

Syllabus: Advanced Phonology IV (LIN1224H1S)

Instructor: Alexei Kochetov
Office: Sidney Smith 4071
Office Hour: Monday 3-4 pm (or by appointment)
Email: al.kochetov@utoronto.ca (see Email Policy)
Class session: Monday 1-3 pm, **RW 141**

Topic

Accounting for long-distance assimilation – harmony - has been one of the most contentious issues in phonological theory.

- How do segments interact across other segments?
- Are the intervening segments ‘skipped over’ or are they somehow affected?
- Which features participate in long-distance interactions and which don’t?
- What governs the directionality of harmony processes?
- What is the role of phonological contrast in harmony?
- What are the functional - phonetic or cognitive - sources of harmony processes?

Answers to these and other related questions have important implications for our phonological theories of locality, featural representations, rules or constraint interactions, and the interface between phonology and phonetics.

In this course we will focus on *consonant harmony*. Long-distance assimilation between consonants (as an active process or static co-occurrence restrictions) has been traditionally considered cross-linguistically rare, limited to a handful of language cases. Formal analyses of the phenomenon were based on the same assumptions as for vowel harmony or consonant-vowel harmony (e.g. nasalization). Recent empirical and theoretical work (especially Hansson 2001, Rose & Walker 2004) has led to a complete re-evaluation of generalizations about consonant harmony. This work shows that the phenomenon is considerably more common than has been thought and is characterized by a set of properties distinguishing it from other harmony processes. Implications of these findings for theories of locality and assimilation are still to be explored.

As part of this course, we will read and discuss journal articles and dissertations on relevant aspects of consonant harmony. The outline of the course topics is as follows:

- Consonant harmony: Introduction
- Typology
- Analyses
 - Feature spreading
 - Feature agreement
 - Recent developments
- Experimental approaches.

Readings

Primary readings. Every week, there will be a required reading (see the schedule). All registered students are expected to hand in a summary of the required reading for each class, except for the first class. The purpose of writing a summary is to encourage a careful and critical reading of the articles; it can be in any format or length that one finds useful. The summary will not be graded

for the content. In addition, each student will be a discussion moderator for a particular reading (starting with week 4), preparing questions and leading the discussion.

Secondary readings. Additional recently published articles or dissertation chapters on the topic will be assigned for ~20-minute presentations in weeks 9 to 11. These presentations are an important component of the course. It is essential that you carefully read the articles you are presenting. Additionally, all are welcome to read secondary articles, and especially those that will be relevant to your project. Presentations should be accompanied by a handout containing a summary of the article (research questions, the goal, crucial data, and key points of the analysis). The presentation should also note strengths and weaknesses of the paper and raise questions relevant to the class discussion. Depending on the length of the article/dissertation, some presentations may be done by 2 or more students. See evaluation criteria for presentations below.

Reports and assignments

There will be two 2 reports (conducted in groups of 2-3 students) and 1 individual assignment.

The case study report will involve selecting 2 cases of consonant harmony (1 coronal, 1 laryngeal) from Chapter 2 and the Appendix in Hansson (2010), finding primary sources in the library, and preparing a short (2-page) handout to be presented in class. The handout should contain some background on the language, the relevant data, and a brief description of the pattern (triggers, targets, features involved, proximity, blocking, similarity, etc.).

The dictionary evidence report will be part of our joint project – an investigation of apparent cases of sibilant harmony in Panoan languages (South America). We will examine some dictionaries compiled by SIL Peru (<http://www.sil.org/americas/peru/index.asp>) and explore consonant co-occurrence restrictions using the Dekereke phonology software tool (by Rod Casali: <http://casali.canil.ca/>).

The OTSoft assignment will consist of testing a phonological analysis of consonant harmony using the Optimality Theory Software (Hayes, Tesar, & Zuraw 2003: <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/hayes/otsoft/>).

Term paper project

Your final paper is expected to provide an original formal account of phonological data building on the course readings and discussion. Preferably, it should involve an account of a case or cases in consonant harmony or another long-distance assimilatory process. The paper project may also involve an investigation of co-occurrence restrictions in a language you are interested in.

As part of the work on the term paper project, you will be expected to:

- Submit a 1-page term paper outline on Feb. 7, *after* a discussion with the instructor.
- Submit the first draft of a 2-page abstract (the details on the format will be provided) on Feb. 21.
- Review your peer's abstracts (~4) making suggestions for improvement by Feb. 28. Submit a copy of peer reviews to the instructor.
- Revise and re-submit the abstract on Mar. 7; meet with the instructor to discuss your abstract within a week.
- Make a 15-min. presentation of your term paper project on Mar. 28 or Apr. 4; meet with the instructor to discuss your presentation within a week.

