Study questions for Sanders 2001


Notes and tips

- Note that there are two strategies for satisfying a constraint like CUE-voi: provide better cues to voicing (e.g., lengthen the preceding V, or insert a following sonorant [no such candidates are shown]), or delete or devoice the segment so that there’s no voicing to be cued.
- In (23), the different between weak and strong Lexicon Optimization becomes crucial, as Sanders says. Weak Lexicon Optimization essentially wants each morpheme to have a single underlying representation—this is the traditional approach in phonology. So, if there’s an alternation like [rɔt], [rɔd-i], either the unsuffixed form or the suffixed form (or both) will have to be unfaithful. Strong Lexicon Optimization, as Sanders employs it, says that a child exposed to surface [rɔt], [rɔd-i] learns underlying /rɔt/ and /rɔd-i/ or /rɔdsuffixed/.
- In 3.4, the remark about “not passed on genetically” is pointing out that there’s nothing keeping the constraint ranking similar from one generation to the next. Sanders’s approach is that within a generation, people will change their constraint ranking in some minimal way. The children exposed to the output of the new ranking have to figure out a grammar all over again (they can’t see into their parents’ heads). (Things must get more complicated, though, if the old and new variants exist side by side and the children have to learn a variable grammar...)

Question

1. Similar to the Turkish voicing alternations we saw, there are three types of word here: those with non-alternating [u], those with non-alternating [ɔ], and those with an alternation [u]–[ɔ]. Sanders doesn’t spell out exactly what the underlying representations of these three types would be, but he implies that the words that alternate have additional information stored in the lexicon.

Make a proposal—either close to what Sanders implies or not—about the lexical entries and grammar needed to derive [klup, klub-ɨ ; grup, grɔb-i ; gło[p, glɔb-i]. Draw tableaux for the six words.