

## Reconsidering Linearity: Evidence from CV Metathesis<sup>1</sup> WCCFL 24

### 1 Introduction

I present both formal and empirical reasons to develop an alternative to the faithfulness constraint regulating metathesis (Linearity), and suggest one based on the notion of *contiguity* (McCarthy and Prince 1995).

The empirical reasons are drawn exclusively from Kwaráá<sup>2</sup> (Austronesian). Kwaráá makes a good case study because of its especially robust process of CV metathesis (see below).

### 2 Formal Considerations

Linearity is defined as follows (McCarthy and Prince 1995, p. 123):

- (1)  $S_1$  is consistent with the precedence structure of  $S_2$ , and vice versa (No Metathesis).

Let  $x, y \in S_1$  and  $x, y \in S_2$ . If  $x \prec x$  and  $y \prec y$ ,

then  $x$  precedes ( $<$ )  $y$  if  $x$  precedes ( $<$ )  $y$ .

In other words, if a segment precedes another in the input, that precedence relation should be preserved by the corresponding segments in the output.<sup>3</sup>

**How many such relations exist in a word?**

For a word of length  $n$ , there are  $(n^2 - n)/2$  pairs of segments with this precedence relation.

**Example:** The underlying form of hypothetical *salódu* /salódu/ has eight segments, and 28 precedence relations.

---

<sup>1</sup>I would like to thank Sophie Streeter, Kie Zuraw, Donca Steriade, Bruce Hayes, Colin Wilson, Pat Keating, Greg Kobele, Lauren Varner, Andy Martin, and members of the UCLA Phonology Seminar for their assistance in this research.

<sup>2</sup>All the Kwaráá data in this handout comes from Sophie Streeter, a native speaker of Kwaráá to whom I am indebted for her time and commitment to the study of her language.

<sup>3</sup>In this sense, Linearity is essentially a Max constraint, applied to precedence relations, which are ordered pairs. We could equally well talk about a Dep version of Linearity, which is violated for every new precedence relation introduced in  $S_2$ . Domain internal segment-adjacent metathesis would violate each of these constraints equally.

(2)

s	a	l	o	f	i	d	u
s < a	a < l	l < o	o < f	f < i	i < d	d < u	
s < l	a < o	l < f	o < i	f < d	i < u		
s < o	a < f	l < i	o < d	f < u			
s < f	a < i	l < d	o < u				
s < i	a < d	l < u					
s < d	a < u						
s < u							
+7	+6	+5	+4	+3	+2	+1	+0

Thus, Linearity is gradient; the farther a segment moves, the fewer precedence relations are preserved (Hume 2001).

(3)

/salofid/	Linearity
a. salofid	(d < u)
b. saloufid	(f < u) (i < u) (d < u)

However, all of the precedence relations are potentially violable; the candidate which reverses the string [udifolas] preserves none of these relations, and thus violates Linearity 28 times.

In other words, Linearity belongs to a particular class of gradient constraints that are *quadratic*, in the sense of Eisner (1997). Such constraints are problematic because:

- Constraints of this type have been shown to make anomalous predictions like tone-centering (Eisner 1997) and a range of other predictions that McCarthy (2003) discusses.
- They are categorically more powerful than the vast majority of other constraints that phonologists employ in their analyses.
- They are formally too complex to compute optimization over, with any of the current proposals for so doing in the literature.

### 3 Empirical Considerations and Contiguity

#### The Problem

When Linearity is ranked below some markedness constraint then by the Optimality-theoretic principle of strict domination, a candidate which has massive Linearity violations but which does not violate the markedness constraint is still more harmonic than candidates which violate the markedness constraint.

(4)

input	Markedness	Linearity
♥ cand1		
cand2	!	

cand1 cand2.

Generally, the gradient nature of Linearity encourages local solutions to markedness (Hume 2001), but sometimes non-local solutions are in fact optimal.

**In other words, if metathesis is allowed to satisfy some markedness constraint, then any amount (and any kind) of re-ordering is allowed to avoid violating the markedness constraint.**



I assume the faithful candidate is eliminated because it violates the phonotactic that words do not end in a heavy syllable followed by a light syllable. Following Prince (1983), I attribute this to an undominated constraint banning weak moras of heavy syllables from bearing stress. (Kwara~~ar~~Normal form regularly stresses the penultimate mora).

- (10) \*WeakMora= X1 incurs a violation whenever the weak mora of a heavy syllable bears stress.

