Today's objectives:

- Analyzing alternating morphemes
- Proposing URs and rules

Background preparation:

- PP: Dutch
- Handouts Morphology and phonology;
 Morpheme alternations

0. Course information

Today's plan

- Check-in: Morphology and phonology
- Alternating morphemes in Dutch
- How to decide between hypotheses about alternating morphemes
- A procedure for analyzing alternating morphemes

1. Check-in: Morphology and phonology

 Some key points to understand about working with morphologically complex words

Review the handout - "Morphology and phonology"

- What is a morpheme?
- How do we **identify** morphemes in a data set?
- What part of the grammar adds morphemes to form complex words? [graphic, HS Thompson]

1. Check-in: Morphology and phonology

A morpheme with multiple surface forms
 (determined by their environment) is known as a morpheme that ______
 Review the handout - "Morpheme alternations"

- What are some examples that we have seen?

1. Check-in: Morphology and phonology

A morpheme with multiple surface forms
 (determined by their environment) is known as a morpheme that alternates

Review the handout - "Morpheme alternations"

- Examples:
 - Turkish
 - Lamba
 - Dutch

Group discussion

Data set - Dutch

- Which morphemes in Dutch alternate?
- What hypotheses can we formulate about the phonological grammar of Dutch in order to account for these alternation patterns?

Debriefing

- Which morphemes in Dutch alternate?
- What hypotheses can we formulate about the phonological grammar of Dutch in order to account for these alternation patterns?

Review from last time (Lamba)

- *Hypothesis 1:* Lexicon contains /-e.../, and then...
- *Hypothesis 2:* Lexicon contains /-i.../, and then... How did we decide between these hypotheses?

Debriefing

- What hypotheses can we formulate about the phonological grammar of Dutch in order to account for these alternation patterns?
 - *Hypothesis 1:* Lexicon contains /.../, and then...
 - *Hypothesis 2:* Lexicon contains /.../, and then...
- For each hypothesis, consider what phonological process(es) we would need under that hypothesis
 - Compare: Is one of the options for the phonological process(es) preferable?

- Example: [rant] ~ [randən] 'edge -sg, -pl'
 - Hypothesis 1: UR is / rant /
 - Hypothesis 2: UR is / rand /

- What are the pros and cons of each hypothesis?
 - Isolation form is not same as UR (which hyp.?)
 - Phonological process is restricted to only certain morphemes (which hyp.?)
- What are some predictions of each hypothesis?

- Hypothesis 2
 (UR is / rand /; rule *devoices* word-final obstruents)
 - What does this hypothesis predict should happen when a Dutch speaker starts to learn a language that has final voiced obstruents?
 - Listen to <u>this Dutch speaker</u>
 (from Speech Accent Archive (GMU), speaker *dutch8*)
- productivity: when a process in the grammar is extended to novel words or contexts
 - Evidence that there *is* a process in the grammar!

How many URs

does an alternating morpheme have, if the alternation is **phonologically productive**?

- How many URs
 - does an alternating morpheme have, if the alternation is **phonologically productive**?
 - Example: Turkish plural has surface forms
 [-ler] and [-lar] how many URs does this
 morpheme have? | One UR
 - If the surface form is predictable and the process is productive, the pattern is produced by the grammar (not memorized)
 - Start with the (single) UR and apply phonological rules

- 1 Isolate the **morphemes** in the data set
- 2 Identify which morphemes are alternating
- 3 Determine the **phonological context** in which each surface form appears
- 4 Determine the best **analysis** (UR + rule(s) combination)
- 5 Make sure your analysis is formalized using the tools of our phonological model

Data set - <u>Dutch</u>

- 4 Determine the best **analysis** (UR + rule(s) combination)
 - What did we decide, and why?

Data set - Dutch

- 4 Determine the best **analysis** (UR + rule(s) combination)
 - What did we decide, and why?
- From last time, now updated:
 Things to consider when comparing two hypotheses
 - MOST IMPORTANT: Can a consistent generalization be stated across the data set (no "exceptions")?
 - ALSO CONSIDER: Can the environment needed for a process be stated **insightfully** in our model?

Data set - <u>Dutch</u>

- 5 Make sure your analysis is **formalized** using the tools of our phonological model
 - What does this mean?
 What "tools" should we use?
 - → We will follow this up next class (and in the preparation questions)