OCP Effects in Catalan Cliticization[*]

Eulàlia Bonet

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Departament de Filologia Catalana
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain
eulalia.bonet@uab.es

Maria-Rosa Lloret

Universitat de Barcelona. Departament de Filologia Catalana
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585. 08007 Barcelona (Spain)
lloret@lincat.ub.es

Abstract

In Catalan, sequences of sibilants are never pronounced as such. In most contexts all varieties coincide in the «strategies» used to avoid these sequences, namely epenthesis or deletion. Variation is only found in the domain of pronominal clitics (but not with other types of clitics). One source of variation is accounted for by decomposing a general constraint into two specific ones, which implies partial constraint reranking. The other source of variation, which involves a case of apparent opacity, is explained through an Output-Output constraint that makes reference to paradigmatic relations.

Keywords: OCP, clitics, epenthesis, deletion, fusion, opacity, Optimality Theory.

1. Introduction

In Catalan, sequences of sibilants are never pronounced as such (in normal speech). In the cases where two adjacent sibilants would potentially occur, two main ways of avoiding this adjacency can be found: (a) reduction of the two sibilants to one, and (b) insertion of an epenthetic vowel between the two sibilants. As we shall see, reduction is by far the most common strategy while epenthesis is restricted to very specific morphophonological environments.[1]

---

1. There is an additional strategy, with a dissimilatory effect, which is found only in Majorcan and Minorcan Catalan. In these varieties a sequence of sibilants is pronounced as a lengthened affricate in the contexts where other varieties show reduction (a sequence like *dos sons* 'two sounds', for instance, is pronounced [dot.t͡sɔ́ns] in these two varieties but [do.sɔ́ns] in the other dialects). In this paper we disregard these data because we focus on the differences of distribution between epenthesis and reduction, especially in the domain of clitics (in some varieties belonging to Central Catalan). An analysis of the different strategies (including dissimilation) used to avoid sibilant sequences in Catalan within autosegmental phonology appears in Palmada (1994a, b).

All varieties of Central Catalan (i.e., the dialects spoken in eastern Catalonia, including the Barcelona area) coincide in inserting an epenthetic schwa between two adjacent sibilants when they belong to the same word and the second *s* is a suffix (e.g., *cuses* /kuz+z/, pronounced [kú.zəs] '(you) sew'), except in masculine nominals, in which [u] is most commonly inserted (cf. *casos* /kaz+z/, pronounced [ká.zus] 'cases'). In the other contexts where all varieties of Central Catalan coincide, only reduction of the two sibilants to one (fusion or deletion) is found. Reduction appears, for instance, when a definite determiner in the plural, *els* (masc.) or *les* (fem.) (both being clitics), is adjacent to a word starting with a sibilant (e.g., *els sons* [əl.sóns] 'the sounds' or *les sopes* [lə.só.pəs] 'the soups') or when the sibilants belong to different words (e.g., *portes sacs* [pɔ̀r.tə.sáks] '(you) bring sacks', or *pis senzill* [pì.sən.zíʎ] 'simple apartment'). Within words, deletion/fusion of sibilants is found in compounds (e.g., *dos-cents* [do.séns] 'two hundred') and in prefixed words (e.g., *dessalar* [də.sə.lá] 'to desalt', with the prefix *des* and the verb *salar*).[2] The data presented so far are identical (with slight differences in pronunciation) in almost all varieties of Catalan. There is one fact, though, that has passed unnoticed: within Central Catalan (more concretely, in the Barcelona area) three types of variation can be found as to the choice of reduction or epenthesis in clitic–verb sequences.[3] The main goal of this paper is to explain why this variation occurs only in the domain of pronominal clitics.[4]

The clitics that end in *s* in the varieties of Catalan under discussion are the following: *es* /s/ third person reflexive/impersonal clitic; *ens* /nz/, first person plural; *us* /uz/, second person plural; *els* /l+z/, third person accusative masculine plural, and *les* /l+a+z/, third person accusative feminine plural. The examples in (1) show the phonetic realization of these clitics in these varieties when the verb starts with a non-sibilant consonant. Some clitic forms show an initial epenthetic schwa for syllabification purposes; for instance, the clitic *els* in (1d), with an underlying form /l+z/, needs an initial epenthetic vowel in proclitic position because the sequence [lz] does not constitute a possible onset. (From now on, we underline all occurrences of epenthetic schwas for expository reasons.)

(1) a. Es   trenca.   [əs.tɾɛ́ŋ.kə]
       itself breaks
       'It breaks.'

---

2. Even though we refer simply to sequences of sibilants, all the cases we contemplate in this paper are sequences of voiced or voiceless anterior coronal sibilants. We ignore sequences of sibilants involving a different place of articulation (/ʃ/ or /ʒ/) because they are fairly rare and because their behavior implies complications that escape the scope of this paper.
3. It is impossible to know what the facts would be in verb–clitic sequences; that is, in enclisis: the only clitic starting with *s* is the third person reflexive/impersonal clitic *es* (/s/, realized [sə] postverbally after a consonant: *fer-se* [fér.sə]), and this clitic can never cooccur with a verbal form ending in a sibilant (only the imperative second person forms *vés* 'go!' and *fes* 'do!' end in a sibilant, and they cannot combine with the third person clitic /s/).
4. We use the term *clitic* for convenience; it does not necessarily have to be understood as a primitive of the theory (for a proposal, within Optimality Theory, in which the different types of clitics are derived from differences in constraint ranking, see Selkirk 1995).

b. Ens   parla.   [ə̲ns.pár.lə]
   to-us   talks
   '(S/he) talks to us.'

c. Us   creu.   [us.kɾέw]
   you (pl.) believes
   '(S/he) believes you all.'

d. Els   porta.   [ə̲ls.pɔ́r.tə]
   them (masc.) brings
   '(S/he) brings them.'

e. Les   compra.   [lə̲s.kóm.pɾə]
   them (fem.) buys
   '(S/he) buys them.'

As mentioned, variation is found only when the verb that follows one of these clitics starts with a sibilant. One of the varieties, let us call it variety A, systematically inserts a schwa in this context, as shown in (2). The presence of this schwa has its reflex in the orthography only in the case of the third person reflexive/impersonal clitic *es* (i.e., *se*), illustrated in (2a).

(2) a. Se   sap.   [sə̲.sáp]
        impers. knows
        'It is known.'

     b. Ens sent.   [ə̲n.zə̲.sén]
        us   hears
        '(S/he) hears us.'

     c. Us   citarà.   [u.zə̲.si.tə.ɾá]
        you (pl.) will-quote
        '(S/he) will quote you all.'

     d. Els   sé.   [ə̲l.zə̲.sé]
        them (masc.) know
        '(I) know them.'

     e. Les   supera.   [lə̲.zə̲.su.pé.ɾə]
        them (fem.) overcomes
        '(S/he) overcomes them.'

