

Tobias Scheer  
Université de Nice, CNRS 6039\*

Markéta Ziková  
Masarykova Univerzita v Brně

## The Coda Mirror v2

### 1. Introduction

The Coda Mirror is a theory of lenition and fortition that is couched in the syllabic environment CVCV.<sup>1</sup> It was laid out in Ségéral & Scheer (2001a)<sup>2</sup> and has known various implementations and applications.<sup>3</sup> Below we develop the Coda Mirror further by amending its mechanics in one central point: government and licensing are not equal-righted. The motivation for this move comes from the word-final (or rather: domain-final, see Kaye 1995) situation, i.e. where non-phonological factors come into play. Shaping linguistic theory according to interface requirements is quite a minimalist thing to do.<sup>4</sup>

We show that the four-way typology which follows from the parameterization of the lateral abilities of (word-)final empty nuclei (FEN) when government and licensing freely combine is inadequate because it overgenerates. There is no empirical response for FEN that can license but not govern (there are no word-final consonants that show strong position behaviour, i.e. which are only licensed), or for FEN that can govern but not license (there are no cases where word-final consonants stand in some kind of nightmare position, i.e. are weaker than regular codas).

The only parametric variation that is found at the right edge of the word (or of domains) concerns the final consonant, which may either be "extrasyllabic" or not. Being extrasyllabic means that it is intervocalic, i.e. governed and licensed in terms of the Coda Mirror v1, while being non-extrasyllabic identifies the consonant as a true coda, i.e. a consonant that is neither governed nor licensed. The parametric variation regarding the lateral abilities of FEN thus appears to be binary: either FEN are good lateral actors (i.e. can govern and license), or they are not (i.e. can do neither).

Another aspect of the word-final situation is that it cannot be true that the parameterized lateral abilities of FEN are distributed by morphology ("morphology switches the governing/licensing ability of FEN on or off via a Translator's Office", and FEN are also "externally" governed, see Scheer 2004a: §406, 2008). This is because government and licensing in CVCV constitute the actual computation that the phonological module carries out; intermodular communication, however, is unable to bear on computational properties: it can only modify the *application* of computation (morphology cannot decide to add a rule to the phonological grammar, it can only influence the application of existing rules). Hence the parametric variation regarding the lateral abilities of FEN must be true parameters, that is hard-wired as all other parameters. This follows Kaye's (1990, 1995) original management of FEN and the associated variation.

Finally, we ask the question why the right edge of the word, rather than the left edge, is special in phonology: why do phonologists always talk about the last, rather than about the first nucleus in a domain? That is, why is there parametric variation associated to last, but not to first (empty) nuclei? And why do only consonant-final words show parametric variation (why are there no extrasyllabic vowels)? We propose that this is because the string is parsed from right to left: lateral relations

---

\* Laboratoire Bases, Corpus, Langage (BCL, UMR 6039), Université de Nice - Sophia Antipolis, CNRS ; MSH de Nice, 98 Bd E. Herriot, 06200 NICE.

<sup>1</sup> CVCV (or strict CV) was initiated by Lowenstamm (1996) and is developed, among others, by Szigetvári (2001), Cyran (2003), Scheer (1998a, 2004a), Ziková (2008), Rowicka (1999).

<sup>2</sup> Ségéral & Scheer (2001) is a slightly more evolved French version of the original English manuscript Ségéral & Scheer (1999), which is available online.

<sup>3</sup> Among others, the following may be quoted: Szigetvári (1999, 2008), Cyran (2003, 2008), Seigneur-Froli (2003, 2006), Ségéral & Scheer (2001b, 2005, 2008a,b), Scheer (2004a: §§110, 556, 2004b) Marotta (2008), Kijak (2005), Csides (2000, 2007), Passino (2005).

<sup>4</sup> This article is a piece of Scheer (forth), where a more elaborated version appears.

(government and licensing) are only regressive. Hence the FEN is phase-initial, and there is no way for the computation of a string to proceed if the lateral abilities of the FEN are not defined: the lateral abilities of all other constituents in a given domain depend on the status of the FEN. If the phase-initial nucleus is contentful, things are set and there is no reason for variation. In case it is empty, its lateral abilities need to be defined by a parameter in order for the computation to be able to be initiated.

The modification of the domain-final picture has also consequences on the domain-internal situation, where the Coda Mirror v1 also produces the nightmare situation. We show that this can be done away with if the solution that we derive for the domain-final issue is generalized: government and licensing cannot act independently of one another. Rather, they obey a hierarchy that determines their behaviour when they could in principle apply simultaneously: government over licensing. That is, in case a constituent can potentially be subject to both lateral forces, it will be governed (and unlicensed).

