Cl. Manchu exceptional non-triggers for ATR-harmony (Smith, 2017)
4. Exceptional non-target: Weak element does not change			
$A_1^{\ A} + B_{0.6}$ $A_1^{\ A} + B_1$	*X^A	$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ A_1A_1	SMG Mixtec exceptional non-hosts for floating tones; GSRO analysis in (Zimmermann, 2017*a*,*b*)
5. Lexical support			
$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ $A_1\ B_{0.6} + B_{0.6}$	*Weak!	A_1 $A_1\ B_{0.6}$	Japanese Rendaku voicing only if stem and suffix trigger it; GSR analysis in Rosen (2016)
6. True competition			
$A_{0.8} + C_1$ $A_{0.8} + B_{0.6}$	1Elem!	C_1 $A_{0.8}$	**→ MCS case study**

Argument 1: More than two grades of activity

- in most accounts that directly implement some concept of strength, only a **binary** division into strong and weak is relevant
  (Inkelas, 2015; Vaxman, 2016*a*,*b*; Sande, 2017)

→ true **gradience** of activity is argued to account for the stress system of Moses Columbia Salish where **feet with 5 different degrees of activity** compete for realization

Argument 2: Exceptionality for more than one process

- such a representational account where exceptionality follows from a property of the underlying representation predicts that **elements can be exceptional for multiple phonological processes**
- → borne out in the case study of MCS where vowel deletion treats the same morpheme types differently as stress assignment

(2)

	Fully active consonant Affix 1: /-k_1/	Exceptional weak consonant Affix 2: /-$p_{0.5}$/
Epenthesis	/$b_1a_1t_1$-k_1/	/$b_1a_1t_1$-$p_{0.5}$/
	[batək]	[batp]
Nasal Ass.	/$t_1u_1n_1$-k_1-o_1/	/$t_1u_1n_1$-$p_{0.5}$-o_1/
	[tuŋko]	[tunpo]

Case study: Moses Columbia Salish Stress

Data: Lexical stress in MCS

Moses Columbia Salish

(Kinkade, 1982; Czaykowska-Higgins, 1985, 1993*a*,*b*, 2011; Willett, 2003, =MCS)

- a **single main-stressed** syllable in every word
- the default-stress position is the **rightmost** syllable for stems in isolation (3-a+b)
- **prefixes are never stressed**; even if they contain the only full V (3-c)

(3) *Default stress (Czaykowska-Higgins, 1993*a*, 205+225)*

a. hananík
'jackrabbit'

b. q'aláχ
'fence'

c. niʔwəpwápəlqs
niʔ-wp∼wp=lqs
Loc-Red-hair=nose
'hair in nose'

Vowel epenthesis and deletion

- there is vowel **epenthesis**:
  - e.g. weak CC-roots always have an epenthetic V between stem-C's
  - e.g. epenthesis before /ʔ/
  - quality predictable: e.g. i/__j, a/__ʔ, ə elsewhere,...)

(4) nq'ij'apánaʔ
n-q'j'=ap=anʔ
Loc-write=bottom=ear
'branded on the cheek' (215)

- unstressed V's are **deleted** if they follow the stressed V

(5) kaʃħújʧnmncn
kaʃ-ħuj=ʧin-min-t-ʃi-n
unrealized-irritate=mouth-relational-TR-2SG.O-1SG.S
'I'm going to bother you (by mouth)' (202)

(stem=underlined)

Lexically determined stress in Salish

- hierarchy of stress-preferences based on a lexical two-way-distinction for stems and affixes into:
  - dominant 'D' and recessive 'R' suffixes
  - strong 'S' and weak 'W' stems

  → **D-Sfx ≫ S-stem ≫ {R-Sfx, W-stem}**

- very similar systems in all Interior Salishan languages except Lillooet (Idsardi, 1991; Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade, 1998; Revithiadou, 1999)

