

## Class 2: Case study of Dutch

Data come mainly from Booij 1977<sup>1</sup>, Booij 1995<sup>2</sup>, Booij 2002<sup>3</sup>; analysis is based on Booij 1999.<sup>4</sup>

I'll start by asserting that p-words are formed a certain way in Dutch, then go through the phenomena that support the description.

### I. P-wd formation

#### (1) Left edge of stem (N,V,A) projects left edge of p-wd

*Compounds*

/N+N/	ALIGN(Stem,L,PWd,L)	NORECURSION
☞ a. (N)-(N)		
b. (N-N)	*!	
c. (N-(N))		*!
d. ((N)-N)	*!	*

#### (2) Suffixes

*form their own p-word if they can*

/draag <sub>V</sub> + baar/ 'bearable'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	NORECURSION	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
☞ a. (draag)-(baar)			
b. (draag-baar)			*!
c. (draag-(baar))		*!	*
d. ((draag)-baar)		*!	

*but not if the suffix lacks a full vowel (lijk = /læk/)*

/draag <sub>V</sub> + lijk/ 'bearable'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINIMALITY	NORECURSION	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
a. (draag)-(lijk)		*!		
☞ b. (draag-lijk)				*
c. (draag-(lijk))		*!	*	*
d. ((draag)-lijk)			*!	

MINIMALITY = shorthand for requirements that p-wd contain a foot, foot contain at least two moras, and schwa be nonmoraic.

<sup>1</sup> Geert Booij (1977). *Dutch Morphology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

<sup>2</sup> Geert Booij (1995). *The Phonology of Dutch*. Oxford: Clarendon.

<sup>3</sup> Geert Booij (2002). *The Morphology of Dutch*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>4</sup> Geert Booij (1999). The role of the prosodic word in phonotactic generalizations. In T. Alan Hall & Ursula Kleinhez (eds.) *Studies on the Phonological Word*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

and not if the suffix is vowel-initial

/wandel <sub>V</sub> + aar/ 'walker'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINI- MILITY	GOOD TREE	ALIGN (PWd,L/R,Stem,L/R)	ONSET
a. (wan.del).-(aar)					*!
b. (wan.de).(l-aar)				*!	
c. (wan.de.l)-(aar)			*!		
☞ d. (wan.de.l-aar)					

GOODTREE: something like “a segment can’t belong simultaneously to  $D_1$  and to  $d_1$  if  $d_1$  is dominated by  $D_2$  (distinct from  $D_1$ )” (where  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are instances of the same-level domain)

except for one exception: -achtig always forms its own p-wd—insert theory of exceptions.

**(3) Prefixes**

form their own p-word if they can, even if hiatus results (though see below)

/on+aard <sub>A</sub> +ig/ 'unkind'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINI- MILITY	NO RECURSION	ONSET	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
☞ a. (on).-(aar.d-ig)				*	
b. (o.n-aar.d-ig)	*!				
c. (on.-(aar.d-ig))			*!	*	

but not if the prefix lacks a full vowel (be = /bə/)

/be+adem <sub>V</sub> / 'breathe air into'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINI- MILITY	NO RECURSION	ONSET	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
a. (be).-(a.dem)		*!		*	
b. (be.-a.dem)	*!			*	
☞ c. (be.-(a.dem))			*	*	

**(4) Clitics**

generally join the preceding word ('t = /ət/)

/kochten <sub>V</sub> 't boek <sub>N</sub> / 'bought the book'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINIMALITY	NORECURSION	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
a. (kochten)('t)(boek)		*!		
☞ b. (kochten 't)(boek)				*
c. (kochten)('t boek)	*!			
d. ((kochten)'t)(boek)			*!	
e. (kochten)('t(boek))			*!	

but if there is no preceding word, adjoin to following word (je = /jə/)

/je eet <sub>V</sub> / 'you eat'	ALIGN (Stem,L,PWd,L)	MINIMALITY	NORECURSION	ALIGN (Stem,R,PWd,R)
a. (je) (eet)		*!		
b. ((je) eet)	*!		*	
☞ c. (je (eet))			*	

(A few clitics are directional, specifying that they must encliticize; a few function words are optionally freestanding p-words.)