We show that while this system maintains all effects of the Coda Mirror v1, it offers two additional benefits. For one thing, no consonant is exposed to schizophrenia anymore: intervocalic consonants in the Coda Mirror v1 were simultaneously governed and licensed. They are now only governed. Also, a by-product of the amended system is a new definition of closed and open syllables: vowels in open syllables are licensed (hence their distributional latitude is maximal), while vowels in closed syllables are not (hence inventories are defective etc.).

We proceed as follows: section two provides a stenographic introduction of the bare bones of the Coda Mirror as it stands. Section three shows in which way and where exactly the independence of government and licensing produces overgeneration. The remedy that makes the Coda Mirror v2 is then introduced in section four, and its consequences for the parameterisation of FEN are evaluated in section five. Section six clarifies the status of the FEN-related variation as phonological parameters, while section seven shows that the absence of extrasyllabic vowels and comparable left-edge variation follows from the premises of CVCV. Section eight offers some concluding remarks.

## 2. The Coda Mirror as it stands

The central idea of the Coda Mirror is that positional strength of consonants depends on the distribution of empty nuclei. The five relevant positions cluster into two disjunctions according to their behaviour, plus the intervocalic position V\_\_V: the coda \_\_{#,C} and its mirror, the Strong Position {#,C}\_\_. As may be seen under (1) below, the two disjunctions are reduced by the Coda Mirror so that consonants in coda position occur before empty nuclei, while consonants in the Strong Position are found after empty nuclei (and intervocalic consonants are not adjacent to any empty nucleus).


### (1) the five positions and their interpretation in the Coda Mirror

	position	usual name				
a.	#_V	word-initial	} Strong Position	ø__	} weak positions	
b.	VC._V	post-coda				
c.	V_.CV	internal coda	} Coda	__ø		
d.	V_#	final coda				
e.	V__V	intervocalic	V__V	no adjacent ø		

The Coda Mirror builds on the Mirror effect: it can hardly be by accident that the coda and its mirror, the Strong Position, are exactly symmetric not only as far as their structural description is concerned (\_\_{#,C} vs. {#,C}\_\_), but also regarding their effect: coda consonants are weak, while coda mirror consonants are strong. The reduction of both disjunctions, an insuperable obstacle in a traditional syllabic environment, produces the same symmetry (\_\_ø vs. ø\_\_). The question why the former, rather than the latter is weak (and the latter, rather than the former strong) is answered by the lateral relations government and licensing that make the architecture of syllable structure in CVCV (which is thus built on lateral dependency-type relations, rather than on trees).


Government spoils the segmental expression of its target, while licensing provides support. Each nucleus that is a good lateral actor (i.e. that can dispense lateral relations) can govern and license, and will always do so (a nucleus cannot "decide" not to govern or not to license). Empty nuclei require government from the following nucleus, which is therefore unable to govern its own onset. This is the reason why

empty nuclei introduce a disruption of the intervocalic equilibrium. Table (2) below shows the effect of empty nuclei on following consonants, which stand in Strong Position (target consonants are underscored). Following Lowenstamm (1999), the beginning of the word is represented by an empty CV unit (see e.g. Ségéral & Scheer 2008b for discussion).



The nucleus following word-initial and post-coda consonants is called to govern its preceding peer, which is empty. It cannot govern its own onset for that reason. At the same time, the nucleus in question has no specific licensing duties and therefore licenses its own onset. A consonant in strong position is thus licensed but ungoverned.

Table (3) below shows the situation of the three remaining positions.



Consonants in the coda disjunction (3)a,b occur before an empty nucleus; they are both ungoverned and unlicensed for that reason: empty nuclei are laterally disabled. On the other hand, intervocalic consonants are not adjacent to any empty nucleus. They are therefore both governed and licensed: their nucleus is contentful (and hence a good lateral actor), but unlike under (2) has no governing duties. In sum, the two lateral relations define the five positions in the following way.

(4)

Licensing	Government	position	segmental health according to predictions
+	-	Coda Mirror	splendid
+	+	V__V	unfavourable
-	-	Coda	unfavourable
-	+	impossible	—

The forth logical possibility, i.e. where a consonant is governed but licensed, was held to be impossible by Ségéral & Scheer (2001a). It may be called the nightmare position since consonants will be spoiled (by government) and in addition unsupported (by licensing). The nightmare position will play a prominent role below.

### 3. FEN: the parametric system of Scheer (2004a) overgenerates

#### 3.1. Four logical possibilities

Table (5) below reproduces the four-way parametric space that is generated in Scheer (2004a:§545), i.e. on the assumption that government and licensing apply independently.

(5) the word-final situation: four-way parametric system of Scheer (2004a:§545)

FEN can	vowels before word-final consonants	word-final consonants are in
a. + license + govern	behave like in open syllables	intervocalic position
b. + license - govern		post-coda (strong) position
c. - license + govern	behave like in closed syllables	nightmare position
d. - license - govern		coda position

That this system overgenerates was already made explicit in Scheer (2004a:§543), and is also pointed out in Cyran's (2006:534ff) review of the book. Cyran goes through the detail of the predicted configurations that do not appear to correspond to any empirical record.

