

Abstract: On the influence of phonology in morphological realization

This talk concerns the question how phonology can affect morphological realization. I will discuss the role of phonology in morphological mismatches that are triggered by phonological information as in Vata: Nouns in class A trigger the agreement marker [ɪ] on adjectives (a) and nouns in class B trigger the agreement marker [wa] on adjectives (b). As shown in (c), when adjectives with the stem-vowel [ɔ] like *pɔp* ‘white’ or *wɔt* ‘cold’ agree with **class-B** nouns, these adjectives take the **class-A** agreement marker [ɪ] instead of the **class-B** agreement marker [wa]. The vowel [ɔ] thus triggers a mismatch in class between adjective and noun.

- a. *fil-i* *kad-ɪ*
 rat.A-PL big-AGR:A.PL
- b. *dɔlj-a* *kad-wa*
 mouse.B-PL big-AGR:B.PL
- c. *dɔlj-a* *kad-wa* *pɔp-ɪ* *wɔt-ɪ*
 mouse.B-PL big-AGR:B.PL white-AGR:A.PL cold- AGR:A.PL

The aim of this talk is twofold: First, I will introduce new morphological patterns in which the phonology creates a morphological mismatch as in Vata. I will discuss clitic clusters in Spanish (Grimshaw 1997) and number mismatch in North-Eastern Central Catalan (Bonet, Lloret & Mascaró 2015). Second, informed by these two languages, I expand on my previous analysis: I argue that morphology is realizational (Halle 1990) which means that the phonological realization of morphosyntactic information is determined by vocabulary items (lexical pairings of phonological features and morphosyntactic structure) after the syntactic computation has applied. As in my earlier talk, I claim that phonological constraints are active at Vocabulary Insertion.

However, motivated by the data discussed in this talk, I claim that the decisive power of phonological constraints is restricted to what I call *Phonologically triggered impoverishment*: A phonological constraint can trigger a mismatch as in (c) only in so far, that it causes the non-realization of a morphosyntactic feature by a vocabulary item. If the input is specified for the syntactic features [A, B], the effect of a phonological constraint is thus limited to the non-insertion of a VI or the insertion of VIs that are specified for [A], [B] or [A, B].

References

- Bonet, Eulàlia, Maria-Rosa Lloret & Joan Mascaró. 2015. The prenominal allomorphy syndrome. 32. *Perspectives from Optimality Theory*. Equinox eBooks Publishing, United Kingdom. p. 5-44 Jul 2015. ISBN 9781845532970. <https://www.equinoxpub.com/home/view-chapter/?id=25215>. Date accessed: 25 Jun 2020 doi: 10.1558/equinox.25215. Jul 2015
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1997. The Best Clitic: Constraint Conflict in Morphosyntax. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar* (Kluwer International Handbooks of Linguistics), 169–196. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_4 (18 June, 2020).
- Halle, Morris. 1990. An approach to morphology. In ja Carter, Philipp B. Dechaine & Toby Sherer (eds.), *Proceedings of the North eastern Linguistics Society annual Meeting*, 150–184. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 2004. Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar. In. <https://doi.org/10.7282/T34M92MV>.