Chapter 10

Romansh allomorphy (Again!)

Martin Maiden
Oxford University

This essay resumes a debate which has continued for some years between me and Stephen Anderson regarding the correct analysis of a complex set of data from the verb morphology of the Romansh dialect of Savognin. Anderson believes that the data are an example of "phonologically conditioned allomorphy", whilst I maintain that they exemplify "morphomic", or autonomously morphological, alternation patterns, whose only phonological motivation lies in diacrhrony. I reply below to Anderson's most recent analysis of the data, by discussing reasons in support of my "morphomic" account. I conclude, however, by considering the possibility that our two accounts may be too exclusivist in their respective "phonologizing" and "morphologizing" stances, and that they are not necessarily wholly incompatible.

1 Introduction

Some readers might regard this essay as an example of chutzpah, or downright impertinence, but it is a sincere mark of respect for Steve Anderson that I feel able to disagree with him even in a collection published in his honour. One would not do this with a less intellectually generous scholar. What follows is, in fact, a further instalment in an amicable difference of opinion I have had with him for some years (see Anderson 2008; Anderson 2011b; Maiden 2011b; Anderson 2013) concerning the analysis of a set of data from some Romansh dialects, and principally, the Surmiran variety spoken in Savognin. Readers, and not least the honorand himself, may be feeling that there is little left to say. That there is reason to continue the debate is suggested, for example, by Andrea Sims' deft review of the issues (Sims 2015: 202–206), to which I return in my conclusion.

Anderson's analysis displays not only his characteristically penetrating theoretical rigour, but also a quite formidable grasp of the data. Reasons of space, and the fact that the data are lucidly laid out by him in previous publications (e.g., Anderson 2008, 2011) permit me to do no more here than summarize them: Savognin has a recurrent pattern of vocalic alternations] in the verb root (or "stem"), such that one alternant occurs in the root of the singular and third person forms of the present indicative imperative, throughout the present subjunctive, and also in third conjugation infinites, while another occurs in the root in the remainder of the paradigm. What is involved originates

as alternation in vowel quality, phonologically conditioned by stress. The distinctions between stressed and unstressed positions may additionally manifest as differences in the number of syllables in the root, and in sundry consonantal alternations, including metathesis. In fact, what Savognin (and Romansh generally) exhibits is an unusually florid manifestation (in respect of the range of different alternation types involved) of a pattern of alternation recurrently attested across Romance languages, and I have argued extensively (e.g., Maiden 2005; 2011c) that it arose historically because of stress-related vowel differentiation, but then became "autonomously morphological" or "morphomic" in nature, being no longer determined by stress, but simply by the heterogeneous set of paradigm cells, one property of which is that they are "rhizotonic" (i.e., stressed on the lexical root). This set I label (for reasons that are here unimportant) the "N-pattern". Important diachronic proof that the N-pattern is independent of phonological causation is the rise in various Romance languages of alternation patterns whose phonological content cannot possibly ever have been determined by stress (including lexical suppletion), but which replicates the pattern originally "etched out" by the effects of stress. The distribution of alternation found in Savognin constitutes a widespread variant of this "N-pattern". [1] There is no space to recapitulate all the data and arguments, but crucially Anderson (e.g., 2010: 25;2011: 34f;2013: 10,16,23;2011: 173) accepts the "morphomic" nature of the "N-pattern" and its importance in determining morphological change in the Romance verb generally. He believes, however, that modern Savognin (and other Romansh varieties: cf. Anderson 2013) is, in effect, a "special case", indeed a prime example of 'phonologically conditioned allomorphy'. He convincingly shows that the alternation types involved have often become so disparate, and refractory to unique underlying representation, that they must be represented directly in the grammar, but he also argues that the alternant-pairs characteristically contain one member more suited to appear under stress, and another more suited to appear in unstressed position (Anderson 2011b: 18), and that the alternants are accordingly conditioned by the presence vs absence of stress. He also shows that the position of stress in Savognin is systematically predictable from the segmental content of the word-form. It follows that the alternations are fully predictable from the position of stress, and that appeal to the "N-pattern" is inappropriate. My response, *in nuce*, has been that there exist nonetheless within Savognin morphological phenomena that really are irreducibly "morphomic" and follow the N-pattern. Given this, I say that Anderson misses an important generalization by divorcing the vocalic alternations from clear-cut cases of the N-pattern. Anderson's response is, in effect, that my alleged N-pattern examples are secondary effects of the principle of stress-related allomorph selection, and that invocation of the morpheme risks missing another significant generalization, namely that the alleged stress-related alternations found in the verb are found across the grammar, outside the verb.

I need to comment briefly on a methodological assumption. Steve Anderson objected to me orally some years ago (cf. also Anderson 2011b: 13f.;17) that I could not draw in-

---

[1] Savognin is among a number of Romance dialects where the N-pattern alternant also appears in the first and second persons plural present subjunctive. The reasons are complex and not immediately relevant here (cf. Maiden 2012).

ferences about Savognin from apparently parallel developments in other Romance languages for which my "morphomic" analysis seemed correct, observing quite reasonably that the inhabitants of Savognin were "not Romance linguists" (and therefore could not know about what happens in other Romance languages). My very delayed response is, in effect: "Yes, but they are still Romance speakers". Let us suppose that in some other Romance variety, distant both historically and geographically (a real case is Romanian), virtually identical patterns of alternation are found, except that this time they are clearly morphomic; let us further assume that the analysis appropriate to, say, Romanian is perfectly *possible* for Romansh, even though rival possible accounts exist. Obviously native speakers of Romansh are not native speakers of Romanian, nor are they Romance linguists enjoying Olympian vistas over comparative Romance morphology: nothing we could say about Romanian could ever be definitively probative for Romansh. What does not follow, however, is that the comparative evidence can be ignored. Speakers of both languages obviously have the same mental endowment, and both languages have inherited much that is structurally common, particularly with regard to the organization of the inflexional morphology of the verb. What this means is that an analysis which is *justified* for Romanian deserves consideration as *plausible* for Romansh. The Romance languages ought not to be treated as hermetically isolated entities: rather, the analysis of one variety should always be allowed to inform that of another. That, in fact, is one of the reasons for doing Romance linguistics from a comparative perspective (in fact, there is no other way of doing it), and in the following pages the analysis will frequently be guided, with all due caution, by comparisons and inferences across cognate but separate varieties. I now examine the facts which seem to me to require acknowledgement of the morphomic N-pattern in Savognin.

