

Anderson 1984, ch. 9¹ study questions

Due Oct. 23

Notes

- (reminder from notation review)
p. 125: “ $X(Y)_0Z$ has to be applied disjunctively, with only the longest expansion applicable being applied”: this means the schema expands into rules that look for XZ , XYZ , $XYYZ$, $XYYYYZ$, etc., but only the longest of the applicable rules (the one that demands the most Y s) gets to apply.
“disjunctive” = involving an exclusive choice among options—i.e., at most one of the infinite number of rules defined by the schema can apply.
- p. 125: “mora”—a unit of abstract *weight* (which roughly correlates, in the physical world, with duration, though not exactly). Moras were proposed mainly because they are useful in describing the typologies of stress and compensatory lengthening.
- p. 126: “two different forms of the infinite schema notation”: i.e., $(X)_0$ and $(X)^*$.
- p. 132: “exchange rule” e.g. $\left[\begin{array}{c} V \\ \alpha\text{round} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow [-\alpha\text{round}] / _ C\#$. It’s not clear, though, that such rules really exist, so the limitation Anderson proposes may not be necessary.

Questions

1. In OT, which case is predicted straightforwardly: iterative application or non-iterative application (like Nitinat, described on p. 132)?
2. Show what each of the following rules would do to the string /badlupikronebuta/, under the assumptions of pp. 124-125 (don’t apply the rules one after another; treat each one as a separate derivation):

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \#C_0 _$

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \#C_0VC_0VC_0 _$

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \#C_0(VC_0VC_0) _$

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \#C_0(VC_0VC_0)_0 _$

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \#C_0(VC_0VC_0)^* _$

and show what this rule would do, if it can apply to its own output (show each iteration, in order):

$[+\text{syll}] \rightarrow [+\text{stress}] / \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \# \\ \left[\begin{array}{c} V \\ +\text{stress} \end{array} \right] C_0V_0 \end{array} \right\} C_0 _$

3. What does Anderson propose to replace the X^* notation? What are some of his arguments for doing so (just the form of the argument, not the supporting examples)?

¹ Anderson, Steven (1984). *The Organization of Phonology*. New York: Academic Press. Ch. 9: pp. 124-133.