(11)

/σ <sub>1</sub> σ <sub>2</sub> /	*WeakMora= X1	SWP	Linearity
☉ a. 'σ <sub>2</sub> .σ <sub>1</sub>			
b. 'σ <sub>1</sub> .σ <sub>2</sub>		!	
c. 'σ <sub>1</sub> .σ <sub>2</sub>	!		

As a result, [\*CV<sub>1</sub>V<sub>4</sub>.CV<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub>C] is more harmonic than winning [CV<sub>1</sub>.CV<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub>V<sub>4</sub>C].

The problem extends to all words /CV(CVV)<sup>n</sup>CV/.

Idea: The order of the vowels in the input must be the same in the output.

(12)

/σ <sub>1</sub> σ <sub>2</sub> /	Preserve V Order	SWP	Linearity
a. 'σ <sub>2</sub> .σ <sub>1</sub>	(u < a <sub>2</sub> )! (a <sub>1</sub> < a <sub>2</sub> )		
♥ b. 'σ <sub>1</sub> .σ <sub>2</sub>			

### 3.3 Solution to Case One

#### 3.3.1 Contiguity

Proposal:

- (13) Linearity can be replaced by a richer family of Contiguity constraints.

I define the *contiguity* relation ( ) as *immediate precedence*.

Therefore, Contiguity constraints are linear; that is, the potential number of violations is limited by a linear function of the length of the word.

(14)

s	a <sub>1</sub>	l	o	f	i	d	a <sub>2</sub>
s a <sub>1</sub>	a <sub>1</sub> l	l o	o f	f i	i d	d a <sub>2</sub>	
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0

These Contiguity constraints come in two types Max and Dep (McCarthy and Prince 1993).

- (15) Max-Contiguity:

Let  $x, y \in S_1$  and  $x, y \in S_2$ . If  $x \prec x$  and  $y \prec y$  then  
 if  $x$  immediately precedes ( )  $y$  then  $x$  immediately precedes ( )  $y$ .  
 (No deletion of contiguity relations)

(16) Dep-Contiguity:

Let  $x, y \in S_1$  and  $x, y \in S_2$ . If  $x \leq x$  and  $y \leq y$  then

if  $x$  immediately precedes  $(\ )y$  then  $x$  immediately precedes  $(\ )y$ .

(No insertion of contiguity relations)

**Example:**

	/salog <sub>10</sub> /	Max-Contig	Dep-Contig
a.	salog <sub>10</sub>	(i d) (d u)	(i u) (u d)
b.	salou <sub>10</sub>	(o f) (d u)	(o u) (u f)

⌘ These constraints lack the property that long-distance metathesis costs more! C.f. McCarthy (2003).

%Max-Contiguity and Dep-Contiguity have the same properties of I-Contig and O-Contig (McCarthy and Prince 1995) that make deletion and epenthesis at edges cheaper than domain internally.<sup>7</sup>

~~%In Kwara%~~ In Normal form, both of these constraints must be ranked below SWP.

### 3.3.2 V-Tier Contiguity

✂The above empirical problem is solved by recognizing that CV metathesis never allows the vowels themselves to change order, which has the effect of prohibiting long distance CV metathesis.

(18) V-Tier Max-Contiguity: if  $V_1$  immediately precedes  $V_2$  in the vowel tier of the input, then the correspondent of  $V_1$  must immediately precede the correspondent of  $V_2$  in the vowel tier of the output.

Thus the input /*u<sub>1</sub> a<sub>1</sub> u<sub>2</sub>*/ also has a set of contiguity relations on the vocalic tier: (i u), (u a<sub>1</sub>), and (a<sub>1</sub> u<sub>2</sub>).

[illegible]

<sup>7</sup>The input-output pair  $(xyz, xz)$  violates I-Contig once, Max-Contig twice, and Dep-Contig once. The input-output pair  $(xyz, xy)$  violates I-Contig zero times, Max-Contig once, and Dep-Contig zero times. The input-output pair  $(xz, xyz)$  violates O-Contig once, Dep-Contig twice, and Max-Contig once. The input-output pair  $(xy, xyz)$  violates O-Contig zero times, Dep-Contig once, and Max-Contig zero times.

### 3.4 Case Two

The second class, exemplified below in (20), are those with longer underlying forms like /CV<sub>1</sub>CV<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub>CV<sub>4</sub>CV<sub>5</sub>/.

(20)	Citation	Normal	
a.			four (pl) hands
b.			fearful
c.			hunts (collective)
d.			his trying

Ranking Linearity below SWP predicts that the diphthong should be broken up to make the first syllable heavy.

