

Theory and description in African Linguistics

Selected papers from the 47th
Annual Conference on African
Linguistics

Edited by

Emily Clem

Peter Jenks

Hannah Sande

Contemporary African Linguistics

./langsci/graphics/lan

Contemporary African Linguistics

Editors: Akinbiyi Akinlabi, Laura J. Downing

In this series:

1. Payne, Doris L., Sara Pacchiarotti & Mokaya Bosire (eds.). Diversity in African languages: Selected papers from the 46th Annual Conference on African Linguistics.
2. Persohn, Bastian. The verb in Nyakyusa: A focus on tense, aspect and modality.
3. Kandybowicz, Jason, Travis Major & Harold Torrence (eds.). African linguistics on the prairie. Selected papers from the 45th Annual Conference on African Linguistics.

ISSN: 2511-7726

Theory and description in African Linguistics

Selected papers from the 47th
Annual Conference on African
Linguistics

Edited by

Emily Clem

Peter Jenks

Hannah Sande

Emily Clem, Peter Jenks & Hannah Sande (ed.). 2018. *Theory and description in African Linguistics: Selected papers from the 47th Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (Contemporary African Linguistics). Berlin: Language Science Press.

This title can be downloaded at:

<http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/000>

© 2018, the authors

Published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISBN: no digital ISBN

no print ISBNs!

ISSN: 2511-7726

no DOI

Source code available from www.github.com/langsci/000

Collaborative reading: paperhive.org/documents/remote?type=langsci&id=000

Cover and concept of design: Ulrike Harbort

Fonts: Linux Libertine, Libertinus Math, Arimo, DejaVu Sans Mono

Typesetting software: Xe_{La}TeX

Language Science Press

Unter den Linden 6

10099 Berlin, Germany

langsci-press.org

Storage and cataloguing done by FU Berlin

no logo

Contents

I Phonetics and phonology

1 Obstacles for gradual place assimilation

Andrew Lamont

3

II Syntax and semantics

III Areal features and linguistic reconstruction

Indexes

25

Part I

Phonetics and phonology

Chapter 1

Obstacles for gradual place assimilation

Andrew Lamont

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Tshivenda (Guthrie S21) shares with other Southern Bantu languages a distinctive alternation in the form of the verb, termed the conjoint/disjoint alternation. I will present data from original fieldwork showing that, in contrast to other related languages, the Tshivenda conjoint and disjoint forms are not in complementary distribution by syntactic context, and instead show a distinctive three-way split in acceptability. I will also show that the same three-way split obtains in the frequency of utterance-internal penultimate lengthening. I discuss two possible analyses of this correlation, one in which the disjoint is a purely prosodic phenomenon and one in which the correlation is due to the influence of some third factor such as information structure.

1 Introduction

Harmonic Serialism (HS) is a serial version of Optimality Theory (OT) (princesmolensky1993; mccarthy2000).¹ HS shares the basic framework of OT: a function GEN takes an input and produces a set of candidates. The set of candidates is fed into a function EVAL, which returns the optimal candidate with respect to the ranked set of constraints, CON.

The main difference between HS and Parallel OT is the function GEN. In Parallel OT, GEN is unrestricted, producing an infinite set of candidates that can differ from the input in unlimited ways. In HS, GEN is restricted to producing a set of candidates that differ only minimally from the input. Given a finite set of operations, the candidate set includes the fully faithful candidate and every candidate that can be derived from the input via the application of a single operation. This property of GEN is called *gradualness*.

¹See mccarthy2016 for a recent overview.

Gradualness means that derivations involving the application of more than one operation take multiple steps in HS. This is modeled by looping between GEN and EVAL. An initial input in_0 is fed into GEN, and EVAL selects the optimal candidate out_0 . If candidate out_0 differs from its input in_0 , it serves as the input to the next step, $in_1 = out_0$, and the process repeats. The derivation converges once the optimal candidate does not differ from the most recent input: $out_n = in_n$. That final optimal candidate is the output.

The effects of gradualness are clearly seen in iterative processes like feature spreading (mccarthy2009). For example, in Copperbelt Bemba (Bantu), if a word does not end in a high toned mora, the rightmost high tone will spread to the end of the word (kulabickmore2015), e.g. /bá-ka-fík-a/ > [bá-ká-fík-á] ‘they will arrive’. In Parallel OT, the output [bá-ká-fík-á] is a member of the candidate set produced from the input /bá-ka-fík-a/ by GEN. In HS, GEN is limited to spreading the high tone once, and this derivation takes three steps: /bá-ka-fík-a/ > bá-ká-fík-a > bá-ká-fík-á > [bá-ká-fík-á].

