

Stress is the Trigger of Chamorro Umlaut*

Aaron Kaplan
UC Santa Cruz
afkaplan@ucsc.edu

MALC
October 27, 2007

1 Introduction

- In Chamorro umlaut, front-voweled prefixes/particles cause fronting of root-initial vowels (Chung 1983, Topping 1968):

(1)	a.	nána	‘mother’	i náena	‘the mother’
	b.	gúmaʔ	‘house’	i gímaʔ	‘the house’
	c.	cúpa	‘cigarettes’	i cípa	‘the cigarettes’
	d.	sónsuŋ	‘village’	i séŋsuŋ	‘the village’
	e.	hága	‘daughter’	i háega	‘the daughter’
	f.	átcuʔ	‘rock’	i átcuʔ	‘the rock’
	g.	dáŋkulu	‘big one’	i dáéŋkulu	‘the big one’
	h.	láhe	‘male’	i láehe	‘the male’
	i.	tómo	‘knee’	i témo	‘the knee’

- Two interesting aspects of umlaut:

- (2) Umlaut only occurs if the root-initial vowel is stressed:

a.	pulónnun	‘trigger fish’	i pulónnun	‘the trigger fish’
b.	mundónŋu	‘cow’s stomach’	i mundónŋu	‘the cow’s stomach’

- Why not spread to/through unstressed vowels?
- “Reverse” Positional Faithfulness: unstressed vowels block umlaut.

*Thanks to Lev Blumenfeld, Junko Ito, Abby Kaplan, Armin Mester, Jaye Padgett, Joe Pater, David Teeple, and participants in the Stanford phonology reading group for helpful suggestions throughout the development of this paper.

(3) Umlaut optionally targets (a certain kind of) secondary stress:

- a. mí-pìgas, ‘abounding in uncooked rice’
 mí-pùgas
- b. i gìma?níha, ‘their house’
 i gùma?níha
- c. i kèbblinmámi, ‘our (excl.) cash’
 i kòbblinmámi

- Goals for today:
 - Account for (1) & (2) with Positional Licensing constraints.
 - Account for (3) using Stratal OT (Kiparsky 2000).

2 The Big Picture: Processes

- Umlaut looks noniterative:
- [-back] may spread one syllable to the right. If the stressed syllable can’t be reached with this, no spreading may occur.
- Umlaut sheds light on the status of noniterativity and processes in phonology.
- Rule-Based Theories: Grammars are composed largely of processes; languages can directly regulate their application.
 - An iterativity parameter (e.g. Archangeli & Pulleyblank 1994)
- Optimality Theory: Processes aren’t formal constructs; they emerge from constraint interactions.
 - Can’t directly regulate how a process applies.
 - Constraints for iterative phenomena (ALIGN, SPREAD, PARSE...) can’t be turned noniterative with the flip of a switch. Wholly different constraints are needed.
 - Markedness constraints can’t see inputs, so true noniterativity shouldn’t exist.
- My claim: There are no genuinely noniterative phenomena. Those that look noniterative result from factors not concerned with noniterativity.

3 Umlaut as Root Licensing

3.1 Positional Licensing through Prominence Hierarchies

- More examples of umlaut:¹

(4)	a.	káttá	‘letter’	ni káetta	‘the letter (obl.)’
	b.	húɲuk	‘to hear’	in-híɲuk	‘we (excl.) heard’
	c.	fógon	‘stove’	ni fégon	‘the stove’
	d.	óksoʔ	‘hill’	gi éksoʔ	‘at the hill’
	e.	túɲoʔ	‘to know’	en tíɲoʔ	‘you (pl.) know’
	f.	góde	‘to tie’	g-in-éde	‘thing tied’
	g.	lígu	‘north’	sæn láegu	‘towards north’
	h.	ótdot	‘ant’	mi-étidot	‘lots of ants’

- [-back] spreads from a weak position to a strong position to enhance its salience.
- Source = prefixes² immediately preceding primary stress (= “pretonic”)
 - Affixes are weak: They license fewer contrasts than roots (Urbanczyk 2006) and are psycholinguistically weak (e.g. Jarvella & Meijers 1983).
 - Pretonic syllables are weak in Chamorro: Clash is generally tolerated, but pretonic syllables must not be stressed.
- Target = the root, which is strong compared to affixes.
- Positional Licensing (Kaplan 2006, Walker 2001, Zoll 1998): [-back] in *prosodically* weak position is licensed by association to a strong *morphological* position.