2 Suppletion: dueir and deir

The verb *dueir* 'must, be obliged to (cf. German *sollen*)' (from Latin DEBERE) plays a central role in the debate, because it has a suppletive root allomorph in precisely that set of cells which, in other verbs, displays the "stressed" alternant (Table 1):

Table 1: *Dueir* in Savognin

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
INF	*duéir*					
PST.PART	*duía*					
GER	*duónd*					
PRS.IND	*stó*	*stóst*	*stó*	*duágn*	*duéz*	*stón*
PRS.SBJV	*stóptga*	*stóptgas*	*stóptga*	*stóptgan*	*stóptgas*	*stóptgan*
IPF.IND	*duéva*	*duévas*	*duéva*	*duévan*	*duévas*	*duévan*
COND	*duéss*	*duéssas*	*duéssa*	*duéssan*	*duéssas*	*duéssan*

The suppletive forms are taken from another verb, *stueir* 'must, be necessarily the case (cf. German *müssen*)', which unlike *dueir* continues to have its own complete paradigm (Table 2):

Table 2: *Stueir* in Savognin

INF	*stuéir*					
PST.PART	*stuía*					
GER	*stuónd*					
	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS. IND	*stó*	*stóst*	*stó*	*stuágn*	*stuéz*	*stón*
PRS. SBJV	*stóptga*	*stóptgas*	*stóptga*	*stóptgan*	*stóptgas*	*stóptgan*
IPF	*stuéva*	*stuévas*	*stuéva*	*stuévan*	*stuévas*	*stuévan*
COND	*stuéss*	*stuéssas*	*stuéssa*	*stuéssan*	*stuéssas*	*stuéssan*

For Anderson (2008; 2010) *dueir* is a defective verb and its pattern of alternation is a matter of phonologically conditioned allomorphy: he believes that the explanation of the suppletion is that *dueir* lacks a stressed stem-alternant, having only unstressed /dʊ/. Since /dʊ/ contains a vowel whose phonological characteristics debar it from occurring under stress, speakers in effect plug the resultant phonological gap by borrowing appropriate stressed forms from a near synonym of *dueir*, namely *stueir*. My view, from comparative and diachronic evidence, is that it is highly unlikely that *dueir* could ever have been, in any relevant sense, "defective", and that even if it were, the filling of the alleged gap could have nothing to do with phonology. Indeed, any explanation in terms of phonological conditioning crucially fails to account for the fine details of the allomorphy. If I am correct, and what we observe is a pattern of allomorphy identical in distribution to the vocalic alternations, yet independent of phonology, then in principle whatever explains the paradigmatic distribution of forms of *dueir* should also be available to explain the vocalic alternations. Indeed, considerations of economy would lead us to prefer that single explanation. This is a view that I have expounded before (e.g., Maiden 2011b: 46–49), while Anderson, in his latest discussion 2013: 8 states that there are no new facts, and that we simply disagree. I think that the facts remain very important, and I (re-)present them below in a slightly revised form.

The 'defectiveness' of *dueir* is the effect, not the cause, of the suppletion. All suppletive verbs whose morphology reflects the incursion of forms of the paradigm of one lexeme on the paradigm of another are, in one sense, "defective". If, for example, Grisch (1939: 89f.n5), *DRG* s.v. *dovair*, p.378, Decurtins (1958: 155;158), or Signorell, Wuethrich-Grisch & Simeon (1987: 165f), describe Romansh reflexes of DEBERE as "defective", this simply means that there are parts of the paradigm occupied by forms which are patently unconnected (diachronically or synchronically) with *dueir*, and which obviously are connected with *stueir*. This does not mean that the paradigm of the lexeme meaning 'must' somehow has "holes" in it.

One might object that the independent existence of *stueir* as a verb with its own full paradigm (and indeed with its own distinctive meaning, as I explain shortly) is grounds to view those forms of it which appear inside *dueir* as synchronic interlopers drafted in to occupy otherwise "empty territory". Such reasoning would force us into the highly counterintuitive position of claiming, for example, that Savognin *esser* 'to be' is "defective" in respect of its past participle, because the latter has the form *sto* which is also (and transparently) the past participle of a different verb, *star* 'to stand'. This is actually a case where there was, *historically*, defectiveness: the Latin ancestor of *esser* had no past participle, for semantic reasons. It is only with the rise in early Romance of verbal periphrases comprising auxiliary + past participle, that the verb 'be' needs to fill the past participle "slot", and it does so (in some regions) by supplying the missing form from the past participle of STARE 'stand'. But the idea that, in modern Romansh, the verb 'be' lacks a past participle and "borrows" it from *star* seems peculiar, given that the verb 'be' itself, and the use of forms of it involving its past participle, are utterly basic. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge no grammarian of the Romance languages has ever described the wholesale suppletion of 'be' in the Romance languages as involving "defectiveness". If one can analyse Savognin *esser* as suppletive but not defective, then surely the same analysis should be available for *dueir*.

My principal difficulty with Anderson's analysis of *dueir* is that I see absolutely no motivation to view this verb as defective, beyond the morphological facts which are the explanandum. All its cells are well and truly *filled* — and it is almost inconceivable that a subset of present-tense cells of a verb expressing such a basic meaning could ever be empty. Here, again, a comparative perspective is useful. Virtually all Romance languages conserve reflexes of DEBERE, with a full inflexional paradigm, and no Romance languages show any sign of defectiveness in the verb meaning 'must', whatever its origin: there is no reason for parts of its paradigm to be missing. Many Romansh dialects indeed have a full paradigm all of whose forms still continue DEBERE (see Decurtins 1958: 152f. *DRG* s.v. *dovair*), and the rhizotonic forms (usually *dé-*) are robustly attested from the earliest records, including in central dialects (of which Savognin is one); cf. also Anderson (2010: 30;32). There is simply nothing in the phonology of these dialects, either synchronically or diachronically, which could have determined *deletion* of such stressed forms, and the defectiveness certainly cannot be explained as a phonological effect of stress.[2]

Anderson (2010: 32) suggests that "the primary factor in the emergence of defectiveness in Surmiran *dueir*, as well as the complementary pattern in the Engadine languages, was the morphologization of the vowel alternations in Swiss Rumantsch. If we hypothesize that this was combined with reduced use of the verb due to competition with others such as *stueir*, it could well have led to the present situation with only one stem

---

[2] Could a stress-based account be salvaged if, unlike Anderson, one said that *any* kind of alternation, including an alternation where one of the alternants was zero, could be effected by stress? Given that the position of stress in Savognin is predictable on grounds of segmental phonological content, one can hardly invoke the case of zero alternants which would, by definition, lack any segmental content. The best one could say is that zero forms appear in those parts of the paradigm where stress *would normally be expected* to appear. But then one would have to ask: "Where would stress normally be expected to appear?", and the answer would be purely morphological: "the N-pattern".

conserved". I discuss later the nature of the "competition" from *stueir*, which involves overlap and replacement, not defectiveness. As for the alternation, regular sound change would indeed have given rise to a unique alternation between a stressed alternant /de/, and unstressed alternant /du/ (in the latter the back vowel is the result of an adjustment of the unstressed front vowel triggered in the environment of a following labial consonant: cf. Italian 3SG.PRS.IND *déve* vs INF *dovére*). But the notion that Romansh would eliminate an alternation type because it was "morphologized" (or, perhaps better, idiosyncratic and unpredictable), especially in such a high-frequency verb, seems unlikely, particularly given that Romansh is notable for retaining extreme and idiosyncratic patterns of vocalic alternation, even in isolated verbs which surely have a much lower frequency of use. Rogers (1972), in an analysis of Surselvan, lists no fewer than eleven sets of vocalic alternation each apparently limited to just one verb, with meanings such as 'vomit', 'scythe', 'drivel' - all without sign of resort to defectiveness; see also my discussion of Savognin *deir* 'say', below. One might add that the most natural response to any idiosyncratic type of alternation would surely be not to create a "gap", by jettisoning one alternant, but to attempt some kind of "repair" by analogically remodelling the alternants to be less different.[3] The last thing one expects is a reaction resulting in an alternation which, by virtue of being suppletive, is even stranger than the rejected original.

