

Syncope, opacity and maximal word size in Modern Hebrew

Dafna Graf (LUCL[®])
D.Graf@let.leidenuniv.nl

Martin Krämer (Tromsø/CASTL[™])
m.kraemer@hum.uit.no

1 Introduction

1.1 The problem

Hebrew suffixed forms show a pattern of vowel deletion when compared to their unsuffixed bases.

(1) Verbal forms with /a, e, o/ deletion under affixation

a.	a	katáv	/katav-a/	katvá	'he wrote'
					'she wrote'
b.	e	dibér	/diber-a/	dibrá	'he spoke'
					'she spoke'
c.	o	tipól	/tipol-u/	tiplú	'you will fall'
					'they will fall'

(2) Nominal forms in which /a/ or /e/ delete

a.	a	katsár	/katsar-im/	ktsarím	<i>short ~ PL.</i>
		pakíd	/pakid-ut/	pkidút	<i>clerk~ clerical work</i>
		gader	/gader-ot/	gderót	<i>fence sg. ~ pl.</i>
b.	e	tipéj	/tipej-a/	tipjá	<i>stupid ~ fem. *tpejá</i>

This has been attributed to a maximal word size condition in Hebrew (Bat-El 1994 et sequ., Ussishkin 2000).

The pattern is complicated by several factors:

- a) Phonotactics: CCC clusters are avoided (3a,c);
verbs do not allow word-initial clusters (3b),
nominals avoid coda consonants (3c).
- b) High vowels are never deleted (4).
- c) In some forms /a/ and /o/ are replaced by surface [e] (5a,b).
- d) There is no replacement if the target vowel is high (5c).

Conditions (b), (c) and (d) have escaped satisfactory explanation so far.

(3) Avoidance of consonant clusters

a.	tedabér	/tedaber-i/	tedabrí	*tedbrí, *tdabrí, *tdbrí
	'you m. will speak'		'you f. will speak'	
	kamcán	/kamcan-ut/	kamcanút	*kmcánút, *kamcnút, *kmcnút
	'stingy'		'stingyness'	
b.	katáv	/katav-a/	katvá	*ktavá, *ktvá
	'he wrote'		'she wrote'	
c.	katsár	/katsar-im/	ktsarím	*katsrím, *ktsrím
	'short'		'short.pl'	

(4) Forms in which /i/ and /u/ don't delete under affixation

a.	tipéj	/tipej-a/	tipjá	*tpejá
	'stupid'		'stupid.fem'	
b.	mitún	/mitun-im/	mituním	*mtunim, *mitnim
	'recession'		'recessions'	

(5) Verb forms in which a non-high vowel is realized as [e]

a.	a	hutxál	/hutxal-a/	hutxelá	*hutxlá
		'he was started'		'she was started'	
b.	o	yigmór	/yigmor-u/	yigmerú	*yigmrú
		'he will finish'		'they will finish'	
c.	i	tatxil	/tatxil-i/	tatxilí	*tatxelí
		'you m. will start'		'you f. will start'	

Aims of the paper:

- ✓ analyse Hebrew vowel deletion as effect of markedness restrictions on unstressed syllables, rather than word size restriction;
- ✓ explain notorious resistance of high vowels to deletion;
- ✓ give a parallel account of apparent derivational effect (deletion-insertion interaction)

1.2 Outline of the solution

Hebrew unstressed syllables are subject to markedness constraints against too sonorous nuclei. These are satisfied by reduction to *i*, *u* and schwa in Bulgarian and other languages (Crosswhite 2001), by deletion in Hebrew.

Deletion is another strategy to avoid violation of the same constraints that trigger reduction (Gouskova 2003).

(6) The fate of unstressed vowels - Surrender or die:

- a. Reduction: MAX-V >> MARKEDNESS >> IDENT(F)
- b. Deletion: IDENT(F) >> MARKEDNESS >> MAX-V (Gouskova 2003)

[®] LUCL: Leiden University Center for Linguistics.

[™] CASTL: Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics.

The replacement (emergence of [e] in some unstressed syllables) is deletion of the underlying vowel with simultaneous insertion of an unmarked vowel to avoid the emerging consonant cluster.

