

Consonant Mutation and Reduplication in Blin Singulars and Plurals

Paul D. Fallon
Howard University

1. Introduction

Blin¹, a Central Cushitic (Agaw) language of Eritrea, displays a complex series of consonant mutations between plural and singular forms, with several unusual properties. This paper describes several such properties, focusing on consonant mutation (or apophony), especially in relation to reduplication, using Correspondence Theory (McCarthy and Prince 1995) within the overall framework of Optimality Theory, drawing on data based on both published sources (e.g. Lamberti and Tonelli 1997) and the author's fieldwork in Eritrea. This paper describes the rare interaction between mutation and reduplication, and provides additional support for Mc Laughlin's (2000) analysis of mutation as the result of featural affixation (Akinlabi 1996, Zoll 1998) to the root node of a consonant. However, unlike Mc Laughlin's analysis, where mutation was stem-initial, in Blin such mutation is stem-final.

One of the more unusual properties of Blin is that for phonological purposes, it is often easier to take the plural as the underlying form, since singulars and singulatives are morphologically marked. For example, /kiriŋ/ 'stones' has a singular /kiriŋ-a/. One common mutation is the lenition of velar stops: /lək/ 'fires', /ləx-a/ (sg.). The loss of continuancy also results in the loss of ejection (/gak'/ → /gax-a/ 'cave (pl./sg.)', but not labialization /ʔik^win/ → /ʔix^win-a/ 'woman (pl./sg.)', /sak^w/ → /sax^w-a/ 'fat (n.)(pl./sg.)'. In addition, velar lenition may occur word-medially, e.g. [bəkil] → [bəxl-a] 'mule (pl./sg.)'. More than one mutation process may also occur within the word: /dik^wil/ → /dix^war-a/ 'donkey (pl./sg.)'. Besides consonant mutation, some plurals are formed using partial reduplication of the final stem consonant, with the high central vowel regularly epenthesized, e.g. /ʕil/ → /ʕil-il/ 'eye (sg./pl.)', /gix/ → /gix-ix/ 'horn (sg./pl.)'. This contrasts with cases in which the plural is the base for the singular.

After a brief overview of the phonemic inventory and the role of epenthesis, this paper examines the how singulars are formed, contrasting non-alternating cases with reduplication in plural formation and various types of mutation in the singular.

2. Phonemic Inventory

The phonemes of Blin are, after Palmer (1960), Lamberti and Tonelli (1996), and Fallon (2001) listed as follows, with [tʃ] found in loans, and the phonemic status of glottal stop dubious:

* The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of a grant from the Howard University Funds for Academic Excellence to travel to ACAL 35. He is now affiliated with the Department of English, Linguistics, and Speech at the University of Mary Washington, 1301 College Avenue, Fredericksburg, VA 22401, USA. The author also thanks an anonymous reviewer of this paper, along with remarks by Fiona Mc Laughlin at ACAL, and various audience members of the 2005 LSA, who heard a slightly different version. Of course the usual disclaimers apply.

¹ Following native speaker preference (e.g. Kiflemariam 2005, Eritrean Ministry of Education n.d.), I use the spelling Blin. The language is commonly spelled Bilin in English publications, or Bilen, under Tigrinya influence.

(1)	t	(tʃ)	k	k ^w		(ʔ)
b	d	dʒ	g	g ^w		
	t'	tʃ'	k'	k ^w '		
f	s	ʃ	x	x ^w	ħ	h
	z				ʕ	
m		n	ŋ	ŋ ^w		
		l, r				
w			j			

3. Epenthesis

Epenthesis occurs frequently in Blin to break up consonant clusters in syllable onsets or codas, which are strictly prohibited (Fallon 2001). The example below shows epenthesis of the high central vowel /i/ between the stem-final consonant /g-/ and its reduplicant.