The clitics that end in a consonant other than *s* do not cause the appearance of a schwa after the clitic even when the verb does start with a sibilant. If vowel insertion is required for syllabification purposes, a schwa appears, as mentioned, in initial position (cf. *em sent* /m#sent/, [ə̲m.sén] '(s/he) hears me'; *el simula* /l#simul+ə/, [ə̲l.si.mú.lə] '(s/he) simulates it (masc.)'). The epenthetic schwa between the pronominal clitic and the verb appears only to break the contact between two sibilants.

It is important to recall that, in variety A, the behavior of the third person accusative plural pronominal clitic is very different from the otherwise identical definite determiner. Before a host starting with a non-sibilant consonant they both surface, in their masculine forms, with an initial schwa, inserted for syllabification purposes (cf. *els portes* '(you) bring them': [əls.pɔ́r.təs], from an underlying form /l+z#pɔrt+ə+z/, and *els porcs* 'the pigs': [əls.pɔ́rks], from an underlying form /l+z#pɔrk+z/). Before a sibilant, the behavior of both clitics differs. In the case of the pronominal clitic, as illustrated in (2d,e), epenthesis takes place (cf. *els sé* '(I) know them': [əl.zə̱.sé], from an underlying form /l+z#se/), while in the case of the definite determiner, the «strategy» used to avoid the contact of sibilants is deletion/fusion (cf. *els sons* 'the sounds': [əl.sɔ́ns], from an underlying form /l+z#sɔn+z/).

A different variety, variety B, inserts a schwa after a clitic only when the first sibilant belongs to the third person reflexive/impersonal clitic, which has the underlying form /s/ (shown in (3)). With all other clitics ending in a sibilant, fusion/deletion is found when the verb starts with a sibilant (as shown in (4)).

(3) Se   sap.   [sə̱.sáp]
    impers. knows
    'It is known.'

(4) a. Ens sent.   [ən.sén]
       us   hears
       '(S/he) hears us.'

    b. Us   citarà.   [u.si.tə.ɾá]
       you (pl.) will-quote
       '(S/he) will quote you all.'

    c. Els   sé.   [əl.sé]
       them (masc.) know
       '(I) know them.'

    d. Les   supera.   [lə.su.pé.ɾə]
       them (fem.) overcomes
       '(S/he) overcomes them.'

Finally, what we can call variety C systematically presents fusion/deletion when a clitic ending in *s* is adjacent to a verb starting with an *s*. This is shown in (5).

(5) a. Se   sap.   [ə̱.sáp]
       impers. knows
       'It is known.'

    b. Ens sent.   [ən.sén]
       us   hears
       '(S/he) hears us.'

    c. Us   citarà.   [u.si.tə.ɾá]
       you (pl.) will-quote
       '(S/he) will quote you all.'

d. Els   sé.   [ə̲l.sé]
    them (masc.) know
    '(I) know them.'

e. Les   supera.   [lə.su.pé.ɾə]
    them (fem.) overcomes
    '(S/he) overcomes them.'

The table in (6) summarizes all the facts concerning the realization of underlying sequences of sibilants in the varieties A, B, and C of Central Catalan. We exclude from the table and the analysis the insertion of [u] in masculine nominals, previously mentioned, due to the interference of gender allomorphy (/u/ being a marked masculine morph), an issue that lies beyond the scope of this paper. In (6) all epenthetic vowels appear underlined. (As said, those include not only the schwas that break sequences of sibilants but also the initial schwas that are needed for syllabification purposes.) We use the notation «~Verb» to reflect the fact that the definite determiner can appear with any category other than verb (cf. *els sempre disposats a …* 'the always ready to…', *els de la Maria* 'those of Mary', *els que et dic* 'those that I tell you').

(6)

		Epenthesis	*Reduction*	*Epenthesis & Reduction*
X+suffix	*cuses* /kuz+z/	**A, B, C** [ku.zə̲s]		
cl # Verb	*se sap* /s#sab/	**A, B** [sə̲.sáp]		**C** [ə̲.sáp]
	els sé /l+z#se/	**A** [ə̲l.zə̲sé]		**B, C** [ə̲l.sé]
	Les supera /l+a+z#supeɾə/	**A** [lə.zə̲.su.pé.ɾə]	**B, C** [lə.su.pé.ɾə]	
cl # ~Verb	*els sons* /l+z#sɔn+z/			**A, B, C** [ə̲l.sɔ́ns]
prefixed words	*dessalar* /dəs##sal+a+ɾ/		**A, B, C** [də.sə.lá]	
compounds	*dos-cents* /doz##sent+z/		[do.séns]	
between words	*portes sacs* /pɔɾt+ə+z##sak+z/		[pɔ̀r.tə.sáks]	

Epenthesis and reduction (deletion or fusion) are two ways of avoiding the contact of sibilants, which would constitute a violation of the Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP), a principle originally proposed in Leben (1973) for tones, but later extended to other phonological and morphological domains. Myers (1997) argues convincingly for an Optimality-theoretic account of the OCP and the whole range of «repair strategies» that are used to avoid adjacent similar elements in tone phonology. In the next sections, we provide an account for the choice between epenthesis and deletion/fusion in the different contexts where a potential OCP violation would occur in the three Central varieties considered in this paper. We first present an analysis of variety A, including all the cases in which this variety does not differ from the others. Section 2.2 is devoted to variety B, and section 2.3 deals with variety C. Most of our assumptions are based on Bonet and Lloret (in press), which provides a detailed analysis of the phonology of pronominal clitics, both in contact with the verb and in clitic sequences. As previously mentioned, a crucial claim in that paper, assumed here, is that the schwa that appears associated to some clitics and in different positions is the product of epenthesis, and that it is not necessary to resort to allomorphy to account for all the shapes a clitic might surface with. Our analysis is framed in Optimality Theory, a framework that has proved to be more adequate than others in accounting for the phonology of Catalan clitics.

2. The analysis

2.1. Variety A

The fact that sibilant sequences are systematically avoided in Catalan shows that the constraint OCP is very high-ranked in Catalan, in the version of it that makes reference to sibilants. We give an informal formulation of the constraint in (7).

(7)   OCP-SIBILANT (OCP$_S$): Adjacent sibilant segments are forbidden.

The high ranking of the Markedness constraint OCP-SIBILANT in Catalan forces outputs to be less faithful to their inputs. Both the addition of an epenthetic vowel and the deletion of a consonant constitute violations of Faithfulness constraints. In the case of epenthesis, the constraint that punishes it is DEP-IO.