Deletion/insertion is blocked in potential closed syllables (CVC). (tedabri 'you f. will speak' - *tedebri)

The parallelist analysis below is based on CONTIGUITY-Syllable (Pater 1997).

2 Analysis

(7) Prominence Scales:

a. Nucleus (Prince & Smolensky 1993): a > e, o > i, u > ə

*Peak i,u >> *Peak e,o >> *Peak a

b. Sonority driven prominence reduction (Crosswhite 2001):

*UNSTRESSED/a > UNSTRESSED/e,o > *UNSTRESSED/i,u > *UNSTRESSED/ə

Unstressed vowels should be less sonorous than stressed vowels.

2.1 Word-/Foot-binarity?

Derived words strive to be disyllabic, i.e. *minimal. Disyllabicity* can be accounted for in different ways: by aligning the syllable to the edges of the Prosodic Word (Ussishkin 2000) or by foot-binarity and foot alignment (Bat-El 2004). Downing (2005) suggests a morphological approach correlating a morpheme to a syllable.

Different accounts have in common the assertion that disyllabicity is *enforced* upon a word by some constraints and is a trigger for phonological processes such as vowel deletion (Adam, Bat-El, Ussishkin).

(8) Vowel deletion by force of word minimality

(adapted from Bat-El 2003): gadal-a 'she grew'

/gadal-a/	*CCC	WORDMIN	MAX-V
a. gá.da.lá		*!	
☞ b. gad.lá			*

(9) New proposal

/gadal-a/	*CCC	*UNSTRESSED/V	MAX-V
a. ga.da.lá		**!	
☞ b. gad.lá		*	*
c. gdlá	*!		

(10) Why not reduction?

/gadal-a/	*CCC	IDENT (F)	*UNSTRESSED /a,e,o	MAX-V
☞ a. gad.lá			*	*
b. gidilá		*!*		

(Note that schwa doesn't exist in Modern Hebrew.)

2.2 Cluster avoidance in nouns and verbs

(11) Why not deletion of the first vowel in Verbs? complex onsets are not tolerated.

/gadal-a/	*CCC	*COMPLEX ONSET	*UNSTRESSED /a,e,o	MAX-V
☞ a. gad.lá			*	*
b. gdalá		*!	*	

Nouns prefer candidate (b).

Why are nouns different?: Different ranking for nouns.

(12) No coda enforced in nominals - complex onsets tolerated

/katar-im/	*CODA	*UNSTRESSED /a,e,o	*CMLX ONS	MAX-V
a. katsrím	*!	*		*
☞ b. ktsarím		*	*	

(13) Interim rankings

a. Verbs:

*CCC, *COMPLEXONSET, IDENT(F) >> *UNSTRESSED/a,e,o >> *CODA, MAX-V

b. Nominals:

*CCC, *CODA, IDENT(F) >> *UNSTRESSED/a,e,o >> *COMPLEXONSET, MAX-V

(14) No deletion of high vowel: /mitun+im/ 'recessions'

/mitun-im/	IDENT (F)	*CCC	*UNSTRSSD /a,e,o	MAXV	*UNSTRSSD /i,u
☞ a. mituním					***
b. mtním		*!		*	
c. mtuním				*!	**
d. mitním				*!	**

Trisyllabic forms or longer forms are the result of:

- Restrictions on syllable margins
- Differential syncope (i.e., low sonority vowels are not targeted).

- We assume co-phonologies for verbs and for nominals
- The assumption is supported by further phonological processes

2.3 "Pseudo-reduction" in verbs

(15) Some verbs display a change of unstressed a,o to e. This is not found in nouns.

Verb: yigmór /yigmor-u/ yigmerú 'will finish m./f.'

Nominal: miklát /miklat-im/ miklatím 'refuge sg./pl.'

The verbal strategy: syncope + epenthesis

The nominal strategy: syncope blocked to avoid CCC cluster, epenthesis not possible.

If /a/ deletes and is replaced by an epenthetic vowel to avoid a consonant cluster, why is it not a high vowel, that is favoured here?

