Theorien der Morphologie 7

Modul 006-1006: Grammatiktheorie, SoSe 2019

Di, 11:15–12:45, HSG, HS 20

Leading Forms

Gereon Müller (Universität Leipzig)

General idea:
Some member of a paradigm may act as a "leading form" in the sense that it determines properties of another member of the paradigm.

1. Brugmann on Analogy

Ref.: Brugmann & Osthoff (1878)

(1) Erstens: Aller Lautwandel, soweit er mechanisch vor sich geht, vollzieht sich nach *ausnahmslosen Gesetzen* ... Alle Wörter, in denen der der Lautbewegung unterworfene Laut unter gleichen Verhältnissen erscheint, werden ohne Ausnahme von der Änderung ergriffen.

(2) Zweitens: Da sich klar herausstellt, dass die Form-Assoziation, d.h., die Neubildung von Sprachformen auf dem Wege der Analogie, im Leben der *neueren* Sprachen eine sehr bedeutende Rolle spielt, so ist diese Art von Sprachneuerung unbedenklich auch für die *älteren* und *ältesten* Perioden anzuerkennen.
... So glauben wir also, dass auch der Einwand, unser Arbeiten mit dem Analogieprinzip sei darum verwerflich, weil es auf ein bloßes Raten herauslaufe, sich als ein ungerechtfertigter erweist.

2. Wurzel on Leading Forms

Lit.: Wurzel (1984; 1987; 1990; 1998)

Wurzel's assumption:
There are *leading forms* (*principal parts*, "Kennformen") in complex inflectional paradigms.

- Leading forms are privileged over other forms of a paradigm.
- Leading forms signal membership in inflection classes.
- If one knows one (or several) leading forms, one can derive the rest of the forms of a paradigm, via *paradigm structure conditions* ("Paradigmenstrukturbedingungen").
- Leading forms are stored in the mental lexicon; all other forms can be derived via rules. The ending of a leading forms acts as an inflection class feature.
- Leading forms can correspond to the syntactically unmarked instantiation of a grammatical category (e.g., nominative singular with nominal inflection), but they do not have to.

Also see Carstairs-McCarthy (1994), Blevins (2004).

(3) *Strong feminine inflection classes in Icelandic*

	Fa *vél* ('machine')	Fa′ *drottning* ('queen')	Fi *mynd* ('picture')	Fc1 *geit* ('goat')	Fc2 *vík* ('bay')
nom sg	vél-Ø	drottning-Ø	mynd-Ø	geit-Ø	vík-Ø
acc sg	vél-Ø	drottning-u	mynd-Ø	geit-Ø	vík-Ø
dat sg	vél-Ø	drottning-u	mynd-Ø	geit-Ø	vík-Ø
gen sg	vél-ar	drottning-ar	mynd-ar	geit-ar	vík-ur
nom pl	vél-ar	drottning-ar	mynd-ir	geit-ur	vík-ur
acc pl	vél-ar	drottning-ar	mynd-ir	geit-ur	vík-ur
dat pl	vél-um	drottning-um	mynd-um	geit-um	vík-um
gen pl	vél-a	drottning-a	mynd-a	geit-a	vík-a

What are the leading forms here?

The leading forms are the nominative plural, accusative plural and, in one case, the genitive singular forms.

Analysis of the strong feminine declensions in Wurzel's approach
Generalizations:

- Fi does not need a lexical specification (no inflection class feature).
- Fa needs /ar/ as a lexical specification for nom./acc.pl. environments.
- Fc1 needs /ur/ as a lexical specification for nom./acc.pl. environments.
- Fc2 needs /ur/ as a lexical specification for gen.sg. environments (i.e., the genitive singular form is the leading form of this inflection class).

(4) *Paradigm structure conditions*

a. (i) [+noun] → [*um*/dat.pl.]
   (ii) [+noun,–C–V] → [*a*/gen.pl.]
   (iii) [+noun,+fem,#σ#] → [Ø/dat./acc.sg.]

b. (i) [*ir*/nom/acc.pl.] → [*ar*/gen.sg.]
   (ii) [*ar*/nom/acc.pl.] → [*ar*/gen.sg.]
   (iii) [*ur*/gen.sg.] → [*ur*/nom/acc.pl.]