**II. Evidence for p-wd** (by the way, stress is too much of a mess, so I haven't attempted it)

**(5) Domain of syllabification (B2002 p. 168, N&V)**

...with syllable, in turn, being the domain of final (i.e., coda) devoicing.

syllabification

	(lood).-(spet)	'drop of lead'	
(stem)+(stem)	(loods).-(pet)	'sea captain's cap'	
	(lan[t]).-(a.del)	'landed gentry'	< land-adel
(stem)+(suffix)	(roo[t]).-(ach.tig)	'reddish'	< rood-achtig
(stem+suffix)	(ro.[d]-ig)	'reddish'	
(prefix)+(stem+suffix)	(ont).-(er.v-en)	'to disinherit'	

**(6) Domain of obligatory schwa deletion (B1995 pp. 49-50, 68)**

	(kade+en)	>	[kad_ən]	'quays'	
(stem+suffix)	(zÿde+ig)	>	[zɛid_əx]	'silky'	
	(Roma+ein)	>	[rom_ɛin]	'Roman'	
	(zijde)+(achtig)	>	[zɛidəɑxtəx]	'silky'	
(stem)+(stem)	(zijde)+(inkomsten)	>	[zɛidəɪŋkɔmstən]	'silk revenues'	schwa-deletion can happen here but is optional
	(mode)+(opleiding)	>	mod[ə]-opleiding	'fashion academy'	
(prefix+(stem))	(be+(antwoorden))	>	[bəɑntvordən]	'to reply'	

**(7) Domain of r-coloring (N&V, Gussenhoven & Jacobs 1998 p. 252<sup>5</sup>)**

Long vowels have their quality modified before *r*—indicated by underlining (schwa off-glide?)

	(s <u>mer</u> is)	'copper'
(stem)	(d <u>or</u> ade)	'dorado' (shows V and r don't have to be in same foot, assuming trochaic feet in Dutch)
(stem+suffix)	( <u>keu</u> r-ing)	'test'
(stem)+(stem)	( <u>keu</u> )-(ring)	'cue ring'
(prefix)+(stem+suffix)	( <u>mee</u> )-(reis-en)	'accompany'

Notice that r-coloring doesn't drive prosodification:

	/dorade/ 'you eat'	*(...V <sub>uncolored</sub> r...)PWd	ALIGN (PWd,L/R,Stem,L/R)	IDENT(Vcolor)
a.	(d <u>or</u> ade)			*
b.	(dorade)	*!		
c.	(do)(rade)		*!	

<sup>5</sup> Carlos Gussenhoven & Haike Jacobs (1998). *Understanding Phonology*. London: Arnold.

**(8) Domain of s-voicing (Gussenhoven & Jacobs 1998 p. 252)**

s → z / [+voice] \_\_ V (optional?)

(stem)	(ma[s]a)	‘mass’
(stem+suffix)	(hij[s]-en)	‘to hoist’
(stem)+(suffix)	(ij[z])-(achtig)	‘ice-like’
(stem)+(stem)	(men[z])-(aap)	‘orangutan’
(prefix)+(stem)	(mi[z])-(oogst)	‘mis-harvest’

- What Selkirkian category does this rule fall into?

**(9) Domain of obligatory degemination (B1995, pp. 68-69)**

(stem+suffix)	( <i>groot-te</i> )	>	[γrotə]	‘size’
(pref+(stem+suffix))	(on-(middel-lijk))	>	[ɔmɪdələk]	(don’t know what happened to the /n/)
	(ver)-(assen)	>	[vɛrəsən]	‘to cremate’
(pref)+(stem)	(ver)-(rassen)	>	[vɛr:əsən]	‘to surprise’ (degemination is actually optional here, and in larger domains in general: B1995 p. 151)

**(10) Domain of obligatory /t/-deletion (B1995, pp. 152-153)**

(stem+suffix)	(klacht-je)	‘complaint’	
	(kast-je)	‘cupboard’	
	(echt-st)	‘most real’	obligatory
	(echt-s)	‘(something) real’	
(stem)+(stem)	(vracht)-(wagen)	‘truck’	
	(herfst)-(kleuren)	‘autumn colours’	Optional, “although for many speakers it will be obligatory in frequent words such as <i>postkantoor</i> ”
(stem)+(suffix)	(zicht)-(baar)	‘visible’	
(pref)+(stem+suffix)	(ont)-(ploff-en)	‘to explode’	

Many factors, apparently, probabilistically affect optional *t*-deletion: sonority of surrounding segments, word frequency, whether CtC string is spread over one p-phrase or two

**(11) Domain of phonotactics (i.e., static prohibitions)**

*Long vowels, diphthongs, and schwa can’t be followed by a complex coda, except that word-final (clusters of) coronal obstruents don’t count* (B1995 p. 28):

