Class 10: Correspondence review

To do
- Fijian assignment (on last week's material) is due tomorrow (Fri)
- Next reading is Moreton 2008 (due Tuesday)
- Project: have 1st meeting with me by the end of this week

1 Trick question

- Does /tui/ → [ty] violate IDENT-IO(round)?

2 Correspondence (McCarthy & Prince 1995) = Part-numbering

- Every segment in the input bears a unique index (and perhaps every unit of structure, including features, moras, syllables…), usually written as a subscript number.

- The relation of *correspondence* between input and output segments is encoded by identical indices (subscripted numbers).

	/$t_1u_2i_3$/	IDENT(round)	IDENT(back)
a	[t_1y_2]		*
b	[t_1y_3]	*	

- Candidate *a* says that /t_1/ corresponds to [t_1], and /u_2/ corresponds to [y_2].
  - Another way to write that: Corr(/t_1/,[t_1]), Corr(/u_2/,[y_2]).
  - Yet another way: Candidate *a*'s correspondence relation = {(/t_1/,[t_1]), (/u_2/,[y_2])}
  - We can also draw it:

input *output*
/t/——————[t]
/u/——————[y]
/i/

- You'll probably never see a tableau with candidates this outrageous, but they are candidates:

	/$p_1a_2t_3o_4k_5$/	
a	[$p_1a_2t_3o_4k_5$]	
b	[$p_5a_1t_4o_2k_3$]	
c	[$p_1a_1t_1o_1k_1$]	
d	[$p_6a_7t_8o_9k_{10}$]	

(I left space in case we want to consider some constraints that this violates)

3 Good and bad correspondence relations

Faithfulness constraints (aka *correspondence constraints*) regulate these relations.
Here are the ones proposed by McCarthy & Prince. We add "**IO"** to specify that we're talking about **i**nput-**o**utput correspondence.

IDENT(F)-IO	(don't change feature values)	If an input segment and an output segment correspond, they must bear identical values for feature [F].
MAX-C-IO	(don't delete)	Every consonant in the input must have a correspondent in the output.
MAX-V-IO		Every vowel in the input must have a correspondent in the output.
DEP-C-IO	(don't insert)	Every consonant in the output must have a correspondent in the input.
DEP-V-IO		Every vowel in the output must have a correspondent in the input.
LEFT-ANCHOR(X)-IO		If there is an input segment A at the left edge of X (X = word, stem, phrase, whatever) in the input, and an output segment B is at the left edge of the same X in the output, A must correspond to B.
RIGHT-ANCHOR(X)-IO		If there is an input segment A at the right edge of X (X = word, stem, phrase, whatever) in the input, and an output segment B at the right edge of X in the output, A must correspond to B.
UNIFORMITY-IO	(don't coalesce)	Nothing in the output can have more than one correspondent in the input.
INTEGRITY-IO	(don't split)	Nothing in the input can have more than one correspondent in the output.
LINEARITY-IO	(don't metathesize)	If A precedes B in the input, and A and B both have correspondents in the output, then A's output correspondent has to precede (but not necessarily immediately precede) B's output correspondent.
O-CONTIGUITY-IO	(don't intrude)	If A immediately precedes B in the input, and A and B both have correspondents in the output, then A's output correspondent has to <u>immediately</u> precede B's output correspondent.
I-CONTIGUITY-IO	(don't skip)	If A immediately precedes B in the output, and A and B both have correspondents in the input, then A's input correspondent has to <u>immediately</u> precede B's input correspondent.

(MAX = *maximize* the preservation of material in the input
DEP = every segment in the output should *depend* on a segment in the input.)

- Given the input /$p_1a_2t_3o_4k_5$/, devise, for each of the correspondence constraints above, an output candidate that violates it.
- Can you think of a candidate that violates DEP but not I-CONTIG?
- Can you think of a candidate that violates MAX but not O-CONTIG?
- Can you think of a candidate that violates DEP and L-ANCHOR(Word) in the same place?
- Can you think of a candidate that violates MAX and R-ANCHOR(Word) in the same place?

- Does /$p_1a_2t_3o_4a_5$/ → [$p_1a_2t_3w_4a_5$] violate MAX-C-IO?

4 Where it gets tricky

- Does this violate O-CONTIG: /$p_1a_2t_3o_4k_5$/ → [$p_1a_2t_3a_4u_4k_5$]? I-CONTIG?

We usuall don't worry about it. CONTIG constraints were designed to regulate deletion and insertion inside a candidate (as opposed to at the edge), so they probably wouldn't appear in a tableau with that candidate.

- Does this violate IDENT(round): /$t_1u_2i_3$/ → [$t_1y_{2,3}$]?

Struijke 2001 & Struijke 2000, working on reduplication, proposes that faithfulness constraints should be defined existentially:

- IDENT(F)-IO: if A is an input segment with one or more output correspondents, at least one of A's output correspondents must have the same value for [F] as A does.

because this is asymmetrical, I guess we'd also need

- IDENT(F)-OF: if B is an output segment with one or more input correspondents, at least one of B's input correspondents must have the same value for [F] as B does.

5 Strings that can be subject to correspondence

- Input-Output
- Base-Reduplicant
- Output-Output (Benua 1997; Crosswhite 1998; Kenstowicz 1996; Steriade 2000; Burzio 1999 and many others)
- Variant-Variant (Kawahara 2002)

References

Benua, Laura. 1997. Transderivational Identity: Phonological Relations between Words.. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Burzio, Luigi. 1999. *Surface-to-surface morphology: When your representations turn into constraints.*. Baltimore, MD.

Crosswhite, Katherine M. 1998. Segmental vs. prosodic correspondence in Chamorro. *Phonology* 15(3). 281–316.

Kawahara, Shigeto. 2002. Similarity among Variants: Output-Variant Correspondence.

Kenstowicz, Michael. 1996. Base-identity and uniform exponence: alternatives to cyclicity.. In Jacques Durand & Bernard Laks (eds.), *Current Trends in Phonology: Models and methods*, 363–393. Paris-X and Salford: University of Salford Publications.

McCarthy, John J & Alan Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and Reduplicative Identity.. In Jill Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey, & Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18*, 249–384. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA Publications.

Steriade, Donca. 2000. Paradigm uniformity and the phonetics-phonology boundary.. In Janet Pierrehumbert & Michael Broe (eds.), *Acquisition and the Lexicon (Papers in Laboratory Phonology 5)*, 313–334. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Struijke, Caro. 2000. Why constraint conflict can disappear in reduplication.. In Masako Hirotani (ed.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society 30*, 613–626. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA Publications.

Struijke, Caro. 2001. Existential faithfulness: A study of reduplicative TETU, feature movement, and dissimilation.. University of Maryland, College Park.