



The empirical concerns surrounding the tools above are amplified by the fact that these analyses also require (iv) *morpheme-specific triggering* and (v) *floating features* or some equivalent alternative when the modern trigger is silent, e.g. (3). In fact, (iv-v) in some form are necessary and sufficient to account for the core pattern, and we do not need historical phonology, such as the epenthesis rule in (4), to be part of the modern linguistic competence.

**Morpheme-Specific Phonology Analysis:** Following (Gibson and Ringen 2000), we assume that a COINCIDECOLOR constraint is violated if [-back,+round] features on a suffix fail to spread to a root. Details of the spread analysis are unimportant here as long as they capture a bifeatureal ‘sour grape’ spread scenario (Padgett 1995). A COINC-COL-L constraint is co-indexed with trigger morphemes, e.g. /-ym.DAT.PL/, but not /-ys.NICKNAME/. A unidirectional faithfulness constraint (see Pater 1999), ID-I→O[ROUND], is violated by unrounding which therefore is not available to satisfy the harmony constraint. IDENT-IO is violated for each input-output feature mismatch. Our analysis of triggering and non-triggering is exemplified by (7) and (8) respectively.

- (7) Basic umlaut effect, *dögum* ‘days-DAT.PL.’ (indexed dative plural morpheme)

/tay-ym-DAT.PL/	ID-I→O[ROUND]	COINCCOL-L	ID-IO	COINCCOL
a. ta:ym̥		*!		*
b.  tœ:ym̥			**	
c. ta:ym̥	*!		*	

- (8) Non-triggering with /-ys/, *Hrafnus* ‘Hrafn.NICKNAME’

/rapn-ys.NICKNAME/	ID-I→O[ROUND]	COINCCOL-L	ID-IO	COINCCOL
a.  rapnys				*
b. rœpnys			*!*	

**Conclusion and Further Issues:** A purely phonological generalization in the spirit of (1) does not hold up empirically. Triggering must be licensed by specific morphemes. The indexed constraints approach captures the intuition that the effect is phonological, while positioning the umlaut within a literature on the nature of exceptional morpheme-associated triggering. In the talk, we also discuss cases of so-called ‘iterative’ application of the umlaut, a case of harmony which can variably target a syllable or a larger constituent. These facts can be neatly captured in our analysis under standard optimality-theoretic variation frameworks.

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1969a. An outline of the phonology of Modern Icelandic vowels. *Foundations of Language* 5:53–72.
- Anderson, Stephen Robert. 1969b. West Scandinavian vowel systems and the ordering of phonological rules. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Gibson, Courtenay St John, and Catherine O Ringen. 2000. Icelandic umlaut in Optimality Theory. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 23:49–64.
- Jurcic, Peter. 2011. Feature spreading 2.0: a unified theory of assimilation.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some consequences of lexical phonology. *Phonology yearbook* 2:85–138.
- Markússon, Jón Símon. 2012. Eðli uhljóðvarpsvíxla í íslenskri málsögu. Master’s thesis, University of Iceland.
- Padgett, Jaye. 1995. Partial class behavior and nasal place assimilation. In *Proceedings of the Arizona Phonology Conference: Workshop on Features in Optimality Theory*.
- Pater, Joe. 1999. 8 Austronesian nasal substitution and other NÎ effects. *The prosody-morphology interface* 79:310.
- Pater, Joe. 2009. Morpheme-specific phonology: Constraint indexation and inconsistency resolution. *Phonological argumentation: Essays on evidence and motivation* 123–154.
- Rögnvaldsson, E. 1981. U-hljóðvarp og önnur a-ö víxl í nútímaíslensku. *Íslenskt mál* 2:25–51.
- Valfells, Sigríður. 1967. „Umlaut“-Alternations in Modern Icelandic. Ph. D dissertation, Harvard University.
- Árnason, Kristján. 2005. *Hljóð. Handbók um hljóðfræði og hljóðkerfisfræði*. Reykjavík: Almenna bókafélagið.
- Porgeirsson, Haukur. 2012. Getum við lært eitthvað af Aröbonum? Enn um a/ö-víxl í íslensku. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* 34:127–138.