Lexically determined stress in MCS

(6)

a. p’iʃtɬ’aʔákʃt (S-**Ó**)
p’iʃtɬ’ʔ=akʃt
big.PL=hand
‘big hands’ (229)

b. ʃatʃím’xəx^{w} (**Ś**-R)
ʃatʃ-ʔim’x-mix
IPFV-move-IPFV
‘he’s moving’ (208)

c. ʃatʃím’xəx^{w} (S-**Ó**-R)
kaʃ-p’iq=ʧin-ʧut-mix
unrealized-cook=food-REFL-IPFV
‘he’s going to cook’ (209)

Further distinction for stems: E-stems

- E-stems are stressed if directly followed by one D-suffix
- but loose stress to a D-suffix if at least **one other suffix intervenes**

(7)

a. japkʷánkʃn (**SÉ**-D)
jap-kʷan=akʃt-n-t-ø-n
Loc-grab=hand-Ctrl-Tr-3.O-1Sg.S
'I grab so. by the hand' (229)

b. kɬkʷntʃnákʃn (SE-D-**Ú**)
kɬ-kʷan=tʃin=akʃt-n-t-ø-n
Loc-grab=mouth=hand-Ctrl-Tr-3.O-1Sg.S
'I grab so. by wrist' (231)

c. xatmʃtʃút (SE-R-**Ú**)
xat-min-ʃtu-tʃut
raise-relational-Caus-Refl
'he's raising up' (271)

Lexically determined stress: Interim summary

(8)

	S	W	SE	WE
a.	**Ś**(-R)-R	W(-R)-**Ŕ**	**SÉ**(-R)-R	**WÉ**-R
b.	S-**Ď**	W-**Ď**	**SÉ**-D	**WÉ**-D
c.	S-**Ď**-R(-R)	W-**Ď**-R(-R)	**SÉ**-D-R(-R)	
d.	S-D(-D)-**Ď**	W-D(-D)-**Ď**	SE-D(-D)-**Ď**	WE-D(-D)-**Ď**
e.			SE-R-**Ď**	

Asymmetry: Intervening suffix between E-stem and D or not

- hierarchy: **SE/WE ∼ D ≫ S ≫ {R, W}**
- multiple suffixes of the type that should be stressed: the **rightmost** one receives stress

Additional suffix-type R*: Stress-attracting R-suffixes

- two suffixes behave like R-suffixes except that they **attract stress even though they are not the rightmost** in a sequence of R-suffixes

(9)

a. kʷúɬnmn (**Ś**-R*)
kʷuɬn-min-t-ø-n
borrow-relational-CTR-TR-3.O-1SG.S
'I'm borrowing it' (251)

b. ʧqənaʔqímnʧn (W-D-**Ď**-R*)
ʧq=anʔ=qin-min-t-ʃi-n
hear=ear=head-relational-TR-2SG.O-1SG.S
'I heard about you' (251)

c. jərmíʃtm (W-**Ŕ***-R)
jr-min-ʃtu-ø-n
push-relational-CAUS-3.O-1PL.S
'We push him' (252)

Additional suffix-type D*: Stress-attracting D-suffixes

- D*-suffixes behave like D-suffixes except that **they are stressed when adjacent to an SE/WE-stem**

(10)

a. ptχujútija?ʃn (S-**Ď***-R)
ptiχuj=utj?-ʃtu-ø-n
spit=?-CAUS-3.O-1SG.S
'I spittled on them' (270)

b. wak^{w}túɬn (SE-**Ď***)
wak^{w}-tuɬ-t-ø-n
hide-redirective-TR-3.O-1SG.S
'I hid it from s.o.' (256)

c. t'əɬwíl'x (WE-**Ď***)
t'ɬ-wil'x
dirty-inch
'sth. used until it got dirty' (256)

Lexically determined stress: Summary

(11)