- (2) a. /kiriŋ/ 'stones' / kiriŋ-a/ 'stone'
 b. /lak'l/ → [lak'ił] 'bees' /lax.l-a/ 'bee-sg.'
 c. /gug+ RED/ → [gug-iŋ] 'roads' /gug/ 'road'

4. Regular Singular Formation

Before looking at some of the more complex types of plural formation, we will first examine suffixal plural formation. In addition to a singular/plural distinction, Blin has a distinction between general/collective and individuative/singulative (Lamberti and Tonelli 1997:507) in which the singular (singulative) is formally marked. Compare the following types, where (3) shows the singular marked with either the suffix /-ra/ or more frequently, /-a/, both of whose distribution is morphologically determined:

(3)	<u>Plural</u>		<u>Singular/Singulative</u>	
	ʔiŋk ^w irəʃ	'frogs'	ʔiŋk ^w irəʃ-ra	'frog' LT97:508 ²
	giriw	'men'	giriw-a	'man' LT97:508

There are usually no stem alternations when the plural is expressed through simple suffixation. The examples in (4) are shown by the final stem consonant.

(4)	<u>Plural</u>		<u>Singular</u>	
d	galud	'knives'	galud-a	'knife' LT97:508
ʃ	ʔəʃ	'leaves'	ʔəʃ-a	'leaf'
n	kan	'trees/firewood'	kan-a	'tree' LT97:508
ŋ	kiriŋ	'stones'	kiriŋ-a	'stone' LT97:508
l	mak'əl	'female friends'	mak'əl-a	'femalefriend' LT97:508
r	k ^w ir	'children/babies'	k ^w ir-a	'child/baby' LT97:508
w	giriw	'men'	giriw-a	'man' LT97:508

5. Reduplicative Plural Formation

We turn next to a description and analysis of those Blin plurals which show only reduplication. If

² Abbreviations for printed sources: LT96 = Lamberti and Tonelli 1996; LT 97 = Lamberti and Tonelli 1997; P58 = Palmer 1958; P60 = Palmer 1960; Z76 = Zaborski 1976 (whose data come in turn from Reinisch 1882). My own data are largely in accord with the published sources. All transcriptions are normalized to standard IPA usage.

a singulative suffix is present, it is not of course in the plural, which is formed on the basis of the stem. The Blin plural reduplicant corresponds to the final consonant of the singular stem; epenthetic /i/ is inserted to break up the coda consonant cluster. We will first examine the data, and then will begin to formalize the constraints involved.

(5) Final consonant of base is reduplicated as a suffix; neutral vowel epenthesized

	<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
d	g ^w ind-aj	g ^w inad-id	'stump' (loan)	LT97:510
k	birik	birk-ik	'elbow'	LT97:509
	ʃaŋk-a	ʃaŋk-ik	'pasture'	LT97:509 ³
k ^w	ʔerk ^w -i	ʔerk ^w -ik ^w	'tooth'	P58:386
	lik ^w	lik ^w -ik ^w	'leg/foot'	LT97:509
	mikk ^w -a	mikk ^w -ik ^w	'buttocks'	LT97:510
k'	məŋk'-a	məŋk'-ik'	'pot of clay'	LT97:510
	laŋk'-i	laŋk'-ik'	'tongue'	LT97:510
g	gug	gug-ig	'road'	LT97:509
	ʔiŋg-i	ʔiŋg-ig	'village'	LT97:510
f	kanf-í	kanf-íf	'wing'	P58:386
s	kəs	kəs-is	'shoulder'	P58:386
ʃ	gəʃ	gəʃ-íʃ	'face'	P58:386
	gaʃ-aj	gaʃ-íʃ	'guest'	LT97:510
	k ^w imíʃ	k ^w imíʃ-íʃ	'cheek'	P58:379
x	gix	gix-ix	'horn'	LT97:509
m	kirm-á	kirm-ím	'neck'	P58:386
l	ʃəl	ʃəl-íl	'boundary'	P58:386
	ʔil	ʔil-íl	'eye'	LT97:509
r	fír-a	fír-ir	'seed/fruit'	LT97:509

The constraints proposed here are standard (McCarthy and Prince 1995, Kager 1999). The first one is to account for the fact that reduplication in Blin is not of the whole stem, but is instead partial reduplication of the final consonant of the stem.

(6) MAX-BR

Every element of Base has a correspondent in Reduplicant ('No partial reduplication').

