

Two Processes or two Forms?

Accounting for Ambiguous Tone Spreading in Prinmi



► 1. OVERVIEW

This project provides a unified theory of **tone spreading** in two varieties of **Prinmi** (Půmǐ), positing **more complex representations** rather than diverging phonological processes

► 2.THE PRINMI (PŮMĬ) LANGUAGE

Sino-Tibetan Qiangic language(s) spoken in China's Southwestern provinces of Sichuan and Yunnan

Present work focuses on the Wǎdū Pǔmǐ (WDP) and Xīnyíngpán Pǔmǐ (XYP) varieties

Both show two kinds of rightward tone spreading from stems to suffixes and clitics:

- Contour Spreading (CS)
- $F + \sigma \rightarrow H.L$
- High Tone Spreading (HTS) $H + \sigma \rightarrow \underline{H.H}$

Tone Spreading in WDP and XYP

Tone	σ	$\sigma + \sigma$	$\sigma + \sigma.\sigma$	σ + σ.σ.σ
F	F	H.L	H.L.L	H.L.L.L
Н	Н	<u>H.H</u>	<u>H.H</u> .L	<u>H.H</u> .L.L
R+S	R	L.H	L. <u>H.H</u>	L.<u>H</u>. L
R-S*	R	L.H	L.H.L	L.H.L.L

^{*}attested in XYP only

► 3. PROBLEM

In **WDP**, contour spreading **always** results in high tone spreading:

1. $/pi^R/+/=gonni/ \rightarrow [pi^L=go^Hnni^H]$ Eng. Gloss: belly=AGT (Daudey, 2014)

In **XYP**, only **some** rising tone words show both **CS** and **HTS**:

2. $/dzj\tilde{o}dz^{iR}/ + /=mz^{H}[e/ \rightarrow [dzj\tilde{o}^{L}dz^{iL}=mz^{H}]e^{L}]$ Eng. Gloss: buffalo=tail (Ding, 2014)

Connor Bechler – bechler4@msu

► 4. POSSIBLE ACCOUNTS

- I. Different rules → doesn't explain XYP
- II. Serial effects → paradoxical predictions
- III. Different underlying representations...
- a. ... to **block spreading** (Hyman, 2009)
- b. ... to trigger spreading (Ding, 2014)

L BLOCKS SPREADING?

Positing R-S is /LHL/ stops spreading in R-S:

3. $/LHL/ + \sigma.\sigma \rightarrow [L.H.L]$

However, this requires $/HL/ \rightarrow [H]...$

- 4. a. $/LHL/ \rightarrow [LH]$ b. $/LHL/ + \sigma \rightarrow /L.HL/ \rightarrow [L.H]$
- ... which predicts no surface F tones (Hyman, 2009)
- 5. a. /HL/ *→ [H]
 - b. $\sigma + /HL/ \rightarrow [\sigma.HL] * \rightarrow [\sigma.H]$

... and H and F tones are (minimally) contrastive on monosyllables (Daudey, 2014; Ding, 2007)

> HH TRIGGERS SPREADING?

Positing **H** is /HH/ and **R+S** is /LHH/ accounts for both kinds of spreading via one process:

6. a. /LHH/ + σ . $\sigma \rightarrow$ [L.H.H] b. /HH/ + $\sigma \rightarrow$ [H.H]

Doesn't require additional pruning of pathological outputs like underlying /LHL/:

- 7. a. $/HH/ \rightarrow [HH]$ b. $/LHH/ \rightarrow [LH]$ c. $/LHH/ + /\sigma/ \rightarrow [L.HH] = [L.H]$
- Requires an apparent OCP violation, but some other Sino-Tibetan languages allow adjacent high tones (Tianjin Mandarin, c.f. Chen, 2000; Yu, c.f. Jia, 2021)

> SERIAL RULES/STRATAL OT?

Both **CS** and **HTS** occur across morpheme and stem boundaries:

8. $/ \text{Jatsi}^R / + / \tilde{\text{o}} / + / = \text{ge} / \rightarrow [\text{Jatsi}^L \tilde{\text{o}}^H = \text{ge}^H]$ $/ \text{liquor} + clean + TOP \rightarrow "As for clean liquor"}$ (Ding, 2006)

Post lexical spreading implies spread across tone group boundaries → doesn't occur

If conditioned by rule order, paradox in XYP

- 9. R+S: $/R/ + \sigma.\sigma \rightarrow /L.H.\sigma/ \rightarrow [L.H.H]$ Requires CS to produce H feeding HTS
- 10. R-S: $/R/ + \sigma.\sigma \rightarrow /R.\sigma.\sigma/ \rightarrow [\textbf{L.H}.\sigma]$ Requires CS after HTS to counterfeed

► 5. TAKE AWAYS

L blocks spread implies distinct HTS and CS

- Favored if <u>prioritizing simplest tone URs</u>
- → but predicts zero surface falling tones and requires additional pruning rules

HH triggers spread explains HTS via CS

- Favored if <u>prioritizing simplest processes</u>
- → but requires WDP learners to store unnecessary info

If falling tones are contrastive, then HH triggers spread is more parsimonious

► 6. ASK ME MORE!

- Why assume these two varieties are comparable?
- II. What diachronic implications does this have?
- III. How could I fully answer this?
- IV. What about floating tones?

REFERENCES