- Submit your paper on April 18. It should be between 20 and 30 pages long (double-spaced, Times 12 pts., 1” margins) and should follow the prescribed format. Papers turned in after the due date will lose 1 full point (e.g., A → A-) for each day late.

The paper will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- The paper contributes new empirical observation(s) or studies previous empirical observations using more systematically.
- The paper provides a good review of previous literature and makes it clear how it is situated in the context.
- The paper provides an original analysis of relevant data.
- The analysis is rigorously argued for and potential objections and alternative analyses are considered.
- The paper is well-organized and clearly written.
- The paper helps our understanding of the “big picture” by making a connection to theoretical issues of interest in the field.

The abstract peer review will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- The review briefly summarizes the main claim and the content of the proposed paper.
- The review points out the merits and weaknesses of the abstract.
- When weaknesses are pointed out, the review makes a constructive suggestion regarding how the abstract may be revised.
- The review may (but doesn’t need to) make stylistic or editorial suggestions regarding how the abstract should be organized.

The presentation will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Clear presentation of the main claims, crucial data, and key arguments.
- Clear organization of the handout and appropriate content (the right amount of information to help follow the article).
- Appropriate method of delivery: the presenter is engaged and communicating with audience rather than just reading from the handout.

Attendance and Participation

Regular attendance and active participation in the discussion of readings is essential to successful completion of this course.

Evaluation

- Case study report (group, week 2) 2%
- Dictionary evidence report (group, week 4) 5%
- OTSoft assignment (week 6) 5%
- Discussion moderation (primary readings, once; weeks 4-12) 3%
- Term paper outline, abstract and peer review (weeks 5, 7-9) 5%
- 2 article presentations (weeks 9-11) 10%
- Term paper presentation (weeks 12-13) 10%
- Overall participation, reading summaries 10%
- Term paper (April 18) 50%

The list of readings (incomplete)

- Arsenault, Paul. (forthcoming). Retroflex consonant harmony in South Asia. Ph. D. thesis, University of Toronto.
- Arsenault, Paul & Alexei Kochetov. (in press). Retroflex harmony in Kalasha: Agreement or spreading? In *Proceedings of the 39th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 39)*, 12 pp.
- Brown, Jason. 2008. Theoretical issues in Gitksan phonology. Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia. [selected chapters]
- Gafos, Adamantios I. 1999. *The articulatory basis of locality in phonology*. New York: Garland. [1996. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Ph.D dissertation.]
- Gallagher, Gillian. 2010. Perceptual distinctness and laryngeal (dis)harmony. *Phonology* 27. 435-480.
- Gallagher, Gillian & Jessica Coon. 2009. Distinguishing total and partial identity: Evidence from Chol. *Natural Language Linguistic Theory* 27. 545-582
- Hansson, Gunnar Ólafur. 2007. Blocking effects in agreement by correspondence. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38. 395-409.
- Hansson, Gunnar Ólafur. 2010. *Consonant harmony: Long-distance interaction in phonology*. UC Publications in Linguistics, University of California Press. [2001. Theoretical and typological issues in consonant harmony. Berkeley, CA: University of California dissertation.]
Permalink: <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/2qs7r1mw>
- Jurgec, Peter. 2010. Feature spreading 2.0: A unified theory of assimilation. PhD thesis, University of Tromsø. [primarily Ch. 4, 8].
- Kochetov, Alexei & Milica Radišić. 2009. Latent consonant harmony in Russian: Experimental evidence for Agreement by Correspondence. In Maria Babyonyshev, Darya Kavitskaya, & Jodi Reich (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL) meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Jindřich Toman's Michigan Slavic Publications. 111-130.
- Mackenzie, Sara. 2005. Similarity and contrast in consonant harmony systems. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 24. 169-182.
- Mackenzie, Sara. 2009. Contrast and similarity in consonant harmony processes. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto.
- Martin, Andrew Thomas. 2005. The effects of distance on lexical bias: Sibilant harmony in Navajo compounds. Master's Thesis. UCLA.
- McCarthy, John J. 1997. Process-specific constraints in Optimality Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 231-251.
- McCarthy, John J. 2007. Consonant harmony via correspondence: Evidence from Chumash. In Leah Bateman, Michael O'Keefe, Ehren Reilly & Adam Werle (eds.) *Papers in Optimality Theory* 3, 223-237. Amherst: GLSA.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2010. *Locality in vowel harmony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Ch. ?]
- Ní Chiosáin, Máire & Jaye Padgett. 1997. Markedness, segment realisation, and locality in spreading. Report no. LRC-97-01, Linguistics Research Center, UCSC, Santa Cruz, CA.
- Rose, Sharon. (to appear). Long distance assimilation of consonants. Marc van Oostendorp, Colin Ewen, Elizabeth Hume, & Keren Rice (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rose, Sharon. & Lisa King. 2007. Speech error elicitation and co-occurrence restrictions in two Ethiopian Semitic languages. *Language and Speech* 50. 451-504.
- Rose, Sharon & Rachel Walker. 2004. A typology of consonant agreement as correspondence. *Language* 80. 475-531.
- Walker, Rachel. 2007. Nasal and oral consonant similarity in speech errors: Exploring parallels with long-distance nasal agreement. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 22. 1-41.
- Walker, Rachel, Dani Byrd, & Fidèle Mpiranya. 2008. An articulatory view of Kinyarwanda coronal harmony. *Phonology* 25. 499-535.
- Walker, Rachel & Fidèle Mpiranya. 2006. On triggers and opacity in coronal harmony. In Rebecca T. Cover & Yuni Kim (eds.), 383-394. *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistics Society*.