This example also speaks to the trade-off between GEN and CON in HS. Both the Parallel OT and HS analyses require a motivating markedness constraint against final toneless moras (kulabickmore2015). A simple constraint against toneless final moras is sufficient for a Parallel OT analysis; candidates like [bá-ká-fík-a] are not optimal because they contain final toneless moras. In an HS analysis, forms like [bá-ká-fík-a] are optimal candidates at intermediate steps and this markedness constraint cannot motivate gradual spreading. Instead, an alignment constraint is necessary (mccarthyprince1993), assigning violations in proportion to the number of intervening moras between the rightmost high tone and the end of the word. The optimal candidate at each step of the derivation improves on this constraint by spreading the high tone further until the derivation converges.

Derivational steps in HS exhibit *harmonic improvement*, and can be modeled in a harmonic improvement tableau (Table 1). Table 1 shows that the output at each step of the derivation better satisfies the constraint ranking than the input at that step. Successive optima improve gradually on the gradient alignment constraint, ALIGN-R(WORD, H), which penalizes the distance between the right edge of the word and the rightmost high tone. Violations of the faithfulness constraint against spreading a high tone, NoSPREAD, are determined relative to the input of the current step, not the input to the entire derivation. Hence, each successive output only violates NoSPREAD once. Every step of the derivation must show harmonic improvement.

Tableau 1: Harmonic improvement in Copperbelt Bemba

/bá-ka-fík-a/	ALIGN-R(WORD, H)	NO SPREAD
a. bá-ka-fík-a	3	
b. bá-ká-fík-a	2	1
c. bá-ká-fík-a	1	1
d. [bá-ká-fík-á]		1

In Parallel OT, the constraint set CON defines the predicted typology. In HS, the predicted typology results from the interaction between CON and GEN. Imposing limits on GEN restricts the typological predictions. Determining the operations available to GEN is an important research question in HS (see the papers in [mccarthy2016](#) for perspectives on a broad range of topics).

This paper compares two approaches to place assimilation in HS, focusing on [progressive place assimilation](#): a two-step derivation with delinking and then spreading ([mccarthy2007](#); [mccarthy2008](#)), and a one-step derivation where place features are directly changed, ultimately arguing that the one-step derivation better fits the attested typology. These two approaches to place assimilation are laid out in §2. §3 tests the predictions of these approaches against cases of [progressive place assimilation](#) cross-linguistically. §4 concludes.

2 Place assimilation in Harmonic Serialism

Place assimilation is a common process cross-linguistically wherein a consonant takes on the place features of an adjacent consonant. Assimilation is overwhelmingly regressive, i.e. in a cluster C_1C_2 , C_1 is much more likely to assimilate to C_2 than C_2 is to assimilate to C_1 ([webb1982](#); [jun1995](#)). A robust example of [regressive assimilation](#) is found in Diola-Fogny (Niger-Congo) ([sapis1965](#)). Table 1 gives examples of the four phonemic nasals in the language taking on the place features of a following consonant in coda-onset clusters, e.g. /ni-gam-gam/ > [ni.gam.gam] ‘I judge’ (1a).²

Progressive place assimilation, i.e. where C_2 assimilates to C_1 in a C_1C_2 cluster, is often restricted to certain environments such as root-enclitic junctures ([lamont2015](#)). An example is found in Masa (Chadic) ([antonino1999](#); [shryock1997](#)). Table 2 gives examples of the [masculine](#) enclitic /-na/ and the [feminine](#) enclitic /-da/. Attached to roots ending with vowels, the enclitics surface faithfully with

²Tones are omitted from data throughout this paper.

Table 1: Regressive place assimilation in Diola Fogy

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/ni-gam-gam/	[ni.ga.gam]	‘I judge’
b.	/pan-i-ma/	[pa.i.ma]	‘you (plural) will know’
c.	/ku-b-b/	[ku.bm.b]	‘they sent’
d.	/na-ti-ti/	[na.tin.ti]	‘he cut (it) through’

coronal place, e.g. /tuu-na/ > [tuu.na] ‘body-MASC’ (2a). Attached to roots ending with obstruents or nasals, the enclitics surface with the place features of the root-final consonant, e.g. /vok-na/ > [vok.ɲa] ‘front-MASC’ (2g).

