

## TAKEAWAY

- New findings* regarding the lack of previously attested **rounding harmony** in Kazan Tatar.
- Backness harmony** and **exceptionality** handled well by current OT framework.

## Introduction

- Kazan Tatar** is a Turkic language of the Kipchak branch spoken in Tatarstan in the Russian Federation
- 5.2 million speakers** worldwide, 4.28 mil w/in Russia. Largest ethnolinguistic minority there.
- This research investigates and analyzes the present phonological behaviors of **Tatar’s vowel system**

## Background

- Based on transcribed speech data from two adult female native speakers, 37 and 62 y/o
- Elicitation set was a pre-determined word list consisting of nouns
- Wordlist from Comrie 1997 and supplemented by additional words

## Kazan Tatar Phonetics

- Tatar has 25 consonant and **10 vowel phonemes**

### Vowel Inventory

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded	Unrounded	Rounded
High	i	y	ɯ	u
Mid	e	ø	ɣ	o
Low	æ	--	ɑ	--

## Vowel Harmony in Kazan Tatar

Tatar does not allow word-internal disharmony in native words.

Domain: **prosodic word** (PWd); feature sensitivity: **backness**

	[-back]	[+back]
SG	эби /ebi/ ‘ <i>grandma</i> ’	йолдыз /joldɯz/ ‘ <i>star</i> ’
PL	эбиләр /ebilær/ ‘ <i>grandma-PL</i> ’	йолдызлар /joldɯzlar/ ‘ <i>star-PL</i> ’

Compound words are **phonologically separate**

	[-back]	[+back]
SG	туган көн /tuɣankøn/ ‘ <i>birthday</i> ’	билбай /bilbaw/ ‘ <i>belt</i> ’
PL	туган көннәр /tuɣankønnær/ ‘ <i>birthday-PL</i> ’	билбаулар /bilbawlar/ ‘ <i>belt-PL</i> ’

**Loanwords** are permitted to be disharmonic, but are not always.

*/e/ and /i/ are handled as transparent to allow this*

	[-back]	[+back]
SG	кәгазь /kæɣæz/ ‘ <i>paper</i> ’	совет /savjet/ ‘ <i>soviet</i> ’
PL	кәгазьләр /kæɣæzlær/ ‘ <i>paper-PL</i> ’	советлар /savjetlar/ ‘ <i>soviet-PL</i> ’

Rounding harmony not found in my data:

	[-back]	[+back]
NOM. SG	өй /øj/ ‘ <i>home</i> ’	авыз /awɯz/ ‘ <i>mouth</i> ’
NOM. PL	өйләр /øjlær/ ‘ <i>home-PL</i> ’	авызлар /awɯzlar/ ‘ <i>mouth-PL</i> ’
2 <sup>nd</sup> .PL. GEN	өйгез /øjegez/ ‘ <i>home-2<sup>ND</sup>.PL.GEN</i> ’	авызгоз /awɯzoɣoz/ ‘ <i>mouth-2<sup>ND</sup>.PL.GEN</i> ’

## Lack of Rounding Harmony

- RH *attested* as weak/gradient in mid vowels but **not found in data** (2, not 4 allomorphs).
- Proven using **phonetic data analysis** and statistics (Conklin 2015).
- Evaluated the **second person plural genitive** forms for rounding harmony (Comrie 1997)
- RH in decay across Turkic langs. (McCollum 2016) suggesting it is a **less salient** process.

## OT Analysis

SPREAD([back], PWord)	If a token of [back] is linked to any segment in a PWord, it is linked to all segments
IDENT-IO([back])	Corresponding segments in the input and output have identical values for the feature [back]
*SKIP-σ	Penalty assigned when feature spreading skips an intervening syllable
MAX-V	all UL vowels must have a correspondent in the output
LOANWORD CORRESPONDENCE	<b>CORR-LW</b> : Every segment in the input must be in output for loanwords (Tsuchida 1995)
IDENT-Sσ <sub>1</sub> -A ([back])	Source affix feature value information for [back] from the first syllable in the stem

SPREAD as harmony-driving constraint and IDENT-IO (Walker 2012, Turkish)

joldɯz	SPREAD([back],PWord)	IDENT-IO(back)	joldɯz + lVr	SPREAD([back],PWord)	IDENT-IO(back)
☞joldɯz			☞joldɯzlar		
jøldɯz	*!	*	Joldɯzlær	*!	
joldyz	*!	*	jøldyzlær		*!
jøldyz		*!			

Rules are sensitive to PWd, so boundaries make it work for compounds too!

[tuɣan] <sub>PWd</sub> [køn] <sub>PWd</sub>	SPREAD	IDENT-IO(back)	[tuɣan] <sub>PWd</sub> [køn] <sub>PWd</sub> + nVr	SPREAD	IDENT-IO(back)
☞tuɣankøn			☞tuɣankønnær		
tuɣankon		*!	tuɣankønnar	*!	
tyɣænkøn		*!	tuɣankonnar		*!

To allow disharmony, **\*SKIP-σ** ranked below HDC in loanword strata (also Walker 2012)

[savjet] <sub>LW</sub> + lAr	MAX-V	CORR-LW	IDENT-Sσ <sub>1</sub> -A	SPREAD	IDENT-IO	*SKIP-σ
☞savjetlar				*		*
savjetlær			*!	**		**
sævjetlær		*!			*	
savjtlar	*!					
svjetlær	*!					

### Acknowledgements

I would like to express gratitude for the feedback of Kie Zuraw, Roslyn Burns, Brice Roberts, and Jesse Zymet of UCLA Linguistics and the UCLA Phonology Seminar audience. Additional thanks are given for the support and mentorship of my colleagues at ARL, who have helped me train to become a researcher and support me in my journey to becoming a career linguist. I would also like to thank Sofia Mazgarova for contributing her time and expertise on the Tatar language. I dedicate this and my future Tatar work to my Tatar host family, Lyalya and my dearest әбу, Saima. They instilled in me a great love and respect for the Tatar people and culture during my time there.