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John J. McCarthy
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“I took to drinking in the middle of the day with Mussa… He found me in the bar one afternoon poring over the Wehr Dictionary, digging for new roots.” Jonathan Raban, Arabia p. 179

1. Introduction

The study of reduplicative and root-and-pattern morphology has emerged in recent years as a touchstone for the relation between the theory of phonology and the theory of word formation. In reduplicative and root-and-pattern morphology, grammatical distinctions are expressed by imposing a fixed phonological shape on varying segmental material. For example, the Ilokano reduplicative plural in (1) specifies a prefix whose canonical shape is constant—a heavy syllable—but whose segmental content varies in an obvious way depending on the base to which it is attached:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
<th>Dim.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaldíŋ ‘goat’</td>
<td>kal-kaldíŋ ‘goats’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>púsá ‘cat’</td>
<td>pus-púsá ‘cats’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jyáŋitor ‘janitor’</td>
<td>jyan-jyáŋitor ‘janitors’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>róʔot ‘litter’</td>
<td>ro:-roʔot ‘litter (pl.)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trák ‘truck’</td>
<td>tra:-trák ‘trucks’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the root-and-pattern morphological system of Arabic, the productive plural and diminutive are expressed by imposing a fixed light-heavy syllable sequence (an iambic foot) on the singular noun base. As shown in (2), this canonical shape holds only of the initial boldface sequence by virtue of prosodic circumscription (McCarthy and Prince 1990a):

(2) Arabic Productive Plural & Diminutive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
<th>Dim.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>húkm</td>
<td>/hakaam/</td>
<td>hukaym ‘judgment’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ſinab</td>
<td>/ťanaab/</td>
<td>ſunayb ‘grape’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaziir+at</td>
<td>jazač’ir</td>
<td>juzayyir ‘island’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaagil</td>
<td>šawaagil</td>
<td>šuwaygíl ‘engrossing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaamuus</td>
<td>jawaamiis</td>
<td>juwaymíis ‘buffalo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jundub</td>
<td>janaadib</td>
<td>junaydib ‘locust’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulTaan</td>
<td>salaaTiin</td>
<td>sulayTiin ‘sultan’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Ilokano, the Arabic categories ‘plural’ and ‘diminutive’ are expressed by an invariant shape or canonical form, rather than by invariant segmental material.

The morphemes or formatives that express these fixed shapes are called templates. The theory of Prosodic Morphology (McCarthy and Prince 1986 et seq.) has established as its central claim that there is a very close relation between the structure of templates and the theory of phonology, embodied in the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis:1

1Earlier proposals for a specific role for prosody in templatic morphology include McCarthy (1979), Marantz (1982), Levin (1983), McCarthy (1984), and Lowenstamm and Kaye (1986).
Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis

Templates are defined in terms of the authentic units of prosody.

That is, templates must have a direct prosodic interpretation, like the heavy syllable template of the Ilokano plural or the iambic foot template of the Arabic productive plural and diminutive. This claim is quite surprising and also quite easily falsified, since it establishes a very close relation between a purely morphological notion, the template, and a purely phonological one, prosody.

This article, which emerges from my collaboration with Alan Prince on Prosodic Morphology, will explore the consequences of the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis for a fairly complete account of the central regularities of canonical form in two Semitic root-and-pattern morphological systems, those of Arabic and Akkadian. We will see that the core of the Arabic nominal system is templatic in character, with templates that conform to (3). But two more specialized nominal constructions depart from (3) and are provably non-templatic. They are analyzed instead in terms of two other notions from Prosodic Morphology theory, prosodic circumscription and a-templatic prosodic morphology. The Arabic and Akkadian verb system is even more radically non-templatic; just a single template underlies all verb forms, and other morphological regularities are derived by rules of affixation, sometimes via prosodic circumscription.

The remainder of the article consists first of an overview of the essential elements of the theory of Prosodic Morphology, followed by an analysis of the Arabic noun. The discussion then turns to the Arabic verb and for crucial confirmation to the verb in Akkadian, a language which has not figured previously in the literature on templatic morphology.

2. Theoretical Background

Our goal in this section is to review those elements of the theory of Prosodic Morphology that are essential to subsequent discussion. The treatment is necessarily incomplete, touching only briefly on matters that are dealt with at much greater length elsewhere (see McCarthy and Prince (1986, 1990a, 1990b, 1991a, 1991b) and other references in the bibliography).

The Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis in (3) is complemented by two other essential aspects of the theory, the Template Satisfaction Condition in (4), which says how templates are actually matched in words, and the Prosodic Hierarchy in (5), which defines the actual units of prosody out of which templates must be constructed.

Template Satisfaction Condition (McCarthy and Prince 1986)

Satisfaction of templatic constraints is obligatory and is determined by the principles of prosody, both universal and language-specific.

Prosodic Hierarchy (cf. Selkirk 1980)

According to the Template Satisfaction Condition, the result of filling a template must exactly match the universal and language-particular conditions on the prosodic units making up that template. For instance, the template of the Ilokano plural in (1) is a heavy syllable (σH), matched by CvC kal or Cvv ro: but not Cv. But universally the heavy syllable is indifferent to the size of the onset, which may be simple (kal, ro:) or complex (jyan, tra:).
The units of prosody are the elements of the Prosodic Hierarchy in (5): the mora \( \mu \), the syllable \( \sigma \), the metrical foot \( F \), and the prosodic word \( \text{PrWd} \). The mora is the unit of syllable weight (Prince 1980, van der Hulst 1984, Hyman 1985, McCarthy and Prince 1986, Hayes 1989, Itô 1989, etc.); the most common syllable weight typology is given in (6), where CV syllables like \( pa \) are light and CVV or CVC syllables like \( paa \) or \( pat \) are heavy.

(6) Syllable Types in Moraic Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \mu )</td>
<td>( \mu ) ( \mu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p a )</td>
<td>( p a t )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This equivalence between two types of heavy or bimoraic syllables can be seen in morphological phenomena like the Ilokano plural (1) and in phonological ones like stress, closed syllable shortening, compensatory lengthening, and versification.

The theory of metrical feet in (7) is proposed by McCarthy and Prince (1986) and Hayes (1987) to account for Hayes’s (1985) typological findings. (Subsequent work along the same lines includes Hayes (1991), Kager (1989, 1992a, 1992b), Prince (1992), Mester (to appear), and others.) This theory is justified on the basis of the cross-linguistic analysis of systems of lexical stress assignment but, as we will see, its properties also have important consequences for template form.

(7) Foot Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iambic</th>
<th>Trochaic</th>
<th>Syllabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>H, LL</td>
<td>( \sigma \sigma )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The iamb consists maximally of a Light-Heavy sequence, with smaller Light-Light and simply Heavy expansions available. The trochee is Heavy or Light-Light, and the quantity-insensitive foot is just disyllabic. Two logically possible foot types are notably absent from this theory. First, the foot inventory in (7) is asymmetric; there is no anti-iambic HL foot, though this is countenanced in other approaches (Hayes 1980, Halle and Vergnaud 1987, Halle and Kenstowicz 1991, Prince 1992). Second, degenerate feet, consisting of just a single light syllable, are not part of the basic typology, though they may play a marked role in stress assignment (Kager 1989, Hayes 1991). It is useful to extract this prohibition from the foot typology and state it as a general condition on foot form (McCarthy and Prince 1991a):

(8) Foot Binarity

Feet must be binary under syllabic or moraic analysis.

From the Prosodic Hierarchy and Foot Binarity, McCarthy and Prince (1986, 1990a, 1991a, 1991b) derive the notion “Minimal Word”. In the Prosodic Hierarchy, the category Prosodic Word dominates the category Foot, which entails that any Prosodic Word must contain at least one Foot. But since feet are binary, any instance of the category Foot must contain a heavy syllable or two light ones (in quantity-sensitive, iambic or trochaic systems) or simply two syllables (in quantity-insensitive, syllabic systems). By transitivity, then, a Prosodic Word must contain two moras (or syllables). Hence the minimal Prosodic Word in a quantity-sensitive system is a bimoraic monopod. This notion of word minimality turns out to have broad cross-linguistic applicability; see among others Itô (1992), Mester (to appear), Spring (1990a, 1990b), and Hayes (1991).

That covers the core of Prosodic Morphology; we now turn to two other ideas that support the overall program. The first is a-templatic prosodic morphology, proposed independently by Archangeli (1991), Bat-El (1989: 40f.), and McCarthy and Prince (1990b: 31f.). A template specifies the canonical form of its output, like the heavy syllable in Ilokano or the iamb in the Arabic plural and diminutive. But
Unexpectedly, the jussives of biliteral roots are like *yäsk*/*k* `place a peg in the ground`. This is perhaps related to the fact that Chaha nouns never have final geminates (v. Leslau (1950: 15) on *qurr*/*k* for *qurr* `basket`).

Suppose in some particular morphological formation there is no template; then the segmental melodemes will simply organize themselves according to whatever principles of phonological well-formedness, such as epenthesis or Stray Erasure, obtain in that language.

The most obvious, almost trivial case of a-templatic prosodic morphology is total reduplication (McCarthy and Prince 1986, 1990a, 1991b), like the Indonesian plural: *harian—harian* `newspapers`, *kerusahan—kerusahan* `riots`. In total reduplication, unlike partial reduplication (1), there is copying of segments but no templatic limitation on the canonical form of the result. The result of copying is simply syllabified according to the rules of Indonesian, rather than by mapping to a template. Hence, the result can have any canonical form that is possible in Indonesian prosody, rather than the fixed canonical form of a templatic formation like the Ilokano plural in (1).