Table 2: Progressive place assimilation in Masa

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/tuu-na/	[tuu.na]	‘body-MASC’
b.	/gam-na/	[gam.ma]	‘fish species-MASC’
c.	/vun-na/	[vun.na]	‘mouth-MASC’
d.	/ze-na/	[ze.a]	‘warthog-MASC’
e.	/cop-na/	[cop.ma]	‘gremer lid-MASC’
f.	/vet-na/	[vet.na]	‘hare-MASC’
g.	/vok-na/	[vok.a]	‘front-MASC’
h.	/naga-da/	[naga.da]	‘earth-FEM’
i.	/lum-da/	[lum.ba]	‘canoe-FEM’
j.	/binen-da/	[bi.nen.da]	‘fish species-FEM’
k.	/hara-da/	[ha.ra.ga]	‘light-FEM’
l.	/rip-da/	[rip.pa]	‘termite species-FEM’
m.	/fat-da/	[fat.ta]	‘sun-FEM’
n.	/benek-da/	[be.nek.ka]	‘herb species-FEM’

2.1 Place assimilation as a two-step process

mccarthy2007; mccarthy2008 proposes an HS analysis of place assimilation in which the targeted consonant first loses its place features and then place from an adjacent consonant spreads onto the target. Because only one operation can ap-

Tableau 2: Regressive place assimilation: Step 1

/ni-gam-gam/	CODA COND	MAX(PL)
a. ni.gam.gam	W	L
b. ni.gam.Ham	W	1
→ c. ni.gaN.gam		1

Tableau 3: Regressive place assimilation: Step 2

ni.gaN.gam	HAVE PLACE	NO LINK(PL)
a. ni.gaN.gam	W	L
→ b. ni.gaŋ.gam		1

ply at a time in HS, this gives two derivational steps: debuccalization and spreading. This two-step process is referred to as *gradual place assimilation* in this paper exactly because it takes multiple steps in the derivation.

In *regressive assimilation*, debuccalization, the first step, satisfies the Coda Condition (CODA COND), which is violated by place features that are not associated with an onset. This constraint motivates deleting the place features from the coda consonant, which violates MAX(PLACE). Table 2 shows the first step of /ni-gam-gam/ > [ni.gaŋ.gam] ‘I judge’ (1a). Candidates (1a) and (1b) violate CODA COND because the labial place associated with the medial nasal is not associated with an onset; the final-consonant is taken to be exceptional. A place node deletes in (??b) and (??c), as indicated with the capital letters *H* and *N*, for debuccalized oral and nasal consonants, respectively. (1c) is optimal because it does not violate CODA COND. This tableau demonstrates that only the coda can be targeted for debuccalization; deleting the place features from the onset does not improve on CODA COND.

The second step satisfies a *markedness constraint* against placeless segments, HAVE PLACE. This constraint motivates spreading the place features from an adjacent consonant onto the placeless segment, which violates NO LINK(PLACE). Table ?? shows this step, continuing the derivation from Table ??; the input to this step is the output of the previous step [ni.gaN.gam]. Candidate (??a), the output of Table ??, contains a placeless nasal and violates HAVE PLACE. Candidate (??b) is optimal because it does not contain any placeless segments. This candidate will be the input to a third step, where the derivation converges (not shown here).

The output of each step of the derivation is shown in the *harmonic improvement* Table ?? along with the full constraint ranking. As this tableau makes clear,

Tableau 4: Harmonic improvement in Diola Fogny

/ni-gam-gam/	CODA _{COND}	HAVE _{PLACE}	MAX(PL)	NO _{LINK} (PL)
a. ni.gam.gam	1			
b. ni.ga _N .gam		1	1	
c. [ni.ga _ŋ .gam]				1

Tableau 5: Progressive place assimilation: Step 1

/vok-na/	*PLACE _{AFFIX}	MAX(PL)
a. vok.na	W	L
b. voH.na	W	1
→ c. vok.Na		1

each subsequent optimum increases in harmony until the convergent optimum is reached (4c). This candidate does not violate either **markedness constraint** and therefore does not motivate further derivational steps. As the square brackets indicate, it is the ultimate output.

Progressive place assimilation, like that in **Masa**, cannot be motivated by CODA_{COND}, as this constraint is only satisfied by debuccalizing a coda consonant. Instead, **mccarthy2008** analyzes the first step as satisfying a constraint against place features belonging to affixes, *PLACE_{AFFIX}. The derivation is otherwise identical to **Diola Fogny**'s: the targeted consonant debuccalizes before place features spread from an adjacent consonant.

Tables ?? and ?? below show the derivation of /vok-na/ > [vok.ŋa] 'front-MASC' (2g). In Table ??, the faithful candidate (??a) and a candidate in which the root-final coda has debuccalized (??b) both violate *PLACE_{AFFIX}, and lose to the optimal candidate (??c), in which the affix nasal has lost its place features. This candidate serves as the input to Table ??, where it loses to candidate (??b), in which the place features of the adjacent dorsal stop spread onto the nasal.