(stem)+(suffix)	(koorts)-(achtig)	‘feverish’
(stem)+(stem)	(heftst)-(kleuren)	‘autumn colours’
(prefix)+(stem)	(aarts)-(bisschop)	‘archbishop’

*Superheavy syllables are allowed only word-finally*

Here is a case where, for some words, faithfulness can drive prosodification. These are supposed to be monomorphemic words that (as diagnosed by stress) act like compounds (B2002 p. 173—see Riggle & Munro 2004,<sup>6</sup> Martin 2005<sup>7</sup>):

(áal)(mòes) ‘alms’  
 (máar)(schàlk) ‘marshall’  
 (óor)(dèel) ‘verdict’ (B2002 p. 173)

(There are exceptions, though, and suffixed words somehow escape the restriction [e.g., béem.d-en ‘meadows’]—see B1995 p. 34)

### No non-prevocalic obstruent-liquid sequences

The domain of this restriction can't be the (root) morpheme (B1999 p. 50):

(celebr-**eer**) ‘to celebrate’  
 (emigr-**eer**) ‘to emigrate’

No  $C_i\partial C_i$  (B1999 pp. 56-57):

(stem+suffix)	(sted-[ə]ling) <sub>ω</sub>	‘city dweller’	*(kal-[ə]ling) <sub>ω</sub>	‘bald person’
	(sted-[ə]lijk) <sub>ω</sub>	‘city-’	*(taal-[ə]lijk) <sub>ω</sub>	‘linguistic’
(stem) <sub>+</sub> (stem)			(formul[ə])-(lijst)	‘formula list’
			(final[ə])-(lied)	‘final song’

### (12) Constituent in “prosodic gapping” (B2002 pp. 171-172, B1995 p. 51)

(stem)<sub>+</sub>(stem)

(land)-\_\_ en (tuin)-(bouw) ‘agri-(culture) and horticulture’  
 (wespe)-\_\_ en (bijes)-(teken) ‘wasp-(stings) and bee-stings’  
 (hoofd)-\_\_ of (neven)-(accent) ‘main (stress) or secondary stress’  
 (regel)-(ordering) en \_\_-(toepassing) ‘rule ordering and (rule) application’  
 (heren)-(schoenen) en \_\_-(jassen) ‘men’s shoes and (men’s) coats’  
 (wis)-\_\_ en (natuur)-(kunde) ‘mathematics and physics’

(stem)<sub>+</sub>(suffix)

(rood)-\_\_ of (groen)-(achtig) ‘redd(ish) or greenish’  
 (storm)-\_\_ en (regen)-(achtig) ‘storm(y) and rainy’  
 (zicht)-\_\_ en (taast)-(bar) ‘visi(ble) and tangible’  
 (christen)-\_\_ en (heiden)-(dom) ‘Christen(dom) and heathendom’  
 (een-zij-dig)-\_\_ of (part-ij-dig)-(heid) ‘onesided(ness) or partiality’  
 (twee)-\_\_ en (drie)-(ling-en) ‘twins and triplets’  
 (oever)-\_\_ en (zoute)-(loos) ‘bank(less) and saltless’ i.e., endless and insipid  
 (zwangr)-\_\_ en (moeder)-(schap) ‘pregnanc(y) and motherhood’  
 (eer)-\_\_ en (deugd)-(zaam) ‘respectable and virtuous’  
 (ijs)-\_\_ en (bruine) (beren) ‘polar (bears) and brown bears’—note first item is  
 compound, second phrase

(stem+suffix)

<sup>6</sup> Jason Riggle & Pamela Munro (2004). One morpheme, two reduplicants; pseudo-compounds in Pima. Presented at LSA, Boston.

<sup>7</sup> Andy Martin (2005). Loanwords as pseudo-compounds in Malagasy. Presented at AFLA XII, UCLA.

\*absurd- en (banal-iteit) ‘absurd(ity) and banality’  
 \*rod-\_\_ of (groen-ig) ‘redd(ish) or greenish’

(*prefix+(stem)*)

\*(be-(fiets-en)) of \_\_-lop-en ‘to cycle on or to walk on’

(*prefix)+(stem)* (G&J p. 248)

(in)-\_\_ en (uit)-(voer) ‘im(port) and export’

More on *wis- en natuurkunde*—arguments against internal compounding

- *wis* ‘certain’ is an adjective, and *natuur* is a noun
- Wis- en natuurkunde zijn moeilijke vakken  
 ‘Math and physics are (plural) difficult subjects (plural)’