Since Blin does have partial and not total reduplication like *gix-gix 'horns', this constraint is low-ranked. The second constraint is the epenthesis constraint, since material in the Reduplicant (the epenthetic vowel) does not correspond to what is within the stem Base.

(7) DEP-BR

Every element of R has a correspondent in B.

'If undominated, the reduplicant is composed solely of segments that occur in the base'.

In the case of Blin, the epenthetic vowel is added, and so the constraint is violated.

The next constraint determines the size and shape of the reduplicant (RED)—whether it will be the entire stem or some part of it such as a syllable or part of a syllable. We know from the ungrammaticality of forms such as *gix-gix 'horns' that the template is not the stem or the entire syllable. Forms such as /kirm-á/ 'neck' and its plural /kirm-ím/ show that the template is not even the

³ Lamberti and Tonelli (1997:510) record two forms in which the reduplicant appears to occur medially; both are with medial /k/ and final nasal. Note, however, that the medial vowel is not the epenthetic /i/, but instead /a/. The forms are /ʃəkim/ 'chin', pl. /ʃək-ak-im/ and /ʃəkin/ 'knife', pl. /ʃək-ak-in/.

final (coda) consonants of the stem. Instead, the reduplicant template is only the final stem consonant:

- (8) RED=C]_{stem}
The reduplicant is the stem-final consonant.

The next two constraints ensure that the reduplicant template will align with the base in determining the template, and that the reduplicant will be placed as a suffix, not a prefix.

- (9) ANCHORING-BR
Correspondence preserves alignment in the following sense: the left (right) peripheral element of R corresponds to the left (right) peripheral element of B, if R is to the left (right) of B.

- (10) ALIGN-RED-R
Align the reduplicant to the right edge of the base.

Finally, one constraint must account for the dispreferred nature of consonant clusters. The constraint below will need to be refined, but can stand for now as follows:

- (11) *COMPLEX
No complex syllable margins.

These constraints may be displayed in a tableau, which graphically illustrates the ranking of the constraints relative to each other, and how various candidates (potential output forms) fare with respect to constraint violability.

(12)

Input: /gəʃ+ RED/	ALIGN-RED-R	RED=C] _{stem}	*COMPLEX	DEP-BR	MAX-BR
a. $\text{u}^{\text{35}} \text{gəʃi}$				*!	**
b. gəʃʃ			*!		**
c. gəʃgəʃ		**!			
d. ʃgəʃ	***!		*		**

The optimal output candidate, (12a), the attested plural form, is that candidate which does not violate the highest-ranking constraints. Note, however, that it may be in violation of lower-ranking faithfulness constraints since the reduplicant is not a perfect copy of the base. The next type of plural formation to be examined is that of mutation, after which we will examine the interplay between mutation and reduplication.

6. Singular Formation through Mutation

Mutation, following the analysis of Mc Laughlin (2000), is 'the result of featural affixation to the root node' of a consonant. Blin displays a variety of mutation processes, all of which appear to be morphologically (or lexically) determined. The mutations involve the features [voice], [continuant], [sonorant] and [lateral], as well as complex mutations involving combinations of these features. Some of these mutations may have originally been the result of lenition processes induced by affixation of a vowel-initial suffix. The formal analysis will reflect the association of the suffix with floating features which will align with appropriate docking spots.

6.1. Voicing⁴:

The first mutation that we shall examine is voicing. The plural form is taken as the basis for the input forms; clearer evidence for this will be seen in the section on continuancy. We can attribute the changes in stem consonants by associating them with a floating feature for voice which is associated with certain singular suffixes. Display (13) illustrates the data for this relatively minor process:

(13)		<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>		
	d	t	gəlud-a	gəlut ~ gəlud	'big knife' P60:112/LT97:508
	g	k	dərgum-a	dərkum	'sycamore' P58:385
	g ^w	k ^w	gurg ^w im-a	gurik ^w im	'throat' LT96:97
			ʔəng ^w -á	ʔənk ^w -i	'palm leaf' P60:112

Because the singular and plural stems change shapes, there is obviously a lack of correspondence between the input and output with respect to the particular mutating feature. The general type of constraint is expressed as follows:

(14) IDENT-IO(F)

Correspondent IO segments have identical values for the feature F.

