



Template: almost exclusively **1 or 2 syllables** long

- no consistently quadrisyllabic or longer patterns
- only one clear case of trisyllabic template [we will not consider it in this talk]

Anchoring: predominantly anchoring to the **left edge or the stressed syllable** of the Base

- much fewer cases involving the final syllable

"Variable size" patterns: all but one involve copying from one prominent position to another prominent position:

- (1) Southern Italian vocatives: from first syllable to stressed vowel (Alber 2007)

Truncated name	Source name
Bá	Bár.ba.ra
Car.mé	Car.mé.la
An.to.né	An.to.nél.la

## 4. Constraints

### 4.1 Anchoring

TRUNCs typically anchor to the left edge or the stressed syllable of the Base, but how exactly are ANCHOR constraints defined?

- (2) Two possibilities:  
 ANCHOR constraints as alignment constraints: align to some prominent position of the Base  
 ANCHOR constraints as faithfulness constraints: preserve some prominent position of the Base
- (3) Our proposal:  
 ANCHOR- LEFT: an alignment constraint  
 ANCHOR-STRESS: a faithfulness constraint (a case of stress preservation)

#### 4.1.1 ANCHOR- LEFT as an alignment constraint

- (4) Different predictions of ANCHOR- LEFT-ALIGN and ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH:

hypothetical Base: A.na.stá.si.a	ONSET	ANCHOR- LEFT -ALIGN	ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ - FAITH
a. Á.na	*!		
b. Ná.sta		a	*
c. Stá.si		ana!	*

ANCHOR- LEFT -ALIGN: predicts b. as the winner

ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH: has an indeterminacy problem: it cannot decide between b. and c.

So if we assume ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH, something else has to decide in cases like this, e.g. ANCHOR-STRESS:

- (5) Predicted language under ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH:  
 - anchoring normally targets first syllable,  
 - but hops to stressed syllable, if first is not available

(6)	ONSET	ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH	ANCHOR-STRESS
hyp. Base: Ka.te.rí.na			
☞ a. Ká.te			*
b. Té.ri		*!	*
c. Rí.na		*!	
hyp. Base: Anastásia			
a. Á.na	*!		
b. Ná.sta		*	*!
☞ c. Stá.si		*	

- (7) Czech Hypocoristics: one pattern avoids initial onsetless syllables  
 → illustrating indeterminacy (thanks to Věra Dvořák for her help; some ex. also in Bethin 2003)

Ántoni:n	Tón-da, Tó:ň-a, Tóncek
Ántonie	Tón-ča, Tónička
Ívan	Vá:ň-a
Álex	Lé-xa
Álois	Lój-za, Lójzi:k, Lójzek
Áloisie	Lójzka, Lójzička, Lójzinka
Álbert	Bér-ti:k, Bért
Álberta, Álbertina	Bér-ta

Note that Czech stress is consistently initial, in the base as well as in the truncated name  
 This means that when anchoring to the initial syllable is not an option:

- ANCHOR-LEFT -ALIGN will decide for anchoring to the second syllable
- ANCHOR- $\sigma_1$ -FAITH will not make any decision at all

- (8) Russian name truncation illustrating that hopping does NOT take place  
 (Caveat: most names and/or truncations are archaic; thanks to Peter Staroverov for his help)

Base name	Truncated name	Comments
Aleksěj	Ljóša	So; known by P.S.
Aleksěj	Léks'-a, Lék-a	So;
Antonína	Tónja	S; known by P.S.
Anastasíja	Nástja	known by P.S.; other poss. Base: Nastásija
Elizavéta	Líza	known by P.S.; S; other poss. Base: Lisaveta
Afanásij	Fónja, Fán'a	S, So;
Aveníra	Vena, Venja	M; (arch.?)
Adel'fína	Del'fa	So;
Efrosín	Froša, Fros'a	So;
Angelína	Gélja	Internet
Avgust'ín	Gúst-a	So;
Eliséj	Lés'-a	So;
Apollinárij-a (arch.)	Pól'-a	So;

Sources: M=Montermini (2007), S=Stankiewicz (1957), So=Soglasnova (2003)

(9) **Defining Anchoring to the first syllable as alignment** (suggestion kindly provided by A. Prince):**ANCHOR-LEFT:**align the left edge of the *correspondent of TRUNC* in the base with the left edge of the base.

