

**Study questions on K&K ch. 5 (pp. 154-165), K&K ch. 10 (pp. 424-436), Kisseberth 1970<sup>1</sup>**  
To be turned in Tuesday, Oct. 8

**Notes/tips for K&K**

p. 425: There are at least two possible interpretations of “marked 0”. One is that the segment actually has the feature specification [0F], so that it would be distinct from a matrix (in a rule, say), that includes [+F] or [-F]. The other is that the segment is just missing any value for F, and so would not be distinct from a matrix that includes [+F] or [-F].

p. 425, below (34): This is saying that there are two levels of representation in the lexicon: the underspecified level, and then the level after underspecified values have been filled in by MSRs. That’s what it means to say that MSRs apply “in the lexicon”.

Something to think about: How do we decide whether a regularity should be captured by a MSR or by a regular rule?

p. 431 (top): The Klamath argument against the “ordering solution” rests on the assumption that we want to be able to read off from the grammar what are the constraints on the underlying shapes of morphemes (see middle paragraph on p. 429). If we don’t want that from a grammar, then that argument doesn’t apply. So that’s something else to think about: how can we tell/decide whether or in what cases we want a grammar to account for tendencies in morphemes’ underlying forms?

p. 432: Notice that (41) is not an epenthesis rule! (If it were, it would be a bad one, since it wouldn’t tell you which vowel to insert.)

p. 434: Even an “if-then” restriction isn’t necessarily expressible through a rule assigning redundant feature values. For example, what if the restriction were that if the first segment of the root is [+voice], then the root must have 5 segments? (That’s a silly example—are there any real examples like this?)

p. 435: “Directional” is used on this page not in the sense of left-to-right or right-to-left, but in the sense of whether one property predicts another but not vice versa (that would be a directional relationship between the two properties; if they predict each other, the relationship is non-directional).

**Notes/tips for Kisseberth**

p. 293: “trilateral cluster” = CCC

p. 300: The point of the discussion here is to determine whether the [a] is underlying but sometimes deleted, or not underlying and sometimes inserted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kisseberth, Charles (1970). On the functional unity of phonological rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 291-306.

## Questions

1. K&K ch. 5 discuss various types of corpus-external evidence. If you had access to Korean speakers, what are one or more things you could try asking or observing to get external evidence bearing on your analysis in the first problem set? Be sure to explain how that thing would be helpful, and say which of K&K's examples you're basing your idea on.
  
2. In Chamorro (see pp. 62-65 if you want to know more), adding a proclitic with the vowel /i/ to a noun makes the noun's first vowel, if stressed, become front: *láhi* 'male' *i láhi* 'the male'. The vowel also becomes [-round]: *gúmə* 'house', *i gúmə* 'the house'. Moreover, Chamorro lacks front rounded vowels.  
K&K propose two different ways to deal with this type of phenomenon. Show a derivation for 'the house' under the MSR proposal on p. 427 (but where the fronting rule is amended as described right below it in the text), and another derivation for 'the house' under the no-MSR proposal (the "ordering solution") on p. 428.
  
3. Is it necessary to have underspecification in the ordering solution? Show a derivation for Chamorro 'the house' under the ordering solution but with the UR fully specified for [round]. Do you have to make any changes to the rules to get it to work?

4. After showing how Chamorro can be analysed using the “ordering solution”, K&K go on to argue against such solutions in general. Summarize very briefly how, according to them, the ordering approach can go wrong.
  
5. What is Kisseberth’s argument for why the standard theory is wrong to say that “there is no other way in which rules can be the ‘same’ except structurally”? What do you think of his argument?
  
6. On p. 298, Kisseberth draws support for an epenthesis rule from the fact that CVCVC verbs with a C-initial suffix attached always have [i] as the second vowel. Unless some neutralization rule is operating, this would mean that either the stems all happen to be underlyingly /CVCiC/, or that the underlying form is really /CVCC+C.../ and the *i* is inserted to avoid a CCC cluster.  
 If I’m correct in interpreting this analysis to say that there are no \*/CVCVC/ roots, this means, in the K&K approach, that there has to be a morpheme-structure rule that eliminates them, perhaps  $V \rightarrow \emptyset / [_{\text{VerbRoot}}\text{CVC}\_\_\text{C}]_{\text{VerbRoot}}$ . This rule seems strange in light of the phonological rules of Yokuts. What do you think about it? (I know this is a vague and open-ended question; just a sentence or two is fine)