It was already mentioned that the two predicted situations that stand without empirical echo are the two grey-shaded cells under (5). An analysis of this picture shows that it is government, not licensing, that makes the system overgenerate.

There are two well-known loci of variation at the right edge of the word: long vowels before word-final consonants may or may not be subject to closed syllable restrictions (closed syllable shortening, open syllable lengthening), and word-final consonants may or may not behave as codas. Both are controlled by the same parameter, i.e. extrasyllabicity in traditional terms, licensing in the Coda Mirror.

Let us first look at consonants. In languages where FEN can license, word-final consonants do not behave like codas (i.e. they are extrasyllabic) because they are licensed – unlike coda consonants, which are not. On the other hand, word-final consonants behave like true codas in case FEN are unable to license (Scheer 2004a:§542). Unfortunately, the binary choice that is produced by licensing alone is further expanded when government comes into play: FEN that are able to license may or may not be able to govern (see (5)a,b), just as FEN that cannot license (see (5)c,d). According to the standards of the Coda Mirror v1, licensed word-final consonants are intervocalic when also governed ((5)a), but stand in strong position when remaining ungoverned ((5)b). On the other hand, unlicensed word-final consonants are only true codas when also ungoverned ((5)d). Otherwise, they are in the weakest possible situation, the nightmare position ((5)c).

The length of vowels before word-final consonants is also controlled by licensing. This follows from the definition of long vowels, whose complement needs to be licensed. Long vowels that alternate in length are left-headed. Hence their complement nucleus ( $V_2$  in  $V_1V_2C\emptyset CV$ ) fails to be licensed in closed syllables: the following nucleus is empty and governed (Scheer 2004a:§§230, 532). Therefore in languages such as Icelandic where closed syllable shortening applies word-internally, but not in word-final syllables (/VVRTV/ does, but /VVC#/ does not shorten),  $V_2$  in  $V_1V_2C\emptyset\#$  must receive licensing. The only possible source is the FEN. In other words, in extrasyllabic languages where the final consonant does not count for syllabic matters, FEN are able to dispense licensing. By contrast in languages where closed syllable shortening affects internal and final syllables alike, FEN are unable to license.

Although the literature does not really address the question whether vocalic and consonantal effects of extrasyllabicity always go hand in hand, the prediction that the licensing power of FEN decides for both appears to meet the empirical record: "extrasyllabic once, extrasyllabic forever" (see Scheer 2004a:§§364,551). That is, there are no "half-extrasyllabic" languages: word-final consonants cannot be extrasyllabic just for effects that concern their own body (but not for those that affect preceding vowels), and the reverse pattern is also excluded.

### 3.2. The nightmare position is unwarranted

The nightmare position, however, does not appear to have any empirical response: there are no super-weak consonants (which on top occur only in word-final position). Also, it falls foul of another empirical generalization (Ségéral & Scheer 2008a, Scheer 2004a:§536). The variable item of the two disjunctions is always located at the edge: either both internal and final coda consonants behave like codas (C# is not extrasyllabic), or only internal coda consonants behave like codas (while C# behave as non-codas, i.e. are extrasyllabic in traditional terms); the reverse pattern, however, where word-final consonants behave like codas but internal coda consonants do not, does not exist (e.g. l-vocalization affects either both pre-consonantal and word-final codas like in Brazilian Portuguese, or only pre-consonantal codas like in (Old) French). The same is true for the Strong Position: either both word-initial and post-coda consonants are strong like in Romance, or only the internal member of the disjunction, i.e. post-coda consonants, is strong, while word-initial consonants behave like intervocalic consonants; this pattern is found in Greek (Seigneur-Froli 2003, 2006). The reverse pattern where word-initial consonants are strong, but post-coda consonants are not, is not on record.

It also follows from this generalization that edge consonants can only deviate from the internal member of their disjunction in the opposite direction of strength: codas are weak, and word-final consonants may be non-weak (i.e. extrasyllabic); coda mirror consonants are strong, and word-initial consonants may be non-strong (i.e. intervocalic). Nightmare consonants, however, would deviate from the strength pattern of their disjunction by being weaker than codas. This violates the generalization.

### 3.3. Only two patterns have an empirical echo

In sum, only two cases out of four seem to make sense: those which have concordant values for government and licensing. Either word-final consonants are both governed and licensed as under (5)a, which makes them intervocalic and hence extrasyllabic, or they are neither governed nor licensed as under (5)d, in which case they are true codas, i.e. non-extrasyllabic.

If the arbitral award of the empirical echo is taken seriously, what needs to be done in order to eliminate overgeneration is to get rid of (5)b and (5)c. Translated into lateral terms, the rationale is clear: government and licensing must not be independently parameterised. That is, either FEN can dispense both, or none.

