Morphology and/or synphonology in Chácobo (Pano)
Adam James Ross Tallman

Linguists conceptualize, describe and theorize linguistic structure as divided into levelled subsystems. The organization of meaningful forms into larger structures can be divided into **morphology** and **syntax**. Sound patterns can be divided into **phonology** and **phonetics**. Phonological and phonetic processes can be divided into **morphonological** (lexical) and **synphonological** (postlexical) according to whether they tend to interact with morphology or syntax respectively. It is well recognized that the subsystems are diachronically related. Syntactic structures become morphological ones over time (Givon 1971). Phonetic patterns phonologize (Yu 2013). Postlexical processes become lexical ones (Bybee 2001). It is therefore natural that we should also find that there is some continuity between the domains. Linguists often describe boundary cases, which do not fit neatly into any subsystem. The recurrent ubiquity of such boundary cases rarely cause linguists to question the validity of the presupposed subsystems. However, identifying boundary cases that deviate from some 'norm' begs the question as to whether the subsystems (the norms) can be statistically ratified. A new research program proposes to investigate the division of grammar into subsystems as an empirical hypothesis and/or as an aspect of linguistic structure that is subject to cross-linguistic variation (Tallman & Epps 2020; Tallman & Auderset 2022; Tallman 2020).

This talk discusses the distinction between morphological (lexical) and synphonological (postlexical) processes in Chácobo (Pano). I describe six phonological processes in Chácobo (Pano); (i) sibilant cluster reduction; (ii) glottal stop insertion/deletion; (iii) latent coda realization; (iv) apocope; (vi) vowel lengthening; (vii) high tone insertion; (viii) tone reduction, with a heavy focus on the last property. I discuss these processes in relation to the properties that are meant to distinguish between lexical and postlexical phonology; (i) access to morphological information; (ii) exceptionality; (iii) structure preservation; (iv) cyclicity; (v) obligatoriness; (vi) categoriality; (vii) relation to the prosodic hierarchy (Kiparsky 1982; Scheer 2010; Zsiga 2022, *inter alia*). I show that most of the phonological processes of Chácobo span the boundary between lexical and postlexical processes. I highlight certain methodological flaws in the literature where such a distinction is presupposed, particularly a consistent failure to disclose what the morphosyntactic evidence is that a specific process occurs in the morphology rather than in relation to syntax and vice versa. Rather than rejecting the division outright, a more interesting typological program will seek to investigate the distribution of the lexical and postlexical properties of phonological processes cross-linguistically.

Bybee, J. 2001. *Phonology and Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, T. 1971. Historical Syntax & Synchronic Morphology: An Archeologist's field Trip. Papers from the 7th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society Publisher: The Chicago Linguistic Society

Kiparsky, P. 1982. Lexical morphology and phonology. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm.* T. L. S. of Korea (eds.). Seoul: Hanshin,3–91.

Scheer, T. 2010. *A Guide to Morphosyntax-phonology interface theories.* Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter

Tallman, A.J.R. and Sandra A. 2022. Measuring and assessing indeterminacy and variation in the morphology-syntax distinction. Linguistic Typology. https://doi.org/10.1515/

Tallman, A., J.R. & Epps, P. 2020. Morphological complexity, autonomy and areality in Amazonia. In *The complexities of morphology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 230-264.

Tallman, A.J.R. 2021. Constituency and coincidence in Chácobo (Pano). *Studies in Language* 45:2 321-383.

Yu, A (ed.). 2013. *Origins of sound change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zsiga, E. C. 2021. *The Phonology/Phonetics Interface*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.