The particular constraint involved in this section will be that of IDENT-IO(OBSVOICE). The next problem to solve is why there is alteration between voiceless and voiced stops when these stops are not final. It is probable that the constraint involved is not simply that of [voice], but involves the feature [ObstruentVoice]. This accounts for why nasals, which are sonorants, cannot by definition bear the feature [ObsVoice] (used by Kager 1999, among others). The constraint is formalized below:

(15) NAS/-OBSVOICE

If a segment is nasal, it cannot bear [Obstruent Voice]

Using Akinlabi's (1996) notion of featural affixation, we may schematically represent the association of the singular suffix with the floating feature, and the association (alignment) of that feature onto an appropriate landing site. Sonorants are not valid docking sites, so the rightmost obstruents are the preferred site. In (16) below, the floating feature [ObsVoice] searches for the rightmost compatible root node on which to dock. In (16a), that feature is the last segment of the root, the obstruent [t], which becomes [d]. In (16b), the last segment, [m], is skipped over because as a sonorant, it is ineligible to bear [ObsVoice] by (15).

(16) a.	gəlut- + SG	b.	dərkum- + SG
	└───┬───┘		└───┬───┘
	[ObsVoice]		[ObsVoice]

Other languages have been shown to have floating features which dock only on appropriate segments. For example, in Chaha (Banksira 2000), a floating feature (roughly, [+round]) docks freely onto labial and velar obstruents, but will skip alveolar sonorants and obstruents because they may not be labialized. An in-depth and comparative survey of latent segments and floating features may be found in Zoll (2001).

⁴ I have found only one example of a voiceless stem-final consonant in the singular which has a corresponding voiced plural: /k^wələh-a/ 'child', pl. /k^wəlif/ (LT96:97).

6.2. *Continuancy*

The next set of alternations provides stronger evidence that the plural forms are basic to the input. Whereas the singular stem will often end in or contain a velar fricative (18a below), the plural counterpart always corresponds to a velar stop. However, some of the stops are ejectives (18b & d), and others are plain voiceless stops (18a & c). If we take the [-continuant] stop or ejective as the input, we have a more principled explanation for the alternation, since this correctly predicts the output. Furthermore, it is extremely rare for fricatives to be ejective. There is a phonetically grounded reason that fricatives, which are produced with a continuous airstream, are generally incompatible with the feature [constricted glottis]: first, it is difficult to produce a fricative while the airstream is constricted, and secondly, it is difficult to compress air in the post-closure cavity if air is constantly streaming out of the cavity. We may therefore formalize this constraint as:

(17) *[CG, +CONT]

The features [constricted glottis] and [+continuant] are incompatible.


Let us now examine the data:

	<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>			
(18) a. x k	ləx-a	lək	'fire'	LT96:97	
	ʔəx-a	ʔək	'skin'	LT96:97	
	ʔɪŋʃəx	ʔɪŋʃik	'spear'	LT97:511	
	Nonfinal	bəxl-a	bəkil	'mule' (>Sem.)	LT96:97
		dʒəxəl-a	dʒəkəl	'bird'	LT96:97
		ləxən	ləkən	'ulcer'	P60:112
	dixr-a	dikir	'feces'	LT97:511	
b. x k'	gax-á	gák' ~ gak'ík'	'cave'	P60:112; P58:387	
	Nonfinal	laxl-a	lak'íl	'bee'	P58:385
c. x ^w k ^w Nonfinal	ʔix ^w in-a	ʔik ^w in(i)	'woman'	LT96:97	
d. x ^w k ^{w'}	sax ^w -a	sak ^{w'}	'fat (n.)'	LT96:97	
	tix ^w -á	tík ^{w'}	'light'	P58:386	
		nix ^w ax ^w	nix ^w ak ^{w'} -ti	'husband's father'	P58:387
	Nonfinal	ʔix ^w r-a	ʔik ^{w'} ír	'brother'	P58:385
e. w k ^w	siwan-a	sik ^w ən	'thief'	LT97:511	

