Today's topics:

- **Morpheme alternations**
- **Review: Making generalizations**

Background preparation:

- *Reading: Odden (2005), Ch 4 excerpts*
- *PPs: Dutch, Turkish*

0. Today's objectives

After today's class, you should be able to:

- Identify some pitfalls to avoid in analyzing morpheme alternations
- State general phonological processes using segment classes as defined by our feature model
  - Apply these to an analysis of morpheme alternations

1. Warm-up: Analyzing morpheme alternations

Prep questions

- What does Odden propose as the UR for the morpheme that means 'door' in Finnish?
  a. /ovi/
  b. /ove/
  c. /ovia/
  d. /ovea/

1. Warm-up: Analyzing morpheme alternations

Prep questions

- Which of the following is the most **consistent with our current model** of alternating morphemes?

  To make the genitive form of the Russian words in Odden's data set,

  a. take the nominative form and add the suffix /-a/
  b. take the genitive form and remove the suffix /-a/
  c. (both)
  d. (neither)

1. Warm-up: Analyzing morpheme alternations

Prep questions

- Which of the following statements about Turkish are **consistent with our current model**?
  - 2 surface forms that mean ‘PLURAL’, [-ler] [-lar]
  - 2 morphemes that mean ‘PLURAL’, /-ler/ /-lar/
  - ‘PLURAL’ is an alternating morpheme

- Which of these two statements are **inconsistent** with **each other**?

2. Morpheme alternations and our model

- Suppose we observe an **alternating morpheme** that has two surface forms:
  -  , which occurs in the environment 
  -  , which occurs in the environment 
- In our model, this morpheme has **one consistent UR**, and the other surface form is caused by a phonological process
- We have to consider two hypotheses:
  - Hypothesis 1: the UR is /  /
  - Hypothesis 2: the UR is /  /

2. Morpheme alternations and our model

- We have to consider two hypotheses:
  - Hypothesis 1: the UR is /  /
  - Hypothesis 2: the UR is /  /

- In order to decide between the two hypotheses, we need to consider what **phonological process** the grammar would have to make happen in each case
  - Does either option make better **predictions**? (work without exceptions?)
  - Does either option get expressed more **insightfully** in the model?

2. Morpheme alternations and our model

Hypothesis 1: UR is /■/	Hypothesis 2: UR is /■/
/■/	/■/
∧	∧
(no change) [■] [■] **CHANGE**	**CHANGE** [■] [■] *(no change)*
in ○ in ○	in ○ in ○

- If Hypothesis 1 is correct:
  - The grammar changes /■/ to [■] in ○
- If Hypothesis 2 is correct:
  - The grammar changes /■/ to [■] in ○

2. Morpheme alternations and our model

- If Hypothesis 1 is correct:
  - The grammar changes /▬/ to [▰] in ◯
- If Hypothesis 2 is correct:
  - The grammar changes /▰/ to [▬] in ◯
- Now we need to check:
  - Does either option make better **predictions**? (work without exceptions?)
  - Does either option get expressed more **insightfully** in the model?

2. Morpheme alternations and our model

*Here are the steps we take as analysts; the boxed steps are where we **propose an analysis using our model***

1 Isolate the **morphemes** in the data set

2 Identify which morphemes are **alternating**

3 Determine the **best analysis** (UR + rule(s) combination)

- Consider the **phonological context** in which each surface form appears

4 Make sure your analysis is **formalized** using the tools of our phonological model

3. Practice: Alternations and generalizations

Group discussion

- Form groups based on your prep question UR hypothesis for the Turkish genitive suffix
- Propose a **feature-based analysis** for the Turkish genitive morpheme, *given your UR hypothesis*
  - Apply the tools of our model
  - Make the analysis as insightful as you can!
  - Note: This analysis has a pretty good answer and a really good answer — aim high!

3. Practice: Alternations and generalizations

- What is the most insightful analysis of the phonological processes imposed by the grammar, given each UR hypothesis?
  - Do any options make better **predictions**? (work without exceptions?)
  - Do any options get expressed more **insightfully** in the model?
- Can we make an argument for the best UR for the Turkish genitive morpheme?

3. Practice: Alternations and generalizations

Opportunities for generalizations in SC HW #1

- The **segment class** that **undergoes a process**
  - **Identify** the "yes" class with as **few features** as possible, while still **distinguishing** it from the implied "no" class
- **Features** that the grammar needs to **change**
  - Focus on the features that the grammar is actually changing or enforcing!
- Can **multiple cases** be seen as part of the same **general process**? Shared **partial** changes?