

§1 Overview: *Hierarchy model* of lexical categories

- (1) Lexical categories: Noun (N), adjective (A), verb (V)
→ **Also relevant for phonology** (e.g., Cohen 1964, Postal 1968, Kenstowicz & Kisseberth 1977, Smith 1997, 2001, 2011, Bobaljik 2008)
- (2) Phonological evidence supports a **hierarchy model**
§2, §3 LCs form a hierarchical scale, N > A > V
(Ross 1972, Comrie 1975, Croft 1990)
- §4 Proposal connects with general insights about **markedness scales** in linguistic typology
- §5, §6 Binary-feature LC models [$\pm N$], [$\pm V$] (Chomsky 1970, Jackendoff 1977, Baker 2003) make problematic predictions

§2 Phonological evidence: A hierarchy of privilege

- (3) LC-sensitive phonological patterns overwhelmingly follow this hierarchy of privilege: **N > A > V**
• Here, *privilege* is taken to mean *ability to support phonological contrasts*
- (4) This hierarchy predicts languages in which
 - (a) only **nouns are privileged** (N > {A, V}) | (5)
 - (b) only **verbs are restricted** ({N, A} > V) | (6)
 - (c) **adjectives are intermediate** (N > A > V) | (7)
- (5) ***Noun privilege*** (N > {A, V}): Japanese accent (McCawley 1968)
 - (a) N → **contrast**: Accent may occur on any syllable
 - (b) V, A → **no contrast**: Determined by inflectional form
- (6) ***Verb restriction*** ({N, A} > V): Spanish stress (Harris 1983)
 - (a) N, A → **contrast**: Stress on any of the last three syllables
 - (b) V → **no contrast**: Determined by inflectional form
- (7) ***Adj intermediate*** (N > A > V): Hebrew stress (Becker 2003)
 - (a) N → **2 degrees of contrast**
 - Mobile ≠ fixed stress
 - If fixed, location contrastive
 - (b) A → **1 degree of contrast** Mobile ≠ fixed stress
 - (c) V → **no contrast** Mobile stress only
 - For additional examples, see typological survey in Smith (2011)

§3 Modeling privilege: Blocking/triggering classes

- (8) For a phonological grammar to follow the hierarchy of privilege N > A > V, it must produce either/both (a), (b):
 - (a) **Blocking classes**—contrasts are protected
BC{nouns only}, BC{nouns+adj}
 - (b) **Triggering classes**—undergo specific neutralization
TC{verbs only}, TC{verbs+adj}
- (9) Similar patterns, but contradict hierarchy of privilege:
 - (a) ***Blocking classes**—incorrect typological predictions
BC{verbs only}, BC{adj only}, BC{verbs+adj}
 - Empirically *weaker* categories *protected* from neutralization
 - (b) ***Triggering classes**—incorrect typological predictions
TC{nouns only}, TC{adj only}, TC{nouns+adj}
 - Empirically *stronger* categories *targeted* for neutralization
- (10) Goal: **Distinguish the classes in (8) from those in (9)**

§4 Lexical categories as a markedness scale

- (11) Proposal: Lexical categories are a **markedness scale**
- (12) **Markedness scale**: Family of related linguistic features

phonology (de Lacy 2006)	morphosyntax (Aissen 2003)
• sonority (Parker 2002)	• animacy (Silverstein 1976)
• place (Lombardi 2001)	• case (Keenan & Comrie 1977)
• nasalization (Walker 1998)	• definiteness (Croft 1988)
- (13) Linguistic phenomena are **anchored** at one end of scale
 - (a) Sonority: Syllable onsets → low-sonority end
 - High-sonority onsets allowed only if low-sonority onsets are
 - (b) Animacy: Subject → high-animacy end
 - Inanimate subjects allowed only if animate, human subj are
- (14) **Proposal for lexical categories as a markedness scale**
 - (a) **Blocking classes**: anchored to high-privilege end (N)
 - (b) **Triggering classes**: anchored to low-privilege end (V)

