

The curious incident of the Latin liquids.

Philip J. Roberts (University of Oxford)

philip.roberts@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk



Long-distance dissimilation of liquids in a Latin suffix¹. Data:

Form: alternates between [a:li] and [a:ri]

Function of suffix: denominal, adjective-forming.

Elsewhere form: [a:li], e.g. in

- *nauali-s* 'naval-NOM.SG.MF'
- *hiemalis* 'of winter'
- *Augustalis* 'of Augustus'

Suffix preceded by [l] → [a:ris]

- *lunaris* 'lunar'
- *popularis* 'popular'
- *militaris* 'military'

Suffix preceded by [r] → [a:lis]

- *regalis* 'royal'
- *floralis* 'floral'
- *pluralis* 'plural, manifold'

This is as far as the handbooks tend to get (see Meiser 1998: 127, Leumann 1977)
Cser (2010) points out a systematic² exception:

Non-coronal between liquid and suffix → [a:lis]

- *legalis* 'legal' (not **legaris*)
- *Vulcan-ali-a* 'festival of Vulcan-NOM/ACC.PL.N' (not **Vulcanaria*)
- *fulminalis* 'projectile' (not **fulminaris*)

ABC Analysis:

Constraint schema:

–IDENT-CC-x

The logical complement of IDENT-CC-x, i.e. "Assess a violation for every pair of segments in the correspondence relation that differ with respect to x

Effect: enforces the OCP on the CC-correspondence tier.

Definition:

–IDENT-CC-ART

Enforces the CC-OCP on place features.

Two OCP contours:

Perfect — OCP observed by both place and [LATERAL]:

seg	l	e	g	a	l	e
LAT	+		-		+	
ART	COR		DOR		COR	

Least expensive repair strategy — change the liquid in the suffix³

Next-best — OCP observed by [LATERAL] only:

seg	l	u	n	a	r	e
LAT	+		-		-	
ART	COR		COR		COR	

Next-best repair strategy — Eject a non-liquid from the correspondence relation.

Liquid dissimilation as conditional blocking à la Hansson 2007:

/lega:Ris/	–IDENT CC [LAT]	CORR L↔L	–IDENT CC ART	CORR C↔C
a. ☐ lega:lís			*	*
b. lega:lís	*!		*	**
c. lega:ris	*!		*	*
d. lega:ris			*!	**

/luna:Ris/	–IDENT CC [LAT]	CORR L↔L	–IDENT CC ART	CORR C↔C
a. ☐ luna:ris			*	**
b. luna:lís			**!	*
c. luna:lis	*!		*	**
d. luna:ris	*!		**	*

Liquid dissimilation as a preference hierarchy over OCP contours (McCarthy 2010):

/lega:Ris/	–IDENT CC ART	–IDENT CC [LAT]	IDENT CC LIQ	MAX CC
a. ☐ lega:lís			**	*
b. lega:lís	*!	*		**
c. lega:ris		*	**	*
d. lega:ris	*!			**

/luna:Ris/	–IDENT CC ART	–IDENT CC [LAT]	IDENT CC LIQ	MAX CC
a. ☐ luna:ris	*			**
b. luna:lís	**!		**	*
c. luna:lis	*	*!		**
d. luna:ris	**!	*	**	*

Notes:

1. The dissimilation is restricted to this particular suffix (see also note 3). There are no general co-occurrence restrictions on liquid within the language as a whole (Cser 2010), but there are other suffixes with different patterns of dissimilation, most notably *-al/ar*, which is a reflex of the NEUT.SG of *-alis/aris* (with apocope), but has been generalized as a noun-forming suffix. In *-al/ar*, the liquid dissimilation is not blocked by non-coronals. In the Classical language, this dissimilation is likely not phonologically productive, but a lexical residue of an formerly productive pattern (see Roberts 2012; §2.3.3)

2. Cser (2010: 39) discusses a number of apparent counter-examples, but concludes that most are palaeographically unreliable: some are hapaxes, others come from manuscripts we have independent evidence to consider prone to transmission errors. The only serious difficulty is *letalis* 'deadly'.

3. Given that the domain of liquid dissimilation is this particular suffix, the model must be one of phonologically conditioned allomorphy. Accordingly, I have represented the UR of *-alis/aris* as /a:Ris/, which should be taken to represent a morpheme that can be parsed equally faithfully with either of the two attested surface forms. Liquid dissimilation is therefore a TETU effect, with the ABC constraints selecting between allomorphs rather than between allophones (cf. Mascaró 1996, Wolf, to appear).

4. This is the neuter singular inflectional ending.

/lega:Ris/	IDENT CC LIQ	MAX CC	–IDENT CC ART
☐ lega:lís	2	1	0
lega:ris	0	L 2	W 1

/luna:Ris/	IDENT CC LIQ	MAX CC	–IDENT CC ART
☐ luna:ris	0	2	1
a. ● luna:ris	2	W 1	L 2
b. luna:lís	0	4	W 0

See Roberts (2012: 115) and Roberts *passim*.

References:

Cser, András (2010) 'The *alis/aris* allomorphy revisited' in Franz Rainer, Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky & Hans Christian Luschützky (eds.), *Variation and change in morphology: selected papers from the 13th international morphology meeting, Vienna, February 2008* 33–51. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hansson, Gunnar Ólafur (2007). "Blocking effects in agreement by correspondence." *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:395–409.

Karttunen, Lauri (1998). "The proper treatment of Optimality Theory in computational phonology." in Karttunen, Lauri and Kemal Oflazer (eds.) *FSM/NLP '98: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Finite State Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1–14.

Leumann, Mann (1977). *Lateinischen Laut und Formenlehre*. 5th edn, Munich: Beck.

Mascaró, Joan (1996). "External allomorphy as emergence of the unmarked." In Jacques Durand & Bernard Laks (eds.), *Current trends in phonology: models and methods*, 76–86. ESRI: University of Salford.

McCarthy, John J. (2010) 'Agreement by correspondence without CORR constraints.' The Selected Works of John McCarthy. URL: http://works.bepress.com/john_j_mccarthy/106/

Meiser, Gerhard (1998) *Historische Laut und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Roberts, Philip J. (2012) *Towards a computer model of the historical phonology and morphology of Latin*. DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.

Wolf, Matthew (to appear) "Lexical insertion occurs in the prosodic component." To appear in Tranel, Bernard (ed.) *Understanding allomorphy: perspectives from Optimality Theory*. Sheffield: Equinox.

Available from the Rutgers Optimality Archive as ROA 912 (<http://roa.rutgers.edu>)

Why this matters:

These data appear at first sight to instantiate the pattern of conditional blocking predicted by Hansson 2007, and ruled out by McCarthy 2010. The solution involving a top-ranked constraint in favor of consonant place dissimilation is so counter-intuitive that it only became apparent under automated analysis using PyOT (see Roberts 2012, ch. 1, and compare Karttunen 1998). OT grammars are so prone to produce counter-intuitive behaviors that automated analysis is necessary.



<http://brainlab.clp.ox.ac.uk/people/philip-j-roberts>