

Study questions on Anderson 1984 ch. 9¹ and Kaplan 2008 (pp. 1-4, 8-16)²

Notes on Anderson

p. 125 [reminders from notation review] “ $X(Y)_0Z$ has to be applied disjunctively, with only the longest expansion applicable being applied”: this means the schema expands into rules that look for XZ , XYZ , $XYYZ$, $XYYYYZ$, etc., but only the longest of the applicable rules (the one that demands the most Y s) gets to apply.

“disjunctive” = involving an exclusive choice among options—i.e., at most one of the infinite number of rules defined by the schema can apply.

p. 125 “mora”—a unit of abstract *weight* (which roughly correlates, in the physical world, with duration, though not exactly). Moras were proposed mainly because they are useful in describing the typologies of stress and compensatory lengthening.

p. 126 “two different forms of the infinite schema notation”: i.e., $(X)_0$ and $(X)^*$.

p. 132 “exchange rule” e.g. $\left[\begin{array}{c} V \\ \alpha\text{round} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow [-\alpha\text{round}] / _ C\#$. It’s not clear, though, whether such rules exist, so the limitation Anderson proposes may not be necessary.

p. 132 A consonant cluster created by juxtaposing consonants from two different morphemes, as in *stem+...C+C...* is not considered “underlying” here (or “original”, in Swadesh & Swadesh’s words).

p. 133 In (15), I think the stuff after the underscore was supposed to be in {}, not in [].

Questions

1. Show what each of the following rules would do to the string /badlupikronebuta/, under the assumptions of Anderson pp. 124-125 (don’t apply the rules one after another; treat each one as a separate derivation):

[+syll] \rightarrow [+stress] / #C₀ ___

[+syll] \rightarrow [+stress] / #C₀VC₀VC₀ ___

[+syll] \rightarrow [+stress] / #C₀(VC₀VC₀) ___

[+syll] \rightarrow [+stress] / #C₀(VC₀VC₀)₀ ___

[+syll] \rightarrow [+stress] / #C₀(VC₀VC₀)* ___

¹ Anderson, Steven (1984). *The Organization of Phonology*. New York: Academic Press. Ch. 9: pp. 124-133

² Kaplan, Aaron (2008). *Noniterativity is an Emergent Property of Grammar*. UC Santa Cruz dissertation.

and show what this rule would do, if it can apply to its own output (show each iteration, in order):

$$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{V} \\ +\text{stress} \\ \# \end{array} \right] \text{C}_0\text{V} \right\} \text{C}_0 ___$$

2. On p. 132, Anderson describes what sounds like a case of non-iterativity in Nitinat. Looking at the data in Swadesh & Swadesh, it's unclear to me how much we really need non-iterativity here (is the only "consonant cluster" that can end a stem-suffix $\widehat{t\#}$? possible term-paper topic!). But suppose we do. A simplified version of rule (15),

$$\text{V} \rightarrow \emptyset / __ \text{C}_1\# \quad \textit{non-iterative}$$

should apply thus to these hypothetical forms:

$$/\text{sameks}/ \rightarrow [\text{samks}] \quad / \text{somakis}/ \rightarrow [\text{somaks}] \text{ not } *[\text{somks}]$$

Having read Kaplan, briefly explain why this would be problematic for OT (sentence fragments are OK!). Include a failed tableau for /somakis/. (You'll have to invent some crazy-seeming markedness constraint to drive the deletion in the first place.)