Result: The classes in (8) are storable; (9) are not

§5 Feature-based models *overgenerate*

- (15) Binary-feature [$\pm N$, $\pm V$] approaches to LCs

(a) Jackendoff (1977)			(b) Baker (2003)		
	+V	-V		+V	-V
+N	adjective	noun	+N	—*	noun
-N	verb	(preposition)*	-N	verb	adjective

*Baker (2003) argues that *preposition* is a functional, not a lexical, category
- (16) **Problem:** Too many natural classes predicted

classes formalized with single feature	Jackendoff (1977):				Baker (2003):			
	[-V]	[-N]	[+N]	[+V]	[+N]	[+V]	[-V]	[-N]
Predicted classes of lexical categories:	nouns	verbs	nouns	verbs	+adj	+adj		
Is class attested as a...	blocking class? (8a)/(9a)	yes	no!	yes	no!	yes	no!	yes
	triggering class? (8b)/(9b)	no!	yes	no!	yes			
- (17) Need **external stipulations** to rule out undesired classes

§6 Feature-based models *undergenerate*

- (18) Morphosyntax argument for scale-based model of LCs:
 - ‘squishes’ = subdivisions in N, A, V (Ross 1972)
 - Not predicted in a [$\pm N$, $\pm V$] model
- (19) Evidence for squishes in phonology also
 - Jordanian Arabic proper nouns resist syncope; common nouns, other categories undergo syncope (Jaber 2011)
- (20) LC squish has a precedent in phonology: *sonority*
 - Some languages make more distinctions than others

§7 Conclusions

- (21) Phonological typology...
 - supports the **hierarchy model** of LCs (N > A > V)
 - not the feature-based model ([$\pm N$, $\pm V$])
- (22) Modeling LCs as a hierarchy relates LC-specific effects to the general phenomenon of **markedness scales**

References

Aissen, J. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *NLLT* 21. • Baker, M. 2003. *Lexical categories*. CUP. • Becker, M. 2003. Lexical stratification of Hebrew: The disyllabic maximum. *LATL* 19. • Bobaljik, J. 2008. Paradigms (Optimal and otherwise): A case for skepticism. Bachrach & Nevins, *Inflectional Identity*. OUP. • Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. Jacobs & Rosenbaum, *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Ginn. • Cohen, M. 1964. Catégories de mots et phonologie. *Revue de Linguistique* 10. • Croft, W. 1988. *Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de M. le Prince N. S. Trubetzkoy* [1939]. U Alabama. • Comrie, B. 1975. Polite plurals and predicate agreement. *Lg* 51. • Croft, W. 1988. Agreement vs. case marking and direct objects. Barlow & Ferguson, *Agreement in natural language*. CSLI. • Croft, W. 1990. A conceptual framework for grammatical categories. *Journal of Semantics* 7. • Harris, J. 1983. *Syllable structure and stress in Spanish*. MIT Press. • Jaber, A. 2011. High vowel syncope in Jordanian Arabic: A positional faithfulness treatment. Ms., UNC. • Jackendoff, R. 1977. *X-bar syntax*. MIT Press. • Keenan, E., & B. Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *LJ* 8. • Kenstowicz, M., & C. Kisseberth. 1977. *Topics in phonological theory*. Academic Press. • Lacy, Paul de. 2006. *Markedness: Reduction and preservation in phonology*. CUP. • Lombardi, L. 2001. Why Place and Voice are different. Lombardi, *Segmental phonology in Optimality Theory*. CUP. • McCawley, J. 1968. *The phonological component of a grammar of Japanese*. Mouton. • Parker, S. 2002. *Quantifying the sonority hierarchy*. PhD diss., UMass. • Postal, P. 1968. *Aspects of phonological theory*. Harper and Row. • Ross, J. 1972. Endstation Hauptwort: The category squish. *CLS* 8. • Silverstein, M. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. Dixon, *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. • Smith, J. 1997. Noun faithfulness. Ms., UMass. ROA-242. • Smith, J. 2001. Lexical category and phonological contrast. *PETL* 6. U Alberta. • Smith, J. 2011. Category-specific effects. *Blackwell Companion to Phonology*. Blackwell. • Walker, R. 1998. *Nasalization, neutral segments, and opacity effects*. PhD diss., Santa Cruz.