More striking, though, are cases of a-templatic prosodic morphology in systems that are otherwise templatic, like the root-and-pattern morphology of Semitic or Yawelmani. In the Ethiopian Semitic language Chaha (9), a morphological category called the jussive is formed by imposing a CCC or C⁴CC structure on the verbal root:

(9) **Chaha Jussive (Leslau 1964) (Ethiopian Semitic)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Jussive Verb</th>
<th>'Release'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>gfr</em></td>
<td><em>yägr</em></td>
<td>'release'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>k'br</em></td>
<td><em>yäk'br</em></td>
<td>'plant'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ft'm</em></td>
<td><em>yäf't'm</em></td>
<td>'block'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nks</em></td>
<td><em>yänk's</em></td>
<td>'bite'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>srt</em></td>
<td><em>yäsr</em></td>
<td>'cauterize'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>trx</em></td>
<td><em>yätrx</em></td>
<td>'make incision'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gmt</em></td>
<td><em>yägmt</em></td>
<td>'chew off'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice between the two surface shapes of the Chaha jussive—*yägf*r vs. *yäsr*—depends on the relative sonority of the last two root consonants. That is to say, the schwa is inserted by a phonological rule of epenthesis, sensitive to local sonority relations in a familiar way. Because the location of the schwa in the jussive is straightforwardly predictable on purely phonological grounds, it should not be encoded in the template. This observation led McCarthy (1982) and Hayward (1988) to conclude that the actual template of the Chaha jussive is a vowelless CCC skeleton (with the agreement prefix *yä*). From the existence of this vowelless template McCarthy and Hayward draw the general conclusion that templates cannot be characterized in prosodic terms, contrary to the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis (3).

But really a vowelless CCC template is the same as no template at all, since it says only that the underlying representation of the jussive consists of bare root consonants (with the agreement prefix *yä*). From the existence of this vowelless template McCarthy and Hayward draw the general conclusion that templates cannot be characterized in prosodic terms, contrary to the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis (3).

Archangeli (1991) shows that the system of stem formation in Yawelmani is partially templatic, partially a-templatic. The examples in (10) are given in their phonologically justified underlying representations, abstracting away from the results of epenthesis, closed syllable shortening, and other rules.

---

2Unexpectedly, the jussives of biliteral roots are like *yäskak* `place a peg in the ground`. This is perhaps related to the fact that Chaha nouns never have final geminates (v. Leslau (1950: 15) on *qurr* for *qurr* `basket`).
Prince (1992) suggests that the light syllable template of Yawelmani can be dispensed with in favor of a completely a-templatic formation.

The constant shapes of stems are expressed by the templates: a light syllable, a heavy syllable, and an iambic foot. Roots are associated to these templates from left to right, and remaining consonants are a-templatic, so they are organized prosodically by the well-studied rules of syllabification and epenthesis in this language rather than by association to the template. Only the initial substring of a Yawelmani stem has a fixed canonical shape specified by the template, and the rest is a-templatic.3

One remaining aspect of Prosodic Morphology theory will be of central importance in the following discussion: prosodic circumscription. Typically, a morphological operation like affixation is applied to a morphological category like root, stem, or word to give a prefix or suffix of the usual sort. Under prosodic circumscription, though, a morphological operation is applied to a prosodically-delimited substring within the morphological category, often yielding some sort of infix. The theory of prosodic circumscription is introduced and justified in McCarthy and Prince (1990a); only the barest bones will be recapitulated here.

Central to prosodic circumscription is a parsing function $\Phi$ which locates a prosodically defined substring in a base form. Prosodic circumscription can be either positive or negative, depending on how the prosodically-delimited substring is targeted. In negative prosodic circumscription, some prosodic constituent at the edge of a form is disregarded and the morphological operation applies to the remainder. If $O$ stands for the morphological operation (e.g., prefixation), $C$ for the specified prosodic constituent (e.g., a syllable), and $E$ for the edge (left or right), then we write $O/\Phi(C, E)$ to denote the application of $O$ to some form minus the constituent $C$ parsed out at edge $E$ by $\Phi$. In positive prosodic circumscription, the specified prosodic constituent at the edge serves itself as the base for the morphological operation. Using similar notation, we write $O:\Phi(C, E)$ to denote the application of $O$ to the constituent $C$ parsed out at edge $E$ by $\Phi$.

Negative prosodic circumscription, which is analogous to extrametricality, is characteristic of infixes that are located just inside the edge of a stem or word. One simple case is exemplified by the Choctaw passive infix $i$ in (11).
(11) Choctaw Passive (Nicklas 1974: 32)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abani</td>
<td>albani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apisa</td>
<td>/alpisa/ → a pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holkči</td>
<td>/holkči/ → holokči</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takči</td>
<td>/talkči/ → talakči</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This infix appears after the initial Cv sequence of the base, where it accommodates to the phonotactic requirements of the language via an independently motivated rule of epenthesis. Formally, \(l\) infixation is actually prefixation under negative prosodic circumscription of an initial mora (or light syllable \(\sigma_\mu\)). The morphological rule, restricted in this way, is expressed by \(O/\Phi(\mu, \text{Left})\), where \(O = \text{“Prefix } l\text{”}\).

A similar but slightly more complex example comes from the Philippine Austronesian language Balangao, which is analyzed in these terms by Lombardi and McCarthy (1991). In Balangao, various morphological categories are marked by gemination of the medial consonant (combined with prefixing reduplication).

(12) Balangao Reduplicative (Shetler 1976) (examples normalized)

a. Continuous Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dakal</td>
<td>da-dakkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matey</td>
<td>ma-mattey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ayat</td>
<td>?a-?ayyat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Diminutive/Pejorative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Diminutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taba</td>
<td>tab-tabba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ayat-en</td>
<td>?ay-?ayyat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladaw-en</td>
<td>lad-laddaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bontok</td>
<td>bon-bontok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Noun of Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basol</td>
<td>ba-bassol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadaŋ</td>
<td>ga-gaddaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soblak</td>
<td>so-soblak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablot</td>
<td>ha-hablota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The locus of the infix in Balangao is identical to Choctaw, so it can be characterized as negative circumscription \(O/\Phi(\mu, \text{Left})\). In Balangao, the morphological operation \(O\) is “Prefix \(\mu\)”; addition of a mora which is filled by spreading of the following consonant. Schematically, the derivation proceeds as in (13), where \(<\>\) delimits the material that is negatively circumscribed.

(13) Root   dakal
  Negative Circumscriptio <da> kal
  Prefix \(\mu\) <da> \(\mu + \text{kal}\)
  Spread    <da> kkal
  Output    dakkal

\(^4\)But compare Ulrich (1986:136), who suggests that initial \(a\) in examples like \(abani\) may be a prefix, in which case \(l\) could be analyzed as a prefix too. Examples like \(a:pitta\ ‘to place in a container’, passive \(a:pitta\ from /a:lpitta/ require a refinement of prosodic circumscription dealt with in detail by Urbanczyk (1992).
Unlike the / infix of Choctaw, the $\mu$ infix of Balangao remains unrealized when prohibited by syllabic well-formedness conditions. This occurs whenever the initial syllable of the base is already heavy, as in so-so-bolak. For the same reason, gemination is impossible in stressed syllables; hence the continuous aspect of $\tilde{a}n\-\tilde{a}nap \ 'look for' \ is \  \tilde{a}\tilde{a}\-\tilde{a}nap, \ not \ *\tilde{a}\tilde{a}\-\tilde{a}nnap. \ According \ to \ Shetler (1976: 33), stress is characterized by “an added mora of vowel length on non-final CV syllables”; therefore a stressed syllable is heavy per se and cannot support the additional mora of gemination.

These observations about the resistance of heavy syllables to gemination, which follow directly from the circumscriptional account, provide strong evidence against a superficially plausible alternative analysis of Balangao medial gemination. In this alternative analysis, the geminated forms are derived not by mora affixation but by mapping to a template, along the same lines as the account of medial gemination in Arabic verbs in McCarthy (1979, 1981). This analysis would set up a CVCCVC template (or some prosodic equivalent) to which the root is then mapped. Associating the the root /dakal/ to this template yields the desired result dakkal, and the root /bontok/ correctly remains unchanged under template mapping. But this analysis also predicts that medial gemination will apply to examples like /dakal, not *dakkal. The problem here is that the stress (or length) of the initial vowel is a prosodic property that should not affect mapping to a template. Because a template comprehensively specifies the prosodic characteristics of its output, it should not be affected by the prosodic characteristics of its input. Only the circumscriptional analysis of Balangao gemination, not the templatic one, can explain this sensitivity to a prosodic property of the base. This argument, based on transfer of prosody from input to output, is paralleled exactly in McCarthy and Prince’s (1990a: 218-9) analysis of the Arabic plural.

Lombardi and McCarthy (1991) adduce another, even more persuasive argument against the template-substitution analysis of Balangao medial gemination. The morphology of the continuous aspect can apply to a stem that has already undergone prefixation, shifting gemination leftward from the medial to the initial consonant of the root:

(14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>dakal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefixation</td>
<td>pa-dakal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$ Infixation</td>
<td>paddakal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduplication</td>
<td>pa-paddakal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Compare this form with synonymous padadakkal, where pa- prefixation is applied after gemination and reduplication.) Examples like paddakal alongside of dakkal show that gemination in Balangao can apply to inputs of different canonical shapes, affecting them in similar ways. This shape-independence of Balangao gemination is fatal to a template-mapping account. The problem is that a template specifies a fixed canonical shape for its output, but there is no fixed canonical shape that subsumes both disyllabic dakkal and trisyllabic paddakal. But the circumscriptional analysis, which locates gemination with respect to the initial mora, is independent of the length of the input and so encounters no such difficulty. Again, this argument for circumscription and against template substitution is exactly paralleled in the Arabic plural (McCarthy and Prince 1990a: 218-9).