Note: [–C] = ends in a consonant; [–V] = ends in a full vowel; #σ# = monosyllabicity

Problems

(5) *The full system of inflection classes*

	1 Ma	2 Na	3 Fa(′)	4 Mi	5 Fi	6 Mu	7 Mc	8 Fc1	9 Fc2	10 Mw	11 Nw	12 Fw
nom sg	ur	Ø	Ø	ur	Ø	ur	ur	Ø	Ø	i	a	a
acc sg	Ø	Ø	Ø (u)	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	a	a	u
dat sg	i	i	Ø (u)	Ø	Ø	i	i	Ø	Ø	a	a	u
gen sg	s	s	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ur	a	a	u
nom pl	ar	Ø	ar	ir	ir	ir	ur	ur	ur	ar	u	ur
acc pl	a	Ø	ar	i	ir	i	ur	ur	ur	a	u	ur
dat pl	um	um	um	um	um	um	um	um	um	um	um	um
gen pl	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	(n)a	(n)a

Question:
Are there reliable leading forms here?

Problem:
More generally, the assumption seems to be untenable that one will always find morphological exponents that are inflection-class specific. (This also argues against the constraints on paradigm economy suggested by Carstairs-McCarthy (1994) (No Blur Principle; see handout 4) and Noyer (2005) (Interclass Syncretism Constraint).)

Question:
Where do the leading forms come from? How can the learner identify them?

3. Finkel and Stump on Paradigmatic Transparency

Ref.: Finkel & Stump (2007; 2009)

Background:
Static vs. dynamic conception of principle parts (Latin grammar vs. Wurzel); only the latter concept is relevant.

Claim:
Principal parts (leading forms) are *not* directly relevant for determining morphological exponence in paradigms; they are relevant for acquisition and complexity considerations.

(6) *Optimality of dynamic principal parts*:
A set S of dynamic principal parts is optimal for inflection class J iff there is no valid set of dynamic principal parts for J whose cardinality is less than that of S.

(7) Verbs in Comaltepec Chinantec (Oto-Manguean):
V-stem – Stem-modifier – Person/Number

Note:
Person/number exponents are invariant across inflection classes. Stem-modifiers vary a lot, giving rise to a huge number of different inflection classes.

(8) Stem-modifiers:
a. 7 tones: L, M, H, LM, MH, LH, HL
b. Stress: controlled stress (unmarked) vs. ballistic stress (′)
c. Length: [x] vs. [x:]
d. Capacity to trigger tone sandhi: [ ] vs. [$]
e. Final glottality: absence ([ ]) or presence ([ʔ])

(9) *Maximal transparency*:
A paradigm P of a member of conjugation J is maximally transparent if each pairing of a property set with an exponent in P is unique across all conjugations to the paradigms of members of J. If lexeme L has a maximally transparent paradigm P, any cell in P can serve as L's sole dynamic principal part.

Observation:
PDBB is maximally transparent.

Claim:
In P1A, the cell containing the realization of property set 1 uniquely determines the cell containing the realization of property set 2, *but does not uniquely determine any of the remaining ten cells*.

(10) A representative optimal principal part analysis of P1A:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1,12	1	1	1,12	1,12	1,12	1,12	1,12	1,12	12	1,12	1,12	12

(11) Another representative optimal principal part analysis of P1A:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
3,12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3,12	12

(12) The sole optimal principal part analysis of P2C:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
11,12	11,12	12	11,12	12	11,12	11,12	11,12	12	11,12	11,12	11	12

(13) The sole optimal principal part analysis of P1B:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
11,12	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12

(14) The sole optimal principal part analysis of P3E:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
9,10,11,12	10	10	12	12	10	10	10	12	9	10	11	12

(15) *Two criteria for paradigmatic transparency*:
a. *Economy*:
Fewer dynamic principal parts needed to deduce a lexeme's paradigm in an optimal analysis implies greater transparency of that paradigm.
b. *Flexibility*:
More alternative optimal principal-part analyses of a lexeme's paradigm implies greater transparency of that paradigm.

