

de Lacy, Paul and Patrik Bye (in press for 2008). Lenition and stress. In Joaquim de Carvalho, Tobias Scheer, and Philippe Ségéral (eds.) *Lenition and Fortition*. Studies in Generative Grammar. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

On the synchronic phonological level ‘fortition’ and ‘lenition’ are no more than taxonomic labels that provide little insight into the cognitive processes involved. The processes covered by the terms are not formally unified. Both terms may refer to a range of distinct processes, including changes in phonological segment weight (gemination/degemination through insertion/deletion of moras), sonority or continuancy (occlusion/spirantization through change in the value of the feature [continuant], and so on), and voicing. We shall show that the motivations for lenition and fortition are just as diverse as the processes, perhaps even more so.

We will argue that there is no single constraint that motivates every process called ‘fortition’, and the same for ‘lenition’. In fact, even for the prototypical fortition process of metrically conditioned consonant gemination, there is no unique motivation; we identify three, outlined in (1).

- (1) *Metrical motivations for consonant gemination*
 - (a) Main stress weighting: PrWd heads must have two moras.
 - (b) Coda maximization: increase coda segments in foot heads.
 - (c) Syntagmatic restrictions: e.g. avoidance of clash.

Furthermore, consonant gemination is only one in a class of possible repairs. As we shall see, others include vowel lengthening, epenthesis, and metathesis.