Ulwa, a language of the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, presents a remarkably clear case of positive prosodic circumscription. According to Hale and Lacayo Blanco (1989), the possessive in Ulwa is marked by a set of infixes located after the stressed syllable of the noun:
(15) Ulwa Possessive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sú:lu</td>
<td>'dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:kilu</td>
<td>'my dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:malu</td>
<td>'thy dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:kalu</td>
<td>'his/her dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:nilu</td>
<td>'our (incl.) dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:kinalu</td>
<td>'our (excl.) dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:manalu</td>
<td>'your dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú:kanalu</td>
<td>'their dog'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stress is iambic, assigned from left to right (though there is optional retraction of stress from a final syllable). In accordance with the definition of the iambic foot in (7), stress falls on the initial syllable if it is heavy, otherwise the peninitial syllable. Hence, the possessive infixes follow the first syllable if heavy, otherwise the second syllable:

(16) Location of Ulwa Infixes (noun + ‘his’)

- **a. After Initial Syllable**
  - bás bás-ka ‘hair’
  - kíː kíː:-ka ‘stone’
  - sú:lu sú:-ka-lu ‘dog’
  - ásna ás-ka-na ‘clothes’

- **b. After Peninitial Syllable**
  - saná saná-ka ‘deer’
  - amák amák-ka ‘bee’
  - sapáː sapáː-ka ‘forehead’
  - siwának siwá-ka-nak ‘root’
  - kulúluk kulú-ka-luk ‘woodpecker’
  - aná:la:ka aná:-ka-la:ka ‘chin’
  - aráːkus aráː-ka-bus ‘gun’ (< harquebus?)
  - karáːmak karáːs-ka-mak ‘knee’

McCarthy and Prince (1990a) analyze the Ulwa phenomenon as positive prosodic circumscription. The possessive infixes are actually suffixes on a prosodically delimited base, the initial foot. Formally, the morphology of the Ulwa possessive is analyzed as O:Φ(F, Left), where O = “Suffix ka, ki, ma, etc.”. A schematic derivation is given in (17), where <> delimits the residue of positive prosodic circumscription.

(17) Base siwának
    Positive Circumscription     siwá <nak>
    Suffix ka        siwáka <nak>
    Output             siwák anak

The initial iambic foot, rather than the whole noun, functions as the base for suffixation of the possessive morpheme. Of course, with words consisting of a single iambic foot, like bás or kíː, the infixes are authentic suffixes, but with longer words they are infixed.

Positive and negative prosodic circumscription cover roughly similar empirical ground, so we should ask whether both are truly necessary. It turns out that they are, based on arguments ranging from the narrowly parochial to the broadly universal. Consider first the logical possibility of replacing one mode of circumscription with the other simply by complementing the parsed-out prosodic constituent C

---

5The theoretical significance of the Ulwa example was first noted by Bromberger and Halle (1988).
and the edge E. For instance, this would mean replacing the Ulwa schema $O:F(F, \text{Left})$ with $O:F(X, \text{Right})$ or the Choctaw/Balangao schema $O:F(\mu, \text{Left})$ with $O:F(Y, \text{Right})$, where $X$ and $Y$ stand for some constituents at the right edge to which Ulwa $ka$, Choctaw $l$, or Balangao $\mu$ could be prefixed. The obvious problem is that $X$ and $Y$ are incoherent, ranging in the case of Ulwa from the null string (for $bas$) to one or more syllables ($karasmak, ana:la:ka$). Because words come in different sizes, it is not possible to reverse the edge at which the infix is anchored. Likewise, to account for Balangao medial gemination in terms of positive circumscription, it would be necessary to specify a prosodic constituent that delimits the boldface portions of both $dakal$ and $padakal$. But of course there is no such constituent; the location of the Balangao infix is defined with respect to the initial mora, not the rest of the word.

Consider next the simple alternative of replacing positive prosodic circumscription in Ulwa with negative circumscription: $O:F(F, \text{Left})$, $O = \text{“Prefix } ka, ki, ma, \text{ etc.\textquotedblleft.” That is, $ka$ would be a prefix on the residue of negative circumscription rather than a suffix on the parsed-out foot. Ulwa-internal considerations show that this alternative is inferior: in about 10% of the nouns collected by Hale and Lacayo Blanco (1989), $ka$ is an actual suffix on a word that is longer than a single iambic foot: $gobament-ka$ ‘government’, $abana-ka$ ‘dance’, $bassirih-ka$ ‘falcon’, $ispiri-ka$ ‘elbow’. (Of these, about $\%$ have doublets where $ka$ is infixed as expected: $bas-ka-sirih$, $is-ka-piri\text{GD7}$.) So $ka$ is a formal suffix, as the positive prosodic circumscription account requires.

Consider finally the alternative of replacing negative prosodic circumscription in Balangao with positive circumscription: $O:F(\mu, \text{Left})$, $O = \text{“Suffix $\mu$“}$. The problem in this case is that the affixed mora is filled by spreading of the following consonant, which is outside the circumscribed domain—compare the correct derivation in (13). This phenomenon, which argues strongly for the distinction between negative and positive prosodic circumscription, arises even more acutely in cases of infixing reduplication like those of Mangarayi (18) and Samoan (19).

(18) Mangarayi Plural Reduplication (Merlan 1982)

a. baraŋali bararaŋali ‘father-in-law’
gabuji gababuji ‘old person’
yirag yirirag ‘father’
jimgan jimgimgan ‘knowledgeable person’
gambuŋa gambambuŋa ‘classificatory MB/ZC’
muyg-ji muygjuygji ‘having a dog’

b. Analysis (McCarthy & Prince 1986, 1991b)
$O:F(C, \text{Left})$, $O = \text{“Prefix $σ_2$“}$.

(19) Samoan Plural Reduplication (Marsack 1962)

a. táa tataa ‘strike’
nófo nonofo ‘sit’
alófa alolofa ‘love’
¿alága ¿alalaga ‘shout’
fanáu fananau ‘be born, give birth’
manaño mananano ‘desire’

$O:F(F, \text{Right})$, $O = \text{“Prefix $σ_2$“}$.

In the Australian language Mangarayi, infixing reduplication skips the initial consonant and copies the following VC\textsuperscript{+} sequence. In this case of negative circumscription, the copied material is taken from the remainder. Conversely, Samoan infixing reduplication copies the (initial syllable of) the stress foot, which is trochaic in this language. In this case of positive circumscription, the copied material is taken from the parsed-out constituent. Because it requires specification of both the location of the affix and the constituent to which the affix is adjoined, infixing reduplication is an unambiguous diagnostic for positive versus negative circumscription.
This completes the overview of the fundamentals of Prosodic Morphology theory: the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis; syllables, feet, and minimality; a-templatic prosodic morphology; and prosodic circumscription. We now turn to the analysis, beginning with an examination of the Arabic noun in section 3 and continuing with the Arabic and Akkadian verbs in section 4.

3. The Arabic Noun

The goal of this section is to provide evidence for the theory of Prosodic Morphology and specifically for the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis, refining and extending the results in McCarthy and Prince (1990b). This evidence comes in the form of an analysis of important limitations and asymmetries in the shape of Arabic noun stems which have a direct basis in prosodic theory.

The focus of the investigation is on the canonical nouns of Standard Arabic—that is, the nouns that are fully integrated into the morphological system, based on their ability to form broken plurals like those in (2) and other criteria. The vast majority of nouns in the language are canonical, but many (such as recent loans like tilifuun ‘telephone’) are not. The basic data appear in (20), which provides a classification by canonical pattern of all the canonical noun stems of Arabic (disregarding the feminine suffix -at). The percentages given in (20) were obtained by counting all of the canonical noun stems occurring in the first half of the large Wehr (1971) dictionary (N = 2400).

(20) The Canonical Noun Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. H</td>
<td>bahr</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LL</td>
<td>badal</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LH</td>
<td>waziir</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. HL</td>
<td>kaatib</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. HH</td>
<td>jaamuus</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. HL</td>
<td>xanjar</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. HH</td>
<td>jumhuur</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


All patterns are well represented except perhaps for CvvCvC (20e), which is probably an historical innovation in Arabic, since it is absent in Akkadian (von Soden 1969, Gelb 1969).

The classification of nouns in (20) according to the syllable-weight patterns (H, L) assumes final consonant extraprosodicity, which is independently motivated in Arabic. Analysis of these patterns of weight leads to two principal prosodic conditions on canonical nouns:

(21) Prosodic Conditions on Canonicity

a. Minimally bimoraic
   \[ N \geq \mu \mu \]

b. Maximally disyllabic
   \[ N \sim \sigma(\sigma) \]

That is, the minimal canonical noun stem of Arabic is a single heavy syllable (20a) or a sequence of two light syllables (20b). Furthermore, no canonical noun stem is longer than two syllables (20b-g). The deeper explanation for the minimality condition, based on the Prosodic Hierarchy and Foot Binarity, was given above in section 2. The maximality condition is a natural one under considerations of locality, which impose an upper limit of two on rules that count (McCarthy and Prince 1986), but it can perhaps be made even more directly prosodic by requiring that the canonical stem of Arabic conform to the generalized trochee of Prince (1983), Hayes (1991), Kager (1992a, b). The generalized trochee combines the properties of the trochaic and syllabic feet in (7); like the canonical noun stem of Arabic, it is minimally bimoraic, maximally disyllabic.
Within the limits set by these conditions, the bimoraic lower bound and the disyllabic upper bound, every possible combination of heavy and light syllables is actually attested in (20). This is a good result, since it suggests that prosody supplies the right kind of vocabulary for describing the fundamental regularities of the system. But even more structure does emerge when we look beyond the superficial properties of the system, and this further structure provides remarkable confirmation for the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis.