(5) LICENSE-Pre-Primary: [-back] features that immediately precede primary stress must be linked to root segments.

⇒ Scan for pretonic [-back]. Assign a violation if it isn’t linked to a root segment.

- This is part of a fixed hierarchy (see Kaplan 2007, Padgett 2002):

(6) LICENSE-Pre-Primary » LICENSE-Pre-Secondary » LICENSE-Non-Pre-Primary » LICENSE-*ɔ̃* » LICENSE-*ó*

¹Glosses for affixes and particles: *ni* ‘oblique case,’ *in-* ‘1pl. exclusive,’ *-in-* ‘nominalizer,’ *gi-* ‘local case,’ *en* ‘2pl.,’ *sæn-* ‘in the direction of,’ and *mi-* ‘abounding in.’

²Some sources of umlaut are actually clitics, but they behave phonologically like prefixes. I use the term “prefix” to encompass true prefixes, clitics, and infixes that participate in umlaut.

- (7) a. LICENSE-Pre-Secondary: [-back] features that immediately precede secondary stress must be linked to root segments.
 b. LICENSE-Non-Pre-Primary: Non-Pre-Primary [-back] features must be linked to root segments.
 c. LICENSE-ò: Secondary stressed [-back] features must be linked to root segments.
 d. LICENSE-ó: Primary stressed [-back] features must be linked to root segments.
- IDENT[back] outranks all these constraints except LICENSE-Pre-Primary:

(8)

/i gúma?/	LIC-Pre-Primary	IDENT[back]	LIC-Elsewhere
a. i gúma?	*!		
☞ b. i gíma?		*	

- When the prefix isn't pretonic, IDENT blocks spreading:

(9)

/i pulónnun/	LIC-Pre-Primary	IDENT[back]	LIC-Elsewhere
☞ a. i pulónnun			*
b. i pilónnun		*!	
c. i pilénnun		*!*	

- Cf. Crosswhite (1996), Klein (2000): Spreading to the root, but they need additional machinery to block spreading to unstressed syllables.

3.2 Ruling out Other Strategies

- Why don't we find spreading from all pretonic front vowels (e.g. *mìmantikápa* 'more abounding in fat')?

(10)

/mì-mantiká-pa/	LIC-Pre-Primary	IDENT[back]	LIC-Elsewhere
☞ a. mì-mantiká-pa			*
b. mì-mantikáé-pa		*!	*

- To block regressive spreading, split IDENT[back] into IDENT[+back] and IDENT[-back]:

(11)

/i gúma?/	IDENT[-back]	LIC-Pre-Primary	IDENT[+back]	LIC-Elsewhere
☞ a. i gíma?			*	
b. u gúma?	*!			
c. i gúma?		*!		

3.3 Summary

- Stress triggers umlaut; the root is the target.
- No spreading through unstressed syllables to reach stress: umlaut doesn't target stress.
- No “reverse” Positional Faithfulness: unstressed vowels simply don't trigger umlaut.
- Noniterativity is only apparent: LICENSE motivates spreading to the root, so spreading just once is sufficient.

4 Optional Umlaut

4.1 Umlaut Triggered by Cyclic Stress

- One kind of secondary stress optionally triggers umlaut.
- Cyclic stress: Affixes can relocate primary stress, and the previous location of primary stress receives secondary stress.

