Yokuts templates are not emergent

Chris Golston (CSU Fresno)
Martin Krämer (UiT)

UiT THE ARCTIC UNIVERSITY OF NORWAY

FRESNO STATE Discovery. Diversity. Distinction.

TEMPLATIC MORPHOLOGY AND TETU

Prosodic morphology, i.e., reduplication, truncation, root-and-pattern morphology
Usual result = easily definable structures
- Open syllable (reduplication)
- Perfect LL trochee
- Perfect LH iamb

Reduced markedness
e.g., no complex margins or codas in RED, but allowed in the language

1980s: Templates mold base forms into perfect prosodic units (M&P 1986; Archangeli 1983, 1991)

Since M&P (1994) templates don't exist, what appear to be templates are TETU effects:
The Emergence of The Unmarked
For Yokuts in particular, see Guekguezian (2017)

We argue here that Yokuts templates *are not* TETU

THE YOKUTS PROBLEM

- Templates come in different sizes in the same language

(šip^h)–ʔa–ʔ	'write–DUBITATIVE.AGENT–NOM'		
(šip^{h}a)–ʔa–n'	'write–PRESENT–FACT'	/šeep^h-/	Chukchansi
(šip^{h}a:)–č'–i	'write–AGENT–ACC'		

- Templates may be prespecified for vowel quality (–a, –e) or glottalization

(hiwat^h)–č^{h}in–at	'walk—DESIDERATIVE–DUR.PRES'	/hiwi:t^h–/	Wikchamni
(sataʔk')–a	'wake.up–CONSEQUENT.AGENT'	/sa:tak–/	

- Templates may violate general syllable restrictions (V:C)

(ʔu.ṭo:)–l.s–uh.nu–ʔ	'play.music–CAUS/REP–AGENT–NOM'	/ʔuṭu–/	Yawelmani

MARKEDNESS IN TEMPLATES AND DEFAULT STRESS

Many Yokuts templates are iambic: CVCV:, CVCa:, CVCe:, at least one is HL trochaic CV:CVʔ

Yokuts primary stress on *penult* (all languages), suggesting a word-final QI trochee (Newman 1944)
Secondary stress on non-final H syllables.
Reconfirmed by recent phonetic studies (Guekguezian 2014, Peed & Wyatt 2018).

(ˌma:)(ˈmi.la) 'blackberry-ACC'
(ˌmon)(ˈde.hil) 'gambled'

Yokuts stress: TROCH >> IAMB
So the many iambic templates are TET**M**.
Easily done in Direct OT, hard to do with TET**U**.

Guekguezian 2017 argues for a combination of iambs and trochees for this but trochees suffice.

TETU IN OT

Shape of templatic morphology emerges from ranking of Markedness (M) constraints for regular prosodic patterns in the language and Faithfulness to the derived form (BD-F)

Basic ranking for language x:
M1 >> IO-F >> M2 >> M3

Restricted pattern in template:
M1 >> IO-F >> M2 >> BD-F >> M3

= marked structure, banned by M2,
tolerated in language generally (IO-F >> M2)
but not in prosodic morphology (M2 >> BD-F)

YOKUTS BACKGROUND

Penutian languages of central California

Yawelmani	Newman 1944
Chukchansi	Collord 1968
Wikchamni	Gamble 1976
Tachi	Britsch 1980

–very few fluent speakers now

Penultimate main stress

Simple onsets and codas.
V: → V in closed syllables

Epenthesis
Vowel harmony
Long vowel lowering

TEMPLATE SIZE

Multiple templates in the same language
they cannot all be TETU
each has marked bits that cannot be TETU

Multiple templates are shown for
Yawelmani (Newman 1944)
Chukchansi (Collord 1968)
Wikchamni (Gamble 1978)

CHUKCHANSI (fieldwork with Holly Wyatt)

(CVC)-ʔa- DUBITATIVE.AGENTIVE

(xat^h)–ʔa–ʔ	'eat–DUB.AG–NOM	/xat^h/
(hat^{h}am)–ʔa–ʔ	'eat–DUB.AG–NOM	/hat^{h}m/
(max)–ʔa–ʔ	'fetch–DUB.AG–NOM	/ma:x/
(p^{h}an)–ʔa–ʔ	'arrive–DUB.AG–NOM'	/p^{h}ana:/

(CVCa)–ʔa PRESENT

(xat^{h}a)–ʔa–n'	'eat–PRES–FACT'	/xat^h/
(hat^{h}am)-ʔa-n'	'sing–PRES–FACT'	/hat^{h}m/
(maxa)–ʔa–ʔ	'fetch–PRES–FACT'	/ma:x/
(p^{h}ana)–ʔa–ʔ	'arrive–PRES–FACT'	/p^{h}ana:/

(CVCV:)-ič' AGENTIVE

(xat^{h}a:)–č'–i	'eat–AGENT–ACC'	/xat^h/
(hat^{h}a:m)–ič'	'sing–AGENT–NOM'	/hat^{h}m/
(maxa:)–č'–i	'fetch–AGENT–ACC'	/ma:x/
(p^{h}ana:)–č'–i	'arrive–AGENT–ACC'	/p^{h}ana:/

(CVC), (CVCV), (CVCV:), (CV:CV) see right > can't all be TETU

TEMPLATE PRESPECIFICATION

Under- vs. prespecified

(CVCV:)– Wikchamni

(ṭuwo:)–ʔuč'	'wet–AGENT'	
(ʔuso:)–ʔuč'	'steal–AGENT'	
(hoyo:)–ʔoč'	'name–AGENT'	
(tawa:t^h)–ič'	'run–AGENT'	
(ʔut^{h}o:t)–uč'	'get.hungry–AGENT'	
(hiwe:t^h)–ič'	'walk–AGENT'	

