**ABSTRACT**

When considering vowel alternations in English, it is possible to develop a less abstract vowel system than the one developed by Chomsky and Halle by using their laxing rule as the input for a restrictive vowel-shift rule which accounts for the relative height of alternating vowels in alternations such as divine-divinity, extreme-extremity, sane-sanity. The underlying representation of these vowels is tense. After the application of the Chomsky-Halle Trisyllabic Laxing Rule, the vowels are lax and are affected by the vowel-shift rule, restricted in scope so that it will cover only lax vowels that participate in alternations. This can be done by restricting the application of the rule to lexical items that have been specially marked. The result is a rule that has plus-rule features which allow a less complicated underlying interpretation. (VM)
A central problem in English phonology is that of postulating underlying representations and a set of rules that will account for the vowel alternations in related words such as *divine-divinity*, *extreme-extremity*, and *sane-sanity*. Chomsky and Halle (1968) have shown that the set of rules needed to account for one type of alternation simultaneously accounts for the other types as well. Moreover, these rules for front vowels apply to back vowels as well. Thus Chomsky and Halle have demonstrated that certain alternations, which at first may appear to be separate phonological processes, are actually manifestations of a single process.

In order to account for the vowel alternations, Chomsky and Halle have posited abstract underlying representations, i.e. phonological representations that are distinct from their corresponding phonetic realizations. For example, it is postulated that [a^I] and [I] in *divine-divinity* derive from an underlying /i/, that [i] and [e] in *extreme-extremity* derive from /e/, and that [e] and [æ] in *sane-sanity* derive from tense /æ/. Although it has
been claimed that these abstract underlying representations are necessary in order to account for the various alternations, I would like to suggest that we reexamine the case for a less abstract vowel system, one in which the phonological representations corresponding to [a], [i], and [e] in divine, extreme, and sane are /a/, /i/, and /e/, respectively. The phonetic realizations of the corresponding vowels in divinity, extremity, and sanity will be accounted for with Chomsky and Halle's laxing rule and a revised vowel shift rule.

The variety of English investigated here is essentially that described by Kenyon and Knott (1953). The vowels are displayed in Figures 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[+front]</th>
<th>[-front]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-low, +high]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/ beat</td>
<td>/u/ loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɪ/ bit</td>
<td>/ʊ/ look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-low, -high]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/ bait</td>
<td>/o/ loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛ/ bet</td>
<td>/ʌ/ luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+low, -high]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ə/ bat</td>
<td>/o/ lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ɑ/ look</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1**
The vowels in Figure 2 are 'true' diphthongs, i.e. they have distinctive offglides. By 'distinctive' we mean that without the offglides, the diphthongs would no longer contrast with simpler sound types or with each other. For example, it is the high glide of /ɔ/ as in joy that distinguishes this vowel from /ɔ/ as in jaw or /o/ as in Joe. And the high offglides of /ɑ̃/ and /ɑ̃/ distinguish these two sound types from each other. Other putative diphthongs of English, e.g. [e] and [o] are not considered to be true diphthongs, since the offglides are nondistinctive. That is, if the second element of [e] is omitted, the vowel remains distinct from other vowels including its lax counterpart [e]. Whether or not it is pronounced with an offglide, the vowel of late will remain distinct from the vowel of get. In other words, the offglides of true diphthongs are distinctive; the offglides of other vowels are redundant.
The differences between these two types of vowels have been noted repeatedly in the literature; see, for example, Pike 1947 and Lehiste 1964.

It is reasonable to assume that the phonological representations of /aI/, /oI/, and /aU/ should reflect the fact that these diphthongs consist of low vowels followed by distinctive high glides. A rather straightforward conclusion is that the phonological matrices of true diphthongs contain the features [+low, +high], where the feature [+high] is interpreted as the release feature of a low vowel. Notice that the representation of true diphthongs is parallel to that of affricates in two important ways. (1) Both types of sounds contain distinctive features that are contradictory in that the phonetic realization of one precludes a simultaneous realization of the other. The features [+low, +high] cannot be realized simultaneously since the tongue cannot be in both the low and high positions at the same time. Similarly the features [-continuant, +strident] of affricates cannot be realized simultaneously. Stridency requires airflow; noncontinuity precludes it. (2) Contradictory features must be sequenced. For affricates, [-continuant] precedes [+strident], i.e. /tʃ/ is realized as [tʃ] not [ʃt]. For English diphthongs, [+low] precedes [+high].¹ The assignment of contradictory features to the
phonological representations of affricates is a well-established practice and, thus provides a precedent for the treatment of true diphthongs.\textsuperscript{2}