(16) Extreme degrees of paradigmatic transparency
   a. PDBB, PDBD, PDCB, PDCC: only 1 principal part, maximum number of alternative optimal principal-part analyses
   b. P3E: 4 principal parts, minimal number of optimal principal-part analyses

(17) *Paradigm predictability of a lexeme*:
$\mathrm{PP}_L = \frac{|M'|}{|\mathbf{P}(M)|}$

(18) a. M is the set of morphosyntactic property sets associated with the cells in the paradigm P_L of some lexeme L.
   b. M′ is the set {N: N⊆M and the exponence in P_L of the morphosyntactic property sets belonging to N suffices to determine the exponence in P_L of every morphosyntactic property set belonging to M}

Illustration:

- Suppose that there are four morpho-syntactic property sets in M:
  M = { s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 }.
- Then the power set **P**(M) contains 16 elements:
  { Ø, { s_1 }, { s_2 }, { s_3 }, { s_4 }, { s_1, s_2 }, { s_1, s_3 }, { s_1, s_4 }, { s_2, s_3 }, { s_2, s_4 }, { s_3, s_4 }, { s_1, s_2, s_3 }, { s_1, s_2, s_4 }, { s_2, s_3, s_4 }, { s_1, s_3, s_4 }, { s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 } }
- The more of these sets in **P**(M) are also in M′ (i.e., the more of these sets can fully determine all inflectional exponents in a paradigm/inflection class), the larger the paradigm predictability value will be (with 1, i.e., 16/16 in the case at hand, as the limiting case).
- (17) captures the Economy criterion (see (15-a)): If, say, { s_1 } suffices in the same way that { s_1, s_2 } does, or if { s_1, s_2, s_3 } suffices in the same way that { s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 } does, there will be more members in M′ than there are in a scenario where the smaller set does not suffice.
- (17) also captures the Flexibility criterion (see (15-b)): If, say, both { s_1 } and { s_2 } suffice to predict all the forms, there will be more members in M′ than in a scenario where only { s_1 } suffices.

(19) a. I: abb, II: acc, III: bbb, IV: ccc
   b. I: ab, II: ac, III: bb, IV: cc

Problem: If paradigm predictability counts the middle letter in (19-a), lexemes belonging to class I in (19-a) have greater paradigm predictability than lexemes belonging to class I in (19-b).

Proposal:
Let M_ be a maximal subset of M such that no two of members of M_ are identical in their exponence across all conjugations.

Next problem: Where N is a large subset of M_, the exponence in P_L of the morphosyntactic property sets belonging to N is generally very likely to determine the exponence in P_L of every morphosyntactic property set belonging to M_. The subsets that are best for

distinguishing degrees of paradigm predictability tend to be the smaller subsets of M_.

Proposal:
For any set S of sets, we use $\leq_7$S to represent the largest subset of S such that for every s ∈ $\leq_7$S $|s| \leq 7$.

(20) *Paradigm predictability of a lexeme* (revised):
$\mathrm{PP}_L = \frac{|\leq_7 M'\_|}{|\leq_7 \mathbf{P}(M\_)|}$

4. McCarthy on Optimal Paradigms

Lit.: McCarthy (2005)

(21) *Paradigm*:
A paradigm is a set of inflected forms based on a common lexeme or stem, e.g., <*lighten, lightens, lightened, lightening*>.

(22) *Candidates*:
Candidates consist of entire paradigms. Every output realization of a lexeme stands in correspondence with every other output realization of that lexeme. (There is an intraparadigmatic correspondence relation R_{OP} on PxP.)

(23) *Optimal paradigm (OP) constraints*:
There are output/output faithfulness constraints for members of a paradigm.

(24) Predictions:
   a. *Attraction to the unmarked*
   b. *Overapplication only*
   c. *Majority rules*

(25) *Constraints*:
   a. *$\mu\mu\mu_\sigma$:
      No trimoraic syllables
   b. App-σ:
      Do not link a coda consonant directly to the σ node as an appendix.
   c. OP-Id-Wt:
      No vowel length alternation in a paradigm.
   d. IO-Id-Wt:
      Preserve the vowel length of the input.