	S	W	SE	WE	
a.	**Ś**(-R)-R	W(-R)-**Ŕ**	**SÉ**(-R)-R	**WÉ**-R	(D, R)
b.	S-**Ó**	W-**Ó**	**SÉ**-D	**WÉ**-D	
c.	S-**Ó**-R(-R)	W-**Ó**-R(-R)	**SÉ**-D-R(-R)		
d.	S-D(-D)-**Ó**	W-D(-D)-**Ó**	SE-D(-D)-**Ó**	WE-D(-D)-**Ó**	
e.			SE-R-**Ó**		
f.	**Ś**-R*	W-**Ŕ***			(D, R, R*)
g.		W-**Ŕ***-R			
h.		W(-D)-**Ó**-R*	**SÉ**-D-R*(-R)		
i.		W-R*-**Ó**			
j.			SE-**Ó***	WE-**Ó***	(D, R, D*)
k.			SE-D-**Ó***		
l.	S-**Ó***-R				
m.			SE-**Ó***-R*		(D, R, D*, R*)

D* vs. D and R* vs. R

Summary: The challenges

- lexical stress system with a **preference hierarchy**:
  $D^* \gg \underset{\sim}{SE/WE} \sim \underset{\sim}{D} \gg S \gg R^* \gg \{R, W\}$

- an apparent **locality threshold** for E-stems: only stressed if no D-suffix follows separated by at least one other suffix

A cyclic account in Czaykowska-Higgins (1993*a*)

- a cyclic account inside the metrical framework of Halle and Vergnaud (1987*a*,*b*)
- crucial contrast: **cyclic (=D) vs. non-cyclic (=R) suffixes**: the former trigger stress deletion and new assignment of stress
- different stress rules assigning **left- or rightmost** stress
- E-stems assign **extrametricality** to an adjacent morphemes
- R*- and D*-suffixes are **lexically accented**

An OT-account in Revithiadou (1999)

- analysis in a system where conflicts between lexical accents are resolved with reference to morphological structure: the **accent of the morphological head wins** (HdFaith ≫ Faith)
- asymmetry for suffixes then follow from their different morphological structure (=lexical suffixes are part of a compound or predicate structure)

→ not the aim to derive all the data we saw, including 'exceptions'/small classes of only a few morphemes

→ full set of data impossible to derive since it is again a **binary division**: morphological head vs. non-head

Analysis based on gradient activity

The analysis in a nutshell: Competition

- morphemes have **no or underlying feet of different strengths** in their underlying representation

  (difference between strong/weak stems = underlying V/only epenthetic V)

(12)

Fully active φ		← Weaker φ →				No φ	
SE/WE		D*	D	S	R*	R/W	
φ_1	φ_1	$\varphi_{0.9}$	$\varphi_{0.8}$	$\varphi_{0.6}$	$\varphi_{0.4}$		
SE	WE	D*	D	S	R*	R	W

The analysis in a nutshell: Competition

- morphemes have **no or underlying feet of different strengths** in their underlying representation

  (difference between strong/weak stems = underlying V/only epenthetic V)

(12)

Fully active φ		← Weaker φ →				No φ	
SE/WE		D*	D	S	R*	R/W	
φ_1	φ_1	$\varphi_{0.9}$	$\varphi_{0.8}$	$\varphi_{0.6}$	$\varphi_{0.4}$		
SE	WE	D*	D	S	R*	R	W

- competition for φ-realization: **most active one is preferably realized**

(13) MAX-φ:
Assign a violation mark for every input φ without an output correspondent.

Two other (opposing) stress preferences

(14) a. $\acute{V}_{\text{STEM}}$ ('Stress the **stem-vowel**!')

Assign a violation mark for every main-stressed vowel that is not preceded and followed by stem-segments.

b. RM_{COL} ('Stress is **rightmost**!')

Assign a violation mark for every morphemic colour α that intervenes between the right word edge and the stressed vowel that is not of morphemic colour α.

c. RM_{V} ('Stress is rightmost!')

Assign a violation mark for every V^{*} that intervenes between the right word edge and the stressed vowel that is not of morphemic colour α.

→ two versions of RIGHTMOST: asymmetry between R- and D-suffixes and abundant V-deletion in Salish

(*Underlying vowel. Modelled in containment theory (Prince and Smolensky, 1993; Zimmermann, 2017*c*)).

