Kiparsky 1973a study guide and questions
To be turned in Thursday, Oct. 9 in class
Read only pp. 57-75; the rest will be optional after you read the Kisseberth

Notes
This is a difficult paper, in part because Kiparsky (henceforth “K”) discusses a lot of phenomena without giving many examples (because these cases were well known in the literature at the time). Just do your best to grasp the main point of each rule, from its name or the few examples given.

p. 57 “Markovian” rule application means each rule has access only to the result of applying the previous rule (like a Markov chain, if you’ve seen those before, but without the probabilities; so really more like a finite-state transducer).

“Global” rules are rules that have the ability to see more than just the form to which they are trying to apply. In the broadest sense, a global rule can look all the way back to the beginning of the derivation to see things like what the underlying form was and what other rules have applied—that information can then determine whether the rule will apply. A global rule in the broadest sense can also look forward to see how all the rest of the derivation will go if it does or doesn’t apply and use that information to “decide” whether to apply. For example, global Rule B could contain a condition that it applies only to forms that have previously undergone Rule A; or perhaps Rule B contains the condition that it applies only if doing so does not prevent Rule C from applying later. More narrowly, a rule is sometimes termed “global” if it has the ability to look back or forward at all (even if only one step)—this is the sense in which Kiparsky uses the term.

p. 59, second line of second paragraph: “these” refers to “the ‘looking-back’ cases”

p. 61 As in K&K, a dot under a symbol means ‘retroflex’.

p. 61 Typo in the examples: in ‘he will say’ and ‘he wants to lead’, the [s]s should be retroflex.

p. 62 The sandhi rules are not given, and I don’t know their details. The important point, though, is that they treat the two types of surface /ʃ/ differently.

p. 62 Reduplication is a type of morphology that involves copying all or part of the stem. In Sanskrit reduplication gets complicated by V~Ø alternations. In ‘crawls around’, the sr̥ in the middle corresponds to the sar at the beginning. Make sure you are clear why underlying /ʃ/ in /juʃ/ remains [ʃ] when –ran is suffixed.

p. 64 Another typo. Third full paragraph should say “But in that case, they could be represented by /ʃ/ directly in the lexicon.”

---

A neutralization process is one that makes underlying /X/ indistinguishable from underlying /Y/ (though the difference may have left its trace on other segments), for some distinct X, Y. (Think about some of the rules in Yawelmani Yokuts from K&K ch. 4 and whether they obey the Alternation Condition as stated in 2-3 or 2-4.)

**absolute neutralization**: /X/ and /Y/ are made indistinguishable in all contexts (as in Yokuts lowering)

**contextual neutralization**: /X/ and /Y/ are made indistinguishable in just some contexts (as in Russian final devoicing)

p. 68 [k’] means fronted/palatalized [k]

p. 70 Grassman’s Law: an aspirated sound loses its aspirated when followed by another aspirated sound in the same word. K uses bh, dh for “voiced aspirated” (really breathy voiced) sounds.

p. 70 Trisyllabic laxing (a.k.a. trisyllabic shortening) is the rule that governs English alternations like n[æ]tion–n[æ]tional. A word like [ou]beron appears to be an exception because according to the rule it should be [a]beron.

p 73 The neogrammarian position on sound change was that historical sound changes were absolutely regular, affecting all instances equally (regardless of morphology).

### Questions

1. Outline (staple an extra sheet)

2. On p. 63, Kiparsky says that the SPE theory can’t handle the Sanskrit or Finnish cases—why can’t we just put a ‘+’ in the rule?

3. On p. 68, what is the term for the kind of rule ordering that can cause a rule to be non-automatic under clause (a)?