Radboud Repository



PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link. http://hdl.handle.net/2066/42710

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2017-12-06 and may be subject to change.

Proto-Romance Stress Shift Revisited and Shifting from Quantity-Sensitive to Quantity-Insensitive Stress in OT

Haike Jacobs Romance Department Radboud University Nijmegen h.jacobs@let.ru.nl

The notoriously problematic cases of the Late Latin stress shift from the antepenultimate to the penultimate syllable in words with a short vowel in the penultimate followed by a consonant + liquid cluster, such as, in for example, integrum 'total', colubram 'serpent', palpebram 'eye lid', cathedram 'chair' has received considerable attention throughout the history of Romance linguistics (cf. among others, de Groot (1921), Niedermann (1931), Pope (1934), Richter (1934), Ward (1951), Fouché (1958), Bourciez (1974), Pulgram (1975), Steriade (1988), Lahiri, Riad & Jacobs (1999), and more recently Bullock (2001) and Ségéral & Scheer (to appear)). No completely satisfactory account, however, has yet been provided. In all but the last two accounts, broadly speaking three different types of explanation are offered. A change in the number of syllables, a change in the syllabic affiliation of the cluster and a change in the stress rule. De Groot (1921), Niedermann (1931) and Richter (1934) assume an epenthetic vowel which triggered the shift and which was subsequently deleted again (c'olubram EPENTHESIS colub[a]ram > STRESS SHIFT col'ub[a]ram SYNCOPE col'ubram). Fouché (1958) and Bourciez (1974) assume that the first consonant became geminated thereby closing the preceding syllable. Both accounts are problematic, the epenthetic vowel cannot be motivated independently from the shift and the second solution is at odds with the available romance evidence (such as, for instance, the diphthongisation in the French reflexes entier, couleuvre, paupière and chaire (Bullock 2001:177-178)) that shows that the penultimate syllable remained an open syllable. Ward (1951), Pope (1934), Pulgram (1975), Steriade (1988) and Lahiri e.a. (1999), although differing in details, describe the stress shift as a result of a changing stress rule (the leading idea being that the loss of vocalic quantity distinctions and syncope led to the breakdown of the classical Latin stress rule).

Ségéral & Scheer (to appear) provide a government phonology-based approach which basically relies on assuming ambiguous status of consonant+liquid clusters (they can be analysed as coda-onset sequences, as onset clusters or as a monosegmental (affricate-like) onset), which means that they should be coda-onset at the moment of the stress shift, to become onset cluster again at the moment of diphthongisation, rendering the analysis subject to the same criticism as the vowel epenthesis account.

Finally, Bullock (2001) offers an OT-based account and assumes double prosody: an additional mora, projected to the syllable, but not realized by the vowel allows a light syllable to count as heavy before consonant+liquid clusters. Syncope in cases such as *manipulus* > *maniplus* leads to a light (*ma.ni.plus*) penultimate syllable being stressed, unless it is assumed that the mora of the deleted vowel is preserved and associated with the penultimate syllable (the syllable is then heavy, but because the vowel is not long, weight is covert). This double prosody is then carried over to other light syllables preceding stop-liquid clusters, triggering the stress shift. The stress rule of the language therefore remains the same for Classical Latin as well as for Late Latin (Bullock 2001: 187).

Our goal in this talk is twofold. The first is more descriptive, the second more theoretical. After briefly reviewing the proposed accounts, we will concentrate on Bullock's analysis.

We will show that the doubly prosody approach in syncope cases such as *manipulus* > *maniplus*, contrary to her claim, does lead to opacity of the Classical Latin stress algorithm and, hence, that the stress algorithm for Late Latin cannot be the same as for Classical Latin. As a matter of fact, what syncope in these cases, but also the stress shift cases in words such as *mu.l.i.e.rem mul*[j]*érem* share, is the stress has to become lexicalised, leading expectedly to doublets, such as, French *paupières* (from *palpébram*) and Old French *paupres* (from *pálpebram*) or French *entier* (from *intégrum*) and Old French *entre* (from *integrum*). We will then provide a more formal OT-account of the Steriade (1988) line of account, in which the shift is seen as a result of a changing stress system.

The second objective of the paper is to describe within an OT-model the further shift from a quantity-sensitive to a quantity-insensitive stress system, as it occurred in Gallo-Romance. We will argue and demonstrate why the set of standard OT-stress constraints is unable to characterize the distinction between a quantity-sensitive and a quantity-insensitive stress system, but instead makes the wrong typological predictions. We will conclude by providing an OT-account not thwarted by the same drawbacks.

References

Bourciez, E. 1974. Phonétique française. Etude historique. Paris: Klincksieck.

Bullock, B. 2001. 'Double Prosody and stress shift in Proto-Romance,' Probus 13: 173-192.

Fouché, P. 1958. Phonétique historique du français. Paris: Klincksieck.

Groot, A. de. 1921. Anaptyxe im Lateinischen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Lahiri, A. T. Riad & H. Jacobs. 1999. 'Diachrony,' H. van der Hulst (ed.) *Word Prosodic Systems in the Languages of Europe*, 335-422. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Niedermann, M. 1931. Précis de phonétique historique du latin. Paris: Klicksieck.

Pope, M. 1934. From Latin to Modern French. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pulgram, E. 1975. Latin-Romance Phonology: Prosodics and Metrics. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

Richter, E. 1934. 'Chronologische Phonetik des Französischen bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts,' *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Heft 82. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Ségéral, Ph. & T. Scheer. to appear. 'A look at the Gallo-Romance trouble with *muta cum liquida* through the positional prism.

Steriade, D. 1988. 'Gemination and the Proto-Romance syllable shift,' D. Birdsong and J-P. Montrueil (eds.) *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, 371-410. Dordrecht: Foris.

Ward, R. 1951. 'Stop plus liquid and the position of the Latin accent,' Language 27: 477-484