# Minimal vs. maximal truncation in the Kansai Japanese hypocoristics

**Keywords**: *hypocoristics, truncation, coalescence, gemination*

**1. Introduction**: This paper analyzes the hypocoristics of surnames involving truncation and gemination in a subset of Kansai Japanese (KJ) in (1).

(1) a. Kubo**t**a + san → [Ku. bo. **s.** **]** san. b. Haya**sh**i + san → [Ha. ya. **s.]** **s**an.

I claim that the relevant hypocoristics can be in principle derived via coalescence of adjacent consonants. I propose an optimality theoretic analysis of the geminated hypocoristics in which it is argued that coalescence conforms to an identity condition on strings undergoing it, building on de Lacy (1999).

**2. Issues**: When the polite marker suffix *-san* follows a surname, the surname is truncated, and the first consonant of *-san* is geminated in (1). The contrast between (1) and (2) shows that a target of truncation in the name base must be a *voiceless coronal obstruent* (i.e., a truncatable consonant).

(2) a. Yama**d**a + san → *[Ya. ma. s.] san. b. Muraka**m**i + san → *[Mu. ra. ka. s.] san.

However, a truncatable consonant need not be the right edge of a name base. KJ allows cases in which the otherwise non-truncatable consonants in a right-edge or/and medial position of the base can be truncated so long as a truncatable consonant is followed by those consonants as in (3). I call this *maximal truncation*.

(3) a. Ho**sh**ida + san → [Ho. s.] san. b. Ki**t**ahara + san → [Ki. s.] san.

The KJ hypocoristics also display the property of *minimal truncation*. When there are two truncatable consonants in the name base, the rightmost one must be truncated in (4).

(4) I**sh**iba**sh**i + san → [I. shi. ba. s.] san. (*I. s. san.)

The hypocoristics above cannot be captured by the previous templatic (i.e., bimoraic/disyllabic) analyses of crosslinguistic hypocoristics (Itô 1990, Poser 1990, Benua 1997, Itô and Mester 1997, Bat-El 2005). As shown above, the name base of the KJ hypocoristics can be three moras in (1), bimoraic in (3) or four moras in (4). The KJ hypocoristics must be thus explained by a non-templatic account.

**3. Analysis**: (5) is a configuration in which hypocoristic formation in KJ takes place. I argue that gemination of the initial consonant *-s* of the suffix is a result of coalescing C with *s*, after vowel deletion.

(5) $[_{base}\ldots C\cancel{V} \ldots]$ *san*, where C is a voiceless coronal obstruent

I propose an identity condition on strings undergoing coalescence in (6), following de Lacy (1999).

(6) ID(ENT)-F: If an input segment is αF, then its output correspond is αF. (i) F is a feature (ii) α is a featural specification (+ or -).

Given that the manner and place features of *t* and *sh* need not be preserved in (1a) and (1b), I further propose to rank ID-F above ID-[-continuant] and ID-[-anterior]. The geminate *-ss(an)* created by coalescence can preserve the features of C and *s* in the input iff C is a voiceless coronal obstruent: C and *s* match in phonological features. Such an instance of coalescence then satisfies ID-F. I also assume a markedness constraint triggering gemination of the initial consonant of *-san* stated in (7).

(7) **Gem(ination): The initial consonant of the suffix *-san* is geminated.**

Moreover, I adopt MAX C and MAX V as low-ranked faithfulness constraints. The proposed global ranking is given in (8).

(8) **ID-F >> Gem >> ID-[-ant(erior)], ID-[-cont(inuant)], MAX C, MAX V**

(9) illustrates how well-formed hypocoristics in (1) are derived. (9a) satisfies the high-ranked ID-F because *t* in the name base and *s* in the suffix can coalesce due to feature matching.

(9)

| /$Kub_1ot_2a + s_3an$/ | ID-F | Gem | ID-[-ant] | MAX V |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. ☞ $Kub_1oss_{2,3}an$ | | | * | * |
| b. $Kub_1ot_2as_3an$ | | *! | | |

The ill-formed hypocoristic forms in (2) such as *Yamassan* are ruled out by ID-F in (10a): the voiced consonant *d* and *s* do not satisfy the featural identity in (6), and hence coalescence cannot occur. (10b) is instead selected.

(10)

| /$Yam_1ad_2a + s_3an$/ | ID-F | Gem | ID-[-cont] | MAX V |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. $Yam_1ass_{2,3}an$ | *! | | * | * |
| b. ☞ $Yam_1ad_2as_3an$ | | * | | |

I argue that the maximal truncation like *Kissan* in (3) involves deletion of non-truncatable consonants, which feeds coalescence of $t_1$ and $s_4$ in (11a): the deletion creates the situation where two truncatable consonants are adjacent and can undergo coalescence. The low ranked faithfulness constraints (MAX C and MAX V) then allow this derivation.

(11)

| /$Kit_1ah_2ar_3a + s_4an$/ | ID-F | Gem | MAX C | ID[- cont] | MAX V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. ☞ $Kiss_{1,4}an$ | | | ** | * | ** |
| b. $Kit_1ah_2ass_{3,4}an$ | *! | | | | * |
| c. $Kit_1ass_{2,3,4}an$ | *! | | | | ** |
| d. $Kit_1ah_2ar_3as_4an$ | | *! | | | |

Concerning the minimal truncation *Ishibassan* in (4), on the other hand, MAX C and MAX V play a decisive role. (12b) incurs more violations of MAAX C and MAX V than (12a) although both satisfy ID-F. (12a), which only coalesces the right-most truncatable consonant $sh_3$ with $s_4$, is chosen as a winning candidate. MAX C and MAX V thus ban more deletion of C and V than necessary.

(12)

| /$Ish_1ib_2ash_3i + s_4an$/ | ID-F | Gem | MAX C | IDENT[-ant] | MAX V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. ☞ $Ish_1ib_2ass_{3,4}an$ | | | | * | * |
| b. $Iss_{1,3,4}an$ | | | *! | * | *** |