

Apparent weight-dependent infixing reduplication*

Hannah Sande (UC Berkeley)

sande570@berkeley.edu

Replication workshop · July 8-9, 2016

1 Introduction

Amharic (Semitic) [Ethiopia] seems to present two typological singularities:

1. The syllable weight system undeniably treats coda geminates but not other codas as moraic (Sande and Hedding to appear).
 2. There seems to be a cross-linguistically unique infixing reduplication pattern. **The adjectival plural and frequentative verbal infixes only surface in words containing heavy syllables.**
- Because only syllables closed by geminates are heavy, this reduplication pattern could be described on the surface as targeting geminates or heavy syllables:

(1) **Infixing reduplication apparently targets heavy syllables (geminates)**

Schema: CVC_i.C_iVC CV.C_iVC_i.C_iVC

Example: rädʒdʒim tall rädʒadʒdʒim tall.PL

- **Problem:** Geminate consonants and heavy syllables are not attested infixation pivots (Yu 2003, 2007).
 - Edge pivots: left- or rightmost consonant, vowel, or syllable
 - Prominence pivots: Stressed vowel, syllable, or foot
- Amharic infixing reduplication appears to target heavy syllables (those ending in geminates).
- If this is true, Amharic is the first attested language to do so.

In this talk:

1. I describe the infixing reduplication pattern in Amharic adjectives and verbs.
2. I demonstrate that a Stratal OT account of infixing reduplication in Amharic avoids stipulating the otherwise unattested pattern of geminates or heavy syllables as an infixation target.

* Instead, infixation targets stem-level stressed syllables, which include only heavy syllables.

- **The data** in this talk comes from original work with two female speakers from Debre Zeyit, Ethiopia (also called Bishoftu) and one male speaker from Addis Ababa. This data show certain consistent differences from previously attested patterns. When relevant to the analysis, they are pointed out.

*Thanks to my Amharic consultants Martha Ashine, Selamawit Ayalkabet, and Yadel Abraham, my colleague Andrew Hedding, audiences at UC Berkeley and NELS 2015, and to professors Dan Karvonen, Claire Halpert, Sharon Inkelas, and Larry Hyman.

2 Syllable weight and Stress

Simply put, only syllables with a geminate in coda position are heavy in Amharic.

- There are no long vowels in the language, and vowel length does not contribute to weight.
- Syllables may contain only one onset consonant and one coda consonant. Word-finally we see complex codas (ex. *k'ulf*, 'key'), and I assume the final consonant of a word is extrametrical.
- The largest possible syllable is CVC.
- **Stress:** The default stress pattern for standard Amharic is not consistently described in the literature:
 - The final syllable is not likely to be stressed, though the syllable preceding a geminate is (Leslau 2000:16).
 - Stress is not prominent, but the plural suffix /-otʃtʃ/ may be stressed (Hudson 1997:460).
 - There may be multiple (primary) stresses in words containing geminates (Armbruster 1908).
 - Codas in general contribute to weight (Mullen 1986).
 - Stress is lexically conditioned, but often falls on the vowel preceding a geminate (Haile 1987).
- Not all of these generalizations are consistent with each other.
- Here I provide a novel analysis of the stress system based on judgments from speakers and supported by acoustic evidence.
- Many, but not all, of the generalizations made in the previous literature are consistent with my findings.
- **The default stress pattern** of the language involves alternating syllable stress beginning at the left edge of the word.
- In words of odd-numbered syllables, the final syllable is not stressed.

(2) Alternating stresses from the left edge

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|----------------------|
| a. | (<u>mät.fät</u>) | 'to vanish' |
| b. | (<u>do.ro</u>) | 'chicken' |
| c. | (<u>mät.räf</u>).räf | 'to overflow' |
| d. | (<u>k'o.fi</u>).ja | 'hat' |
| e. | (<u>män.k'ä</u>).(sa.k'äs) | 'to move' |
| f. | (<u>t'ä.rä</u>).(p'e.za) | 'table' |
| g. | (<u>as.da</u>).(ka.käl).ku | 'I arranged (trans)' |

- I analyze this default stress pattern as involving binary left-aligned trochees.
- **Heavy syllables, those ending in geminates, are always stressed**, throwing off the default pattern. Syllables ending in a geminate are underlined.