Tableau 6: Progressive place assimilation: Step 2

vok.Na	HAVE _{PLACE}	NO _{LINK} (PL)
a. vok.Na	W	L
→ b. vok.ŋa		1

Tableau 7: Harmonic improvement in Masa

/vok-na/	*PLACE _{AFFIX}	HAVEPLACE	MAX(Pl)	NO LINK(Pl)
a. vok.na	1			
b. vok.Na		1	1	
c. [vok.ŋa]				1

Tableau 8: Default place epenthesis: Step 1

/tuu-na/	*PLACE _{AFFIX}	MAX(Pl)
a. tuu.na	W	L
→ b. tuu.Na		1

A **harmonic improvement** tableau for **progressive place assimilation** in **Masa** is given in (Table 7). This exactly parallels the derivation in **Diola Fogy** (Table 4), except for the highest-ranked **markedness constraint**: CODA_{COND} motivates regressive place assimilation and *PLACE_{AFFIX} motivates **progressive place assimilation**.

This ranking motivates a similar derivation with vowel-final roots like /tuu-na/ > [tuu.na] ‘body-MASC’ (2a). The **markedness constraint** *PLACE_{AFFIX} is violated by the enclitic nasal regardless of the shape of the root. Debuccalization therefore occurs with vowel-final roots just as it does with nasal- and obstruent-final roots.

The enclitics surface with **coronal place** regardless of the adjacent vowel’s quality, e.g. compare [tuu.na] ‘body-MASC’ with [ma.dii.na] ‘dew-MASC’ and [ci.ta.na] ‘job-MASC’. The violation of HAVEPLACE introduced in the first step of the derivation is therefore not repaired by spreading place features from the adjacent root vowel. Instead, **coronal place** features are inserted as a default (lombardi2002; delacy2006), which violates DEP(PLACE).

The derivation of /tuu-na/ > [tuu.na] ‘body-MASC’ (2a) is shown in Tables ?? and ?. In the first step, the affix nasal debuccalizes to satisfy *PLACE_{AFFIX}. In the second step, **default place** features are inserted to satisfy HAVEPLACE. Because spreading place is preferred to inserting place with nasal- and obstruent-final roots, DEP(PLACE) dominates NO LINK(PLACE).

This analysis treats the enclitics as underlyingly having **coronal place** features: /-na/ and /-da/. The facts of the language are also consistent with their being underspecified for place: the **masculine** enclitic underlyingly being /-Na/ and the **feminine** enclitic being /-Ha/, their place and voice features predictable from context. As mccarthy2008 argues, underlyingly placeless consonants do not have to

Tableau 9: Default place epenthesis: Step 2

tuu.Na	HAVEPLACE	DEP(PL)
a. tuu.Na	W	L
→ b. tuu.na		1

Tableau 10: Progressive place assimilation as underspecification

/vok-Na/	CODACOND	MAX(PL)	NO LINK(PL)
a. vok.Na	W		L
b. voH.Na		W	L
→ c. vok.ŋa			1

pass through a debuccalization step, as CODACOND can motivate place assimilation directly.

Such a derivation is shown for [vok.ŋa] ‘front-MASC’ (2g) in Table ??, with the underlying form of the affix containing a nasal underspecified for place. Because CODACOND is satisfied by place features linked to an onset, directly spreading place onto the nasal in (??c) is optimal. Debuccalizing the root-final stop (??b) is dispreferred by the relative ranking of MAX(PLACE) and NO LINK(PLACE). Assuming underspecification, with vowel-final roots, **default place** features are inserted without the enclitics first passing through a debuccalization step.

Gradual place assimilation predicts that targets of **progressive place assimilation** surface with **default place** features in contexts that do not license place spreading. The two analyses given for the **Masa** enclitics here explain their surfacing with **coronal place** intervocally as a result of their derivation, not their underlying form. Underlying place features first pass through a debuccalization step. Because derivations in HS cannot look ahead to later steps, this process applies whenever an enclitic attaches to a root. This debuccalized segment then surfaces with **default place** features that are inserted to satisfy HAVEPLACE. Likewise, in the underspecification analysis, the enclitics enter the derivation placeless and surface with **default place** features intervocally to satisfy HAVEPLACE. The co-occurrence of **progressive place assimilation** and the realization of **default place** features is predicted by **gradual place assimilation**. In general, **gradual place assimilation** is always compatible with an underspecification analysis.

2.2 Place assimilation as a one-step process

The two-step process outlined above can be compared to a one-step process, which grants GEN a place-changing operation. The trade-off between GEN and CON mirrors the distinction between positional markedness and **positional faithfulness** in Parallel OT (zoll2004). The two-step process uses positional markedness constraints, CODA_{COND} and *PLACE_{AFFIX}, and a general faithfulness constraint, MAX(PLACE) in the first step of the derivation. The one-step process uses a general **markedness constraint** and **positional faithfulness** constraints.

