

Mon 10:05-11:25 & Wed 10:05-11:25 (rm 117, 1085 Penfield)

**Instructor:** Heather Goad  
**E mail:** heather.goad@mcgill.ca

**Office:** 1085 Penfield, room 320, 514-398-4223  
**Office Hours:** Tu 3:00-4:00 & Wed 1:00-2:00 or by appointment

### Goals of Course:

This course is concerned with the basic units of phonological structure (feature, segment, syllable, foot, prosodic word). The primary focus is on understanding the kind of evidence that is cited as support for or against these units and their organization into constituents. To this end, considerable emphasis is placed on critically evaluating and comparing alternative theoretically-grounded solutions to empirical phenomena, placing each theory in its historical context.

### Evaluation:

Assignment 1	30%	Handed out: Mon Feb 03	Due: Mon Feb 17
Assignment 2	35%	Handed out: Mon Mar 02	Due: Mon Mar 23
Critical Review	35%		Due: Wed Apr 08

### Assignments:

- Each assignment will take the form of a problem set for which you are required to provide an analysis. Beyond providing an analysis, you must include some argumentation that justifies the analysis you have arrived at. The analysis should be written up in squib (short paper) format.
- Each assignment must be handed in by 11:59pm on the due date. Electronic submission (as pdf) is preferred.
- Collaboration on assignments is encouraged: you can discuss the assignment with other students enrolled in the course, but not with others (e.g. with more senior students in the department, on web based fora, etc.). If you choose to collaborate, you must still write up your analysis on your own. Please indicate who you worked with and cite the contributions of your classmates when they advanced your analysis.

### Critical Review:

- A list of papers for the critical review will be posted shortly on myCourses. You can also select a paper that is not on the list, as long as you check with me first. The critical review should be 7-10 pages long.
- *Goal:* The aim of the review is to provide a brief synthesis of the main points of the article and a critical evaluation of the issues discussed, with particular attention to the presentation of arguments and the nature of supporting evidence. You should try to influence the judgement of the reader as to whether or not the article contributes significantly to the development of theory and/or the illumination of data. The following are rough guidelines:
- *Content:*
  - (a) Give a brief summary of the issues that are addressed in the paper, pointing out whether the focus is on a theoretical problem, or a problem associated with the analysis of a particular body of data, or both. Try to indicate as clearly as possible what hypothesis or hypotheses the author is defending.
  - (b) Summarize the principal arguments and evidence presented in support of the position defended by the author. Provide some examples of relevant data.
  - (c) Most important part: Evaluate the strength of the evidence and arguments. Does the paper contribute either to the clarification or elaboration of a particular theoretical issue? Does it contribute to the explanation of some data? Are the conclusions justified? Are there any interesting predictions? Is the paper (the analysis) internally consistent? *Side note: For all papers that you read for this course, keep (c) in mind.*

### McGill Policy Statements ([http://www.mcgill.ca/tls/teaching/course design/outline#POLICY](http://www.mcgill.ca/tls/teaching/course%20design/outline#POLICY)):

McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (see [www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/](http://www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/) for more information).

In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded.

© Instructor generated course materials (e.g., handouts, notes, summaries, exam questions, etc.) are protected by law and may not be copied or distributed in any form or in any medium without explicit permission of the instructor. Note that infringements of copyright can be subject to follow up by the University under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures.

**Territory Acknowledgement:**

McGill University is on land which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst Indigenous peoples, including the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabeg nations. We acknowledge and thank the diverse Indigenous people whose footsteps have marked this territory on which peoples of the world now gather.