(3) Geminates are always stressed

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------------|
| a. | se.(<u>totʃtʃ</u>) | 'women' |
| b. | mä.(<u>tʃäm.mär</u>) | 'to add' |
| c. | (<u>wiʃ</u> .ʃa).(wotʃtʃ) | 'dogs' |
| d. | (<u>ti.säb</u>).(ral.litʃ) | 'she breaks (trans)' |
| e. | ji.(säb.ra).(uall) | 'he will break (trans)' |
| f. | (<u>ij.jä</u>).(tät).(t'al).(lal).(latʃ.tʃih ^w) | 'you all are hating each other' |

- Geminate are always stressed, even when the result is clash or word-final stress, patterns we never find in words that lack geminates.
- Only syllables with geminate codas and not other codas attract stress (contra Mullen 1986's claim that all codas contribute to syllable weight).
- **Acoustic support**
 - To compare the acoustic properties of syllables marked as stressed versus unstressed based on the above description I performed a t-test.
 - Sample: 517 stressed syllables and 489 unstressed ones
 - Measurements: pitch, (F0), intensity (rms amplitude), and duration
 - Results: For all three measurements the stressed syllables were significantly different from the unstressed ones with a p-value of less than .01 ($p < .01$).
- The phonetic data confirm that those syllables deemed to be stressed given the above description are significantly acoustically different from other syllables.
- We know from other languages that stress is attracted to heavy syllables and from moraic theory that geminates are predisposed to be moraic (Hayes 1985; Hyman 1985; Tranel 1991).
- So, one way of modeling the attraction of stress to heavy syllables in Amharic would be to analyze syllables closed by geminates as bimoraic.
- Throughout this talk I will only consider candidates that are well-formed based on the syllable weight and stress patterns described here.

3 Plural adjective infixing reduplication

- Adjectives agree in number with nouns.
- The default plural affix on adjectives is the suffix /-otʃtʃ/, identical to the nominal plural suffix.

(4) Adjectival plural suffix

- a. takatʃ saw
lazy person
'Lazy person'
- b. takatʃ(-otʃtʃ) saw-otʃtʃ
lazy-PL person-PL
'Lazy people'
- c. k'ondʒo saw
beautiful person
'Beautiful person'
- d. k'ondʒo(-otʃtʃ) saw-otʃtʃ
beautiful-PL person-PL
'Beautiful people'

- The plural suffix /-otʃtʃ/ is always optional on adjectives.

- When an adjective contains a heavy syllable, however, a different plural morpheme surfaces:

a reduplicative infix surfacing inside the heavy syllable.

(5) **Reduplicative infix in plural adjectives containing heavy syllables**

a.	(<u>räd</u> ₃.d₃im)	saw	‘tall person’	rä.	(<u>d₃ad</u> ₃.d₃im)	sa.	(w- <u>otftf</u>)	‘tall people’
b.	(<u>atf</u> .tḥ’ir)		‘short’	a.	(<u>tḥ</u> ’atf.tḥ’ir)			‘short (PL)’
c.	(<u>tḥl</u> .lik’)		‘big’	tḥ.	(<u>lḥl</u> .lik’)			‘big (PL)’
d.	(<u>säf</u> .fi)		‘wide’	sä.	(<u>faf</u> .fi)			‘wide (PL)’
e.	(<u>k’atf</u> .tḥin)		‘skinny’	k’a.	(<u>tḥatf</u> .tḥin)			‘skinny (PL)’
f.	(<u>ad</u> .dis)		‘new’	a.	(<u>dad</u> .dis)			‘new (PL)’
g.	(<u>däm</u> .mak’)		‘bright’	dä.	(<u>mam</u> .mak’)			‘bright (PL)’
h.	(<u>käb</u> .bad)		heavy, difficult	kä.	(<u>bab</u> .bad)			heavy (PL)

