Surface-based generalizations over lexical exceptions∗

- Lexical exceptions impact the grammar. In Optimality Theory, this means that different lexical items respond to different constraint rankings.

- When markedness constraints are involved, exceptions are predicted to be learned in terms of their output properties, i.e. what Albright & Hayes (2003) call product-oriented generalizations.

- I offer an OT-based model that responds to exceptionality by building lexical information into the grammar. This lexically-enriched grammar allows speakers to state generalizations about their exceptions in terms of Universal constraints.

- I present results from an artificial language experiment that shows that speakers are biased to prefer product-oriented generalizations even in the absence of relevant evidence from the source language.

1 Exceptions as a part of the grammar

The observation: Speakers extract partial/statistical generalizations from their lexicon, and project them onto novel items (Bybee & Moder 1983; Pinker & Prince 1988; Prasada & Pinker 1993; Albright & Hayes 2003, and many others):

(1) I love [stIb]-ing. I [stIb] every day. Yesterday, I [stIbd] / [stIb].

(2) I love [snEd]-ing. I [snEd] every day. Yesterday, I [snEdId] / [snEd].
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2 Hebrew plurals

Hebrew has two allomorphs of the plural suffix, [-im] and [-ot].

The learner can discover that [-im] is masculine and [-ot] is feminine by looking at nouns that take different plural suffixes according to natural gender, and then by the completely regular agreement on adjectives and verbs.

(8) sus-ım child-pl
ktan-ım little-pl
rats-ım sing-pl
‘little horses are running’

sus-ót child-pl
ktan-öt little-pl
rats-öt sing-pl
‘little mares are running’

In the native vocabulary, however, masculine nouns can irregularly take [-ot], and feminine nouns can irregularly take [-im]. The true gender of the noun is revealed by agreement on adjectives and verbs (Aronoff 1994):

(9) xalon-öt window-pl
ktan-ım small-pl
niftax-ım open-pl
‘little windows are opening’

(10) cipor-ım bird-pl
ktan-öt little-pl
jar-öt sing-pl
‘little birds are singing’

In the loanword phonology, the plural suffixes don’t get stressed, and their selection is completely regular:

(11) blóg-bloğ-im ‘blog(s)’
banán-a-banán-öt ‘banana(s)’

2.1 The lexicon

The masculine nouns that take [-ot] are not evenly distributed. Native masculine nouns from Bolozky & Becker (2006):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final vowel</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>[ot]-takers</th>
<th>% [ot]-takers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4414</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsurprisingly, when given a masculine noun they haven’t heard before, Hebrew speakers like it better with [-ot] if it has an [o] in it (Berent et al. 1999, 2002; Becker 2009).

2.2 Learning Hebrew with Universal Grammar

The learner will identify [-im] as the masculine plural and [-ot] as the feminine plural, but will accept that the two affixes can compete for the same noun, even if its gender is known.

(13) Φ-MATCH: Stems and affixes must agree in gender (cf. Wolf 2008 §2.4.2)

(14) LICENSE[o]: [o] must be stressed or adjacent to a stressed [o]

If a sound x is only allowed in some position, the position licenses the sound. Many languages require [o] to be licensed by the stressed syllable:

(15) Russian allows [o] only in the stressed syllable: dûn-a ‘at home’, dûn-åx ‘at homes’.

(16) In most dialects of English, [o] can be unstressed (‘piano’, ‘fellow’), but in some dialects, unstressed [o] is not allowed (‘piana’, ‘fella’).

Other languages require [o] to be licensed by the word-initial syllable:

(17) Turkish native nouns allow [o] only in the first syllable of the word.

(18) Shona allows [o] in the root-initial syllable, and an initial [o] can license an [o] later in the word (Beckman 1997; Hayes & Wilson 2008)

Hebrew will turn out to be like Shona, but with stress: In Hebrew, [o] must be stressed, but a stressed [o] allows [o] to appear elsewhere in the word.

(19) Regular x a lón x a lón-im ‘oak tree’

(20) Irregular x a lón x a lón-öt ‘window’
The constraints $\phi$-MATCH and LICENSE[o] are in conflict:

(21) Taking [-im] to satisfy $\phi$-MATCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>$\phi$-MATCH</th>
<th>LICENSE[o]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. $\not\in$ alon-im</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. alon-ot</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) Taking [-ot] to satisfy LICENSE[o]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>LICENSE[o]</th>
<th>$\phi$-MATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. $\not\in$ xalon-ot</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. xalon-im</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When faced with conflicting evidence about the ranking, speakers will clone one of the constraints:

(23) LICENSE[o]$_{alon}$ $\gg$ $\phi$-MATCH $\gg$ LICENSE[o]$_{alon}$

And eventually, as the speaker learns all 523 Hebrew nouns with a final [o],

(24) LICENSE[o]$_{46\ \text{items}}$ $\gg$ $\phi$-MATCH $\gg$ LICENSE[o]$_{77\ \text{items}}$

Given a novel native noun with [o] in it, the speaker will give it a 146/523 = 28% chance of taking [-ot].

