

A Q-THEORETIC SOLUTION TO A'INGAE POSTLABIAL RAISING

Maksymilian Dąbkowski
University of California, Berkeley

Overview

TYOLOGICALLY UNUSUAL POSTLABIAL RAISING IN A'INGAE (OR COFÁN, ISO 639-3: con)

- (1) a. /ai/ → [ii] / B_ b. /ae/ → [oe] / B_ c. /a/ → [a] / B_
 / koehefa -ite / / sefa -ẽ / / sefa /
 [koehefiite] [sefõẽ] [sefa]
 summer -PRD end -CAUS end

where **B** stands for *m, mb, p, ph, f, v*

- Theoretically interesting for two reasons:
 - no obvious phonetic or cognitive motivation,
 - affects different diphthongs differently (1a-b) and it does not affect monophthongs (1c)
- Accounting for the difference between (1a) and (1b):
 - a weighting of feature IDENTITY constraints such that [ii] and [oe] are the optimal candidates given input /ai/ and /ae/, respectively
- Accounting for the underapplication of postlabial raising to /a/:
 - Q-Theoretic (Garvin, Lapierre, and Inkelas, 2018; Garvin, Lapierre, Schwarz, et al., 2020; Inkelas et al., 2016, 2017) representation of vowels:
 - * the monophthongal *a* consists of three subsegments (a^1, a^2, a^3)
 - * the *a*-component of a diphthong – only of two (a^1, a^2, i^3, i^4)

ONE VOCALIC TARGET OF A DIPHTHONG CORRESPONDS TO FEWER SUBSEGMENTS THAN A MONOPHTHONG

- Assuming each subsegment is subject to IDENTITY, this predicts:
 - diphthongs might show TETU effects (McCarthy et al., 1994)
 - while monophthongs surface faithfully

PREDICTION BORNE OUT BY A'INGAE POSTLABIAL RAISING, CONTRIBUTING A NOVEL ARGUMENT FOR Q-THEORY

Licit diphthongs and /ea, ia/ → [ia], /ae/ → [ai]

A'ingae has the five vowels: *i, i, e, a, o* and seven licit diphthongs (2).

- (2) LICIT DIPHTHONGS: *ai, ia, oe, oa, oi, ii, ao*

All of the A'ingae diphthongs have *i* or *o* as their non-syllabic component. All the vowels have nasal counterparts.

The sequences *[ea], *[ae], *[ia], and *[ai] are not licit diphthongs. Underlying /ea/, /ae/, and /ia/ surface as licit diphthongs (3).

- (3) a. /ea/ → [ia] b. /ia/ → [ia] c. /ae/ → [ai]
 / koʔfe -ã / / indzi -a / / paⁿdza -ẽ /
 [koʔfiã] [indzia] [paⁿdzã]
 play -CAUS green -ADN hunt -CAUS

Postlabial raising

After a non-labial consonant, any diphthong is allowed, including the *a*-initial *ai* (4a-b) and *ao* (4c-d) as well as other diphthongs (4e-f).

- (4) a. *dʒai* b. *sai* c. *tsaoʔpa.d.* *taoʔpa* e. *koeʔhe* f. *tii*
 sit pull out nest fluff sun splash

However, *aV* diphthongs may not appear after a B. Sequences *BaV do not appear in roots. In derived environments, they undergo:

POSTLABIAL RAISING: /ai/ → [ii] / B_ (/ai/ → [ai] / elsw)

- (5) a. / koehefa -ite / b. / waita / (Kichwa) / bailar / (Spanish)
 [koehefiite] [(rosa)viita] [biira]
 summer -PRD calendula dance
- (6) a. / na -ite / b. / airo / (Secoya)
 [naite] [airo]
 fruit -PRD mountain

POSTLABIAL RAISING: /ae/ → [oe] / B_ (/ae/ → [ai] / elsw)

- (7) a. / sefa -ẽ / b. / atapa -ẽ / c. / sema -ẽ / d. / paⁿdza -ẽ /
 [sefõẽ] [atapõẽ] [semõẽ] [paⁿdzã]
 end -CAUS breed -CAUS work -CAUS hunt -CAUS

NO POSTLABIAL RAISING: /a/ → [a] / B_

- (8) a. / sefa / b. / atapa / c. / sema /
 [sefa] [atapa] [sema]
 end breed work

Analysis of /ea, ia/ → [ia], /ae/ → [ai]

I analyze the diphthongal processes as aimed at averting marked structures. I assume the featural specifications of (11).