Viewed in a comparative-historical perspective, the notion that the Savognin reflexes of DEBERE could be in any significant sense "defective" seems most unlikely. And even if it were defective, the suppletive filling of the alleged gaps would take place because the *gaps* needed filling, not specifically because of the lack of a "stressed" alternant. What that perspective does suggest, however, is a different scenario (see also Maiden 2011b: 46–49), which involves not "gaps" but "overabundance" (cf. Thornton 2011), in which more than one realization became available for certain cells of the paradigm of *dueir*, and in which one of the alternative realizations ultimately prevails. This situation arises from particular discourse-related circumstances. The reflexes of DEBERE are subject in Romansh and beyond to intensive competition from other nearly synonymous alternatives.[4] I have no space to detail the facts or the mechanisms (see Maiden 2011b),[5] but essentially what appears to be involved is "face-saving": speakers avoid the charge of moral obligation inherent especially in present indicative forms of *dueir* by resorting to alternatives such as expressions equivalent to 'ought' (e.g., conditional forms of the verb), or expressions meaning "absolute" (rather then "moral") necessity, which is exactly expressed by *stueir*. This tendency created, I suggested, a situation in which the frequent use of *stueir* alongside *dueir* in the present tense led to effective synonymy between the two forms, eventually resolved by replacing *dueir* with *stueir* according to the familiar pattern of alternation (the "N-pattern") associated with vocalic allomorphy (a type of

---

[3] In any case, Savognin stems do sometimes have "inappropriate" forms. Thus Anderson (2011b: 32) discusses verbs such *baitár* 'babble' which has a stem suitable for stress only, but which is is nonetheless used throughout the paradigm in unstressed environments as well.

[4] See further Stürzinger (1879: 49); Tagliavini (1926: 84); Kramer (1976: 64); Maiden (2011a)

[5] In addition to the sources cited by Maiden (2011a), see also Pult (1897: 166f.) for the suppletive introduction of forms of the verb 'want' in the dialect of Sent.

reaction to synonymy attested elsewhere in Romance: cf.Maiden 2004; 2006). The same paradigmatic distribution, reflexes of DEBERE alternating this time with those of CONU-ENIRE (originally meaning 'be fitting'), emerges from *ALDII* (maps 829–833; 836–838), for Peio (point 54) and S. Michele all'Adige (point 66). The disappearance of reflexes of DEBERE from certain cells of the present indicative and the present subjunctive of *dueir* never involved "defectiveness", and has never had anything to do with phonology. The perception of "defectiveness" is a synchronic *effect* of the suppletion.

Crucially, the suppletive fusion of *dueir* and *stueir* in Savognin is of a significantly different kind from the alleged phonologically conditioned allomorphy of the vocalic alternations. The latter is a *binary* correspondence between alternants and stress: one alternant is selected under stress, the other elsewhere. The putative relation between the *dueir - stueir* alternation and stress can only be described as binary at a level which is in fact lacking any phonological content. For what, in the case of the suppletion, is allegedly selected by stress is not *a form* correlated with stress, but a whole array of phonologically and morphologically different forms. As Anderson himself points out 2008: 124,[6] "it is not just a single stem, but the full range of irregular forms of *stueir* (*ia stò, te stost, el stò, els ston*; Subjunctive *ia stoptga*, etc.) that replaces those of *dueir* where stress would fall on the stem".[7] More exactly: "the first and second person singular, and third person, forms of the indicative of *stueir* are mapped onto the first and second person singular, and third person, forms of the indicative of *dueir*, and the present subjunctive cells of *stueir* are mapped onto the corresponding cells of *dueir*". Only this way do we get the observed distribution. In effect, it is not "a stem", but an entire, morphomically defined, "slab", of the paradigm of *stueir*, a set of full word-forms replete with their own internal allomorphic idiosyncrasies, that has been mapped onto *dueir*. A rule of phonologically conditioned allomorphy involving stress could in principle select *a* stressed root allomorph of *stueir* and introduce it into *dueir*, but it could not necessarily insert the *right* root allomorph in the relevant cell. A rule that identifies a morphologically-defined portion of the paradigm as that in which the replacement of one lexeme by the other can do just that.

Dueir exemplifies lexical suppletion ("incursion", in the terminology of Corbett 2007), where one historically distinct lexeme obtrudes on the inflexional paradigm of another lexeme. Another diachronic route to suppletion is regular sound change so extreme in its effects that the synchronic result is allomorphy such that the alternants bear no phonological relation to each other. Savognin has at least one case of phonologically induced suppletion, namely *deir* 'say', which inflects as in Table 3:

---

[6] Anderson (2010: 29) even calls this verb "suppletive".

[7] As mentioned earlier, if we ask "where stress would fall on the stem", the answer is ineluctably morphological: in the cells of the singular and third person present and imperative and in the present subjunctive. It seems to me useless to say, instead, "wherever the endings would be unstressed" because the third person singular has no ending, and the distribution of the remaining, unstressed, endings turns out to be the morphomic N-pattern.

Table 3: *Deir* in Savognin

PST.PART	*détg*					
GER	*schónd*					
	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS. IND	*déi*	*déist*	*déi*	*schágn*	*schéz*	*déian*
PRS. SBJV	*schéia*	*schéias*	*schéia*	*schéian*	*schéias*	*schéian*
IPF	*schéva*	*schévas*	*schéva*	*schévan*	*schévas*	*schévan*
COND	*schéss*	*schéssas*	*schéssa*	*schéssan*	*schéssas*	*schéssan*

I cannot here retrace the phonological history of this verb in detail. Suffice to say that the historically underlying root was *dik-, and that sound changes involving, in particular, deletion of unstressed vowels and assimilation of resulting consonant clusters, created the modern situation. The rather unusual present subjunctive of this verb happens to show the effects of analogical levelling in favour of the originally arrhizotonic first and second person plural form stems togther with the associated stressed inflexional ending (cf. Decurtins 1958 for the reflexes of AMBULARE / IRE, DICERE, UENIRE, HABERE, or SAPERE in Samedan, Parsons, and Razen for other Romansh examples of this kind; further discussion also in Maiden, in progress). That aside (and there is every reason to believe that the *déi-* root originally occurred as expected in the present subjunctive), this verb shows N-pattern suppletion. Anderson (2011b: 17) acknowledges that it is "genuinely suppletive" and that "the choice of stem is determined by morphosyntactic features". He defines in the same way some other, less radically suppletive verbs, for which I give here just the present-tense forms, e.g, (*vu*)*léir* 'want', *néir* 'come' (Table 4):

Table 4: (*Vu*)*leir* and *neir* in Savognin

PRS. IND	*ví*	*vót*	*vót*	*léin*	*léz*	*vóttan*
PRS. SBJV	*víglia*	*víglias*	*víglia*	*víglian*	*víglias*	*víglian*

PRS. IND	*vígn*	*vígnst*	*vígna*	*nín*	*níz*	*vígnan*
PRS. SBJV	*vígna*	*vígnas*	*vígna*	*vígnan*	*vígnas*	*vígnan*

If we acknowledge that *deir* and some other verbs have (near-)suppletive patterns determined synchronically by morphosyntactic features, then we have to admit the presence of the morphomic N-pattern in Savognin. Yet if we say that the vocalic alternations

are still a matter of "phonologically conditioned allomorphy", then the fact that they show exactly the same paradigmatic distribution becomes uncomfortably coincidental.