The epenthetic vowel is chosen by

- a. the split-up *UNSTRESSED scale (ruling out *a*)
- b. recovery constraints (ruling out *i, u*):

(16) RECOVER/x: "A syllable nucleus with prominence x must have a correspondent in the input." (Alderete 1999, Gouskova 2003)

(17) REC/i, u: "High vowels have to be recoverable in the input."

(18) Parallel deletion and epenthesis

/hutxal-a/	IDENT (F)	*CCC	REC /i, u	*UNSTRESSED /a > a, o > a, o, e	MAX-V	DEP-V
a. hutxalá				*! * *		
b. hutxlá		*!				
c. hutxilá	*!					
☞ d. hutxilá			*!		*	*
e. hutxolá				*! * *	*	*
☞ f. hutxelá					*	*

(In the analysis we implement de Lacy's (2002) theory of markedness scales, rather than a fixed ranking. This will be crucial in (20) below.)

Why do not all verbs do this?

Many verbs don't show epenthesis as a response to cluster avoidance, only blocking of deletion.

(19) *hitparka* 'she broke apart' no deletion plus epenthesis

/hitparek -a/	IDENT (F)	*CCC	REC /i, u	*UNSTRESSED /a > a, o > a, o, e	MAX-V	DEP-V
a. hitpareká				* *! **		
b. hitprká		*!			**	
c. hitpreká		*!		*	*	
⊗ d. hitparká				* *! *	*	
☛ e. hitperká				*	*	*
☞ f. hitpereká				*! *	*	*

Candidate (e) wrongly wins; candidate (f) threatens candidate (d) as well.

Ranking the scalar markedness constraints on unstressed vowels eliminates (f).

Two unstressed vowels are worse than one.

(20) Candidate (f) eliminated by ranking the markedness constraints:

/hitparek -a/	IDENT (F)	*CCC	REC /i, u	*UNSTRESSED /a, o, e > a, o > a	MAX-V	DEP-V
a. hitpareká				*! * *		
b. hitprká		*!			**	
c. hitpreká		*!			*	
⊗ d. hitparká				* *! *	*	
☛ e. hitperká				*	*	*
☞ f. hitpereká				*! *	*	*

Candidate (e) has deletion/epenthesis in a closed syllable.

Generalisation: Blocking of deletion and epenthesis occurs in closed syllables only.

This is a CONTIGUITY effect: Contiguity punishes unfaithfulness inside constituents but not at margins (McCarthy & Prince 1995, 1999, Alber 2001, Krämer 2005).

(21) I-CONTIGUITY ("No Skipping", McCarthy & Prince, 1995):

The portion of S₁ standing in correspondence forms a contiguous string. Domain (Ø) is a single contiguous string in S₁. /xyz/ → xz

Here, CONTIGUITY is restricted to the syllable: Vowels at the syllable margin in the surface form can be deleted; vowels embedded between two tautosyllabic consonants cannot.

(22) I-CONTIG-σ (Pater 1997: 226)

The portion of S₁ standing in correspondence with the constituents of a syllable forms a contiguous string.

(23) Violations of I-CONTIG-σ (diverging from Pater's interpretation):

/psatka/	I-CONTIG-σ	MAX-IO
a. .psat.ka.	√	√
b. .psa.ka.	√	t
c. .sa.ka.	√	b ₁ t
d. .pst.ka.	*	a
e. .pat.ka.	*	r
f. .pt.ka.	*	r ₁ a
g. .psa.ta.	√	k
h. .ps.ta.	√	a ₁ k

(24) *hitparká* : no deletion/epenthesis

/hitparek-a/	I-CONT- σ	*UNSTRSSD /a,o,e > a,o > a	MAX-V	DEP-V
a. hit.pa.re.ká		**!	*	*
☞ d. hit.par.ká		*	*	*
☞ e. hit.per.ká	*!	*	*	*
f. hit.pe.re.ká		**!	*	*

(25) Deletion and reinsertion in open syllables:

/hutxal-a/	ID (F)	*CCC	REC /i,u	I-CONT -σ	*UNSTRSSD/ a,o,e > a,o > a	DEP- V	MAX- V
☞ a. hutxalá					*	*!	*
b. hutxlá		*!					
c. hutxilá	*!						
d. hutxilá			*!			*	*
e. hutxolá					*	*!	*
☞ f. hutxelá					*		*

© The apparent opaque interaction of deletion and insertion is accounted for in a purely parallelist fashion. No need for extensions to the theory (Sympathy, Stratal OT, candidate chains etc.).

