The foot in truncation

Birgit Alber – University of Verona

Templates, as they arise in truncation, have been claimed to offer evidence for the types of existing feet and their internal structure. This claim could however seem ill-founded, if one considers the multitude of templatic shapes observable crosslinguistically in truncation. On the contrary, we will show that when the typology of existing truncation patterns is analyzed in the framework of Generalized Template Theory (McCarthy&Prince 1999) it is possible to distinguish between patterns that can give us information about the types of possible feet and their structure and patterns that cannot.

The truncation morphemes (TRUNCs) represented in (1) are of very different sizes and internal structure and do not all correspond to canonical feet (cf. Hayes 1995): TRUNCs (1a) and (1c) have been described in the literature with terms such as *minimal words* and *maximal feet*, but neither of these entities corresponds to prosodic categories; the existence of degenerate feet as in (1b) has been questioned in metrical theory; morphemes as in (1e) appear to point to the possibility of foot-types such as ternary feet. Only TRUNCs like those in (1d) correspond to wellformed feet as they have been hypothesized in the literature.

In a larger typological context, the analysis of a database of 101 truncation patterns (Alber&Lappe, in progress) reveals that all TRUNCs fall into one of three categories: the morpheme is either (A) one syllable long (1a-b) or (B) two syllables long (1c-d) or (C) variable in its size (1e). Categories (A) and (B) can be analyzed as the result of specific "size restrictor constraints" (SRCs), which generate monosyllabic and disyllabic templates in a similar fashion as in reduplication processes. Specifically, whenever a SRC favoring monosyllabic templates (cf. Spaelti 1997, Alber 2001, Lappe 2007, Gouskova 2003, among others) dominates MAXBT (the constraint requiring maximal copying of material from the base to the TRUNC) the templatic morpheme is exactly one syllable long. The default case is then a monosyllabic TRUNC which is maximal in its size, due to the influence of MAXBT. This ranking gives rise to the (H) template, often described as a *minimal word* (1a, ranking 2a). When the constraint NOCODA dominates MAXBT as well, TRUNCs of the size of a degenerate foot arise (1b, ranking 2b). The fact that they emerge in a template generating process creating a free standing word shows us that degenerate feet, although marked, do exist.

When SRCs generating a disyllabic template (PARSE-σ, FT-BIN and ALLFTL, s. McCarthy&Prince 1994) dominate MAXBT, the resulting TRUNC is a single foot, which, however, typically is realized as a *maximal foot*, due to the influence of MAXBT requiring maximal copying of the base (1c, ranking 2c). When, in addition to the SRCs, prosodic well-formedness constraints such as the WEIGHT-TO-STRESS PRINCIPLE dominate MAXBT, we obtain a *well-formed foot*, as in 1d. (ranking 2d). In this case, feet such as (HH) trochees are excluded, although they would copy a larger string from the base, since they contain a heavy syllable which is not stressed. It is this type of truncation patterns – where copying is not maximal, as would be required by MAXBT – that give us the most information about the internal structure of feet, since submaximal copying is typically triggered by prosodic wellformedness constraints.

The third category of truncation morphemes, (C), displays a TRUNC that is variable in size. We claim that this type of TRUNC arises when the SRCs are dominated by the ANCHOR constraints ANCHOR-S_1 and ANCHOR-S' demanding anchoring of the first and the stressed syllable, respectively, and thus determining which part of the base is copied. When *both* ANCHOR constraints dominate the SRCs, *both* the first and the the stressed syllable of the base have to be preserved. The SRCs still cut down the base, but they will do so preserving material from the first up to the stressed syllable (1e, ranking 2e). In this case, the TRUNC does not correspond to a template at all, hence cannot tell us anything about the properties of feet or other prosodic constituents. Interestingly, in our database all TRUNCs larger than two syllables can be explained by the domination of ANCHOR constraints. This is a strong argument in favor of the hypothesis that feet are maximally disyllabic, hence typically binary: ternary templates are not found among the truncation patterns.