The basic claim is that there are no anti-iambic or HL noun templates in the morphological system of Arabic. The evidence of this is that the anti-iambic noun patterns like kaatib and xanjar have a very restricted role in Arabic morphology, even though such nouns are quite common. Anti-iambic nouns are derived not by mapping to a template but by other resources of Prosodic Morphology theory, specifically affixation of a mora and a-templatic prosodic morphology. The remaining noun patterns—Heavy, Light-Light, Light-Heavy, and Heavy-Heavy—are actually templatic, and so they are broadly distributed in the lexicon of Arabic and used independently by the morphology. Evidence of this difference between anti-iambic nouns and others will emerge shortly, but first we will explore the prosodic basis for the absence of anti-iambic noun templates.

The explanation for the restricted role of these nouns is that the anti-iambic HL sequence is not a prosodic unit—that is, it cannot be analyzed within the theory of feet given in (7). The authentic templates H, LL, and LH are all single quantity-sensitive feet; in fact, they are all expansions of the iamb. The remaining authentic template HH is a sequence of two (iambic) feet; in fact, it is the only sequence of feet that meets the disyllabic upper bound on canonical nouns in (21b). In contrast, the anti-iamb HL does not have a foot-level analysis; at best it consists of a monosyllabic foot (H) plus a light syllable which cannot be footed because of Foot Binarity.

The Lamb Rule in (22) formalizes these observations about the difference between templatic and non-templatic noun patterns:

(22) Lamb Rule

\[ N \text{ template} \rightarrow F_1^+ \]

The Lamb Rule requires that the template of a noun stem consist of a whole number of iambic feet. The actual noun stem templates—H, LL, LH, and HH—are each analyzable in this way, subject to the overall disyllabic upper bound in (21b).

The claim, then, is that the peculiarly restricted role of anti-iambic noun patterns in Arabic follows from the fact that the anti-iamb does not have a foot-level analysis within prosodic theory. The anti-iambic nouns are non-templatic, in accordance with the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis, which

---

\[ There\text{ are two additional conditions on canonicity of noun stems in Arabic that are not our focus here, though they are dealt with in McCarthy and Prince (1990b):} \]

(i) Final Consonantality

All stems (noun and verb) are consonant-final.

(ii) Cluster Rule

All and only monosyllables end in consonant clusters.

The former condition applies to all stems of Arabic, nouns and verbs. The latter is the locus of a significant difference between Arabic and Akkadian, which otherwise have quite similar noun patterns. According to Gelb (1969) and von Soden (1969), Akkadian has noun patterns with final geminates like kunukk ‘seal’, though these are non-canonical in Arabic.
The proposal that Arabic noun templates consist of a sequence of feet may seem an illegitimate extension of the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis. But in reality rule (22) expresses the structural regularity that underlies several actual noun templates, each of which has a distinct morphological function (cf. (25)). In this respect (22) is like McCarthy’s (1981: 387; cf. McCarthy and Prince 1986: 3-4) template-of-templates for the Arabic verb or, for a precedent within the theory of Prosodic Morphology, Perlmutter’s (1992) master template F (F) that underlies all of the various templates in Japanese (see Poser (1990), Mester (1990), and Itô (1992)). For example, Perlmutter argues that this template-of-templates is required to account for variability in the system of Japanese hypocoristics analyzed by Poser (1990: 88), where a template of one or more bimoraic feet must be satisfied:

(23) CvvCvC vs. CvCvvC Noun Stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HL</th>
<th>LH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CaaCiC</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>CaiiC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaaCaC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CiCaaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaaCuC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CaCaaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CaCuuC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CuCaaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CiCiiC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Total 463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is immediately apparent that the anti-iaimbic pattern is massively skewed to one vowel pattern, but the iambic one is not. Iambic nouns are more common and occur with more vocalic patterns in a more even distribution than anti-iambic ones. Nearly all anti-iambic nouns are vocalized like kaatib, with aa in the first syllable and i in the second. In fact, essentially all of the small number of anti-iambs without this vocalization actually have doublets with it, so the correlation is nearly perfect. (There is only one exception, maalaj ‘trowel’, in a rough check of all of Wehr (1971).)

On closer inspection, the restriction of anti-iambic nouns to aa-i vocalization turns out to have a morphological explanation: anti-iambs have just a single morphological function in Arabic, as participles of the basic or “Measure I” form of the verb. Specifically, the participle kaatib ‘writing, scribe’ is related to the Measure I verb katab ‘wrote’, and a parallel relationship holds for nearly all other
$CaaC_i C$ nouns. Since almost all anti-iambic nouns in Arabic are participles of Measure I, anti-iams are found only with the characteristic $aa$-i vocalism of this participle. In contrast, true iambic nouns like those on the right in (23) have a variety of morphological functions, and some are basic lexical items, with no special morphological function at all. Therefore they occur with a variety of vocalizations.

The second argument is based on a similar asymmetry, this one between HL and HH nouns with a doubled root consonant (e.g., $sukkar$ ‘sugar’ vs. $jabbaar$ ‘giant’). The data are in (24):

(24) CvCCvC vs. CvCCvvC Noun Stems With Doubling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HL</th>
<th></th>
<th>HH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CvCCvC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CvCCvC</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CvCCvC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CvCCvC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that there is a very strong bias in favor of the Heavy-Heavy pattern in nouns with a doubled root consonant, either with the common medial doubling ($jabbaar$) or the rarer final doubling ($jilbaab$ ‘a jilbab’). The few Heavy-Light nouns of this type are fully exceptional, and in fact some form their plurals as if they were Heavy-Heavy: $sullam$ ‘ladder’, pl. $salaaliim$ ~ $salaalim$. Remarkably, this asymmetry is limited to nouns with a doubled root consonant. HL nouns like $xanjar$, without doubling, are actually slightly more common than HH nouns like $jumhuur$, though both are well represented in the lexicon.

The third argument comes from the various broken plural patterns, based on the descriptive and analytic findings in McCarthy and Prince (1990b). Classified by canonical shape, there are three types of internal or “broken” plurals in Arabic:

(i) the modal Light-Heavy iambic plural, exemplified earlier in (2) and by $quluub$ ‘hearts’, the plural of $qalb$.

(ii) the not uncommon Light-Light or trochaic plural, exemplified by $kutub$ ‘books’, the plural of $kitaab$.

(iii) the rather rare Heavy monosyllabic plural, like $humr$ ‘red’, the plural of $?ahmar$.

In sum, the actual plural patterns—LH, LL, and H—consist of all the monopodal noun stems. The bipodal HH noun pattern is not used in plural formation, nor is the anti-iambic HL pattern, which is not a foot at all.8

Finally, the evidence in (25) shows that the various noun patterns which are claimed to be templatic actually have diverse morphological functions in the lexicon of Arabic.

---

8$HH$ and HL plurals with medial gemination are used only for $CaaC_i C$ participial singulars with human referents: $kaafir$, pl. $kuffaar$ ‘infidel’; $kaafil$, pl. $kuffal$ ‘breadwinner’. Neither is terribly common; according to Levy (1971: 72-6), they constitute 23% and 9%, respectively, of the 460 plurals of $CaaC_i C$ nouns in the whole of Wehr (1971). Because this limitation of a plural pattern to a particular noun class is so unusual, McCarthy (1983) and McCarthy and Prince (1990a: 214) propose that these plurals are non-templatic, derived directly from the corresponding singular by spreading the medial consonant leftwards to close the first syllable, usurping its second mora.
(25) Morphological Functions of Noun Types

a. H
CaCC qatl ‘killing’ gerund of Measure I verb
CiCC+at kisr+at ‘piece’ small fragments
CuCC+at ʔukl+at ‘morsel’ small quantities
CuCC ʔulθ ‘one third’ fractions

b. LL
CaCaC maraD ‘sickness’ gerund of Measure I verb
CuCuC θuluθ ‘one third’ fractions

c. LH
CiCaaC ilaab ‘milk-pail’ vessels
CuCaaC uumaam ‘fever’ diseases
CiCaaC+at xilaaf+at ‘caliphate’ offices, posts
CuCaaC+iyy rubaaʃ+iyy ‘quadriliteral’ number of parts in whole

d. HH
CaC C aaC xayyaaT ‘tailor’ occupations
CaC C aaCat barraad+at ‘refrigerator’ instruments

Compare these various morphological roles of the truly templatic noun patterns with the meager use of the anti-iambic noun, limited as it is to just a single deverbal function, as the active participle of the Measure I verb.

To sum up, we have seen four respects in which the anti-iambic noun pattern is different from other noun patterns in Arabic. These observations support the claim that there is an asymmetry between the anti-iamb and other noun patterns. Furthermore, they provide evidence for the more specific proposal that there are no anti-iambic noun templates, from which this asymmetry derives. The lack of anti-iambic noun templates devolves from the Iamb rule in (22), which itself is a special case of the claim embodied in the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis.

This leaves just one question: if anti-iambic nouns are not templatic, what are they? The two principal types of anti-iambic nouns, kaatib and xanjar, have non-templatic sources that appropriately limit their role in the language.

According to the evidence presented in (23), anti-iambic nouns like kaatib are almost entirely restricted to active participles of Measure I verbs. Thus, there must be a direct morphological relation between the anti-iambic noun and the corresponding verb form katab ‘wrote’. The proposal is that this morphological relationship is affixational in character: the noun kaatib is derived from the corresponding verb katab by left-adjoining a mora to the initial syllable (and supplying a new vowel melody, as is quite typical in Arabic morphology). The adjoined mora is realized as length on the vowel of the initial syllable, in conformity with the usual requirements of syllabic well-formedness in Arabic.

This analysis explains why nouns like kaatib are found only as active participles of Measure I—they are derived from Measure I by affixation of a mora. Hence there is no anti-iambic template underlying the noun kaatib, because the source of this noun is complex, involving affixation to the verb stem katab.

