

**Class discussion: Maslen et al (2004)**

Maslen, Robert J. C., Anna L. Theakston, Elena V. M. Lieven, and Michael Tomasello. 2004. A dense corpus study of past tense and plural overregularization in English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 47: 1319-1333.

---

- (1) Do Maslen et al. support the blocking model of overregularization in L1 acquisition as discussed by Pinker (and summarized in the current reading)?
- (2) Group discussion: Each group should prepare to explain the designated tables or figures to the class, with a focus on those aspects that relate to the authors' argument. (Be prepared to look at the relevant discussion in the text, not just at the graphics themselves.)
  - (a) Table 1
  - (b) Figure 1 vs. Figure 2
  - (c) Table 2 vs Table 3
  - (d) Table 4 vs Table 5
  - (e) Figure 3 vs Figure 4—also, why are there no corresponding graphs for nouns?
- (3) *[If time]* What do Maslen et al. say about the fact that *blending* errors (such as droved for the past tense of drive) occur? Can the blocking model explain these forms?
- (4) What does this paper show us?
  - (a) Do you think that Maslen et al. have raised valid arguments against the blocking model as an account of children's acquisition of irregular inflectional morphology?
  - (b) Do you think that the authors have conclusively disproven the dual-route ("words and rules") model of inflectional morphology? (What do the authors themselves claim on this point?)