

Study Questions #3 Due: Oct. 2, 2008

1 K&K 1979, Chap 3 (p. 45-71)

1. Why do K&K reject an approach for Russian that lists multiple allomorphs for those morphemes that alternate?
2. Why do K&K reject characterizing Russian final devoicing environments in morphological terms?
3. 4. 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/.
4. 5. On p. 58, what if l-drop both precedes and follows dental stop deletion (again, in the same derivation)? Illustrate the consequences with a derivation for /rost-l/.
5. What are some of the arguments K&K provide for positing abstract underlying forms to account for the Tonkawa data? Do you find this analysis convincing? Why or why not?

2 Kenstowicz 1994, Chap 4, 4.1-4.2 (p. 136-145) and 4.4 (p. 168-191)

1. Kenstowicz 1994, p. 192, 4.1 A-D
2. Kenstowicz 1994, p. 194, 4.8 A-C