Note that the reduction from four to two options is neutral with respect to the second locus of variation: since the length of vowels in final syllables depends only on licensing, all that is needed in order to cover the pattern is a binary distinction between FEN that can and FEN that cannot license. The reduced system offers this contrast: table (5) shrinks to just (5)a and (5)d, which cover both the consonantal and the vocalic variation.

Finally, as before consonantal and vocalic effects of extrasyllabicity are covered by the same parameter, i.e. the (in-)ability of FEN to license.


It thus seems that the reduction of the parametric possibilities to just those which have concordant values for government and licensing allows for a better fit with the empirical situation. While this is certainly an encouraging result, more needs to be done: the following section shows that the system continues to produce the nightmare situation (5)c.

### 3.4. The nightmare position is a nightmare for the theory: it also occurs word-internally

Even though the shrunk parametric system of FEN does not produce the nightmare position (5)c anymore, this position continues to occur in two other circumstances.

In languages where FEN can license, vowels in final closed syllables are long (Icelandic is a case in point, see Scheer 2004a:§§533,544 for data and literature). In such a language word-final consonants should also be extrasyllabic since they will be licensed by the FEN. This, however, is only true when they follow a short vowel: they fail to be licensed (while still being governed) when preceded by a long vowel because the FEN is called to license the preceding nucleus. The relevant situation is depicted under (6) below.

- (6) extrasyllabic languages (i.e. where FEN can license and govern)  
 a. C# following a lexically short vowel: intervocalic position  
 b. C# following a lexically long vowel: nightmare position



Word-final consonants thus experience different conditions according to whether they are preceded by an underlyingly short or long vowel. In the former case (6)a, they are intervocalic in terms of the Coda Mirror v1 (both licensed and governed), while they face nightmare conditions in the latter (governed but unlicensed, (6)b).

This kind of variable consonantal strength according to whether the preceding vowel is long or short hardly meets any empirical echo. We do not know whether the relative strength of word-final consonants can be controlled in Icelandic (or in other languages where closed syllable shortening occurs only in internal syllables). If it turns out to be identical for (6)a and (6)b, the scenario of (6) is not refuted since the results of lenition in the intervocalic and the nightmare position could coincidentally be the same (just as intervocalic and coda consonants behave alike in some languages). Hence it will be difficult to falsify the prediction that is made by (6). Only a language that indeed attests different reactions of word-final consonants under (6)a and (6)b could provide positive evidence.

In any event, then, it is safe to say that the existence of the nightmare position is certainly not something that a theory can be proud of.

The second instance of the nightmare position is the word-internal equivalent of (6)b, i.e. where a long vowel precedes in intervocalic consonant (/VVCV/). This configuration is identical to (6)b, except that the consonant in question is followed by a contentful nucleus, which is called to license the second nucleus of the preceding long vowel as before. The consonant enclosed will therefore be unlicensed but governed, hence super-weak.

It may be doubted that empirical response is waiting out there, whether in internal or in final position. We therefore consider the nightmare position to be a nightmare for the theory: it needs to be done away with.

#### 4. Coda Mirror v2: government and licensing must not be equal-righted

##### 4.1. Unitary abilities of FEN cannot be the only answer

The preceding discussion has identified the overgeneration that the parametric system of FEN has produced in Scheer (2004a), as well as its origin, the independent application of government and licensing. That is, overgeneration at the right edge of the word can be eliminated if the lateral abilities of FEN reduce to an on/off setting: either FEN are lateral actors and can both govern and license, or they are not, in which case they can dispense neither lateral force. This move prevents the system from generating word-final consonants in strong and in nightmare position.

While this offers a correct description of extrasyllabicity (including its effects on vowels), we have seen in section 3.4 that the Coda Mirror as it stands produces the nightmare position also word-internally. This is motivation enough for engaging into a revision of the lateral network, that is of the Coda Mirror as such. Following Cyran (2006), the guiding idea will be that government and licensing are not equal-righted. We will see that a side-effect of the revised system also offers a better definition of the opposition between open and closed syllables.

## 4.2. Government over licensing

In his review of Scheer (2004a), Cyran (2006:534) recommends to formalize the interaction between government and licensing. The revision of the phonological engine of CVCV that is proposed below follows this advice. The challenge is to modify the rule of the game so to get rid of the nightmare position while not losing any of the generalisations regarding syllable structure and the Coda Mirror. Touching any piece of the puzzle impacts the mechanics elsewhere. This is of course warranted, but severely restricts the room for modifications.

The guiding idea is that government and licensing do not act independently of one another; rather, they obey a natural hierarchy that determines their behaviour when they could in principle apply simultaneously.

### (7) Government over licensing

No constituent can be governed and licensed at the same time. In case a constituent can potentially be subject to both lateral forces, it will be governed.

The following sections discuss the impact of this principle first on the Coda Mirror itself (the general word-internal situation), then on the parametric situation at the right edge (section 5).

