

Yokuts templates are not emergent

Chris Golston & Martin Krämer

California State University Fresno & Universitetet i Tromsø

Recent work in prosodic morphology does away with the templates of the 1980s (eg, McCarthy & Prince 1986) and derives them grammatically as prosodically and segmentally unmarked structures that emerge through the emergence of the unmarked (McCarthy & Prince 1994). The idea is attractive if a language has only one template, less so if it has more than one, since only one template can emerge from TETU assuming a single grammar. We argue here that TETU analyses are inappropriate for Yokuts, based on our reading of the literature since Newman 1944 and on our own fieldwork in Chuckchansi Yokuts, the native language of the last author.

Guekguezian 2014, 2017 (hereafter G) has recently analyzed Chukchansi templates as TETU in this way, arguing that the parenthesized iambic shape in (1) emerges from cyclic spellout that results in a recursive prosodic word (ω) whose inner ω reveals Yokuts' optimal foot to be an iamb (p. 82):

- (1) /wan/ (wa.na:)-la-t 'just made X give'
/ma:x/ (ma.xa:)-la-t 'just made X collect'
/?aml/ (?ama:)l-e-t 'just made X help'

We show here that G's analysis rests on incorrect facts and dubious analysis:

(i) Yokuts' has penultimate stress, which G attributes to *non-final right-aligned* iambs; but right-aligned iambs are otherwise unattested (Alber 2005) and penultimate stress is better analyzed as a final trochee, which G's analysis requires anyway in addition to iambs (p.97). Thus the iambic shape in (1) is not supported by the stress pattern of the language, undercutting G's central claim.

(ii) G's analysis requires that 'all glottal stops must be linked to the coda in Chukchansi' and thus that intervocalic ? is always geminate; but word-initial ? is common in Chukchansi (?ama:l-e-t, above) and intervocalic ? doesn't shorten a preceding vowel (šašaaʔan 'eye-ACC'), suggesting in either case that it isn't geminate, moraic, or in the coda.

(iii) G claims that template-taking suffixes 'share a semantic property: they all modify the causal or dynamic properties of the event' (p.87), excluding suffixes that mark tense, mood, or argument structure (p.88); but G's templatic 'durative -ʔa' is misglossed and marks 'present tense' in G's source (Collord 1968:47), while the suffix glossed 'durative' there is not templatic (-xo, p.51). 3 of G's 8 templatic suffixes, -la 'CAUS', -e 'CAUS', -ta 'CAUS.INCHOATIVE' affect argument structure (they add an argument), and none of them is actually templatic according to Collord (1968:49-53).

(iv) G claims that 'the minimal ω is disyllabic' in Chukchansi (ps.101-2), but only by excluding common native nouns (buʔ 'hawk', č'ey' 'bone', doš 'gut', gos 'pig', hon' 'egg', k'ew' 'earthworm', mos 'sweathouse', ʔop 'sun/moon', p'as 'infant', sox 'skunk', tew' 'rabbit', xoʔ 'house'), quantifiers

(yet '1', pič '100'), adjectives (wa? 'far'), and nonlexical items (nan 'me', gew 'there', ha? 'what', k'ay 'possibly', mič 'really', taa 'that', yo? 'also'), limiting his definition of prosodic word to verbs (for which there are monosyllabic ?et 'get' and xo? 'stay').

(v) G's iambic analysis cannot be surface-true, despite the OT-framework. Template-induced words like xatač 'eater' and t'ulač 'burner' (Collord p. 68-9) are stressed on the penult and form trochees by G's own analysis. So the iambic template competes with trochaic stress—and loses.

(vi) G's iambs include three types, two of which are called –G and –B by Collord, a distinction G treats as 'outside the scope of this paper' (p.86). –G templates fit G's description (šipa:–č'i 'writer–ACC', xata:–č'i 'eater–ACC'), but –B templates glottalize the final sonorant (C or V) of the base and shorten the vowel (šipaʔ–hiya 'pencil–ACC (writing-thing)', xataʔ–hiy 'eating place'). The third type of template is called E-induced by Newman (1944:87) and has invariant e: before the suffix (jawe:w–a–t 'become hard' < jaww– 'hard', hoše:w–a–t 'become cold' < hošw– 'cold'). These idiosyncrasies (glottalization, invariant e:) cannot be the result of TETU, which could at best define –G templates (if Yokuts stress were iambic, which it isn't).

Our analysis is more straightforward in a number of ways but necessarily eschews TETU and the cyclic analysis G proposes. To make comparison easy, we go point by point:

(i') Yokuts' has penultimate stress, which we treat as a word-final trochee.

(ii') ? is analyzed like any other consonant in the language.

(iii') Template-taking suffixes form an arbitrary set w.r.t. phonology and semantics.

(iv') The minimal ω is bimoraic (not disyllabic) and admits of no exceptions.

(v') 'Iambic templates' are the result of distinctive constraint violation (Golston 1996) and surface as such even when words are trochaically stressed ('xatač 'eater', 't'ulač 'burner'). There is no iambic template, just a requirement (imposed by 'template-inducing' suffixes) that the presuffix material contain a trapped L syllable (Mester 1994), in violation of FTBIN (Prince & Smolensky 1993).

(vi') The three types of 'template' all violate FTBIN. Collord's –G type suffixes require violating nothing else; his –B type suffixes violate FTBIN and DEP[c.g.] by inserting glottalization into the base. E-inducing suffixes violate FTBIN and *MID, which rules out mid vowels in e.g., Classical Arabic.

G's analysis of Yokuts stress and templatic morphology are based on a faulty reading of the data and on dubious theoretical assumptions. In our analysis Yokuts has a right-aligned trochee, the prosodic morphology is atemplatic, and the different types of suffix differ in terms of markedness.

Alber 2005: Clash, lapse, and directionality, *NLLT*. **Collord** 1968: *Yokuts grammar: Chukchansi*.

Golston 1996 Direct OT, *Language*. **Guekguezian** 2014: Great Chukchansi Yokuts iambic conspiracy, AMP. — 2017: Templates as the interaction of recursive word structure, *Phonology*.

M&P 1986: Prosodic morphology, MS. — 1994: TETU, ROA-13. **Mester** 1994: The quantitative trochee in Latin, *NLLT*. **Newman** 1944: *Yokuts language of California*.