Ioannis-Konstantinos Katochoritis

Leipzig University (Leipzig Universität)

A reanalysis of Cupeño lexical accent in Colored Turbid Accents

Outline In Uto-Aztecan Cupeño inherent root accent overrides inherent affix accent, the latter manifesting only with lexically unaccented roots (Hill & Hill 1968). Previous analyses, like Alderete's transderivational anti-faithfulness (1999) and root-controlled accent (2001), or Yates' (2017) left-alignment preference, either invoke *ad hoc* devices or ignore empirical facts and the role of morphosyntactic structure. **Proposal** I present Cupeño stress as a head-dependent lexical accent system, within a modified version of Revithiadou's (2007) OT Colored Turbid Accent (CTA) model, which blends Goldrick's (2000) Turbid Output Representations (TOR) and van Oostendorp's (2007) Colored Containment (CC), dispensing with root faithfulness, prosodic dominance, edge alignment or morpheme-indexed constraints. The main premise is that (some) morphological information is visible to phonology, and that, in stress clashes, it is the underlying accent of the word's morphological head that prevails, while each accent (linked or floating) is subject to distinct locality restrictions on stress migration (domain of same or different morphological affiliation respectively). The stress system proves less complex in its core, with apparent complications explained by prosody-morphology interface constraints (see below). **Background** CTA consists of two ingredients: (i) TOR, where the output may contain phonetically non-overt material affecting the surface form and triggering opacity. Lexical accent is autosegmentally represented as a mora associated to its sponsoring vowel via two structural relations: (abstract) projection and pronunciation (viz., output realization), the unmarked case being for both to match, with accent pronounced by the vowel that projects it; (ii) CC, where different morphological categories of phonological elements correspond to distinct colors, and lexical accents are born with a particular color as part of their input. Lexically specified projection lines feature the same color as their sponsor and cannot be altered by GEN, which can only manipulate pronunciation lines to generate (locally conditioned) migration effects. Floating accents (belonging to pre-/post-accenting morphemes) lexically lack projection lines, so they cannot be pronounced within the same domain of their sponsor and must shift to an adjacent element of distinct color. Linked accents, bound by their sponsor's color, can only locally migrate within the same morphological domain. **Analysis** In Cupeño, the single primary stress is assigned to a morpheme lexically specified for prominence, otherwise to the word's (default) leftmost syllable. The majority of roots and a few affixes display an underlying accent, the former invariably prevailing under competition. Suppose that an accented, category-neutral root, categorized by a phonologically non-overt head (*n*, *v*, etc.) under a sister relationship, inherits the morphological headedness of the categorizing head; it then follows naturally that, as Cupeño contains no inherently accented, overt derivational affix, the root will always classify as the head and retain its lexical accent when competing with inflectional suffixes, as the latter do not determine the word's grammatical category. **Affix competition** Regarding the two scenarios of an unaccented root combining with more than one (competing) accented inflectional affixes, it is argued, contra Alderete (2001), that none of them ever holds: firstly, the language lacks sequences of accented suffixes, the opposite having been claimed due to false synchronic segmentation. Secondly, alleged competition between a prefix and a (winning) suffix is based on the assignment of lexical accent to subject agreement markers (SAM), which supposedly

claim stress from their immediately preceding (accentless) object agreement markers (OAM). It is shown, however, that OAMs constitute proclitics, not prefixes, so SAMs either bear leftmost default stress or lose to the suffix's (only) underlying mora.

Floating accents Turning to migration locality, it is demonstrated how pre-accenting suffixes dock stress on the immediately preceding root-final vowel of unaccented roots, and how their floating accent is (expectedly) overridden by inherent root accent. The model makes the right predictions on intervention effects, namely, when an unaccented suffix stands between the (unaccented) root and a pre-accenting suffix, with the latter's mora pronounced by the root, or in sequences of pre-accenting suffixes, where it is the first of the two that contributes its floating accent to the root.

Reduplication Reduplication (RED) in Cupeño poses a challenge for all analyses so far, like Yate's (2017) view as a lexically accented prefix. In Hill (2005) full RED is treated as a prefix copying the whole root on its right, with stress falling on the root; partial CV- RED as a prefix that copies the initial CV sequence of the root on its right, with stress consistently shifting on the affixal copy; -VC RED as a suffix copying the relevant part of the root on its left, with stress remaining on the root (whether inherently accented or not). In contrast, using a factorial typology within Sympathy OT (McCarthy 1999, 2003), I suggest that Cupeño RED is not uniform, but its form depends on its position, itself an idiosyncratic property of roots: full RED is a post-accenting prefix with a Condition on Insertion that it be on the left of a root and copy it as a whole; partial RED is a pre-accenting suffix, whose Condition on Position is determined by its subcategorization frame (Kalin & Rolle 2021): CV RED is the result of displacement (viz., epiphenomenal infixation, indistinguishable from prefixation due to segmental identity), inserted after the root's first vowel, whereas VC RED is attached after the root's last rhyme.

A wrong prediction seems to be made, though, with roots lexically accented on their second syllable, whereby stress shifts to the root-initial, pre-RED syllable: stress remains on the root, but does not correspond to its underlying accent. The solution I maintain is that a high-ranked OCP-like constraint enforces minimal dissimilation between the reduplicant and its base, achieved via stress contrast on surface due to an even higher-ranked IDENT-BR (McCarthy & Prince 1995) constraint that requires segmental identity between the base and the reduplicant, necessarily leaving (local) stress shift as the only last-resort option to satisfy both.

Conclusions Cupeño constitutes a simple, transparent interface stress language that reflects interactions of the morphosyntactic and phonological component, with root accent emerging because of the lack of accented derivational ("dominant" in Kiparsky & Halle's (1997) sense) affixes. Accent overriding and migration of floating accents is explicated only by subsuming inherent accentuation to lexical entries and referring to morphological constituency, thus offering a restrictive theory of modularity.

(1) **CULMINATIVITY**: A prosodic word must have exactly one stressed syllable.
(2) **MIRROR-HEAD**: The lexical accent of the morphological head is the head of the prosodic word.
(3) **RECIPROCITY$^{LA}_{V}$**: If a vowel (V) of morpheme/color M projects a lexical accent (LA), then the LA must be pronounced on the V of morpheme/color M.
(4) **LA↘**: Lexical accents must be pronounced.
(5) **INVARIANCE**: A lexical accent LA is pronounced within morpheme/color M iff it is projected by a vowel V of morpheme/color M.
(6) **SCOPE(LA)≡M:** The scope of pronunciation of LA of morpheme/color M equals the total number of segments that the morpheme/color M consists of and no other.

Sel. Ref. Alderete, J. D. 2001. *NLLT 19*(3). • Goldrick, M. 2000. *NELS 30*. • Hill, J. & K. Hill. 1968. *IJAL 34*. • Revithiadou, A. 2007. Colored Turbid Accents and Containment. • van Oostendorp, M. 2007. Derived Environment Effects and Consistency of Exponence. • Yates, A. D. 2017. Against root faithfulness in Cupeno.