(8)   DEP-IO (DEP): «Every segment of the output has a correspondent in the input»; i.e., epenthesis is prohibited (McCarthy and Prince 1995: 264).

In the case of consonant reduction, the appearance of a single sibilant instead of two adjacent ones can, in principle, be interpreted in one of three ways: as deletion of the second *s*, shown in (9a), as deletion of the first *s*, shown in (9b), and as fusion, in which an output [s] corresponds to two input identical segments /s s/, shown in (9c) ('s' stands for any sibilant regardless of its voiced/voiceless realization).

(9) a. $/s_1$ $s_2/$ b. $/s_1$ $s_2/$ c. $/s_1$ $s_2/$ input
        | | \ /
     $[s_1]$ $[s_2]$ $[s_{1,2}]$ output

The representations in (9a,b) constitute violations of the constraint MAX-IO, which bans the deletion of a segment.

(10) MAX-IO (MAX): «Every segment of the input has a correspondent in the output»; i.e., deletion is prohibited (McCarthy and Prince 1995: 264).

In (9c), the case of fusion, MAX is not violated because the two instances of /s/ do have a correspondent in the output; it just happens to be the same one. The constraint that is violated in (9c) is UNIFORMITY-IO:

(11) UNIFORMITY-IO (UNIF): No segment of the output has multiple correspondents in the input; i.e., fusion is prohibited (see McCarthy and Prince 1995).

With the constraints given so far, the presence of an epenthetic schwa between a clitic and a verb in the context of two input sibilants could be obtained with the following ranking:

(12) Provisional ranking: OCP-SIBILANT » UNIFORMITY, MAX » DEP

The tableau in (13) shows how the correct output [əl.zə.sé], from an input /l+z#se/, is obtained through this ranking.

(13) /l+z#se/: [əl.zə.sé] '(I) know them (masc.)'

/l+z$_1$#s$_2$e/	OCP$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. əls$_1$.s$_2$é	*!			*
b. əl.s$_{1,2}$é		*!		*
c. əl.s$_2$é			*!	*
d. əl.z$_1$é			*!	*
☞ e. əl.z$_1$ə.s$_2$é				**

All the candidates in (13) violate the constraint DEP because all of them have at least one epenthetic vowel (the first one being needed for syllabification purposes). The output [əl.zə.sé] is the optimal candidate in spite of the fact that it is the only one with a double violation of DEP. This is so because the other candidates all violate more highly ranked constraints. All the candidates in (13), and in the rest of the tableaux in this paper, appear with the voicing specifications (voiced or voiceless) of the relevant sibilants according to what would be expected. For instance,

the candidate in (13a), [əls₁.s₂é], appears with a first voiceless sibilant because in that context voicing assimilation takes place; the candidate in (13d), [əl.z₁é], appears with a voiced sibilant because we assume, with Mascaró (1986) and others, that (pro)clitics keep their voicing specification intact when the host starts with a vowel, which is the case in [əl.z₁é] (the remaining sibilant belonging to the clitic).

The ranking given in (12), however, would give the wrong result when applied to a non-pronominal clitic like the determiner *els* 'the (pl.)' followed by initial *s*. Parallel to *els sé* in (13), *els sons* 'the sounds', from an input /l+z#sɔn+z/, would have the ungrammatical output *[əl.zə̱.sɔ́ns] instead of the grammatical [əl.sɔ́ns]. The solution to this difference cannot be related to prosodic domains (like the clitic group, as in Nespor and Vogel 1986 and later work), because both the determiner *els* and the pronominal clitic *els* are clitics, more specifically proclitics; therefore they belong to the same type of prosodic domain. The relevant difference here is the fact that in one case the host is a verb (V) while in the other it is a non-verbal form (~V). Alignment constraints, which demand that constituent-edges coincide, can subsume this difference by distinguishing the constraint that ensures the contiguity relation between the pronominal clitic and the verb (the constraint ALIGN(CL-V) given in (14)) from the one that ensures the contiguity relation between the definite determiner and its host (the constraint ALIGN(CL-~V) given in (15)).

(14) ALIGN(CL-V) (AL(CL-V)): Align the left edge of V(erb)[+tense] with the right edge of a pronominal clitic.

(15) ALIGN(CL-~V) (AL(CL-~V)): Align the left edge of ~V with the right edge of a determiner.

The constraint ALIGN(CL-V), which demands the configuration $_{CL})(_V$, has been argued for in Bonet and Lloret (in press) to explain the presence of peripheral epenthesis in clitic–verb sequences (cf. *en tira*: [ən.tí.ɾə] *vs.* *[nə̱.tí.ɾə], from an underlying form /n#tí.ɾ+ə/, '(s/he) throws some': ALIGN(CL-V) is violated in candidates like *[nə̱.tí.ɾə] due to the presence of the epenthetic vowel between the clitic and the verb but it is not violated when epenthesis is peripheral, that is, when the schwa precedes the proclitic, as in the grammatical form [ən.tí.ɾə]).[5] Parallel to ALIGN(CL-V), the constraint ALIGN(CL-~V) is violated whenever the configuration $_{CL})(_{~V}$ is not obtained (e.g., it is violated in *[əl.zə̱.sɔ́ns], from the underlying form /l+z#sɔn+z/ 'the sounds').

As we shall see next, in variety A the different behavior of determiners and pronouns in sibilant contexts (*els sé* [əl.zə̱.sé] *vs.* *els sons* [əl.sɔ́ns]) is explained by the different ranking of these two Alignment constraints (with other constraints

---

5. A parallel constraint, ALIGN(V-CL), accounts for enclisis, and the presence of peripheral epenthesis in that context, that is, the presence of a schwa following the clitic (as in *tirem-ne* 'let us throw some' /tiɾ+ɛ+m#n/, [ti.ɾɛ́m.nə̱]). For variety A, there is no evidence for a different ranking of the two constraints; for this reason they can be collapsed under the term ALIGN(CL/V), as proposed in Bonet and Lloret (in press).

intervening between them). The ranking of ALIGN(CL-~V) (but not that of ALIGN(CL-V)) just below OCP-SIBILANT causes a candidate like *[əl.zə.sɔ́ns], for *els sons* 'the sounds', to be discarded as the optimal candidate, as shown in (16).