Course schedule

Please note that this schedule is *tentative*; changes will be made if we need to spend more or less time on certain topics.

<i>Wk.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Primary readings</i>	<i>Presentations/work due</i>
1	Jan. 10	Consonant harmony: Introduction	Hansson 2010 Ch 1	
2	Jan. 17	Typology, using <i>Dekereke</i>	Rose (to appear), Hansson 2010 Ch 2	Case study report
3	Jan. 24	<i>Continued</i>	Hansson 2010 Ch 3, Arsenault, forthcoming Ch 3	
4	Jan. 31	Analyses: Feature spreading	Ní Chiosáin & Padgett 1997, McCarthy 1997	Dictionary evidence report (<i>Dekereke</i>)
5	Feb. 7	<i>Continued</i> , using <i>OTSoft</i>	Gafos 1999 Ch 2,5	Term paper outline
6	Feb. 14	Analyses: Feature agreement	Rose & Walker 2004	<i>OT Soft</i> assignment,
7	Feb. 21	Reading week: No class		Term paper abstract draft 1
8	Feb. 28	<i>Continued</i>	Hansson 2010 Ch 4,5	Abstract peer review
9	Mar. 7	Analyses: Recent developments	Mackenzie 2009 Ch 3,5	Hansson 2007, McCarthy 2007, Nevins 2009, Walker & Mpiranya 2006; Abstract draft 2
10	Mar. 14	<i>Continued</i>	Jurgec 2010 Ch 4,8	Brown 2008, Martin 2005, Gallagher & Coon 2009, Arsenault & Kochetov, to appear
	Mar. 18, Fri			Experimental Phonology Workshop
11	Mar. 21	Experimental approaches	Hansson 2010 Ch 6	Rose & King 2007, Kochetov & Radišić 2009; Walker 2007
12	Mar. 28	<i>Continued</i>	Walker et al. 2008	Term paper presentation
13	Apr. 4	Wrap-up	Gallagher 2010	Term paper presentation
	Apr. 18			Term paper due

<i>Wk.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Primary readings</i>	<i>Presentations/work due</i>
8	Feb. 28	<i>Continued</i>	Hansson 2010 Ch 4, 5 (Chris H.)	Term paper abstract draft 1 - Friday
9	Mar. 7		Mackenzie 2009 Ch 3,5 (Andrei)	Peer review Hansson 2007, Walker & Mpiranya 2006 (Erin) McCarthy 2007 (?) Nevins 2009 (?)
10	Mar. 14	Analyses: Recent developments	Jurjec 2010 Ch 4, 8 (James)	Abstract draft 2 Brown 2008 (?) Martin 2005 (?) Gallagher & Coon 2009 (Chris S.)
	Mar. 18, Fri			Experimental Phonology Workshop
11	Mar. 21		Hansson 2010 Ch 6 (Erin)	Rose & King 2007 (?) Kochetov & Radišić 2009 Walker 2007 (James)
12	Mar. 28	Experimental approaches	Walker et al. 2008 (Radu)	Term paper presentation
13	Apr. 4	Wrap-up	Gallagher 2010	Term paper presentation
	Apr. 18			Term paper due