

## Research Question

### What drives the creation of prosodic constituents?

Patterns of word-formation in Mandar (Austronesian; Indonesia) suggest that **words are created to resolve a requirement for Existential Correspondence at the syntax-prosody interface.**

## Building Prosodic Constituents

- Phonological strings are organized into a constituent structure that resembles the syntax beneath them (Nespor & Vogel 1986).
- Previous approaches: prosodic constituents are built to satisfy a **content-sensitive need to align syntactic constituents with prosodic counterparts** (Align/Match Theory [Selkirk 1995, 2009]).

/pataka .../	MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)
a. [ω pataka]...	
b. [ω patak] a...	*
c. pataka ...	*

### Proposal: ωs are built to satisfy Existential Match.

- ∃-Match(x<sup>0</sup>,ω): an input x<sup>0</sup><sub>LEX</sub> must correspond to an output ω. (Itô & Mester 2019, Guekguezian 2021; cf. Struijke 2000, Walker & Feng 2004)
- ∃-Match is **content-insensitive**, so it can distinguish between two types of non-isomorphism: mismatch (b) and non-match (c).

/pataka .../	∃-MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)	MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)
a. [ω pataka]...		
b. [ω patak] a...		*
c. pataka ...	*	*

## Empirical Background

Mandar: an Austronesian language of the South Sulawesi subfamily (cf. Makassarese, Selayarese [Mithun & Basri 1986, McCarthy 1995])

Regular penultimate stress → right-aligned disyllabic trochee in ω  
Boundary H tone → right edge of the phonological phrase (φ)

- There are minimal roots of the shape (c)v(c).
- φ-medial positions: surface as monosyllables.
- φ-final positions: forced to take disyllabic forms.

(1) *Phrase-Medial: Monosyllabic*    (2) *Phrase-Final: Disyllabic*

{φ [ω lóppa] } [ω tó ] [ω bándi ]  
hot too really

{φ [ω lóppa] } [ω tó?o ]  
hot too

“Really hot too”                      “Hot too”

### Resolution One: Copy-Epenthesis

UR	/to/	/bo/	/da/	/sun/	/tu?/
EPENTHESIS	[to.ʔo]	[bo.ʔo]	[da.ʔa]	[su.ʔunj]	[tu.ʔuʔ]
GLOSS	too	again	don't!	out	really

### Resolution Two: Allomorphy

UR	/a/	/na/	/ne/	/ndaŋ/	/de?/
ALLOMORPH	/apa/	/inna/	/innai/	/andian/	/de?i/
GLOSS	what	which	who	not	they say

## The Preference for Mismatch

There is a disyllabic minimality constraint at the right edge of the φ, and **there are match-compliant ways for minimal roots to resolve it.**

$$\{\phi[\omega\sigma]\} \Rightarrow \{\phi[\omega\sigma\sigma]\}$$

**But: this constraint is preferentially resolved by mismatch.**

- When minimal roots are at the right edge of a φ and are followed by an unstressed syllable, **they pull that syllable into the ω.**

$$\{\phi[\omega\sigma]\} \{\phi[\omega\sigma\sigma\dots]\} \Rightarrow \{\phi[\omega\sigma\sigma]\} \{\phi[\omega\sigma\dots]\}$$

### (3) Minimal Roots (to, a): Disyllabic at the Right Edge of the Phrase

- a. {φ [ω lóppa] } [ω tó?o ]  
hot too  
“Hot too.”
- b. {φ [ω ápa ] } {φ [ω bémme ] }  
what fall  
“What fell?”

### (4) Unstressed Syllables (ǔ): External Clitics, Pre-Penultimate Material

- a. {φ [ω lóppa] } i<sub>AGR</sub>  
hot  
“It’s hot.”
- b. {φ [ω mupogáú? ] } i<sub>AGR</sub>  
you.do  
“You’re doing it.”

### (5) At the Right Edge: Minimal Roots Pull In Following Unstressed Syllables

- a. {φ [ω lóppa] } [ω tói ]  
hot too.AGR  
“It’s hot too.”
- b. {φ [ω ámu ] } {φ [ω pogáú? ] }  
what you.do  
“What are you doing?”

