

Gemination and Degemination in English Affixation

Lexical Strata, Variability, and Phonetic Evidence

Sonia Ben Hedia & Ingo Plag



17th International Morphology Meeting, 18– 21 February 2016

Morpho-phonology as we know it

- Morpho-phonological alternations are categorical but may have lexical exceptions.
- The formal level of representation of morphemes is phonological in nature.
- Post-lexical phonology and phonetics have no access to lexical information.

Problems

- Morpho-phonological alternations are more variable than previously assumed, and governed by unexpected factors
 - Stress shift (Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013 on *-able*)
 - Stress preservation (Collie 2008, relative frequency as a proxy for morphological segmentability)
- Subphonemic detail may reflect morphological information
 - Free vs. bound stems (Kemps et al. 2005, Blazej & Cohen-Goldberg 2015)
 - Different S morphemes (Plag, Homann & Kunter 2015)
- Serious implications for theories of morpho-phonology (Plag 2014)
 - Exception vs. rule
 - Lexical vs. post-lexical phonology (in linguistic theory, and in speech production models)

(De-)Gemination in English

- Sequence of two identical consonants across a morphological boundary

un- un-natural

in- in-numerous, im-material, il-logical, ir-resistable

-ly sole-ly, technical-ly

- What happens at the segmental level? Gemination or deletion?
- Phonetic correlates
 - Gemination: Longer duration than a singleton
 - Degemination: Same duration as a singleton

Assumptions about gemination in English

- *un-* geminates
- *in-* degeminates
 - (e.g. Cruttenden & Gimson 2014, Cohen-Goldberg 2014, Kiparsky 1982, Mohanan 1986)
- *-ly*
 - ... is variable (*stalely* vs. *fully*, Bauer 2001, Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013)
 - ... geminates (Lexical Phonology: level 2 affix)
- General theoretical assumptions
 - Degemination is affix- or stratum-dependent
 - Degemination is a categorical morpho-phonological process with some lexical exceptions

Predictions

	Level 1	Level 2
Morphological Process	in + numerous	un + natural sole + ly
Phonological Process	i/n/umerous	u/nn/atural so/ll/y
Phonetic Outcome	i[n]umerous	u[n:]atural so[l:]y

Degemination

Gemination

Empirical evidence?

- Only two studies empirically investigated *in-* and *un-* in English
- Type-dependent (Oh and Redford 2013) and speaker-dependent (Kaye 2005) variation in degemination with *in-*prefixed words

immigrational

degemination

immemorial

gemination

immature

variable (by speaker)

- Problems: Only experimental data, only very small set of types
- No empirical study of *-ly*

This study

- What determines degemination at morphological boundaries? Three affixes: *un-*, *in-*, *-ly*
- Diagnostics: Acoustic duration
- Data: Natural conversational speech

Methodology

- Sample of *un-* , *in-* and *-ly-* affixed words with a double or a single consonant at the morphological boundary
- Switchboard Corpus (Godfrey & Holliman 1997)
- For the prefix *in-* the allomorph /*ɪm*/ was investigated
- Manual segmentation and acoustic measurements in Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2014)

Methodology


- Statistical Analysis: Multiple regression with **duration** as dependent variable and **number of consonants** (single vs. double) as predictor
- Coding of pertinent covariates:
 - Preceding Segment Duration
 - Preceding Segment
 - Following segment
 - Speech Rate
 - Stress
 - Syllabicity
 - Word Form Frequency
 - Relative Frequency
 - Affix
 - Semantic Transparency

Overview of the data


	Double Consonant	Single Consonant	Total per affix
<i>un-</i>	23	135	158
<i>in-</i>	89	67	156
<i>-ly</i>	76	80	156

Results: Overview


un-




in-




-ly







Results 1: *un-* geminates







Results 1: *un-* geminates







Results 2: *in-* geminates







Results 2: *in-* geminates




Results 2: *in-* geminates




Results 2: *in-* geminates



Results 3: *-/y* does not geminate




Results 3: -/y does not geminate




Additional covariate: Syllabicity (*ment*[l̥]y vs. *ment*[ə]y, *odd*[l]y)

Results 3: -/y does not geminate



Results 3: *-/y* does not geminate



Summary

- *un-* geminates: no surprise
- *in-* geminates: unexpected result
 - Effect of AFFIX: homophonous locative and negative *in-* prefixes are acoustically different
- *-ly* degeminates: unexpected result
 - effect of RELATIVE FREQUENCY: morphological segmentability influences phonetic implementation

Implications

- Empirical facts contradict received wisdom for *in-* and *-ly*
- Lexical Phonology makes wrong empirical predictions
- Morphological information is directly reflected in the speech signal
 - *in-*: Homophonous affixes exhibit different acoustic properties (cf. Plag, Homann & Kunter 2015 on S)
 - *-ly*: Degree of morphological separability correlates with acoustic duration (cf. Hay 2007, Collie 2008)
- Challenges models of lexical phonology and models of speech production that state that post-lexical phonology has no access to morphological information (e.g. Lexical Phonology, Levelt, Roelofs & Meyer 1999)

Thank you very much for your attention!