## (10) ANCHOR- LEFT as alignment:

Baes: Anastásija	ONSET	ANCHOR- LEFT (ALIGN)	ANCHOR-STRESS
a. [{Ána}stásija]       Ána	*!		*
☞ b. [Á{nastá}sija]         Nástja		a	*
c. [Ána{stási}ja]         Stási		ana!	

**4.1.2 ANCHOR-STRESS as a faithfulness constraint**

## (11) Arguments to view ANCHOR-STRESS as a faithfulness constraint:

- we did not find any typical alignment effects as those just illustrated above for the first syllable
- there are reasons to believe that ANCHOR-STRESS is a constraint similar to those responsible for stress-preservation under morphological derivation:  
as e.g. in: *o.rí.gi.nal* --> *o.rì.gi.ná.li.ty*  
(main stress of *original* preserved as secondary stress in *originality*)

## (12) Stress-anchoring as a case of stress-preservation:

- in truncations which exhibit stress-anchoring, stress is *always* preserved, e.g.:

## (13) Southern Italian Vocatives: anchoring to both the first and the stressed syllable

Bá – Bárbara

Carmé – Carméla      \*Cárme

Antoné – Antonélla      \*Antóne

Stress of the base is preserved on the same vowel in the truncation morpheme, although final stress is *not* the default stress in Italian (default=penultimate)

Stress preservation is not necessary under anchoring to the left edge. Compare:

## (14) Italian disyllabic name truncation:

Fránce – Francésca      \*Francé

Ále – Aléssia      \*Alé

Ánto – Antonélla

similar cases, where stress is preserved although the resulting structure does not necessarily confirm to the metrical default of the language: Dutch (*Patrics-Patricia*, Van de Vijver 1997), English clippings (*celéb – celebrity*, Lappe 2005, 2007)

- it is not enough that the stressed vowel be preserved as such in TRUNC, it has to be preserved as

a *stressed* vowel

- (15) Discontinuous mapping in Spanish hypocoristics (Lipski 1995)

Fínda	Florínda
Fíko	Federíco
Féncho	Fulgencio
Mína	Marína

- (16) Different predictions of ANCHOR-STRESS as a stress-preservation constraint or as a simple faithfulness constraint:

Base: Florínda	PRESERVE STRESSED V OF BASE AS STRESSED	PRESERVE STRESSED V OF BASE	CONTIGUITY
a. Fínda			*!
b. Flóri	*		

In both cases the stressed vowel of the base is preserved, but only in *Fínda* is it preserved as a *stressed* vowel. I.e., under "PRESERVE STRESSED V OF BASE" cand. b. should win, since it does not violate CONTIGUITY either.

- (17) Similar (isolated?) examples from Tongan., showing also alignment effects at the left edge:
- |         |          |       |                         |
|---------|----------|-------|-------------------------|
| a. Máne | Mele Áne | *Méla | (Mele Taimoipeau, p.c.) |
| b. Mía  | Amelía   | *Méli |                         |

N.B.: ex. b. shows also alignment effects on the left edge, similar to the Russian ex. discussed above

- (18) **Defining Anchoring to the stressed syllable as stress preservation:**

**ANCHOR-STRESS:**

Let  $\alpha$  be a segment in the Base and  $\beta$  be its correspondent in TRUNC  
 If  $\alpha$  is the stress peak of the Base, then  $\beta$  is the stress peak of TRUNC  
 (cf. Kager 2000)

**4.2 The template under Generalized Template Theory**

(McCarthy&Prince 1999, McCarthy&Prince 1994, 1995; cf. Benua 1995 for truncation)

There is quite some literature dealing with the 'size restrictor constraints' (SRCs) responsible for templates in truncation and reduplication. We cannot go into a detailed discussion here for reasons of time and will call them simply

- (19) SRC $\sigma$ : size restrictor constraints responsible for monosyllabic templates  
 SRC $\sigma\sigma$ : size restrictor constraints responsible for disyllabic templates

However, we want to underline that we follow Generalized Template Theory in assuming that templates are the effect of constraints which emerge under a 'The Emergence of the Unmarked' - Ranking. We have reasons to believe that the relevant constraints are the following ones (for more details you will have to wait for Alber&Lappe, in prep.):

- (20) SRC $\sigma$ : COINCIDE- $\sigma_1$ : "every segment of the output is in the first syllable of some morpheme"

(Alber 2001, Lappe, 2003, 2005, 2007)

**SRC $\sigma$** : FT-BIN, ALL-FT-LEFT, PARSE- $\sigma$   
(McCarthy&Prince 1994)

### 4.3 Maximality: ANCHOR-R instead of MAX-BT

In most OT-approaches to truncation or reduplication it is assumed that the maximality effect is due to the correspondence constraint MAX-BT, which, even when dominated, will require maximal copying of base material.

