

Derived Environment Effects and Consistency of Exponence

Marc van Oostendorp, Meertens Instituut, Amsterdam

We defend the assumption — introduced to OT by Prince & Smolensky (1993) but never fully explored in the subsequent literature — that Gen is restricted by a principle called Consistency of Exponence. OT analyses usually distinguish between markedness constraints on the one hand and faithfulness constraints on the other. So-called *derived environment effects* (DEE) pose a challenge to this assumption: they refer to markedness on the one hand (since they describe phonological processes, which are usually constructed as repairs to markedness violations) but at the same time they distinguish underlying material from non-underlying material, and hence refer to faithfulness. A well-known case of a (phonological) DEE is palatalisation of /g/ in Polish, which leads to [ʒ] rather than to [j]. Underlying /j/ does not turn into [ʒ], however.

- (1) a. /briĵ+ek/ → [briʃek]
- b. /rog+ek/ → [roʒek], *[rojek]

This mixing of markedness and faithfulness can be seen in the two most prominent current Correspondence-based analyses of DEE: Łubowicz (2000) uses constraint conjunction of markedness and faithfulness constraints. Constraint conjunction approaches suffer from the problem that they do not capture the locality of DEE's: a faithfulness violation anywhere in the word combined with a markedness violation elsewhere could lead to DEE, but this is not attested in the world's languages (See Łubowicz, 2005, for an attempt to solve this problem). An alternative approach, Comparative Markesness (McCarthy, 2003) avoids this problem, but it actually over-generates and predicts that also the reverse of DEE's (process applying only within a word, but not for instance to epenthetic material) should exist. However, such phenomena seem similarly unattested.

In this talk we show how all these problems can be avoided if we take one constraint on Gen seriously: Prince & Smolensky (1993)'s *Consistency of Exponence* (CoE). According to this principle, Gen cannot change the morphological affiliation of material. We argue that this implies that we will be able to read the epenthetic vs. underlying status of phonological material from the surface representation without further ado. DEE constraints get a natural expression within a framework based on this assumption (which was never explicitly abandoned in the OT literature). Contra Walker & Feng (2004), we thus argue that CoE should not and cannot be “demoted” to the status of a violable constraint, but rather should play a central role in our understanding of Gen.

Bibliography

- Łubowicz, Anna (2000). 'Derived Environment Effects in Optimality Theory'. *Lingua*, 112: 243–280.
- (2005). 'Locality of Conjunction'. In: Alderete, J., C. Han, & A. Kochetov (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press. URL <http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~lubowicz/docs/WCCFL24.PDF>.
- McCarthy, John (2003). 'Comparative Markedness'. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 29.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky (1993). 'Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar'. Manuscript, Rutgers University and University of Colorado at Boulder. Available at ROA.
- Walker, Rachel & Bella Feng (2004). 'A Ternary Model of Morphology- A Ternary Model of Morphology-Phonology Correspondence'. In: B. Schmeiser, A. Kelleher, V. Chand, A. Kelleher A. Rodriguez. B. Schmeiser, V. Chand, A. Kelleher A. Rodriguez B. Schmeiser, V. Chand, & A. Rodriguez (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 23*. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press.