Allomorphy between tone and segments: an autosegmental account

A monorepresentational analysis

1.5 sigma → L yu /#/ → a floating L and segmental /yu/; the latter only realized as last resort to realize the L

- Non-realization of /yu/:
  - the /yu/ underlyingly lacks a σ node and since Dep-σ (6-a) dominates Max-S (6-b), the morpheme is preferably not realized (morphememes realized in all contexts have an underlying σ).
  - the L must be realized due to undominated Max-L (6-c)

  (6) a. Dep Assign a violation mark for every output σ without an input correspondent.
b. Max Assign a violation mark for every input segment without an output correspondent.
c. Max Assign a violation mark for every input L tone without an output correspondent.

- Contour creation vs. overwriting:
  - new contour tones are penalized by “Dal→AL” (6-a); overwriting for M-final bases since “DAL dominates Max-M; not for H-final bases since Max-H dominates “DAL” (6-b)

  (6) Floating L overwrites a base-final M

- No adjacent L-initial syllables:
  - no overwriting if two adjacent σ’s associated with an initial L would result; excluded by the contextual, non-local OCP (11)

  (11) “σσσ” Assign a violation mark for every pair of adjacent σ’s that are associated with an initial L

- Realization of /yu/ as last resort:
  - association of L to bases ending in an L is excluded by [TT]
  - realization of /yu/ as last resort to satisfy Max-L

  (13) [TT] Assign a violation mark for every pair of adjacent identical tones associated to one TBU

- No adjacent L’s realization of /-yu/:

Option 3: a ‘polyrepresenalional’ analysis
- L and /yu/ are stored; the latter is realized to avoid homophony (cf. Paster and Beam de Azcona, 2004a, 3-4)

Option 2: a ‘monorepresentational’ analysis
- one underlying representation + phonology

Q1: Why is the low tone sometimes added to the base tones and overwrites the final tone in other contexts?
Q2: How can the realization of tone and segments alternate?

Allomorphy in Yucumanc Mixtepe

(Plack and Reade, 1979; Paster and Beam de Azcona, 2004a, 3-4; Paster, 2007)

- a dialect of Mixtepe Mixtec (~12,000 sp.), Otomanguean
- three tones: H (⇒), M (⇒), L (⇒), and contour tones
- V-length not contrastive (YNYY) noted for (long) contour tone
- default assumption: TBU-σ

1.5g formation in YM
- a low tone is added & creates a new contour on the final σ
- a low tone is added & overwrites the final base tone
- the segmental string /-yu/ surfaces

→ contexts for allomorphs phonologically predictable:

A. a final low tone is added to H-final stems
(1) náma ‘soup’ námmá ‘my soup’ L H → L H L
xíiń ‘hat’ xíixin ‘my hat’ H H → H H H LH
B. a low tone overwrites M on final σ
(2) la’tsa ‘mucus’ la’tásá ‘my mucus’ M M → M L
xáñu ‘cigarette’ xáñuxá ‘my cigarette’ H M → H L
→ if this would not create an LH L sequence
(3) yútiit ‘sand’ yútiīt ‘my sand’ LH M → LH ML
yóðbón ‘metate’ yóðbónyé ‘my metate’ LH M → LH ML
→ or an L L sequence
(4) titzi ‘stomach’ titzii ‘my stomach’ L M → L ML
kwá’a ‘man’s sister’ kwá’xá ‘my man’s sister’ L M → L ML
C. /-yu/ ‘surfaces’ if the stem ends in an L-toned σ
(5) sòkò ‘shoulder’ sòkòyu ‘my shoulder’ L L yu → L L yu
tútia ‘paper’ tútuyé ‘my paper’ M L → ML yu

Option 3: a ‘polyrepresenalional’ analysis
- L and /yu/ are stored; the latter is realized to avoid homophony (cf. Paster and Beam de Azcona, 2004a, 3-4)

Option 2: a ‘monorepresentational’ analysis
- one underlying representation + phonology

Q1: Why is the low tone sometimes added to the base tones and overwrites the final tone in other contexts?
Q2: How can the realization of tone and segments alternate?
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