(26) *Arabic verbs and optimal paradigms: Vowel length*:

/faʕaːl/ + {a, tu, ...}	*$\mu\mu\mu_\sigma$	*App-σ	OP-Id-Wt	IO-Id-Wt
☞O_1: <faʕala, faʕaltu, ...>				**
O_2: <faʕaːla, faʕaːl$_\sigma$tu, ...>		*!		
O_3: <faʕaːla, faʕaːl$_\mu$tu, ...>	*!			
O_4: <faʕaːla, faʕaltu, ...>			*!	*

Note:
Here the leading form (which determines the properties of other forms in the same paradigm) is not stipulated. It is picked by the two high-ranked markedness constraints (which require

a short *a* for the *-tu* form: attraction to the unmarked), and the ranking OP-Id-Wt ≫ IO-Id-Wt then ensures that this property spreads to the *-a* form where it is not intrsinsically motivated (overapplication of vowel shortening).

(27) *Arabic verbs and optimal paradigms: Epenthesis*:

/faʕl/ + {a, tu, ...}	*$\mu\mu\mu_\sigma$	*App-σ	OP-Dep-V	IO-Dep-V
☞O_1: <faʕila, faʕiltu, ...>				**
O_2: <faʕla, faʕl$_\sigma$tu, ...>		*!		
O_3: <faʕla, faʕl$_\mu$tu, ...>	*!			
O_4: <faʕla, faʕiltu, ...>			*!	*

"Epenthesis metastasizes throughout the paradigm, even in forms where it is not required for markedness reasons."

(28) *Moroccan Arabic verbs: Majority rules*:

/ʃərb/ + {t, na, ti, tu, u, ət}	*ə$_\sigma$	*CCC	OP-Max-V	SonCon	IO-Max-V	IO-Dep-V
☞O_1: <ʃrəb, ʃrəbt, ʃrəbna, ʃrəbti, ʃrəbtu, ʃərbu, ʃərbet>			20x*	*	5x*	5x*
O_2: <ʃərb, ʃrəbt, ʃrəbna, ʃrəbti, ʃrəbtu, ʃərbu, ʃərbet>			24x*!		4x*	4x*
O_3: <ʃrəb, ʃrəbt, ʃrəbna, ʃrəbti, ʃrəbtu, ʃrəbu, ʃrəbet>	*!*			*	7x*	7x*
O_4: <ʃərb, ʃərbt, ʃərbna, ʃərbti, ʃərbtu, ʃərbu, ʃərbet>		*!***				

Note:
Completely uniform candidates (O_3, O_4) fatally violate high-ranked markedness constraints. These constraints are satisfied by O_1, O_2, which only differ with respect to *3.masc.sg.* forms (the first member of the paradigm). O_1 wins because "the CCəC pattern is better represented in the reset of the paradigm" than the CəCC pattern. (Note: Low ranking of IO-faithfulness implies that the input could also have been different. Also note: 20 = 5x2x2, 24 = 4x3x2: All stems are equally important for this constraint, i.e., OP-Max-V is violated for *ər* stems by *rə* stems, and for *rə* stems by *ər* stems).

Also note:
Majority rules can only become relevant here because of a low ranking for the markedness constraint SonCon. Otherwise, there would be attraction to the unmarked.

5. Albright on Leading Forms

Lit.: Albright (2002; 2008), Albright & Hayes (2002)

Case study (Albright (2008)): Nominal paradigms in Yiddish.

(29) a. Middle High German (MHG):
/bund/, /bundə/ → [bunt], [bundə]
b. Yiddish (NEY):
/bund/, /bundə/ → [bund], [bundə]

Problem for Optimal Paradigms model:
The Yiddish change is unexpected since the model relies on overapplication only (of devoicing, in the case at hand).

