## Argument:

Two distinct empirical situations regarding SCs:

- effects to their left (the nucleus to their left is active)
effects to their right (the nucleus to their right is active)
Option 1 cannot express this variation
. The Issue: Syllabic Consonants (SCs)
Cs are 'phonological hermaphrodites
Scs are 'consonants which behave like vowels'
Anchoring of SCs:
in the nucleus - Option 1
S. in a consonant

Structure
right

|  | right- |
| :--- | :--- |
| vs. left- | Option |
| vs. right- and left-branching | - Option |
|  | - Option |

Option 1. SCs are nuclear in essence
Literature: Carr [1993], Hayes [1989], Kenstowicz [1994 Rubach [1977], Spencer [1996].
lable peaks (cf.
poetry; counted by natives)
SCs may bear stress (at
least in certain languages)
BUT:

- Confusion between representation
(shape) and function (behaviour)
- Strong violation of basic autoseg
mental principles: the phonological iden
tity as well as the pronunciation of pieces of melody depends on the type of constituent that they ar That is, $[j]$ and $[i]$ for example have the same melodic identity, the difference being one of association: $[j]$ is produced if the melody is dominated by an onset, [i] in case it depends on a nucleus. Therefore something that is pronounced as a consonant.
$\rightarrow$ No symmetry between consonants standing in nuclear position (SCs) and vowels standing in consonantal position (glides): a vowel (e.g. [i]) sitting [j]) but a consonant which sits in a nucleus is NOT pronounced as a vowel
Alternations between $C$ and ${ }^{2} C$
Option 2. SCs are consonantal in essence ... because they sit in onsets. Vocalic behaviou of SCs: SCs branch on a neighbouring nucleus.
Option 2a. SCs are right-branching $c \quad V$ Literature: Blaho [2001], Rennison
[1999:333ff],
Option 2b. SCs are left-branching
Literature: Hall [1992:35ff], Harris
[1994:224f], Scheer [1998, 2004, 2008],
Szigetvári [1999:117ff, 2001], Toft [2002],
Szigetvari [1999:117.
Wiese [1996:246]...

Option 2c. SCs are left- and rightbranching
Problem:
2 nuclei filled with a piece of
melody $\rightarrow$ equivalent of a long vowel $C$
Literature: Blaho [2001:23ff, 2004:46]...
(A)

$$
\rightarrow C=\partial C \text {, in English and German }
$$

OSL in (Standard) German

Lengthening Lic.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}C_{1} & V_{1} & C_{2} & V_{2} & C_{3} & V_{3} & C_{1} & V_{1} & C_{2} & V_{2} & C_{3} \\ V_{3} & V_{3} & C_{4} & V_{4}\end{array}$
$b e \rightarrow[e:] \quad r \quad a \quad a \rightarrow[$ a: $] \quad$ । $\quad \varnothing+\varnothing$
Orphan



Conclusion:
SCs sit in onsets and branch either on a preceding or a following nucleus

- Parametric variation: left vs. right branchingness
- Long SCS (like long vowels) branch on 2
nuclei (left AND right, cf. Slovak)
$\rightarrow$ Can left- AND right-branchingness coexist within a single language?
(B)
$C=C_{2}$, in Serbian

SCs:


Gov.

$\rightarrow$ SCs are left-branching in German
Lic.

$$
C_{1} V_{1} C_{2} V_{2} C_{3} V_{3} C_{4} V_{4}
$$

$k \underset{\text { e } \rightarrow \text { [e] } \quad 9 \quad \varnothing}{ }$
(C) Eastern Middle German

Literature: Paul, Wiehl \& Grosse [1998 (1881)], Schirmunski [1962 (1956)]...

