

## Duke-of-York Epenthesis in Arapaho

Daniel Gleim, University of Leipzig (gleimdani@gmail.com)

**Main claim:** Duke-of-York (DoY) Phenomena are a class of opaque patterns that prove especially problematic for Optimality Theory (OT). In derivational terms, they are defined as a sequence of processes, in which the second process reverses the changes effectuated by the first process ( $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$ ). McCarthy (2003) claims, that apparent DoY should be re-analysed and that real DoY patterns (defined as  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow B' \rightarrow A'$ ) do not exist. I will show new evidence for exactly such a DoY pattern of epenthesis and vowel deletion in Arapaho, which does not refer to stress and foot-structure, unlike cases discussed so far in the literature (e.g. Kager (1999)). I claim that the best analysis lies in the adoption of Stratal OT (Kiparsky, 2000; Bermúdez-Otero, 2011). Epenthesis applies in a first stratum, and deletion, triggered by a ganging up of several constraints against low-sonorous nuclei, on a higher stratum. I show that alternative approaches in parallel OT and serial versions without re-ranking (HS, McCarthy (2000, 2010)) fail to account for the same data.

**Data:** Arapaho (Plains Algonquin, (Cowell & Moss, 2008)) is a polysynthetic language with a comparatively small phoneme inventory and two tones, H and L. It displays an intriguing pattern of interactions between epenthesis, place- and manner assimilation, floating tones and tone-sensitive vowel deletion. Epenthesis is employed to re-syllabify coda consonants due to a constraint against place features in codas. (1).

- (1) a. /béteen<sup>-H</sup> too-noo/ → béteenítoonoo 'I'm worshipping'  
b. /oow<sup>-H</sup> see/ → hoowúsee 'to walk down'

The epenthetic vowel is a high vowel, in most contexts [i] but in phonologically predictable cases [u]. If it is [i], it triggers the same segmental changes on preceding consonants as underlying front vowels do: de-larisation of velar consonants (/k,x,w/ → [tʃ,s,b], see (2-a)) and a noise-augmenting chain shift in coronal obstruents (/t/ → [θ], /θ/ → [s] see (2-b)).

- (2) a. /nóóhow-éθen/ → nonóóhobéθen 'I see you'  
b. /toot-ííhi?/ → tooθííhi? 'nearby'

Epenthetic vowels are the preferred hosts for floating high tones (3-a). If there is no epenthetic vowel, the floating tone replaces adjacent stem tones (3-b).

- (3) a. /tʃew<sup>-H</sup>-see/ → tʃebísee 'to walk along'  
b. /ne<sup>-H</sup> woʔéín/ → nónoʔéín 'my necklace'

If there is no floating high tone available, epenthetic vowels are low-toned by default. A final relevant process is (optional) deletion of monomoraic high vowels in word medial position – unless they bear a high tone, in which case they never delete (1). For epenthetic vowels, this deletion is obligatory. In consequence, epenthetic vowels are only realised on the surface if they were able to attract a floating high tone, see (4) for a case without epenthesis.

- (4) wóxhoox, \*wóxuhoox 'horse'

Crucially, if an epenthetic vowel is expected after a consonant that undergoes consonantal changes, these changes surface even though the epenthetic vowel does not surface (5).

- (5) /nih-bebíθ-tii-t/ → nihbebíistiit 'she fixed it'

Derivationally, epenthesis thus applied, triggered the change and then deleted, which is exactly the  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow B' \rightarrow A'$  pattern.

**Analysis:** Parallel approaches cannot derive this pattern, because they cannot refer to a nec-

essary intermediate step. An alternative parallel analysis, assuming that the real trigger of epenthesis is the floating tone itself, fails to derive the over-application of consonantal changes. The hurdles for HS are similar: even though it is inherently based on intermediate steps, re-ranking is impossible and DoY phenomena thus ruled out. The solution for this puzzle lies in the adoption of Stratal OT. Stratal OT assumes different levels or strata, normally 3, in which different morphophonological layers are computed. In between the strata, a re-ranking of constraints is possible. I assume that epenthesis, consonantal change and tone assignment all apply on a lower stratum, the stem level (6), while deletion of low-toned vowels of low sonority, happens on a later stratum, the word level (7). There is no independent evidence from affixation for the strata. Between strata, constraints are re-ranked and formerly high ranked NOCODA which penalises coda consonants is now dominated by the constraint against low-sonorous nuclei. Vowel deletion is enforced by the constraint SYNCOPE and the somewhat mysterious consonantal changes by the ad hoc constraint C-CHANGE.

(6) Stem level

input: bebiiθ-tii	NOCODA	MAX-T	*FLOAT	DEP-V	C-CHANGE	SYNCOPE	IDENT-T	IDENT-C
a. bebiiθtii	*!							
☞ b. bebiisitii				*		*		*
c. bebiiθitii				*	*!	*		

(7) Word level

input: bebiisitii	SYNCOPE	MAX-T	*FLOAT	DEP-V	C-CHANGE	NOCODA	IDENT-T	IDENT-C
☞ a. bebiistii						*		
b. bebiisitii	*!							

**Summary and further implications:** Besides presenting a new pattern for DoY that constitutes strong argument for Stratal OT, this talk contributes to the empirical discussion on the relationship between tone, epenthesis and deletion. The data and analysis are in accordance with Blumenfeld's (2006) claim that tone is never a trigger for epenthesis. On the other hand, it shows that tone may well influence vowel deletion, in contrary to claims by de Lacy (2006).

## References:

- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2011. The architecture of grammar and the division of labor in exponence. In Jochen Trommer (ed.), *The morphology and phonology of exponence*, chap. 2, 8–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blumenfeld, Lev. 2006. *Constraints on Phonological Interactions*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Cowell, Andrew & Alonzo Moss. 2008. *The Arapaho Language*. Boulder, Colorado: Colorado University Press.
- Kager, René. 1999. Surface opacity of metrical structure in optimality theory. *The derivational residue in phonological Optimality Theory* 28. 207.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2000. Opacity and cyclicity. *Linguistic review* 17(2-4). 351–366.
- de Lacy, Paul. 2006. *Markedness: Reduction and Preservation in Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John J. 2000. Harmonic serialism and parallelism. In *Proceedings of nels 30*, 501–524. Amherst MA: GLSA Publications.
- McCarthy, John J. 2003. Sympathy, cumulativity, and the Duke-of-York gambit. In Caroline Féry & Ruben Van de Vijwer (eds.), *The syllable in optimality theory* January, 23–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John J. 2010. An introduction to Harmonic Serialism. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4. 1001–1080.