(30) *Optimal Paradigms: Overapplication only*

a. *No OP effect*

/bund/, /bund-ə/	FinDevoi	IO-Id(voi)	OP-Id(voi)
☞O_1: [bunt], [bundə]		*	*
O_2: [bunt], [buntə]		*!*	
O_3: [bund], [bundə]	*!		

b. *OP effect*

/bund/, /bund-ə/	OP-Id(voi)	FinDevoi	IO-Id(voi)
O_1: [bunt], [bundə]	*!		*
☞O_2: [bunt], [buntə]			**
O_3: [bund], [bundə]		*!	

(31) *Final devoicing in MHG*:

a. Voiced obstruents

Stem	NomSg	GenSg	NomPl	gloss
lob-	lop	lobes	lobe	'praise'
rad-	rat	rades	reder	'wheel'
wëg	wëc	wëges	wëge	'way'

b. Voiceless obstruents

Stem	NomSg	GenSg	NomPl	gloss
blat-	blat	blates	bleter	'leaf'
roc-	roc	rockes	röcke	'overcoat'
schif-	schif	schifes	schiffe	'ship'

(32) *Analogical leveling in Modern Northeast Yiddish (NEY)*:

Stem	Sg	Pl	gloss	MHG Sg
loyb-	loyb	loybən	'praise'	lop
rɔd-	rɔd	reder	'wheel'	rat
veg-	veg	vegən	'way'	wëc
hoyz-	hoyz	hayzər	'house'	hu:s

(33) *Persistence of devoicing outside the paradigm in NEY*:

Sg.	Pl.	derivationally related word
veg	vegən	a-vek ('away')
faynd	faynd	faynt həbən ('come to hate')

(34) *Persistence of devoicing in word-final obstruent clusters*:

1sg	lib	1pl	libən
2sg	lipst	2pl	lipt
3sg	lipt	3pl	libən

Note:
This implies that the absence of devoicing in (32) in NEY is a paradigmatic (morphophonological) effect, not a genuine phonological effect, and that it does not go hand in hand with a change in inputs.

(35) *Constraints*:

a. Faithfulness constraints:
(i) Ident(voi):
Preserve underlying voicing value.

(ii) IDENT$_{\text{Onset}}$(VOI):
Preserve voicing in onset position.

(iii) IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI):
Preserve voicing within roots of lexical categories.

b. Markedness constraints:

(i) FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$:
No faithfully voiced obstruents in coda position.

(ii) FINDEVOI$_{\text{N}}$:
No derived (new) voiced obstruents in coda position.

(iii) *DD#:
No word-final sequences of voiced obstruents.

(iv) AGREE:
Consecutive obstruents may not have conflicting [voice] specifications.

(v) AGREE/__#:
Consecutive obstruents may not have conflicting [voice] specifications at the ends of words.

(36) *Ranking* (in stochastic OT):
AGREE/__# ≫ IDENT$_{\text{Onset}}$(VOI), *DD# ≫ FINDEVOI$_{\text{N}}$, AGREE, IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI) ≫ FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$ ≫ IDENT(VOI)

Note:
In (36), "≫" stands for no (or hardly any) overlapping domains of constraints, "," stands for overlapping domains, with the relative (non-categorical) ranking corresponding to the order presentation.

(37) *Crucial partial ranking for MHG and NEY*:

a. MHG:
FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$ ≫ IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI), IDENT(VOI)

b. NEY:
IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI) ≫ FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$ ≫ IDENT(VOI)

(38) *Absence of final devoicing in Yiddish: Conspiracy of regular constraints*

/bund/, /bund-ə/	IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
O$_1$: [bunt], [bundə]	*!		*
O$_2$: [bunt], [buntə]	*!*		**
☞O$_3$: [bund], [bundə]		*	

Note:
This simple analysis seems to work well for Yiddish; by taking into account all the other constraints, all other data where one can or must have devoicing after all can be accomodated.

(39) *Blocking of final voiced+voiced sequences in Yiddish*:

/lib-t/	*DD#	AGREE	IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
O$_1$: [libt]		*!		*	
O$_2$: [libd]	*!			**	*
☞O$_3$: [lipt]			*		*

Another case: (Variation in) regressive devoicing.