(21) MAX-BT: every segment in the base has a correspondent in the TRUNC morpheme

(22) Maximal monosyllabic template: English

Base: Marvin	MAX-IO	SRC $\sigma$	MAX-BT
☞ a. Marv			in
b. Mar			vin!
c. Ma			rvin!
d. Marvi		*!	

The minimal word (H) = maximal monosyllabic template

We will abandon the idea that MAX-BT is responsible for the maximality effect since the interaction between MAX-BT and the ANCHOR constraints makes unwelcome predictions. Consider the following ranking, where MAX-BT dominates the ANCHOR constraint:

(23) **SRCs >> MAX-BT >> ANCHOR**

This ranking describes a truncation process, since some SRC >> MAX-BT

However, since MAX-BT >> ANCHOR, preserving as many segments as possible from the base is more important than good anchoring

A hypothetical language to illustrate the case:

- a language with a monosyllabic TRUNC-morpheme
- anchoring to the left edge
- locus of anchoring shifts according to where a maximum of base segments can be preserved

(24) Hypothetical language: anchoring is sacrificed in order to maximize satisfaction of MAX-BT

	SRC $\sigma$	MAX-BT	ANCHOR-LEFT
hyp. Base: Car.mé.la			
☞ a. Carm		ela	
b. Mel		ca, la	car
hyp. Base: Pe.tro.síl.la			
a. Pet		rosilla!	
☞ b. Tros		pe illa	pe

i.e.: going from left to right, the sequence is picked out which allows for copying of the biggest number of segments





### 1. SRCs >> ANCHOR<sub>x</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>y</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>z</sub>

- Well-formed templates are created; if necessary, at the expense of anchoring
- Among ANCHOR<sub>x</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>y</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>z</sub>, the dominant Anchor-constraint will decide on the Anchor-site

What about the "at the expense of anchoring" case?

Not easy to construct:

- under anchoring to the left-edge, there is no reason, ever, to create suboptimal templates
- under anchoring to the stressed vowel:

A hypothetical case: take a language with

- a disyllabic TRUNC template
- anchoring to the stressed vowel
- > when stress is final, anchoring could jump to the first syllable, under ANCHOR-L

(30) Hypothetical language: anchoring is sacrificed in order to guarantee a wellformed template

	SRCσσ	ANCHOR-STRESS	ANCHOR-L
hyp. Base: Vicénte			
☞ a. Cénte			vi
b. Vícen		*!	
c. Cén	*!		vi, te
hyp. Base: Agostín			
a. Stín	*!		ago
☞ b. Á.go		*	

No pattern of this type can be found in our database. Is this due to the requirement of a very specific context (disyllabic template+stress anchoring+possibility of final stress) or is there a bigger problem lurking?

### 2. ANCHOR<sub>x</sub> >> SRCs >> ANCHOR<sub>y</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>z</sub>

- well-anchored to one edge or stress; well-formed template, in the limits of dominant anchoring constraint
- ANCHOR<sub>x</sub> will decide on the anchor-site. It will insist on this anchor site, even if template wellformedness has to be sacrificed

(31) Spanish hypocoristics; stress-anchored, disyllabic template (Piñeros 1999)

a. Disyllabic TRUNC	b. Monosyllabic TRUNC possible?	Base name:
Cénte	*Cen	Vicénte
Géntfo	*Xen	Fulgéncio
Cánda	*Can	Cándida

but when Base has final stress:

'Standard' Dialects	Central American Dialects (Southern Mexico, Guatemala)	
Tíno	Tin	Agustín
Tíča	Tiʃ	Beatríz
čóna	čon	Encarnación

i.e.:

- TRUNCs are stress-anchored

- default template is disyllabic
- when stress is final, stress-anchoring conflicts with the requirement of a disyllabic template
- two possibilities arise: either attach a vowel (column a.) or sacrifice the disyllabic template and go for a monosyllabic one (column b.). Choice b. corresponds to our ranking: the template is sacrificed in order to keep anchoring constant.