(16) /l+z#sɔn+z/: [əl.sɔ́ns] 'the sounds'

/l+z_1#s_2ɔn+z/	OCP$_S$	AL(CL-~V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. əls_1.s_2ɔ́ns	*!				*
b. əl.$s_{1,2}$ɔ́ns		*!	*		*
☞ c. əl.s_2ɔ́ns				*	*
☀️ d. əl.z_1ɔ́ns				*	*
e. əl.z_1ə.s_2ɔ́ns		*!			**

The candidate in (16e), with an epenthetic vowel between the determiner and the noun —and with a configuration $_{CL})$ə$(_{~V}$—, is not the only one to violate ALIGN(CL-~V). In (16b) fusion also causes a violation of this constraint, given that the left edge of the noun is *before* $s_{1,2}$, while the right edge of the determiner is *after* $s_{1,2}$ (the configuration being [əl$(_{~V}$ $s_{1,2}$ $_{CL}$)ɔ́ns]). In (16), then, both the candidate with epenthesis and the candidate with fusion are ruled out. However, two ouputs fare even: (16c), with deletion of the first sibilant, and (16d), with deletion of the second sibilant and a faithfully voiced first sibilant, which does not correspond to the grammatical phonetic form, [əl.sɔ́ns], with a voiceless sibilant. An additional constraint, justified below, is needed to undo the tie.

Words like *esport* 'sport' or *especificar* 'to specify' surface, in Catalan, with an initial epenthetic vowel [ə]: [əs.pɔ́rt], [əs.pə.si.fi.ká]. When a proclitic is added to these words, this epenthetic vowel remains: /l#spɔrt/ 'the sport' surfaces as [ləs.pɔ́rt] (cf. *[əls.pɔ́rt], also with a well-formed syllabification in Catalan), and /u#spəsifikə/ '(s/he) specifies it' surfaces as [wəs.pə.si.fí.kə] (cf. *[us.pə.si.fí.kə], which would be more faithful to the input and would not cause any syllabification problems). Traditionally it has been assumed that epenthesis takes place first at the word level, and clitics are added later to the epenthesized word. Leaving aside some problems such a cyclic account would have to face in dealing with the phonology of clitics, Optimality Theory offers several alternatives to cyclicity that avoid having to resort to levels, one of them being Output-Output correspondence constraints (see, for instance, Benua 1995 or Kenstowicz 1996). In this type of Faithfulness constraints a correspondence relation is established between the base form (which has to be a possible free standing word) and an affixed (or cliticized) form. The Output-Output constraint stated in (17) makes reference to the initial segment of the base. The final segment of the base is more unstable (for instance, the final schwa of a verbal form like *passa* 'pass!', [pá.sə], might be deleted before the neuter clitic *ho* (/u/) in some of the varieties discussed in this paper (cf. *passa-*

ho 'pass it!': [pá.su]). A parallel constraint, Output-Output_FINAL, punishes the dele-
tion in a candidate like [pá.su], for *passa-ho*, and can be ranked differently with
respect to Output-Output_INITIAL depending on the variety.[6]

(17) Output-Output_INITIAL (OO_IN): The initial segment of a base has a correspondent
in the affixed or cliticized word.

For an input form like /u#spəsifikə/, the highly ranked constraint Output-
Output_INITIAL favors the candidate [wə̲s.pə.si.fí.kə] over *[us.pə.si.fí.kə], because
the former, but not the latter, keeps the first segment of the base [ə̲s.pə.si.fí.kə]. The
corresponding tableau is given in (18). (The constraint Onset (Ons), which demands
that syllables have onsets, has to be ranked below Align(cl-V) to ensure initial
epenthesis in examples like *en sap* /n#sab/, [ə̲n.sáp], instead of *[nə̲.sáp] '(s/he)
knows some'; cf. Bonet and Lloret in press.)

(18) /u#spəsifikə/: [wə̲s.pə.si.fí.kə]

/u#spəsifikə/	OO_IN	AL(CL-V)	ONS	DEP
a. us.pə.si.fí.kə	*!		*	
☞ b. wə̲s.pə.si.fí.kə		*		*

Going back to the problem posed by the tableau in (16), corresponding to *els
sons* 'the sounds', the tie between the two candidates [ə̲l.s₂ɔ́ns] and *[ə̲l.z₁ɔ́ns] can
be resolved with the inclusion of Output-Output_INITIAL, ranked between OCP-SIBI-
LANT and Align(CL-~V), as shown in (19).

(19) /l+z#sɔn+z/: [ə̲l.sɔ́ns] 'the sounds'

/l+z_1#s_2ɔn+z/	OCP_S	OO_IN	AL(CL-~V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. ə̲ls_1.s_2ɔ́ns	*!					*
b. ə̲l.$s_{1,2}$ɔ́ns			*!	*		*
☞ c. ə̲l.s_2ɔ́ns					*	*
d. ə̲l.z_1ɔ́ns		*!			*	*
e. ə̲l.z_1ə̲.s_2ɔ́ns			*!			**

---

6.   An anonymous reviewer suggests that Output-Output_INITIAL should universally be ranked above
Output-Output_FINAL. According to him/her, the reason might be related to the linearity of the lin-
guistic sign, the beginning of words being perceptually more relevant than the end of words.

The candidate *[əl.z_1ɔns] is ruled out because the initial segment of the base [sɔ́ns] has not been kept, while the initial sibilant survives in the optimal candidate [əl.s_2ɔ́ns].

The first tableau for the clitic–verb sequence *els sé* '(I) know them' (realized [əl.zə.sé]), in (13), took into account only the constraints OCP-SIBILANT, UNIFORMITY, MAX, and DEP. The inclusion of the constraint ALIGN(CL-V), which has to be ranked above MAX (as argued for in Bonet and Lloret in press), and OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{INITIAL}$ would rule out the grammatical candidate [əl.zə.sé], and would wrongly give *[əl.s_2é] as the optimal candidate in this variety.

(20) /l+z#se/: [əl.zə.sé] '(I) know them (masc.)'

/l+z_1#s_2e/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	AL(CL-~V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. əls_1.s_2é	*!					*
b. əl.$s_{1,2}$é			*!	*		*
●※ c. əl.s_2é					*	*
d. əl.z_1é		*!			*	*
e. əl.z_1ə.s_2é			*!			**

The decisive constraint that is missing from (20) is the well established constraint REALIZE-μ, defined below.[7]

(21) REALIZE-μ (REAL$_μ$): A morpheme must have some phonological exponent in the output (Walker 1998).

The ranking of REALIZE-μ, between OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{INITIAL}$ and ALIGN(CL-V), gives the grammatical output [əl.zə.sé] as the optimal candidate, as shown in (22).

(22) /l+z#se/: [əl.zə.sé] '(I) know them (masc.)'

