

Manner as Government

The co-habitation of the CV skeleton and Element Theory, and the internal set-up of the latter itself is a much-discussed subject in Government Phonology. We could streamline the melodic representation by accepting Szigetvári's (2002) proposal to see a continuant consonant as a governed **C** slot. Since, in Szigetvári's model (1999), only post-consonantal and word-initial **C**s escape government, only there could occlusives stick by, allowing for words like *tofu*, but not *photo*. Such an idea should not be discarded, however, as it banishes the chief villain of the stop paradox, **?**, from the representation. It could also be argued that **?** is flop-sided in the sense that it can not cling to **V** slots (though such a representation of laryngealised vowels has been attempted). Omitting **?** fits the tendency to account for redundancies by coding melody in the skeleton. Cyran (1998) and Sóskuthy (2007) propose replacing **L** (voice) with a skeletal configuration while Carvalho has a representation of *fortis* obstruents as virtual geminates (2002). Scapegoating the structure culminates in van der Hulst's Radical CV (1994), drawn from in GP (Živanović 2004). Živanović's paper directly addresses Szigetvári's proposal and takes a path were the CV skeleton is, at least in part, discarded.

Ours is an attempt to investigate possible solutions to this *tofu* problem while maintaining a strict CV skeleton (or VC, whichever one fits better). One way could be to include a **V** slot, right-adjacent to the **C**, in the representation of continuant consonants. This has several clear drawbacks, such as that continuant and syllabic consonants then fall together, an undesirable outcome, not to mention further oddities, like the trouble to explain the occurrence of several frequent phonotactic patterns as the new **V** slots confound the lateral relations. The other way to be taken is to consider government optional, which would be no novelty: Kaye et al. (1990) define government so that it *may* apply, giving variations like *fam(ə)ly* or *fil(ə)m* (as in Harris 1994 on English syncope). It is possible to give typologies of frequent phonotactic patterns in such a model, but only with several concessions, each weakening the restrainedness and descriptive power thereof.

The question will be, then, whether it is possible to dodge **?** in CV phonology without giving up too much of the theory, a problem of wider scope itself, as many of the elements in Harris & Lindsey's (1995) inventory have already been discarded (like **R**) or are under fire (like **h**) and melody is subject to constant debate.