## 4.3. Consequences for the Coda Mirror: intervocalic consonants

(7) impacts most directly the identity of intervocalic consonants: while they were both governed and licensed before, they are now only governed.


This move also addresses a critique that is sometimes levelled against the Coda Mirror (among others by Cyran 2006:530ff,537): how could the reaction of an onset be calculated if its melodic expression is simultaneously inhibited and enhanced? Intuitively, opposite forces cancel each other out. The Coda Mirror has always been explicitly agnostic regarding the interpretation of simultaneously governed and licensed constituents. The only thing that was important was the ability of the theory to formally distinguish the two weak positions, intervocalic and the coda ("two ways of being weak", cf. Scheer 2004a:§131, Szigetvári 2008), while making sure that both of them are weaker than the Strong Position.

As a matter of fact, thus, the relative strength of both weak positions remained an open question (see Scheer 2004a:§§130f). On the assumption of (7), the theory now makes a clear statement: consonants are weaker in intervocalic than in coda position since the former are spoiled (and only spoiled), while the latter do not experience any lateral influence. One could say that they appear "naked" on the surface, i.e. in the positional conditions that are produced by the absence of phonological computation. Figures (8)a,b below recall the situation of coda consonants, which is unchanged, while (8)c shows intervocalic consonants when (7) is applied.


### (8) Coda Mirror v2

consonants in codas: ungoverned and unlicensed  
intervocalic consonants: governed but unlicensed


a. internal coda \_\_.C



b. final coda \_\_#



c. intervoc. V\_\_V



The confrontation with the empirical record must show whether it is true that intervocalic consonants are weaker than consonants in coda position. A hint that this could be correct is the implicational relationship that appears to govern spirantisation patterns across languages: spirantisation in codas only seems to occur if it is also observed intervocalically; on the other hand, in

many systems intervocalic consonants spirantise without spirantisation affecting codas. Hence the attack of spirantisation appears to first consider the weakest targets – intervocalic consonants –, and may then optionally extend to more solid codas.

The general conditions that consonants experience when (7) is applied appears under (9) below. Note that the only situation that is modified with respect to the Coda Mirror v1 is the intervocalic position: the definition of the Strong Position and the coda is as before.

(9) Coda Mirror v2		
	position	definition in terms of lateral relations
a.	Strong Position	{#,C}__ licensed but ungoverned
b.	coda	__ {#,C} unlicensed and ungoverned
c.	intervocalic	V__V governed (but unlicensed)

The fourth logical possibility, i.e. a constituent that is both governed and licensed, is ruled out by (7). Also note that the configuration "governed but unlicensed" characterised the nightmare position before, but now describes regular intervocalic onsets. Therefore the system is unable to produce a situation where a consonant is weaker than both codas and intervocalic onsets. That is, (7) kills two birds with one stone: the equal-rightedness of government and licensing is done away with, and the nightmare position is eliminated.

The following section shows that the nightmare position is really absent from the plot, also when it comes to the representation of vowel length.


#### 4.4. Intervocalic relations

##### 4.4.1. Long vowels

The revised lateral identity of intervocalic onsets has also consequences for internuclear relations. In order to see that, consider the ground rules under (10) below. Note that they have not varied since Scheer (2004a) and the Coda Mirror v1, except for (10)c2, which is a consequence of (7).

- (10) origin and application of lateral relations
- nuclei exhaust their lateral potential: nuclei which are enabled to govern do govern, nuclei which are enabled to license do license (Scheer 2004a:§148).
  - by default, nuclei target their own onset, i.e. "choose" the shortest move.
  - they target other nuclei in two situations:
    - when they are called to either govern or license a preceding empty nucleus.
    - when they govern their onset and hence cannot license it simultaneously.

In a language where the initial CV marks the beginning of the word, the Strong Position is thus unchanged as under (11) below.




Regarding government, the two situations at hand are instances of (10)c1: the government of the contentful nucleus is called to apply to the preceding empty nucleus.


The symmetric case occurs when the empty complement nucleus of a lexically long vowel calls for licensing from the nucleus to its right. This configuration is shown under (12)a below.



- (12) intervocalic licensing  
a. long vowels



- b. intervocalic consonants



(12)b shows the situation of a simple intervocalic consonant. The comparison with the long vowel under (12)a demonstrates that unlike in the original system, intervocalic consonants after long and short vowels experience the same conditions: they are governed (and unlicensed). Recall from section 3.4 (figure (6)b) that in the original system, (12)a was the configuration that placed the intervocalic consonant in the unwarranted nightmare position.

The configuration has not changed (the consonant is governed and unlicensed as before), but the interpretation thereof is not the same anymore. That is, being governed (but unlicensed) as under (12)b are now the conditions that are experienced by regular intervocalic consonants because of (7): no constituent can be simultaneously governed and licensed. Since for that reason the source nucleus cannot license its own onset, it must exhaust its licensing potential by licensing the preceding nucleus (see (10)a).