Standard language: OSL affected MHG short vowels followed by full vowels, empty nuclei and SCs

Gov.
Eastern Middle German (EMG):
Orphan
OsL did not take place before SCs $C_{1} V_{1} C_{2}$ V $C_{2} C_{3} C_{4} V_{4}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { E.g. MHG vater> Ya:]ter (stand.) } \\ & \text { vs. f[a]ter (EMG) "father" }\end{aligned} \quad v \underset{a \rightarrow{ }_{[a]}+\varnothing r}{ }+\varnothing$
SCs were not able to license a preceding nucleus in EMG
$\rightarrow$ SCs are not left-branching in EMG
$\rightarrow$ SCs are right-branching in EMG
$\rightarrow$ SCs are right-branching in Cz, Se. and SI.

## (D) Short vs. long SCs in Slovak

Literature: Blaho [2001, 2004]

- No minimal pairs (minimal pairs are attested for long vs short vowels)
- Speaker intuition rather not reliable for distinguishing long and short SCs
BUT: Good phonological evidence from Rythmic Law
Case markers with underlyingly long
vowels (e.g. Dat. PI. -ám) shorten when the root vowel is long (prohibition of two long vowels in a row) a. and b . $\rightarrow$ reaction on short SI . vs. long root vowels

|  | Nom. Sg . | Dat <br> PI. | Glosses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. | žena ulica | žen-ám ulic-ám | "woman" "street" |
| b. | lúka knieža | lúk-am kniež-am | "meadow" "prince" |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { srna } \\ & \text { vina } \end{aligned}$ | srn-ám vIn-ám | $\begin{aligned} & \text { "roe" } \\ & \text { "wave" } \end{aligned}$ |
| d. | vŕba hlbka | vŕb-am $h \overrightarrow{b l} k-a m$ | "willow" "depth" |

c. and d. $\mathbf{\rightarrow} 2$ classes of SC

SCs under d. do, SCs under
c. do no
of -ám

1. Left- vs. right-branching of SCs: diagnostics Two kinds of tests/diagnostics
A. Relationship with a preceding (schwa-like) nucleus, cf. (A):
e.g.: əC > C: NHG dunkel ['dunkl] < OHG tunkal Eng. button ['bstn] < Fr. boton

- and/or in synchrony (free variation)
e.g.: free variation between $\partial C$ and $C$

NHG dunke/['dunkl] or ['dunkl] "dark"
Eng. bottle ['bdtal] or ['bdtl]
B. Behaviour of SCs with regards to a following consonant cluster (CC), cf. (B):
( $\cdot$ in diachrony or)
e.g.: SCs may be followed by the samichrony SCs may never be followed by complex coda(onset) clusters in English and German
2. Complementary distribution of diagnostics Language exhibit evidence for A OR for B-not for both at the same time
English and German: SCs alternates with $2 C$
SCs are never followed by CCs
Serbian, Czech etc. : C alternates with $C_{0}$
SCs may be followed by CCs
$\rightarrow$ Two very different structures appear as SCs on the surface
$\rightarrow$ The difference between German-like and Czechlike SCs cannot be accounted for if we assume that SCs simply sit in the nucleus
3. Conclusion

Two kinds of effects observed => two situations
Situation 1: Relationship with preceding nucleus e.g. English and Standard German (cf. (A))

- Situation 2: Relationship with following nucleus e.g. Czech, Serbian, Slovak and EMG (cf. (B))
$\rightarrow$ Two kinds of SCs - left-vs. right-branchingness of SCs is a language-specific parameter
Prediction: within a single language, the preceding and the following nucleus cannot be active at the same time... except in systems where SCs are contrastive for length, e.g. Slovak (cf. Blaho [2004])


## 4. Discussion

Can left-branching and right-branching SCs coexist within a single language?
If yes: left-vs. right-branchingness = lexical
If no: True, universal parameter

## 5. Key

C. "Consonant Cluster" // Cz "Czech" // Dat. "Dative" // E English" // Emg "Eastern Middle German" // Gov. Government" // Lic. "Licensing" // MHG "Middle High German (1050-1350) // NHG "New High German" (1650-) // Nom.
"Nominative" // PI. "Plural" // SC "Syllabic Consonant" // Se. Nominative" // PI. "Plural" // SC "Syllabic Consonant" // Se
$\qquad$

## . Selected references




## 

 1 Tid