...and against morphological gapping

- (wis)-\_\_ en (natuur)-(kund-ig-e) overwegingen  
 ‘mathematical and physical considerations’  
*kundige* is only a phonological constituent, not a morphological constituent  
 [[[wis]<sub>A</sub> [kunde]<sub>N</sub> ]<sub>N</sub> ig]<sub>A</sub> ]<sub>A</sub>
- similarly, (land)-\_\_ en (tuin)-(bouw-er-s) ‘agri(culturers) and horticulturers’  
 [[[[land]<sub>N</sub>[bouw]<sub>N</sub>er]<sub>N</sub>s]<sub>N</sub>

*Further evidence for left-edge orientation*

“linking phonemes” /s/ and /ə/ often occur between two elements of a compound

(hon.[d]-e)-(brod) ‘dog’s food’  
 (hond-e)-\_\_ en (katt-e)-(brood) ‘dog-(food) and cat-food’

### III. Issues and puzzles

#### (13) Hiatus resolution

Within a p-word, hiatus is resolved by...

- glottal stop between [a] and main-stressed V  
 pa[ʔ]élla ‘paella’  
 a[ʔ]órta ‘aorta’
- nothing between [a] and other Vs  
 cháos ‘chaos’  
 fárao ‘Pharaoh’
- schwa-deletion if first V is schwa (as seen above)
- glide insertion otherwise:  
 Édu[ɥ]ard ‘Eduard’  
 Ge[j]a ‘Gea’  
 zee+en [zejən] ‘seas’  
 Ru[v]anda ‘Rwanda’  
 hou+en [həuvən] ‘to hold’

But at a p-word boundary you can have either [ʔ]-insertion (the usual option) or glide insertion:

(koe)-(achtig) [kuʔaxtəx] or [kuvaχtəx] ‘cow-like’  
 (zee)-(arend) [zeʔarənt] or [zejarənt] ‘sea eagle’ (B1995 pp. 65-68)

Glide insertion can also apply across the IP:

(Henk)<sub>φ</sub> (haalde)<sub>φ</sub> (de vlo)<sub>φ</sub> [v](uit het eten)<sub>φ</sub> )<sub>IP</sub> ‘Henk removed the flea from the food’

*Hiatus resolution with clitics* (B1995 ch. 8):

(Zij) (koch.t-e.n ’t ) (buk) If /n/ were p-word final, it would be able to delete.  
 they bought the book

(Ik) (zie.[j] ’t ) (boek) glide insertion  
 I see the book

(Ik) (merkte ’t) (direkt) > [mɛrktət] or [mɛrktənət] schwa deletion or n-insertion  
 I noticed it immediately

Enclitics vs. proclitics:

(wilde-[n]-ik) ‘wanted I’ vs. (je [ʔ](eet)) (lekker) ‘you eat nicely’

#### (14) Lexicalization of historically complex words (B2002 p. 173, B1995 p. 50)

<i>aard</i>	‘earth’	+	<i>appel</i>	‘apple’	>	(aar.[d]a.ppel)	‘potato’
(han[t]).-(a.ppel)	‘eating apple’	<	<i>hand</i>				
<i>tand</i>	‘tooth’	+	<i>arts</i>	‘doctor’	>	(tan.[d]arts)	‘dentist’
<i>reuz</i>	‘giant’	+	<i>achtig</i>	‘-like’	>	(reu.[z]ach.tig)	‘fantastic’
cf. reu[s].ach.tig	‘giant-like’						
<i>her</i>	‘re-’	+	<i>inneren</i>	‘internalize’	>	(he.ri.nne.ren)	‘to remember’
<i>re</i>	‘re-’	+	<i>ageran</i>	‘act’	>	(re.[j]a.ge.ran)	‘to react’

It would be nice to have independent criteria for calling these examples lexicalized rather than exceptions.

#### (15) Status of clitics

een hon.[t] aan de lijn ‘a dog on the leash’ < *hond*

B1995’s solution (p. 56):

	<i>hɔnd</i>
syllabification	<i>.hɔnd.</i>
coda devoicing	<i>.hɔnt.</i>
SYNTAX	<i>.hɔnt. an</i>
resyllabification	<i>.hɔn.t an</i>

But, there is variation: for frequent verbs, devoicing sometimes doesn't apply before a V-initial clitic, suggesting "that certain verb+clitic combinations are lexically stored" (B1995, p. 175)

	<i>hɛb ik</i> 'have I'
syllabification	<i>.hɛ.bik.</i>
coda devoicing	--
SYNTAX	--
resyllabification	--

If we need cyclicity/lexical phonology, can we do away with the p-word entirely?  
(counteranalysis next time if time)