

Haplology and Correspondence

Paul de Lacy

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
September 1998

Abstract

When the Dutch noun-forming suffix *-eling* attaches to words ending in *-el* (e.g. *edel* ‘noble’) the resulting form is not the expected **edeleling*, but instead *edeling*. This and other cases of morphological haplology raise two main questions:

- What is the nature of haplology?
- What triggers haplology?

Two opposing views have emerged regarding the nature of haplology: that it is *deletion* and that it is *coalescence*. In the deletion view, the phonological material of a haplogized affix is deleted or – equivalently – fails to be realised. In comparison, the coalescence view proposes that no phonological material has disappeared; instead, the two identical phonological strings have merged. This paper argues for haplology as coalescence, and adduces evidence from French and Japanese to support this.

The adoption of the coalescence view offers a ready-made explanation within Optimality Theory: the analysis presented employs the typical coalescence ranking of [MAX-IO, IDENT-IO » C » UNIFORMITY] (McCarthy 1995, Lamontagne & Rice 1993), where C is the haplology-triggering constraint (see below). It is demonstrated that this accounts not only for ‘typical’ cases of haplology as for *-eling*, but also for cases of partial-identity haplology, non-local haplology, discontinuous haplology, and reduplicative haplology.

The issue of what triggers haplology has also been given a great deal of attention. The approaches can be broadly divided into the *OCP* proposal and the *anti-structure* proposal. The OCP has been used to ban two adjacent identical elements on the same tier. To act as a trigger for haplology, the OCP has been extended to ban not only adjacent *elements*, but adjacent identical *strings*. In comparison, the anti-structure approach simply bans the proliferation of structure. This desire to minimise representation conflicts with a need to realise underlying features. In effect, this permits only identical strings to coalesce. The anti-structure approach is advocated here, showing that the anti-structure constraint *STRUC is an adequate motivating force for morphological haplology.

The Constraints:

- **MAX-IO** “Every segment in the input has a corresponding segment in the output.”
- **IDENT-F** “If a segment has a specification αF in the input, its output correspondent has the same specification.”
- ***STRUC** “Incur a violation for every element of structure.”
- **UNIFORMITY**: “Every segment in the output has only one input correspondent.”

(1) Haplology: *edel* ‘noble’ + *eling* → *edeling*, **edeeling*

$e d e_1 l_2 + e_3 l_4 i \eta$	MAX-IO	IDENT-F	*STRUC	UNIFORMITY
a. $e d e_1 l_2 e_3 l_4 i \eta$			x x x x x x x x!	
b. $e d e_1 l_2 i \eta$	x x ! (e ₃ & l ₄)		x x x x x x	
c. $e d e_3 l_4 i \eta$	x x ! (e ₁ & l ₂)		x x x x x x	
☞ d. $e d e_{1,3} l_{2,4} i \eta$			x x x x x x	x x

- Form (a) shows standard concatenation without haplology. This form is not the most harmonic due to its excessive violation of *STRUC – *edeeling* has more structure than *edeling*.
- Forms (b) and (c) show deletion of either affix material (b) or root material (c). The high-ranking MAX rules both these candidates out.
- Form (d) is the most harmonic. MAX is satisfied since every input element has a correspondent in the output. The fact that UNIFORMITY is violated is of no consequence given its low rank.

(2) No Haplology: *ban* ‘ban, prohibit’ + *eling* → *banneling* ‘exile’, **banning*, **beling*

$b a_1 n_2 + e_3 l_4 i \eta$	MAX-IO	IDENT-F	*STRUC	UNIFORMITY
☞ a. $b a_1 n_2 e_3 l_4 i \eta$			x x x x x	
b. $b a_{1,3} n_{2,4} i \eta$		x x!	x x x	
c. $b e_{1,3} l_{2,4} i \eta$		x x!	x x x	x x
d. $b a_1 n_2$	x x x x ! (eli η)			

- Tableau (2) is the contrasting case to *edeling*. For *ban+eling* there is no haplology due to the fact that there is no substring in *ban* that is identical to a substring in *eling*. There is no need to invoke a specific constraint against adjacent identical sequences, though. The fact that haplology only happens with identical strings is due to the high rank of IDENT-F...
- Candidates (b) and (c) have coalesced elements. In (b) the /a/ and /e/ have coalesced to form /a/. However, since /a/ and /e/ are *not identical* it follows that *some featural information will be lost in their coalescence*. This loss causes a violation of IDENT-F. Note that IDENT-F will not be violated if the two coalesced elements are *identical*. This difference in the violation of IDENT-F is the reason why haplology operates on *identical* strings.
- If violations of MAX and IDENT are avoided there is proliferation of structure as in candidate (a). While this causes violations of *STRUC, this is of no importance since the alternative candidates have already been ruled out by higher-ranked constraints.