In the one-step process, both regressive and **progressive place assimilation** are motivated by a **markedness constraint** against heterorganic clusters, AGREE(PLACE) (yip1991; lombardi1999; bakovic2000; bakovic2007). This constraint is satisfied by changing the place features of one of the consonants, violating IDENT(PLACE). Which consonant is targeted follows from the relative ranking of **positional faithfulness** constraints. For the purposes of this paper, the two relevant constraints are IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET} (beckman1998), which is violated by changing the place features of a consonant in onset position, and IDENT(PLACE)_{ROOT} (mccarthyprince1995) which is violated by changing the place features of a consonant in the morphological root.³

In coda-onset clusters, IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET} prefers regressive place assimilation. Table ?? shows the one-step derivation of /ni-gam-gam/ > [ni.gam.gam] ‘I judge’ (1a). The faithful candidate (??a) contains a heterorganic cluster and violates AGREE(PLACE). It is dispreferred to the unfaithful candidates in which the place assimilation operation has applied (8b–c). An onset is targeted in (??b), which is dispreferred to (??c), in which a coda is targeted. Under this analysis, the word-final consonant does not enjoy any special status; it is not a member of a cluster, and does not violate the **markedness constraint**.

The conflict between the two **positional faithfulness** constraints is seen at root-enclitic junctures; without a morpheme boundary or another relevant asymmetry (lamont2015), IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET} guarantees that **regressive assimilation** is the default repair. In **Masa**, the enclitic consonant in onset position is targeted for assimilation, so IDENT(PLACE)_{ROOT} dominates IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET}. This is shown

³Positional faithfulness constraints have been shown to produce pathological effects unless the relevant position is defined over the input (jesney2011). This paper assumes that syllabification co-occurs with other operations at each step, following mccarthy2008, which makes IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET} meaningless in the first step as the input is not syllabified. This problem can be avoided by assuming syllabification applies at an earlier derivational step (elfner2009). IDENT(PLACE)_{ROOT} does not have this problem because Consistency of Exponence ensures that morphological affiliation is invariant throughout the derivation (mccarthyprince1993b).

Tableau 11: Regressive place assimilation as one step

/ni-gam-gam/	AGREE(Pl)	IDENT(Pl)	IDENT(Pl) _{ONSET}
a. ni.gam.gam	W	L	
b. ni.gam.bam		1	W
→ c. ni.gam.ɲ.gam		1	

Tableau 12: Progressive place assimilation as one step

/vok-na/	AGREE(Pl)	IDENT(Pl)	IDENT(Pl) _{ROOT}	IDENT(Pl) _{ONSET}
a. vok.na	W	L		L
b. vot.na		1	W	L
→ c. vok.ɲa		1		1

in Table ?? with /vok-na/ > [vok.ɲa] ‘front-MASC’ (2g). If the relative ranking of the **positional faithfulness** constraints were switched, regressive place assimilation would be preferred, and (??b) would be the optimal candidate.

Because AGREE(PLACE) is only violated by consonant clusters, it does not motivate any operations in intervocalic contexts. Assuming underlying **coronal place**, the derivation of /tuu-na/ > [tuu.na] ‘body-MASC’ (2a) converges in one step because there is no reason to change the enclitic nasal. Under the one-step derivation, underlying place features surface in intervocalic contexts. If the enclitic nasal is underlyingly underspecified for place, it will pass through a derivational step in which **default place** is inserted just as in the two-step process.

The intervocalic context is where the two analyses make different predictions. Under the two-step process, affix consonants debuccalize and then surface with **default place** features. Under the one-step process, affix consonants surface faithfully. The following section presents a modest survey of **progressive place assimilation** and argues that predictions of the one-step process are borne out.

3 Progressive place assimilation cross-linguistically

Progressive place assimilation often only targets a single suffix in a language, motivating an analysis that relies on morpheme-specific constraints (pater2009). When that suffix surfaces with **default place** features, it is consistent with an underspecification account and therefore consistent with a two- or one-step derivation. For example, the progressive suffix in **Noni** (Niger-Congo) is analyzed underlyingly as /-te/ (hyman1981noni). Attached to roots with final vowels, it sur-

faces with a lateral. Roots with final labial nasals take [-te], roots with final coronal nasals take [-e], and roots with final dorsal nasals take [-ke]. Examples are shown in Table 3. Like the **gender** enclitics in **Masa**, the **Noni** progressive is amenable to having an initial stop underspecified for place: /-He/.

Table 3: Progressive place assimilation in Noni

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/cii-te/	[cii.le]	‘drag-PROG’
b.	/cim-te/	[cim.te]	‘dig-PROG’
c.	/bin-te/	[bi.ne]	‘dance-PROG’
d.	/ci-te/	[cii.ke]	‘tremble-PROG’

Languages where the targeted suffix surfaces with marked place features cannot be analyzed this way. For example, the qualitative suffix in Kukú (**Nilotic**) assimilates to root-final nasals and obstruents and surfaces as a palatal stop intervocalically (**cohen2000**). Examples are given in Table 4. Similar allomorphy is found in the related languages **Bari** (**yokwe1987**) and **Mundari** (**stirtz2014**). In Kukú, palatal place features are neutralized in coda position: compare [gɲa] ‘be snapped’ and [gm] ‘snap’. This indicates that palatals are more marked than plain coronals. From the perspective of **default place** insertion, the word [ʃu.ɲɪ] ‘sharpen-QUAL’ (4a) is surprising; an unmarked stop is expected, e.g. *ʃu.dɪ.

