Study questions on K&K Chapter 3
To be turned in Thursday, Oct. 6 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. Why do K&K reject an approach for Russian that lists multiple allomorphs for those morphemes that alternate? (You don’t have to write this part down, but also consider what you think of their reasons—we’ll discuss it in class.)

3. Why do K&K reject characterizing Russian final devoicing environments in morphological terms? (Again, you don’t have to write this part down, but also consider what you think of their reasons—we’ll discuss it in class.)
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)