Tobias Scheer
Université de Nice

The representation of morphological information in Phonology

Morphological information plays an important role in a number of phonological processes. It is usually referred to by non-phonological symbols such as "-", "+" or "#". These are taken to interact with properly phonological categories such as consonants and vowels, while remaining truly morphological in both Signifiant and Signifié.

   We will review various attempts that have been made in order to ship this morphological information into phonology. For example, Lexical Phonology (e.g. Kiparsky 1982,1985, Mohanan 1986) has proposed to encode morphological information through different derivational levels. Government Phonology has approached this problem through the definition of different kinds of domains (analytic/ non-analytic), cf. Kaye (1995). As a result, morphological boundaries disappear in the statement of phonological processes.

   The aim of this course is to explore the possibility of eliminating boundary- symbols in yet another way: Morphology could be a device of grammar whose Signifiant has a phonological identity. That is, the existence of a morphological boundary is decided by the morphological component alone, but once a boundary has come into being, it is expressed through a unit that enjoys a truly phonological identity. Hence, phonological processes refer only to phonological objects.

   Illustration of this representational alternative comes from the word-initial situation: consequences of the proposal by Lowenstamm (1999) according to which the phonological identity of "#" is an empty Onset followed by an empty Nucleus will be examined. The crucial feature of this approach is its ability of expressing empirical contrasts observed word-initially by a PRIVATIVE opposition: the word-initial context is either marked by the presence of an initial CV-unit, or by its absence. This option is not available unless a phonological identity is given to the morphological information "beginning of the word". Under the traditional approach, there is no way of considering that # is absent: it occurs in all word-initial representations because no part of its identity is independent from this particular context. Only when it is thought of as a phonological unit can "#" possess an identity that is partly independent from its position in the string: "word-initial" refers to the Signifié of "#" alone, which is morphological and inalterable. By contrast, its Signifiant enjoys an independent phonological life and hence may be conceived of as either present or absent.

   In order to evaluate this proposal, various phonological phenomena that are sensitive to the left margin of the word will be reviewd:
   - word-initial restrictions on consonant clusters: TR-only languages (e.g. "regular" Indo-European such as German, French etc.) vs. RT-languages (e.g. Slavic, Moroccan Arabic) [T=any obstruent, R=any sonorant, "TR-language"=language where only TR-clusters occur word-initially, "RT-language"=language where both TR and RT occur word-initially].
   - Lenition and Fortition. Typically, the consonants occurring word-initially and in post-Coda position are strong, i.e. escape lenition or are subject to fortition.
   - processes that occur word-initially and in stressed syllables: distribution of aspiration in English, of the glottal stop in German, of [h] in Dutch, Verner's Law in Germanic.
   - schwa-syncope in French.

Suggested readings

Kaye, Jonathan 1995. Derivations and Interfaces. *Frontiers of Phonology*, edited by Jacques Durand and Francis Katamba, 289-332. Londres & New York: Longman.

Lowenstamm, Jean 1996. CV as the only syllable type. Current trends in Phonology. Models and Methods, edited by Jacques Durand and Bernard Laks, 419-441. Salford, Manchester: ESRI.

Lowenstamm, Jean 1999. The beginning of the word. In: *Syllables?!*, edited by J. Rennison & K. Kühnhammer, 153-166. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Scheer, Tobias 1998. A theory of consonantal interaction. Folia Linguistica **32**, 201-237.

Scheer, Tobias 1999. On constraints vs. non-circular approaches to word-initial clusters. Phonologica 1996, edited by John Rennison and Klaus Kühnhammer, 289-304. La Hague: Holland Academic Graphics. (= abriged version of the previous reference)

Ségéral, Philippe, Tobias Scheer 2001. The Coda Mirror. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.

Material available online at www.unice.fr/dsl/nis01/cvcv.htm

1. Ségéral, Philippe, Tobias Scheer 2001. The Coda Mirror. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. English version.

2. The Coda Mirror – handout.

3. Strict CVCV syllable structre – why it is, how it looks like and what it buys us. Handout for the course on syllable structre taught by Tobias Scheer at the Summer School 1999 in Plovidv/ Bulgaria.

4. Disjunctive contexts – handout. Processes that make reference to the word-initial position AND to another phonological property.

5. A representational theory of morphological information in phonology. Handout with emphasis on data from Slavic.

6. Scheer, Tobias 1999. On constraints vs. non-circular approaches to word-initial clusters. Phonologica 1996, edited by John Rennison and Klaus Kühnhammer, 289-304. La Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Other references mentioned

Kiparsky, Paul 1982. From Cyclic Phonology to Lexical Phonology. *The structure of phonological representations I*, edited by Harry van der Hulst & Norval Smith, 131-175. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kiparsky, Paul 1985. Some Consequences of Lexical Phonology. *Phonology Yearbook* **2**, 85-138.

Mohanan, Karuvannur 1986. *The Theory of Lexical Phonology*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Locality in Phonology

In this part of the course, we will discuss whether it is possible/ desireable/ interesting to conceive of phonological relations as being local in the sense that is familiar from syntax. That is, two categories of the same kind may contract a lateral relation only if no other object of similar nature intervenes. Relevant phonological categories that are eventually subject to Locality are syllabic constituents such as Onsets and Nuclei. The issue of Locality is raised only if a strict CVCV-approach (that will be introduced in the first part of the course) is assumed: Onsets and Nuclei are related by lateral relations such as Government and Licensing, and these may be local or not.

The discussion on Locality will bear a somewhat experimental character since it is purely

formal and tries to accommodate views from different linguistic fields, to the effect that theoretical arguments from syntax may have a direct bearing on phonological structure. It also raises questions related to UG: is there ONE UG with a single set of principles that enjoy syntactic, phonological, semantic etc. expression, or are there separate phonological, syntactic, semantic etc. UGs whose content is not interrelated? In other words: is phonology different?

Suggested readings

In order to follow the discussion, you must be aware of CVCV, Government and Licensing. Cf. the references quoted before.