

'Spread' won't spread

There are no fortis+fortis clusters in English

Péter Szigetvári <szigetvari@elte.hu>

Eötvös Loránd University

PLM, Poznań 2017-09-19

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*
- ▶ across foot boundary: also

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*
- ▶ across foot boundary: also
 - ▶ fortis+lenis: *Afghan, anecdote*

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*
- ▶ across foot boundary: also
 - ▶ fortis+lenis: *Afghan, anecdote*
 - ▶ lenis+fortis: *Aztec, gazpacho*

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*
- ▶ across foot boundary: also
 - ▶ fortis+lenis: *Afghan, anecdote*
 - ▶ lenis+fortis: *Aztec, gazpacho*
- ▶ this scheme fits what we see in voicing languages: adjacent obstruents share “voice”

monomorphemic obstruent clusters: wide-spread view

- ▶ at word edges
 - ▶ mostly fortis+fortis: *spot, stop, scot; apse, quartz, ax, depth; wasp, cost, soft, mosque; apt, act*
 - ▶ rarely lenis+lenis *adze, aux* [o:gz]
- ▶ within foot: only
 - ▶ fortis+fortis: *aspen, aster, rascal; chapter, actor; asphalt, esthete*
 - ▶ lenis+lenis: *husband, wisdom, Glasgow; observation, existential; abdomen, Ogden*
- ▶ across foot boundary: also
 - ▶ fortis+lenis: *Afghan, anecdote*
 - ▶ lenis+fortis: *Aztec, gazpacho*
- ▶ this scheme fits what we see in voicing languages: adjacent obstruents share “voice”
- ▶ but English is not a voicing language

comparison of “voice” and nasal place sharing

	“voice”	nasal place
within foot	obligatory	obligatory
across foot boundary	—	optional**
across morpheme boundary	—/obligatory*	optional***

comparison of “voice” and nasal place sharing

	“voice”	nasal place
within foot	obligatory	obligatory
across foot boundary	—	optional**
across morpheme boundary	—/obligatory*	optional***

- * voice sharing **only** with past/pp suffix (-ed), enclitic *had*, *would* ('d; henceforth D) and pl/gen/3sg suffix (-(e)s), enclitic *has*, *is* ('s; henceforth Z), why?

comparison of “voice” and nasal place sharing

	“voice”	nasal place
within foot	obligatory	obligatory
across foot boundary	—	optional**
across morpheme boundary	—/obligatory*	optional***

* voice sharing **only** with past/pp suffix (-ed), enclitic *had*, *would* ('d; henceforth D) and pl/gen/3sg suffix (-(e)s), enclitic *has*, *is* ('s; henceforth Z), why?

** *dieffenbáchia* [nb]/[mb], *mangánic* [ng]/[ŋg]

comparison of “voice” and nasal place sharing

	“voice”	nasal place
within foot	obligatory	obligatory
across foot boundary	—	optional**
across morpheme boundary	—/obligatory*	optional***

* voice sharing **only** with past/pp suffix (-ed), enclitic *had*, *would* ('d; henceforth D) and pl/gen/3sg suffix (-(e)s), enclitic *has*, *is* ('s; henceforth Z), why?

** *dieffenbáchia* [nb]/[mb], *mangánic* [ng]/[ŋg]

*** *ten pounds* [np]/[mp], *ten quid* [nk]/[ŋk]

fortis vs lenis

fortis obstruents

- ▶ may spread their Cness on adjacent sounds (voicelessness, aka aspiration, preglottalization, shortening of preceding vowel; nb aspiration is “shortening of (the voiced part of) the following vowel”)
- ▶ represented by [spread (glottis)], [aspirated], H, . . .

fortis vs lenis

fortis obstruents

- ▶ may spread their Cness on adjacent sounds (voicelessness, aka aspiration, preglottalization, shortening of preceding vowel; nb aspiration is “shortening of (the voiced part of) the following vowel”)
- ▶ represented by [spread (glottis)], [aspirated], H, ...

lenis obstruents

- ▶ may accommodate (some of) the Vness (spontaneous voicing) of adjacent sounds (sonorants)
- ▶ represented by the absence of [spread], [aspirated], H, ...

