

~~Remarks on Gussenhoven's *Sicmad*~~

**Representations as an alternative to rule ordering and sympathy**

Marc van Oostendorp, HIL/Leiden, (in cooperation with Jan Nijen Twilhaar)  
TiN-dag, February 4 1999

**1. Bleeding in Hellendoorn nasal assimilation (Nijen Twilhaar)**

(1)	a.	/lop+N/	[lo.pm̩]	`walk'
	b.	/wet+N/	[we.tŋ]	`know'
	c.	/pɑk+N/	[pɑ.kŋ]	`grab'
	d.	/lop+ən/	[lo.pm̩]	`walk a'
	e.	/rɑmp+nɑχt/	[rɑmp.nɑχt]	`disastrous night'
	f.	/lip+N/	[li.pm̩]	
	g.	/lop+ən+ker/	[lo.pŋ.kɪ:r]	`walk one time'

(2)		<b>regressive assimilation:</b>	x x	
				[nasal] domain: ? (word? phrase?)
		<b>progressive assimilation:</b>	x x	
				[nasal] domain: syllable

(3)	a.	/stɔp+t+N/	[stɔ.pŋ]	`walked'
	b.	/zɛt+t+N/	[zɛ.tŋ]	`put'
	c.	/pɑk+t+N/	[pɑ.kŋ]	`grabbed'

(4)		<b>t deletion:</b>	t → 0 / C __ C
		<b>progressive assimilation:</b>	x x

(5)		/stɔp+t+N/	/zɛt+t+N/	/pɑk+t+N/
	PA	stɔptn	zɛttn	pɑktn
	t deletion	[stɔ.pŋ]	[zɛ.tŋ]	[pɑ.kŋ]

**Advantage:**

- It works without being overly complicated.

**Problems:**

- Why no t deletion in Standard Dutch? Is it a coincidence that this rule and progressive assimilation is ordered in this way?
- Why two assimilation rules? Why are they ordered in this way?

## 2. The problem with constraint ranking

- (6) NASALPLACE: Nasals outside the onset should not have an independent place feature.  
 CONTOUR: Two segments should not share a place feature.  
 SYLLCONTOUR: Two segments within a syllable should not share a place feature.

(7) NASALPLACE >> SYLLCONTOUR, CONTOUR

(8)

/pɑk+N/	NASALPLACE	SYLLCONTOUR	CONTOUR
pɑ.kn	*!		
☞ pɑ.kŋ		*	*

(9)

/pɑk+N+buk/	NASALPLACE	SYLLCONTOUR	CONTOUR
☞ pɑ.km.buk			*
pɑ.kn.buk	*!		
pɑ.kŋ.buk		*!	*

- (10) : Don't delete t.  
 CCC: No clusters of three consonants.

(11)

/pɑk+t+N /	NASPL	SYLLCONT	CONT	CCC	MAX-T
pɑ.ktn		*	*	*!	
⊗ pɑ.kn	*!				*
☞ pɑ.kŋ		*	*		*

### Advantage:

- Captures the 'conspiracies'

### Disadvantage:

- Does not work for the imperfective forms (ranking paradox)

## 3. Sympathy

(12)

/pɑk+t+N /	CCC	MAX- *,O	NASPL	SYLLCONT	CONT	✱MAX-T
pɑ.ktn	*!			*	*	
☞ pɑ.kn			*!			*
pɑ.kŋ		*!		*	*	*

### Advantage:

- Works for imperfective forms

### Disadvantage:

- Sympathy Theory: same problems as a derivational account

#### 4. Representations

- (13) *Recoverability*: Don't delete morphemes without leaving a visible trace in the output.

Recoverability can be seen:

- As a principle constraining the application of rules
- As an OT constraint

- (14) EXPRESS-[F] (Van Oostendorp 1998: TiN-dag talk!)  
The morphological feature F should be expressed in the output. (Some underlying phonological feature of F should be present in the output)

(15)

/pɑk+t+N /	CCC	EXPRESS-TENSE	NASPL	SYLLCONT	CONT
pɑk.tn	*!			*	*
☞ pɑ.kn			*!		
pɑ.kŋ		*!		*	*

(16)

/zɛt <sub>1</sub> +t <sub>2</sub> +N /	CCC	EXPRESS-TENSE	NASPL	SYLLCONT	CONT
zɛ t <sub>1</sub> . t <sub>2</sub> n	*!			*	*
☞ zɛ. t <sub>2</sub> n			*!		
zɛ .t <sub>1</sub> n		*!		*	*

NB The representations above may have been slightly simplified. In the last two examples of (16), t<sub>1</sub> or t<sub>2</sub> probably are ambisyllabic.