(25) No reason to take [-ot] in loanwords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>LICENSE[o]</th>
<th>$\phi$-MATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. $\not\in$ blog-im</td>
<td>!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. blog-ot</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Learning Hebrew without Universal Grammar

The Minimal Generalization Learner (MGL, Albright & Hayes 2002, 2003, 2006) learns morphology by creating rules of increasing generality:

(26) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>change</th>
<th>environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[xon] $\sim$ [xonot]</td>
<td>$\emptyset \rightarrow [ot]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aron] $\sim$ [aronot]</td>
<td>$\emptyset \rightarrow [ot]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalization:</td>
<td>$\emptyset \rightarrow [ot]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The generalized rule can apply to any noun that ends in [+son [+cont] on, including an [im]-taker like [alon]. Each rule is associated with a success rate, or its rate of correct application.

As the MGL learns the nouns of Hebrew, it identifies two changes: $\emptyset \rightarrow [im]$ and $\emptyset \rightarrow [ot]$. The environments for the two changes are different:

(27) $\emptyset \rightarrow [im]$ has a high success rate with [a], [e], [i], [u], and a somewhat lower success rate with [o]. But [a, e, i, u] don’t make a natural class that excludes [o], so the general rule is: $\emptyset \rightarrow [im] / _\emptyset$.

(28) $\emptyset \rightarrow [ot]$ has a very low success rate with [a], [e], [i], [u], and a reasonable success rate with [o]. So we get two very general (sets of) rules:

(a) $\emptyset \rightarrow [ot] / _\emptyset$ (low success rate)
(b) $\emptyset \rightarrow [ot] / o C _\emptyset$ (reasonable success rate)

The learner discovers that having [o] in the root makes adding [ot] more likely.

2.4 With or without Universal Grammar?

The MGL takes a singular noun, and decides which change to apply to it. If the singular has [o] in it, it is more likely to take [-ot].

My learner creates a set of plural forms as candidates, and chooses the optimal one. If a plural has an unlicensed [o] in it, it is likely to be rejected.

The MGL makes decisions based on changes between singul ars and plurals (source-oriented), and my learner makes decisions based on the plurals (product-oriented).
In real Hebrew, every noun that has [o] in its plural stem also has [o] in the singular, and almost every noun that has [o] in its singular stem keeps that [o] in the plural.

Real Hebrew is described equally well by both learners, because in real Hebrew, the [o] is present both in the singular and in the plural.

3 Artificial Hebrew

3.1 The languages

Singulars are plausible native Hebrew nouns with an [o] or an [i] in their final syllable. In the plural stems, [o] alternates with [i] and vice versa.

The choice of the plural suffix agrees with the plural stem vowel in the “surface” language and with the singular stem vowel in the “deep” language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singulars</th>
<th>Plural Stem Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“surface” language</td>
<td>“deep” language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amīg</td>
<td>amog-ōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axīs</td>
<td>axos-ōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ațīx</td>
<td>ațox-ōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afiv</td>
<td>ațov-ōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adīc</td>
<td>adoc-ōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apōz</td>
<td>apiz-īm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agōf</td>
<td>ațif-īm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acōk</td>
<td>ațik-īm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōf</td>
<td>ațif-ôte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alōd</td>
<td>alid-īm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After speakers learned one of the two languages, they were given nouns in the singular, and were asked to generate the plural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Surface Plural</th>
<th>Deep Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ațic, azīd, agīf, ațfī, ațfī, ațfī, ațfī</td>
<td>ațic, azīd, agīf, ațfī, ațfī, ațfī</td>
<td>ațic, azīd, agīf, ațfī, ațfī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were 60 native speakers of Hebrew, who were students at the Hebrew University or at Tel Aviv University (average age: 23.4). Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the two languages.

3.2 The predictions

Prediction of my markedness-based approach: When a speaker creates a plural form, the Universal constraint LICENSE[o] wants [o] to be licensed. It doesn’t care what any vowels might have been in the singular.

