

<b>Reading guide: Yu (2005)</b>
---------------------------------

- General comment: This paper relates not only to our recent discussions about non-concatenative (“prosodic”?) morphology, but also to earlier topics from the course. Keep your eyes open for interesting connections to prior discussions.
  - A note about section 3.2.2, “Deriving the ‘base’ by directional surface correspondence” — This is a complex discussion that is less relevant to our main concerns in the course, so it might make sense to give this a lower priority and only discuss it if we have time. (The final two paragraphs and ranking summary are quite useful, however.)
- (1) What correspondence relation(s) is/are involved in reduplicative copying, according to Yu? How does this differ from the McCarthy & Prince 1995/1999 approach?
  - (2) As always when we are dealing with a-templatic analyses of reduplication, we need some other (non-template-based) explanation if the reduplicant has a size limit. What is Y’s explanation for why the reduplicant is never larger than a syllable?
  - (3) Y says that codas don’t normally contribute to weight in Washo.
    - (a) On what basis does he make this claim?
    - (b) What prosodic structure does he give to (unstressed) CVC syllables to account for their status as light?
    - (c) Thinking about other papers we have read in this course, is the prosodic structure that Yu gives to CVC syllables the only way to account for their behavior as light (when not stressed)?
  - (4) What is the evidence that stressed syllables are generally heavy in Washo? Why is this important for explaining the behavior of reduplicants?
  - (5) What is Y’s account of “coda attraction” and “moraic stability” in Washo reduplication? How are these two patterns related?
  - (6) Concerning the past analyses that Y considers and rejects in §4: Do any of the reasons for rejection bear on crucial issues discussed in this course?

#### Implications and extensions

- (7) Small point, but interesting: Look at how Y defines ANCHOR-R(HdFt, PrWd) (p 445). There’s something unusual about this constraint. What is it?
- (8) How does Y model faithfulness to moraic structure? Can we see any problems with respect to predicted pathological rankings (McCarthy, Campos-Astorkiza)?

- (9) How does CRISPEGE stack up against McCarthy's (2003) argument that there should be no constraints specifically targeting geminates?
- (10) Gouskova (2003: dissertation) argues that \*STRUC constraints (which penalize all phonological structure, or all structure of a certain type — as in Y's, which is properly speaking \*STRUC-segment) are pathological. Can we replace \*STRUC in Y's analysis with some other constraint that will still select the appropriate winners?
- (11) News flash: When I was looking up the reference for the preceding point, I found a paper by Gouskova says the following:

“Unfortunately, removing templatic constraints from CON does not remove templatic backcopying from the theory. The backcopying effect can be produced by DEP-OO, as well—it makes the same distinction, penalizing only the material in RED...” (Gouskova 2004: 110)

Gouskova, Maria. 2004. Minimal reduplication as a paradigm uniformity effect. *WCCFL* 23: 101-114.

[http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mg152/downloads/gouskova\\_wccfl2004.pdf](http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mg152/downloads/gouskova_wccfl2004.pdf)