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial
 - ▶ presupposes \$sC contra plenty of evidence

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial
 - ▶ presupposes \$sC contra plenty of evidence
 - ▶ also no aspiration after other fortis fricatives: *kaftan*, *gestalt*, even *fifteen* (G. Kiss 2017), so *fi\$ftéen*~*fif #teen*

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial
 - ▶ presupposes \$sC contra plenty of evidence
 - ▶ also no aspiration after other fortis fricatives: *kaftan*, *gestalt*, even *fifteen* (G. Kiss 2017), so *fi\$ftéen*~*fif* #*teen*
- ▶ a simpler account (cf Twaddell 1935, Davidsen-Nielsen 1969): fortis fricatives are followed by **lenis** plosives (but cf Kirby & Ladd 2016)
⇒ *spar* [sba:], *star* [sda:], *scar* [sga:], *kaftan* [kafdan]

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial
 - ▶ presupposes \$sC contra plenty of evidence
 - ▶ also no aspiration after other fortis fricatives: *kaftan*, *gestalt*, even *fifteen* (G. Kiss 2017), so *fi\$ftéen*~*fif* #*teen*
- ▶ a simpler account (cf Twaddell 1935, Davidsen-Nielsen 1969): fortis fricatives are followed by **lenis** plosives (but cf Kirby & Ladd 2016)
⇒ *spar* [sba:], *star* [sda:], *scar* [sga:], *kaftan* [kafdan]
- ▶ *mystique* [misdíjk], *mystic* [mísdik], *mist* [misd], and consequently *missed* [misd]

voiceless fricative+plosive clusters

- ▶ plosives are not aspirated after [s] (eg in *spar*, *star*, *scar*)
- ▶ traditional account: they are not syllable initial
 - ▶ presupposes \$sC contra plenty of evidence
 - ▶ also no aspiration after other fortis fricatives: *kaftan*, *gestalt*, even *fifteen* (G. Kiss 2017), so *fi\$ftéen*~*fif* #*teen*
- ▶ a simpler account (cf Twaddell 1935, Davidsen-Nielsen 1969): fortis fricatives are followed by **lenis** plosives (but cf Kirby & Ladd 2016)
 - ⇒ *spar* [sba:], *star* [sda:], *scar* [sga:], *kaftan* [kafdan]
- ▶ *mystique* [misdíjk], *mystic* [mísdik], *mist* [misd], and consequently *missed* [misd]
- ▶ nb a pretonic fortis plosive is aspirated irrespective of the preceding context

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless \neq fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless \neq fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not $C_{[fortis]}—\#$

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless \neq fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not $C_{[fortis]}—\#$
 - ▶ the final C of *rib, rid, ridge, rig, live, with, Liz* is also only partly voiced (if at all)

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless \neq fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not $C_{[fortis]} \text{---} \#$
 - ▶ the final C of *rib*, *rid*, *ridge*, *rig*, *live*, *with*, *Liz* is also only partly voiced (if at all)
- ▶ so *missed* [misd], *sniffed* [snifd], *fished* [fiʃd]

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless \neq fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not $C_{[fortis]} \text{---} \#$
 - ▶ the final C of *rib*, *rid*, *ridge*, *rig*, *live*, *with*, *Liz* is also only partly voiced (if at all)
- ▶ so *missed* [misd], *sniffed* [snifd], *fished* [fiʃd]
- ▶ likewise *dipped* [dipd], *itched* [itʃd], *kicked* [kikd]: the suffix displays a voiceless, **but not fortis(!)** allomorph

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless ≠ fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not C_[fortis]—#
 - ▶ the final C of *rib*, *rid*, *ridge*, *rig*, *live*, *with*, *Liz* is also only partly voiced (if at all)
- ▶ so *missed* [misd], *sniffed* [snifd], *fished* [fiʃd]
- ▶ likewise *dipped* [dɪpd], *itched* [itʃd], *kicked* [kɪkd]: the suffix displays a voiceless, **but not fortis(!)** allomorph
- ▶ D has two regular allomorphs: the lenis plosive [d] and the syllabic [əd], there is no need to hypothesize a third, fortis allomorph, [t]

whence the past allomorph [t]?