Two other (opposing) stress preferences

(14) a. $\acute{V}_{STEM}$ ('Stress the **stem-vowel**!')

Assign a violation mark for every main-stressed vowel that is not preceded and followed by stem-segments.

b. RM_{COL} ('Stress is **rightmost**!')

Assign a violation mark for every morphemic colour α that intervenes between the right word edge and the stressed vowel that is not of morphemic colour α.

c. RM_{V} ('Stress is rightmost!')

Assign a violation mark for every V^{*} that intervenes between the right word edge and the stressed vowel that is not of morphemic colour α.

→ two versions of RIGHTMOST: asymmetry between R- and D-suffixes and abundant V-deletion in Salish

(*Underlying vowel. Modelled in containment theory (Prince and Smolensky, 1993; Zimmermann, 2017*c*)).

→ **gang-effect in HG for E-stems**: stems are preferably stressed but stress can't be too far away from the right word-edge

Realization of the only underlying φ

(15)

φ0.8 W D R	MAX-φ 100	V́STEM 30	RMV 30	RMCOL 16	DEP-φ 5	
a. φ1 W D R	-0.8	-1			-1	-115
☞ b. φ0.8 W D R		-1		-1		-46
c. φ1 W D R	-0.8		-1	-2	-1	-147

(epenthetic=grey background)

Preservation of the φ with the highest activity

(16)

φ0.6 S φ0.9 D* φ0.4 R*	Max-φ 100	V́Stem 30	RMV 30	RMCol 16	Dep-φ 5	
a. S D* φ0.4 R*	-1.5	-1				-180
☞ b. S φ0.9 D* R*	-1	-1		-1		-146
c. φ0.6 S D* R*	-1.3		-1	-2		-192

E-stems: A gang effect

- stress on an **E-stem** is more preferred than stress on a D-suffix by both MAX-φ and $\acute{V}_{STEM}$
- if, however, more than one suffix intervenes between an E-stem and a D-suffix, stress would be too far away from the right edge and is realized on the **D-suffix** instead

→ a **gang-effect in HG**

…has a higher weight than…			
0.2 x MAX-φ + $\acute{V}_{STEM}$	≫	RM_{COL} + RM_V	Cf. (17)
and			
2 x RM_{COL} + RM_V	≫	0.2 x MAX-φ + $\acute{V}_{STEM}$	Cf. (18)

Gang effect I: Stress on E-stem with one D-suffix

(17)

φ1 φ0.8 SE D	Max-φ 100	V́Stem 30	RMV 30	RMCol 16	Dep-φ 5	
a. φ0.8 SE D	-1	-1				-130
☞ b. φ1 SE D	-0.8		-1	-1		-126

Gang effect II: Stress on D-suffix if more suffixes intervene

(18)

φ1 SE R φ0.8 D	Max-φ 100	V́Stem 30	RMCol 30	RMV 16	Dep-φ 5	
☞ a. SE R φ0.8 D	-1	-1				-130
b. φ1 SE R D	-1.8	-1	-1	-1	-1	-261
c. φ1 SE R D	-0.8		-1	-2		-142

Interim Summary

- the representations (19) predict the position of main stress: Underlying feet of different activity compete for stress realization

(19)

Fully active φ		← Weaker φ →				No φ	
SE/WE		D*	D	S	R*	R/W	
φ_1	φ_1	$\varphi_{0.9}$	$\varphi_{0.8}$	$\varphi_{0.6}$	$\varphi_{0.4}$		
SE	WE	D*	D	S	R*	R	W

Interim Summary

- the representations (19) predict the position of main stress: Underlying feet of different activity compete for stress realization

(19)

Fully active φ		← Weaker φ →				No φ	
SE/WE		D*	D	S	R*	R/W	
φ_1	φ_1	$\varphi_{0.9}$	$\varphi_{0.8}$	$\varphi_{0.6}$	$\varphi_{0.4}$		
SE	WE	D*	D	S	R*	R	W

- this representational account predicts **exceptional behaviour of weakly active elements for more than one process**:
  - → evidence from facts about vowel deletion/secondary stress that these is indeed the case