(12)	a.	swéddu	‘salary’	swèddunmámi	‘your (sg.) salary’
		inéŋɣulu?	‘peeping’	inèŋɣulóʔŋa	‘his peeping’
	b.	néŋkanu?	‘food’	mínèŋkanu?	‘abounding in food’
		adáhi	‘be careful’	gófaddhi	‘be very careful’
		kwentúsi	‘to speak to’	ékwentùsi	‘to speak to one another’

- Cyclic secondary stress optionally triggers umlaut:

(13)	púgas	‘uncooked rice’	mí [́] pìgas, mí [́] pùgas	‘abounding in uncooked rice’
	gúma?	‘house’	i gì [̀] ma?níha, i gù [̀] ma?níha	‘their house’
	kóbbli	‘cash, money’	i kè [̀] bblinmámi, i kò [̀] bblinmámi	‘our (excl.) cash’

- Syllables that should have cyclic stress but don't because of pretonic clash can still trigger umlaut:

(14)	cúpa	‘cigarettes’	i cupáŋa, i cipáŋa	‘his cigarettes’
	sóŋsuŋ	‘village’	i suŋsóŋŋa, i siŋsóŋŋa	‘his village’

- Rhythmic stress: Secondary stress on alternating syllables to the left of primary stress:

(15)	àtma ^h ygósu	‘vegetable sp.’		
	ki ^h masón	‘to burn’		
	ma ^h gágu	‘clothes’	màgagúpa	‘his clothes’
	ba ^h pót	‘ship’	bàpotníha	‘their ship’

- Rhythmic stress does not trigger umlaut:

(16)	pùtamunéda	‘wallet’	i pùtamunéda,	‘the wallet’
			*i pìtamunéda	

- My analysis, in Stratal OT (Kiparsky 2000, Rubach 1997): Umlaut occurs before rhythmic stress is added and clash is resolved.
- Output-Output Faith (Benua 1997, Crosswhite 1996) won’t work: There’s not always a viable base (Klein 2000).

4.2 Stratal OT

- Let’s assume just two levels.
- First level: affixes are present, primary and cyclic stress is assigned, and umlaut occurs.
 - I assume correct stress in all candidates (see Crosswhite 1996, Klein 2000).
 - Optionality: no crucial ranking between IDENT and LICENSE-Pre-Secondary (cf. multiple grammars (Anttila 2006, 2007)).
 - A ranking between these constraints is chosen for each evaluation.

⇒ *i gimáʔ-ɲa/i gumáʔ-ɲa* ‘his house’ (deleted cyclic stress):

- LICENSE-Pre-Secondary ≫ IDENT:

(17) Level 1: *i gimáʔ-ɲa*

//i gùámáʔ-ɲa//	IDENT[-bk]	LIC-1st	LIC-2nd	IDENT[+bk]	LIC-Else
a. /i gùámáʔ-ɲa/			*!		
☞ b. /i gìmáʔ-ɲa/				*	

- Level 2: rhythmic stress appears (STRESS-ALT), pretonic syllables are destressed (*CLASH), and IDENT is promoted to prevent further umlaut.

(18) Level 2: *i gimáʔ-ɲa*

/i gìmáʔ-ɲa/	STRESS-ALT	*CLASH	IDENT[+bk]	IDENT[-bk]	LICENSE
a. i gìmáʔ-ɲa		*!			
☞ b. i gimáʔ-ɲa					
c. i gùámáʔ-ɲa		*!	*!		*
d. i gumáʔ-ɲa			*!		*

- Again, with IDENT ≫ LICENSE-Pre-Secondary:

(19) Level 1: *i gumáʔ-ɲa*

//i gùámáʔ-ɲa//	IDENT[-bk]	LIC-1st	IDENT[+bk]	LIC-2nd	LIC-Else
☞ a. /i gùámáʔ-ɲa/				*	
b. /i gìmáʔ-ɲa/			*!		

