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## I. Main claims

1. 'Checked tones' as monomoraic syllables

Traditionally transcribed as closed syllables with /2/ codas (Qian 1992, Wang 2011) Contemporary status of $/ 2 /$ has not been studied phonetically
Based on my fieldwork acoustic data, they are plain short vowels in monomorai (open) syllables
First-time phonetic evidence of contrastive vowel length (monomoraic vs. bimoraic)
2. 'Exceptional' light-initial sandhi patterns

The second syllable can influence tone sandhi only when the initial syllable is light (traditionally 'checked') - I refer to this as 'light-initial sandh'
Counter to previous descriptions, where only the initial syllable determines the sandhi pitch pattern ('Left dominance')(Duanmu 1999, Shi \& Jiang 2013) I propose a more refined foot-based analysis for this novel light-initial pattern

## II. Background

1. Lexical tones in Suzhou

A Northern Wu dialect with seven lexical tones




Checked tones. Monomoraic
[H] Bimoraic, $T_{\mu}$

|  |  | Monomoraic, $\mathrm{T}_{\mu}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [HLH] | [LHL] | [H] | [LH] |

2. Left dominance: the traditional tone-sandhi analysis

Assumed for many Wu dialects (Chan \& Ren 1989 for Wuxi, Duanmu 1999 for Shanghai, Chan 1995 for Danyang, Shi \& Jiang 2013 for Suzhou) Initial syllable determines the surface pitch; everything else is irrelevan
Captured by left-aligned, non-iterative syllabic trochees
A strong syllable ( $\sigma^{+}$) retains its tonal material; a weak footed syllable ( $\sigma^{-}$) can receive tone through re-association, but cannot retain its own tone; third \& fourth syllables are unfooted and are subject to phonetic implementation. (Shi \& Jiang 2013)

LH/ + T + T + T


## 3. Complications in Suzhou

Tone redistribution does not always happen: $\mathrm{LLH} /+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}=$ [L.H.L.L], but
/HL/ + T + T + T = [HL.L.L.L]
Complex contours (HLH, LHL) as initial syllables do not preserve everything HLH/ $+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}=$ [H.H.L.L]
$\mathrm{H} L+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{T}=[\mathrm{H} . \mathrm{H} . \mathrm{L} .\llcorner ]$
III. Findings of the current study
$\star$ All phonetic data come from my fieldwork, mainly consisting of disyllabic nouns elicited in a carrier sentence

1. No phonetic evidence for /P/

No coda stop closure for the 'checked tones' (a and b)
Intervocalic consonant durations are the same for 'checked'/ 'unchecked' tones (a vs. c)
'Unchecked' vowels ( $\approx 250 \mathrm{~ms}$ in running speech) are more than twice as long as 'checked' ones ( $\approx 100 \mathrm{~ms}$ )






$\star$ Conclusion: 'checked tones' are light monomoraic open syllables (e.g. [kə.sعi])
2. Second syllable plays a role in light-initial sandhi forms
$\star$ What we would expect if the traditional analysis were true: $/ \mathbf{H}_{\mu}+\mathbf{T}=\left[H_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{L}_{\mu \mu}\right]$ always; $/ \mathbf{L H} / \mu+\mathrm{T}=\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu} \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]$ always - Pattern A: $\left[\mathrm{H}_{\mu} . \mathrm{L}_{\mu \mu}\right]$


| Rows: initial toneColumns: second tone | $/ T / \mu+/ T / \mu$ |  |  |  |  | $/ T / \mu+/ T / \mu$ |  | Traditional Account | A: $\left[\mathrm{H}_{\mu} . \mathrm{L}, \mu_{\mu}\right]$ <br> B: $\left[H_{\mu} . H_{\mu} L_{\mu}\right]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \mathrm{H}_{\mu \mu}$ | $/ \mathrm{LH} /{ }_{\mu \mu}$ | $1 \mathrm{HL} /$ य | $/ \mathrm{HLH} / \mu$ | /LHL/ $/{ }^{\text {u }}$ | $/ H_{\mu}$ | /LH/ $/$ |  |  |
| / $\mathrm{H} /{ }^{\text {/ }}$ | A | A | B | B | A | c | c | A | D: $\left[L_{\mu} \cdot H_{\mu} L_{\mu}\right]$ |
| /LH/ | D | D | D | D | D | E | E | D | $\mathrm{E}:\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu}\right]$ |