	/CV <sub>1</sub> CV <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub> CV <sub>4</sub> CV <sub>5</sub> /	SWP	Linearity
(21)	a.		
	b.	!	
	c.	!	

V-Tier-Max-Contig cannot help since the order of the vowels has not changed.

### 3.5 Solution to Case Two

Proposal: CV metathesis may create new vowel clusters on the surface, but it cannot destroy ones that exist in the underlying form.

- (22) V-V Max-Contiguity if V<sub>1</sub> immediately precedes V<sub>2</sub> in the input, then the correspondent of V<sub>1</sub> must immediately precede the correspondent of V<sub>2</sub> in the skeletal tier of the output.

	/CV <sub>1</sub> CV <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub> CV <sub>4</sub> CV <sub>5</sub> /	V-V Max Contig	SWP	Max Contig	Dep Contig
(23)	a.	(a u)!			
	b.				
	c.		!		

Note the violations of this constraints are always a subset of the violations of the general Max-Contiguity constraint. Whenever this constraint is violated, so is Max-Contiguity.

### 3.6 Case Three

The third class of words, exemplified in (24), are underlying forms of the kind /CVCVCV/.

(24)	Citation	Normal	
a.			my hands
b.			gather them together
c.			moon, month

In this case, the ranking SWP > Linearity predicts, for example, that \*[k u d a], where the [u] has moved rightward, is more harmonic than [k d u a], where the [a] has moved leftward<sup>8</sup>.

(25)

/k u d a/	SWP	Linearity
a. [k u d a]		
b. [k d u a]	!	
c. [k u a d]	!	

### 3.7 Solution to Case Three

When you consider the contiguity relations that have been destroyed and the new ones that have been created, we see the following.

(26)

/k u d a/	SWP	Max-Contig	Dep-Contig
a. [k u d a]		(k u)(u d)(d a)	(k d)(d u)(u a)
b. [k d u a]	!	(u d)(d a)	(u a)(a d)

The key is to recognize that CV metathesis in Kwarang never creates CV transitions.<sup>9</sup>

- (27) C-V Dep-Contiguity If C immediately precedes V in the skeletal tier of the output, then the correspondent of C must immediately precede the correspondent of V in the input.

(28)

/k u d a/	C-V Dep Contig	SWP	Max Contig	Dep Contig
a. [k u d a]	(d u)!			
b. [k d u a]				
c. [k u a d]		!		

### 3.8 Summary

Generally, there are no stressed light syllables in Kwarang.

There are a few classes of words that are exceptions to this phonotactic.

Such exceptions are not predicted to exist under the standard faithfulness constraint regulating linear order (Linearity).

These exceptions are accounted for by replacing Linearity with a family of Contiguity constraints. In addition to the basic Max/Dep-Contiguity, I have suggested the following constraints to account some generalizations.

<sup>8</sup>There is evidence that CVC syllables should be treated as heavy syllables (see Heinz (2004) for details).

<sup>9</sup>Directionality of CV metathesis appears to depend on the stress pattern of the language (Blevins and Garrett 1998, 2004). However, since the Normal and Citation forms have different stress patterns (Heinz 2004), and since the stress pattern of the Normal form is predictable, it is not clear how to encode this hypothesis in OT in the case of Kwarang. In the system presented here, the stress pattern would have to be linked to the ranking C-V Dep-Contiguity > SWP.

- (29) ~~%%~~V-Tier-Max-Contiguity ~~%%~~V metathesis does not change the order of the vowels with respect to each other.  
~~%%~~V-V-Max-Contiguity ~~%%~~V metathesis requires underlying contiguous vowels to be contiguous on the surface.  
~~%%~~V-Dep-Contiguity ~~%%~~V metathesis does not introduce new CV transitions.

## 4 Where to go from here

### 4.1 The Contiguity Family

~~%%~~This suggests a family of Contiguity constraints with the following constraints operating on the skeletal tier...

~~%%~~Max/Dep-Contiguity  
~~%%~~V-V-Max/Dep-Contiguity  
~~%%~~C-V-Max/Dep-Contiguity  
~~%%~~V-C-Max/Dep-Contiguity  
~~%%~~C-C-Max/Dep-Contiguity

~~%%~~... and with constraints operating on V (and C) tiers:

~~%%~~V-Tier-Max/Dep-Contiguity  
~~%%~~C-Tier-Max/Dep-Contiguity

### 4.2 Phonetic Groundedness

~~%%~~It has been observed that vowels are coarticulatory even with intervening consonants (Chen 1966) (see (Keating 1988) for an overview), which may justify a constraint like V-Tier-Max-Contig.