/l+z_1#s_2e/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	REAL$_μ$	AL(CL-V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. əls_1.s_2é	*!						*
b. əl.$s_{1,2}$é				*	*!		*
c. əl.s_2é			*!			*	*
d. əl.z_1é		*!				*	*
☞ e. əl.z_1ə.s_2é				*			**

7. An equivalent constraint, within the Containment model of OT, can be found, with the label PARSE-MORPH, in Akinlabi (1996), for instance.

REALIZE-µ rules out the candidate *[ə̲l.s$_2$é] in (22c) because the deletion of the first sibilant implies the lack of realization of the plural morpheme of the clitic. A candidate like (22b), *[ə̲l.s$_{1,2}$é], does not violate REALIZE-µ because the single surfacing [s] represents both the plural morph of the clitic and the first segment of the verb; this form is ruled out by UNIFORMITY.[8]

There is an additional context in which epenthesis is used to avoid the OCP problem posed by sequences of sibilants: all varieties, not only variety A, insert a schwa after a stem-final sibilant and a sibilant morph. The example *cuses* '(you) sew', [kú.z̲əs], from an underlying form /kuz+z/, was previously used to illustrate such a case.[9] The Alignment constraints introduced so far, ALIGN(CL-~V) and ALIGN(CL-V), are irrelevant in this type of case, but a similar kind of constraint needs to be invoked, one that ensures the adjacency relation between the stem and the suffix. We give a general formulation of this constraint in (23).

(23) ALIGN(µ-µ) (AL(µ-µ)): Align the left edge of a morph X with the right edge of morph Y.

For an input like /kuz+z/, ALIGN(µ-µ), unranked with respect to REALIZE$_µ$, is violated by the candidate with epenthesis (actually the only grammatical candidate for all the varieties of Catalan) and by the candidate with fusion. ALIGN(µ-µ) together with OCP-SIBILANT and REALIZE$_µ$ would wrongly give *[kús$_2$] as the optimal candidate. A possible solution to this puzzle can be related to the constraint MAX, which has, and must have, a fairly low ranking. So far we have considered MAX to be a constraint that punishes the deletion of *any* segment. However, this constraint can be «broken» into more specific constraints, by distinguishing, for instance, a version of it that makes reference to vowels and another one that makes reference to consonants (see, e.g., McCarthy 2000 for arguments in favor of this possibility). Although a complete analysis of the phonology of Catalan might give arguments for a fairly detailed specification of the different MAX-constraints, for the purposes of this paper it is enough to distinguish the general MAX constraint (with the same definition and ranking assumed so far) from a particular version of it that makes specific reference to sibilants. This constraint is stated in (24).

(24) MAX-SIBILANT (MAX$_S$): Every sibilant segment of the input has a correspondent in the output; i.e., deletion of a sibilant consonant is prohibited.

This specific version of MAX receives support from general facts related to deletion in Catalan. In internal coda consonant clusters, for instance, deletion of

---

8. In order to account for cases with a monomorphemic clitic, like *ens sap* [ən.z̲ə.sáp] '(s/he) knows for us' (with a clitic /nz/), an additional constraint is needed. This constraint is introduced in (24), and the tableau corresponding to [ən.z̲ə.sáp] appears in (27).

9. This type of example is discussed by Colina (1995) and Jiménez (1997), but they do not consider candidates with fusion or deletion of one of the segments.

the second consonant is fairly common (words like *augment* 'augmentation' are commonly pronounced [ǝw.mén]; cf. *[ǝg.mén]); this is so except when the second consonant is *s*, in which case the first consonant is deleted (a word like *monstre* 'monster' is often pronounced [mɔ́s.trǝ]; cf. *[mɔ́n.trǝ]). Ultimately, the fact that sibilants are reluctant to deletion could be related to their perceptual prominence. The more specific MAX-SIBILANT must universally be ranked above the more general MAX (a consequence of the Paninian constraint relation, see Prince and Smolensky 1993), as is shown in the tableau corresponding to [kú.zǝs]. We exclude from the tableau all the constraints (like OO_{INITIAL}) that are irrelevant for this example.

(25) /kuz+z/: [kú.zǝs] '(you) sew'

/kuz$_1$+z$_2$/	OCP$_S$	REAL$_\mu$	AL(μ-μ)	MAX$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. kús$_1$s$_2$	*!						
b. kús$_{1,2}$			*		*!		
c. kús$_2$				*		*!	
d. kús$_1$		*		*!		*	
☞ e. kú.z$_1$ǝs$_2$			*				*

The unordered status of REALIZE-μ, ALIGN(μ-μ), and MAX-SIBILANT causes a tie between the candidates in (25b), (25c), and (25e); UNIFORMITY and MAX become, then, the decisive constraints.[10]

For an example like *els sons*, [ǝl.sɔ́ns], 'the sounds' (see the tableau in (19)), the inclusion of MAX-SIBILANT does not alter the results already obtained, given that MAX-SIBILANT is ranked lower than ALIGN (CL-~V), the lowest decisive constraint. The results are not different, either, for an example like *els sé*, [ǝl.zǝ.sé], '(I) know them' (see the tableau in (22)): MAX-SIBILANT punishes two candidates, (22c) and (22d), which also violate REALIZE-μ and OO$_{INITIAL}$, respectively. The definite tableau corresponding to [ǝl.zǝ.sé] is almost identical to the one for *se sap*, [sǝ.sáp], 'it is known', given in (26).

---

10. Following Kenstowicz (2001), one could attribute the ungrammaticality of an output *[kús] corresponding to the input /kuz+z/ (second person singular) to a Contrast constraint, which would rule out deletion or fusion because the output would become identical to another form of the verbal paradigm, namely the third person singular of the same tense, *cus* [kús]. However, pursuing this type of approach could have many consequences for other paradigms not too easy to foresee.

(26) /s#sab/: [sə̯.sáp] 'it is known'

/s₁#s₂ab/	OCP_S	OO_IN	REAL_μ	MAX_S	AL(CL-V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. s₁s₂áp	*!							
b. s₁,₂áp					*	*!		
c. s₂áp			*	*!			*	
d. s₁áp		*!		*			*	
☞ e. s₁ə̯.s₂áp					*			*
f. ə̯s₁.s₂áp	*!							*

As shown in (27), a clitic like *ens*, first person plural, does not violate REALIZE-μ when its sibilant is deleted (candidate *[ə̯n.s₂áp] in (27c)), given that we assume its underlying form to be monomorphemic (/nz/), and the deletion of the sibilant does not imply the deletion of the whole morpheme (the /n/ remains). Nevertheless, candidate (27c) is discarded because it violates MAX-SIBILANT.