In sum, truncation tells us several things about the foot-inventory and the internal structure of feet: the absence of truncation templates bigger than two syllables means that feet are maximally disyllabic; the patterns of wellformed feet which emerge whenever the truncation template does not copy maximally, show us what the wellformedness conditions operating on feet look like; degenerate feet, although highly marked, do exist as a truncation template, hence must be included in the inventory of possible feet; finally, the

minimal word (H) is the result of a monosyllabic truncation template copying maximally material from the base. It is therefore not a prosodic constituent of its own, but the result of constraint interaction.

Data

(1)	a. minimal word:	(H)	(Yupik: *Aŋukaʁnaq* --> *Aŋ*, German: *Andreas* --> *And-i*)
	b. degenerate foot:	(L)	(Italian: *Cristina* --> *Cri*)
	c. maximal foot:	(σH)	(Spanish: *Fernándo* --> *Fér.nan)*
	d. wellformed foot:	(H), (LL)	(even trochees in Japanese: *Yuuko* --> *o-Yuu, Midori* --> *o-Mi.do*)
	e. variable size:		(Southern Italian vocatives: *Páola* --> *Pá*, *Francésca* --> *Fránce*, *Antonélla* --> *Antoné*)

Ranking summary:

(2)	a. SRC (monosyll.) >> MAXBT >> NOCODA	monosyllabic, maximal foot
	b. SRC (monosyll.), NOCODA >> MAXBT	monosyllabic, degenerate foot
	c. SRC (disyll.) >> MAXBT	disyllabic, maximal foot
	d. SRC (disyll.), WSP >> MAXBT	disyllabic, wellformed foot
	e. ANCHOR-S_1, ANCHOR-S' >> SRCS, >> MAXBT	variable truncation morpheme

Sources of quoted truncation patterns:

Yupik: Woodsbury 1985, Weeda 1992; German: Wiese 2001; Spanish: Piñeros 1998; Japanese: Mester 1990; Italian: Alber 2007

References

Alber, B. 2001. Maximizing First Positions. In: Féry C., Green A., Van De Vijver R. (eds.) Linguistics in Potsdam 12. Proceedings of HILP 5, Universität Potsdam, Potsdam, 1-19.

Alber, B. 2007. Deutsche und italienische Kurzwörter im Vergleich. In: Claudio Di Meola, Livio Gaeta, Antonie Hornung, Lorenza Rega (eds.). Perspektiven Zwei. Akten der 2. Tagung Deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in Italien (Rom, 9.-11.2. 2006). Istituto Italiano di Studi Germanici, Roma, 101-112.

Alber, B. & S. Lappe, in progress, Towards a Universal Typology of Truncation, ms. University of Verona and University of Siegen.

Gouskova, M. 2003. Deriving Economy: Syncope in Optimality Theory. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. ROA-610.

Spaelti, P. 1997. Dimensions of Variation in Multi-Pattern Reduplication. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. ROA-311.

McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1994. The Emergence of the Unmarked. Optimality in Prosodic Morphology. In: M. Gonzàlez (ed.), NELS 24: Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 24. GLSA, Amherst, MA, 333-379.

McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1999. Faithfulness and Identity in Prosodic Morphology. In: René Kager, Harry van der Hulst & Wim Zonneveld (eds.), The Prosody Morphology Interface. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. ROA-216.

Lappe, S. 2007. English Prosodic Morphology. Dordrecht: Springer

Mester, A. 1990. Patterns of truncation. Linguistic Inquiry 21, 478-485.

Piñeros, C.E. 1998. Prosodic Morphology in Spanish: Constraint Interaction in Word Formation. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

Hayes, Bruce. 1995. Metrical stress theory: principles and case studies, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Wiese, R. 2001. Regular Morphology vs. Prosodic Morphology? The Case of Truncations in German, Journal of Germanic Linguistics,131-17.

Woodbury, A. C. 1985. Formation of affectionate names by truncation. Unpublished section of Woodbury (1987) eliminated prior to publication, University of Texas at Austin.
Weeda, D. 1992. Word truncation in prosodic morphology. PhD Diss., University of Texas, Austin.