(40) a. *Regressive devoicing in /abta/*

/abta/	IDENT$_{\text{Onset}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{N}}$	AGREE	IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
O$_1$: [abta]			*!		*	
O$_2$: [abda]	*!			*	*	*
☞O$_3$: [apta]				*		*

b. *No regressive voicing in /apta/*

/apda/	IDENT$_{\text{Onset}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{N}}$	AGREE	IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI)	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
☞O$_1$: [apda]			*			
O$_2$: [abda]		*!		*		*
O$_3$: [apta]	*!			*		*

Situation so far:
The analysis works technically. However: At no point does the concept of a *leading form* (a "base", in Albright's terminology) play a role in the analysis. This changes in the last five pages of the paper, where an alternative (?) analysis is presented that is based on the model developed in Albright (2002). The new approach replaces IDENT$_{\text{LexCat}}$(VOI) with BASEIDENT$_{\text{pl}}$ which requires faithfulness to a *preselected plural base form*.

(41) *Absence of final devoicing in Yiddish: Paradigmatic leveling*

a. Plural form without devoicing:

/bund-ə/	BASEIDENT$_{\text{pl}}$	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
☞O$_1$: [bundə]			
O$_2$: [buntə]			*!

b. Singular form without devoicing (so as to match the plural form):

/bund/	BASEIDENT$_{\text{pl}}$	FINDEVOI$_{\text{O}}$	IDENT(VOI)
☞O$_1$: [bund]		*	
O$_2$: [bunt]	*!		*

Question:
How is the plural form selected as the base form (leading form)?

Answer:
The plural form is the most informative part of the paradigm. It is "the form that most clearly exhibits lexical contrasts and extending the plural variant does the least violence to recoverability" (p. 300). "See Albright (2002) for details and algorithmic implementation." (Crucial concepts: reliability score of rules (hits divided by scope), adjustment by confidence scores, etc.)

Hunch:
It might in principle be possible (though perhaps less plausible) to carry out leading form determination in inflectional morphology in OT *within* OT (rather than by invoking some algorithm like the Minimal Generalization Learner of Albright (2002)). As a matter of fact, there is already such a proposal: Sympathy theory (McCarthy (1999)).

6. McCarthy on Sympathy Theory

Lit.: McCarthy (1999)

Problem:
Instances of opaque rule application in derivational phonology (counter-bleeding, counter-feeding) cannot straightforwardly be accounted for in representational optimality-theoretic phonology ("harmonic parallelism").

(42) *Counter-bleeding in Tiberian Hebrew*:

a. Epenthesis into final clusters:
/melk/ → melex "king"

b. ʔ-Deletion outside onsets:
/qaraʔ/ → qārā_ "he called"

c. Interaction – Epenthesis → ʔ-Deletion:
/dešʔ/ → dešeʔ → deše_ "tender grass"

Note:
Standard (parallel) optimality theoretic can only produce the result of transparent rule application: **deš*.

McCarthy's (1999) idea:
The intermediate stage of the derivation in (42-c), viz., *dešeʔ*, corresponds to a candidate that competes with (and loses against) the optimal form *deše_*, but that is more faithful to the input /dešʔ/ in one respect – it maintains the ʔ. *deše_* blocks *deš* because it is more faithful to the candidate that corresponds to the intermediate step in a derivational approach. This latter instance of faithfulness is called sympathy.

(43) *Basic tenets of sympathy theory*:

a. Certain (input/output faithfulness) constraints F_i divide the candidate set C into two non-overlapping subsets: C_{+Fi} is the class of candidates that respect F_i, and C_{-Fi} is the class of candidates that violate F_i. F_i is called a "selector".

b. The optimal member of C_{+Fi} is called $\bullet_{Fi}$. This is the ☸-candidate selected by F_i. $\bullet_{Fi}$ does not have to be optimal in C.

c. There are ☸-faithfulness constraints that demand faithfulness (sympathy) to $\bullet_{Fi}$ candidates, rather than to the input itself. If high-ranked, these ☸-faithfulness constraints can render non-transparent candidates optimal and thereby account for opacity effects like counter-bleeding.