Table 4: Progressive place assimilation in Kukú

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/u-a/	[u.]	‘sharpen-QUAL’
b.	/jm-a/	[jm.ba]	‘cast the evil eye-QUAL’
c.	/a-a/	[an.da]	‘dismantle-QUAL’
d.	/d-a/	[d.ga]	‘perform surgery-QUAL’
e.	/ip-a/	[ib.b]	‘sound-QUAL’
f.	/jt-a/	[jd.d]	‘plant-QUAL’
g.	/uk-a/	[ug.g]	‘build-QUAL’

Another suffix incompatible with underspecification is the **Afrikaans** (**Germanic**) diminutive /-ʃki/ (**lamont2017**). Examples are given in Table 5. The diminutive surfaces with **dorsal place** intervocalically (5a), which is unattested as a de-

fault (delacy2006). Furthermore, the diminutive triggers bidirectional place assimilation: it surfaces with labial place after labial-final roots, e.g. /rɑ:m-^jki/ > [rɑ:m.pi] ‘frame-DIM’ (5b), but triggers root-final coronals to undergo **regressive assimilation**, e.g. /mɑ:n-^jki/ > [mɑ:jŋ.ki] ‘moon-DIM’ (5c). Without positing underlying **dorsal place** features, the **regressive assimilation** seen with coronal-final stems is inexplicable.⁴

Table 5: Bidirectional place assimilation in Afrikaans

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/pɪ:-ki/	[pɪ:.ki]	‘father-DIM’
b.	/rɪ:m-ki/	[rɪ:m.pi]	‘frame-DIM’
c.	/mɪ:n-ki/	[mɪ:j.ki]	‘moon-DIM’
d.	/kun-ki/	[ku.n.ki]	‘king-DIM’

Not all languages target a single affix for **progressive place assimilation**. Some, such as **Masa**, have multiple affixes that undergo **progressive place assimilation**. A richer inventory of targeted affixes can be found in the closely related language **Musey** (Chadic) (shryock1996). **Musey** has cognates of the **Masa** gender enclitics /-na/ and /-da/ as well as a host of other enclitics that undergo **progressive place assimilation**. Table 6 gives examples with the negative enclitic /-dɪ/ and the intensifier enclitic /-kɪjo/. dassidi2015 also reports similar allomorphy with the infinitive marker /-da/ and the causative marker /-gi/.

As in Kukú and **Afrikaans**, the dorsal-initial morphemes /-kɪjo/ and /-gi/ make an underspecification analysis implausible, as **dorsal place** would have to be inserted as a default. Furthermore, because **Musey** also has coronal-initial morphemes that undergo **progressive place assimilation**, **default place** insertion would have to be lexically-specified so that some morphemes receive **coronal place** by default and others **dorsal place** by default.

Under the one-step process, these data are not problematic. Each affix/enclitic enters the derivation with underlying place features that surface faithfully unless an obstruent- or nasal-final root triggers assimilation; jun1995 gives an analysis in Parallel OT along these lines. Tables Table ?? and ?? give the derivations for /ka-dɪ/ > [ka.dɪ] ‘exist-NEG’ (6a) and /kulum-dɪ/ > [ku.lum.bi] ‘horse-NEG’ (6b) as one-

⁴An anonymous reviewer points out that an interesting comparison can be made between HS and Stratal OT (kiparsky2000). The work of root-faithfulness in HS parallels spelling out root features before affixation or cliticization. The analysis of **Afrikaans** in lamont2017 requires violable root-faithfulness, which seems difficult to reconcile with cyclic spell out.

Table 6: Progressive place assimilation in Musey

	Underlying	Surface	Gloss
a.	/ka-i/	[ka.i]	‘exist-NEG’
b.	/kulum-i/	[ku.lum.bi]	‘horse-NEG’
c.	/sun-i/	[sun.da]	‘work-NEG’
d.	/e-i/	[e.gi]	‘strength-NEG’
e.	/too-kjo/	[too.g.jo]	‘sweep-INTENSE’
f.	/hum-kjo/	[hum.b.jo]	‘hear-INTENSE’
g.	/fen-kjo/	[fen.d.jo]	‘blow one’s nose-INTENSE’
h.	/gala-kjo/	[ga.la.g.jo]	‘shake-INTENSE’

Tableau 13: Faithful realization intervocalically

/ka-ɖi/	AGREE(PL)	IDENT(PL)	IDENT(PL) _{ROOT}	IDENT(PL) _{ONSET}
→ a. ka.ɖi				
b. ka.bi		W		W

step derivations. As Table ?? shows, with vowel-final roots, the enclitic surfaces faithfully and the derivation converges. As Table ?? shows, with obstruent- and nasal-final roots, the enclitic surfaces homorganic to the root-final consonant. The optimal candidate of Table ?? will be the input to a second step, where the derivation converges (not shown here).