- The reduplicative morpheme is always required in plural adjectives containing geminates.
- The same adjectives can also optionally take the suffix *-otftf*: räd₃ad₃d₃im-otftf.
- The following properties are always true of the reduplicative infix:
 - It has the shape CV
 - It surfaces inside the heavy syllable
 - The C of the reduplicant has identical features to the geminate of the heavy syllable
 - The V of the reduplicant is always central (like all epenthetic Vs in Amharic)
- In standard Amharic, reduplication in plural adjectives is unique to words containing geminates in penultimate root consonant position: *dägg* + PL ≠ **dägagg* (Leslau 2000; Mullen 1986).
- For my consultants, reduplication in adjectives occurs no matter where in the stem the geminate falls.
 - This finding is supported by corpus data.
 - In a recently developed corpus of 20,287,250 Amharic words, linguistics professor and native Amharic speaker Binyam Ephrem Seyoum reports that there are 72 instances of reduplicated *dägagg* (p.c.).
 - There are 593 total occurrences of the unreduplicated form *dägg*, all of which occur before singular or mass nouns.
- Despite what has been previously recorded for Amharic, I have found that speakers prefer reduplicated forms of all plural adjectives containing a geminate, no matter the position of the geminate within a stem.
- It is impossible for the reduplicative infix to surface in an adjective without a heavy syllable: **ta*ka*katf*, **k’o*no*ndzo*.
- Plural adjectives with heavy syllables must surface with the reduplicative infix, and may also surface with the suffix */-otftf/*: räd₃ad₃d₃im(otftf), **räd*₃d₃imotftf.
- We see two distinct adjectival plural morphemes, the suffix */-otftf/* and infixing reduplication.

4 Frequentative verbal infixing reduplication

- There is a frequentative morpheme which surfaces as a reduplicative infix within Amharic verbs.
- Like the plural marker on adjectives, the reduplicating frequentative morpheme can only surface in verbs whose stems contain a geminate¹.
 - To express a frequentative meaning for verbs without geminates, there is no alternative morpheme. Instead, a periphrastic construction is used.
- There is no semantic reason why verbs that contain a geminate should be able to take a frequentative meaning while others cannot (cf. (6a,b) where the only difference is the aspect of the verb).

(6) Verbal iterative infixing reduplication

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. | (<u>säb</u> .bä.)rä | ‘he broke’ | sä.(<u>bab</u> .bä.)rä | ‘he broke repeatedly’ |
| b. | (jə.sä.)b(ə)r | ‘he breaks’ | *(jə.sä.)(‘ba.b(ə)r) | ‘he breaks repeatedly’ |
| c. | (<u>mär</u> .rä.)qä | ‘he blessed’ | mä.(<u>rar</u> .rä.)qä | ‘he blessed repeatedly’ |
| d. | jə.(<u>mär</u> .räq) | ‘he blesses’ | (jə.mä.)(<u>rar</u> .räq) | ‘he blesses repeatedly’ |

- All verbs have a geminate in the perfective stem, so all verbs can reduplicate in the perfective aspect (6a,c) ².
- Not all verbs contain a geminate (heavy syllable) in the imperfective stem, thus not all imperfective verbs can undergo reduplication (6b).
- Those verbs that do not contain a geminate in the imperfect are called Type A verbs, while Type B and C verbs contain geminates in both the imperfect and the perfect. Types B and C are differentiated by other verb forms (Leslau 2000).

(7) Verb classes with geminates

	Perfect	Imperfect
Type A	Geminate	Geminate
Type B/C	Geminate	No Geminate

- Other forms in which heavy syllables do not always appear include imperatives, jussives, gerunds, participles, verbal nouns and instrumentals (Leslau 2000).
- Whether a verb in each of these forms can surface with frequentative reduplication is determined by whether that verb contains a geminate in the stem, not by the a verb’s inflectional class or meaning.
- Though some verbal prefixes and suffixes contain geminates (8), only stem geminates, underlined, can be the target of reduplication:

(8) Infixing in verbs with heavy syllable affixes

Non-iterative	Gloss	Iterative	*Iterative
<u>säbbär</u> -atftf-əhu	‘you all broke’	<u>säbabbär</u> -atftf-əhu	* <u>säbbär</u> -at fat ftf-əhu
ijjā- <u>käbbädä</u>	‘they are becoming heavy’	ijjā- <u>käbabbädä</u>	*ijjā- <u>käbbädä</u>

- Unlike the adjectival plural, there is no morphological alternative to express the iterative.