3 The "augment"

The "augment" is a functionally empty formative which, in certain cells of the inflexional paradigm of the verb, occurs between the lexical root and desinences denoting tense, mood, person, and number (for detailed discussions of its nature and origins, which lie in Latin and proto-Romance Aktionsart suffixes, see especially Maiden 2003;2011: 249–53;2016: 715f.). In Latin, the relevant affixes were restricted to imperfective-aspect forms, but had no restrictions for person, number, or tense. In most Romance languages, augments are associated with particular inflexion classes (in Romansh, usually the first and fourth conjugations), and have become restricted to certain cells of the inflexional paradigm defined by tense, mood, person, and number. In Savognin, the augment occurs solely in the singular and third person forms of the present indicative, and in all forms of the present subjunctive. That is to say, of course, that it has exactly the same paradigmatic distribution as the "stressed" vocalic alternants, a fact which clearly suggests a link between them. Thus first conjugation *luschardár* 'strut', and fourth conjugation *tradéir* 'betray' (Table 5):

Table 5: The augment in Savognin first and fourth conjugation verbs

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
First conjugation						
PRS. IND	*luschardésch*	*luschardéschas*	*luschardéscha*	*luschardágn*	*luschardéz*	*luschardéschan*
PRS. SBJV	*luschardéscha*	*luschardéschas*	*luschardéscha*	*luschardéschan*	*luschardéschas*	*luschardéschan*
IPF.IND	*luschardéva*	*luschardévas*	*luschardéva*	*luschardévan*	*luschardévas*	*luschardévan*
Fourth conjugation						
PRS. IND	*tradésch*	*tradéschas*	*tradéscha*	*tradígn*	*tradíz*	*tradéschan*
PRS. SBJV	*tradéscha*	*tradéschas*	*tradéscha*	*tradéschan*	*tradéschas*	*tradéschan*
IPF.IND	*tradíva*	*tradívas*	*tradíva*	*tradívan*	*tradívas*	*tradívan*

It is undisputed that the distribution of the Romance augment cannot be explained, diachronically or in modern varieties, as the output of any kind of phonological process. The view that I have developed (see, e.g., Maiden 2005; 2011b,c) is that the redistribution of the alternant from Latin to Romance is *purely morphologically* determined, and reflects sensitivity to a paradigmatic pattern created, originally, as an effect of vocalic alternations between stressed and unstressed vowels: the same pattern can be shown to have provided a "template" for the suppletive merger of distinct lexical verbs in various Romance languages (notably, the verb 'go'). I see no reason why what we see in Savognin, and more generally in Romansh, should be viewed any differently: the distribution of the augment appears a matter of pure morphology, and given that the vocalic alternations have the same distribution as the augment, they too can be accounted for in the same, purely morphological, terms.

Anderson views the facts, in effect, in terms of a kind of "defectiveness": verbs showing the augment lack a stressed vocalic alternant, and the augment is inserted wherever this occurs. Since the augment is inherently stressed, the preceding root-form must be unstressed, and the lack of a stressed root allomorph is thereby resolved. My view is that this analysis inverts cause and effect: it is not the case that the augment is applied because there is no stressed root allomorph but, rather, that there is no stressed root allomorph because the relevant cells of the paradigm are specified as being filled by forms containing the augment. This latter analysis has the immediate advantage of avoiding the problem of arbitrary stipulation of defectiveness in one set of cells only. After all, if stressed alternants can be defective, why should not unstressed alternants too? Why do we not also find, that is, verbs with a stressed alternant but not an unstressed one? And if the distribution of the augment is dictated by the need to plug a phonological "gap", how is it that such gaps only occur in first and fourth conjugation verbs, precisely the inflexion classes to which the augments are historically restricted across the Romance?

Discussion of the Savognin augment has tended to focus on first conjugation verbs, where it is most productive, but where it still only constitutes a subset (and apparently a minority) of such verbs. We should not forget that the augment also appears in the great *majority* of fourth conjugation verbs (characterized by infinitives in *-eir*), a class comprising dozens of lexemes and endowed with some productivity. If we follow Anderson, this means that almost all of the fourth conjugation is characterized by lack of a stressed alternant. Nothing logically excludes this, but it seems counterintuitive to say that a major, semi-productive, inflexion class is, in effect, "defective" in most of its present tense. Nobody would countenance such an analysis for the cognate Romance varieties (Daco-Romance, Italo-Romance, Catalan) where the fourth conjugation behaves in this way.

Anderson (2011b: 22) points out that the augment frequently appears in neologisms, including where speakers feel doubt about the identity of the stressed allomorph. This does not mean, however, that the augment is *usually* a response to perceived lack of a stressed alternant. Using the Savognin first conjugation verb *luschardár* 'strut' (exemplified above), Anderson (2008: 122) observes that: "The use of this pattern [...] has the advantage that the speaker does not need to retrieve any information about the specific alternation pattern of the stem in order to produce all of the correct forms. Otherwise, it would be necessary to choose [...] among a variety of possibilities such as **luscharda*, **luscheirda*, **luschorda*, **laschurda*, **laschorda*, etc. Each of these patterns is more or less secure with reference to at least some verbs in the Surmiran lexicon, but the availability of the paradigm [given above] makes it possible to avoid the choice when positive evidence is not readily available." The problem here is that that there *is* unequivocal evidence for the stressed vowel. This verb is transparently and directly derived from the nominal *luschárd* 'dandy, fop, vain, proud', which actually contains, moreover, a highly frequent stressed pejorative suffix *-árd*. In this case, the identity of the "right" stressed alternant is patent. This is in fact true of a large number of other verbs that take *-esch*, all transparently derived from nouns or adjectives whose stressed vowel is known (examples from Signorell 2001), such as those give in Table 6:

Table 6: Nouns, adjectives, and derived verbs in Savognin

Basic noun/adjective	Infinitive	3sg.prs.ind	
cisél	*ciselár*	*ciseléscha*	'chisel'
dimóra[8]	*dimorár*	*dimoréscha*	'dwell (-ing)'
discrédit	*discreditár*	*discreditéscha*	'discredit'
fáx	*faxár*	*faxéscha*	'fax'
figúra	*figurár*	*figuréscha*	'figure'
fílm	*filmár*	*filméscha*	'film'
fírma	*firmár*	*firméscha*	'sign (-ature)'
guíd	*guidár*	*guidéscha*	'guide'
líber	*liberár*	*liberéscha*	'free'
nivél	*nivelár*	*niveléscha*	'level'
ódi	*odiiér*	*odiéscha*	'hate'
penél	*penelár*	*peneléscha*	'paint (-brush)'
schicána	*schicanár*	*schicanéscha*	'chicane'
teléfon	*telefonár*	*telefonéscha*	'telephone'
unifórm	*uniformár*	*uniforméscha*	'uniform'
vagabúnd	*vagabundár*	*vagabundéscha*	'bum'

What such derived forms lack is not a "stressed" alternant but an *unstressed* one: what appears in the verb is simply the root of the corresponding rhizotonic nominal form. Yet there is no sign of attempts to invent a predictable "unstressed" counterpart for the stressed vowel of the base-form (e.g., INF **udiiér from the noun *ódi* after the model of 3sg.prs.ind *dórma* 'sleeps' vs INF *durméir*) and quite simply the derived verb-forms preserve the segmental identity of the base form. Many scholars have suggested that in Romance generally the augment serves to obviate root allomorphy that might otherwise occur in the lexical root. There are various reasons why this view does not account for the facts (cf. Maiden 2011c: 251f.), but note that in any case this kind of "solution" comports a paradox: one type of alternation is merely replaced by another, that between the augment and its absence, the augment itself retaining an irreducibly "N-pattern", morphomic, distribution.