(31) In the “surface” language, LICENSE[o] is always satisfied, because all plural stem [o]’s go with [-ot]. LICENSE[o] helps the speakers make the right choice.

(32) In the “deep” language, plural stem [o]’s go with [-im], causing a violation of LICENSE[o]. LICENSE[o] discourages the speakers from making the right choice.

The “surface” language is predicted to be easier to generalize than the “deep” language.

Prediction of the MGL: In real Hebrew, the two available changes are Ø → [im] and Ø → [ot]. In each artificial language, there are two different changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“surface” language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o C] → [i C im]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i C] → [o C ot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes of the artificial languages are not found in real Hebrew, and vice versa. Both the “surface” and the “deep” languages are equally distant from Real Hebrew, so they should be equally easy/hard to generalize.

3.3 Results

Speakers were more successful generalizing the “surface” language than the “deep” language. In the “deep” language, speakers were less successful with the [i] → [o] mapping relative to the [o] → [i] mapping.
Trials with successful vowel changes

By-item analysis: same picture. Significantly more success with the “surface” group, for the stem vowel change (paired t-test, $t(19) = 7.36, p < .001$) and for the stem vowel change and affix selection (paired t-test, $t(19) = 9.25, p < .001$).

Successful stem vowel change, with and without successful affix selection, by item

The “surface” group treats both vowel changes equally ($t(t(17.67)) = .268, p > .1$). The “deep” group is significantly worse with $[i] \rightarrow [o]$ ($t(t(17.17)) = 4.430, p < .001$).

The by-subject analysis shows an advantage for the “surface” participants, but the distribution is bimodal in both groups, so the stats are tricky.

Successful stem vowel change and affix selection, by participant

At a cut-off point of 17, the difference between the groups is significant (Fisher exact test: odds ratio 3.736, $p < .05$). The choice of 17 for the cut-off point comes from the “surface” group, where no participant scored in the 13–17 range.

Mixed-effects logistic regression model, with participant and item as random effect variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“deep” language</td>
<td>−1.859</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>−1.843</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular [o]</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“deep”:singular [o]</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the groups was not due to the random smartness of the “surface” language participants: Participants in both groups performed equally well on memorizing the singulars ($t(t(57.14)) = .61, p > .1$).
3.4 The relevance to natural language

There is good reason to think that the participants were not only treating the artificial languages as an extension of real Hebrew, but specifically that they were treating the artificial items as masculine native nouns of Hebrew.

(38) Speakers invariably generated plural forms with final stress, as in the Hebrew native phonology, and unlike Hebrew loanword phonology.

(39) Speakers chose [-im] 55.5% of the time, which is significantly more often than the expected 50% (n = 60, M = .555, Wilcoxon test with µ = 50%, V > 1200, p < .05). This shows that speakers treated the new words as masculine nouns, which are heavily biased towards [-im] in real Hebrew.

3.5 A role for phonotactics?

In native masculine plural forms, [-im] is by far the most common. In the native plurals, disharmonic vowel sequences are more common than harmonic sequences.

(40) Prefinal vowels in native plural nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...o-ım</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...i-ım</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...o-ôt</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...i-ôt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greater frequency of disharmonic vowel sequences is apparent in roots, too:

(42) Vowel sequences in native singulars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All singulars</th>
<th>Di-syllabic masculines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-o</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-i</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-i</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-o</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If speakers went by raw phonotactics, they would have preferred the “deep” language, which has disharmonic sequences on the surface.

3.6 Summary

• Real Hebrew provides evidence for a correlation between having an [o] in the stem and taking the plural [-ot]. Real Hebrew does not provide evidence about the level of the generalization: Singulars, plurals, or the mappings between them.

• My markedness-based analysis predicts that speakers state the generalization over output forms, or plurals. I contrasted this with the MGL’s rule-based analysis, which states the generalization over singular-plural mappings.

• When given an artificial language that puts [o]’s only in the singulars or only in the plurals, speakers prefer the language that pairs [-ot] with plural [o]’s.

4 Using the grammar to learn lexical statistics

For nouns that have [o] in their final syllable, there is a conflict between \(\phi\)-MATCH and LICENSE[0]:

(43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LICENSE[0]</th>
<th>(\phi)-MATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. xalon-ôt ≻ *xalon-im</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. alon-im ≻ *alon-ôt</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speakers know two things about the distribution of [-ot]: It accounts for \(\sim 30\%\) of the nouns that have [o] in their stem, and for \(\sim 2\%\) of the nouns that don’t.

