

Non-uniformity in phonologically conditioned affix order in Yidij:
Evidence for strata

Marie-Luise Popp (Leipzig University), marie_luise.popp@uni-leipzig.de

In Yidij (Pama-Nyungan, Australia), some affixes lengthen the preceding syllable, such as the GOING and COMING suffixes. In combination with monosyllabic affixes, their position depends on the syllable structure of the root. With a bisyllabic root, the lengthening suffix follows the root, see (1-a). With a trisyllabic root, the lengthening suffix follows the CAUS/COMIT suffix, see (1-b). Dixon (1977) concludes that the affixes are ordered in such a way that the GOING suffix lengthens an even-numbered syllable. The INTRANS suffix is phonologically similar to the GOING suffix as it also lengthens the preceding syllable, as shown in (1-c). In (1-d), it combines with a trisyllabic root and a monosyllabic, inflectional PURP suffix creating a context which is similar to (1-b). In (1-d), however, reordering does not take place (see (1-e)). Hence there is an asymmetry between the derivational and inflectional suffixes: derivational suffixes are reordered, inflectional suffixes do not despite having the correct phonological shape.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(1) Affix order in Yidij</p> <p>a. magi-:ri-ŋa-l-ŋ
 [(ma.gi:)(ɹi.ŋal)]
 climb.up-GOING-COMIT/CAUS-CL-PRES</p> <p>b. maɟinda-ŋa-li-ŋ
 [(ma.ɟin)(da.ŋa:)liŋ]
 walk.up-COMIT/CAUS-GOING-PRES</p> <p>c. ɟara-:ɟi-ŋada-ŋ
 [(ɟa.ra:)(ɟi.ŋa)daŋ]
 stand-INTRANS-COMING-PRES</p> | <p>(Dixon 1977, 228)</p> <p>d. wuŋaba-:ɟi-na
 [(wu.ŋa).(ba.ɟi:).na]
 hunt.for-INTRANS-PURP</p> <p>e.*[(wu.ŋa).(ba.na:).ɟi]</p> |
|---|--|

Another asymmetry between derivation and inflection comes from final syllable shortening. In words with an odd number of syllables, the vowel of the final syllable is deleted to produce words with binary feet, but only if the resulting words end in a licit coda. With respect to this rule, derivational affixes behave differently than inflectional affixes. Consonants of inflectional affixes may be deleted to produce a licit coda (compare (2-a) and (2-b)) whereas consonants of derivational affixes may not be deleted, preventing shortening, see (2-c-e).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(2) Word-final deletion in Yidij</p> <p>a. /binarŋa-l-ŋunda/
 [(bi.nar)(ŋalŋu:n)]
 ‘warn-CL-DAT.SUBORD’</p> <p>b.*[(bi.nar)(ŋalŋu:nd)]</p> | <p>c. /guriŋ-ŋa/
 [(gu.ri:ŋ).ŋa]
 ‘good-CAUS/COMIT’</p> <p>d.*[(gu.ri:ŋŋ)]</p> <p>e.*[(gu.ri:ŋ)]</p> |
|---|--|

Phonologically conditioned affix order in Yidij is non-uniform: affixes behave differently despite having similar phonological shapes. I suggest an analysis couched in Stratal Optimality Theory stating that inflectional affixes are irrelevant for reordering because they enter the word-building process at a later point in the derivation, thus counter-feeding phonologically conditioned affix placement. In short, I take the asymmetries between derivational and inflectional affixes to result from a stratal makeup of the word, where the former belong to the stem level, while the latter belong to the word-level. Crucially, phonologically conditioned reordering and syllabification apply at stem-level, thus protecting consonants from deletion.

Reference: Dixon, Robert (1977) ‘A grammar of Yidij’