Today's objectives:

- **Applying rules and features**
- **Testing predictions of our model**

Background preparation:

- *Handout – Feature charts worksheet*
- *Data set – Turkish (focus on the genitive)*

0. Today's plan

- Checking in: Features?
- Practice with features and rules: Turkish
- Some predictions of our model
  (these are discussed in the context of the features and rules examples above)

1. Checking in: Features

Building and assessing a scientific model

- What kind of **evidence** makes the strongest case in favor of including a particular feature in our phonological model?

1. Checking in: Features

- Any **questions** on the feature set aspect of our phonological model?
  - Feature charts worksheet
    (see answer key on Canvas)
  - Padlet board

- *For more on features:*
  Each of the phonology **books** on reserve for our course presents and discusses a feature model, but they all differ slightly in the details (use with caution)

1. Checking in: Features

Group discussion

- What is the difference in the **predictions** made by
  - a **binary** feature (like [±son])

    versus
  - a **monovalent** or **privative** feature (like [LAB])?

1. Checking in: Features

Debriefing

- What is the difference in the **predictions** made by
  - a **binary** feature (like [±son])
    versus
  - a **monovalent** or **privative** feature (like [LAB])?

- Some reminders
  - What kinds of phonological data are features intended to describe/predict/explain?
  - How does the grammar model "use" features?

2. Practice with features and rules

Group discussion

- Data set – Turkish
  - Assume that the **UR** of the genitive suffix is **/-in/**
  - Write **rules**, using features, that produce the **other surface forms** of the genitive suffix in the relevant **environments**
  - Make your analysis as **simple** and **insightful** as you can (use features minimally!)

2. Practice with features and rules

Debriefing

- Data set – Turkish
  - A key point in developing this analysis:
    Are you "translating" from segments to feature sets, or are you *thinking in terms of features?*

  - How does this analysis provide **evidence** that the phonological grammar makes use of **features**, rather than treating segments as "atoms"?