(27) /nz#sab/: [ə̯n.zə̯.sáp] '(s/he) knows for us'

/nz₁#s₂ab/	OCP_S	OO_IN	REAL_μ	MAX_S	AL(CL-V)	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. ə̯ns₁.s₂áp	*!							*
b. ə̯n.s₁,₂áp					*	*!		*
c. ə̯n.s₂áp				*!			*	*
d. ə̯n.z₁áp		*!		*			*	*
☞ e. ə̯n.z₁ə̯.s₂áp					*			**

So far we have accounted for most of the cases in which a potential OCP-SIBILANT violation might occur in variety A (even though some of the results are shared by varieties B and C). Before examining the behavior of the other varieties in clitic–verb sequences, let us briefly see how the rest of the cases in (6) could be dealt with, even though many of the issues that arise are of a very general nature and fall beyond the goals of this paper. These cases include prefixed words (like *dessalar* [də.sə.lá] 'to desalt'), compounds (like *dos-cents* [do.séns] 'two hundred') and adjacent independent words (like *portes sacs* [pɔ̀r.tə.sáks] '(you) bring sacks', or *pis senzill* [pì.sən.zíʎ] 'simple apartment'). Given the analysis put forward so far, it is not possible to account for the lack of epenthesis in prefixed words, like *dessalar* 'to desalt'. The solution to this problem might be related to whatever properties cause prefixes to behave phonologically as independent words (in many respects),

like the other cases to be dealt with. Compounds like *dos-cents* 'two hundred' are made out of independent words; therefore, at least for the time being, they can be treated like word sequences, like *portes sacs* '(you) bring sacs' or *pis senzill* 'simple apartment'. Sequences of words can readily be dealt with, if two considerations are made. An Alignment constraint has to ensure that adjacent words are in fact adjacent (as was the case with clitic–verb sequences, morphemes, etc.). Let us call this constraint ALIGN(WORD-WORD) (in the following tableaux, abbreviated as AL(w-w)). Moreover, although we defined OO_INITIAL as a constraint that related bases to their affixed or cliticized counterparts, it can be reformulated in such a way that it establishes a correspondence relation between a base and all occurrences of that base. Assuming this modification of the constraint, the candidate (28d), below (corresponding to the input /piz##sənziʎ/) violates OO_INITIAL because the first segment of the second word, [ə] (the /s/ having been deleted), does not correspond to the first segment of the base [sən.zíʎ].

(28) /piz##sənziʎ/: [pì.sən.zíʎ] 'simple apartment'

/piz₁##s₂ənziʎ/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	AL(w-w)	REAL$_\mu$	MAX$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. pìs₁.s₂ən…	*!							
b. pì.s₁,₂ən…			*!			*		
☞ c. pì.s₂ən…					*		*	
d. pì.z₁ən…		*!			*		*	
e. pì.z₁ə.s₂ən…			*!					*

In (29) we give a slightly different example with the same result, *portes sacs* '(you) bring sacs', in which the first sibilant (i.e., the last segment of *portes*) constitutes the second person singular morph.

(29) /pɔrt+ə+z##sak+z/: [pɔ̀r.tə.sáks] '(you) bring sacs'

/pɔrt+ə+z₁##s₂ak+z/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	AL(w-w)	REAL$_\mu$	MAX$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. …təs₁.s₂áks	*!							
b. …tə.s₁,₂áks			*!			*		
☞ c. …tə.s₂áks				*	*		*	
d. …tə.z₁áks		*!			*		*	
e. …tə.z₁ə.s₂áks			*!					*

2.2. *Variety B*

In variety B most pronominal clitics behave like determiners do; that is, when a proclitic ending in a sibilant is adjacent to a verb starting with a sibilant, a single [s] is present in the surface form. In this variety, then, no distinction is made between the two types of clitics. For this reason there is no need for the existence of a constraint ALIGN(CL-V) different from ALIGN(CL-~V); the two constraints can be collapsed into a more general one, ALIGN(CL-LEX).[11]

(30) ALIGN(CL-LEX) (AL(CL-LEX)): Align the left edge of a lexical word with the right edge of a clitic.

ALIGN(CL-LEX) occupies the same position as ALIGN(CL-~V) in variety A, unordered with respect to OO$_{INITIAL}$. The tableau in (31) shows how the output [əl.sé] is obtained for *els sé* '(I) know them'.

(31) /l+z#se/: [əl.sé] '(I) know them'

/l+z$_1$#s$_2$e/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	AL(CL-LEX)	REAL$_\mu$	MAX$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. əls$_1$.s$_2$é	*!							*
b. əl.s$_{1,2}$é			*!		*			*
☞ c. əl.s$_2$é				*	*		*	*
d. əl.z$_1$é		*!			*		*	*
e. əl.z$_1$ə.s$_2$é			*!					**

Not all the pronominal clitics behave like *els*. The impersonal/reflexive clitic surfaces with an epenthetic vowel instead of showing deletion or fusion (cf. *se sap* [sə.sáp]). At first sight this different behavior among the clitics might seem surprising, but there is a crucial difference between the reflexive clitic and all the other clitics that end in a sibilant: the reflexive clitic is underlyingly a single segment, /s/, while the other clitics have more than one segment (cf. third person masculine plural, /l+z/; third person feminine plural, /l+a+z/; first person plural, /nz/; second person plural, /uz/). Therefore, if the sibilant of the reflexive clitic is deleted, the whole clitic is deleted, while this is not the case for any other clitic. The constraint that punishes the deletion of a whole clitic is REALIZE-CLITIC.

---

11. In footnote 5 it was mentioned that ALIGN(CL-V) and ALIGN(V-CL) have an identical ranking in variety A; for this reason they can be collapsed into a single constraint ALIGN(CL/V). In a similar way, one could wonder whether in variety B it is possible to collapse all proclisis and enclisis into a constraint ALIGN(CL/LEX). This might be the case, but a detailed study of enclisis in this variety is needed before jumping to such conclusions.

(32) REALIZE-CLITIC (REAL$_{CL}$): A clitic must have some phonological exponent in the output.

As mentioned, this constraint will only be relevant when the clitic is a single segment (of course, in any complete tableau for other clitics there will be a candidate with deletion of all the consonants, thus violating REALIZE-CLITIC; but this candidate will also violate many other constraints and will not have a chance to survive). The tableau in (33) shows how *se sap* is obtained in variety B.