Anderson (2013)broadens his survey beyond Savognin, arguing for a similar analysis for other Romansh varieties. In fact, in dialects where stress has a somewhat different distribution from Savognin, the augment duly follows that distribution. Thus Anderson (2013: 21f.), in Vaz (Valbella; data from Ebneter 1981) the first person plural present indicative, in addition to arrhizotonic forms, as in Savognin, also has rhizotonic forms with unstressed desinence *-an*, and the predicted "stressed" stem: e.g., INF *amblidár* 'forget', 1sg

---

[8] In fact, *dimóra* and *fírma* below may be derived from the corresponding verbs (cf. Thornton 2004: 517, and Cortelazzo & Paolo 1988 ss.vv. *dimorare, firmare* for this type in Italian). If this holds for Savognin, then these verbs do possess a 'stressed' alternant.

amblóid, 1PL *amblidáin*, but INF *amprastár* 'lend', 1SG *amprést,* 1PL *ampréstan.* Sometimes, the same verb has two possible first person plural present indicative forms, e.g.: INF *gudáir* 'enjoy', 1SG *giód,* 1PL *gudáin / giódan.* In verbs taking the augment, there are, correspondingly, forms in 1PL *-áin* without augment (e.g., INF *adorár* 'adore', 1SG *adorésch,* 1PL *adoráin*), and forms in 1PL unstressed *-an* duly showing it (e.g., INF *habitár* 'inhabit', 1SG *habitésch,* 1PL *habitéschan*). According to Anderson (2013: 23) such behaviour poses a "problem" for the morphomic account, because "it is fairly clear that the stem alternation and the appearance of *-esch* […] are tied directly to the position of stress, even where this is potentially variable, and not to a fixed set of morphological categories". With respect to Anderson, I think that it poses no such problem: all it shows is that whatever principle governs the stressed root allomorph also governs the augment. In this particular case, in fact, we are not dealing with a change in position of stress at all: rather, we have a syncretism such that the first person plural form tends to be "taken over" by the third person plural. This is quite systematic in Vaz (and elsewhere), and occurs independently of stem stress (for example, in non-present forms).

More revealing is the case presented in Maiden (2011b: 45f.), of distributional *discrepancy* between augment and stressed vocalic alternant. The dialects of the Val Müstair (see Schorta 1938: 132) tend to place stress on the root of the infinitive in all conjugations.[9] Indeed, they are unique among Romance languages in generally having rhizotonic infinitives even in the first conjugation, as shown in Table 7:[10]

Table 7: Rhizotony in Val Müstair first conjugation infinitives

ARARE	>	ˈarər	'plough'
CAPTARE	>	ˈcatər	'find'
FILARE	>	ˈfilər	'spin'
IEIUNARE	>	jaˈynər	'fast'
LAETARE	>	ˈlai̯dər	'spread dung'
PESCARE	>	ˈpɛʃcər	'fish'
SCOPARE	>	ˈʃkuər	'sweep'
titˈtare	>	ˈtɛtər	'suckle'
IANTARE	>	ˈjai̯ntər (or janˈtar)	'breakfast'
telefonare	>	teleˈfonər	'telephone'

Schorta states, however, that root stress in first conjugation infinitives systematically fails to happen in that class of first conjugation verbs having the element *-aj-*, which I

---

[9] Some second conjugation verbs are exceptions.

[10] This phenomenon is mentioned by Stürzinger (1879: 35) and Huonder (1901: 518f.), and is amply confirmed by data from Val Müstair covered by *ALDI/II.* See also Grisch (1939: 222) for Vaz, Candrian (1900: 51) for Stalla, Solèr (1991: 135) for Schams.

identify as the augment.[11] Here, stress always remains on the ending of the infinitive: e.g., INF *bɐˈtjar* 'baptize', 3SG.PRS *bɐˈtjaja*; INF *biˈar* 'build', 3SG.PRS *biˈaja*; INF *guˈjar* 'dare', 3SG.PRS *guˈjaja*. The same holds of fourth conjugation infinitives, but apparently only if they belong to that minority of verbs that lack the augment: Schorta cites INF *fiˈnir* 'finish', a verb which takes the augment; compare this with, e.g., INF *ˈbwɔʎɐr* 'boil' a verb that does not show the augment). Now the most likely explanation of why the augment does not appear in the infinitive here is that, in Romance languages generally, root-stress in infinitives is limited to third conjugation verbs (cf. Maiden 2011c: 201f. 2016: 509), all other classes having non-rhizotonic infinitives. The augment, however, is characteristic solely of the fourth and first conjugations, not the third. The third, while a relatively small and unproductive class, contains some of the semantically most basic, and highest frequency, verbs, and the appearance of root stress in the Val Müstair fourth and first conjugations is almost certainly modelled, therefore, on the third conjugation. If no augment can appear in first conjugation infinitives, it is because the distribution of the augment is *morphologically* specified, and that specification happens to exclude infinitives.

In Maiden (2011b) I argued as follows: if the function of the augment is in effect to supplete the absence of a stressed root-alternant, and if infinitives in the Val Müstair are generally root-stressed, then we should expect verbs with the augment duly to show that augment in the infinitive, in lieu of root-stress (e.g., INF **bɐˈtjajǝr rather than the actually occurring bɐˈtjar). The fact that the augment never appears in the infinitive therefore also suggests that its distribution is independent of stress, and purely morphologically specified. The only way to "save" the stress-based account (and this is what Anderson 2013 does) is to claim that the augment is inherently limited to "tensed" forms, and is therefore not available for the infinitive. He observes, in support of his view, that it does not occur, either, in participles or in "related non-verbal forms". Since the augment also appears in second person singular imperatives, it is not clear that "tensed" is quite the right term: it might be more accurate to say that the domain of the augment involves cells with values for person and number. But now Anderson's claim must be that the augment is selected in those parts of the paradigm specified for person and number where stress would otherwise fall on the root, while my account can easily be reformulated, if we wish, as also applying to those parts of the paradigm specified for person and

---

[11] I must acknowledge here a different, and very careful, analysis of these facts by Kaye (2015: 291–310), for whom *-aj-* is not the 'augment' but part of the stressed lexical root of the verb, whose historically regular unstressed counterpart is *-j-* (*bateˈdjare > *bɐˈtjar*; *baˈtedja > *bɐˈtaja*). In a form such as *bɐˈtjaja*, on Kaye's account, the unstressed element *-j-* has been analogically generalized into the root of the stressed alternant, originally of the type *bɐˈtaja < *baˈtedja (Kaye 2015: 307); resistance of *bɐˈtjar* (< *bateˈdjare) to stress retraction is then, Kaye suggests2015: 309, a function of the degree of phonological difference between stressed and unstressed root. I would observe that *-aj-* is exactly the expected reflex of the proto-form of the augment (although rarely attested in the rest of Romansh, where is has been supplanted by *-ef-*), and that it is not clear why the root found in the root-stressed present-tense forms of the verb would be phonologically disfavoured in root-stressed infinitives. In fact, even if *-aj-* turns not to be, in origin, an "augment", such an analysis suggests that speakers have effectively analysed *bɐtj* as the lexical root, treating *-aj-* as a kind of excrescent element following it, and one that occurs just in the N-pattern cells. That is to say that its synchronic status is equivalent to that of the augment in other verbs.

number, except for the first and second persons plural present indicative. Both accounts acknowledge that the phenomenon is heavily *morphologized*, and applies over a domain whose definition corresponds to no natural phonological or morphosyntactic class. Even Anderson's account is, I submit, implicitly "morphomic".

