

Kiparsky 2000¹

due Oct. 30

Notes

- p3: the “prosodic head” of the word is its main-stressed syllable.
- p. 3: in (2), the idea is that the stress rule stresses a final syllable if it is (C)VCC (so /katab+t/ → [ka.tábt], and the [i] is inserted later). If the final syllable is just (C)V(C) and the penult is (C)V, it stresses the antepenultimate (second-to-last) syllable: /katab+at/ → [ká.ta.bat].
- p. 3 again: You saw data like (3) in K&K ch. 10: the /aa/ (or /aja/, in K&K’s analysis) becomes [i] when __CC, but stays (or becomes) [aa] when __CV.
- p. 4: You can skip the part about Sympathy! Skip to middle of p. 5.
- p. 5: “lexical” phonology applies first, to single words, then the results are put together and subjected to “postlexical” phonology. Kiparsky’s proposal is to do this in OT: have one constraint ranking that applies to stems, then add object suffixes to the result and run it through a second, potentially different, constraint ranking that applies to whole words, then put the results together into phrases (if necessary) and send them through a third, postlexical, ranking.

Questions

1. On p. 11 in (20), you see a tableau for part of Kiparsky’s analyses of ‘he understood us’ (top) and ‘we understood’ (bottom). The part of the input in brackets represents what has already been done at the stem level (in ‘he understood us’, it’s just the verb root because there’s no overt subject suffix, and in ‘we understood’ it’s the verb root plus subject suffix *-na*). The stuff outside the brackets is the morphology being added now, at the word level (in ‘he understood us’, it’s the object suffix *-na*, and in ‘we understood’, it’s nothing because there’s no object suffix). The winning candidate in each tableau is the output of the word-level phonology, which can then be sent off to the postlexical phonology.

For what happens earlier, see schematic on bottom of p. 10: the verb root goes through the stem level constraint ranking alone, then gets the subject suffix added (if any) and goes through the stem level again, then gets the object suffix added (if any) and goes through the word level.

Complete Kiparsky’s analysis by showing both rounds of application of the earlier, stem level, for ‘he understood’, ‘he understood us’, and ‘we understood’. The output of the second round should match the second line in the derivation on the bottom of p. 10. That is, it needs to turn /fihim/ into [fíhim], /fíhim / into [fíhim] (no change) and /fíhim+na/ into [fihímna]. The stem level may have a different ranking than the word level.

¹ Kiparsky, Paul. 2000. Opacity and Cyclicity. *The Linguistic Review* 17:351-367.