As in the case with voicing, roots which are ineligible to bear a particular feature are skipped over. All the cases in (18) that are skipped involve either /l/ or /n/, both of which are controversially defined as continuants. Nasals are phonetically classified as stops, and thus [-continuant], since they sometimes induce occlusion (Kenstowicz 1994), though the airstream is continuously egressive through the nasal cavity. Conversely, the lateral is typically specified for [+continuant] since in Spanish, for example, it patterns with vowels, liquids, and fricatives in triggering spirantization of stops (Kenstowicz 1994:487). The Blin data suggest that

(19) LATNAS/ +CONT

If a segment is lateral or nasal, it cannot bear the feature [+continuant]



Note that the singular suffix in the word 'ulcer' has no segmental material associated with it—only the floating feature [+continuant].

The following tableau shows that the featural alignment of the singular suffix is violated by the more highly-ranked constraint LATNAS/ +CONT, and thus candidate (21a) is optimal. Although (21b) respects ALIGN-R, it produces an ill-formed nasal which is simultaneously a fricative: perhaps *lækəzn̩ or *lækəʒ̥:

(21)

lækən + SG [+cont]	LATNAS/ -CONT	ALIGN-R
a. $\text{[+cont]} \text{ lækən}$		*
b. lækədn̩	*!	

6.3. Voicing and Continuancy

The next class of mutations involves both voicing and continuancy, though the feature values appear to be reversed between singular and plural for [cont]. In the labial mutations of (22a), which are quite pervasive throughout the language, a stem-final /b/ in the singular, whether or not it is followed by the suffix /-a/, corresponds to /f/ in the plural. Recall that in (13), plural stems which contained a voiceless stop corresponded to voiced stops in the singular, while in (18), the plurals with stops ([-continuant]) corresponded to fricatives ([+continuant]) in the singular. This suggests that the two features may act independently of each other and it further affirms the morphologically conditioned nature of consonant mutation.

As in other mutations, the ALIGN-R constraint is ranked low because it is often violated; medial consonants undergo mutation. Other voicing and continuancy alternations such /d ~ s/ (22b) and /dʒ ~ ʃ/ (22c) exactly parallel /b ~ f/, while in one case there is an additional twist such as the feature for palatalization /d ~ ʃ/ (22d).

	<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>			
(22)a. b f	jīb-á	jíf	'leopard'	P60:112	
	keləb	kelóf	'fence'	P58:385	
	mər̥b-a	mərif	'needle'	LT96:97	
	wər̥əb-á	wərof	'river'	P58:386	
	bamb-á	bámf-i	'fig tree'	P58:386	
	ʔittib	ʔittif	'navel'	LT97:511	
	ʔər̥əb	ʔərof	'blind man'	LT97:511	
	arib	arif	'tomb'	Z76:122	
	gırob	gırof	'body'	Z76:122	
	Nonfinal	ləbbək-a	ləffək	'heart'	LT96:97
		ʔabaj	ʔafaj-ti	'enemy'	LT96:97
		ʔibin	ʔifin	'bladder'	P58:385
		gəbón-a	gəfón	'river bank'	P58:385
		wabır-a	wafir	'lizard'	LT97:508
	ʔəmbıl-a	ʔənfıl	'billy goat'	LT97:508	
	ábin	áfin	'guest, stranger'	Z76:122	
b. d s	mad-a	mas	'friend'	LT96:97	
	ʔawəd	ʔawəs	'fool'	P58:385	
	ámıd	ámıs	'Thursday' (> Sem.)	Z76:122	
	Nonfinal	fədən	fəsən	'seed'	LT97:511

c.	d ʃ Nonfinal	kidiŋ	kiʃiŋ	'field'	LT96:97
		gidiŋ	giʃiŋ	'dog'	LT96:97
		dan	ʃán	'brother'	P58:385
d.	dʒ ʃ Nonfinal	gəndʒin-á	gəŋʃin	'slave'	P58:385
e.	w k ^w Nonfinal	sɪwan-a	sik ^w ən	'thief'	LT96:97
		tawin-a	tak ^w in	'clothes'	P60:112

As I have indicated in each display, there are again instances in which the featural alignment constraint ALIGN-R is violated precisely when the stem ends in a nasal. Since such features as [+cont] are incompatible with nasal, this markedness constraint outranks the alignment constraint.