¹This pattern holds for my consultants, but presents some differences from what has been previously said in the Amharic literature. Rose (2003) and Leslau (2000) describe a pattern where penultimate root radicals can reduplicate to form the frequentative, regardless of whether a heavy syllable is present. I plan to conduct a corpus search project to determine which pattern is most prominent in modern day Amharic. For now, I continue describing the facts for my two consultants, though for an analysis of frequentative reduplication in Amharic as standardly described, see Rose (2003) and Schluter (2008).

²See Rose (2000, 2003) on the failure of reduplication of certain forms in Amharic and related languages due to certain phonetic and semantic constraints.

5 A Stratal OT approach

I argue for a Stratal OT account (Bermúdez-Otero 1999; Kiparsky 2000, 2008) of Amharic infixing reduplication. Any analysis of this data must account for the following:

1. The position of the reduplicative infix inside stem heavy syllables.
 2. The reduplicant shape as CV.
 3. The features of the reduplicant C as identical to the geminate consonant of the heavy syllable.
 4. The choice of the correct morpheme (infix or suffix) in the case of adjectives.
- For the proposed analysis, the relevant strata during which constraint evaluation takes place are the stem and word levels.

5.1 The position of the reduplicative infix

- Heavy syllables and geminates are not attested infixation pivots (Yu 2003, 2007).
- However, *stressed syllables* are attested targets of infixation; see Ulwa (McCarthy and Prince 1993) and Chamorro (Topping and Dungca 1973; Klein 1997).

(9) **Chamorro infixation targets the stressed syllable** (Yu 2003 citing Topping and Dungca 1973:259)

Noncontinuative	Gloss	Continuative	Gloss
'saga	'stay'	'sasaga	'staying'
hu'gando	'play'	hu'gagando	'playing'
'taitai	'read'	'tataitai	'reading'
'eggaʔ	'watch'	'eʔeggaʔ	'watching'

- To account for infixation targeting stressed syllables, we could posit a constraint such as **ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ)**, which aligns a morpheme to a stressed syllable.
 - **Align-L(Morpheme, 'σ)**: Assign one violation for every segment separating the left edge of X morpheme from the left edge of a stressed syllable³.
- Because only geminates are underlyingly moraic in Amharic, and all bimoraic syllables are stressed, at the stem level of analysis the only stressed syllables are the heavy ones, those ending in geminates.
- The pattern of left-aligned trochees is a surface phenomenon, which applies at the word level.
- So at the stem level we have **ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ)** ranked above a constraint on strict adjacency and immediate precedence from the input to the output, **CONTIGUITY** (McCarthy and Prince 1993).

(10) **ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ) ≫ CONTIGUITY (Stem Level)**

rädʒdʒim + PL(RED)	ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ)	CONTIGUITY
a. rä'dʒadʒdʒim		*
b. ra-rädʒdʒim	*!	

³In general, morpheme-specific constraints are disallowed in Stratal OT; however, prosodic alignment constraints are an exception to this rule (Bermúdez-Otero 2012)

(11) CONTIGUITY \gg ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ) (Word Level)

rä'dʒadʒdʒim + PL(otʃtʃ)	CONTIGUITY	ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ)
☞ a. rä.'dʒadʒ.dʒi.'m-otʃtʃ		*
b. rä.'dʒ-otʃ.'tʃ-adʒ.dʒim	*!	

- If a constraint like ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ) was highly ranked at the word level, we could imagine /-otʃtʃ/ as an infix, or affix heavy syllables as the target of infixation: *sābbār-atʃatʃtʃ-əhu.
- Thus, at the word level, ALIGN-L(PLURAL, 'σ) must be dominated by CONTIGUITY.
- This constraint ranking gets us the fact that only stem-level geminates can be the target of reduplicative infixation in Amharic.
- By aligning the plural morpheme to stressed syllables at the stem level, we avoid stipulating that the target of infixation in Amharic is a heavy syllable or a geminate, two otherwise unattested phenomena (cf. Yu 2003, 2007's typology).

