Overview

In Standard Indonesian (St; Lapoliwa 1981; Cohn 1989), suffixes seem ‘closer’ than prefixes to lexical roots for some phonological processes but for others, this relation is reversed.

I argue that this kind of mismatch requires two types of conditioning in phonology: representational (i.e. through reference to prosodic units) and procedural (i.e. through cyclic derivation), as originally proposed by Boosj & Rubach (1984).

I propose an account of the St data couched in Stratal Optimality Theory, in which some processes are restricted to earlier derivational strata (encompassing roots and prefixes), while others to the prosodic word domain (encompassing roots and suffixes).

Stress assignment

Normally, in St the penultimate syllable is stressed. Stress may be placed both on lexical morphemes and on suffixes (LBl: 33; C89: 169; SIO: 11).

(2) Penultimate stress in Standard Indonesian (C89: 176, 182, 193)

[15] ‘to look for’ (iwa) [ma sakan] ‘food’
[ma npan’kana] ‘to look for it’ [ma npan’a] ‘my food’

Prefixes are never stressed.

(3) No stress on prefixes (LBl: 128; C89: 182)

[16] [tk] ‘to type’ [fat] ‘to print’
[ditk] (‘di tiki’) ‘to be typed’
[ditat] (‘di tarat’) ‘to be printed’

Hiatus resolution

Within morphemes (aa) and at root-suffix boundaries (ab), vowel sequences in which the first vowel is high tend to be broken up by a glide (LBl: 121).

(4) Glide insertion (LBl: 91, 121; C89: 192; C&MCG: 84)

a. [di:am] → [di am] ‘quiet’ [bu:st] → [bu:st] ‘to do’
[ti:up] → [ti up] ‘a blow’ [za:n] → [za:n] ‘money’

[5] ‘to hunt’ [min:um] ‘to drink’

Elsewhere, including prefix-root boundaries (aa) and root-redundant boundaries (ab), a glottal stop is used to break up the hiatus.

(5) Glottal stop insertion (C89: 192)

a. [ma:ga:si] ‘to teach’
[di:ta:ban] ‘beautiful’
[za:’in da:man] ‘beauty’

b. [api] ‘fire’
[api:pi] ‘matches’
[umbi] ‘tuber’
[umbitum’ban] ‘all kinds of tubers’

Assumptions and derivation

(6) Stratal OT (Kiparsky 2000, 2015; Bermúdez-Otero 2011, 2012, 2018) ordered strata with potentially different constraint ranking. The output of one level of evaluation serves as input to the following level.

Three strata below the sentence level (Stratal Preprocessing Hypothesis; Trommel 2011: 75).

Proodic structure for St words adopted from Cohn (1989): suffixes incorporate into the leftmost prosodic word unit. prefixes adjoin higher, to another word.

Weighted, rather than ranked, constraints.

Comparison with alternative approaches

EXCLUSIVELY PROSODIC CONDITIONING WITH EXPANDED PROSODIC HIERARCHY (Inkelas 1989; Downing 1999, 2000; Kao 2015)

▶ Nasal assimilation prohibited across the right edge of the P-root.
▶ Separate metrical hierarchy governs stress.
▶ The lack of vowel epenthesis with [bar]-[bar] and no prefix (e.g. [bar’cat] ‘paint’ vs. [ma’cat] ‘to paint’; S580: 185) is explained.
▶ So is resyllabification with epenthetic but not underlying vowels: [mapi] ‘to check’, [npi] ‘m@N’ vs. [m@Npi] ‘to talk’ S580: 268.

EXCLUSIVELY PROCEDURAL CONDITIONING (Scheer 2012, Newell 2018) for glide vs. ? insertion, see e.g. Rubach 2000, C&MCG: 105–106

▶ Ordering paradox: prefixes should not be available when glide epenthesis appears but suffixes should. The reverse holds for nasal assimilation.


▶ Glide insertion as the default hiatus resolution strategy; prefixes and reduplicants as exceptional non-undersgoers: *MULTILIN:V* (glottal-stop insertion as ‘last resort’).

Suffices and reduplicants as exceptional non-tryers of nasal assimilation: *MULTILIN:Vw*, *MULTILIN:V* (nasal assimilation within reduplicants – B-R correspondence). 
▶ *Sคน*' as exceptional non-undersgoers: *MULTILIN:V* (this predicts a different relative in /m-пай/ vs /m-пай/)

Prosodic constraints are not sufficient to explain the presence of suffixes.
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