Having discussed the underlying representations of true diphthongs and other vowels, we can turn now to the problem of accounting for vowel alternations. The alternations of the front vowels are summarized in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Vowel Alternations</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+low, +high]</td>
<td>a\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-low, +high]</td>
<td>i -- I</td>
<td>extreme --- divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-low, -high]</td>
<td>e -- ε</td>
<td>sans --- extremity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+low, -high]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>sanity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3

The differences in the relative height of the alternating vowels are accounted for by the Vowel Shift Rule:\textsuperscript{3}

(1) VOWEL SHIFT RULE

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{alow} & + & \text{-blow} \\
\text{ahigh} & | & \text{ahigh}
\end{array}
\]
According to the Vowel Shift Rule, the specification ('+' or '-' ) of the feature [high] to the right of the arrow must agree with the specification of the feature [low] to the left of the arrow. The specification of the feature [low] to the right is the opposite of the feature [high] to the left. Thus the Vowel Shift Rule is an abbreviation of Rules 2, 3, and 4:

(2) \[ a^I \rightarrow I \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
+\text{low} & +\text{high} \\
-\text{low} & -\text{high}
\end{array} \]

(3) \[ i + e \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
-\text{low} & -\text{high} \\
+\text{high}
\end{array} \]

(4) \[ e + a \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
-\text{low} & +\text{low} \\
-\text{high} & -\text{high}
\end{array} \]

The derivation of words like divinity, extremity, and sanity also includes a laxing rule that applies to the alternating vowels. The underlying representation of these vowels is tense. After the rule applies, the vowels are lax. The part of the rule that applies to divinity, etc. is given below as Rule 5.

(5) TRISYLLABIC LAXING RULE (Chomsky and Halle 1968:180, Rule 19b)

\[ V \rightarrow [-\text{tense}] / _-_ C (C) \overline{V} (C) V \]
Rule 5 applies to any vowel that is followed by two syllables, provided the first contains a lax vowel.

The fact that the Laxing Rule applies to words like *divinity*, *extremitity*, and *sanity*, but not to words like *divine*, *extreme*, and *sane* provides a precise way of distinguishing the vowels that undergo vowel shift from those that do not. Lax vowels—as in *divinity*—are shifted, but tense vowels—as in *divine*—are not. Hence, the Laxing Rule provides the input to the Vowel Shift Rule and must apply before this latter rule. In order to restrict the application of the Vowel Shift Rule to lax vowels, we must add the feature [-tense] to the left side of the arrow (see Rule 6).

In addition to preventing the Vowel Shift Rule from applying to tense vowels, we must further restrict the scope of the rule so that it will apply only to lax vowels that participate in alternations, but not to others such as [I] in *bid* and [e] in *bed*. An obvious solution is to restrict the application of the rule to lexical items that have been specially marked. Following this suggestion, we will mark the vowels that undergo vowel shift with the rule feature [+Rule VS], where VS represents the number of the Vowel Shift Rule. The rule feature must be added to the Vowel Shift Rule also, so that it will apply only to marked vowels. The final form of the rule is given
below as Rule 6. With the addition of the features [−tense] and [+Rule VS], the rule will apply to divinity, etc. after the operation of the Laxing Rule, but not to divine, where the Laxing Rule does not apply, nor to bid, where the lax vowel is not marked for the rule.

(6) VOWEL SHIFT RULE

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{VOWEL} & \text{+} & \text{−}
\hline
\text{αlow} & \text{βlow} & \text{αhigh}
\text{βhigh} & \text{−tense} & \text{+Rule VS}
\end{array}
\]

Rules that have plus rule features are called minor rules and contrast with major rules, which do not have such features (see G. Lakoff 1965 for an early discussion). I would like to suggest that the classification of a rule as major or minor be considered a hypothesis concerning the relative productivity of the rule. That is, major rules characterize the highly productive processes of a language, minor rules certain less productive processes." By productivity, we are referring to the ability of a rule to apply to new items that have been added to a grammar. Consider, for example, the Plural Suffix Rule, which determines the phonetic characteristics of the plural endings, viz.
[-s], [-z], or [-əz]. The productivity of the rule is attested by recent additions to the language, such as sputnik-sputniks and mistakes by children, such as sheep-*sheeps.