5.2 The reduplicant shape

The reduplicant in Amharic surfaces as a CV.

- A constraint ensuring that each morpheme is pronounced rules out a zero-morph.
- Constraints against additional structure penalize larger reduplicants, constraints on well-formed syllables penalize shorter ones.
 - **RealizeMorph(eme)** (Kurusu 2001)
Assign one violation for each input morpheme that is not phonologically realized in the output.
 - ***Struc(ture)** (Prince and Smolensky 1993)
Assign one violation for each segment present in the output.
- Constraints regulating well-formed syllables rule out a C or V infix (cf. section 2).

(12) REALIZEMORPH \gg *STRUC (Stem Level)

rädʒdʒim + PL(RED)	REALIZEMORPH	*STRUC
☞ a. rä('dʒadʒ.dʒim)		8
b. ('rädʒ.dʒim)	*!	6
c. ('rädʒ.)'dʒadʒ.dʒim		9!

- A highly-ranked MAX-IO constraint prevents input structure from being deleted to satisfy *STRUC.

(13) REALIZEMORPH, MAXIO \gg *STRUC (Stem Level)

rädʒdʒim + PL(RED)	REALIZEMORPH	MAX-IO	*STRUC
☞ a. rä('dʒadʒ.dʒim)			8
b. ('rädʒ.dʒim)	*!		6
c. ('dʒadʒ.dʒim)		*!*	6

- The above constraint ranking shows that the CV shape of reduplicative infixes is phonologically optimizing and we need not specify it in the input.
- REALIZEMORPH must be ranked lower than MAX-IO at word level, equal to or rerankable with *STRUC in order to make the word-level plural affix /-otʃtʃ/ optional.

(14) MAXIO \gg REALIZEMORPH, *STRUC (Word Level)

rä('dʒadʒ.dʒim) + PL(otʃtʃ)	MAX-IO	REALIZEMORPH	*STRUC
☞ a. rä.('dʒadʒ.dʒi).('m-otʃtʃ)			11
☞ b. rä('dʒadʒ.dʒim)		*	8
c. ('dʒadʒ.dʒi).('m-otʃtʃ)	*!*		9

5.3 The reduplicant features

The infix consonant always shares features with a geminate stem consonant.

- To ensure that the infix consonant shares features with the geminate, I posit a constraint PROMINENCE.
 - **Prominence:** Assign one violation for every output consonant that is not identical to a prominent output consonant.
- A *prominent* segment is one that is moraic. At the stem level the only prominent consonant is the moraic geminate.
- This PROMINENCE constraint could be reworded as a correspondence constraint (Hansson 2001; Rose and Walker 2004) such as CORRCC-PROM. This constraint would be similar to Walker (2005)'s use of strong versus weak triggers.
 - For simplicity I use PROMINENCE, but I recognize that this is equivalent to a set of Agreement-by-Correspondence style constraints.
- This constraint must be ranked below IDENT-IO (Prince and Smolensky 1993) in order to prevent *all* consonants from surfacing identically to the geminate consonant (15c).
- Additionally, at the stem level PROMINENCE must be ranked *above* a constraint INTEGRITY against the input segment being doubly pronounced (McCarthy and Prince 1995) (15a,b).

(15) IDENT-IO \gg PROMINENCE \gg INTEGRITY (Stem Level)

rädʒdʒim + PL(RED)	IDENT-IO	PROMINENCE	INTEGRITY
☞ a. rä.('dʒadʒ.dʒim)		**	*
b. rä.('tadʒ.dʒim)		***!	
c. dʒä.('dʒadʒ.dʒidʒ)	*!*		***

- The ranking IDENT-IO \gg PROM ensures that only output segments that were not present in the input will surface with features of the prominent segment.
- At the stem level, we see that the ranking IDENT-IO \gg PROM \gg INTEGRITY gives us the correct stem.
- However, at the word level, we do not want consonants (including prominent ones) to correspond with more than one output segment: IDENT-IO \gg INTEGRITY \gg PROM.