Further evidence: Vowel deletion asymmetries

Vowel deletion asymmetry: E-stems and D-suffixes

- unstressed V's are sometimes **deleted if they precede the stressed V**
  - the unstressed V of a D-suffix is deleted between an SE-stem and a stressed D-suffix (20-a)
  - but the unstressed V of a D-suffix is only variably/for some speakers deleted between a W-stem and a stressed D-suffix (20-b)

(20)

a. kɬʧ'awlqʷqnákʃtm (SE-Dø-Dø-**Ḱ**)
kɬ-ʧ'aw=alqʷ=qin=akʃt-m
Loc-wash=pole=Top=arm-Mid
'wash wrists' (246)

b. kjər'jər'qnalqʷákʃtn (W-$D_{V/ø}$-$D_{V/ø}$-**Ḱ**)
k-jr'∼jr'=qin=alqʷ=akʃt-n-t-ø-n
Loc-RedP∼roll=Top=pole=arm-Ctr-Tr-3.O-1Sg.S
'roll up sleeves' (245)

Secondary stress

- optional secondary stress can be found on:
  - stem vowels
  - suffix vowels preceding the main stress
  - → **in the context where vowel deletion applies optionally**

(21)

a. niʔk’əmàn’kàkst (W-D̀$_{V/ø}$-**Ḍ**)
niʔ-k’m=ank=akst
Loc-surface.of=flat=hand
‘palm of hand’ (246)

b. nməq’^{w}àpánaʔ (W-D̀$_{V/ø}$-**Ḍ**)
n-mq’^{w}=ap=anʔ
Loc-bulge=base=ear
‘bulge on side of face’ (249)

Secondary stress

- optional secondary stress can be found on:
  - stem vowels
  - suffix vowels preceding the main stress
  - → **in the context where vowel deletion applies optionally**

(21)

a. niʔk'əmàn'kàkst (W-D̀$_{V/ø}$-**Ď**)
niʔ-k'm=ank=akst
Loc-surface.of=flat=hand
'palm of hand' (246)

b. nməq'^{w}àpánaʔ (W-D̀$_{V/ø}$-**Ď**)
n-mq'^{w}=ap=anʔ
Loc-bulge=base=ear
'bulge on side of face' (249)

- → secondary stress is what **saves those vowels from deletion**!

Account: Second foot blocks vowel deletion

- suffix-vowels without main stress can optionally be realized if they are integrated into a foot (=**secondary stress**)

(22)

Underlying form

	φ0.8		φ0.8
	σ	σ	
k'ʷʔ	akʃt	n	ʧut
W	D	C	D

Option 1: D-Vowel realization

	φ0.8	φ0.8
σ	σ	σ
k'ʷa	ʔakʃ	nʧut

Option 2: D-Vowel deletion

	φ0.8
σ	σ
k'ʷaʔ	kʃnʧut

Possibility of a second foot in a word

- implicit assumption so far: feet compete for realization since only a single foot is possible
  (consequence from, for example, ER-L/R (McCarthy, 2003))
- if the responsible constraint is (at least optionally) lower-weighted **two feet in a word are possible**:
  - avoids vowel deletion of unstressed affix-V
  - is better for Max-φ because more feet are realized
  - but is only possible if the secondary-stress φ is not stronger than the main-stress φ (*AsymmetricStrengthφ)
  - and **maximally two feet** in a word are possible

Possibility of a second foot in a word

(23)

SE-D-D	W-D-(C-)D
1. Underlying	
φ1 φ0.8 φ0.8 σ σ σ x'^{w}ir akʃt atk^{w}	φ0.8 φ0.8 σ σ k'^{w}ʔ akʃt n tʃut
2. Option 1: D-Vowel deletion	
φ1 φ0.8 σ σ x'^{w}irkʃ tatk^{w}	φ0.8 σ σ k'^{w}aʔ kʃntʃut
☺ Stronger (stem)-foot realized as secondary stress	☺ Only other foot realized as secondary stress
3. Option 2: D-Vowel realization	
* φ0.8 φ0.8 σ σ σ x'^{w}i rakʃ tatk^{w}	φ0.8 φ0.8 σ σ σ k'^{w}a ʔakʃ ntʃut
☹ Weaker (affix)-foot realized as secondary stress	☺ Stronger (stem)-foot realized as secondary stress

