

## More about mora structure

Questions to consider:

- Do all mora types show the same phonological behavior?
- If not, how can we insightfully express generalizations about which mora types can occur where?

- (1) Can just *any* sequence of allowable moras create a legitimate word shape? (The symbol ‘\*’ means that a form is *ungrammatical*: not accepted by the mental grammar of a native speaker.)

\*[ mbo ]

\*[ ntai ], \*[ ttai ]

- Do these potential “words” consist of legal moras?

*compare:*

[ tombo ] ‘dragonfly’

[ hantai ] ‘opposite’

[ ittai ] ‘(what) in the world...?’

- Which of Tsujimura’s “mora types” (a)–(c) can start a word?

- (2) Consider the following Tokyo Japanese examples. The location of the pitch accent (the last high tone before the pitch fall) is marked with an acute accent, as in [ á ]. Can we explain why not all the logically possible accent patterns shown here are legitimate word shapes in Tokyo Japanese?

(a) [ sánsee-wa ] ‘third generation’

[ sensée-wa ] ‘teacher’

[ sansee-wa ] ‘agreement’

(b) \*[ sańsee-wa ]

\*[ sanseeé-wa ]

- Which of Tsujimura’s “mora types” (a)–(c) can be the location of a pitch accent in Tokyo Japanese?

- (3) “Geisha/bargirl client names” (data from Poser 1990)

- This is a specific kind of nickname-formation process, more restricted than the general one we saw earlier. What principles determine an allowable nickname?

| <i>Name</i>    | <i>Nickname, option 1</i> | <i>Option 2</i>  |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| [ honda ]      | [ o-hoo-san ]             | [ o-hon-san ]    |
| [ kondo ]      | [ o-koo-san ]             | [ o-kon-san ]    |
| [ saitoo ]     | [ o-saa-san ]             | [ o-sai-san ]    |
| [ φudzimuura ] | [ o-φuu-san ]             | *[ o-φudzi-san ] |
| [ tanaka ]     | [ o-taa-san ]             | *[ o-tana-san ]  |

- Which of Tsujimura’s “mora types” (a)–(c) can be used here, in which positions?

- (4) The morpheme /-si/ 市 ‘city’ has a predictable effect on the pitch accent when it attaches to a place name. Again, we see a difference between (a) and (b). What explains this difference? (data adapted from Vance 2008)

|     |                  |     |     |                 |     |
|-----|------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|
| (a) | [ kʷaré-ɕi ]     | 呉市  | (b) | [ mʷororán-ɕi ] | 室蘭市 |
|     | [ akitá-ɕi ]     | 秋田市 |     | [ nikkóo-ɕi ]   | 日光市 |
|     | [ kʷamamotó-ɕi ] | 熊本市 |     | [ sendái-ɕi ]   | 仙台市 |

- (5) Given your analysis for (a)-(b) in (4), what can we say about the following examples?

- (c) [ mʷumbái-ɕi ] ‘Mumbai city’  
[ hanói-ɕi ] ‘Hanoi city’  
[ kʷurakáu-ɕi ] ‘Krakow city’ (Polish place name, but borrowed via English)  
[ bisáu-ɕi ] ‘Bissau city’
- (d) [ managuá-ɕi ] ‘Managua city’
- (e) [ ɸʷukwái-ɕi ] ~ [ ɸʷukúui-ɕi ] ‘Fukui city’ 福井市