## Stratal OT and underspecification. Evidence from Tundra Nenets

Darya Kavitskaya and Peter Staroverov University of California, Berkeley and Leipzig University

The process of final debuccalization in Tundra Nenets presents both a famous descriptive problem (Tereshchenko 1956; Janhunen 1986; Salminen 1997; Nikolaeva 2014) and a serious theoretical challenge, because the opaque interactions of this process seem to not match its domain of application (Kavitskaya & Staroverov 2010). This paper proposes a new autosegmental account of Tundra Nenets glottal stop, framed within Stratal OT and building in particular on the proposals in Bermúdez-Otero (2001, 2012) and Ramsammy (2012). Our account relies on the assumption that both nasals and obstruents lose their place finally at the word level, but nasals may regain place specification due to postlexical assimilation. Our account thus solves a problem for Stratal OT by postulating an underspecified output at an intermediate step.

**Problem**. The Tundra Nenets data in this paper come from the authors' original fieldwork. In Nenets, phrase-final /t d s n  $\eta$ / change to a glottal stop. While obstruent debuccalization is fully compatible with our proposal, the problem is best illustrated with debuccalization of nasals in (1a). Phrase and word-medially, nasals undergo place assimilation, with concomitant voicing of a following obstruent (1b,c).

(1) Alternations of Tundra Nenets underlying nasals

- a. Debuccalization phrase-finally (in isolation):  $/s^{i}in\#/ \rightarrow [s^{i}i?]$  'lid'
- b. Assimilation word-medially:  $/s^{i}in-ta/ \rightarrow [s^{i}inda]$  'his lid'
- c. Assimilation across word boundary: /n<sup>j</sup>e-n xAnA/ 'woman-GEN.SG sledge'  $\rightarrow$  [n<sup>j</sup>en gAn] 'a woman's sledge'

Phrase-finally, the vowel  $/\Lambda/$  is deleted, and final  $/\Lambda/$ -deletion counterfeeds debuccalization (1c, 2b). Interestingly, a final-syllable  $/\Lambda/$  is also deleted before [?], thus debuccalization triggers (or feeds) pre-final vowel loss.

(2) Vowel deletion in Tundra Nenets: phrase-finally or before a phrase-final [?] a.  $/x \wedge n / \# \to [x \wedge n]$  'sledge'; b.  $/n^{j} en^{j} ets^{j} \wedge n / \# \to [n^{j} en^{j} ets^{j} ?]$  'man'

These data present several problems for Stratal OT and in fact for any OT framework. Debuccalization must be post-lexical since it only applies phrase-finally (1), but at the same time debuccalization must precede final / $\Lambda$ /-deletion (2). Attributing debuccalization to a stratum earlier than that of apocope would predict that there is a cyclic phrasal domain where debuccalization applies but apocope does not. Yet, such a phrasing is not possible. For example /n<sup>j</sup>en<sup>j</sup>ets<sup>j</sup>An sawa/ 'the man is good' can be pronounced [n<sup>j</sup>en<sup>j</sup>ets<sup>j</sup>An zawa] (alternating as in 1b-c) or [n<sup>j</sup>en<sup>j</sup>ets<sup>j</sup>? sawa] (alternating as in 2b) but not \*[n<sup>j</sup>en<sup>j</sup>ets<sup>j</sup>A? sawa].

**Analysis**. On our analysis, final / $\Lambda$ /-deletion only applies post-lexically, while place loss is only active lexically. We analyze nasal debuccalization as a two-step process. At the lexical level final /n  $\eta$ / lose their place features (\*C-PLACE]<sub>Wd</sub> >> MAX-[place], \* $\Lambda$ ]<sub>Phr</sub>) but retain their nasality, thus /n  $\eta$ /  $\rightarrow$  [N] (see also McCarthy 2008; Ramsammy 2012).

Post-lexically a previously created placeless nasal /N/ may either lose its nasality (phrase-finally:  $[s^{j}i?#]$  'lid') or assimilate to a first consonant of a following word (phrase-medially:  $[n^{j}en gAn]$  'woman's sledge'), since surface [N] is disallowed (\*N >> IDENT-[nas]). Post-lexical /A/-deletion exposes new place-bearing consonants to phrase-final position: [xAn#] 'sledge', (3a). On the other hand, the final nasal which lost its place at the word level may now change to [?] and trigger deletion of a preceding /A/:  $[n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}?#]$  'man', (3b).

ι.	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}$										
		хлпл	$^{*}\Lambda]_{Phr}$	MAX-[place]	MAX-seg	$*C-PLACE]_{Wd}$					
	൙ a.	хлп			1	1					
	b.	хлпл	W1		L	L					
	c.	хл?		W1	1	L					

## (3) Feeding and counterfeeding in TN post-lexical phonology a Post-lexical counterfeeding: $/x_{A}n_{A}/ \rightarrow [x_{A}n]$ (phrase-final)

b. Post-lexical feeding:  $/n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}\Lambda N / \rightarrow [n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}?]$  (phrase-final)

	0			-	,	
	$n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}\Lambda N$	$^{*}\Lambda]_{Phr}$	*N	MAX-seg	IDENT-[nas]	*C-PLACE] <sub>Wd</sub>
☞ a.	n <sup>j</sup> en <sup>j</sup> ets <sup>j</sup> ?			1	1	
b.	$n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}\Lambda N$	W1	W1	L	L	
c.	n <sup>j</sup> en <sup>j</sup> ets <sup>j</sup>			W2	L	W1
d.	$n^{j}en^{j}ets^{j}\Lambda$ ?	W1		L	1	

On this analysis, only the output of lexical level shows place loss but no apocope (intermediate  $|n^j e n^j e t s^j \Lambda N$  sawa| 'the man is good'). The subsequent post-lexical alternations ensure that the final syllable vowel only gets deleted if the intermediate /N/ loses its nasality.

Alternatives. Any treatment of the Nenets data, including the autosegmental approach sketched above, is not directly compatible with Harmonic Serialism or OT-CC (McCarthy 2007; Kavitskaya & Staroverov 2010; Jarosz 2014). Place loss ( $/n^j en^j ets^j \Lambda n / \rightarrow [n^j en^j ets^j \Lambda N]$ ) and apocope ( $/x\Lambda n\Lambda / \rightarrow [x\Lambda n]$ ) require the opposite rankings of \*C-PLACE]<sub>Wd</sub> and \* $\Lambda$ ]<sub>Phr</sub>, and hence no single constraint hierarchy can derive both processes. The paper will also show that previous-step constraints, which could solve this problem (Kavitskaya & Staroverov 2010), encounter a difficulty in accounting for the typology of coda place loss.

**Conclusion**. Our account solves the descriptive problem of dual behavior of Tundra Nenets glottal stop, and assumes only one [?] on the surface. We reconcile Tundra Nenets data with Stratal OT at the cost of assuming an intermediate output nasal unspecified for place /N/. Thus Stratal OT has to rely on underspecified representations (Keating 1988; Cohn 1990, 1993; Bermúdez-Otero 2001), and in particular our account relies on nasals unspecified for place (see also Ramsammy 2012).