(33) /s#sab/: [sǝ.sáp] 'it is known'

/s$_1$#s$_2$ab/	OCP$_S$	OO$_{IN}$	REAL$_{CL}$	AL(CL-LEX)	REAL$_\mu$	MAX$_S$	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a.　s$_1$s$_2$áp	*!								
b.　s$_{1,2}$áp				*			*!		
c.　s$_2$áp			*		*	*!		*	
d.　s$_1$áp		*				*!		*	
☞ e.　s$_1$ǝ.s$_2$áp				*					*

REALIZE-CLITIC is a constraint also present in variety A, although it did not appear in the corresponding tableau in (26) for expository reasons. In a way parallel to what we see in (33), REALIZE-CLITIC fatally punishes the candidate with deletion of the clitic (*[s$_2$áp]), a candidate that also violates REALIZE-μ and MAX-SIBI-LANT, as can also be seen in (33).

2.3. Variety C

Variety C is almost identical to variety B.[12] The lack of epenthesis between the clitic and the verb in cases like *els sé* [ǝl.sé] '(I) know them', which are treated like sequences with determiners (like *els sons* [ǝl.sóns]), indicates that the relevant Alignment constraint for these cases is ALIGN(CL-LEX). We can assume the same ranking it has in variety B.

The only difference between variety B and variety C lies in the behavior of the reflexive/impersonal clitic, the only clitic of the language that consists of a single sibilant. A sequence like *se sap* 'it is known' is realized, in variety C, as a sequence with sibilant deletion/fusion *and* initial epenthesis: [ǝ.sáp] (from an underlying form /s#sab/). This case raises one of the most difficult problems for Optimality Theory, namely the problem of opacity. The sequence [ǝ.sáp] is opaque

---

12. Variety C, in comparison with varieties A and B, is spoken by few people in the Barcelona area. Most of the speakers of this variety have Catalan as a second language.

because there is no apparent need for the initial epenthetic vowel: the OCP problem is solved via deletion or fusion, and the initial schwa is not needed for syllabification (*[sáp] would be fine). Given our claim that the schwa is not present in the underlying form, the presence of an epenthetic vowel in the grammatical output cannot be explained straightforwardly. With the constraints we have presented so far, *[sáp], in any of the interpretations for the appearance of a single [s], will always violate a subset of the constraints violated by [ə.sáp], which violates DEP in addition to others. In a serial model of phonology one could stipulate that the rule inserting the epenthetic vowel applies before the rule that deletes one of the sibilants or fuses them (an instance of extrinsic ordering), a possibility not available here.

Intuitively, the absence of the initial schwa (in a form like *[sáp]) would cause the sequence to become phonetically identical to the simple verb, [sáp] (the presence of the clitic could not be perceived). The schwa in [ə.sáp] is the clue for the presence of the clitic, even if the clitic itself cannot be identified (at least, apparently). Moreover, the presence of the schwa between the proclitic and the verb (like in [sə.sáp] for varieties A and B) would constitute the only instance of epenthesis between a clitic and its host, all other proclitics having initial epenthesis when needed (cf. *en sap* [ən.sáp] '(s/he) knows some', *em veu* [əm.bέw] '(s/he) sees me', *et truca* [ət.trú.kə] '(s/he) calls you'). On the contrary, and leaving aside the OCP problem, initial epenthesis in [ə.sáp] causes the clitic /s/ to have exactly the same phonological behavior as all the other consonantal clitics, which drives them to have a final VC(C) shape in proclitic position (cf. [əm], [ət], [ən], [əl], [əls], [əns], *and* [əs]). Even though capturing these intuitions within the framework adopted here is not easy and the issue needs further investigation, we can assume, following the lines of Kenstowicz (2001) for paradigmatic uniformity phenomena, an Output-Output constraint between members of a paradigm, in the present case pronominal clitics.[13] For the clitic *es*, this Output-Output constraint, let us call it OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{PARADIGM}$ (OO$_{PAR}$), will favor an output with a VC shape, namely [əs], parallel to the other consonantal proclitics of the language. This constraint can be ranked fairly low, just above UNIFORMITY. The tableau corresponding to [ə.sáp] is given in (34).[14] Notice that in this case, but not in other cases of deletion /fusion (in which deletion of the first consonant was the «strategy» chosen), the optimal candidate is realized with fusion of the sibilants; therefore the clitic does have a final VC shape ([əs]) without causing, at the same time, a violation of OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{INITIAL}$ in the verb ([sáp]): [ə.s$_{1,2}$áp].

---

13. Kenstowicz (2001) considers paradigmatic uniformity phenomena the cases where «the grammar strives to maintain the same output shape for pairs of inflected words that the regular phonology should drive apart». In this paper, we extend this notion to the set of pronominal clitics.

14. Another, obvious, way of avoiding the opacity problem raised in this section is to assume that the initial schwa in [ə.sáp] is not epenthetic but part of the clitic. If the underlying form of the clitic (at least in certain contexts) is /əs/, the problem disappears, and the realization [ə.sáp] for an underlying sequence /əs#sab/ is explained exactly like the other cases. However, this would be the only case in which an underlying schwa would have to be posited for pronominal clitics.

(34) /s#sab/: [ə.sáp] 'it is known'

/s_1#$s_2$ab/	OCP_S	OO_{IN}	$REAL_{CL}$	$AL(CL\text{-}LEX)$	$REAL_\mu$	MAX_S	OO_{PAR}	UNIF	MAX	DEP
a. $s_1s_2$áp	*!						*			
b. $s_{1,2}$áp				*			*!	*		
c. $s_2$áp			*		*	*	*!		*	
d. $s_1$áp		*				*	*!		*	
e. s_1ə.$s_2$áp				*			*!			*
f. əs_1.$s_2$áp	*!									*
☞ g. ə.$s_{1,2}$áp				*				*		*
h. ə.$s_2$áp		*			*	*	*!		*	*
i. ə.$s_1$áp		*				*!			*	*

The OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{\text{PARADIGM}}$ constraint is obviously also present in the other varieties, although its effects are not noticeable because it is ranked lower (at least below UNIFORMITY and MAX).[15]

3. Conclusions

In this paper we have examined the effects that the highly ranked constraint OCP-SIBILANT has in different varieties of Catalan, especially in environments involving clitics. As we saw, the main difference among the three varieties under discussion is whether all clitics behave alike (as in varieties B and C) or a distinction is made between pronominal clitics and other types of clitics (as in variety A). In OT, dialectal and language variation has commonly been accounted for by constraint reranking. In our analysis, the different behavior of variety A with respect to varieties B and C is captured by the decomposition of a general constraint, ALIGN(CL-LEX), into more specific constraints, ALIGN(CL-~V) and ALIGN(CL-V), which are to be considered members of the same constraint family. The ranking ALIGN(CL-~V) » ALIGN(CL-V) cannot be attributed to the Paninian constraint relation because there is no subset relation between the two constraints.[16] In addition,

---

15. A reviewer pointed out to us that the slightly higher ranking of OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{\text{PARADIGM}}$ in variety C, which corresponds to speakers that have Catalan as a second language (and thus are less competent in Catalan than native speakers), might not be a coincidence, since from the point of view of language acquisition it is well known that regular forms are learned before irregular ones. In this sense, the general low ranking of the constraint OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{\text{PARADIGM}}$ in all varieties might not be language specific but derivable from a more general imperative.