4 The generality of the alternations: derivational morphology

Anderson's analysis gains support from the fact that the vocalic alternations that occur within the verb also occur outside it: nouns and adjectives with stressed derivational affixes show the corresponding "unstressed" vocalic alternants in the derived forms. The sensitivity of these alternations to stress is thereby argued to be a general property of the grammar, and not a peculiarity of verb morphology.morphology Take, for example, the behaviour of the vocalic alternants in derivational morphology (Table 8), as presented by Anderson (2011: 28–30;2013: 13–17):

Table 8: Vocalic alternants in Savognin derivational morphology

	Verb		Basic noun	Derived nouns
Infinitive	3SG.PRS.	PST.PART		
guttár 'drip'	*gótta*		*gót* 'drop'	*gutélla* 'drip'
liiér 'bind'	*léia*		*léia* 'union'	*liadéira* 'binding'
néiver 'snow'	*néiva*	*navía*	*néiv* 'snow'	*naváglia* 'big snowfall'

In reality, this might be no more than the residual, and synchronically more or less accidental, effect of historical differentiation of vowel quality according to stress. This is suggested by the fact that there are derived forms with stressed suffixes (and therefore with unstressed roots) where, nonetheless, the *stressed* alternant occurs. Thus Table 9:

Table 9: Discrepancy between vowel alternation in verbs and derived forms

Verb	Derived forms
Infinitive	3SG.PRS.
satgér 'dry'	*sétga*
accumpagnér 'accompany'	*accumpógna*
durméir 'sleep'	*dórma*

Similar phenomena recur elsewhere in Romansh, as Anderson (2013: 20) points out: thus Vallader has *scóula* 'school', *scolár* 'to school' (3sg.prs.ind *scóula*), *scolaziún* 'education', yet diminutives *scoulína* 'kindergarten', *scoulétta* 'craft school'. Anderson (2011b: 28) deals with such apparent counterexamples by assuming an architecture of the grammar in which morphology and phonology "interact cyclically (with some appropriate subsystem) of the phonology applying to adjust the results of each stage of morphological elaboration of a form". The selection of the stressed or unstressed stem alternant operates only during the "first cycle"; once the stem-shape is determined 'the decision is not revisited on subsequent cycles'. A "stressed" base will then persist through later cycles, even if it is itself no longer stressed: the derivational counterexamples can now be explained in terms of the cycle on which they occur.

One immediate objection is that saying that an apparently phonological phenomenon is confined to a particular "cycle" is in fact to concede that it is "morphologized" (the cycles being defined, precisely, as stages of "morphological elaboration of a form"), and restriction of a phonological rule to some morphologically defined domain is to introduce into the analysis a considerable degree of arbitrariness (precisely one of the things that for Anderson consitutes an objection to the purely "morphomic" analysis). Things look even more arbitrary, and "morphological", if we consider that we now have to say that the domain of the phonologically conditioned allomorphy is defined over two quite disparate sets of forms: "tensed" forms of the verb (at least in Vallader) and the "first cycle" in derivation. A more fundamental difficulty is that it is not always true that the "stressed" stem persists unchanged after the "first cycle": why do we have, say, derived forms *accumpagnedér* or *durmiglión* with "unstressed" alternants, yet *accumpognamáint* or *dormulént* with "stressed" alternants?[12] Actually, the predicted selection of the "unstressed" alternant usually occurs in words belonging to inherited vocabulary, but not in neologisms, which led me to conclude (Maiden 2011b: 41) that what we have is evidence of the "death" of phonological selection of the allomorphs, now reflected only in traditional vocabulary. This claim *tends* to be reflected in the behaviour of adjectives showing reflexes of Latin -abilis, -ibilis (equivalents of English -*able*, -*ible*): the "popular" reflex by direct inheritance from Latin (-*evel*) displays the "unstressed" alternant (e.g., ludével 'praiseworthy'), while the "learned" -*ábel*/-*íbel* displays the "stressed" alternant (e.g., accumodábel 'accommodatable'). One might, perhaps, want to assign -*evel* to the "first cycle", and -*abel* to the second, but even this does not work too well, for we find occasional examples of the distinctive "unstressed" alternant with -*ábel*/-*íbel*: e.g., *schliíbel* 'soluble', *bavábel* 'drinkable', *purtábel* 'portable', *duvrabel* 'usable'.

Anderson (2013: 15) observes an "asymmetry", in that the counterexamples to his claim all involve the appearance of a "stressed" stem that does not bear stress, while no examples exist in which an "unstressed" stem appears under stress. But this is not proof that that the stem alternants are sensitive to stress. On such evidence as Anderson presents (and from Signorell 2001), the small inventory of possibly derived forms involving a stressed stem displays that stem simply because it is the phonologically regular result of their etyma (e.g., *prescháint* 'present' (adj.) < praeséntem). In any case, it is perfectly

---

[12] For an inconclusive discussion of these data, see Wolf (2013: 171).

possible that some forms such as *prescháint* are not "derived", but are the base forms from which the corresponding verbs are derived. Anderson also observes 2013: 18 that in Surselvan (in fact, more widely) only "unstressed" root alternants appear in factive verbs formed with the suffix -*ent*- or -*ant*-,[13] where the lexical root is systematically unstressed (e.g., INF *béiber* 'drink', 1PL.PRS *buéin*, but factive INF *buentár* 'cause to drink', never **beibentár). He cites similar phenomena in Puter (Anderson 2013: 10), such as *stanglantér* from *stáungel* 'tired', but says that "[m]ore research is needed to establish the generality of the phenomenon". Here I concur: we need to be sure that selection of the "unstressed" stem is synchronically productive and therefore psychologically real. Otherwise, all we may have is the regular, lexicalized, outcome of old sound changes in the relevant derived forms. In any case, there do seem to be examples of factive verbs in -*entar* that bear the "stressed" root allomorph. Jaberg (1939: 291f.) lists Surselvan examples most of which indeed bear the "unstressed" allomorph, but also gives *dormentár* 'put to sleep' (cf. INF *durmír* 'sleep', 1SG.PRS.IND *dorm*), and a case in which the unstressed vowel of the derived form, while phonologically plausible, does not correspond to that of the base verb (*scumpentár* 'cause to be saved, heal', from INF *scampár* 'save', 3SG.PRS.IND *scómpa*).

