Two Repairs in One Grammar?

Obligatory Epenthesis & Variable t/d deletion in English

Jennifer Nycz, New York University

1. Introduction

Some processes that affect regular past tense forms in English:

- **Vowel Epenthesis:** /wet+d/ → [wetId] *waited*
- **Voicing Assimilation**: /kIs+d/ → [kIst] *kissed*
- **T/D Deletion** optionally applies to clusters whose members are not both coronal stops, deleting suffix coronal. The more features the 2 segments share, the more likely it is that deletion of the final coronal will occur (Guy & Boberg 1997)

  /kIs+d/ → kIst → [kIs] *kissed*

Epenthesis & deletion both repair marked sequences. How to choose the correct repair for each case?

With rules: Epenthesis bleeds deletion

	/wet+d/ (*wait+PAST*)	/kIs+d/ (*kiss+PAST*)
epenthesis	wetId	-----
deletion	-----	kIs
output	[wetId]	[kIs]

In OT:

1. To get epenthesis, DEP must be dominated by constraints ruling out coronal stop sequences (see Bakovic 2005)

/wet+d/	NoGem	Agree[voi]	MAX-C	DEP-V	Ident[voi]
wetd		*!			
wett	*!				*
wet			*		
☞ wetId				*	

2. To get deletion, MAX must be variably ranked wrt constraints militating against clusters (see Côté 2004)

/kIs+d/	Agree[voi]	DEP-V	*st	MAX-C	Ident[voi]
kIsd	*!				
☜ kIst			*!		*
☜ kIs				*!	
kIsId		*!			

Note the ranking paradox! If DEP-V >> MAX-C, epenthesis would be correctly ruled out in *kissed,* incorrectly so in *waited.* If MAX-C >> DEP-V, deletion would be ruled out in *waited,* but epenthesis predicted for *kissed.*

2. The Problem

- The specific repair chosen must result from the relative ranking of faithfulness constraints (which can't be variable!). Given ranking $\mathbf{M_1 >> F_1 >> M_2 >> F_2}$, violation of F_2 will be preferred repair for both M_1 and M_2 violations - unless some other constraint C distinguishes F-violating candidates across derivations. What form could C take?
- Can't distinguish the final clusters morphologically, since all involve same past tense morpheme.
- Looks like a case for Licensing-by-Cue (Steriade 1997): explode Faith constraints so a high-ranked MAX rules out deletion candidate [wet]. *BUT:* MAX(t)/t_ >> MAX(t)/s_ is contra claims of L-by-C.

/kIs+d/	NoGEM	Agree[voi]	MAX(t/t_)	DEP	*st	MAX(t/s_)	Ident[voi]
kIsd		*!					
☜ kIst					*!		*
☜ kIs						*!	
kIsId				*!			

/wet+d/	NoGem	Agree[voi]	MAX(t/t_)	DEP	*st	MAX(t/s_)	Ident[voi]
wetd		*!					
wett	*!				(*)		*
wet			*			*	
☞ wetId				*			

- L-by-C doesn't explain why the segment w/ poorest cues (post-coronal [d]) is *saved by epenthesis* rather than *deleted.*

3. A Level-Ordering Account

- Not a typical case of opacity: both generalizations are surface-true and -apparent, and no intermediate representations are needed. Thus OT machinery which has been proposed for dealing with these aspects of opacity (e.g. Sympathy) is not helpful.
- Each process potentially bleeds the other
- Not possible to derive different repairs from same constraint ranking, without formulating constraints in a way that refer specifically to structure being repaired. To maintain independence of markedness violations and repair, must locate repairs at different levels (corresponding to Lexical and Post-Lexical)

Proposal: High-ranked MAX-Morpheme constraint ensures that past-tense suffix is preserved; low-ranked general MAX-C means deletion is still possible in monomorphemic forms at Lexical level, resulting in higher deletion rates for these forms (see Guy 1991)

First level: Faithfulness to morphemes

/wet+d/	NoGem	Agree[voi]	MAX-morph	DEP-V	*st	MAX-C
wetd		*!				
wett	*!				(*)	
wet			*!			*
☞ wetId				*		

/kIs+d/	NoGEM	Agree[voi]	MAX-morph	DEP-V	*st	MAX-C
kIsd		*!				
☞ kIst					*	
kIs			*!			*
kIsId				*!		

/mIst/	NoGEM	Agree[voi]	MAX-morph	DEP-V	*st	MAX-C
☜ mIst					*	
☜ mIs						*
mIsIt				*!		

Second level: Morphemes expendable

/wetId /	NoGem	Agree[voi]	DEP-V	MAX-C	*st	MAX-morph
☞ wetId						
wetI				*!		*

/kIst/	NoGEM	Agree[voi]	DEP-V	MAX-C	*st	MAX-morph
☜ kIst					*	
☜ kIs				*		*
kIsId			*!			

/mIst/	NoGEM	Agree[voi]	DEP-V	MAX-C	*st	MAX-morph
☜ mIst					*	
☜ mIs				*		*
mIsIt			*!			