#### 4.4.2. Closed vs. open syllables

In the new system, contentful nuclei that are preceded by another contentful nucleus cannot license their own onset anymore. A welcome by-product of this situation is a distinction between vowels in open and closed syllables that could not be expressed before.

- (13) definition of open vs. closed syllables  
a. vowels in open syllables are licensed.  
b. vowels in closed syllables are unlicensed.

That this is indeed what the new system produces may be seen when comparing the situation of (12) (where long and short vowels in open syllables are depicted) with the configuration of (11)b that shows a vowel in an internal closed syllable:  $V_1$  under (11)b is followed by a governed empty nucleus, which is thus unable to dispense either government or licensing. That is, vowels in closed syllables are unlicensed by definition because they are followed by a laterally disabled empty nucleus.

The definition of open vs. closed syllables that was proposed in Scheer (2004a:§163) is less precise and also less adequate: a vowel was supposed to sit in an open syllable iff it was subject to either government or licensing. According to the new definition, vowels in open syllables can only be licensed. This makes sense: licensing enhances the segmental content of its target. Hence vocalic inventories in open syllables are expected to express the full range of melodic possibilities, while only a curtailed inventory should occur in closed syllables, which lack support from licensing. This is precisely the pattern that is pervasively observed across languages (e.g. Harris 1997).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The impact (or rather: the non-impact) of the revised system of lateral relations on the representation and the behaviour of branching onsets cannot be discussed in the frame of this article. The identity of branching onsets that is presented in Scheer (2004a:§14) (also Scheer 1999) is modified in Scheer (2000) in order to make the structure comply with locality requirements (see Brun-Trigaud & Scheer 2007, forth a,b). The new system of lateral relations is entirely transparent to the status of branching onsets in their local coat.





for the existence of consonant-final words: cases where they occur only in a specific morpho-syntactic construction, or for the purpose of a specific phonological process, are not on record.

The alternative view interprets governing and licensing abilities of FEN in terms of representational objects – the arrows that originate in FEN – that are inserted into phonological representations as carriers of morpho-syntactic information in the same way as hash-marks (#) or prosodic constituency are inserted (i.e. through mapping/translation of morpho-syntactic into phonological information). This must be wrong since government and licensing, although graphically represented as arrows, constitute the actual phonological computation in a CVCV grammar. They are not representational objects that the computation considers as an input.

Therefore, the variation associated to FEN, both concerning their lateral actorship and their own phonetic expression, is due to a language-specific and phonological parameter setting.

## 7. Why there is no word-initial variation and why only C-final words produce variation

### 7.1. Morpheme-final is phase-initial

Let us now consider two questions: why do languages display parametric variation at the right, but not at the left edge of words? And why is the right-edge variation only encountered with consonant-final words? In other words, why are there extrasyllabic consonants, but no extrasyllabic vowels? Nothing withstands a scenario where word-final vowels are extrasyllabic (Scheer 2004a:§549): in some languages, vowel-final words could behave as if the vowel were not there; the preceding consonant would then have coda status. In other languages where final vowels are not extrasyllabic, the preceding consonant would then be regular onsets. This kind of variation is not on record.

The answer to these questions is in-built in CVCV and the way it conceives of phonological computation. Let us first make explicit the fact that the stretch of the linear string whose right edge we are talking about is the phase (or cycle in more traditional phonological terminology, or the domain in GP-coined terms). Cyclic (or inside-out) derivation, a cornerstone of generative grammar, supposes that syntactic structure is interpreted piecemeal: rather than in one single go, phonological computation applies to strings of growing size from the most to the least embedded item. In modern phase theory, these are called phases (Uriagereka 1999, Chomsky 2000 and following).

Let us now look at what happens when a phase-defined string arrives in phonology. On the account of CVCV, two properties of phonological interpretation are hard-wired: all strings end in a nucleus, and they are parsed from right to left, hence starting with the last nucleus. Regressive interpretation follows from the fact that all lateral relations (and almost all phonological processes) are head-final (Scheer 1998b, 2004a:§218). That is, phonological computation in CVCV consists of the application of government and licensing to a string that is made of onsets, nuclei and (eventually) associated melodic material. Given that lateral relations are head-final, the lateral status of constituents (i.e. whether they are governed and/or licensed, and in turn whether they can govern and/or license) is always determined by the lateral status of a constituent to their right. Therefore the computation of constituent *n* supposes that the phonological status of constituent *n+1* is already determined. Hence phonological computation parses the string from right to left.

FEN are thus the last item in the string (from the point of view of Western spelling), but they are the first item to be processed by phonological computation: FEN are phase-initial.