**Course Topics and Readings:**

Week	Date	Topics	Readings
1	Jan 06, 08	Why phonology?	Berent, I. (2013) The phonological mind. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> 17: 319-327.
1-2	Jan 08, 13, 15	A brief history of phonology over the last 50 years	Harris, J. (2007) Representation. In P. de Lacy (ed) <i>The Cambridge handbook of phonology</i> . Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 119-137.
			Odden, D. (2011) Rules v. constraints. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A.C.L. Yu (eds) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1-39.
			McCarthy, J. (2002) <i>A thematic guide to Optimality Theory</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Ch 1: The core of Optimality Theory.
		<b>Features &amp; Segments</b>	
3	Jan 20	Feature function, feature substance	Mielke, J. (2008) <i>The emergence of distinctive features</i> . Oxford: OUP, Ch 1: Natural classes and distinctive features in phonology.
3-4	Jan 22, 27	Internal structure of segments	McCarthy, J. (1988) Feature geometry and dependency: A review. <i>Phonetica</i> 43: 84-108. Padgett, J. (2002) Feature classes in phonology. <i>Language</i> 78: 81-110.
	Jan 29	Feature (under)specification	Archangeli, D. (2011) Feature specification and underspecification. In M. van Oostendorp, C. Ewen, E. Hume & K. Rice (eds) <i>The Blackwell companion to phonology</i> . Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
5	Feb 03, 05	Segment and feature behaviour in Optimality Theory: Focus on NC clusters	Itô, J., R.A. Mester & J. Padgett (1995) Licensing and underspecification in Optimality Theory. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 26: 571-613.
			Pater, J. (2001) Austronesian nasal substitution revisited. In L. Lombardi (ed) <i>Segmental phonology in Optimality Theory: Constraints and representations</i> . Cambridge: CUP, pp. 159-182.
		<b>Harmony</b>	
6	Feb 10, 12	Long-distance segmental interaction	Rose, S. & R. Walker (2011) Harmony systems. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A.C.L. Yu (eds) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 240-290.
		Approaches to vowel harmony (in OT)	Beckman, J. (1997) Positional faithfulness, positional neutralisation and Shona vowel harmony. <i>Phonology</i> 14: 1-46.
		<b>Syllables</b>	
7	Feb 17	Why syllables	Goldsmith, J. (2011) The syllable. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A.C.L. Yu (eds) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 164-196.
	Feb 19	Alternative views on their internal structure	Hayes, B. (1989) Compensatory lengthening in moraic phonology. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 20: 253-306. Kaye, J.D. (1990) 'Coda' licensing. <i>Phonology</i> 7: 301-330.

8	Feb 24	Syllable structure in OT	Kager, R. (1999) <i>Optimality Theory</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Ch 3: Syllable structure and economy.
	Feb 26	Perception vs. structure: Focus on sC clusters	Fleischhacker, H. (2001) Cluster-dependent epenthesis asymmetries. <i>UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics</i> 7: 71-116. Goad, H. (2012) sC clusters are (almost always) coda-initial. <i>The Linguistic Review</i> 29: 335-373.
	Mar 02-06	<b>Reading Week</b>	
9	Mar 09, 11	Licensing by prosody vs. licensing by cue	Lombardi, L. (1999) Positional faithfulness and voicing assimilation in Optimality Theory. <i>Natural Language &amp; Linguistic Theory</i> 17: 267-302.
			Steriade, D. (1997) Phonetics in phonology: The case of laryngeal neutralization. Published 1999 in <i>UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics</i> 2: 25-146.
		<b>Stress</b>	
10	Mar 16	Typology	Gordon, M. (2011) Stress systems. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A.C.L. Yu (eds) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 141-163.
	Mar 18	Stress in OT	Kager, R. (1999) <i>Optimality Theory</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Ch 4: Metrical structure and parallelism.
11	Mar 23	Iambic-trochaic law and foot typology	Hyde, B. (2011) The iambic-trochaic law. In M. van Oostendorp, C. Ewen, E. Hume & K. Rice (eds) <i>The Blackwell companion to phonology</i> . Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1052-1077.
12	Mar 25	Gradient effects	Ryan, K.M. (2014) Onsets contribute to syllable weight: Statistical evidence from stress and meter. <i>Language</i> 90: 309-341.
		<b>Phonology-morphology interface</b>	
13	Mar 30, Apr 01	Prosodic morphology	McCarthy, J. & A. Prince (1995) Prosodic morphology. In J. Goldsmith (ed.) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> . Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 318-366.
		Generalized alignment	McCarthy, J. & A. Prince (1993) Generalized alignment. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.) <i>Yearbook of Morphology 1993</i> . Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 79-153.
		Stratal OT	Bermúdez-Otero, R. (2011) Cyclicity. In M. van Oostendorp, C. Ewen, E. Hume & K. Rice (eds) <i>The Blackwell companion to phonology</i> . Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 2019-2048.
		<b>Variation</b>	
14	Apr 06, 08	Approaches to capturing variation	Coetzee, A. & J. Pater (2011) The place of variation in phonological theory. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A.C.L. Yu (eds) <i>The handbook of phonological theory</i> , 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 401-431.
		Patterned exceptions	Zuraw, K. (2010) A model of lexical variation and the grammar with application to Tagalog nasal substitution. <i>NLLT</i> 28: 417-472.