
Dominance and anti-dominance in Lithuanian

Yuriy Kushnir

Universität Leipzig

yuriy.kushnir@uni-leipzig.de

Introduction. The classic notion of dominance describes a scenario in which a derivational suffix erases the existing accent of a prosodically strong base and imposes its own accent (Halle & Vergnaud 1987; Inkelas 1998). This is found in the following derivation in Lithuanian: $\acute{e}ln + \acute{i}en \rightarrow eln\acute{i}en-$, $*\acute{e}lnien-$ ‘deer meat’ (Ambrazas 2005, 2006; Stundžia 2009). In another type of dominance, a derivational suffix does not impose its own accent but makes an underlyingly strong accent within the base weak: $\acute{e}ln + en \rightarrow \acute{e}lnen-$ ‘deer hide’. The interesting part about this leniting dominance type is that the accent of the base is not lost entirely (Kushnir 2019). Finally, Lithuanian has a mirror-image phenomenon called fortification (Kushnir 2019), whereby a suffix consistently makes a weak accent within a base strong: $dra\acute{u}g + i\check{s}k \rightarrow dra\check{u}gi\check{s}k-$ ‘friendly-’.

Proposal. Existing literature (Halle & Vergnaud 1987, Inkelas 1998, Alderete 2001) usually explains fully erasing dominance and does not predict leniting dominance and fortification effects. My analysis relies on supplying the above derivational morphemes with floating accents whose activity level can be positive or negative: $H_{[-0.5]}\acute{i}en$, $H_{[-0.5]}en$, $H_{[+0.5]}i\check{s}k$ (cf. Smolensky & Goldrick 2016; Rosen 2016; Kushnir 2019; Zimmermann 2018, 2019, 2021 for models with Gradient Symbolic Representations). Due to their association with the suffix, the floating accents must find a docking host within the base. Since every morphological base in Lithuanian has an accent (Kushnir 2022), the least costly thing to do for the floating accent of the derivational morpheme is to coalesce with the existing accent of the base: this prevents constraint violations incurred by creating and erasing association lines. An accent with a negative activity level subtracts activity from the accent of the base. If the suffix has its own accent, it may then win due to its strength. If the suffix has no accent of its own, the accent of the base survives despite having been weakened. If the derivational morpheme has a positively specified accent, it will add activity to a weak accent.

- (1) $\acute{e}ln + H_{[-0.5]}\acute{i}en \rightarrow eln\acute{i}en-$
 $\acute{e}ln + H_{[-0.5]}en \rightarrow \acute{e}lnen-$
- (2) $dra\acute{u}g + H_{[+0.5]}i\check{s}k \rightarrow dra\check{u}gi\check{s}k-$

Adding floating featural material to the underlying representations of derivational morphemes allows one to capture three related morphophonological effects in a uniform manner without having to resort to lexically-indexed constraints, output-output correspondence or other complications of the evaluative component of the grammar.