

## Paradigm Uniformity is not part of phonology - it only optimizes the lexicon...

Noam FAUST, Université Paris VIII

Most phonological models adopt a distinction between an underlying form or an acoustic target and its realization, the phonetic output. The latter emerges from the application of Phonology to the former. In Optimality Theory, the role of the phonological filter is played by constraints and their ranking, and the candidates are possible outputs. Yet many researchers formulate constraints that have little to do with phonological well-formedness, and intertwine them with well-formedness constraints, thereby making them part of the computation of the output. In this talk I will show that one such type of constraints, namely Paradigm Uniformity (PU), cannot be optimizing the output form, and thus has no place in their computation. I will show that if anything, such considerations optimize the lexicon, i.e. the underlying form.

The empirical background of the claim is Standard Yiddish and MH German adjectives. In both languages, [ən] is generally unaccepted word-finally, where one finds syllabic [ŋ] instead, e.g. [ofŋ] ‘open’ (in both languages). However, in the conjugations of such adjectives a schwa reemerges before the otherwise syllabic consonant: [ofənə, ofənək, ofənəm] in both languages, and further [ofənəs, ofənən] in German. There is not one adjective in either language whose uninflected form has a final syllabic consonant and whose inflection lacks this [ə], even though there is nothing wrong phonologically with \*[ofnə] or \*[ofnək] (such forms exist outside the adjectival paradigm, e.g. Yiddish [liŋ] ‘lie’, [liŋək] ‘liar’). The question is why.

Raffelsiefen (1995) explains the German case in the following manner. She proposes an ad-hoc constraint against  $CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$ , i.e. a sequence of two identical sonorants separated by a schwa and immediately following another consonant. Thus, \*[ofnən] is bad and must surface as [ofənən]. A requirement for PU then inserts [ə] in the same position in all other inflected form, even though phonologically it is locally unmotivated. The base, it is argued, is not part of the paradigm and therefore surfaces as [ofŋ], rather than \*[ofən] (which would violate DEP). If so, Raffelsiefen’s account derives the surface representation from Paradigm Uniformity.

The Yiddish data challenge this explanation in two ways. First, although Yiddish has the same distribution among adjectives, there is no form [ofənən] in this adjective’s inflection; the parallel to German [ofənən] is [ofənəm], which doesn’t violate  $*CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$ . One could nevertheless extend the constraint against  $CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$  to rule out \*[ofnəm] too. A more serious challenge is posed by vowel-final adjectives (of Slavic origin) like [modnə] ‘strange’. Their masc.dat form is exactly [modnəm], which would violate the extended  $*CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$  constraint. The difference between [ofənəm] and [modnəm] is precisely the bases [ofŋ] vs. [modnə]; but if PU worked the way Raffelsiefen suggests, and bases were irrelevant, we would expect \*[modənəm, modənək etc.].

The issue is resolved if one considers that PU does not operate in the production of surface forms, but in the stabilization of one underlying representation for the entire paradigm, based on the realization of the uninflected form. [ofŋ] is compatible with both /ofn/ and /ofən/ (through syllabication). The UR /ofn/ would produce the  $*CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$  violation \*[ofnəm], and so the UR /ofən/ is selected. Since there is no rule of schwa deletion in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005), [ofənə, ofənək] also have this Schwa. In contrast, [modnə] is not compatible with /modənə/; and so the inflected form cannot be \*[modənəm] and must be the  $*CL_i\bar{\alpha}L_i$ -violating [modnəm]. If so, in both cases a single UR is stabilized for the entire paradigm on the basis of what the uninflected form is compatible with. Once that UR is stabilized, all forms are derived from it. In other words, the appearance of [ə] in the surface form [ofənə], where it is phonologically unmotivated, is due to its presence in the UR, not to an analogy with [ofənəm]: Paradigm Uniformity optimizes not surface realizations but the lexicon, where lexical/phonemic representations dwell. It therefore cannot be computed alongside well-formedness constraints mapping inputs to outputs.