- ▶ does [spread] spread on the suffix? across #? (this process would be limited to D and Z, no other case of regular fortis~lenis alternation in the language)
- ▶ so why do we commonly transcribe *missed* as [mist]?
 - ▶ because this plosive is voiceless?
 - ▶ but voiceless ≠ fortis (even sonorants may be voiceless in E)
 - ▶ a lenis obstruent may be (partly) voiced when adjacent to a sonorant, but certainly not C_[fortis]—#
 - ▶ the final C of *rib, rid, ridge, rig, live, with, Liz* is also only partly voiced (if at all)
- ▶ so *missed* [misd], *sniffed* [snifd], *fished* [fiʃd]
- ▶ likewise *dipped* [dɪpd], *itched* [itʃd], *kicked* [kɪkd]: the suffix displays a voiceless, **but not fortis(!)** allomorph
- ▶ D has two regular allomorphs: the lenis plosive [d] and the syllabic [əd], there is no need to hypothesize a third, fortis allomorph, [t]
- ▶ [t] as past/pp occurs irregularly: *burnt, spelt, spoilt*

three types of morpheme-internal obstruent clusters

fortis+lenis

[sg]: *discrete, discussed, disgust*; [sd]: *mistake, misdate*

three types of morpheme-internal obstruent clusters

fortis+lenis

[sg]: *discrete, discussed, disgust*; [sd]: *mistake, misdate*

lenis+fortis

Aztec, lieutenant [levténənt] ([t] is aspirated, ie cannot be preceded by [s] or [f], although the preceding fricative is not voiced)

three types of morpheme-internal obstruent clusters

fortis+lenis

[sg]: *discrete, discussed, disgust*; [sd]: *mistake, misdate*

lenis+fortis

Aztec, lieutenant [levténənt] ([t] is aspirated, ie cannot be preceded by [s] or [f], although the preceding fricative is not voiced)

lenis+lenis

husband, wisdom, Pisgah, abdomen, Sogdian, absorb, kudzu, exact

three types of morpheme-internal obstruent clusters

fortis+lenis

[sg]: *discrete, discussed, disgust*; [sd]: *mistake, misdate*

lenis+fortis

Aztec, lieutenant [levténənt] ([t] is aspirated, ie cannot be preceded by [s] or [f], although the preceding fricative is not voiced)

lenis+lenis

husband, wisdom, Pisgah, abdomen, Sogdian, absorb, kudzu, exact

fortis+fortis only across morphemes

mis#time, beef #cake

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstek]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstɛk]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]
- ▶ so *tracked* [trakd] (and *tracks* [trakz])

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjʃdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkðəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]
- ▶ so *tracked* [trakd] (and *tracks* [trakz])

repeat: there are 3 types of obstr. cluster: [bz], [pz], [bs], *[ps]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]
- ▶ so *tracked* [trakd] (and *tracks* [trakz])

repeat: there are 3 types of obstr. cluster: [bz], [pz], [bs], *[ps]

- ▶ *rhapsody* [pz] vs *absolute* [bs]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]
- ▶ so *tracked* [trakd] (and *tracks* [trakz])

repeat: there are 3 types of obstr. cluster: [bz], [pz], [bs], *[ps]

- ▶ *rhapsody* [pz] vs *absolute* [bs]
- ▶ *Leipzig* [pz] (no contrast between [pz] and “[ps]”)

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

revealed by aspiration: [t] is aspirated, [d] is not

- ▶ *Aztec* [áztek] vs *Mixtec* [míjstdek]
- ▶ *galactose* [gəlágtəws] vs *anecdote* [ánəkdəwt]
- ▶ *tractate* [trágtèjt]

morpheme identity (“don’t alternate”)

- ▶ *track* [trak]
- ▶ so *tracked* [trakd] (and *tracks* [trakz])

repeat: there are 3 types of obstr. cluster: [bz], [pz], [bs], *[ps]

- ▶ *rhapsody* [pz] vs *absolute* [bs]
- ▶ *Leipzig* [pz] (no contrast between [pz] and “[ps]”)
- ▶ (cf *absurd* [bs] vs *absorb* [bz])

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

- ▶ *tract* [tragt] or [trakd]?