### 7.2. There are no extrasyllabic vowels because contentful nuclei come with full lateral specifications

If a consonant-final string is in fact FEN-final, and if FEN are phase-initial, it follows that variation is only encountered at the right edge of consonant-final words. The difference between an empty and a contentful nucleus is that the latter inherits full phonological abilities from its melodic content: contentful nuclei are always good governors and good licensors. Empty nuclei, on the other hand, have no phonological properties per se: their governing and licensing abilities depend on whether they are subjected to government or not.

In case the first item that is hit by phonological computation is a(n) (final) empty nucleus, its phonological properties must somehow be defined. Everywhere else in the string, the lateral properties of constituents are defined by constituents to their right. That is, phonological computation cannot begin unless the phonological properties of its first domino are defined. Since the phase-initial nucleus

itself does not bear any in case it is empty, a surrogate mechanism must provide the information that is necessary in order to initiate the computation. This is done by a parameter setting. In case the last nucleus is contentful, no such crutch needs to be resorted to: contentful nuclei come with full lateral equipment.

This scenario also explains why there is no equivalent variation at the left edge of words (or phases): the left edge is computation-final, which means that nuclei never lack lateral specifications.

## 8. Conclusion

In the system of Scheer (2004a), government and licensing were independent actors, both regarding the Coda Mirror and the parameterisation of FEN. In this article, their equal-rightedness was identified as a factor of overgeneration. On this backdrop and following Cyran (2006), a hierarchical relationship between government and licensing was introduced: in case a constituent could be subject to both forces, it will only be governed. This move modifies the engine of the Coda Mirror regarding intervocalic consonants, which are now only governed (while they were both governed and licensed before).

The parametric system of FEN was also revised according to the new rule. The motivation here is empirical, but meets the idea that government and licensing do not apply independently: only two out of the four logical parametric situations have an empirical echo in form of a variation that is specific to the right edge. That is, FEN are either sound lateral actors (which means that they dispense both government and licensing), or are not (in which case they are unable to issue either).

The conjunction of the two evolutions regarding the engine of the Coda Mirror and the parametric system of FEN eliminates a number of problems and offers new perspectives. No consonant is in nightmare position anymore, neither word-internally nor word-finally. Also, the overgeneration of the parametric system of FEN is marshalled: word-final consonants cannot be in Strong Position anymore, and the system captures the phenomenology known as extrasyllabicity by an on/off switch. Also, languages cannot be half-extrasyllabic, i.e. counting the word-final consonant for phenomena that touch its own body, but not for those concerning the preceding vowel (or vice versa).

Another benefit is a comprehensive definition of the difference between open and closed syllables: Nuclei in open syllables are always licensed, which explains why vowels in this position show the maximal vocalic inventory. They are unlicensed (i.e. unsupported) in closed syllables and therefore typically host inventories whose melodic distribution is curtailed.

Finally, the new system allows for a clarification regarding the variation observed for FEN and the initial CV: while the latter is a genuine piece of boundary information (i.e. the phonological carrier of online-created morpho-syntactic structure), the variation associated to the former is due to phonological parameters.

A last virtue of the Coda Mirror v2 to be mentioned is that it does away with the schizophrenia of intervocalic consonants. These were both governed and licensed before, and it was unclear how they could obey both antagonistic forces at the same time, or why they do not cancel each other out. In the amended system, schizophrenic consonants do not occur anymore since no constituent can be simultaneously governed and licensed.

## References

Items followed by the mention WEB are available at [www.unice.fr/dsl/tobias.htm](http://www.unice.fr/dsl/tobias.htm).

Brun-Trigaud, Guylaine & Tobias Scheer 2007. La lénition des attaques branchantes en français et dans les dialectes de l'ALF. Paper presented at GalRom07, Nice 15-16 January. WEB.

Brun-Trigaud, Guylaine & Tobias Scheer forth a. La lénition des attaques branchantes en français et dans les dialectes de l'ALF. *Approches de la variation linguistique gallo-romane*, edited by Mario Barra-Jover, Guylaine Brun-Trigaud, Jean-Philippe Dalbera, Patric Sauzet & Tobias Scheer. WEB.

Brun-Trigaud, Guylaine & Tobias Scheer forth b. Lenition in branching onsets in French and