What about [ot]-takers that don’t have an [o] in their final syllable?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gir} & \sim \text{gir-ı́m} \quad \text{‘chalk(s)’} \\
\text{kir} & \sim \text{kir-ö́t} \quad \text{‘wall(s)’}
\end{align*}
\]

The learner can use any Universal constraint that happens to prefer [kir-ö́t] to [kir-ı́́m] such as \(*\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH}\) (Kenstowicz 1997; de Lacy 2004).

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{LICENSE[o]} & \phi\text{-MATCH} \\
\hline
\text{a. xalon-ö́t} & \text{W} & \text{L} \\
\text{b. alon-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\text{c. kir-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{L} \\
\text{d. gir-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The analysis uses constraints to partition the lexicon:

\(\text{(47)}\) LICENSE[o] identifies nouns that have [o] in their final syllable, and distinguishes [im]-takers from [ot]-takers.

\(\text{(48)}\) \*\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH} distinguishes [im]-takers from [ot]-takers no matter what the shape of the stem is.

To make sure that \*\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH} doesn’t account for all [ot]-takers, LICENSE[o] must be allowed to list [ot]-takers first.

The nouns that don’t have an [o] in them don’t form a natural class ([a e i u]). They are the nouns that are left over after the nouns with [o] in them were taken care of.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{LiC[o]} & \text{LiC[o]} & \text{*\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH}} & \phi\text{-MATCH} \\
\hline
\text{a. xalon-ö́t} & \text{xalon-ı́́m} & \text{W} & \text{L} \\
\text{b. kir-ı́́m} & \text{kir-ı́́m} & \text{W} & \text{L} \\
\text{c. alon-ı́́m} & \text{alon-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\text{d. gir-ı́́m} & \text{gir-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The resulting grammar:

\(\text{(51)}\) LICENSE[o] \(\gg\) *\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH} \(\gg\) \phi\text{-MATCH} \(\gg\) LICENSE[o].

And as all the native nouns of Hebrew are learned,

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{LiC[o]} & \text{LiC[o]} & \text{*\, \hat{\sigma} / \text{HIGH} }_{\text{gir}} & \phi\text{-MATCH} \\
\hline
\text{a. xalon-ö́t} & \text{xalon-ı́́m} & \text{W} & \text{L} \\
\text{b. kir-ı́́m} & \text{kir-ı́́m} & \text{W} & \text{L} \\
\text{c. alon-ı́́m} & \text{alon-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\text{d. gir-ı́́m} & \text{gir-ı́́m} & \text{L} & \text{W} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

When given a novel noun and asked to supply its plural, a speaker has a 28% chance of choosing [-ot] if the novel noun has an [o] in its final syllable, and a 2% chance of choosing [-ot] otherwise.

The nouns that don’t have an [o] in them don’t form a natural class ([a e i u]). They are the nouns that are left over after the nouns with [o] in them were taken care of.
5 OT analysis of the artificial languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“surface” language</th>
<th>“deep” language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amíg amog-ót</td>
<td>amíg amog-im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apóz apiz-im</td>
<td>apóz apiz-ót</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the “surface” language, stems with [o] always take [-ot], [-im] otherwise:

The “surface” language is a simplified, regular version of real Hebrew.

In the “deep” language, stems with [o] take [-im]: \( \phi \text{-MATCH} \gg \text{LICENSE}[o] \).

But if stems without [o] take [-ot], then \( *\phi/\text{HIGH} \gg \phi \text{-MATCH} \).

Which predicts that all nouns take [-ot], so there is no consistent grammar for the “deep” language.

Possible grammar for the “deep” language:

\[
\phi/\text{HIGH}(\text{[o]} \text{, axis, amig, axiz, adic}) \gg \phi \text{-MATCH} \gg *\phi/\text{HIGH}(\text{agof, apoz, acok, abof, abod}) \cdot \text{LICENSE}[o].
\]

This grammar correctly predicts that [-im] will be selected 50% of the time, but this prediction is true regardless of the vowel of the stem. This grammar cannot be used to correlate the choice of plural suffix with the choice of stem vowel.

6 Conclusions

- Hebrew speakers know that having [o] in the stem is conducive to choosing [-ot], but real Hebrew doesn’t tell them whether this generalization is stated over singulars or singular-plural mappings (source-oriented) or over plurals (product-oriented).

- In an artificial language experiment that put [o] only in the singular or only in the plural, speakers preferred the correlation of [-ot] with a plural [o], i.e. they preferred a product-oriented generalization.

- The Universal bias for product-oriented generalizations follows naturally from an OT-based analysis that uses markedness constraints.
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