The plural marker for the class in (a) and (b) is floating features [+voice], [-continuant]. The small class in (c) removes palatalization; the small set in (d) is affricated; (e) is lenited into a labial sonorant from a labiovelar obstruent.

6.4. Voicing and Sonority

An additional mutation type involves a plural /t/ corresponding to the singular in /r/ (23a), a mutation also found in Seereer-Siin (Mc Laughlin 2000). I have found one token of /t/ corresponding to /l/ in the singular (23b), and only two tokens of plural /k^w/ corresponding to /w/ in the singular (23c).

(23)a.	r t	gir-a	git	'mountain'	LT96:97
		dʒəggir-a	dʒəggit	'monkey'	LT96:97
		ʃəŋʃur-a	ʃəŋʃut	'ant'	LT96:97
		ʔəmər-a	ʔəmət-ət	'year'	LT96:97
		lilor-a	lilot-a	'pigeon'	LT96:97
		maʃir	maʃit	'sickle'	P60:112
		ʃimár	ʃimát	'tail'	P58:385
		nihár	nihát	'chest'	P58:385
		ʔunar	ʔunat	'week'	LT97:509
		ʔəx ^w ər	ʔəx ^w ət	'head/roof'	LT97:509
b.	l t	gəmər	gəmət	'rope' (> Sem.)	LT97:509
		ʔələl-a	ʔələt	'heifer'	P60:112

These correspondences involve the feature [sonorant], which is the chief difference between the voiceless obstruent /t/ and the sonorant /r/, which is typically realized as a tap medially and a trill finally. I envision the formalism as before, with a floating feature [+sonorant] associated with the singular morpheme (whether or not it has the suffixal /-a/). Although obstruents by definition do not bear [+sonorant], and thus we would predict, following the previous patterns, that the feature would dock on something compatible, this feature aligns in such a way as to be "feature-changing".

6.5. Laterality

The final mutating feature is [-lateral], which is associated with the singular morpheme. All stem-final plurals in this category ending in /l/ have singulars with corresponding /r/.

(24)a.	r l	wixir	ʔə-wixil	'bull'	LT96:98
		bir-a	bil	'bull/ox'	LT96:98
		ʔətər-a	ʔətəl	'pea'	LT96:98
		bəxər	bəxl-in	'adult'	LT96:98
		ʔixir	ʔixil	'father'	P58:385
		gər	gəl	'calf'	LT97:511

6.6. Multiple Processes

The most complex aspect of mutation involves morphemes which combine more than one mutation within the morpheme. Almost every conceivable combination of floating features is attested:

	<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>		
(25)a. d/s, g ^w /k ^w	g ^w ədɪg ^w	g ^w əsɪk ^w	'belly'	P58:385
b. x/k, r/l	ʔixɪr	ʔikil	'father'	LT97:511 (note var.)
c. x/k', r/l	səxər-a	sək'əl	'honey/kinds of h.'	LT96:97
	bəxɪr	bək'lil	'eldest son'	P58:386
d. x ^w /k ^w , r/l	dix ^w ar-a	dik ^w 'il	'donkey'	LT96:97
e. b/nf, r/l	kələmbu-ra	kələnfu-t	'drum'	LT97:507
f. b/f, r/t	ʃabɪr	ʃafɪt	'leather rope'	P58:385
	kəbar	kəfat	'milking pail'	P58:385
	abɪr	afɪt	'corn bag'	Z76:122
	gɪbár	gɪfát	'wooden plate'	Z76:122
	ʃabɪr	ʃafɪt	'leather rope'	P58:385
	kəbar	kəfat	'milking pail'	P58:385
	gɪbár	gɪfát	'wooden plate'	Z76:122
g. d/s, g ^w /k ^w	g ^w ədɪg ^w	g ^w əsɪk ^w	'stomach/womb'	LT96:97

Due to space limitations, a full, formalized analysis can only be sketched here. However, I have suggested that these cases involve multiple instances of featural alignments, alignments which can violate ALIGN-R in response to markedness constraints. We turn next to the formation of plurals through the interplay of both reduplication and mutation.

