

Study questions on K&K Ch. 3 pp. 45-62 and Ch. 9 pp. 331-339

To be turned in Thursday, Sept. 30

Notes/tips

p. 51: K&K aren't claiming that aspiration never alternates in English (*compáre* vs. *cómparable*—think about which [p]s should be aspirated according to the rule of ch. 2), just that many morphemes don't have any aspiration alternation, because they don't find themselves in both aspirating and non-aspirating environments (e.g. *cab*). Even without aspiration alternations, K&K still want to account for English aspiration by rule because it is predictable and, they claim, part of a speaker's implicit knowledge.

pp. 338-339: Ponder the point made about conciseness vs. naturalness. Where this is leading is that the evaluation metric can't depend on conciseness alone. Or, if it does, we need to find a way to allow natural rules to be made more concise than structurally similar unnatural rules.

p. 338: The way the term "optimality" is used here has nothing to do with OT.

The rest of ch. 9 (pp. 342-377) covers similar ground as the notation review we're doing in class, so it's a good reference if you're looking for more.

Questions

1. In chapter 3, why do K&K reject an approach for Russian that lists multiple allomorphs for those morphemes that alternate?

(Also contemplate what you think of their reasons, but you don't need to write that down. We'll discuss your thoughts in class.)

3. Again in chapter 3, why do K&K reject characterizing Russian final devoicing environments in morphological terms? (Again, also consider what you think of their reasons—we'll discuss it in class.)

4. In chapter 9, the introduction of the conciseness condition in (8) rests in part on the argument that (6) does a better job than (7) of capturing Russian speakers' competence. Besides arguments from brevity and generality (the use of which would be circular), can you find evidence from ch. 3 that the subparts of (7) bear a special relation to each other, and what do you think of that evidence?

Can you imagine other types of evidence that could bear on this question?

5. On p. 57, does final devoicing really need to apply only after *l*-drop? What if it applied both before and after (in the same derivation: i.e., devoicing, then *l*-drop, then devoicing)? Illustrate the consequences with derivations for the noun /xleb/ and the verb /greb-l/. (I am asking this because we will later consider theories in which a rule can be “unordered” and will try to apply at every point in the derivation.)

6. On p. 58, what if *l*-drop both precedes and follows dental stop deletion (again, within the same derivation)? Illustrate the consequences with a derivation for /rost-l/.

Further reading if you're curious

Ernestus, Mirjam & Harald Baayen (2001). Predicting the unpredictable: interpreting neutralized segments in Dutch. *Language* 79, 5-38.

Reports on an experiment in which speakers are given new words and required to ‘undo’ a voicing neutralization (i.e., they have to decide if a final consonant is underlyingly voiced or voiceless)