## K\&K Chapter 8 study question

due Oct. 23

## Notes

p. 291: I think that by "partially ordered rules" K\&K are referring to cases in which the order of two or more rules is unknowable (because the rules don't interact), not that it is ever crucial for the rules to be unordered with respect to each other. In other words, a partial ordering like

means here that we have no way of knowing the order of 2 vs . 3 , not necessarily that they apply simultaneously or that their order varies. (Just as we've seen in OT that you can have constraints whose ranking is unknowable given the data-this is different from variable order or some kind of tied-order scheme.)

By the way, in mathspeak something like

, where the ordering is actually total, can still be called a partial ordering (all total orderings are partial orderings, but not all partial orderings are total). So "partial" really means "not necessarily total (but could be total)". If you want to specify that a partial ordering is not total, you can call it a "strict partial ordering".

## Questions

1. For each of the two alternatives to linear rule ordering that K\&K discuss (DMH and FRH), say whether it can handle each of the four types of rule interaction listed:

|  | DMH | FRH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| feeding |  |  |
| bleeding |  |  |
| counterfeeding |  |  |
| counterbleeding |  |  |

2. In pp. 318-327, $\mathrm{K} \& \mathrm{~K}$ discuss the predictions of various answers to the question of multiple application. Briefly evaluate how each of those answers does on the following data from Woleaian. ${ }^{1}$ That is, for each approach, show the predicted result for the two bolded forms; where that result is wrong, briefly say why.

| /mata/ mate | 'eye' | /mata+i/ | metai | 'my eyes' | /mata+mami/ | matemami | 'our eyes' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /parasa/ perase | 'switch' | /parasa+rasa/ ${ }^{2}$ | peraserase | 'splashintrans.' |  |  |  |
| final-V raising |  | $\mathrm{V} \rightarrow$ [-low] / __ \# |  |  |  |  |  |
| dissimilation |  | $\mathrm{V} \rightarrow$ [-low] / _ $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $0\left[\begin{array}{l} - \text { cons } \\ + \text { low } \end{array}\right]$ |  |  |  |  |

Assume that final-V raising applies first (there is no multiple-application issue). Then dissimilation applies (for some forms there is a multiple-application issue).

Derivations with no multiple-application issue (because the S.D. of dissimilation is met at most once in the form):

|  | $/ \mathrm{mata} /$ | $/ \mathrm{mata}+\mathrm{i} /$ | /parasa/ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| final-V raising | mate | -- | parase |
| dissimilation | -- | metai | perase |

simultaneous application: /mata+mami/ /parasa+rasa/
iterative application:
/mata+mami/
/parasa+rasa/
directional iterative application (left to right): /mata+mami/ /parasa+rasa/

[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data originally from Sohn, Ho-Min (1975). Woleaian Reference Grammar. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii. Case pointed out to me by Colin Wilson.
    ${ }^{2}$ There could be another analysis of this that takes advantage of the presence of reduplication.