The other class of anti-iams is the set of CVCCVC nouns like xanjar. The fundamental observation about this pattern, documented in (24), is that it is restricted to true quadriliterals, nouns with four (different) root consonants. Nouns of this type are essentially never found with a geminated or
doubled root consonant. The explanation is that these nouns are a-templatic. In other words, a noun like xanjar consists of just its four root consonants, without any templatic constraint on form. This does not mean that its form is free; on the contrary, the canons of Arabic syllable structure—obligatory onset and no tautosyllabic consonant clusters—limit the ways in which four consonants can be organized into a phonotactically well-formed word. The constraints on canonical nouns in (21) and note 6 limit the options still further, by imposing a disyllabic upper bound and requiring that any consonant cluster be medial. The actual surface form of CVCCVC nouns like xanjar is uniquely determined by these conditions. It is simply the result of organizing four consonants into a stem according to the constraints on Arabic syllable structure and noun canonicity. There is no template, nor is there any need for one. This analysis obviously provides an immediate explanation for why nouns of this type are limited to true quadriliterals: a trilateral root cannot force the CVCCVC shape without calling on an otherwise prohibited anti-iambic template.9

This completes the examination of the Arabic noun. We have seen that the core of the noun system is fully templatic in character, with templates conforming to the Iamb Rule (22) and by extension to the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis. Two types of anti-iambic noun patterns, which could not be templatic in this sense, were shown to have a number of properties that separate them from the rest of the nominal system and they were given treatments in terms of mora affixation and a-templatic prosodic morphology that illuminate their peculiarities.

4. The Verb in Arabic

The properties of the verb in Arabic are strikingly different from those of the noun. As we will see, there is just a single authentic template in the verb system, with other regularities of shape derived from that core template by affixation. The expositional strategy I will follow is first to give an affixational analysis of the derivational system of the Arabic verb and provide a number of arguments for this approach from within the grammar of Arabic. Then in section 5 I will turn for confirmation to the richer system of verbal derivation in Akkadian, a fairly distant relative of Arabic within the Semitic language family.

The more common derivational classes or “measures” of the Arabic verb, numbered according to the traditional Occidental system, appear in (27). They are exemplified with citation biliteral, triliteral, and quadriliteral roots, approximate glosses for each derivational class are given, and the exact frequency of each type is provided from the whole of the Wehr (1971) dictionary (N = 3330 verb roots, of which 339 are quadriliteral).

---

9CvCCvC nouns like /mijnan/ ‘shield’ cannot be a-templatic, since they have biliteral roots with m- prefix. There are just six examples, so this type might be inconsequential. Such nouns may also be secondary (deverbal), because of connection with thematic vowel of corresponding verb: yašrab ‘he drinks’/mašrab ‘place of drinking’; yajlis ‘he sits’/majlis ‘place of sitting’.
### (27) Common Arabic Verb Measures

Citation roots `sm` ‘poison’, `fśl` ‘do’, `dhrj` ‘roll’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Biliteral</th>
<th>Trilateral</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>samam</td>
<td>fafal</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>Basic, underived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>nsamam</td>
<td>nfafal</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Passive of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>stamam</td>
<td>ftafal</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>Passive, middle of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>7asmam</td>
<td>7afaṣal</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>Causative of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>stasmam</td>
<td>staffal</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Reflexive of I, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>samamam</td>
<td>faṣal</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Causative of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>tasammam</td>
<td>tafaṣal</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Reflexive of II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>saamam</td>
<td>faaṣal</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Reciprocal of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>tasaamam</td>
<td>tafaṣal</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Reflexive of III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadriliteral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other verb measures are exceedingly rare by comparison (v. (33)) and will be mostly disregarded in subsequent discussion. Later, though, I will suggest how to integrate them into the overall approach.

From the standpoint of the theory of Prosodic Morphology and the analysis of the noun developed in section 3, the Arabic verb is quite puzzling. The verb forms are prosodically incoherent and difficult to rationalize with anything like the Iamb Rule or the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis. Examples of prosodic incoherence in the verbal measures include: the anti-iambic Heavy-Light sequence of Measures II (`fafal`), III (`faaṣal`), IV (`afaṣal`), and QI (`dāhraj`); the initial unsyllabified consonant of Measures VII (`nfafal`) and VIII (`ftaṣal`); and the combination of the two in Measure X (`staffal`). The verbs of Measures II and III, in particular, have characteristics that are essentially forbidden in nouns (cf. (23) and (24)), for reasons attributed to the Iamb Rule and the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis. It is clear, then, that the analysis of the verb requires a very different approach.

In outline, the proposal is this: take the Measure I form `fafal` as truly basic for the triliteral and biliteral verb. Its LL template, a type of iambic foot, conforms to the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis. The other measures are derived from this base by affixation. Therefore there are no separate templates for the other measures; all derive ultimately from the prosodically well-formed `fafal` template of Measure I. In comparison with earlier accounts of Arabic root-and-pattern morphology, particularly McCarthy (1979, 1981), this claim is surprising. After all, the Arabic verb measures were supposed to be the prototype of template-based morphology. The claim that there is just a single template, `fafal`, with other forms derived from it by affixation, represents a significant departure from this earlier view. I will take up the explicit comparison of the two approaches below, after establishing the basic premises of the new one.

The `ta-` prefix, which marks some sort of derivational reflexive, is transparently and uncontroversially an affix. Prefixation of `ta-` transforms Measures II (`fafaṣal`), III (`faaṣal`), IV (`afaṣal`), and QI (`dāhraj`) into Measures V (`tafafaṣal`), VI (`tafaṣal`), and QII (`tadāhraj`), respectively. But there are three other prefixes that have not been recognized as such. The `n-` prefix of Measure VII (`nfafaṣal`) forms the passive of Measure I (`fafaṣal`). The `ṣa-` prefix of Measure IV (`ṣaṣaṣal`) and the `sta-` prefix of Measure X (`staffaṣal`) are somewhat less obvious formally, because the output of prefixation undergoes a rule of Syncope (28), deleting the medial vowel of the underlying forms `/faaṣal` and `/staffaṣal`.

### (28) Syncope

\[ V \rightarrow \emptyset [\text{CVC}___\text{CVC}]_{\text{Stem}} \]

This is a syncope rule of the classic “two-sided open syllable” type, proposed originally by Brame (1969) and Levy (1971). It is independently motivated by an inflectional alternation: the Measure I imperfect with
prefix Ca also loses its medial vowel, as in /ya+katub/ → yaktub ‘he writes’. Modulo the effects of Syncope, Measures IV and X are both derived by prefixation from the Measure I fafal base.

Though Measure I of the biliteral and triliteral verb is formed on a LL fafal template, Measure QI of the quadriliteral verb (dahraj) is a-templatic. Indeed, the treatment of Measure QI is identical to that of the anti-iambic quadriliteral noun.

This much is fairly straightforward. But the crux of any analysis of the Arabic verb lies in how it deals with the measures that are marked by infixation, vowel lengthening, or consonant gemination. We take each of these in turn.

The t infix of Measure VIII (fta fal) is prefixed to the Measure I fa fal template under negative prosodic circumscription of the initial consonant. Formally, the morphological rule, restricted in this way, is O/Φ(C, Left), where O = “Prefix t”. A schematic derivation is provided in (29):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(29) Base} & \quad \text{fa fal} \\
\text{Negative Circumscription} & \quad <f> \text{ a fal} \\
\text{Prefix t} & \quad <f> t + \text{a fal} \\
\text{Result} & \quad \text{fta fal}
\end{align*}
\]

The infix t is a prefix to this prosodically delimited base (like the ta- prefix of Measures V and VI, with which it is roughly synonymous). So t is an affix, but its mode of affixation is via negative prosodic circumscription.

The Measure III verb (fafa l) with lengthening of the initial vowel is derived from the Measure I fa fal base by adjoining a mora to the initial syllable. This is formally equivalent to the derivation of the Measure I active participle in (26). The Measure II verb (fa fal) with medial gemination is also derived from the Measure I base, but with prefixation of a mora under negative prosodic circumscription. Formally, this rule is O/Φ(µ, Left), where O = “Prefix µ”, exactly like the Balangao example in (12). The prefixed mora is then filled by spreading of the following consonant. A schematic derivation appears in (30).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(30) Base} & \quad \text{fa fal} \\
\text{Negative Circumscription} & \quad <fa> \text{ f al} \\
\text{Prefix µ} & \quad <fa> µ + \text{f al} \\
\text{Spread} & \quad <fa> \text{ f al} \\
\text{Result} & \quad \text{fa fal}
\end{align*}
\]

So the anti-iambic Measures II and III are derived from the prosodically well-formed LL template of Measure I by mora affixation, combined in the case of Measure II with prosodic circumscription.

This covers all of the common verbal measures. The table in (31) summarizes the analysis:
There are, though, some cases where the presumed Measure I source is non-existent (like English
uncanny<*canny). Again using lexical entries in Wehr (1971) as a basis, we find that 81% of
Measure II verbs, 90% of Measure III verbs, 91% of Measure IV verbs, 96% of Measure VII verbs,
and 94% of Measure VIII verbs also occur in Measure I, their claimed source. Remarkably, in the
transparently prefixed Measures V, VI, and QII, the ratios are even lower: 68% of Measure V verbs also
occur in Measure II, 60% of Measure VI verbs also occur in Measure III, and 68% of Measure QII verbs
also occur in Measure QI. So cooccurrence of measures in a lexical entry may be a poor measure of
lexical relatedness.

These statistics on cooccurrence of measures are based on the structure of lexical entries in
Wehr (1971). Generally, this dictionary only lists two measures in the same lexical entry if they are truly
related, rather than accidentally homophonous. But a better though far more cumbersome test would be
to judge relatedness based on actual semantic compositionality.