### (6) Before Unstressed Syllables: Match-Compliant Repairs Cannot Apply

- a. {φ [ω lóppa] } [ω tó?o ] i<sub>AGR</sub>  
hot too  
“It’s hot too.”
- b. {φ [ω ápa ] } {φ [ω mupogáú? ] }  
what you.do  
“What are you doing?”

## Proposal: Existential Match

The preference for mismatch reflects a ranking of the constraints against epenthesis (DEP) and long allomorph selection (PRIORITY; Mascaró 2007) OVER the constraints that force content-sensitive alignment (ALIGN, MATCH).

/...to...i/	DEP	MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)
a. [ω to i]		*
b. [ω toʔo ] i	#!	
c. to i		*

Problem: if DEP can force violations of content-sensitive ALIGN/MATCH, yielding mismatch (a), **what prevents it from forcing non-match (c)?**

## Solution: the mapping is driven by ∃-MATCH.

- ∃-Match(α,β): AOV for every α that does not correspond to a β.
- ∃-Match is **content-insensitive** and does not see mismatch (a).
- However: ∃-Match will consistently prohibit non-match (c).

/...to...i/	∃-MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)	DEP	MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)
a. [ω to i]			*
b. [ω toʔo ] i		#!	
c. to i	#!		*

## Existential Match is Necessary

**∃-MATCH allows us to distinguish non-match from mismatch.**

- Mismatch can be forced by phonological constraints (Binarity, DEP)
- Non-match cannot be, so it must be ruled out by something distinct.

**This result does not follow from other theories of the mapping.**

- ALIGN(x<sup>0</sup>,ω) (Selkirk 1995; cf. McCarthy & Prince 1993): Right/Left (R/L) edge of α → edge of β.
- MATCH(x<sup>0</sup>,ω) (cf. Selkirk 2009): The L/R edges of an x<sup>0</sup> must correspond to the L/R edges of a ω.
- MATCH(x<sup>0</sup>,ω) (cf. Elfner 2012): for an x<sup>0</sup> that exhaustively dominates a set of terminal nodes α, there must be a ω that exhaustively dominates all and only the phonological exponents of α.

**∃-Match is superior to its closest analogue, Wrap** (Truckenbrodt 1999).

- WRAP(x<sup>0</sup>) (after Truckenbrodt 1999): Each x<sup>0</sup><sub>LEX</sub> is contained in a ω.
- Like ∃-Match, WRAP can handle cases where material is pulled in, ... but it can't allow cases where segmental material is pulled out.

/a ... mupogau?/	WRAP(x <sup>0</sup> )	∃-MATCH(x <sup>0</sup> ,ω)	PRIORITY
a. {φ [ω amu ] } {φ [ω pogau? ] }	#!		
b. {φ [ω apa ] } {φ [ω mupogau? ] }			#!

## Theoretical Integration

**∃-MATCH extends two classical intuitions to the sx-pr interface:**

- The pressure for content-level identity between inputs and outputs (IDENT) is distinct from the pressure for correspondence (MAX).
- The pressure to realize morphosyntactic inputs (REALIZE MORPH) is distinct from requirements on the form of their exponence. (Kurisu 2001)

**Moreover: ∃-MATCH resolves old problems with Match Theory:**

- MATCH constraints fail to distinguish mismatch from non-match.
- Content-sensitive MATCH constraints duplicate the work of ALIGN.

The result is a theory that is at once **empirically more successful and conceptually better integrated with the theory of faithfulness.**

## Summary of Contribution

**Empirically:** a case of positional ω-minimality resolved via mismatch.

**Theoretically:** an argument for ∃-MATCH, stronger than its forebears.

- Mismatch occurs across ωs in the phrasal phonology, rather than in an x<sup>0</sup> between affixes & roots (no morphologization; cf. Guekguezian 2021).
- This occurs in contexts that should allow for content-sensitive match, and it has no relationship to the phonology of focus (cf. Itô & Mester 2019).

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS** Thanks to Jupri Talib, my consultant, for his commitment and generosity. Thanks as well to Ryan Bennett, Myke Brinkerhoff, Junko Itô, Nick Kalivoda, Armin Mester, Jaye Padgett, Jonathan Paramore, Amanda Rysling, and Rachel Walker. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2018267201.

**SELECTED REFERENCES** [1,2] Selkirk 1995, 2009 [3] Truckenbrodt 1999 [4] Itô & Mester 2019 [5] Guekguezian 2021