Since productivity is difficult to measure, I would like to suggest that we consider a substitute procedure, that of examining exceptions to rules in order to infer relative degrees of productivity. We can begin by examining some exceptions to the Vowel Shift Rule. According to this rule, sane-sanity and explain-explanatory illustrate a regular alternation while detain-detention (instead of *detantion) and retain-retentive (instead of *retantive) are exceptions. The list can easily be lengthened: retention, retentivity, abstention, etc. To determine the status of these forms, let us compare some exceptions to the Plural Suffix Rule--feet and sheep. It can be assumed that speakers know that feet and sheep are irregular and that *foots and *sheeps would be the corresponding regular forms. However, although feet and sheep are immediately recognizable as exceptions, detention is not, nor are speakers normally aware that *detantion would be the corresponding regular form. *Detantion--in contrast to *foots and *sheeps--is a completely hypothetical form. Although young children and other language learners can be expected to utter words like *foots and *sheeps, it
is extremely unlikely that language learners—or any speakers, for that matter—will ever use the form *detantion. If a rule is highly productive, it readily applies to new items. Moreover, it should, under certain circumstances, e.g. slips of the tongue, apply also to its own exceptions, thereby regularizing them. Thus the plural of foot is sometimes regularized to foots. However, there is absolutely no tendency for the Vowel Shift Rule to apply to detain + tion, thereby regularizing it to *detantion. Consequently the Vowel Shift Rule can not be considered a highly productive rule of Modern English.

Clearly, the Plural Suffix Rule—a highly productive rule—and the Vowel Shift Rule—a less productive rule—occupy different positions on a productivity-nonproductivity scale. If we accept the view that the classification of rules into major, minor, and other types is a formal means of distinguishing these positions, then the above comparison of exceptions to the Plural Suffix Rule and the Vowel Shift Rule provides support for the conclusion that the latter one is a minor rule.
FOOTNOTES

1Mark Lester (personal communication) has suggested that English is a low-high language. That is, in a hierarchy of features, [low] dominates [high]. Presumably this type of ordering is language specific. German is also a low-high language; see K.C. Hill 1969.

2In accord with the assumption that true diphthongs are parallel to affricates, K.C. Hill (personal communication) has suggested assigning to certain true diphthongs the feature [+delayed release], which previously had been restricted to consonants such as the nonstrident affricate [tʰ]. According to Hill's proposal, the feature [+delayed release] is assigned to true diphthongs in languages having true diphthongs that are not characterized by the contradictory features [+low, +high] or [+front, +back]. For further discussion, see the analysis of Swabian vowels by Dunn (forthcoming).

3Although the vowel shift rule presented here differs greatly from that of Chomsky and Halle (1968:187 and elsewhere), it has essentially the same form as rules proposed independently by K.C. Hill (1968:83) and Wang (1968:707). In his presentation, Wang justifies the use of the paired variables α and β, and, in addition, presents a number of criticisms of Chomsky and Halle's rule.
"The need for distinguishing various degrees of productivity has not gone unnoticed. Maher (1969), for example, cites an impressive number of items that call for precisely this distinction.

Chomsky and Halle (1968:202) account for detention by extending their vowel shift rule so that it applies to specially marked items. Detention is marked with the feature [+F] and undergoes the shift from *detantion to detention. It is obvious, of course, that any exception that is accounted for by an ad hoc device is still an exception.

For a discussion of a type of rule located between major and minor rules on the productivity-nonproductivity continuum, see the analysis of regular strong verbs in Krohn 1969.

A very strong distinction between the Plural Suffix Rule and the Vowel Shift Rule is made by Ladefoged (1970:25): 'There is no doubt that we all have the competence to form plurals of new words. These kinds of phonological rules can definitely be said to exist in our minds. But I have serious doubts whether the vowel shift rules have a similar existence.' Although Ladefoged's claim is much stronger than the hypothesis concerning degrees of productivity advanced here, his observations do provide further support for the conclusion that the two rules are of different types.
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