(31) Arabic Verb Measures: Affixational Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Triliteral Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>faʃal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>nfafal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>tfafal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>?afal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>stafal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>faʃal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>tafaʃal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>faʃal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>tafaʃal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>dahraj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>tadahraj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fa- prefixed forms are derived from other measures, but the remaining forms of the triliteral verb are
derived from Measure I, the semantically neutral, morphologically unmarked, and statistically most
frequent of the forms of the Arabic verb.10

In contrast to the affixational analysis in (31), the account of the Arabic verb measures in
McCarthy (1979, 1981) is almost purely templatic, with each measure (except for the fa- prefixed ones)
having its own template, unrelated to the templates of the other measures. No special status is accorded
Measure I, with its CVCVC template. The affixes n and st of Measures VII and X are pre-linked to
consonantal slots in the templates; similarly, the infix t of Measure VIII is pre-linked to the boldface slot
of a CVVCVC template. Lengthening of the initial vowel in Measure III is specified by a CVCCVC
template, and medial gemination in Measure II is accomplished with a CVCCVC template and a special
association rule. The table in (32) summarizes the properties of this templatic analysis, except for the
treatment of fa- prefixed forms, which is the same in both accounts.

10There are, though, some cases where the presumed Measure I source is non-existent (like
English uncanny<*canny). Again using lexical entries in Wehr (1971) as a basis, we find that 81% of
Measure II verbs, 90% of Measure III verbs, 91% of Measure IV verbs, 96% of Measure VII verbs,
and 94% of Measure VIII verbs also occur in Measure I, their claimed source. Remarkably, in the
transparently prefixed Measures V, VI, and QII, the ratios are even lower: 68% of Measure V verbs also
occur in Measure II, 60% of Measure VI verbs also occur in Measure III, and 68% of Measure QII verbs
also occur in Measure QI. So cooccurrence of measures in a lexical entry may be a poor measure of
lexical relatedness.

These statistics on cooccurrence of measures are based on the structure of lexical entries in
Wehr (1971). Generally, this dictionary only lists two measures in the same lexical entry if they are truly
related, rather than accidentally homophonous. But a better though far more cumbersome test would be
to judge relatedness based on actual semantic compositionality.
Arabic Verb Measures: Templatic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Triliteral</th>
<th>Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>fā'āl</td>
<td>CVCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>nfañāl</td>
<td>CCVCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>flañāl</td>
<td>CCVCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>?aflāl</td>
<td>CVCCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>stafal</td>
<td>CCVCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>faññal</td>
<td>CVCCVC mod special association rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>fañal</td>
<td>CVVCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>dañraj</td>
<td>CVCCVC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These CV templates could of course be recast in terms of prosodic notions like syllable, mora, rhyme, or nucleus, as in Levin (1983), Lowenstamm and Kaye (1986), and McCarthy and Prince (1986). That relatively minor reformulation would not alter the profound differences in approach between the affixational and templatic analyses.

The two accounts have now been clearly distinguished. The affixational analysis, which is embedded within Prosodic Morphology and governed by a very restrictive theory of template form (the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis), posits just a single template for Arabic verbs, the LL fañal. Other invariant properties of the various measures (the infix t, vowel length, gemination) are expressed by affixation rules, in some cases via prosodic circumscriptio. But the templatic analysis of McCarthy (1979, 1981), with a very rich theory of template form, attributes all invariant properties of the various measures to the templates themselves. Infixation of t in Measure VIII is done by pre-linking the t to the template CCVCVC; gemination in Measure II is accomplished with a CVCCVC template and special association rule; lengthening in Measure III is specified by a CVVCVC template. With this sketch of the two approaches in hand, we are now ready to compare them.

The templatic analysis in (32) enjoys the apparent advantage of broader empirical coverage. By introducing additional templates, it encompasses the rare Arabic verbal measures. These are given with their frequencies of occurrence in the Wehr (1971) dictionary in (33), including two measures that are apparently now extinct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Triliteral</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>fññal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Colors &amp; bodily defects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>fñañal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Like IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>fñawñal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intransitive?, stative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>fñawwal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>fñamlal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>fñanlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>dñamraj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>dñarraj</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But this supposed advantage of the templatic analysis is illusory. For one thing, a vast statistical gulf separates these rare measures from the common ones, so they are probably an entirely peripheral phenomenon, of no probative value. For another, they can be mostly accommodated with a straightforward extension of the affixational analysis. Like the common measures, the rare ones can be derived from the LL fañal base, but by initially associating the second root consonant to the onset of the
first syllable. (The initial root consonant would then receive the same treatment as the extratemplatic consonants of Yawelmani (cf. (10)).) These measures also involve various infixes which, like the μ of Measure II, are located after the first syllable.

In contrast, the many advantages of the affixational analysis are quite real. First and most important, the single LL template of the affixational analysis explains why there is so little variation in canonical shape among the verbal measures compared to the noun patterns. Unlike nouns, verbs are never monosyllabic and always have a light (i.e., short-voweled) final syllable. Verbs are never monosyllabic because the template that underlies all verbs is disyllabic; the final syllable of verbs is always light because it is light in the LL template and all verbal derivation involves prefixes. But in the templatic analysis, the resemblances among the various templates in (32) are completely unexplained, accidental properties of the system rather than lawful regularities.

Second, the a-templatic treatment of the basic quadriliteral measure QI explains why quadriliteral verbs are strictly quadriliteral, being essentially impossible with a doubled root consonant. Among all the 340 verbs in Wehr (1971) that follow a quadriliteral pattern, only four are based on an apparently triliteral root by doubling a consonant (ta+baγdad ‘to swagger like a Bagdadi’, ta+jalbab ‘to wear a jilbab’, two affective (ṣaxlal ‘to jingle’, qajulal ‘to dazzle’)). The CVCCVC quadriliteral template in the templatic analysis (32) predicts that there should be many such verbs, in which a triliteral root spreads to fill a quadriliteral template.

Third, even the templatic analysis must countenance a mora affixation rule that parallels the one required to account for Measure III in the affixational analysis (v. McCarthy (1979: 322)). Evidence of this comes from a nominalization pattern shared by several verbal measures, in which the final vowel of the stem is lengthened and the vocalism i-a is imposed. The measures that normally or always form their nominalizations in this way are listed in (34).

(34) i-a Nominalizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Nominalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>ʔaʕaľ</td>
<td>ʔiʕa'al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>nʕaʕal</td>
<td>nʕa'al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>fʕaʕal</td>
<td>fʕa'al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>sʕaʕal</td>
<td>sʕa'al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>dahrja</td>
<td>dihraaj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is also the pattern of nominalization with all of the rare measures. Clearly, because the form of the nominalization depends on the form of the related verb, there cannot be a separate template for the nominalization. (Once again, this is parallel to the argument against template substitution in the Arabic plural made by McCarthy and Prince (1990a: 218-9).) Therefore any theory must posit a rule adjoining a mora to the final syllable to nominalize the verb. But of course this rule is not different in kind from the treatment accorded Measure III in the affixational analysis.

Other arguments in support of the affixational analysis over the templatic one rely on more local properties of Measures II and III:

- The moraic prefixes posited in the affixational analysis of Measures II and III are actually absent in some nominalizations of these verbs, so the moraic affix may be strictly verbal. All attested nominalizations of Measure II—taffiil (N = 383), taffil+at (N = 48), and taffi'al (N = 8)—lack medial gemination. A common nominalization of Measure III—biʕaal (N = 80)—also lacks the moraic prefix (and follows the pattern in (34)).

- The difference in mode of attachment of the mora—adjunction in Measure III versus prosodic circumscription in Measure II—accounts for the difference between vowel lengthening and consonant gemination without requiring a prosodic distinction between Cvv and CVC heavy
Detailed analysis of the vocalization ("vowel melodies") of the Akkadian verb is beyond the scope of this article, but the central regularities are quite compact and straightforward. For the tensed and imperative verb forms cited, there are just two basic vocalization patterns. In the G, N, QN, and QŠ, the initial syllable of the stem is \(i\), medial syllables have \(a\), and the final syllable is a thematic vowel that alternates between the past and the present/perfect. The quality of this vowel is lexically idiosyncratic (compare \(ipparra\)/\(iptara\)/\(iprus\) ‘decide’, \(ipaqqid\)/\(iptaqid\)/\(ipqid\) ‘hand over’, \(ilammad\)/\(iltamad\)/\(ilmad\) ‘teach’). In the D and Š, the initial syllable is vocalized with \(u\), medial syllables again with \(a\), and the final syllable has \(i\) in the past, \(a\) in the present and perfect. The active participles, except for the exceptional G form \(paaris\), are vocalized \(u\)-\(a\)-\(i\). Therefore all vocalization patterns observe the "edge-in" pattern identified by Yip (1988), with specified initial and final syllables and default \(a\) in medial syllables.

In summary, the evidence makes a strong case for the plausibility of the affixational analysis of the Arabic verb. Since the affixational analysis is actually forced on us by the comparison with the noun and ultimately by the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis, the overall program of Prosodic Morphology is supported as well. But the most compelling arguments for the affixational analysis come from a related language, Akkadian.

5. The Verb in Akkadian

The system of measures in the Akkadian verbal system is considerably more complex than that of Arabic. Furthermore, Akkadian calls on infixation and gemination to express inflectional as well as derivational distinctions, exercising the resources of Prosodic Morphology much more than Arabic does. Because of this richer morphological environment, Akkadian reveals that a purely templatic treatment of infixation and gemination is provably impossible. They must be analyzed by affixation under prosodic circumscription.

The discussion of Akkadian begins with an overview of the verbal system and continues with a characterization of the simple concatenative morphology, introducing certain essential phonological processes as required. This is followed by the analysis of infixation and consonant gemination in the verbal system, leading to the argument for an affixational over a templatic treatment. The Akkadian evidence is mostly drawn from the standard handbook of this language, von Soden (1969), augmented with some of the more important specialized studies, Gelb (1969), Goetze (1947), Heidel (1940), Reiner (1966), Steiner (1981), Voigt (1987), and Whiting (1981).

