## Assignment \#3: beginning OT in 3 parts

Due Friday, Oct. 16

## Part I: Yawelmani Yokuts (first, some simple OT mechanics)

Going back to your Kisseberth reading...

1. Show an OT tableau for /giti:n+hnil/ $\rightarrow$ [gi.ti:n.nil] (p. 295). Include the rival candidates *[gi.ti:n.hnil], *[gi.ti:h.nil], and *[gi.ti:n.hi.nil].
2. Show an OT tableau for /Rilk+hin/ $\rightarrow$ [?i.lik.hin] (p. 296). Include the rival candidates $*$ [Ril.khin], $*$ [Ril.hin], and $*$ [2il.kin].
3. Show an OT tableau for /pu:lm/ $\rightarrow$ [pu:.lum] (p. 297). Include the rival candidates *[pu:lm] and $*[p u: 1]$.
4. Show an OT tableau for /di:yl+t/ $\rightarrow$ [di:y.lit] (p. 297). Include the rival candidates *[di:ylt], *[dii.yilt], and *[di:y]. Kisseberth uses [y] to represent a glide (IPA [j]), not a vowel. Treat glides as consonants ( C ) for purposes of evaluating constraints.
5. Assume a markedness constraint $* V$, forbidding vowels in surface representationsobviously, this is an example of a constraint that gets violated quite often! Show an OT tableau for /kili:y+a+ni/ $\rightarrow$ [ki.li:y.ni] (p. 301). Include the rival candidates *[ki.li..ya.ni] and *[kli..ya.ni].

## Notes/tips

- In general it will be up to you to determine which rival candidates to include, but in this case just stick with the ones I listed above (you may notice an obvious one that is missing). We can discuss in class or section.
- Assume that there are separate OT faithfulness constraints for stems (e.g., MAX-C $\mathrm{C}_{\text {stem }}$ vs. MAX-C).
- We are ignoring the special behavior of the zero-stems (rule 7).
- The "other rules" are also ignored in these five questions, and not all the morphemes are shown.


## Part II: Guinaang Kalinga infixes (next, formulate your own constraints)

These are the data we saw in class, from Gieser $1970^{1}$

| (1) dábi | (hypothetical) | dinábina | (hypothetical) | rule out <br> *dinbina |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (2) dopá | 'fathom' | dimpána | 'he fathomed' | *dinpána |
| (3) gobá | 'firing (pots)' | gimbána | 'she fired' |  |
| (4) Romós | 'bath' | Timmósna | 'she bathed' | *Rinmósna |
| (5) botá? | 'broken piece' | bintá?na | 'she broke' |  |
| (6) Rodáw | 'requesting' | Pindáwna | 'he requested' |  |
| (7) bosát | 'sudden break' | binsátna | 'he snapped' |  |
| (8) ponú | 'filling' | pinnúna | 'she filled' |  |
| (9) toRóp | 'satisfaction' | tin?ópna | 'he satisfied' | *tip̃?ópna (that's a nasal glottal stop) |
| (10) sogób | 'burning' | siggóbna | 'he burned' | *singóbna |
| (11) doyól | 'report' | digyólna | 'he heard' |  |
| (12) Rolót | 'tightening' | 2illótna | 'he made tight' | * Pinlótna, <br> *Riillótna (nasalized lateral) |
| (13) Rowá | 'doing, making' | 2iywána | 'he made, did' | *?inwána, *?imwána, <br> *2imŋfána (labial-velar nasal) |

## Directions

Provide an OT account of the Kalinga data that covers the following points (in any order), writing it up like a short paper.
a. Assume that the underlying forms already have the infix /in/ in them, and already have the stress marked: /d+in+opá+na/, etc.
b. Use a constraint *UnSTRESSEDO to account for the vowel deletion.
c. Your main job is to account for the different forms that the infix takes on
d. Say which markedness constraint(s) force(s) the alternations you observe.
e. Think of other ways that the markedness constraints could have been satisfied, and say which faithfulness constraint(s) would be violated in those cases.
f. Argue for constraint rankings. Every word uses the same ranking.
g. Give tableaux to illustrate all the key cases. Remember to include in each tableau (i) all your constraints, (ii) the winning candidate, (iii) the fully faithful candidate, and (iv) candidates that illustrate other ways of satisfying the markedness constraint(s)—including at least the ones listed above.

[^0]
## Part III: Ladakhi numerals (now come up with a whole analysis)

Data from Norman $2005^{2}$; based on a Tibetan problem from Halle and Clements via McCarthy

| Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gloss | transliteration in source | attempted transcription | gloss | translit. | transcr. | gloss | translit. | transcr. |
| 1 | chik | $\overline{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{j} \mathrm{k}$ | 11 | chukshik | $\overline{t j u k J i k ~}$ |  |  |  |
| 2 | nyis | jis | 12 | chuknyis | tfuknis | 20 | nyishu | nifu |
| 3 | sum | sum | 13 | chuksum | ¢fuksum | 30 | sumchu | sumtJu |
| 4 | zhi | 3 i | 14 | chupzhi | tfupzi | 40 | zhipchu | $3 \mathrm{ipt} \int \mathrm{u}$ |
| 5 | nga | ya | 15 | chonga ${ }^{3}$ | tfuya | 50 | ngapchu | yaptfu |
| 6 | tuk | tuk | 16 | churuk | Tfuruk | 60 | $\dagger$ ukchu | tuktfu |
| 7 | dun | dun | 17 | chupdun | tfupdun | 70 | dunchu | duntfu |
| 8 | gyat | giat | 18 | chopgyat $^{4}$ | tfupgiat | 80 | gyatchu | giattJu |
| 9 | gu | gu | 19 | churgu | tfurgu | 90 | gupchu | gupt $\widehat{\text { u }}$ |
| 10 | chu | tfu |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Directions

Provide an OT account of the Ladakhi data that covers the following points (in any order), writing it up like a short paper. Analyze the transcription, not the transliteration.
a. Morpheme order: How does Ladakhi form -teen $(X+10)$ and $-t y(X * 10)$ numbers?
b. Alternations. Ignore 'eleven' and 'twenty'. The presence of [ [] instead of [ $[\mathrm{t}]$ ] there seems to be an irregularity.
c. Underlying forms: Give the underlying form for each morpheme. Just as in rule-based theories, a morpheme has the same underlying form every time it's used.
d. Say which markedness constraint(s) force(s) the alternations you observe. You'll need a constraint for the $[\mathrm{t}] \sim[\mathrm{r}]$ alternation even though you have only three data points; just take a guess.
e. Think of other ways that the markedness constraints could have been satisfied, and say which faithfulness constraint(s) would be violated in those cases. You may run into cases where one of two consonants is deleted, even though deleting the other one would have worked too; don't worry about the candidate that deletes the other consonant.
f. Argue for constraint rankings. Every word uses the same ranking.
g. Give tableaux to illustrate all the key cases. Remember to include in each tableau (i) all your constraints, (ii) the winning candidate, (iii) the fully faithful candidate, and (iv) candidates that illustrate other ways of satisfying the markedness constraint(s). If your constraints refer to syllable structure, indicate syllable boundaries in all candidates.

[^1]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gieser, C.R. (1970). The morphophonemic system of Guininaang (Kalinga). Philippine Journal of Linguistics 1/2, 52-68 plus insert.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Norman, Rebecca. 2005. Getting started in Ladakhi. Leh: Melong Publications of Ladakh.
    ${ }^{3}$ I think the $o$ represents vowel harmony. Don't try to analyze it-go with the transcription.
    ${ }^{4}$ Ditto: ignore this $o$. (obviously, the transcription is somewhat sanitized)