© Conclusion: When the initial syllable is monomoraic/light, the second syllable influences the sandhi form

## IV. Analysis for the light-initial sandhi

## 1. Tones

(T): underlyingly floating; [I]: short duration

Evidence for representations come from heavy-initial sandhi (not discussed here)

| Bimoraic, $\mathrm{T}_{\mu}$ |  |  |  |  | Monomoraic, $\mathrm{T}_{\mu}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /(HH)/ $/$ | /(LH)/н | / $/ \mathrm{HL} /$ / | $1 \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{L}) \mathrm{H} / \mu^{\prime}$ | /(LHL)/ヶн | / $\mathrm{H} /{ }^{\text {/ }}$ | /(L)H/山 |
| [H] | [LH] | [HL] | [HLH] | [LHLL] | [H] | [내] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mu \mu \\ & \mathrm{H} \mathrm{H} \end{aligned}$ | $\mu \mu$ | ${\underset{H}{\mu}}_{\mu}^{\mu}$ |  | $\mu \mu$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[ } \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\mu}{L}_{\mathrm{H}}$ |

## 2. Crucial observations

A unified syllabic trochee ( $\sigma+\sigma$ ) does not account for light-initial sandhi $/(\mathrm{LH}))_{\mu \mu}+\mathrm{T}_{\mu \mu}=\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu \mu}\right]$
(L) $\mathrm{H} / \mu+\mathrm{T}_{\mu \mu}=\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu} \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]$ (but not $\left.{ }^{*}\left[L_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu \mu}\right]\right)$

Second $\sigma$, as the non-initial "dependent", demonstrates contradicting behaviors Initial $\sigma$ is heavy: second $\sigma$ cannot influence sandhi but hosts a bimoraic $[H]$ Initial $\sigma$ is light: second $\sigma$ can influence sandhi but cannot host a bimoraic [H]
If we list all possible light-initial sandhi pitch patterns

- [ $\left.H_{\mu} . \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]$
$\left[H_{\mu} . \mathrm{H}_{\mu} \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]$
- $\left[\mathrm{H}_{\mu} . \mathrm{H}_{\mu}\right]$
[ [L. $\left.\mathrm{H}_{\mu} \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]$
- $\left[L_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu}\right]$

The third mora in a light-initial sandhi never carries [H]. This looks a lot like unfooted third\&fourth syllables in a syllabic trochee. What kind of footing has a third unfooted mora?
$\star$ Conclusion: light-initial sandhi has a different foot structure: left-aligned moraic trochees. (Kager 1993)

## 3. Alternating foot structures

Moraic trochees in light-heavy disyllables violates syllable integrity, but ensures that the head (monomoraic) is not lighter in quantity than the dependent (Head Dependent Asymmetries) (Kager \& Martínez-Paricio 2018, Dresher \& van der Hulst 1998)


Moraic rochee for a light-heavy disyliable Syllabic trochee for a light-light disyllable
(no difference if it's moraic) (no difference if it's moraic)

Footing in Suzhou serves two purposes
(a). It constrains syllable quantity relationship between head and dependent Heavy-heavy: syllabic Heavy-light: syllabic Light-light: syllabic Light-heavy:moraic
(b). It licenses tone-TBU association
$\left(\sigma^{+} . \sigma\right) . \varnothing$ in a syllabic foot; $\left(\mu^{+}, \mu\right) \varnothing$ in a moraic foot $(\varnothing=$ toneless $)$ Third syllable toneless vs. third mora toneless; perfect parallel
4. Demonstration of tone sandhi

$$
/(\mathrm{LH})_{\mu \mu}+\mathrm{T}_{\mu \mu}=\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu \mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu \mu}\right] \quad /(\mathrm{L}) \mathrm{H}_{/ \mu}+\mathrm{T}_{\mu \mu}=\left[\mathrm{L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu} \mathrm{L}_{\mu}\right]\left(\text { but not } *\left[\mathrm{~L}_{\mu} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{\mu \mu}\right]\right)
$$