3 Conclusions

- Vowel deletion in Hebrew is an effect of sonority requirements on unstressed nuclei.
- No word-size restrictions are needed.
- High vowels are of low sonority and thus conform to the above markedness restrictions.
There is no reason to delete high vowels if deletion happens to reduce markedness in unstressed syllables rather than because of a maximal word size constraint.
- Change from /a, o/ to [e] is not reduction, but rather deletion plus epenthesis.
- Blocking of /a,o/ → [e] occurs in closed syllables only: Contiguity effect

References

- Adam, Galit. 2002. *From Variable to Optimal Grammar: Evidence from Language Acquisition and Language Change*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tel-Aviv University.
- Alber, Birgit. 2001. Regional variation and edges: Glottal stop epenthesis and dissimilation in standard and southern varieties of German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 20. 3-41.
- Alderete, John. 1999. Faithfulness to Prosodic Heads. In Ben Hermans and Marc van Oostendorp (eds.) *The Derivational Residue in Phonological Optimality Theory*, 29-50. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bat-El, Outi. 1994. Stem modification and cluster transfer in Modern Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 571-596.

- Bat-El, Outi. 2003. The fate of the consonantal root and the binyan in Optimality Theory. In: J. Lowenstamm (ed.) *Revue Linguistique de Vincennes*. pp. 30-56.
- Bolozky, Shmuel, 1978. Some Aspects of Modern Hebrew Phonology. In R. Berman (ed.), *Modern Hebrew Structure*, 11-64. Tel-Aviv: University of Tel-Aviv Publishing Projects.
- Bolozky, Shmuel. 1997. Israeli Hebrew Phonology. In: Alan S. Kaye *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*, 287-311.
- Broselow, Ellen. 1992. Parametric Variation in Arabic Dialect Phonology. E. Broselow, M. Eid & J. McCarthy (eds.) *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics IV*: 7-47.
- Crosswhite, Katherine. 2000. Sonority-driven reduction. *Proceedings of BLS 26*.
- Crosswhite, Katherine. 2001. *Vowel Reduction in Optimality Theory*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Crosswhite, Katherine. 2004. *Vowel Reduction*. In Bruce Hayes, Robert Kirchner and donca Steriade (eds.). *Phonetically Based Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 191-231.
- de Lacy, Paul. 2002. *The Formal Expression of Markedness*. Ph. D. Dissertation, UMass, Amherst.
- Downing, Laura. 2005. *Why minimal truncations are optimally longer than Minimal Word*. Handout, OCP 2, Jan. 2005, University of Tromsø
- Gouskova, Maria. 2003. *Deriving economy: Syncope in Optimality Theory*. Ph.D. Dissertation, UMass, Amherst.
- Graf, Dafna. 2003. *Prosodic control: Consonant clusters in Modern Hebrew*. Ms. Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf.
- Hammond, Michael. 1997. Vowel Quantity and Syllabification in English. *Language* 73: 1-17.
- Krämer, Martin. 2005. Contiguity and non-derived environment blocking of s-voicing in Lombardian and Tuscan Italian. *Probus* 17: 227-251.
- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and Reduplicative Identity. In Jill N. Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey & Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.). *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*. Amherst: GLSA. 249-384.
- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince. 1999. Faithfulness and identity in prosodic morphology. In René Kager, Harry van der Hulst & Wim Zonneveld (eds.). *The Prosody-Morphology Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 218-309.
- Pater, Joe 1997. Minimal violations and phonological development. *Language Acquisition* 6, 201-253.
- Ravid, D. & Y. Shlesinger. 2001. Vowel reduction in Modern Hebrew: Traces of the past and current variation. *Folia Linguistica* 35, 3—4, 371-397.
- Ussishkin, Adam, 2000. *The Emergence of Fixed Prosody*. Ph.D. Dissertation, UC Santa Cruz.