The intervocalic context poses a challenge to the two-step process. Following the derivation given for **Masa** above, we expect the intensifier enclitic in **Musey** to surface with **default place** when the context for spreading is unavailable. This is shown in Tables ?? and ?? with /too-kjo/ > [too.gi.jo] ‘sweep-INTENSE’ (6e). Even if **dorsal place** were somehow the default in **Musey**, it would not explain why other enclitics surface with **coronal place** after this step.

Tableau 14: Progressive place assimilation as one step

/kulum-ɖi/	AGREE(PL)	IDENT(PL)	IDENT(PL) _{ROOT}	IDENT(PL) _{ONSET}
a. ku.lum.ɖi	W	L		L
b. ku.lun.ɖi		1	W	L
→ c. ku.lum.bi		1		1

Tableau 15: Problematic default place epenthesis: Step 1

/too-kijo/	*PLACE _{AFFIX}	MAX(PL)
a. too.ki.jo	W	L
→ b. too.Hi.jo		1

Tableau 16: Problematic default place epenthesis: Step 2

too.Hi.jo	HAVEPLACE	DEP(PL)
a. too.Hi.jo	W	L
→ b. too.ti.jo		1

mccarthy2008 suggests that the general phonotactics of the language can account for this. **Musey** only allows the placeless consonants [h] and [ɦ] word-initially (shryock1996). This suggests a **markedness constraint** against word-internal placeless consonants, such as ALIGN-L(h, WORD).⁵ This constraint is violated when the segments [h] and [ɦ] do not occur word-initially. It is also violated by debuccalized segments, because, by definition, these are placeless.

Introducing this constraint into the two-step analysis results in a ranking paradox. This is shown in Table ?? with the first steps of /too-kijo/ > [too.gi.jo] ‘sweep-INTENSE’ (6e) and /hum-kijo/ > [hum.bi.jo] ‘hear-INTENSE’ (6f). The left hand column gives the desired winner and a competing candidate in the first step separated by a tilde. In the intervocalic context (??a), debuccalization should not occur. In the consonant cluster context (??b), debuccalization should occur to feed place spreading. The markedness constraints *PLACE_{AFFIX} and ALIGN-L(h, WORD) are given with their evaluations of the winner ~ loser pairs.

There is a stark ranking paradox in Table ?. Including ALIGN-L(h, WORD) in the constraint set does not have the desired effect of blocking debuccalization only in intervocalic contexts. If it is ranked above *PLACE_{AFFIX}, it blocks debuccalization in all contexts, preventing any place assimilation from occurring. Whereas the one-step process adequately models the **Musey** allomorphy,

⁵A lowercase *h* is used to represent placeless consonants instead of an uppercase *H* to avoid confusion with the high **tone alignment constraint** used in §1.

Tableau 17: Ranking paradox in Musey

	*PLACE _{AFFIX}	ALIGN-L(h, WORD)
a. too.ki.jo ~ too.Hi.jo	L	W
b. hum.Hi.jo ~ hum.ki.jo	W	L

the two-step process cannot. This result holds for Kukú, Afrikaans, and any language that targets a consonant with marked place features for progressive place assimilation.

4 Conclusion

Research in Harmonic Serialism (HS) is concerned not just with the content of CON, but also with what operations are available to GEN. This paper examined the predictions made by removing place assimilation as a basic operation in HS and replacing its functionality with a delinking and then spreading derivation, as proposed by mccarthy2007; mccarthy2008. This restricted GEN was argued not to be able to model attested progressive place assimilation systems found in Kukú, Afrikaans, and Musey. It was shown that allowing GEN a basic place assimilation operation results in a better fit of the attested data.

As noted earlier, place assimilation is overwhelmingly regressive. Up until very recently, all cases of progressive place assimilation known in the theoretical literature targeted consonants with unmarked place features except for the Musey intensifier enclitic /-kjo/. mccarthy2007 even calls Musey a “unique challenge” to the two-step derivation, emphasizing that no other affix was known that shared these properties.

Relying on the Coda Condition to motivate place assimilation predicts progressive place assimilation like that in Musey is phonologically impossible, fulfilling the typological observation. In light of a survey of Musey-like languages (lamont2015), this strong typological prediction has to be weakened. There are more languages like Musey cross-linguistically that are well-behaved phonologically, which any phonological theory needs to be able to account for.

