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1 Introduction

Claim: Affix order in Washo is partially phonologically conditioned. Stratal OT offers a particularly interesting set of options and restriction in dealing with phonologically conditioned affix order (PDAO).

Overview:
- in Washo, stem-level suffixes are reordered to avoid a stem-final stressed syllable if possible
- at the stem level, the phonological constraint NONFINALITY outranks morphological alignment constraints (making this a $P \gg M$ analysis, see McCarthy & Prince 1993, Paster 2006a,b, 2009)
- unstressed suffixes are later added at the word level but counterbleed the observed change in affix order

2 PCAO

- “phonologically conditioned affix order”: semantically and/or morphologically unexpected affix order triggered by phonological constraint(s), affixes may be more than one segment long
- Paster (2009) argues that “true” PCAO does not exist, reported cases reduce to either segmental metathesis or infixation
- Washo (isolate, North America) is a counterexample:
- affix order in Washo is non-transitive (c.f. Ryan 2010)
- data\textsuperscript{1} from Jacobsen (1964, 1973), who also identified the pattern as phonologically conditioned

\textsuperscript{1}Abbreviations: 1SBJ: first person subject, PL.INCL: plural inclusive, NEAR.FUT: near future, IND: independent mood, NEG: negation
3 Washo verbs in Stratal OT

Stratum 1: Stem-level suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/ímeP/, /hu/, /é:s/</th>
<th>NONFINALITY</th>
<th>NEG-R</th>
<th>INCL-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ímeP-hu-é:s</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ímeP-é:s-hu</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- affixes are unordered in the input, only stem-level affixes present
- some affixes are stressed. Stress is treated as inherent here (though probably assigned at an earlier “Stratum 0”)
- morphologically preferred order (semantically transparent, transitive) encoded in alignment constraints which are violated once for every morpheme intervening between e.g. NEG and the right edge of the stem
- NONFINALITY (here, simply: do not have a stressed last syllable, compare Prince & Smolensky 2004) causes that order to change, yielding non-transitive, potentially opaque order
- on Stratum 2, prefixes and word-level suffixes are added. The word-level suffixes are never stressed, so they never violate NONFINALITY.

4 Cyclicity and PCAO

- why are all stem-level affixes added on one cycle?
- process of dislocating an unstressed suffix such as Plural Inclusive -hu may apply across intervening affixes:
(5) lémaʔášaʔé:shuyi
le-ímeʔ-ášaʔ-é:s-hu-i
1SBJ-drink-NEAR.FUT-NEG-PL.IND
“We (incl.) aren’t going to drink”

- sidenote: this rules out an analysis where Negative -é:s acts as an infix (c.f. Paster 2006a,b 2009), because infixes cannot change the respective order of other affixes
- assuming Bracket Erasure (Kiparsky 1982, see also Bermúdez-Otero 2011), the morphological makeup of the inner stem becomes invisible, PCAO is thus predicted to be possible only between Bracket Erasures

(6) a) *[le-[[[ímeʔ]-hu-ášaʔ-é:s]x-i] vs. b) *[le-[[[[ímeʔ]-hu]-ášaʔ]-é:s]x-i]

5 Conclusion

- PCAO exists
- there may be many more cases of e.g. stem-level PCAO effects which are obscured by later suffixes
- PCAO locality determined by Bracket Erasure and thus the number of cycles
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