## Dominance Meets Ghost Vowels: Moses-Columbia Salish Accent Revisited

Jochen Trommer Leipzig University jtrommer@uni-leipzig.de Moses-Columbia Salish (Cm) stress has been used as a major argument against the Level Ordering Hypothesis of Stratal Phonology (Bermúdez-Otero 2018), which claims an inherent connection between affix order and the type of phonological rules and constraints applying in morphological domains (see Saarinen & Hay, 2014, Lieber 2019, Kiparsky 2020 for recent controversial discussion). Czaykowska-Higgins (1993) (CH) argues that 'dominant' grammatical affixes triggering stress-deleting cophonologies are interspersed with grammatical 'recessive' affixes which would require at least 10 otherwise unmotivated word-internal stratal levels.

In this talk, I argue for an alternative interpretation of the apparent dominant/recessive contrast in the language. 'Dominant' affixes have full vowels, recessive affixes 'ghost' vowels, i.e., vowels which lack a vocalic root node and are hence prone to deletion, a phenomenon well-documented crosslinguistically (see, e.g. Zoll 1993,1996, Rowicka 1999, Rubach 2013, Zimmermann 2019). I develop a Stratal-OT analysis of Cm where the Stem-Level stratum corresponds to lexical suffixation of bound roots, and the Word Level to the affixation of grammatical (valency-changing and narrowly inflectional) suffixes as has been argued for other languages of the pacific Northwest (see, e.g., Stonham 2007 on Nuu-chah-nuulth). The stratal analysis also derives general asymmetries between these domains not covered by the strictly cyclic framework of CH or alternatives in terms of cophonologies (Inkelas 19998,2017) or Gradient Symbolic Representations (Zimmermann 2018): Extrametricality effects do not extend to the Word Level, and at the Stem Level there are only two distinct types of affixes, both dominant.

The representational reinterpretation of dominance at the Word Level in Cm is possible since stress assignment and vowel deletion in the language are intimately related. Cm exhibits pervasive deletion of unstressed vowels. In particular, all vowels following the stressed vowel are deleted. The reanalysis proposed here builds on the new empirical generalization in (1):

(1) Vowels of dominant grammatical suffixes are never deleted.

Based on (1), dominant affix vowels can be understood as full vowels and recessive affix vowels as defective (ghost) vowels. The tableaux in (2) illustrate how this derives the different behavior of dominant and recessive affixes (full vowels are marked by '•'). RIGHTMOST(V \*) (RM) captures that Cm words have stress on the rightmost full (surface) vowel, and L(EFT)M(OST)(x \*) the requirement that stress corresponds to the leftmost (underlying) accent. Max V and Max v are the faithfulness constraints targeting full and defective vowels respectively. In (2a), RM triggers deletion since the suffix vowel u is only protected by low-ranked Max v. In contrast, for the full vowel suffix in (2b), RM is satisfied by shifting stress since Max V – is undominated.

Input: = a.	RM(V *)	Max V	LM(x *)	Max v	Input: = a.	RM(V *)	Max V	LM(x *)	Max v
a. ?í <sub>•</sub> tx-stu-n	*!	I			a. wá•k-tu•l-n	*!	I		
☞ b. ?í <sub>•</sub> tx-st-n	l l			*	☞ b. wa•k-tú•l-n	I		*	
c. ?i <sub>•</sub> tx- <del>stú</del> -n		1	*!		c. wá•k-tl-n		*!		

(2) a. Accented Stem + Recessive Suffix b. Accented Stem + Dominant Suffix

These constraints also capture other aspects of the system: RM that in combinations of two recessive unaccented affixes the rightmost wins, and LM that in combinations of two weak accented suffixes, the first wins. I conclude by discussing problematic typological predictions of alternative accounts. CH's cyclic account, Cophonologies, and Gradient Symbolic Representations all predict that languages may employ arbitrary numbers of distinct accentual affix types without connection to the order of affixes, and independently of vowel deletion. In contrast, the stratal approach predicts the actual crosslinguistic distribution: Stratum-internal dominance and the multiplicity of accentual affix types observed in Cm is only possible in a language where recessiveness is inherently correlated with deletion.