~~%%~~However, it is more difficult to justify the other members of the constraint family.

~~%%~~Is there any advantage to restating the Contiguity constraints in ~~%%~~er detail, say in the terms of gestural scores (Browman and Goldstein 1992, Gafos 2002)?

### 4.3 Typology

~~%%~~The family of constraints above is sufficient to enlarge the typology to include languages like Kwarang.

~~%%~~Without adopting specific rankings, it is not sufficient to rule out unusual and unattested patterns, e.g. Kwarang, which ranks V-Tier-Max-Contig below SWP.

~~%%~~What are the necessary rankings?



## 5 Conclusions

Linearity is formally too powerful a constraint, and its realization as an OT constraint makes incorrect empirical predictions in Kwara'ang.

Both the formal and empirical problems are resolved by replacing Linearity with a richer family of Contiguity constraints.

This has led to identifying three relevant properties of CV metathesis, namely

The order of the vowels may not change.

Underlying contiguous vowels must be contiguous on the surface.

A prohibition on the introduction of CV transitions (in Kwara'ang).

## A Normal Form Vowel Qualities

The following table summarizes how the diphthong in the Normal form is predictably derived from two vowels from the set [i,u,e,o,a].

(30)

V <sub>1</sub> V <sub>2</sub>		V <sub>2</sub>				
		i	u	e	o	a
V <sub>1</sub>	i					
	u					
	e					
	o					
	a					
		= <i>unattested</i>				
		Nuclei following a  occur in faster speech				

The quality of the second element of the diphthong is predictable given V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub>.

Likewise, given any cell, V<sub>2</sub> is predictable.

## B Alternatives to SWP

The problems above persist even if different markedness constraints are employed to motivate metathesis in Kwara'ang.

This is illustrated with the constraints in (31) with respect to Case One (2).

- (31) a. \*Unstressed Syllable incurs a violation for each unstressed syllable in the output form.

- b. \*Struc incurs a violation for each syllable in the output (economy was the motivating factor for Kwarang metathesis in Sohn (1980)).
- c. Final-C (at the foot level) incurs a violation for each foot which does not end in a consonant.

### \*Unstressed Syllable

Consider underlying forms like  $/(C)V_1CV_2V_3(CV(C)V_n)^n/$ .

(32)	Citation	Normal	
a.			your (pl) hands
b.			fearful
c.			hunts (collective)
d.			his trying

\*[CV1CV2CV3CV(CV(C)Vn)^n] because the former has no unstressed syllables, whereas the actual winner has one.

	$/(C)V_1CV_2CV_3(CV(C)V_n)^n/$	*UnstressedSyl	Linearity
(33)	a.		
	b.	!	

In general,  $*[(C)V_1V_n.CV_2V_3.(CV(C)V_n)^nCV(C)]$  is more harmonic than actual surface  $[(C)V_1.CV_2V_3.(CVV_nC)^n]$ .

### \*Struc

Consider forms of the  $/CVVCVCVCV/$  variety:

(34)	Citation	Normal	
a.			my being alive
b.			to slip
c.			to ask them

\*Struc must be ranked below a constraint like \*Triphthong<sup>10</sup>.

	$/(C)V_1CV_2CV_3CV(CV(C)V_n)^n/$	*Triphthong	*Struc	Linearity
(35)	a.			
	b.	!		

As a result, in words like those in (9)  $/CVCVVCV/$ , we have:

<sup>10</sup>In Normal form monosyllabic words like *fuamu* 'you' Citation [CV1CV2CV3CV(CV(C)Vn)^n] Normal [CV1CV2CV3CV(CV(C)Vn)^n], metathesis occurs presumably to satisfy some other constraint such as the prohibition of stress on the weak mora of a heavy syllable (Prince 1983), or foot-alignment to the right.



- Norquest, Peter. 2001. The Collapse of the Foot in Oceanic. In *Proceedings of the Western Conference of Linguistics (WECOL) 2001*.
- Ohman, S. 1966. Coarticulation in VCV Utterances: Spectrographic Measurements. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America* 39:1511-1520.
- Prince, Alan. 1983. Relating to the Grid. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14(1).
- Prince, Alan. 1992. Quantitative Consequences of Rhythmic Organization. *CLS* 26:355-398.
- Parasession of the Syllable in Phonetics and Phonology.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1980. An Analysis of Metathesis in Kwarang. *Lingua* 52.