

TEMPLATE VARIATION IN CHUKCHANSI YOKUTS

PETER ARA GUEKGUEZIAN

Department of Linguistics, University of Rochester

1 Templatic Morphology in Chukchansi Yokuts

Templatic morphology in Chukchansi, as in other Yokuts languages, involves phonologically unpredictable root alternations that are associated with specific suffixes.¹² These root alternations involve inserting, deleting, shortening, lengthening, and altering the quality of vowels; they can also involve insertion of a glottal stop or glottalization. The alternations are phonologically unpredictable because they are not driven by syllable phonotactics, which drive other vowel alternations in Chukchansi. I follow the literature in calling such alternations “templatic” because roots with different shapes in other contexts have a single target shape in the context of specific suffixes. The target shape can be characterized in terms of either consonants and vowels—a CV-template (McCarthy 1979, Archangeli 1983)—or syllables—a prosodic template (McCarthy & Prince 1986, Archangeli 1991).

For example, in (1), the root /lihm/ ‘run’ has different forms in (1 a-b) and (2). With the RECENT PAST suffix /t /, the form of the root is [lih.m]; the high vowel [i] is inserted between the root and the suffix [t]. With the REMOTE PAST suffix /t a /, the form of the root is [li.him], with [i] inserted inside the root. In both (1 a-b), the appearance of epenthetic [i] is predictable, based on the CV(X) syllable canon in Yokuts languages, which disallows consonant clusters within a syllable (Newman 1944, Hockett 1967, Kenstowicz and Kisseberth 1979).

¹ Chukchansi belongs to the Yokuts group of languages, indigenous to Central California. Previous studies of Chukchansi include Newman (1944), as part of his grammar of six varieties of Yokuts, and Collord’s (1968) *Chukchansi Grammar*. All word forms in this paper have been spoken by two native speakers of Chukchansi, Holly and Jane Wyatt, who are sisters raised by their Chukchansi-speaking grandmother. Chukchansi, like all indigenous

- (1) a. [lih.mit] *[lihmt]
 /lihm-t /
 run-RCT.PST³
 ‘ran’ (recent past)
- b. [li.him.t a] *[lihmt a]
 /lihm-t a /
 run-REM.PST
 ‘ran’ (remote past)

In (2), with the AGENTIVE nominalizer /t ’/, the form of the root is [le.he:.m]: a long mid vowel [e:] is inserted into the root, creating a light-heavy disyllable (henceforth “LH”). A high vowel [i] is also epenthesized, between the root and the suffix [t ’].

- (2) [le.he:.mit ’] *[lih.mit ’]
 /lihm-t ’ /
 run-AGTV
 ‘one that runs’ (nom)

The appearance of the long vowel [e:] is not driven by phonotactics, since the other epenthetic vowel [i] suffices to syllabify all the consonants of the word. Rather, the goal is for the root to form an LH, or equivalently, that the word begins in LH. This is the sense in which Chukchansi has templatic mor-50 (E)-2 (he) Q (l) -nensi

(3) Different roots, same templatic suffix = LH template

a. [

root or suffix, or even between different forms of a templatic word that has the same morphological and semantic content.

The question this paper poses is: What can template

short. Note the alternations in the atemplatic forms of /pe:wn/, with shortening and [i]-epenthesis in (10a) and [i]-epenthesis inside the root in (10b); these are motivated by syllable phonotactics.

(9) Short High Vowel 3C Roots

[le.he".met]

(repeated from (4a))

/lihm-e-t /

run-CAUS-RCT.PST

'made someone run' (recent past)

(10) Long Mid Vowel 3C Roots

a. [pew.nit]

/pe"wn-t /

sew-RCT.PST

'sewed it' (recent past)

b. [pe".win.t a]

/pe"wn-t a /

sew-REM.PST

'sewed' (remote past)

c. [pe.we".net]

/pe"wn-e-t /

sew-AGTV

'made someone sew' (recent past)

Roots with low vowels always have two low vowels in templatic forms, whether 2C roots like /xat / (5) or 3C roots like / aml/

(11) 2C vs. 3C durative form

a. [xa.t a. an']
/xat - a-n'/
eat-DUR-

[CV.Ca.- a-n']

4 Lexical Specification

This section looks at template variation that is lexically specified

- b. [he.wet .t a]
 /hewe t -t a /
 walk-REM.PST
 ‘walked’ (remote past)
- c. [hiw.t it ’] Collord (1968:68)
 /hewe t -t ’/
 walk-AGTV
 ‘one that walks’ (nom) “walker” in Collord
- d. [he.we .t et]
 /hewe t -e-t /
 walk-CAUS-RCT.PST
 ‘made someone walk’ (recent past)

In our consultant’s speech, the agentive form does not have the monosyllabic template, but is LH instead [he.we .t it ’] ‘one who walks’.

The agentive templatic suffix also occurs with lengthened final root vowels of some multi-vowel (MV) roots. As noted at the beginning of section 3, templatic morphology is typically restricted to roots with one vowel (or CVCV:(C) roots, which pattern with one-vowel roots in Yokuts; Newman 1944, Gamble 1978). Multi-vowel (MV) roots for the most part do not undergo

(17) MV Roots with vowel lengthened in Agentive forms

- a. [tuk.mat]
/tukma-t /
bruise-RCT.PST
'bruised' (recent past)
- b. [tuk.ma.t a]

- Guekguezian, Peter. 2017a. Templates as the interaction of recursive word structure and prosodic well-formedness. *Phonology* 34.1, 81-120.
- Guekguezian, Peter. 2017b. *Prosodic Recursion and Syntactic Cyclicality inside the Word*. PhD Dissertation, USC.
- Hockett, Charles. 1967. The Yawelmani basic verb. *Language* 43, 208-222.
- Kenstowicz, Michael and Charles Kisseberth. 1979. *Generative Phonology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1967. *Yawelmani Phonology*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- McCarthy, John J. 1979. *Formal Problems in Semitic Phonology and Morphology*. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- McCarthy, John J. and Alan Prince. 1986. *Prosodic Morphology*. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst and Brandeis University.
- Newman, Stanley. 1944. *Yokuts Language of California*. New York: Viking.
- Tranel, Bernard. 1995. Rules vs. constraints: a case study. *Rutgers Optimality Archive* 72.
- Zoll, Cheryl. 1996. *Parsing below the Segment in a Constraint-based Framework*. PhD Dissertation, UC Berkeley.