

Study Questions #5 Due: October 16, 2008

Notes

This article is tough (though worth it). You can read pp. 421-424 in K&K (ask me) or Chapter 5 of K1994 if you want more review of the basic concepts. Don't expect to follow everything. Notes below are keyed to example numbers so that they work for either the version in the reader or the excerpt in Goldsmith's *Phonological Theory: the essential readings*.

Beginning A word-formation process, or word-formation rule, is a morphological operation, such as (informally) “add -ed to form past tense”, or “change nothing to form a denominal verb”. See (3) and following for notation.

Examples of derivational morphological doublets (not always perfect synonyms): warmth/warmness, defender/defendant.

After (9), item 4 This is evaluation-metric reasoning again (i.e. measuring the complexity of a particular grammar). We assume that the evaluation metric is able (perhaps via learners) to shape languages, so that common behaviors either across languages or within a language's lexicon are taken to be less costly than uncommon ones. If attaching idiosyncratic semantics to a derived or inflected word has a cost (the morphological rule has to include a list of these idiosyncrasies), then this should be fairly uncommon. And, with regular inflection, for example, it is uncommon: English Xs generally means just ‘more than one X’. But, with irregular inflection, like English plural -en, the rule has to list the words it applies to anyway, and Kiparsky assumes that the added cost of listing any semantic idiosyncrasies is in that case small. So, we more commonly see idiosyncratic meanings for irregularly inflected forms (like brethren).

(10) If you've met the ‘elsewhere condition’ again, this is yet another formulation...

After (14) Endocentric compound=compound that contains its head. E.g., *milk teeth* are teeth of a kind. Exocentric (bahuvrihi) compound=compound that does not contain its head. E.g., *sabertooth* is not a kind of tooth, but a kind of tiger.

(17) The brackets being referred to here are morphological and syntactic brackets. In (14), the input to level 3 is just [grandstand]_V—there's no internal morphological structure any more because it's been erased.

After (28) ‘Cyclic’ here means roughly ‘applying after each morphological operation’. Kiparsky argues first that once you get up to the finished word, you don't keep applying phonological rules to ever-larger constituents. That is, you don't apply phonology to fox, then to brown fox, then to quick brown fox, etc. Rather, you just put together the words quick, brown, and fox, which have all been through the phonology separately. (And maybe you apply one more round of phonology at the end.) But see below for

“phrase phonology”, a level that may intervene between word and sentence phonology. (30) and below Kiparsky considers here at what point a word starts going through the phonology. The proposal considered here is that the “cyclic rules” (those that apply after each morphological operation within their level) don’t apply until the UR has reached the size of a lexical category (N, V, A). A bare root that has not yet received the morphology it needs in order to belong to a lexical category doesn’t undergo those rules.

After (31) The “classical phonemic level”: don’t worry about what that means—it’s a pre-generative notion. Read Anderson’s *Phonology in the Twentieth Century* if you’re curious.

(32) “Shorten”ing here means quality changes as well as duration reduction.

(40) The point of these hypothetical data is that the first V is underlyingly long, because it shows up that way when unstressed (shortens only when stressed). The reason it’s short when stressed is trisyllabic shortening, which, unlike in real English words, applies within a morpheme here.

(43) The point here is that even before the right suffixes, trisyllabic shortening applies only when the target vowel is followed by two unstressed syllables.

Below (47) “Cyclic ordering” means being ordered within the cyclic component of the model (in the lexicon rather than postlexically).

After (61) The “SW” tree means strong-weak—i.e., the first syllable it associates to (par) is stressed and the second (ent) is not.

After (75) Typo, perhaps: the /b/ of absent is lexically specified as [+voice]

(78) Another evaluation-metric idea. It’s hard to see how a learner could effectively use this idea because it’s not enough to look at the lexicon and rules; the learner has to go through all the derivations, too. (Unless the learner has a smarter technique for finding short derivations.)

I don’t understand the point regarding short derivations. (Maybe one of you will have some ideas?) It seems to be assumed that a derivation is done when the word achieves its surface form—otherwise, all derivations of the same morphological complexity would have the same length, regardless of where the phonological rules were ordered—even though the rest of the rules still have to be checked for applicability. It doesn’t seem obvious that “lines” of the derivation where nothing happens should count towards a derivation’s length if they occur in the middle of the derivation, but not if they occur at the end.