T_1: Counter-bleeding and sympathy in Tiberian Hebrew in McCarthy (1999)

Input: /dešʔ/	☸Max-V$_{Max-C}$	*Complex	Anchor	CodaCond	Max-C	Dep-V
☞O$_1$: deše					*	*
☛O$_2$: deš	*!				*	
O$_3$: dešʔe			*!			*
☸O$_4$: dešeʔ				*!		*
O$_5$: dešʔ	*!	*		*		

Note:
Sympathy theory identifies leading forms and ensures that properties of these leading forms (☸ candidates) can be transported to other forms in the same candidate set. Normally the selector is a faithfulness constraint, but perhaps this does not have to be the case (see, e.g., Müller (2002) on sympathy in syntax). In principle, it might be possible to extend this to paradigmatic leveling; the only technical issue would be that if paradigms (rather than word forms) are subject to optimization, it looks as though the ☸ optimization would have to take place within the paradigm first (cyclically, or in a separate stratum).

Yet another alternative?
Harmonic serialism: Leading forms as outputs of prior optimizations can somehow be the *inputs* for subsequent optimization, so that regular faithfulness constraints derive analogical leveling. (In the case of Yiddish, singular forms must be derived from plural forms.)

References

Albright, Adam (2002): The Identification of Bases in Morphological Paradigms. PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Albright, Adam (2008): Inflectional Paradigms Have Bases Too. Arguments from Yiddish. In: A. Bachrach & A. Nevins, eds., *The Bases of Inflectional Identity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Albright, Adam & Bruce Hayes (2002): Modeling English Past Tense Intuitions with Minimal Generalization. In: M. Maxwell, ed., *Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the ACL Special Interest Group in Computational Phonology*. ACL, Philadelphia.

Blevins, James (2004): Inflection Classes and Economy. In: G. Müller, L. Gunkel & G. Zifonun, eds., *Explorations in Nominal Inflection*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 51–95.

Brugmann, Karl & Hermann Osthoff (1878): *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Hirzel, Leipzig. 158 Seiten.

Carstairs-McCarthy, Andrew (1994): Inflection Classes, Gender, and the Principle of Contrast, *Language* 70, 737–787.

Finkel, Raphael & Gregory Stump (2007): Principal Parts and Morphological Typology, *Morphology* 17, 39–75.

Finkel, Raphael & Gregory Stump (2009): Principal Parts and Degrees of Paradigmatic Transparency. In: J. P. Blevins & J. Blevins, eds., *Analogy in Grammar: Form and Acquisition*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 13–53.

McCarthy, John (1999): Sympathy and Phonological Opacity, *Phonology* 16:3, 331–399.

McCarthy, John (2005): Optimal Paradigms. In: L. Downing, T. Hall & R. Raffelsiefen, eds., *Paradigms in Phonological Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 170–210.

Müller, Gereon (2002): Free Word Order, Morphological Case, and Sympathy Theory. In: G. Fanselow & C. Féry, eds., *Resolving Conflicts in Grammars: Optimality Theory in Syntax, Morphology, and Phonology*. Buske, Hamburg, pp. 9–48. Special issue of *Linguistische Berichte*.

Noyer, Rolf (2005): A Constraint on Interclass Syncretism. In: G. Booij & J. van Marle, eds., *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 273–315.

Wurzel, Wolfgang Ullrich (1984): *Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.

Wurzel, Wolfgang Ullrich (1987): Paradigmenstrukturbedingungen: Aufbau und Veränderung von Flexionsparadigmen. In: W. U. Wurzel, ed., *Studien zur Morphologie und Phonologie II*. Number 156 *in* 'Linguistische Studien, Reihe A: Arbeitsberichte', Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin, pp. 135–155.

Wurzel, Wolfgang Ullrich (1990): The Mechanism of Inflection: Lexical Representation, Rules, and Irregularities. In: W. U. Dressler, ed., *Contemporary Morphology*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Wurzel, Wolfgang Ullrich (1998): Drei Ebenen der Struktur von Flexionsparadigmen. In: R. Fabri, A. Ortmann & T. Parodi, eds., *Models of Inflection*. Niemeyer, Tübingen.