(16) IDENT-IO \gg INTEGRITY \gg PROMINENCE (Word Level)

rä.('dʒadʒ.dʒim) + PL(otʃtʃ)	IDENT-IO	INTEGRITY	PROMINENCE
☞ a. rä.('dʒadʒ.dʒi).('m-otʃtʃ)			**
b. dʒä.('dʒadʒ.dʒi).('m-otʃtʃ)	*!	*	*
c. rä.('dʒadʒ.dʒi).ma.('tʃ-otʃtʃ)		*!	***

5.4 Morpheme selection

The reduplicant is the preferred plural morpheme in Amharic.

- There are two adjectival plural morphemes: the reduplicative infix and the suffix /-otʃtʃ/.
- /-otʃtʃ/ is always optional, both in words with and without geminate consonants.
- The reduplicant is never optional. It is required in stems containing geminates and it is impossible in stems without geminates.
- Because the reduplicant is a stem-level affix and /-otʃtʃ/ is a word-level one, a stem must undergo reduplication if possible (cf. Caballero and Inkelas 2013).
- The free ranking of REALIZE MORPH with *STRUC at the word level gives us the optionality of /-otʃtʃ/ (recall (14)).
- We need not specify a PREFER-MORPH constraint like Wolf (2008)'s analysis of suppletive allomorphs in Dyirbal because morpheme selection falls out from our other constraints.

5.5 Summary

The rankings above ensure that the reduplicant is required in stems containing geminates but impossible in those without.

- We have accounted for:
 - The position of the reduplicative infix in heavy syllables (stem-level stressed syllables),
 - The shape of the reduplicant as CV,
 - The features of the reduplicated consonant as identical to the geminate,
 - The choice of the correct plural morpheme.
- Crucially, we did not have to specify a constraint that aligns an infix to a heavy syllable or a geminate, which would be typologically unattested.

5.6 An apparent problem

- The addition of the passive/reflexive /t-/ prefix determines whether the stem it attaches to contains a geminate (Leslau 2000).
- Because it affects the shape of the stem, we could say the passive prefix is a stem-level one.
- This prefix /t-/ assimilates completely with the initial root consonant in non-perfective forms, creating an initial geminate.
 - One class of verbs (Type B) contains a geminated penultimate root consonant in the jussive (17a).
 - But the penultimate stem consonant of a Type B verb is not geminated in the passive jussive (17b). The geminate /ff/ in (17b) is the passive /t-/ combined with the stem-initial /f/.

(17) **Passive /t-/** (Leslau 2000:75)

- | | | | |
|----|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|
| a. | jɨ'fällig | ‘let him want’ | Type B jussive |
| b. | jɨffäläg | ‘let him be wanted’ | Type B passive jussive |

- The bimorphemic geminate created in passive forms is never the target of infixation in Amharic.

- **Problem:** If this prefix is stem-level and creates a stem-initial geminate, we would expect that geminate to be a possible target of infixation given the proposed analysis: *ji.(**faf**.fä.)läg
- **Solution:** I posit along the lines of Marvin (2002) that morphological operations and morphophonological constraints are evaluated after each syntactic phase (Chomsky 2001), and I claim that the passive /t-/ in Amharic is a phase head⁴.
- Following Buckley (to appear), I propose that a phase head can influence the shape of a stem without itself being part of that stem. Note that Vocabulary Insertion of the passive, in Distributed Morphology terms (Halle and Marantz 1994), is not necessary to determine the shape of the stem.
- Thus, the passive prefix determines whether the stem will contain a geminate second radical or not, but is not itself part of the stem-level of analysis.

6 Alternative approaches

While a Stratal OT approach can adequately account for the Amharic infixation data, both parallel and Harmonic Serialism accounts require stipulation and typologically ungrounded constraints.