### 3. ANCHOR<sub>x</sub>, ANCHOR<sub>y</sub> >> SRCs >> ANCHOR<sub>z</sub>

- anchoring is satisfied for more than one ANCHOR constraint; if necessary, at the expense of template wellformedness.

This ranking represents a particularly interesting group of languages which has not deserved much attention in the literature, so far. Its effects depend on which Anchor constraints stay on top:

#### 3.1. ANCHOR-L, ANCHOR-STRESS >> SRCs >> ANCHOR-R

Atemplatic truncation, anchored to the left edge and the stressed syllable: examples

##### a. Southern Italian Vocatives

Bá	Bárbara
Carmé	Carméla
Antoné	Antonélla
Vá	Válerin (German name, truncated the Southern Italian way)

##### b. German i-Bildungen, 'exceptions' (Wiese 2001)

Elegánt-i	Elegánter
Kompóst-i	Kompóst
Verstéck-i	Verstéckspiel

##### c. English unsuffixed disyllabic clippings (Lappe 2005, 2007)

celéb	celebrity
metróp	metrópolis
exéc	executive

##### d. Dutch hypocoristics (van de Vijver 1997)

Regíen	Regína
Patrías	Patrícia
Pandóor	Pandóra

i.e., the typology predicts that high-ranking anchoring constraints may result in *atemplatic* truncation. We do find examples of this type in our database and we can now explain patterns which were considered exceptions in previous analyses (i.e. the German ex. above).

## (32) Anchoring to both prominent positions: atemplatic Southern Italian Vocatives

/Bárbara/	ANCHOR-Left	ANCHOR-STRESS	SRC $\sigma^1$	ANCHOR-R
☞ a. Bá				rbara
b. Bár.ba			*!	ra
/Carméla/				
a. Ca		*!		rmela
☞ b. Car.mé			*	la
c. Car.mé.la			**!	
/Antonélla/				
a. An		*!		tonella
b. An.to		*!	*	nella
☞ c. An.to.né			**	lla
d. An.ton.nél.la			***!	

## 3.1. ANCHOR-R, ANCHOR-STRESS &gt;&gt; SRCs &gt;&gt; ANCHOR-L

Generally, right-anchoring patterns are rare in our database. But some isolated cases exist in Italian, where material from the stressed syllable to the right edge is preserved in TRUNC:

- (33) Tóforo - Cristóforo (Thornton 1996)  
 Ménico - Doménico  
 Níbale - Anníbale  
 Pólito - Ippólito

## 3.1. ANCHOR-R, ANCHOR-L &gt;&gt; SRCs &gt;&gt; ANCHOR-STRESS

This type of ranking will lead to truncation only if we can violate contiguity and delete material in the middle of the base. Again we find some isolated cases in Italian:

- (34) Róbo - Robérto  
 (Gio) Bátta - (Giovanni) Battístá  
 bénza - benzína

## 6. Summary

- We have established a set of more or less plausible **constraints** targeting the properties of truncation patterns:
  - constraints responsible for anchoring: ANCHOR-LEFT, ANCHOR-RIGHT, ANCHOR-STRESS
  - constraints shaping the template
    - SRC $\sigma\sigma$ : FT-BIN, PARSE- $\sigma$ , ALLFTLEFT
    - SRC $\sigma$ : COINCIDE- $\sigma_1$

As they are defined, we predict them to generate

- alignment effects at the left and at the right edge (confirmed by data)
- stress preservation effects (confirmed by data)

<sup>1</sup> Violations of SRC $\sigma$  are counted here in number of syllables outside of the first syllable – but the number of violations obviously depends on the exact definition of the constraints assumed to make part of SRC $\sigma$ .