Only the stronger foot can become a secondary stress

- a second foot can 'save' a D-suffix-V following a W-stem but not one following an SE-stem: being able to save a suffix-vowel from deletion is **not a good enough reason to realize the weaker φ**

(24)

φ1 σ x'wir φ0.8 σ akʃt φ0.8 σ atkw	Max-φ 100	Max-V 10	
☞ a. φ1 σ x'wirkʃ φ0.8 σ tatkw	-0.8	-1	-90
b. σ x'wi φ0.8 σ rakʃ φ0.8 σ tatkw	-1		-100

Only the stronger foot can become a secondary stress

- a second foot can 'save' a D-suffix-V following a W-stem but not one following an SE-stem: being able to save a suffix-vowel from deletion is **not a good enough reason to realize the weaker φ**

(24)

φ1 σ x'wir φ0.8 σ akʃt φ0.8 σ atkw	Max-φ 100	Max-V 10	
☞ a. φ1 σ x'wirkʃ φ0.8 σ tatkw	-0.8	-1	-90
b. σ x'wi φ0.8 σ rakʃ φ0.8 σ tatkw	-1		-100

- again, simple **competition** about which φ is realized; only in another domain (=secondary stress and avoidance of vowel deletion)

Summary and Conclusion

Summary

- lexical stress system in MCS follows from assuming **6 different types of underlying foot structure** for morphemes
  - position of main stress follows from competition about φ-realization
  - exceptionality of E-stems is a threshold-effect in HG

Summary

- lexical stress system in MCS follows from assuming **6 different types of underlying foot structure** for morphemes
  - position of main stress follows from competition about φ-realization
  - exceptionality of E-stems is a threshold-effect in HG

- this representational account also predict exceptional behaviour for vowel deletion: **exceptionality for multiple processes**

  (=argument against lexically indexed constraints (e.g. Alderete, 2001; Pater, 2009; Finley, 2009): It is a coincidence that at least two different constraints are indexed to the same class of (exceptional) morphemes)

Summary

- lexical stress system in MCS follows from assuming **6 different types of underlying foot structure** for morphemes
  - position of main stress follows from competition about φ-realization
  - exceptionality of E-stems is a threshold-effect in HG

- this representational account also predict exceptional behaviour for vowel deletion: **exceptionality for multiple processes**

  (=argument against lexically indexed constraints (e.g. Alderete, 2001; Pater, 2009; Finley, 2009): It is a coincidence that at least two different constraints are indexed to the same class of (exceptional) morphemes)

- the argument for **GSR(O) is strengthened** in showing that this predicted type of exceptionality is borne out as well

Gradience in the output: Predicted typology of exceptions

Underlying	Phon.	Output	e.g.
1. Exceptional repair: Weak element not realized			
$A_1 + B_{0.6}$ $A_1 + B_1$	*AB	A_1 A_1B_1	Nuuchahnulth unstable C's (Kim, 2003)
2. Exceptional repair: Weak element realized			
$A_1\ B_{0.6} + A_1$ $A_1\ B_{0.6} + C_1$	*AA	$A_1\ B_{0.6}A_1$ A_1C_1	Catalan exceptional u-realization (Bonet et al., 2007)
3. Exceptional non-trigger: Weak element not repaired			
$A_1 + B_{0.6}$ $A_1 + B_1$	*AB	$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ A_1C_1	Cl. Manchu exceptional non-triggers for ATR-harmony (Smith, 2017)
4. Exceptional non-target: Weak element does not change			
$A_1{}^A + B_{0.6}$ $A_1{}^A + B_1$	*X^A	$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ A_1A_1	SMG Mixtec exceptional non-hosts for floating tones; GSRO analysis in (Zimmermann, 2017*a*,*b*)
5. Lexical support			
$A_1\ B_{0.6}$ $A_1\ B_{0.6} + B_{0.6}$	*Weak!	A_1 $A_1\ B_{0.6}$	Japanese Rendaku voicing only if stem and suffix trigger it; GSR analysis in Rosen (2016)
6. True competition			
$A_{0.8} + C_1$ $A_{0.8} + B_{0.6}$	1Elem!	C_1 $A_{0.8}$	**→ MCS case study**

References

Alderete, John (2001), *Morphologically governed accent in Optimality Theory*, Routledge, New York.

