Phonological Change Problem

(Be careful if you print this out! Answer is given below after a space.)

Describe the changes in the phonological system produced by each of the following phonetic changes, first in structuralist, then in generative terms.

Proto-Italic had a set of voiceless unaspirated stops /p/, /t/, /k/; voiced stops /b/, /d/, /g/; and voiceless aspirated stops /p h /, /t h /, /k h /. It also had a fricative /s/. It had no other stops or fricatives.

- 1. Voiceless aspirated stops became voiceless fricatives (e.g. $*p^her\bar{o} > fer\bar{o}$ 'I carry', $*rut^hro > ru\theta ro$ 'red', $*t^h\bar{e}k\bar{\iota} > *\theta\bar{e}k\bar{\iota}$ 'I put, made')
- 2. In Latin $\theta > f$ next to u (e.g. * $ru\theta ro > *rufro `red'$)
- 3. In Latin all voiceless fricatives became voiced stops between voiced sounds (e.g. *rufro-> ruber 'red', *kon- $\theta\bar{o}$ > cond \bar{o} 'I put together')
- 4. In Latin $\theta > f$ (e.g. * $\theta \bar{e} k \bar{i} > f \bar{e} c \bar{i}$ 'I made')

Solution:

Structuralist:

- 1. Non-phonemic (new phonetic realization)
- 2. Partial merger (/f/ already existed by the preceding change)
- 3. Partial merger
- 4. Complete merger

Generative:

- 1. Restructuring
- 2. Restructuring or rule addition (I gave you no synchronic allomorphic alternations)
- 3. Rule addition (it seems likely that the simple & compound forms of 'put', e.g., would be enough to give speakers a basis for a synchronic rule). Note that if you added a rule in step 2, it could still exist. You would simply have to order the two rules.
- 4. Restructuring (of morphemes with $/\theta$ / either to /f/ or to /d/). Loss of the rule added in step 3. I admit that if you make the rule in 3 apply to all voiceless fricatives, then the change in step 4 gets very complicated, since it's not immediately clear what happens to the rule for the fricatives other than $/\theta$ /. If you added a rule in step 2, it surely has been lost in step 4.