16. The ranking ALIGN(CL-~V) » ALIGN(CL-V) in variety A might not be arbitrary though; it might be motivated by the fact that in sequences with a determiner the consonant eligible for deletion can only

the decomposition of a general constraint into more specific ones implies that at least one constraint has to intervene between them (in the case at hand, three unordered constraints intervene: REALIZE-μ, ALIGN(μ–μ), and MAX-SIBILANT); otherwise there would be no evidence for such decomposition. Decomposition necessarily involves partial constraint reranking, as shown in (35).

The other source of variation we have seen is restricted to the behavior of a specific clitic, namely the third person reflexive/impersonal clitic (/s/). In variety C, as opposed to varieties A and B, the output form of this clitic constitutes an apparent opacity case. As an alternative to levels or extrinsic rule ordering, we have proposed an approach in terms of an Output-Output constraint, OUTPUT-OUTPUT$_{PARADIGM}$, which forces the clitic /s/ to adopt the same output shape (a VC structure) as all the other consonantal proclitics, establishing thus a kind of analogical relation.

To conclude, in (35) we give the complete hierarchy for varieties A, B, and C. The constraints that constitute a source of variation appear in bold face.

(35) a. *Variety A*
OCP$_S$ » OO$_{IN}$, REAL$_{CL}$, AL(W-W), **AL(CL-~V)** » REAL$_μ$, AL(μ–μ), MAX$_S$ » **AL(CL-V)** » UNIF, MAX » DEP, **OO$_{PAR}$**

b. *Variety B*
OCP$_S$ » OO$_{IN}$, REAL$_{CL}$, AL(W-W), **AL(CL-LEX)** » REAL$_μ$, AL(μ–μ), MAX$_S$ » UNIF, MAX » DEP, **OO$_{PAR}$**

c. *Variety C*
OCP$_S$ » OO$_{IN}$, REAL$_{CL}$, AL(W-W), **AL(CL-LEX)** » REAL$_μ$, AL(μ–μ), MAX$_S$, **OO$_{PAR}$** » UNIF, MAX » DEP

---

be the plural morph *s*, whose conveyed information is always recoverable from other plural morphs within its phrase due to agreement (in *els sons* [əl.sɔ́ns] 'the sounds', for instance, the last [s] of the noun would be sufficient to mark the plural character of the sequence). In clitic–verb sequences, however, the information conveyed by the *s* of the pronominal clitic (whether this information is grammatical, as 'plural' in /l+z/, or lexical, as part of the stem in /nz/) cannot be straighly recovered by other means precisely because they are pronouns (e.g., *els sé* '(I) know them (masc.)' pronounced [əl.sé] is homophonous with *el sé* '(I) know it (masc.)'; *ens sap* 's/he knows for us' pronounced [ən.sáp] is homophonous with *en sap* 's/he knows it'), not even in reflexive constructions (in *ens sostenim* '(we) hold ourselves', for instance, the pronunciation with sibilant reduction, [ən.sus.tə.ním], is homophonous with *en sostenim* '(we) hold it'). As a reviewer pointed out to us, it will be interesting to look in greater depth at cases of *s* deletion with respect to other dialects that show, in general, more instances of consonant deletion, and see to what extent *s* behaves differently from other consonants. We leave this issue for further research (see, though, Bonet and Lloret in press for a first approximation to consonant loss with respect to deletion of morphs in verb–clitic sequences).

References

Akinlabi, Akinbiyi (1996). «Featural Affixation». *Journal of Linguistic* 32: 239-289.

Benua, Laura (1995). «Identity Effects in Morphological Truncation». In: Beckman, J.; Walsh Dickey, L.; Urbanczyk, S. (eds.). *Papers in Optimality Theory*. Amherst, Mass.: Graduate Linguistic Student Association (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18), p. 77-136.

Bonet, Eulàlia; Lloret, Maria-Rosa (in press). «More on Alignment as an Alternative to Domains: the Syllabification of Catalan Clitics». *Probus.*

Colina, Sonia (1995). *A Constraint-based Analysis of Syllabification in Spanish, Catalan, and Galician*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Jiménez, Jesús (1997). *L'estructura sil·làbica del dialecte valencià*. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat de València.

Kenstowicz, Michael (1996). «Base-Identity and Uniform Exponence: Alternatives to Cyclicity». In: Durand, J.: Lacks, B. (eds.). *Current Trends in Phonology: Models and Methods*, vol. 1. Salford: European Studies Research Institute (ESRI), University of Salford, p. 363-393.

Kenstowicz, Michael (2001). «Paradigmatic Uniformity and Contrast». Handout, *3èmes Journées Internationales du GDR Phonologie*, Université de Nantes, June 1, 2001.

Leben, William (1973). *Suprasegmental phonology*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Mascaró, Joan (1986). *Morfologia*, Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana.

McCarthy, John (2000). «The Prosody of Phase in Rotuman». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 147-197.

McCarthy, John; Prince, Alan (1995). «Faithfulness and reduplicative identity». In: Beckman, J.; Walsh Dickey, L.; Urbanczyk, S. (eds.). *Papers in Optimality Theory*. Amherst, Mass.: Graduate Linguistic Student Association (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18), p. 249-384.

Myers, Scott (1997). «OCP Effects in Optimality Theory». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 847-892.

Nespor, Marina; Vogel, Irene (1986). *Prosodic Phonology*, Dordrecht: Foris.

Palmada, Blanca (1994a). *La fonologia del català. Els principis generals i la variació*. Bellaterra: Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Palmada, Blanca (1994b). «Sobre la semblança excessiva en fonologia». *Els Marges* 49: 95-106.

Prince, Alan; Smolensky, Paul (1993). *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Rutgers University, New Brunswick; University of Colorado, Boulder. To be published, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth (1995). «The prosodic structure of function words». In: Beckman, J.; Walsh Dickey, L.; Urbanczyk, S. (eds.). *Papers in Optimality Theory*. Amherst, Mass.: Graduate Linguistic Student Association (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18), p. 439-469.

Walker, Rachel (1998). *Nasalization, Neutral Segments, and Opacity Effects*. Doctoral dissertation, UC, Santa Cruz. To be published, New York: Garland.