Bonet, Eulàlia, Maria-Rosa Lloret and Joan Mascaró (2007), 'Allomorph selection and lexical preferences: Two case studies', *Lingua* **117**(6), 903–927.

Coelho, Gail (2002), 'Primary word stress in Thompson River Salish', Ms, ROA 000569.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa (1985), 'Predicting stress in Columbian Salish', *ICSNL* **20**.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa (1993*a*), 'Cyclicity and stress in Moses-Columbia Salish (Nxa'amxcin)', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **11**, 197–278.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa (1993*b*), The phonology and semantics of CVC reduplication in Moses-Columbian Salish, *in* A.Mattina and T.Montler, eds, 'American Indian Linguistics and ethnography in honor of Laurence C. Thompson', UMOPL, pp. 47–72.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa (2011), The morphological and phonological constituent structure of words in Moses-Columbia Salish (Nxa?amxcín), *in* E.Czaykowska-Higgins and M. D.Kinkade, eds, 'Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives', de Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, Boston, pp. 153–196.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa and Marvin Dale Kinkade (1998), Salish languages and linguistics, *in* E.Czaykowski-Higgins and M.Kinkade, eds, 'Salish languages and linguistics: theoretical and descriptive perspectives', de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp. 1–68.

Faust, Noam (2017), 'How much for that vowel?', talk, presented at the Workshop on strength, Leipzig University, November 11th, 2017.

Finley, Sara (2009), 'Morphemic harmony as featural correspondence', *Lingua* **119**, 478–501.

Halle, Morris and Jean-Roger Vergnaud (1987*a*), *An essay on stress*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Halle, Morris and Jean-Roger Vergnaud (1987*b*), 'Stress and the cycle', *Linguistic Inquiry* **18**, 45–84.

Idsardi, William (1991), 'Stress in Interior Salish', *Chicago Linguistics Society* **27**, 246–260.

Inkelas, Sharon (2015), Confidence scales: A new approach to derived environment effects, *in* Y. E.Hsiao and L.-H.Wee, eds, 'Capturing Phonological Shades Within and Across Languages', Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 45–75.

Kim, Eun-Sook (2003), *Theoretical issues in Nuu-chah-nulth phonology and morphology (British Columbia)*, UMI, Ann Arbor, MI.

Kinkade, M. Dale (1982), 'Transitive inflection in (Moses) Columbian Salish', *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* **7**, 49–62.

Legendre, Geraldine, Yoshiro Miyata and Paul Smolensky (1990), 'Harmonic grammar – a formal multi-level connectionist theory of linguistic well-formedness: Theoretical foundations', *Proceedings of the 12th annual conference of the cognitive science society* pp. 388–395.

McCarthy, John (2003), 'Ot constraints are categorical', *Phonology* **20**, 75–138.

Nformi, Jude and Sören Worbs (2017), 'Gradient tones obviate floating features in Oku tone sandhi', talk, presented at the Workshop on strength, Leipzig University, November 11th, 2017.

Pater, Joe (2009), Morpheme-specific phonology: Constraint indexation and inconsistency resolution, *in* S.Parker, ed., 'Phonological Argumentation: Essays on Evidence and Motivation', Equinox, London, pp. 123–154.

Potts, Christopher, Joe Pater, Karen Jesney, Rajesh Bhatt and Michael Becker (2010), 'Harmonic grammar with linear programming: From linear systems to linguistic typology', *Phonology* pp. 77–117.