(20) Level 2: *i gumáʔ-ɲa*

/i gùámáʔ-ɲa/	STRESS-ALT	*CLASH	IDENT[+back]	IDENT[-back]	LICENSE
a. i gìmáʔ-ɲa		*!	*!		
b. i gimáʔ-ɲa			*!		
c. i gùámáʔ-ɲa		*!			*
☞ d. i gumáʔ-ɲa					*

⇒ *i pùtamunéda* ‘the wallet’ (rhythmic stress):

(21) Level 1: *i pùtamunéda*

//i putamunéda//	IDENT[-bk]	LIC-1st	LIC-2nd	IDENT[+bk]	LIC-Else
☞ a. /i putamunéda/					*
b. /i pùtamunéda/				*!	

(22) Level 2: *i pùtamunéda*

/i putamunéda/	STRESS-ALT	*CLASH	IDENT[+bk]	IDENT[-bk]	LICENSE
a. i putamunéda	*!				*
☞ b. i pùtamunéda					*
c. i pùtamunéda			*!		
d. i pitamunéda	*!		*!		

- Corroboration for this sequence: Gemination and Vowel Lowering distinguish the two kinds of stress.
- Chung (1983) rejects a cyclic account: an optional rule can’t produce obligatory umlaut on primary stress.
- Licensing: optional vs. obligatory umlaut comes from the ranking of IDENT within the Licensing constraint hierarchy.
- Another solution: All umlaut is optional lexically, umlaut on primary stress is obligatory postlexically (Kiparsky 1986).

5 Conclusion

- With unstressed syllables as blockers, umlaut is puzzling.
- Taking stress to be a trigger, not a target, helps us make sense of the pattern.
- Umlaut is driven by Positional Licensing constraints based on prosodic and morphological prominence.
- Optional umlaut provides evidence for Stratal OT.
- Umlaut is not inherently noniterative; perhaps nothing is truly noniterative?

References

- Anttila, Arto (2006) Variation and Opacity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **24**(4): 893–944.
- Anttila, Arto (2007) *Variation and Optionality*, 519–536. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Archangeli, Diana & Douglas Pulleyblank (1994) *Grounded Phonology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Benua, Laura (1997) *Transderivational Identity: Phonological Relations Between Words*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Chung, Sandra (1983) Transderivational Relationships in Chamorro Phonology. *Language* **59**: 35–66.
- Crosswhite, Katherine (1996) Base-Derivative Correspondences in Chamorro. In *UCLA Working Papers in Phonology*, Chai-Shune Hsu, ed., vol. 93, 57–85, UCLA Graduate Linguistics Circle.
- Jarvella, Robert J. & Guust Meijers (1983) *Recognizing Morphemes in Spoken Words: Some Evidence for a Stem-Organized Mental Lexicon*, 81–112. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Kaplan, Aaron F. (2006) The Nature of Iterativity: Evidence from Lango, ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Kaplan, Aaron F. (2007) Chamorro Umlaut, ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1986) Systematic Optionality in the Lexical Phonology of Chamorro.
- Kiparsky, Paul (2000) Opacity and Cyclicity. *The Linguistic Review* **17**: 351–367.
- Klein, Thomas B. (2000) “Umlaut” in *Optimality Theory: A Comparative Analysis of German and Chamorro*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Padgett, Jaye (2002) Constraint Conjunction versus Grounded Constraint Subhierarchies in Optimality Theory, ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Rubach, Jerzy (1997) Extrasyllabic Consonants in Polish: Derivational Optimality Theory. In *Derivations and Constraints in Phonology*, Iggy Roca, ed., 551–581, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Topping, Donald M. (1968) Chamorro Vowel Harmony. *Oceanic Linguistics* **7**(1): 67–79.
- Urbanczyk, Suzanne (2006) Reduplicative Form and the Root-Affix Asymmetry. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **24**(1): 179–240.
- Walker, Rachel (2001) Positional Markedness in Vowel Harmony. In *Proceedings of HILP 5. Linguistics in Potsdam*, Caroline Féry, Antony Dubach Green, & Ruben van de Vijver, eds., vol. 12, 212–232, University of Potsdam.
- Zoll, Cheryl (1998) Positional Asymmetries and Licensing, Ms., MIT ROA-282 <http://roa.rutgers.edu>.