7. Plural Formation through Reduplication and Mutation

Yet another method of Blin plural formation involves a complex interaction between mutation (analyzed in §6) and reduplication (§5). As Mc Laughlin (2000) has noted, the interaction of these two processes is rare, and thus the data and partial analysis here lay the groundwork for some important findings. Section 7.1 looks at devoicing, §7.2 on devoicing and continuancy, and §7.3 on laterality.

7.1. Devoicing

There are a few interesting cases of voiced consonants in the singular corresponding to voiceless consonants in the plural. The reduplicant is usually aligned right, but occasionally, as in 'thorn', the first item in (26a), the final consonant is not reduplicated and a medial one is instead.

(26)				
a.	g k	ʔɪgɪm	ʔɪkɪkɪm	'thorn' LT96:97
		dɪŋ-á	dɪŋk-ík	'vein; tendon' P60:112
		ʔəg	ʔəg-ik ~ ʔək-ik	'maternal uncle' P58:387; LT97:51
b.	g ^w k ^w	ʔɪŋg ^w -i	ʔɪŋg ^w -ik ^w	'teat' P58:387

The devoicing within the reduplicant is reminiscent of the emergence of the unmarked, though there is a need for such mutations in contexts other than reduplication.

7.2. Voicing and Continuancy

If, as I argue, the plural stem is taken to end in /f-/, then reduplication is straightforward, with simple BR correspondence and right-alignment of the reduplicant. The singular would then undergo voicing and stopping as in the mutations of (22a).

If, however, the singular were taken as basic, (which is possible given the different feature values associated with the singular in sets (18) and (20)), the analysis could be one of 'reduplicative back-copying', in which 'the overapplication or underapplication of some process in the base, under pressure to preserve identity with the reduplicant' (Kager 1999:244), which would show emergence of the unmarked. While this is an intriguing possibility, it is inconsistent with the analysis proposed here and seems to violate Occam's Razor.

(27)					
a.	b f	ʔəb	ʔəfif	'mouth'	P58:386
		gʲirib	gʲirifif	'knee'	LT97:510
		gʲib	gʲifif	'shield'	P58:386
		gʲimb-i	gʲimfif	'stick'	LT96:97
		dəriḃ	dərf-if	'road/path'	LT97:511
		ʔəb-a	ʔəf-if	'well'	LT97:510
b.	d s	ʔid	ʔisis	'door'	LT96:97
		kad	kasís	'stomach'	P58:386
c.	ḃ ʃ	mandḃ-í	manʃíʃ	'grindstone'	P58:386
d.	x k	gix	gʲikik	'horn'	P58:387
e.	x k'	gax-á	gák' ~ gak'ík'	'cave'	P60:112; P58:387

7.3. Laterality

A similar process is found for the features of laterality:

(28)	r l	sir	silil	'vein'	LT96:98
		tər	təlil	'breast bone'	P58:387

The underlying plural form contains the [+lateral] /l/, which is reduplicated in straightforward fashion. The singular however, causes mutation to the [-lateral] /r/.

7.4. Formalization

The following constraint contributes to a formal understanding of the processes in this section:

(29) IDENT=BR(F)

Let α be a segment in B, and β be a correspondent of α in R. If α is [γ F], then β is [γ F].

The constraint IDENT=BR(F) ensures that any particular feature F is the same in both base and reduplicant. This constraint is often outranked for the 'emergence of the unmarked' in cases in which the reduplicant is less marked than the base. In Blin, as we saw in the simple reduplicated plurals in (5), and in (27), reduplication isn't violated and the reduplicant is faithful in identity to the base. In the singulars, however, we see violation of constraint (14), IDENT-IO(F) with respect to such features as [voice], [sonorant], [continuant], and [lateral]. It is therefore lower-ranked than (29).