Prince, Alan and Paul Smolensky (1993), 'Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar', Technical reports of the Rutgers University Center of Cognitive Science.

Revithiadou, Anthi (1999), Headmost Accent Wins: Head Dominance and Ideal Prosodic Form in Lexical Accent Systems., PhD thesis, LOT Dissertation Series 15 (HIL/Leiden Universiteit), Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.

Rosen, Eric (2016), Predicting the unpredictable: Capturing the apparent semi-regularity of rendaku voicing in Japanese through harmonic grammar, *in* E.Clem, V.Dawson, A.Shen, A. H.Skilton, G.Bacon, A.Cheng and E. H.Maier, eds, 'Proceedings of BLS 42', Berkeley Linguistic Society, pp. 235–249.

Sande, Hannah (2017), Distributing morphologically conditioned phonology: Three case studies from Guébie, PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Smith, Caitlin (2017), 'Harmony triggering as a contrastive property of segments', *Proceedings of AMP 2016* .

Smolensky, Paul and Matthew Goldrick (2016), 'Gradient symbolic representations in grammar: The case of French Liaison', *ROA 1286* .

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson (1992), *The Thompson language*, UMOPL, Missoula.

Vaxman, Alexandre (2016*a*), 'Diacritic weight in the extended accent first theory', *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* **22**.

Vaxman, Alexandre (2016*b*), How to Beat without Feet: Weight Scales and Parameter Dependencies in the Computation of Word Accent, PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.

Willett, Marie Louise (2003), A grammatical sketch of Nxa'amxcin (Moses-Columbia Salish), PhD thesis, University of Victoria.

Zimmermann, Eva (2017*a*), 'Being exceptional is being weak: tonal exceptions in San Miguel el Grande Mixtec', poster, presented at AMP 2017, New York, September 16, 2017.

Zimmermann, Eva (2017*b*), 'Gradient symbols and gradient markedness: a case study from Mixtec tones', talk, given at the 25th mfm, 27th May, 2017.

Zimmermann, Eva (2017*c*), *Morphological Length and Prosodically Defective Morphemes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Conflicting directionality

- if a root **only contains epenthetic vowels, the leftmost is stressed**
- (not uncommon in Interior Salishan, a similar pattern in Thompson River Salish (Thompson and Thompson, 1992; Coelho, 2002))

(25) *Leftmost stress in epenthesis-only words*

a. sq'íj'q'ijs (**W**-R)
s-q'j-q'j-s
Nmlz-write-characteristics-Poss
'his/its/her writing' (222)

b. k'áməlqstxən (**W**-R-R)
k'm=lqst=xn
surface.of=shin=leg
'lower leg' (222)

The analysis in a nutshell: Morphological affiliation

- apparent conflicting directionality follows from **contrast between coloured/epenthetic material**: There is a preference for stems to be stressed and RM_V does not count epenthetic vowels

(26) RM_V:
Assign a violation mark for every non-epenthetic vowel that intervenes between the right word edge and a stressed vowel.

Conflicting directionality

- in the absence of underlying stress, **default rightmost stress** is predicted (27-a)
- if there are no underlying vowels, leftmost stress on the stem is predicted since $\acute{V}_{STEM}$ prefers leftmost stress and **no violations of** RM_V **are induced by potentially following epenthetic vowels** (27-b)
- additionally, epenthesis 'inside' affix material is worse than epenthesis 'inside' stem material [2ex]

(27) *'Conflicting Directionality' = the invisibility of epenthetic vowels*

...has a higher weight than...			
$\acute{V}_{STEM}$ + $*EP_{AFFX}$	$\gg$	2 x RM_{COL}	(28)

W and R: no underlying vowels

(28)

k'm lqʃt xn W R R	Max-φ 100	V́$_{Stem}$ 30	RM$_{V}$ 30	RM$_{Col}$ 16	*Ep$_{A}$ 5	
☞ a. k' φ1 ə m ə lqʃt x ə n W R R				-2		-32
b. k' ə m ə lqʃt x φ1 ə n W R R		-1			-1	-35