Phonological problems that arise in input-output mappings or in historical changes are usually solved through phonological mechanisms. For example, in Catalan consonantal groups that do not conform to the Sonority Sequencing Principle are typically repaired with vowel insertion, in general [i] in Central Catalan and [e] in Valencian Catalan (differences in the quality of certain vowels are due to different patterns of vowel neutralization in unstressed position, Central Catalan having three vowels, [i, e, u], and Valencian Catalan having five, [i, e, a, o, u]): /pɔbr/, [pɔβɾə] / [pɔβɾe] ‘poor (masc. sg.)’, /pɔbr+z/, [pɔβɾas] / [pɔβɾəs] ‘poor (masc. pl.)’; /rɔmp+z/, [rɔmpɾə] / [rɔmpɾə] ‘to break’). There are some cases, though, where morphology comes at rescue, leading to different kinds of interactions between phonology and morphology. In Catalan, for instance, sibilant contacts are repaired, in masculine nouns, through the insertion of [u] (Central Catalan) / [o] (Valencian Catalan), which is an irregular masculine morph, while [a] (Central Catalan) / [e] (Valencian Catalan) is inserted elsewhere: /felis+z/, [fəlisus] / [fəlisos] ‘happy (masc. pl.)’, /piz+z/, [pizəs] / [pizəs] ‘apartments (masc. pl.)’; but /felis+z/, [fəlisəs] / [fəlisəs] ‘happy (fem. pl.)’, /kuz+z/, [kuzəs] / [kuzəs] ‘you sew’. Along the same lines, in third conjugation verbal forms that show syllabification problems Valencian Catalan adds [i], which is the regular third conjugation morph, while Central Catalan inserts [a]: /5br/, [5βɾi] / [5βɾə] ‘(s)he opens’, /5br+z/, [5βɾis] / [5βɾəs] ‘you open’.

Authors agree in considering that in the aforementioned cases specific allomorphs are used instead of default phonology to repair phonology, but there is no agreement as to which mechanisms lead to different choices. Specifically, analyses that merely predetermine lexical allomorphy compete with more elaborated approaches that try to derive the choice through mechanisms such as lexical ordering of allomorphs and allomorph selection through specific constraints (e.g. Bonet et al. 2007), allomorph selection through lexical conservatism (Steriade 1999, 2008) and other output-output correspondence constraints (e.g. Bonet&Torres-Tamarit 2009), and extreme paradigmatic migration (e.g. Lloret 2002, 2009). In this talk, we will examine some of these morphological repairs and optimality-theoretic approaches to them in order to evaluate the degree of complexity they introduce in the theory.
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