6.1 A parallel OT account

- In Parallel OT (Prince and Smolensky 1993), constraints are evaluated only once, as opposed to once at each the stem, word, and phrase levels like in Stratal OT.
- This poses problems for a parallel account of Amharic reduplicative infixation, which surfaces only in *stem* heavy syllables (cf. section 5.1).
- **Problems:**
 - If referring to heavy syllables, how do we distinguish stem-level heavy syllables from non-stem heavy syllables in parallel OT?
 - If referring to stressed syllables, how do we distinguish the correct stem-level stressed syllable from possible other stem-level stressed syllables at the word level?
 - **Option 1:** Align infixes to stem heavy syllables: ALIGN-L(INFIX, $\sigma_{\mu\mu}$ -STEM)
 - * This is not ideal from a typological standpoint. We have to align an infix to a heavy syllable, which is not otherwise attested.
 - * We must refer to the stem-level of representation. In Stratal OT, this is built into the system, where as in Parallel OT it is a stipulation.
 - **Option 2:** Align infixes to stressed syllables in the stem: ALIGN-L(INFIX, ‘ σ -STEM)
 - * Like Option 1, this constraint must still refer to the stem.
 - * This constraint is not sufficient to ensure that *only* the stem-level heavy syllable will be stressed, since it is possible for multiple stem-level syllables to be stressed on the surface.
- **Takeaway:** Without stipulation and language-specific constraints that challenge existing typologies of infixation (Yu 2003, 2007), we cannot get Amharic plural and frequentative infixes to surface in the correct place in a parallel account: stem-level stressed syllables, surface-level heavy syllables.

⁴Further syntactic analysis is needed to determine whether there is further evidence to support this claim.

6.2 A Harmonic Serialism account

- An optimality-based serial alternative is Harmonic Serialism (HS) (McCarthy 2000)⁵
- HS, like Stratal OT, serially evaluates possible output forms of a single input, updating the input candidate along the way.
- Unlike Stratal OT, levels of evaluation in HS are not linked to hierarchical divisions (root vs stem vs word). Instead, each candidate in HS can be phonologically different from the input in maximally one way. The optimal candidate for one level of evaluation then becomes the input to the next level.

(18) Harmonic Serialism schema

First Level of Evaluation

Input	Constraint 1	Constraint 2
☞ Candidate 1		*
Candidate 2	*!	

Second Level of Evaluation

Candidate 1	Constraint 1	Constraint 2
☞ Candidate 1		*
Candidate 3	*!	

- I argue that an HS analysis of Amharic reduplication is inferior to a Stratal OT account for much the same reason that a parallel account is inferior (cf. section 6).
- **Position of the infix:** The position of the reduplicant inside stem-level heavy (stressed) syllables was easily accounted for in Stratal OT because there is a built-in stem level of analysis.
 - In HS, like parallel OT, we would need a constraint that specifically aligns the reduplicant to stem-level objects.
- Word-level affixes containing geminates are never the target of infixation (8), which is unproblematic in a Stratal OT account where the reduplicating infix is inserted at the stem level, before non-stem geminates are present.
 - In HS it is unclear how to target stem-level geminates without specifically referring to the stem, which is not otherwise a necessary theoretical object in HS.
- **Choice of plural morpheme:** Because /-otʃtʃ/ is not present at the stem level in a stratal analysis, we were able to give preference to the reduplicating morph due to precedence (cf. Caballero and Inkelas 2013).
 - Because there are not strata in HS, root, stem, and word-level morphemes must all be present in the input from the beginning: /rädʒdʒim+RED+otʃtʃ/.
 - Thus, we would need an alternative way to explain why the reduplicating plural morpheme is required when possible, but /-otʃtʃ/ is always optional.
- **Takeaway:** While an HS account of Amharic infixing reduplication may be possible, it is far less elegant than a Stratal OT account.

⁵See Hedding (2012) for an alternative attempt to analyze Amharic reduplication in Harmonic Serialism. He, too, concludes that the Amharic reduplication data is difficult to model in HS.

7 Conclusions

- Here we have seen that Amharic reduplicative infixation can better be accounted for with a Stratal OT account than a parallel one.
 - Any analysis that accurately accounts for Amharic reduplication must make reference to the stem.
 - Because distinct constraint rankings for root-, stem-, and word-levels of evaluation are built into Stratal OT, it seems to be the best model to fit the Amharic data.
- We have also seen that Amharic’s apparent weight-dependent infixation results from a synthesis of other properties:
 - A syllable weight system where only geminate codas make a syllable heavy,
 - A stress system where heavy syllables attract stress,
 - Stem-level infixation targeting stressed syllables.
- Thus, we can account for this system in a Stratal OT analysis with a combination of well-attested, typologically sound constraints, and without language-specific stipulations.
- Two of the three properties above are typologically rare, thus the combination of these three properties is even more rare, which explains why we don’t see more languages in which infixation appears to target heavy syllables.

