

Study questions on McCarthy & Prince 1995

de Tuesday, Feb. 7

Notes

p. 330 Stray erasure: if a segment can't be incorporated into a syllable, delete it.

p. 331 It might seem strange to call the things in (20) underlying representations: isn't a given morpheme supposed to have always the same underlying representation? Think of them as intermediate representations: after morphology has applied but before various phonological rules.

p. 342 Don't worry too much about the mechanics of prosodic circumscription, since that approach was largely superseded by using markedness constraints (see end of paper).

p. 346 Calling *jaziir* 'iambic' doesn't mean it actually has an iambic foot, (*jazíir*). Rather, it simply has an unstressed-stressed pattern resulting from footing the final syllable alone, *ja(zíir)*.

p. 348 It would be nice to have a two-syllable V-initial word from Timugon Murut or a 3-syllable C-initial word—with the data Prentice gives, the generalization could just be "copy the initial CV of the penult".

p. 359 *g-um-radwet* is actually possible. You can see for yourself by searching the web for "gumraduate" and "grumaduate". (Zuraw 2007)

Question

1. One way to translate a basic templatic analysis of reduplication into OT is with these constraints:

- MAX-InputBase: every segment in the input must have a correspondent in the base (*base*=the part of a reduplicated word that is not the reduplicant)
- MAX-BaseReduplicant: every segment in the output base must have a correspondent in the output reduplicant
- RED= σ : The reduplicant should be exactly one syllable long

For the input /RED+sulat/, think of some reasonable output candidates. Make sure that for each constraint, you have at least one candidate that fully satisfies it. In fact, for any two constraints, you should be able to devise a candidate that fully satisfies both of them.

Now determine what the *factorial typology* of these constraints is: there are 6 possible rankings of these constraints, yielding up to 6 different outcomes that ought to be typologically possible. Briefly discuss the results. (This could be a good opportunity to try out the "factorial typology" button in OTSoft.)

McCarthy, John J & Alan Prince. 1995. Prosodic morphology.. In John A Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 318–366. Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Zuraw, Kie. 2007. The role of phonetic knowledge in phonological patterning: Corpus and survey evidence from Tagalog. *Language* 83. 277-316.