8. Conclusion

The significance of this paper lies in being the first formal, not simply descriptive, treatment of Blin plurals. It argues, along with Mc Laughlin (2000), that mutation is featural affixation, thus contributing to a formalism of consonantal mutation and constraints in subsegmental phonology (Zoll 2001). Finally, it briefly examined the interplay between reduplication and mutation, with a preliminary analysis which must be fleshed out in future work. In addition to examining the implications of this data for Correspondence Theory, the grammar of Blin will be better understood when constraints proposed for the nominal system are compared with those proposed for the verbal system (Fallon 2004).

References

- Akinlabi, Akin. 1996. Featural affixation. *Journal of Linguistics* 32.239-289.
- Banksira, Degif Petros. 2000. Sound mutations in the morphophonology of Chaha. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eritrean Ministry of Education. N.d. (1997?). *The alphabets*. Asmara.
- Fallon, Paul D. 2001. Some phonological processes in Bilin. *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Special Session on Afroasiatic Linguistics*, ed. by Andrew Simpson, 49-60. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Fallon, Paul D. 2004. Reduplication in frequentative verbs in Blin (Central Cushitic). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America. Boston, 8-11 January 2004.
- Kager, René. 1999. *Optimality Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenstowicz, Michael. 1994. *Phonology in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Kiflemariam Hamde. 2005. Blin language maintenance, shift and revitalization. Paper presented at the First Conference on Blin Language and Culture, July 14-16, 2005, London.
- Lamberti, Marcello and Livia Tonelli. 1996. Some phonological and morphophonological aspects of Bilin. *Afroasiatica Neapolitana: Contributi presentati all'8° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semita)*, Napoli 1996, *Studi Africanistici: Serie etiopica* 6), a cura di Alessandro Bausi - Mauro Tosco, 81-99. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Lamberti, Marcello and Livia Tonelli. 1997. The noun system of Bilin. Ethiopia in broader perspective: Papers of the XIIIth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Kyoto, 1997, ed. by K. Fukui, E. Kurimoto, and M. Shigeta, vol. 1, 499-524. Kyoto: Shokado.
- McCarthy, John J. and Alan Prince. 1993a. Prosodic morphology I: Constraint interaction and satisfaction. Amherst: University of Massachusetts and New Brunswick: Rutgers, ms.
- McCarthy, John J. and Alan S. Prince. 1993b. Generalized alignment. *Yearbook of Morphology*, ed. by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 79-153. Dordrecht: Kluwer. Excerpt reprinted in *Essential readings in phonology*, ed. by John Goldsmith, 102-36. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- McCarthy, John J. and Alan S. Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers* 18.249-384.
- Mc Laughlin, Fiona. 2000. Consonant mutation and reduplication in Seereer-Siin. *Phonology* 17.333-363.
- Palmer, Frank. 1958. The noun in Bilin. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21.376-91.
- Palmer, F.R. 1960. An outline of Bilin phonology. *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici (Roma 2-4 April 1959)*, 114-16. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Prince, Alan and Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality Theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Report no. RuCCS-TR-2. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science.
- Reinisch, Leo. 1882. *Die Bilin-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*. Vienna: Carl Gerold's Sohn. Also printed in *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 94:2.583-718.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1976. Consonant apophony and consonant alternation in Blin plurals. *Afro-Asiatic Linguistics* 3.6.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1986. The morphology of nominal plural in the Cushitic languages. (*Veröffentlichungen der Institute für Afrikanistik und Ägyptologie der Universität Wien*, 39. *Beiträge zur Afrikanistik*, 28). Wien.
- Zoll, Cheryl. 1998. Parsing below the segment in a constraint based framework. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Zoll, Cheryl. 2001. Constraints and representation in subsegmental phonology. *Segmental phonology in Optimality Theory: Constraints and representations*, ed. by Linda Lombardi, 46-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages and Linguistics in Broad Perspectives

edited by John Mugane,
John P. Hutchison, and Dee A. Worman

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2006

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics:
African Languages and Linguistics in Broad Perspectives
© 2006 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-410-5 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Fallon, Paul D. 2006. Consonant Mutation and Reduplication in Blin Singulars and Plurals. In *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. John Mugane et al., 114-124. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Fallon, Paul D. 2006. Consonant Mutation and Reduplication in Blin Singulars and Plurals. In *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. John Mugane et al., 114-124. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1302.