- in ALF dialects. *Development of Language in Eyes of Formal Grammar*, edited by Petr Karlík & Markéta Ziková. München: Lincom.
- Chomsky, Noam 2000. *Minimalist inquiries: the framework. Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, edited by Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Csides, Csaba 2000. Government and Licensing: a CV analysis of consonant lenition. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 10: 41-80.
- Csides, Csaba 2007. A strict CV approach to consonant lenition: bidirectional government in English phonology. *Language Sciences* 29: 177-202.
- Cyran, Eugeniusz 2003. *Complexity Scales and Licensing Strength in Phonology*. Lublin: KUL.
- Cyran, Eugeniusz 2006. Book Review: *A Lateral Theory of Phonology*, by Tobias Scheer. *The Linguistic Review* 23: 505-542.
- Cyran, Eugeniusz 2008. Consonant clusters in strong and weak positions. *Lenition and Fortition*, edited by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer & Philippe Ségéral, 447-481. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Harris, John 1997. Licensing Inheritance: an integrated theory of neutralisation. *Phonology* 14: 315-370. WEB.
- Kaye, Jonathan 1990. 'Coda' licensing. *Phonology* 7: 301-330. WEB.
- Kaye, Jonathan 1995. Derivations and Interfaces. *Frontiers of Phonology*, edited by Jacques Durand & Francis Katamba, 289-332. London & New York: Longman. Also in *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 3, 1993, 90-126. WEB.
- Kijak, Artur 2005. Polish and English complex consonantal onsets: a contrastive analysis within the Government Phonology framework. Ph.D dissertation, University of Katowice.
- Lowenstamm, Jean 1996. CV as the only syllable type. *Current trends in Phonology. Models and Methods*, edited by Jacques Durand & Bernard Laks, 419-441. Salford, Manchester: ESRI. WEB.
- Lowenstamm, Jean 1999. The beginning of the word. *Phonologica* 1996, edited by John Rennison & Klaus Kühnhammer, 153-166. La Hague: Holland Academic Graphics. WEB.
- Marotta, Giovanna 2008. Lenition in Tuscan Italian (Gorgia Toscana). *Lenition and Fortition*, edited by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer & Philippe Ségéral, 235-271. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Passino, Diana 2005. Aspects of consonantal lengthening in Italian. Ph.D dissertation, University of Padova.
- Rowicka, Grażyna 1999. On Ghost vowels. A Strict CV Approach. Ph.D dissertation, Leiden University.
- Scheer, Tobias 1998a. Governing domains are head-final. *Structure and Interpretation. Studies in Phonology*, edited by Eugeniusz Cyran, 261-285. Lublin: Folium. WEB.
- Scheer, Tobias 1998b. A unified model of Proper Government. *The Linguistic Review* 15: 41-67. WEB.
- Scheer, Tobias 1999. A theory of consonantal interaction. *Folia Linguistica* 32: 201-237. WEB.
- Scheer, Tobias 2000. *De la Localité, de la Morphologie et de la Phonologie en Phonologie*. Habilitation thesis, Université de Nice. WEB.
- Scheer, Tobias 2004a. *A Lateral Theory of Phonology. Vol.1: What is CVCV, and why should it be?* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Scheer, Tobias 2004b. How minimal is phonological change? *Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 69-114. WEB.

- Scheer, Tobias 2008. Why the Prosodic Hierarchy is a diacritic and why the Interface must be Direct. *Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology*, edited by Jutta Hartmann, Veronika Hegedüs & Henk van Riemsdijk, 145-192. Amsterdam: Elsevier. WEB.
- Scheer, Tobias forth. How morpho-syntax talks to phonology. A survey of extra-phonological information in phonology since Trubetzkoy's *Grenzsignale*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 1999. The Coda Mirror. Ms, slightly less evolved English version of Ségéral & Scheer 2001. WEB.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 2001a. La Coda-Miroir. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 96: 107-152. WEB.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 2001b. Les séquences consonne + yod en gallo-roman. *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 30: 87-120. WEB.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 2005. What lenition and fortition tells us about Gallo-Romance *Muta cum Liquida*. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* 2003, edited by Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken & Haike Jacobs, 235-267. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 2008a. Positional factors in lenition and fortition. *Lenition and Fortition*, edited by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer & Philippe Ségéral, 131-172. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ségéral, Philippe & Tobias Scheer 2008b. The Coda Mirror, stress and positional parameters. *Lenition and Fortition*, edited by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer & Philippe Ségéral, 483-518. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Seigneur-Froli, Delphine 2003. Diachronic consonant lenition & exotic word-initial clusters in Greek: a unified account. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 23rd annual meeting of the department of linguistics*, edited by M. Stavrou-Sifaki & A. Fliatouras, 345-357. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki. WEB.
- Seigneur-Froli, Delphine 2006. Le Statut phonologique du début de mot grec. *Lénitions consonantiques et libertés phonotactiques initiales dans la diachronie de la langue commune et dans le dialecte de Lesbos*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Nice. WEB.
- Szigetvári, Péter 1999. VC Phonology: a theory of consonant lenition and phonotactics. Ph.D dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University Budapest.
- Szigetvári, Péter 2001. Dismantling syllable structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48: 155-181.
- Szigetvári, Péter 2008. Two directions for Lenition. *Lenition and Fortition*, edited by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer & Philippe Ségéral, 561-592. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Uriagereka, Juan 1999. Multiple spell-out. *Working Minimalism*, edited by Samuel Epstein & Norbert Hornstein, 251-282. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ziková, Markéta 2008. Alternace e-nula v současné češtině. *Autosegmentální laterální analýza*. Ph.D dissertation, Masarykova univerzita v Brně.