We gratefully acknowledge financial support by
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Grant PL151/8-1 'Morpho-
phonetic Variation in English')

References

- Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological productivity. Cambridge studies in linguistics: Vol. 95.* Cambridge England, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, L., Lieber, R., & Plag, I. (2013). *The Oxford reference guide to english morphology. Oxford Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blazej, L. J., & Cohen-Goldberg, A. M. (2015). Can we hear morphological complexity before words are complex? *Journal of experimental psychology. Human perception and performance*, 41(1), 50–68.
- Boersma, P. & Weenink, D. (2014). Praat: doing phonetics by computer. Retrieved from <http://www.praat.org/>
- Cohen-Goldberg, Ariel M. (2013): Towards a theory of multimorphemic word production: The heterogeneity of processing hypothesis. In: *Language and Cognitive Processes* 28 (7), S. 1036–1064.
- Collie, S. (2008). English stress preservation: the case for ‘fake cyclicity’. *English Language and Linguistics*, 12(03), 505–532.
- Cruttenden, Alan; Gimson, Alfred Charles (2014): *Gimson's pronunciation of English.* 8th ed. London, New York: Routledge.
- Giegerich, H. J. (1999). *Lexical Strata in English: Morphological Causes, Phonological Effects:* Cambridge University Press.
- Godfrey, John J.; Holliman, Edward (1997): *Switchboard-1 Release 2.* [Philadelphia, Pa.]: Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Hay, J. (2007). The phonetics of 'un'. In J. Munat (Ed.), *Studies in functional and structural linguistics: v. 58. Lexical creativity, texts and contexts* (pp. 39–57). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Kaye, A. S. (2005). Gemination in English. *English Today*, 21(2), 43–55.
- Kemps, Rachel J J K, Ernestus, M., Schreuder, R., & Baayen, R. H. (2005). Prosodic cues for morphological complexity: the case of Dutch plural nouns. *Memory & cognition*, 33(3), 430–446.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1982): *Lexical morphology and phonology.* In: *Linguistics in the morning calm. Selected papers from SICOL-1981.* Unter Mitarbeit von The linguistic society of Korea. Seoul, Korea: Hanshin Pub. Co.
- Mohanan, K. P. (1986). *The theory of lexical phonology. Studies in natural language and linguistic theory: [v. 6].* Dordrecht, Boston, Norwell, MA: D. Reidel Pub. Co.; Sold and distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada by Kluwer Academic.
- Oh, Grace E.; Redford, Melissa A. (2012): The production and phonetic representation of fake geminates in English. In: *Journal of Phonetics* 40 (1), S. 82–91.
- Plag, I. (2014). Phonological and phonetic variability in complex words: An uncharted territory. *Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di Linguistica.*
- Plag, I., Homann, J., & Kunter, G. (2015). Homophony and morphology: The acoustics of word-final S in English. *Journal of Linguistics.*
- R Development Core Team. (2014). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <http://www.r-project.org>

un-model

```
# Call:
# lm(formula = bc ~ TransitionType + LocSpeech, data = unComplex2)
#
# Residuals:
#   Min     1Q   Median     3Q      Max
# -0.081237 -0.027028 -0.000937  0.025328  0.096961
#
# Coefficients:
#   Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
# (Intercept)      0.581989   0.014676  39.655 < 2e-16 ***
# TransitionTypesingle-C -0.049389   0.009505  -5.196 6.59e-07 ***
# TransitionTypesingle-V -0.099885   0.009641 -10.360 < 2e-16 ***
# LocSpeech         -0.007646   0.001063  -7.196 2.83e-11 ***
# ---
# Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#
# Residual standard error: 0.03788 on 149 degrees of freedom
# Multiple R-squared:  0.6011, Adjusted R-squared:  0.5931
# F-statistic: 74.84 on 3 and 149 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

im-model

```
# lm(formula = bc ~ NoCons + LocSpeech + StressPattern + Affix,  
#   data = imComplex4)  
#  
# Residuals:  
#   Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max   
# -0.081827 -0.023172 -0.002205  0.023101  0.083318  
#  
# Coefficients:  
#   Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)        
# (Intercept)      0.2856713  0.0112978  25.286 < 2e-16 ***  
# NoConsdouble      0.0442330  0.0064822   6.824 2.08e-10 ***  
# LocSpeech        -0.0032078  0.0007413  -4.327 2.76e-05 ***  
# StressPatternstr-unstr -0.0344743  0.0071455  -4.825 3.44e-06 ***  
# AffixinNeg        0.0196406  0.0069752   2.816 0.00553 **  
# ---  
# Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
#  
# Residual standard error: 0.0325 on 149 degrees of freedom  
# Multiple R-squared:  0.5392, Adjusted R-squared:  0.5268  
# F-statistic: 43.58 on 4 and 149 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

-ly-model

```
# lm(formula = AbsDurCon ~ NoCons + logRelFreq + PrecSegVC + LocSpeech +  
#   Syllabic, data = lyComplex2)  
#  
# Residuals:  
#   Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max   
# -0.046194 -0.013208 -0.001831  0.011909  0.045429  
#  
# Coefficients:  
#   Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)      
# (Intercept)      0.0799558  0.0086899   9.201 3.41e-16 ***  
# NoConsdouble     -0.0074318  0.0056623  -1.313 0.191410  
# logRelFreq       -0.0014775  0.0006016  -2.456 0.015219 *  
# PrecSegVCV        0.0168499  0.0047635   3.537 0.000542 ***  
# LocSpeech        -0.0022602  0.0004393  -5.145 8.49e-07 ***  
# Syllabicnon-syllabic -0.0138244  0.0068922  -2.006 0.046726 *  
# ---  
# Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
#  
# Residual standard error: 0.01876 on 146 degrees of freedom  
# Multiple R-squared:  0.2435, Adjusted R-squared:  0.2176  
# F-statistic: 9.398 on 5 and 146 DF, p-value: 8.768e-08
```

Types

	Doubles	Singles
<i>un-</i>	6	93
<i>in-</i>	17	65
<i>-ly</i>	76	72