- maximal 'stretching' of the copied base material (=maximal copying) (confirmed by the data)
- We have seen **some interaction** between these constraints. The interaction predicts:
  - systems where the anchor site may be changed in order to create a wellformed template (not confirmed so far by data)
  - systems where the template requirements are sacrificed in order to guarantee satisfaction of anchoring (confirmed by the data)
  - the possibility of a templatic truncation when double anchoring is required (confirmed by the data)

## References

- Alber, B. 2001. Maximizing First Positions. In: Féry C., Green A., Van De Vijver R. (eds.) *Linguistics in Potsdam 12. Proceedings of HILP 5*, Universität Potsdam, Potsdam, 1-19. ROA-516.
- Alber, B. 2007. Deutsche und italienische Kurzwörter im Vergleich. In: Claudio Di Meola, Livio Gaeta, Antonie Hornung, Lorenza Rega (eds.). *Perspektiven Zwei. Akten der 2. Tagung Deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in Italien* (Rom, 9.-11.2. 2006). Istituto Italiano di Studi Germanici, Roma, 101-112.
- Benua, Laura 1995. Identity Effects in Morphological Truncation. In: Jill Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey & Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.). *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*. GLSA, Amherst, MA. 77-136. ROA-74.
- Bethin, Christina. 2003. "Metrical Quantity in Czech: Evidence from Hypocoristics," in: W. Browne, B. Partee and R. Rothstein (eds.). *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials, 63-82.
- Cohn, A. (2005) "Truncation in Indonesian: Evidence for violable minimal words and AnchorRight," *Proceedings of NELS 34, Volume 1*, pp. 175-189.
- Kager, René (2000), "Stem stress and peak correspondence in Dutch", in J. Dekkers, F. van der Leeuw, and J. van de Weijer (eds.), *Optimality Theory: Phonology, Syntax and Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lappe, Sabine 2003, *Monosyllabicity in Prosodic Morphology: The Case of Truncated Personal Names in English*. In G. Booij et al. (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2002*, Kluwer, Dordrecht. 135-186.
- Lappe, Sabine 2005, *English Prosodic Morphology*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Siegen, Siegen.
- Lappe, Sabine 2007, *English Prosodic Morphology*, Springer, Dordrecht.
- Lipski, John (1995) "Spanish hypocoristics: Towards a unified prosodic analysis." *Hispanic Linguistics* 6, 387-434.
- McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1993. Generalized alignment. *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, edited by G. Booij & J. van Marle, 79-153. Kluwer, Dordrecht. ROA-7.
- McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1994. The Emergence of the Unmarked. *Optimality in Prosodic Morphology*. In: M. González (ed.), *NELS 24: Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 24*. GLSA, Amherst, MA, 333-379. ROA-13
- McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. In Jill Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey & Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*. GLSA, Amherst, MA. 249-384. ROA-60
- McCarthy, J. & A. Prince 1999. Faithfulness and Identity in Prosodic Morphology. In: René Kager, Harry van der Hulst & Wim Zonneveld (eds.), *The Prosody Morphology Interface*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. ROA-216.
- Montermini, Fabio. 2007. "Hypocoristiques et minimalité en russe", in Delais-Roussarie E., Labrune L. (eds), *Des sons et des sens. Données et modèles en phonologie et en morphologie*, Paris, Hermès, 199-213.
- Piñeros, C.E. 1998. *Prosodic Morphology in Spanish: Constraint Interaction in Word Formation*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Piñeros, C.E. 1999. Foot-sensitive word minimization in Spanish. ROA-308.
- Piñeros, C.E. 2000. Prosodic and segmental unmarkedness in Spanish truncation. *Linguistics* 38, 1, 63-98.
- Soglasnova, Svetlana. 2003. *Russian Hypocoristic Formation: A Quantitative Approach*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Chicago.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1957. "The expression of affection in Russian proper names". *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 1.3, 196-210
- Thornton, Anna Maria 1996, *On some phenomena of prosodic morphology in Italian: accorciamenti, hypocoristics and prosodic delimitation*. In *Probus* 8, S. 81-112.
- Thornton, Anna Maria 2004, chapter "Accorciamenti" and "Antroponimia". In M. Grossmann, M. et al. (eds.), *La formazione delle parole in italiano*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen. 561-566 and 601-606.
- van de Vijver, Ruben (1997), *The Duress of Stress: On Dutch Clippings*, In: Coerts, Jane & Helen de Hoop (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1997*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 219-230.
- Weeda, Donald (1992). *Word truncation in prosodic morphology*. PhD Diss., University of Texas, Austin.
- Wiese, Richard (2001), *Regular Morphology vs. Prosodic Morphology? The Case of Truncations in German*, *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 131-17.