References

- Armbruster, C.H. 1908. *Initia Amharica: An introduction to spoken Amharic*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 1999. *Constraint interaction in language change: quantity in English and Germanic*. University of Manchester.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2012. The architecture of grammar and the division of labour in exponence. In *The morphology and phonology of exponence*, ed. Jochen Trommer, volume 41, 8–83. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Buckley, Eugene. to appear. Global effects in Kashaya prosodic structure. In *The morphosyntax-phonology connection: Locality and directionality at the interface*, ed. Vera Griбанова and Stephanie Shih. Oxford University Press.
- Caballero, Gabriela, and Sharon Inkelas. 2013. Word construction: tracing an optimal path through the lexicon. *Morphology* 23:103–143.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Haile, Alemayehu. 1987. Lexical stress in Amharic. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 20:19–43.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1994. Some key features of Distributed Morphology. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 21:88.
- Hansson, Gunnar Ólafur. 2001. Theoretical and typological issues in consonant harmony. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1985. *A metrical theory of stress rules*. New York: Garland.
- Hedding, Andrew. 2012. Reduplication strategy in Amharic adjectives. *Honor's thesis, University of Minnesota*.
- Hudson, Grover. 1997. Amharic and Agrobba. In *The Semitic languages*, ed. Robert Hetzron. Routledge.
- Hyman, Larry. 1985. *A theory of phonological weight*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2000. Opacity and cyclicity. *The linguistic review* 17:351–367.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2008. Fenno-Swedish quantity: Contrast in Stratal OT. In *Rules, constraints, and phonological phenomena*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, Thomas B. 1997. Output constraints and prosodic correspondence in Chamorro reduplication. *Linguistic inquiry* 707–715.
- Kurusu, Kazutaka. 2001. The phonology of morpheme realization. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz.
- Leslau, Wolf. 2000. *Introductory grammar of Amharic*. Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Marvin, Tatjana. 2002. Topics in the stress and syntax of words. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- McCarthy, John, and Alan Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. In *University of Massachusetts occasional papers in linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*, ed. Jill Beckman, Laura Dickey, and Suzanne Urbanczyk, 249–384. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- McCarthy, John J. 2000. Harmonic serialism and parallelism. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society 30*, ed. Masako Hirotani, 501–524. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- McCarthy, John J, and Alan Prince. 1993. *Generalized alignment*. Springer.
- Mullen, Dana. 1986. Issues in the morphology and phonology of Amharic: The lexical generation of clitics. Doctoral Dissertation, U of Ottawa.
- Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. 2004. *Optimality Theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*.
- Rose, Sharon. 2000. Multiple correspondence in reduplication. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, volume 23, 315–326.
- Rose, Sharon. 2003. The formation of Ethiopian Semitic internal reduplication. *Language Acquisition and*

Language Disorders 28:79–98.

- Rose, Sharon, and Rachel Walker. 2004. A typology of consonant agreement as correspondence. *Language* 475–531.
- Sande, Hannah, and Andrew Hedding. to appear. Amharic syllable weight. In *Syllable weight in Africa*, ed. Paul Newman.
- Schluter, Kevin. 2008. Amharic internal reduplication and foot structure: A word-based approach. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* .
- Topping, Donald M, and Bernadita C Dungca. 1973. *Chamorro reference grammar*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Tranel, Bernard. 1991. CVC light syllables, geminates and moraic theory. *Phonology* 8:291–302.
- Walker, Rachel. 2005. Weak triggers in vowel harmony. *Natural language & linguistic theory* 23:917–989.
- Wolf, Matthew Adam. 2008. Optimal interleaving: Serial phonology-morphology interaction in a constraint-based model. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Yu, Alan. 2003. The phonology and morphology of infixation. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley* .
- Yu, Alan. 2007. The phonology-morphology interface from the perspective of infixation. *New challenges in typology: Broadening the horizons and redefining the foundations* 35–54.