Main Claim

The existence of anticyclical mutation is unexpected given a standard paradigmatic account for non-concatenative morphology; a prediction explicitly formulated as the principle of ‘Strict Base Mutation’ (=SBM; Alderete, 2001a,b)

→ We show different types of anticyclical mutation and hence extend the typology of existing counterexamples to the SBM principle.

→ We argue that anticyclical mutation is expected under an analysis assuming that mutation is an epiphenomenon that follows from the affixation of (non-segmental) phonological elements.

Anticyclical Mutation

Type I: Stem–Affix Mutation

-28 classes of nouns; class 2 and 5 have same surface tone pattern but differ following morpheme (affix/word) differently

(4) Plural formation in Kpelle (Kononenko, 2008, 24)

Class Base
1. H.H. wúù wúù–váà ‘we’
2. L.L. yiáá yiáá–váà ‘you’
3. L.H.L. ywúɔ ywúɔ–váà ‘our’
4. H.H.L. yié–váà ‘our’
5. L.L. gbóò gbóò–váà ‘we’

Analysis
- plural affix is underlyingly low: gbóò–váà (cl.5)
- final H of N spreads to this affix: wúù–váà (cl.1)
- final H on N simplified via tone shift: yié–váà (cl.3+4)
- class 2 has a final floating H: yiáá–váà

→ Kpelle – Tone

Type II: Affix–Affix Mutation

- Tense-Aspect is structurally inside subject agreement (6)
- some TAM categories are only marked by tone (7), realized on the subject marker

(6) Inflection in Ga (Paster, 2000, 8)&(Paster, 2003, 32)

1SG-PRF-dig 3SG-PRF-dig

(7) Tonal overwriting on AGR in Ga (Paster, 2003, 28–30)

HINHALT  PERFECTIVE SIMPLE PAST
1SG mi–cha–a mi–cha mi–du
2SG o–cha–a o–cha o–dú

→ Ga – Tone

Type III: Chaha – Consonant Quality

- strong (~voiced, hardened) and weak consonant series
- two forms for object markers: ‘heavy’ form after plural subject affixes, the 2.Sg.Fem., or the impersonal (9)

(8) Object marking in Chaha (Rose, 2007, 39)

Moralefective Light Heavy Beneffectve
1.SG jë–p–jë +p +m +n +ñ (11)
3.SG F. jë–p–a +p +a +a +a
3.PL. F. jë–p–a +a +a +a +a

(9) Object marking in Chaha: example (Rose, 2007, 40)

jë–p–a

→ Chaha – Consonant Quality

No anticyclical mutation: AntiFaithfulness

→ all mutation and non-concatenative morphology is the result of affixation (Lieber, 1992; Bermúdez-Otero, 2012; Trommer and Zimmermann, 2014)

→ (nonlinear) morpheme may in principle affect the preceding or the following morpheme

(11) An affixation account for Ga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticyclical mutation: affixation account

→ only a mutation that distinguishes a morphologically more complex word from a less complex base can be demanded
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