

<b>Discussion questions: Ito &amp; Mester (1999)</b>
--

Alternative for Assignment #2 • Due Tuesday, September 6

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you are a linguistics graduate student in your second year or higher, you must complete this alternative to Assignment #2.</li> <li>• Otherwise, if you have background in Optimality Theory phonology (LING 200, LING 523), you may choose to complete this alternative to Assignment #2.</li> </ul> |
|---|

Answer the following questions completely but concisely, based on the information in the reading (and any other relevant knowledge you might have). Please avoid using direct quotations unless absolutely necessary; you should be able to restate the points made in the reading, using your own words.

- (1) What do I&M mean by *lexical strata* (singular: *stratum*)? What are some of the strata that are traditionally distinguished in the lexicon of Japanese? Are lexical strata synchronically relevant, or are they only relevant for diachronic linguistics?
- (2) What do I&M mean when they refer to *core-periphery relations*? Give one example from the reading.
- (3) What kinds of OT constraints do I&M propose as having stratum-specific counterparts? (see also question (7) below)
- (4) What do I&M mean by *impossible nativization*? Give an example.
- (5) On p 18, I&M say:  
 "...in (27a-c) *siči* is not just non-optimal in individual competitions, but is a perpetual loser — it is always bettered by some other candidate."  
 Is this true even if the input is /*siči*/? Illustrate your answer with a constraint tableau or tableaux as needed. And what are the implications of your finding?
- (6) I&M claim that the impossible nativization facts of Japanese forms like /*siti*/ support their indexed-constraint model over an alternative, the input prespecification/underspecification model. Summarize their argument and assess its effectiveness: Are you convinced, and why or why not?
- (7) In section 4, I&M argue that a certain type of constraint can be indexed to lexical strata, and another type cannot. What are the two types? *In brief*, what is the main point of I&M's argument for making this claim?
- (8) What is the principle of Ranking Consistency? Why does it seem to be needed — what type of wrong prediction is made without it?
- (9) Sino-Japanese morphemes are never longer than two moras in Japanese (possible shapes include CV, CV:, CVV, CVCV, CVN [N=mora nasal]). Yamato morphemes can be anywhere from one to at least four moras in length (*mu.ra.sa.ki* 'purple'). Is this difference between SJ and Yamato something we would expect to see, based on I&M's core-periphery model of the lexicon? Why or why not?