

## Midterm exam: Discussion assignment

Alternative for midterm exam

- If you have background in phonology beyond LING 101 (such as from LING 200 or LING 523), you may choose to complete this alternative to the in-class midterm exam.
- **If you are not a graduate student in linguistics**, please confer with me before choosing this option.

Please read the following two papers and answer the discussion questions. Answer the questions *completely but concisely*, based on the information in the readings (and any other relevant knowledge you might have). Avoid using direct quotations unless absolutely necessary; you should be able to restate the points made in the readings, using your own words.

Labrune, Laurence [she/her]. 2012. Questioning the universality of the syllable: Evidence from Japanese. *Phonology* 29 (1): 113–152. [[JSTOR link through UNC Libraries](#)]

Kawahara, Shigeto [he/him]. 2016. Japanese has syllables: A reply to Labrune. *Phonology* 33 (1): 169–194. [[JSTOR link through UNC Libraries](#)]

- (1) Labrune (2012) makes a number of arguments that the syllable plays no role in the phonology of Japanese.
  - Choose the argument that you find to be the strongest and summarize it, presenting and explaining (some of) Labrune’s data if needed to support the argument.
  - Explain why you find this argument to be comparatively strong.
  - Do you find the argument to be convincing? Why or why not? You may wish to draw on points covered in our course in answering this question.
- (2) Kawahara (2016) argues that it is indeed necessary to include syllables in the phonological grammar of Japanese.
  - Choose the argument that you find to be the strongest and summarize it, presenting and explaining (some of) Labrune’s data if needed to support the argument.
  - Explain why you find this argument to be comparatively strong.
  - Do you find the argument to be convincing? Why or why not? Again, you may wish to draw on points covered in our course in answering this question.
- (3) In your opinion, is Kawahara’s paper an effective response to Labrune’s? Briefly discuss why or why not. You might wish to consider either the content of Kawahara’s arguments or the way he structures his discussion, or both.