Even leaving counterexamples aside (and I acknowledge that they are not many), it is not obviously necessary to invoke stress: given that the vast majority of cells of the inflexional paradigm of any Romansh verb are arrhizotonic, one might equally say that what we call the "unstressed" stem is the default, on which affixally derived forms are usually built. An apparent counterargument to such an approach might come (cf. Anderson 2013: 17) from the fact that, in cases of derivation where the stress falls on the root, it is always the "stressed" allomorph that appears: e.g., Surmiran *cumónd* 'order' (cf. INF *cumandár*, 1SG.PRS.IND *cumónd*), *clóm* 'call' (cf. INF *clamár*, 1SG.PRS.IND *clóm*), *gartétg* 'success' (cf. INF *gartagér*, 1SG.PRS.IND *gartétg*), *dórma* 'narcotic' (cf. INF *durmír*, 3SG.PRS.IND *dórma*), *stéma* 'esteem' (cf. INF *stimár*, 1SG.PRS.IND *stéma*). Significantly, however, Signorell, Wuethrich-Grisch & Simeon (1987: 51) describe such forms, pre-theoretically, as "deriving from a finite form": what we may have here is simply nominalization of first or third person singular verb-forms (which happen to contain stressed roots), not a derivational process which specifies a stressed root, and thereby must select the "stressed" alternant. In short, while it is indeed true that many patterns of root-alternation found in the verb recur across the grammar, this is largely a historical residue, not necessarily evidence of an active synchronic phonological principle.

5 Conclusion

Anderson (2013: 23) accepts that "morphological categories play a role (e.g. in constraining the appearance of -*esch* to tensed forms of first and fourth conjugation verbs)", but asserts that 'there is no warrant for invoking the further step of complete and arbitrary morphological categorization that would be implied by associating the variation with

---

[13] Cf. Signorell, Wuethrich-Grisch & Simeon (1987: 103f.).

a morphome'. I suggest that the data are in fact already inextricably permeated with "arbitrary" morphological specifications: in Savognin, and in Romansh at large, the morphomic N-pattern is really present. The need to specify that the alleged phonological principle only applies to "tensed" verb forms (for Val Müstair), or to certain levels of derivational morphology makes that principle itself "arbitrary". Given that the behaviour of suppletion in *dueir* and the distribution of *-esch* are, as I have argued, incompatible with the "phonological" account, attempts to account for the identically distributed vocalic alternations in phonological terms become superfluous. Finally, given that countless Romance varieties do have genuinely morphomic patterns of the kind attested in Savognin, treatment of Savognin as a special case is what may be "unwarranted". And yet....

I do not think that Savognin can be presented as the perfect example of "phonologically conditioned allomorphy" that Anderson claims, and yet one must ask whether Anderson's insight – that right across the grammar there is a close correlation between stress and the selection of alternants, might be at risk of being abandoned too lightly. My criticism has been that there exist some cases where such an analysis does not "work", and that since we need independently to invoke the N-pattern even for Savognin, we should do so for all types of alternation which follow that pattern. But there is an unspoken assumption here which may need to be challenged, and it involves what might be described as the "ghettoization of the morphomic". The classic examples of "morphomic" phenomena as adduced by Aronoff (1994) make the case for the existence of a "morphomic level" of linguistic analysis precisely because they are not plausibly explicable as effects of phonological, syntactic, or semantic conditioning: they are cases of "morphology by itself". In morphologists' enthusiasm to assert the existence of genuinely morphological phenomena, much weight has been placed on the notion of the "autonomy" of morphology (witness the titles of Maiden 2005, or Maiden et al. 2011). While there are very good reasons to proclaim loudly that "autonomously morphological" phenomena exist, the search for them should not become a reductivist obsession, nor is there any good reason to suppose that there cannot exist phenomena which contain a very high degree of purely morphological determination, while yet also possessing some degree of phonological or other conditioning.

The seeds of a possible compromise appear in Maiden (2013) (actually, in the same volume as, and immediately following, Anderson 2013). This deals with patterns of consonantal alternation in Italian verbs historically caused by two different kinds of palatalization. Synchronically, the result is that phonologically quite disparate types of alternant tend overwhelmingly to conform to a common distribution such that one alternant occurs in all (or most) forms of the present subjunctive, and in the first person singular and third person plural forms of the present indicative, but nowhere else in the paradigm. There are powerful arguments (see, e.g., Maiden 1992,20112011: 205–63) to say that this pattern has lost all phonological causation and is genuinely morphomic. In Maiden (2009) I had been extremely critical of attempts by Burzio (2004) to force a synchronic phonological analysis of the modern Italian facts, quite often by what is, in effect, the illegitimate resurrection of long dead phonological conditioning environments. For the

most part, these are criticisms I stand by: it cannot be said too often that morphology suffers from a kind of "phonologizing bias" which too readily dismisses morphological analyses of the data, and is far too prone to give credence to phonologically-oriented accounts, even at the expense of postulating conditioning environments lacking plausible synchronic justification. Burzio's analysis appeared to me an example of this kind, but observation of some of the fine details of the diachrony of the alternations at issue later caused me to moderate my view.

One type of alternation involved an opposition between velar consonants and palatal affricates, the latter arising, historically, through palatalization and affrication of velars before front vowels. Now it is beyond reasonable doubt that there has existed no productive process of palatalization/affrication of velars before front vowels for over a millennium, such a putative process being massively counterexemplified by the existence of unmodified velars before front vowels from the time of the earliest documents, including within the paradigm of the verbs at issue. The principal fact[14] which made me revise (Maiden 2013) the "morphological exclusivism" of my earlier treatments of the subject, however, was the observation that in medieval Italian a certain type of analogical innovation affecting verbs displaying the relevant types of alternation, whereby the root of the present subjunctive was optionally extended into gerund forms with the ending *-endo*, was strikingly, and systematically, *blocked* just where the result would have been a velar consonant followed by a front vowel. Informally: "don't allow a velar alternant before a front vowel if an alternative (and more phonologically "natural") palatal alternant is also available". Thus Table 10 (where "**" means "not occurring"):

Table 10: Analogically reformed subjunctives in old Tuscan

subjunctive	inherited gerund	gerund analogically reformed on subjunctive
possa 'can'	*potendo*	*possendo*
ve/dʤ/*a* 'see'	*vedendo*	*ve*/dʤ/*endo*
te/ɲɲ/*a* 'hold'	*tenendo*	*te*/ɲɲ/*endo*
abbia 'have'	*avendo*	*abbiendo*
pia/tʃ/*a* 'please'	*pia*/tʃ/*endo*	*pia*/tʃ/*endo*
di/k/*a* 'say'	*di*/tʃ/endo	***di*/k/*endo*
pian/g/*a* 'weep'	*pian*/dʤ/*endo*	***pian*/g/*endo*

While it would have been impossible to explain the distribution of the alternants in *purely* phonological terms (for the reasons, see Maiden 2013: 25–31), this behaviour clearly suggests residual sensitivity to *phonologically plausible* environments for the distribution of certain alternants.

In short, while Anderson's analysis of the Savognin data seems to me too "phonologizing", it may be that my own approach, insisting on purely morphological aspects

---

[14] But see also Maiden (2013: 31–35).

of the phenomenon, has been too "morphologizing", and both approaches seem to be subject to the questionable assumption that redundancy must be eliminated from the analysis. I do not think that Savognin is as "pure" an example of "phonologically conditioned allomorphy" as Anderson believes, but the possibility that speakers are sensitive to the recurrent correlation between certain types of alternation and stress should not be sacrificed too hastily on the altar of formal economy. As Sims (2015: 205f.) observes, our two approaches need not in fact be mutually exclusive. We have probably reached the point where only appropriately devised psycholinguistic experimentation would be able to tell us more about the Savognin data. However that may be, morphologists and Romance linguists are truly in Steve Anderson's debt for having focused our attention so sharply on these fascinating data.

