

# Transitivizer Deglottalization in St’at’imcets: Rethinking Intraparadigmatic Faithfulness

Carolyn Spadine

September 25, 2016

In St’at’imcets, an Interior Salish language spoken in British Columbia, the transitivizer *-min’* loses glottalization on the final nasal under main stress, but also, according to van Eijk 1997, in positions where it could potentially receive main stress with the addition of inflectional morphology:

- |     |    |  |     |    |  |
|-----|----|--|-----|----|--|
| (1) | a. | λ’íq-min’<br>arrive-RED<br>“to bring someone”                  | (2) | a. | λ’íq-min’-tʃ-af<br>arrive-RED-1SG.OBJ-3PL.ERG<br>“they brought me”             |
|     | b. | p’an’t-min<br>return-RED<br>“to returned something to someone” |     | b. | p’an’t-mín-tʃ-af<br>return-RED-1SG.OBJ-3ERG<br>“they returned something to me” |

In (1a) and (2a), glottalization surfaces on *-min’*, but in (2b) that glottalization is lost under stress. The account for deglottalization in (2a) given in van Eijk 1997 is that (2a) is influenced by the inflected form in (2b), and deglottalizes in anticipation of (2b) and other inflected forms.

Caldecott 2005 translates this generalization into an OT analysis by employing McCarthy 2005’s Optimal Paradigms framework, which allows for entire inflectional paradigms to be evaluated simultaneously to enforce intraparadigmatic uniformity. Central to the Optimal Paradigms framework is the claim that the Base Priority Principle of Benua 1997, which states that derived forms do not influence the realization of their bases, does not hold for inflectional paradigms – that bases can be influenced by their inflected forms.

I address the analysis presented in Caldecott 2005 on two fronts: first, I claim that it is possible to account for the data in (1) and (2) without appealing to intraparadigmatic faithfulness. I argue that deglottalization can be reanalyzed as being sensitive to any level of prosodic prominence, rather than being understood as an effect of main stress, in order to account for the attested alternations.

Second, I raise a broader theoretical concern about the complications implicit in Caldecott’s analysis. While the Optimal Paradigms framework is intended to work alongside Benua’s O-O Correspondence framework, exactly how the two models could be combined in the case of inflectional paradigms of morphologically complex verbs is unclear. I suggest that the relationship between the two required by Caldecott 2005, in which a OO evaluation of the verb feeds an OP evaluation of its inflectional paradigm, makes potentially problematic theoretical claims.