Five study questions on K&K Chapter 3
To be turned in Tuesday, Oct. 5 in class

Notes/tips

p. 51: K&K aren’t claiming that aspiration never alternates in English (compáre vs. cómparable)—think about which [p]s should be aspirated according to the rule of ch. 2), just that many morphemes don’t have any aspiration alternation, because they don’t find themselves in both aspirating and non-aspirating environments (e.g. cab). Even without aspiration alternations, K&K still want to account for English aspiration by rule because it is predictable.

Questions
1. Outline

2. Why do K&K reject an approach for Russian that lists multiple allomorphs for those morphemes that alternate?

3. Why do K&K reject characterizing Russian final devoicing environments in morphological terms?
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/.

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/.

Further reading if you’re curious

Reports on an experiment in which speakers are given new words and required to ‘undo’ a voicing neutralization (i.e., they have to decide if a final consonant is underlyingly voiced or voiceless)