(CVCa:)– Wikchanmi

(hiwa:t^h)–it^h	'walk–PASS.AOR'	
(ʔot^{h}o:y)–it^h	'put–PASS.AOR'	(rd harm)
(piwa:n)–it^h	'sew–PASS.AOR'	
(p^{h}uwa:s)–it^h	'pound–PASS.AOR'	
(t'oto:)–ʔot^h	'peek–DUR'	(rd harm)
(ʔuša:)–at^h	'steal–DUR'	

(CVCe:)– Chukchansi

(pone:)y–a–	'2–INCHO'	/ponoy/
(šop^{h}e:)y–a–	'3–INCHO'	/šop^{h}in/
(hate:)p–a–	'4–INCHO'	/hatpanay/
(yet'e:)š–a–	'5–INCHO'	/yitšinil/
(č'ole:)p^h–a–	'6–INCHO'	/č'olipp^{h}iy/

(CV:CVʔ)– Chawchilla (Newman 1944:52-3)

(le:hiʔm)–a:	'run–CONTIN'	/lihm/
(yo:muʔx)–a:	'frghten–CONTIN'	/yumx/
(pe:wiʔn)–a:	'sew–CONTIN'	/pe:wn/
(he:wiʔt^h)–a:	'walk–CONTIN'	/hiwe:t^h/
(ya:waʔl)–a:	'follow–CONTIN'	/yawa:l/

a:, e:, ʔ prespecification can't all be TETU

TEMPLATE SYLLABLE STRUCTURE

V:C vs. VX

(CV.CV:C) Yawelmani (Newman 1944:94)

(ʔu.ṭ^{h}o:)–l.s–	'play.music–CAUS/REP' /ʔu.ṭ^{h}u/
(ni.ne:)–l.s–	'be.still–CAUS/REP' /ni.ne:/
(ta.ʔe:)–l.s–	'come.to.life–CAUS/REP' /taʔal/
(ʔɔ.p^{h}e:)–t.s–	'get.up–CAUS/REP' /ʔɔp^{h}o:t^h/

'This stem violates the rule of vowel shortening (§2:17). The o: or e: vowel of the final stem syllable is not shortened, although that syllable is closed by the addition of the following suffixes.' (Newman 1944:52)

Phonetic processes. §2:17. In all dialects the closing of a syllable automatically shortens the vowel of that syllable. (Newman 1944:525)

We know of no similar fact elsewhere in prosodic morphology, templatic or reduplicative

WHAT'S REQUIRED OF ANY ANALYSIS

- At most one foot shape can be unmarked.
The rest violate FTFORM.
- Insertion of [mid], [low], [c.g.] violates DEP.
- Creation of superheavy violates *μμμ.

Given one grammar, only one type of object is TETU.

Co-phonologies might work, but still get TETU

No grammar prefers (CV:CV).
No grammar prefers (CV:CVʔ), (CVCe:) feet.
No grammar prefers μμμ syllables.

How do we nail down the markedness?

ANALYSIS

Direct OT (Golston 1996):
Lexical representations are constraint violations.

- Unmarked foot is (ˈσσ): *penultimate stress*
LL violates SWP
LH violates DEPμ
HL violates ITL
- Unmarked μ-insertion lengthens what's there
[e:] violates DEPMID
[a:] violates DEPLO
[ʔ] violates DEPCG
- Unmarked syllable structure is μμ
V:C rhymes violates *μμμ

cf. Bontok reduplication (Golston & Thurgood 03)

Intens	L	ka–kamaNan	'hurry a lot'
		la–layd◦n	'like a lot'
Progress	H	ʔik–ʔikkan	'is doing'
		ləb–ləbak	'is pounding'
Repetit	Ft	yaŋgu–yaŋgu	'keep dancing (m)'
		sagni–sagni	'keep dancing (f)'

3 sizes of reduplicant can't be TETU.

CONCLUSION

Yokuts languages have *multiple* distinct templates.

Most involve TET**M**, not TET**U**,
as only one per language can be TET**U**.

Marked structures in the templates include
foot shapes
vowel and consonant features
syllable structure

Yokuts templates can be modeled as
intentional violation of **M**arkedness constraints.

These constraints are otherwise
highly ranked in Yokuts.

We thank

Holly Wyatt
Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians
Geoff Gamble
Montana State University
Peter Guekguezian
University of Rochester

References
Alber 2005. Clash, lapse, and directionality, *NLLT*. ✧ Archangeli 1983. The root CV-template as a property of the affix: evidence from Yawelmani. *NLLT*. ✧ — 1991. Syllabification and prosodic templates in Yawelmani. *NLLT*. ✧ Britsch 1980. *Tachi: a syntactic sketch*. MA Thesis, CSU Fresno. ✧ Collord 1968. *Yokuts grammar: Chukchansi*. ✧ Gamble 1978 *Wikchamni Grammar* ✧ Golston 1996. Direct OT, *Language*. ✧ Golston & Thurgood 2003. Reduplication as Echo. ROA 456. ✧ Guekguezian 2014. Great Chukchansi Yokuts iambic conspiracty. *AMP*. — 2017. Templates as the interaction of recursive word structure, *Phonology*. ✧ M&P 1986. Prosodic morphology, MS. ✧ — 1994: TETU, ROA-13. ✧ Newman 1944. *Yokuts language of California*. ✧ Peed & Wyatt 2018 A quantity-sensitive trochaic analysis of Chukchansi Yokuts. *WAIL*.

UNIVERSITY OF TROMSØ