The one-step process that relies on AGREE(PLACE) is able to adequately model the attested place assimilation typology. However, it predicts that Musey-like languages should be much more common than they are. Whenever a conflicting faithfulness constraint dominates IDENT(PLACE)_{ONSET}, progressive or bidirectional assimilation is predicted. Given the very limited distribution of these systems, the factorial typology vastly overpredicts their occurrence. This strongly suggests an external influence on the typology such as articulatory or perceptual pressures (jun1995; steriade2001), but such a discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Kelly Berkson, Gosia Cavar, Stuart Davis, Gaja Jarosz, Samson Lotven, John McCarthy, Joe Pater, Katie Tetzloff, audiences at ACAL 47 and the 2016 IULC Spring Conference, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback and discussion. For sharing data with me, I am indebted to Pius Akumbu, Andries Coetzee, and Aaron Shryock. All remaining errors are mine.

Abbreviations

DIM	diminutive	NEG	negative
FEM	feminine	PROG	progressive
INTENSE	intensifier	QUAL	qualitative
MASC	masculine		

References

Akumbu, Pius W. 2011. Tone in Kejom (Babanki) associative constructions. *Journal of West African Languages* 38(1). 69–88.

Akumbu, Pius W. 2015. Babanki verb tone. *Studies in African Linguistics* 44(1). 1–26.

Akumbu, Pius W. 2016. Babanki coda consonant deletion and vowel raising: A case of allomorphy. In Emily Clem, Virginia Dawson, Alice Shen, Amalia Horan Skilton, Geoff Bacon, Andrew Cheng & Erik Hans Maier (eds.), *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 3–20. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Boersma, Paul & David Weenink. 2016. *Praat: Doing phonetics by computer*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam. Version 6.0.14.

Clements, George N. 1983. The hierarchical representation of tone features. In Ivan R. Dihoff (ed.), *Current approaches to African linguistics*, vol. 1, 1–17. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Clements, George N. & Kevin C. Ford. 1979. Kikuyu tone shift and its synchronic consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10. 179–210.

Connell, Bruce. 2014. *Downdrift, downstep, and declination*. (Paper presented at the Typology of African Prosodic Systems Workshop. Bielefeld University, Germany, May 18–20, 2001.)

Grebe, Karl & Winnifred Grebe. 1975. Verb tone patterns in Lamnsok. *Linguistics* 149. 5–23.

- Hyman, Larry M. 1979. Tonology of the Babanki noun. *Studies in African Linguistics* 10. 159–178.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2005. Initial vowel and prefix tone in Kom: Related to the Bantu augment? In Koen Bostoen & Jacky Maniacky (eds.), *Studies in African comparative linguistics with special focus on Bantu and Mande: Essays in honour of Y. Bastin and C. Grégoire*, 313–341. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2010. *Do tones have features?* (Paper presented at Tones and Features: A Symposium in Honor of G. Nick Clements, Paris, June 18–19, 2009).
- Hyman, Larry M. 2011. The representation of tone. In Marc van Oostendorp, Colin Y. Ewen, Elizabeth Hume & Keren Rice (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to phonology*, vol. II, 1078–1102. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mutaka, Ngessimo M. & Esther P. Chie. 2006. Vowel raising in Babanki. *Journal of West African Languages* 33(1). 71–88.
- Odden, David. 1982. Tonal phenomena in KiShambaa. *Studies in African Linguistics* 13(2). 177–208.
- Odden, David. 1995. Tone: African languages. In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 444–475. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Pulleyblank, Douglas. 1986. *Tone in lexical phonology*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Snider, Keith. 1990. Tonal upstep in Krachi: Evidence for a register tier. *Language* 66. 453–74.
- Snider, Keith. 1998. Phonetic realisation of downstep in Bimoba. *Phonology* 15(1). 77–101.
- Snider, Keith. 1999. *The geometry and features of tone*. Dallas: The Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Snider, Keith & Harry van der Hulst. 1993. Issues in the representation of tonal register. In Harry van der Hulst & Keith Snider (eds.), *The phonology of tone: The representation of tonal register*, 1–27. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stewart, John M. 1965. The typology of the Twi tone system. *Bulletin of the Institute of African Studies, Legon* 1. 1–27.
- Yip, Moira. 1980. *The tonal phonology of Chinese*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Yip, Moira. 1989. Contour tones. *Phonology* 6. 149–174.

Part II

Syntax and semantics

Part III

Areal features and linguistic reconstruction

Did you like this book?

This book was brought to you for free

Please help us in providing free access to linguistic research worldwide. Visit <http://www.langsci-press.org/donate> to provide financial support or register as a community proofreader or typesetter at <http://www.langsci-press.org/register>.

./langsci/graphics/langsci_

Theory and description in African Linguistics

change your blurb in localmetadata.tex