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

- ▶ *tract* [tragt] or [trakd]?
- ▶ perhaps [tragt] to avoid alternation (cf *tractate* [trágtèjt])

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

- ▶ *tract* [trakt] or [trakd]?
- ▶ perhaps [trakt] to avoid alternation (cf *tractate* [tráktèt])
- ▶ so *traction* [traktʃən]

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

- ▶ *tract* [tragt] or [trakd]?
- ▶ perhaps [tragt] to avoid alternation (cf *tractate* [trágtèjt])
- ▶ so *traction* [tragfən]
- ▶ note that the shortness of the vowel may be caused either by the [k] of [kd] or by the [t] of [gt]!

fortis+lenis or lenis+fortis?

potentially ambiguous cases

- ▶ *tract* [tragt] or [trakd]?
- ▶ perhaps [tragt] to avoid alternation (cf *tractate* [trágtèt])
- ▶ so *traction* [tragfən]
- ▶ note that the shortness of the vowel may be caused either by the [k] of [kd] or by the [t] of [gt]!
- ▶ looks like this contrast is neutralized when not prevocalic:
tracked [trakd] = *tract* [tragt]

why do we misanalyse so many lenis obstruents?

spill [~~s~~bil], *lisp* [~~l~~isb], *lips* [~~l~~ipz]

why do we misanalyse so many lenis obstruents?

spill [s~~p~~bil], *lisp* [lis~~p~~b], *lips* [lip~~s~~z]

- ▶ because speakers of voicing languages (used to voice assimilation) would wrongly interpret transcriptions
spill [sbil] as *[zbil],
lisp [lisb] as *[lizb],
lips [lipz] as *[libz]

why do we misanalyse so many lenis obstruents?

spill [s~~p~~bil], *lisp* [lis~~p~~b], *lips* [lip~~s~~z]

- ▶ because speakers of voicing languages (used to voice assimilation) would wrongly interpret transcriptions
spill [sbil] as *[zbil],
lisp [lisb] as *[lizb],
lips [lipz] as *[libz]
- ▶ this danger is avoided by the common transcriptions
spill [spil],
lisp [lisp],
lips [lips]

why do we misanalyse so many lenis obstruents?

spill [~~s~~bil], *lisp* [~~l~~is~~p~~b], *lips* [~~l~~ip~~s~~z]

- ▶ because speakers of voicing languages (used to voice assimilation) would wrongly interpret transcriptions
spill [sbil] as *[zbil],
lisp [lisb] as *[lizb],
lips [lipz] as *[libz]
- ▶ this danger is avoided by the common transcriptions
spill [spil],
lisp [lisp],
lips [lips]
- ▶ so our misanalysis is a pedagogical device

why do we misanalyse so many lenis obstruents?

spill [~~s~~bil], *lisp* [~~l~~is~~p~~b], *lips* [~~l~~ip~~s~~z]

- ▶ because speakers of voicing languages (used to voice assimilation) would wrongly interpret transcriptions
spill [sbil] as *[zbil],
lisp [lisb] as *[lizb],
lips [lipz] as *[libz]
- ▶ this danger is avoided by the common transcriptions
spill [spil],
lisp [lisp],
lips [lips]
- ▶ so our misanalysis is a pedagogical device
- ▶ we are also misinformed by spelling

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)
- ▶ *fortis+fortis within a morpheme (= [spread] won't spread; more precisely, but less wittily: [spread] is never shared)

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)
- ▶ *fortis+fortis within a morpheme (= [spread] won't spread; more precisely, but less wittily: [spread] is never shared)
- ▶ fortis plosives are aspirated irrespective of preceding context (= if a pretonic plosive is not aspirated, it is not fortis)

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)
- ▶ *fortis+fortis within a morpheme (= [spread] won't spread; more precisely, but less wittily: [s^hpread] is never shared)
- ▶ fortis plosives are aspirated irrespective of preceding context (= if a pretonic plosive is not aspirated, it is not fortis)
- ▶ D has two allomorphs: [d] and [ə^hd]

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)
- ▶ *fortis+fortis within a morpheme (= [spread] won't spread; more precisely, but less wittily: [spread] is never shared)
- ▶ fortis plosives are aspirated irrespective of preceding context (= if a pretonic plosive is not aspirated, it is not fortis)
- ▶ D has two allomorphs: [d] and [əd]
- ▶ Z has two allomorphs: [z] and [əz]

conclusions

- ▶ “not all is fortis that whispers” (voicelessness is not an indicator of fortisness)
- ▶ *fortis+fortis within a morpheme (= [spread] won't spread; more precisely, but less wittily: [spread] is never shared)
- ▶ fortis plosives are aspirated irrespective of preceding context (= if a pretonic plosive is not aspirated, it is not fortis)
- ▶ D has two allomorphs: [d] and [əd]
- ▶ Z has two allomorphs: [z] and [əz]
- ▶ corroboration (or refutation?) from phoneticians needed

thanks to

- ▶ you all
- ▶ NKFIH #119863
- ▶ George Soros