The derivational classes or measures of the Akkadian verb are denoted by German abbreviations: G (Grundform), N (n-Form), D (Doppelungsform), and Š (š-Form). The G corresponds approximately to Measure I of Arabic, the N to Measure VII, the D to Measure II, and the Š to Measure IV. Within each of these principal derivational classes, there are sub-classes denoted by \(Xtn\) and \(Xt\). The \(Xtn\) form, which has no counterpart in Arabic, expresses an iterative or habitative meaning. The \(Xt\) Measures are described as "direction-changing", meaning that they refer to both passive-like notions and to reversal of motion. Finally, within the measures themselves, Akkadian (unlike Arabic) has different stem shapes to form different tenses. The table in (35) summarizes the properties of the system.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Detailed analysis of the vocalization ("vowel melodies") of the Akkadian verb is beyond the scope of this article, but the central regularities are quite compact and straightforward. For the tensed and imperative verb forms cited, there are just two basic vocalization patterns. In the G, N, QN, and QŠ, the initial syllable of the stem is \(i\), medial syllables have \(a\), and the final syllable is a thematic vowel that alternates between the past and the present/perfect. The quality of this vowel is lexically idiosyncratic (compare \(ipparra\)/\(iptara\)/\(iprus\) ‘decide’, \(ipaqqid\)/\(iptaqid\)/\(ipqid\) ‘hand over’, \(ilammad\)/\(iltamad\)/\(ilmad\) ‘teach’). In the D and Š, the initial syllable is vocalized with \(u\), medial syllables again with \(a\), and the final syllable has \(i\) in the past, \(a\) in the present and perfect. The active participles, except for the exceptional G form \(paaris\), are vocalized \(u\)-\(a\)-\(i\). Therefore all vocalization patterns observe the "edge-in" pattern identified by Yip (1988), with specified initial and final syllables and default \(a\) in medial syllables.
An idiosyncratic rule deletes initial \( n \) of the \( Ntn \) verb form.\(^{12}\)

There is another form of the Št, the so-called lexical Št, with idiosyncratic meaning and present-tense gemination: \( uštaparras \).

The handbook \( Ntn \) past form \( ittablakkat \) is is one of the few apparent exceptions to Syncope. But it is attested just once, and cf. \( it-ta-aš-ra-bi-Tu \) in CAD.

---

**Akkadian Verb System**

Citation roots *prs* ‘decide’, *blkt* ‘cross over’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meas.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>iparras</td>
<td>iptras</td>
<td>iprus</td>
<td>purus</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gtn</td>
<td>iptanarras</td>
<td>iptatarras</td>
<td>iptarras</td>
<td>pitarras</td>
<td>Iterative of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt</td>
<td>iptarras</td>
<td>iptatras</td>
<td>iptarras</td>
<td>pitras</td>
<td>Passive of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>ipparras</td>
<td>ipptras</td>
<td>ipparis</td>
<td>napris</td>
<td>Passive of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntn</td>
<td>ittanapras</td>
<td>[ittatapras]</td>
<td>ittapras</td>
<td>itapras(^{12})</td>
<td>Iterative of N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>uparras</td>
<td>uptarris</td>
<td>upparis</td>
<td>purris</td>
<td>Factitive of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtn</td>
<td>uptanarras</td>
<td>uptatarris</td>
<td>uptarris</td>
<td>putarris</td>
<td>Iterative of D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>uptarras</td>
<td>uptatarris</td>
<td>uptarris</td>
<td>putarris</td>
<td>Passive of D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š</td>
<td>ušapras</td>
<td>uštapris</td>
<td>ušapris</td>
<td>šupris</td>
<td>Caus. of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Štn</td>
<td>uštanapras</td>
<td>uštatapris</td>
<td>uštapris</td>
<td>šutapris</td>
<td>Iterative of Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Št(^{13})</td>
<td>uštapras</td>
<td>uštapris</td>
<td>uštapris</td>
<td>šutapris</td>
<td>Passive of Š</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quadriliteral

| QN   | ibbalakkat | ittabalkat | ibbalkit | [nabalkit] | Basic |
| QNtn | ittanablakkat | ittabalkat | ittabalkat | Iterative |
| QS   | ušbalakkat | uštabalkat | ušbalkit | šubalkit | Causative |
| QŠtn | uštanablakkat | uštabalkat | uštabalkit | Iterative |

As in (27), the meanings of the various measures are only approximate and do not reflect the inherent variability of this lexical system. There are other untensed verb forms not given in this table, such as the participle (\( G \) *paaris*, \( N \) *mupparis*, \( D \) *muparris*, Š *mušapris*) or infinitive (\( G \) *paraas*, \( N \) *naprus*, \( D \) *purrus*, Š *šuprus*).

We begin the analysis with the most transparent, plainly concatenative morphology in the Akkadian verb, the system of prefixation. The tensed verbs cited in (35) have the prefix *i* or *u*, which marks 3rd masculine singular subject agreement. (Compare *aprus* ‘I decided’, *iprusu* ‘they decided’, *niprus* ‘we decided’.) There are also two derivational prefixes, the eponymous Š- and n- prefixes of the Š and N Measures, which form derived causatives and passives. The prefix Š- alternates with Š (e.g., Št imperative *šutapris* vs. past *uštapris*) under phonologically-defined conditions, in accord with a completely general Syncope rule. Syncope deletes a short vowel in a (non-final) open syllable if the preceding syllable is also open and short-voweled. Thus, it is a typical two-sided open syllable deletion rule (cf. Greenstein (1984)), with the added twist that it cannot yield CvvC syllables. Some examples appear in (36).\(^{14}\)

**Syncope: Exemplification**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šaakinat} (\text{const.}) & \quad \text{šaakØntum} (\text{nom.}) & \quad \text{‘placing (fem.)’} \\
\text{šubat} (\text{const.}) & \quad \text{šubØtum} (\text{nom.}) & \quad \text{‘seat’} \\
\text{šakin} (\text{const.}) & \quad \text{šakØnum} (\text{nom.}) & \quad \text{‘placed’} \\
\text{eniš} (\text{masc.}) & \quad \text{enØšat} (\text{fem. const.}) & \quad \text{‘weak’} \\
\text{iptaras} (\text{3rd sg.}) & \quad \text{iptarØsu} (\text{3rd pl.}) & \quad \text{‘has decided’}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{12}\)An idiosyncratic rule deletes initial *n* of the \( Ntn \) verb form.

\(^{13}\)There is another form of the Št, the so-called lexical Št, with idiosyncratic meaning and present-tense gemination: *uštaparras*.

\(^{14}\)The handbook \( Ntn \) past form *ittabalakkat* is is one of the few apparent exceptions to Syncope. But it is attested just once, and cf. *it-ta-aš-ra-bi-Tu* in CAD.
The nV- prefix of the N measure also undergoes Syncope, though the result is subject to a further rule assimilating n totally to a following consonant: /inaparís/ \~ ipparís. 15

Syncope is important in the analysis of the verb, since it permits us to derive the G, N, and Š from the same LL or fatau base posited in Arabic (cf. Gelb (1969)). In the G past, for example, syncope takes underlying /i+parus/ to surface ipparís. Similarly, in the Š Syncope applies to underlying /u+ša+parís/, yielding ušaparis. Finally, in the N Syncope deletes the vowel of the prefix rather than the stem, transforming /i+na+parís/ to ipparís, perhaps because of a difference in direction of iteration or cyclic organization.15

With these preliminaries out of the way, we can now turn to the real goal of the investigation, the analysis of infixation and gemination. (37) lists the three morphologically distinct though partly homophonous infixes of Akkadian.

(37) Akkadian Infixes

-\(ta\)- Xr Stem ‘passive’
-\(tana\)- \~ -\(ta\)- Xn Stem (present \~ otherwise) ‘iterative’
-\(ta\)- ‘perfect’

The -\(ta\)- passive infix is the characteristic property of Xr stems like the Gr, the Dr, and the Št. The -\(tana\)- iterative infix marks Xn stems like the Gtn, the Dtn, the Ntn, and the Štn. It is idiosyncratically realized as -\(ta\)- outside the present tense (see Steiner (1981) and Voigt (1987) for discussion). Throughout the verb system, another infix -\(ta\)- marks the perfect tense. Descriptively, all three infixes are located in the context \(\text{Stem}[\text{CV} \ldots]\), where the category \text{Stem} includes derivational (but not inflectional) prefixes. Thus, the G perfect and Gr are pa-ta-ras; the Dr is pa-ta-raras; the Št and Štn are ša-ta-paras; and the Ntn is na-tana-paras. Since the locus of infixation in Akkadian is identical to that of Choctaw and Balangao, it is analyzed in the same way, as positive prosodic circumscription of the initial mora (formally, O/\(\Phi(\mu,\ \text{Left})\)), where O = “Prefix ta(na)”). Multiple layers of infixation are possible, with separate infixation operations applied compositionally: base paras \~ Gr <pa>tararas \~ Gr perfect <pa>tatararas (; iptatras).

Besides the fully productive infixes in (37), two other more marginal infixation operations in Akkadian apply to a base circumscribed in the same way. First, the rare R stem upararras/uptararris/upararris is formed from the D stem (Whiting 1981) by infixing a reduplicative affix \(\sigma\). This construction, though unknown in Arabic, is common in modern Ethiopian languages like Amharic (e.g., sābabbr ‘shatter’). Second, the quadriliteral verb of Akkadian appears to be the product of a lexicalized rule of infixation, since all quadriliteral verbs have a r or l formative after the initial syllable (Heidel 1940). An exhaustive list of quadriliteral bases (minus initial na- or ša-) gleaned from the published volumes of CAD appears in (38).