Abbreviations

AIS   Jaberg & Jud (1964)
ALDI   Goebl et al. (1998)
ALDII   Goebl et al. (2012)

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, Stephen R. 2008. Phonologically conditioned allomorphy in the morphology of Surmiran (Rumantsch). *Word Structure* 1(2).

Anderson, Stephen R. 2010. Failing one's obligations: Defectiveness in Rumantsch reflexes of DĒBĒRE. In Dunstan Brown Matthew Baerman Greville G. Corbett (ed.), *Defective paradigms: Missing forms and what they tell us*, 19–36. Oxford: British Academy & Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2011a. Romansh (Rumantsch). In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The oxford guide to the Romance languages*, 169–184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2011b. Stress-conditioned allomorphy in Surmiran (Rumantsch). In Maria Goldbach, Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds.), *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from Romance inflectional morphology*, 13–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2013. Stem alternations in Swiss Rumantsch. In Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds.), *The boundaries of pure morphology: Diachronic and synchronic perspectives (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 4)*, 8–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Burzio, Luigi. 2004. Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in Italian verbal inflection. Julie Auger, Clancy Clements & Barbara Vance (eds.). 17–44.

Candrian, Johann Paul. 1900. *Der Dialekt von Bivio-Stalla.* Zürich: Halle.

Corbett, Greville. 2007. Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words. *Language* 83(1). 8–42.

Cortelazzo, Manlio & Zolli Paolo. 1988. *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana.* Bologna: Zanichelli.

Decurtins, Alexi. 1958. *Zur Morphologie der unregelmässigen Verben im Bündnerromanischen.* Bern: Francke.

Ebneter, Theodor. 1981. *Vocabulari dil rumantsch da Vaz.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Goebl, Hans, Hans Böhmer, S. Gislimberti, D. Kattenbusch, E. Perini, T. Szekely, I. Dautermann, S. Heissmann, U. Hofmann, A. Kozak, H. Pamminger, H.-M. Rössler, R. Bauer & E. Haimerl. 1998. *Atlant linguistich dl ladin dolomitich y di dialec vejins, 1a pert.* Wiesbaden: Dr. L. Reichert Verlag.

Goebl, Hans, Ilaria Adami, Helga Böhmer, Axel Heinemann, Frank Jodl, Liza Klinger, Daniele Rando, Brigitte Rührlinger, Walter Strauß, Tino Szekely, Paul Videsott, Heidemarie Beer, Gertraud Klingler, Agnes Staudinger, Edgar Haimerl, Bernhard Schauer, Fabio Tosques & Andreas Wagner. 2012. *Atlant linguistich dl ladin dolomitich y di dialec vejins, 2a pert.* Strasbourg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.

Grisch, Mena. 1939. *Die Mundart von Surmeir: Ober-und Unterhalbstein.* Paris/Zurich: Droz/Niehans.

Huonder, Josef. 1901. Der Vokalismus der Mundart von Disentis. *Romanische Forschungen* 11. 430–566.

Jaberg, Karl. 1939. Considérations sur quelques caractères généraux du romanche. In Université de Genéve Faculté des lettres (ed.), *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally*, 283–292. Geneva: Georg.

Jaberg, Karl & Jakob Jud. 1964. *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz.* Zofingen: Ringier.

Kaye, Steven. 2015. *Conjugation class from Latin to Romance: Heteroclisis in diachrony and synchrony.* University of Oxford PhD thesis.

Kramer, Johannes. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Dolomitenladinischen. Formenlehre.* Gebrunn bei Würzburg: Lehmann.

Maiden, Martin. 1992. Irregularity as a determinant of morphological change. *Journal of Linguistics* 28(2). 285–312.

Maiden, Martin. 2003. Verb augments and meaninglessness in Romance morphology. *Studi di grammatica italiana* 22. 1–61.

Maiden, Martin. 2004. When lexemes become allomorphs: On the genesis of suppletion. *Folia Linguistica* 38. 227–256.

Maiden, Martin. 2005. Morphological autonomy and diachrony. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 2004*, 137–175. Dordrecht: Springer.

Maiden, Martin. 2006. Accommodating synonymy: How some Italo-Romance verbs react to lexical and morphological borrowings. In Arturo Tosi & Anna Laura Lepschy (eds.), *Rethinking languages in contact: The case of Italian*, 87–98. Oxford: Legenda.

Maiden, Martin. 2009. From pure phonology to pure morphology: The reshaping of the Romance verb. *Recherches delinguistique de Vincennes* 38. 45–82.

Maiden, Martin. 2011a. Instabilità e variazione dialettale nella storia di un verbo trascurato: Dovere nelle varietà italoromanze e "retoromanze". In Marcato Gianna (ed.), *Le nuove forme del dialetto*, 97–104. Padua: Unipress.

Maiden, Martin. 2011b. Morphomes and 'stress-conditioned allomorphy' in Romansh. In Maria Goldbach, Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds.), *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from Romance inflectional morphology*, 36–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin. 2011c. Morphophonological innovation. In John Charles Smith Anna Laura Ledgeway Martin Maiden (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the Romance Languages*, 216–267. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, Martin. 2012. A paradox? The morphological history of the Romance present subjunctive. In Sascha Gaglia & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Inflection and word formation in Romance languages*, 27–54. Amsterdam.

Maiden, Martin. 2013. Semi-autonomous morphology: A problem in the history of the Italian (and Romanian) verb. In Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds.), *The boundaries of pure morphology*, 216–267. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin. 2016. Inflectional morphology. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, 497–512. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin, John Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.). 2011. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pult, Caspar. 1897. *Le parler de sent*. University of Lausanne PhD thesis.

Rogers, Kenneth. 1972. Vocalic alternation in the Sursilvan Romansh verb. In Fisher John & Gaeng Paul (eds.), *Studies in honor of Mario A. Pei*, 173–181. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Schorta, Andrea. 1938. *Lautlehre der Mundart von Müstair*. Paris: Droz.

Signorell, Faust. 2001. *Vocabulari surmiran-tudestg*. Chur: Departamaint d'educaziun digl Grischun.

Signorell, Faust, Mena Wuethrich-Grisch & Gion Pol Simeon. 1987. *Normas surmiranas*. Chur: Tgesa editoura cantunala per stampats e meds d'instrucziun.

Sims, Andrea. 2015. *Inflectional defectiveness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Solèr, Clau. 1991. *Romanisch im Schams*. Züurich: Phonogrammarchiv der Universität Zürich.

Stürzinger, Jakob. 1879. *Über die Conjugation im Rätoromanischen*. Zurich: Winterthur, Buchdr. von Bleuler-Hausheer & cie.

Tagliavini, Carlo. 1926. Il dialetto del Comelico. *Archivum Romanicum* 10. 1–200.

Thornton, Anna. 2004. Conversione V > N. In Maria Grossmann & Franz Rainer (eds.), *La formazione delle parole in italiano*, 517–525. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Thornton, Anna. 2011. Overabundance (multiple cells realizing the same cell): A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology. In Martin Maiden, John Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from Romance inflectional morphology*, 358–381. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolf, Matthew. 2013. Candidate chains, unfaithful spell-out, and outwards-looking phonologically-conditioned allomorphy. *Morphology* 23(2). 145–178.