- (9) LICIT, or: LIC Assign a violation mark for a sequence of two vowels which do not form a licit diphthong in the language.
- (10) IDENTITY(FEATURE), or: IDF Assign a violation mark each time F(EATURE) has a different value in the input than in the output.

| (11) | <i>i i e a o</i> | (12) | <i>ea</i> | Lic | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} |
|---------|------------------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|
| H(IGH) | + + - - + | i. ea | 1 | | | | | 17.7 |
| B(ACK) | - + - + + | ii. ia | | 1 | | | | 14.5 |
| R(OUND) | - - - - + | iii. oa | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 31.1 |
| | | iv. ii | | | 2 | 2 | | 33.2 |

| (13) | <i>ia</i> | Lic | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} | (14) | <i>ae</i> | Lic | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} |
|------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|
| | i. ia | 1 | | | | 17.7 | | i. ae | 1 | | | | 17.7 |
| | ii. ia | | 1 | | | 6.9 | | ii. ai | | 1 | | | 14.5 |
| | iii. oa | | | 1 | | 9.7 | | iii. ao | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 31.1 |
| | iv. ii | | 1 | | 1 | 21.4 | | iv. oe | | 1 | 1 | | 24.2 |

Analysis of postlabial raising

I propose that postlabial raising reveals a dispreference for sequences of a labial consonant followed by a low vowel (15).

- (15) *C[+LABIAL]V[-HIGH], or: *BA Assign a violation mark for each low vowel after a labial consonant.

PROBLEM 1: postlabial raising does not affect monophthongs: /Ba/ → [Ba]. Unless something more is said about the difference between monophthongs and diphthongs, *BA targets the two equally. If *BA has a weight high enough to correctly predict diphthongal outputs (16), it will incorrectly predict the raising of monophthongs after labials (17), and vice versa (18).

| (16) | Bai | Lic | *BA | IdH | \mathcal{H} | (17) | Ba | Lic | *BA | IdH | \mathcal{H} | (18) | Bai | Lic | *BA | IdH | \mathcal{H} |
|------|---------|------|-----|------|---------------|------|--------|------|-----|------|---------------|------|---------|------|------|------|---------------|
| | i. Bai | 17.7 | 15 | 14.5 | 15 | | i. Ba | 17.7 | 15 | 14.5 | 15 | | i. Bai | 17.7 | 12.1 | 14.5 | 12.1 |
| | ii. Bii | | | 1 | 14.5 | | ii. Bi | | | 1 | 14.5 | | ii. Bii | | | 1 | 14.5 |

PROBLEM 2: different diphthongs undergo different processes: /Bai/ → [Bii] but /Bae/ → [Boe].

SOLUTION TO PROBLEM 1: capturing postlabial raising seen in diphthongs as well as its underapplication to monophthongs with subsegments of Q-Theory (Inkelas et al., 2016):

- each segment (Q) consists of subsegments, commonly closure (q^1), hold (q^2), and release (q^3)
- segments (Q) with one articulatory target have identical cues (q), e.g. $a = (a^1, a^2, a^3)$
- internally complex segments (Q) have different cues (q), e.g. $ts = (t^1, s^2, s^3)$, $bm^b = (b^1, m^2, b^3)$
- I model A'ingae diphthongs with four q's. The first two q's correspond to the first target of the diphthong; the other two q's – to the second one, e.g. $ai = (a^1, a^2, i^3, i^4)$, $oe = (o^1, o^2, e^3, e^4)$:
- I assume that changing the feature of a q incurs only 0.3 of an IDENTITY violation:

–predicts that a monophthong may surface faithfully, while the same vowel in a diphthong exhibits a TETU effect; PREDICTION BORNE OUT BY THE A'INGAE POSTLABIAL RAISING

| (19) | Ba = B(a, a, a) | Lic | *BA | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} |
|------|----------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | i. Ba = B(a, a, a) | 17.7 | 12.1 | 14.5 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 12.1 |
| | ii. Bo = B(o, o, o) | | | 1 | 1 | | 24.2 |
| | iii. Bi = B(i, i, i) | | | 1 | | | 14.5 |

SOLUTION TO PROBLEM 2: /ai/ surfaces as [ii], but /ae/ surfaces as [oe].

- different outcomes are due to phonological optimization given licit diphthong inventory
- modeled with relative weights of the feature IDENT constraints

| (20) | Bai = B(a, a, i, i) | Lic | *BA | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} | (21) | Bae = B(a, a, e, e) | Lic | *BA | IdH | IdR | IdB | \mathcal{H} |
|------|--------------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|---------------|------|--------------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | i. Bae = B(a, a, e, e) | 17.7 | 12.1 | 14.5 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 39.5 | | i. Bae = B(a, a, e, e) | 17.7 | 12.1 | 14.5 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 29.8 |
| | ii. Boe = B(o, o, e, e) | | | 1.3 | 0.6 | | 25.8 | | ii. Boe = B(o, o, e, e) | | | 0.6 | 0.6 | | 16.1 |
| | iii. Bie = B(i, i, e, e) | | | 1 | 1.3 | | 37.0 | | iii. Bie = B(i, i, e, e) | | | 1 | 0.6 | | 27.4 |
| | iv. Bai = B(a, a, i, i) | | | 1 | | | 12.1 | | iv. Bai = B(a, a, i, i) | | | 1 | 0.6 | | 21.8 |
| | v. Bii = B(i, i, i, i) | | | 0.6 | | | 9.7 | | v. Bii = B(i, i, i, i) | | | 1.3 | | | 19.3 |

Q-THEORY'S SUBSEGMENTAL REPRESENTATIONS CAPTURE A'INGAE POSTLABIAL RAISING