---

15Syncope has two other properties that a more complete analysis would need to contend with. First, it applies cyclically in [[prefix][stem]][suffix] configurations: [i[pādrus]] ‘he decided’, [[[pādrus]][u]] ‘they decided’, *[[[pādrus][u]]]. Second, the infixes -\(ta\)- and -\(tana\)- are systematically dispreferred as targets of Syncope: Štn present u+ša+tana+pdras; QNtn perfect i+nd+ta+ta+bdlakkat. This latter condition is quite puzzling, but is independently confirmed by the behavior of the untensed forms of the Gr, where deletion of the infixal vowel is forced: pi-\(id\)-ras. When these forms are suffixed, either infixal immunity or cyclicity must be violated. In fact, the Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian dialects differ on exactly this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying</th>
<th>Old Babylonian</th>
<th>Old Assyrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[pi-ta-rus]um</td>
<td>pit(\sigma)rusum</td>
<td>pit(\sigma)r(\sigma)sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔa-ta-lak]am</td>
<td>ʔat(\sigma)lakam</td>
<td>ʔat(\sigma)talakam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbs ending in \(û\) have final radicals \(w\) or \(y\); the \(û\) is the result of coalescence.\(^{16}\)

Another source of evidence for the circumscriptional character of medial gemination in Akkadian is the formation of the present of “hollow verbs”, which contain a long vowel (originally from \(w\) or \(y\)) in place of the middle radical. In the G of hollow verbs, present tense gemination applies to the final radical, but only in the plural, when it is the onset of the final syllable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>ikaan</td>
<td>iktuun</td>
<td>ikuun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>iku-n-nu</td>
<td>iktuunu</td>
<td>ikuunu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reiner (1966: 90f.) points out that this pattern of gemination has been extended productively another class of surface biconsonantal verbs, those with a high glide as initial radical.

The \(r/l\) infix is clearly unproductive and lexicalized, since the choice of \(r\) or \(l\) is not generally predictable and there is no evidence of a systematic relation between infixed and uninfixed forms. Nevertheless, a couple of verbs may hint at a former regularity: \(zabab\) ‘be in frenzy, act crazily’, \(na+zabab\) ‘rage’; \(makû\) ‘be lacking’, \(na+makû\) ‘lag behind, be late, be in arrears’.

Like the Arabic Measure II, the Akkadian D stem is a derived causative marked by medial gemination. But medial gemination also marks an inflectional category in Akkadian, the present tense. Thus, there is a direct alternation within a paradigm between a stem with and without gemination, so the G past and perfect \(iprus\) and \(iptaras\) correspond to the present \(iparras\). Furthermore, present tense gemination applies to quadriliteral verbs as well as triliteral ones, so the quadriliteral past and perfect \(ibbalkit\) and \(itabalkat\) correspond to the present \(ibbalakkat\).

Medial gemination in Akkadian invariably affects the onset of the stem-final syllable, even in affixed or quadriliteral forms like \(pata-r-ras\), \(napa-r-ras\), \(nabala-k-kat\), or \(šabala-k-kat\). This is in sharp contrast to the location of the -\(ta\)- and -\(tana\)- infixes, which is affected by prior prefixation (compare \(pa-ta-ras\), \(na-ta-paras\)). Therefore medial gemination is anchored on the right edge of the stem, requiring a characterization in terms of positive prosodic circumscription of the final syllable. Formally, then, the process of medial gemination in Akkadian is \(O:\Phi(\sigma, \text{Right})\), where \(O = \text{“Prefix } \mu\text{”}\). For an input like \(naparas\), the schematic derivation proceeds as in (39).\(^{17}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(39) Base} & \quad \text{naparas} \\
\text{Positive Circumscription} & \quad \langle \text{napa} \rangle \text{ ras} \\
\text{Prefix } \mu & \quad \langle \text{napa} \rangle \mu + \text{ ras} \\
\text{Spread} & \quad \langle \text{napa} \rangle \text{ rras} \\
\text{Result} & \quad \text{naparras}
\end{align*}
\]

In the quadriliterals, where the result of \(\mu\) infxation would be \(*nabal\text{kat}\), an independently motivated rule of epenthesis (Greenstein 1984) applies to break up the resulting impermissible CCC cluster.

\(^{16}\)Verbs ending in \(û\) have final radicals \(w\) or \(y\); the \(û\) is the result of coalescence.

\(^{17}\)Another source of evidence for the circumscriptional character of medial gemination in Akkadian is the formation of the present of “hollow verbs”, which contain a long vowel (originally from \(w\) or \(y\)) in place of the middle radical. In the G of hollow verbs, present tense gemination applies to the final radical, but only in the plural, when it is the onset of the final syllable:
After this paper was completed, I received from the author a copy of Bat-El (1992), which presents a structurally similar argument for a non-templatic treatment of the verb in Modern Hebrew based on the transfer of consonant clusters from base noun to derived verb.

(40) Base nabalkat
Positive Circumscription <nabal> kat
Prefix μ <nabal> μ + kat
Spread <nabal> kkat
Epenthesis nabalakkat

Alternatively, we might analyze the quadriliteral infix as la(ra), with the vowel deleted by Syncope in the past and perfect (indabalukat, indabalukit) and preserved in the present (indabalakat).

This completes the sketch of an affixational account of the Akkadian verb, parallel to the affixational analysis of the Arabic verb above in (31). Can the templatic analysis of McCarthy (1979, 1981), summarized for Arabic in (32), be similarly extended to Akkadian? No, the fundamental regularities of infixation and medial gemination in Akkadian verbal morphology can only be captured by affixation under prosodic circumscription, not by mapping to a template. There are two reasons for this.

First, mapping to a template specifies an invariant shape for the whole affected stem, not just the infix or geminate of interest. But infixation and gemination in Akkadian are independent of the shape of the input, except for the single peripheral constituent targeted by prosodic circumscription. So -ta-infixation applies to quite diverse stems like ša-ta-balkit or ša-ta-taparis; and medial gemination applies to triliterals like pa-r-ras, to affixed forms like napa-r-ras, and to quadriliterals like nabala-k-kat. No template could account for this independence of infixation and gemination from the overall shape of the host word combined with very strict dependence on a small substring of the host word located at an edge. Only a prosodic circumscriptional analysis can explain how infixation and gemination are applied in a "structure-preserving" way to diverse inputs.18

Second, mapping to a template in a root-and-pattern morphological system requires selection of the template to map to at the very outset of the derivation, since the template actually forms the stem to which subsequent morphology is applied. But infixation and gemination in Akkadian are not just derivational as they are in Arabic; they also mark an inflectional category, tense, in stems that have already undergone derivational morphology. For example, (41) shows an abbreviated derivation of the QN present, with a derivational nV- prefix added prior to medial gemination.

(41) Base balkat
nV- Prefixation (derivational) nabalkat
-µ - Infixation (inflectional) nabalakkat
Agreement Prefixation inabalakkat
Syncope, n Assimilation ibbalakkat

Only infixation and gemination by affixation under prosodic circumscription, not by template mapping, are compatible with the requirements of compositionality in derivations like (41).

The argument, then, is that a template-mapping account like that in McCarthy (1979, 1981) (cf. (32)) makes two predictions that do not hold in Akkadian. Contrary to the template-mapping analysis, infixation and gemination are possible with inputs and outputs of varying canonical form, not just a single fixed one; and infixation and gemination can have diverse morphological functions, not just an early derivational one. Therefore the analysis of infixation and gemination based on prosodic circumscription turns out to be the only possible one, once we turn from Arabic to the richer verbal system of Akkadian.

18 After this paper was completed, I received from the author a copy of Bat-El (1992), which presents a structurally similar argument for a non-templatic treatment of the verb in Modern Hebrew based on the transfer of consonant clusters from base noun to derived verb.
6. Conclusions

The picture that has emerged here is one in which a strong constraint on template form, the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis, determines how various generalizations about Arabic and Akkadian root-and-pattern morphology must be expressed. Regularities that conform to the Hypothesis are captured with templates, as we saw throughout the Arabic noun. But regularities that do not conform to the requirements of prosody must be dealt with in other ways—in the cases discussed, by affixation under prosodic circumscription and a-templatic prosodic morphology. The core morphology of the Arabic and Akkadian verb has exactly this property.

Thus, the principal theme of this article is the central role of the Prosodic Morphology Hypothesis in actually forcing an affixational analysis of some phenomena that cannot accounted for templatically. This analysis receives extensive empirical confirmation. More broadly, these results show that not all morphological phenomena involving fixed canonical shape have templatic origins; some may derive only indirectly from templates. Moreover, the results also establish somewhat closer connections between work in Prosodic Morphology and work in process-based theories of morphology such as Anderson (1991), by securing a role for rules of word formation as well as templates in expressing generalizations about canonical form.

Finally, there is another, less obvious connection that this work suggests. The profound formal differences between nouns and verbs in Arabic—the former principally templatic, the latter principally non-templatic—accord with the morphological organization of the language. There is a systematic derivational relation among verb stems (katab ‘write’, kattab ‘cause to write’, etc.) that is the focus of the analysis developed in sections 4 and 5. But N-N derivation involves only external morphology, really simple suffixation, like salb ‘negation’ → salb+iyy ‘negative (adj.)’ → salb+iyy+at ‘negativism’. (The only systematic exception to this is the formation of the plural and diminutive (2), which is mediated by prosodic circumscription (McCarthy and Prince 1990a).) Therefore, essentially all morphological relationships in which one word is derived from another in Arabic are affixational. Mapping to a template is not used in word-based word formation; it is used only to derive words from consonantal roots. Possible functional explanations for this observation come to mind, but full realization of its consequences must be left for the future.
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