

Tues & Thurs 9:05-10:25
(over Zoom; links provided on myCourses)

INSTRUCTOR: Heather Goad
E-mail: heather.goad@mcgill.ca
Office Hours: Tues & Thurs 10:30-11:30 (over Zoom; links provided on myCourses); April 15: OH 12:00-1:00

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	10%	Given out:	Thurs Jan 21	Due:	Thurs Jan 28
Assignment 2	25%	Given out:	Thurs Feb 4	Due:	Thurs Feb 18
Assignment 3	30%	Given out:	Thurs Mar 4	Due:	Thurs Mar 25
Critical Review	35%			Due:	Tues Apr 13

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 submitted by 11:59pm on the due date. Assignments must be submitted electronically (in pdf format) on myCourses. An assignment folder will be created for this.
- Collaboration on assignments is strongly 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 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.

Goals:

- The goal 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:

- 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.
- Summarize the principal arguments and evidence presented in support of the position defended by the author. Provide some examples of relevant data.
- *Most important:* 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?

PROCEDURES:**Lectures:**

- The course will be taught live (synchronous delivery) over Zoom.
- Handouts for the classes will be posted on myCourses ahead of time.

Class Participation:

- You are strongly encouraged to ask questions during the lectures and participate in class discussions. Your questions can be asked live (optimal) or posted using the chat function in Zoom.

MCGILL POLICY STATEMENTS:

Academic Integrity:

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/ for more information).

Language of Submission:

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.

Conformément à la Charte des droits de l'étudiant de l'Université McGill, chaque étudiant a le droit de soumettre en français ou en anglais tout travail écrit devant être noté.

Copyright:

© Instructor-generated course materials (e.g., handouts, notes, summaries, exam questions) 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.

COURSE TOPICS AND READINGS:

Week	Date	Topics	Readings
1-2	Jan 7, 12	Why phonology?	Berent, I. (2013) The phonological mind. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> 17: 319-327.
2-3	Jan 14, 19, 21	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.
		Features & Segments	
4	Jan 26	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.
4-5	Jan 28, Feb 2	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. (skim)
	Feb 4	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.
6	Feb 9, 11	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. (skim)

		Harmony	
7	Feb 16, 18	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.
		Syllables	
8	Feb 23	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 25	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. (skim)
	Mar 2, 4	Reading Week	
9	Mar 9	Syllable structure in OT	Kager, R. (1999) <i>Optimality Theory</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Ch 3: Syllable structure and economy.
	Mar 11	Perception vs. structure: Focus on sC clusters	Fleischhacker, H. (2001) Cluster-dependent epenthesis asymmetries. <i>UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics</i> 7: 71-116. (skim) Goad, H. (2012) sC clusters are (almost always) coda-initial. <i>The Linguistic Review</i> 29: 335-373. (skim)
10	Mar 16, 18	Licensing by prosody vs. licensing by cue	Lombardi, L. (1999) Positional faithfulness and voicing assimilation in Optimality Theory. <i>Natural Language & 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. (skim)
		Stress	
11	Mar 23	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 25	Stress in OT	Kager, R. (1999) <i>Optimality Theory</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Ch 4: Metrical structure and parallelism.
12	Mar 30	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.
	Apr 1	Gradient effects	Ryan, K.M. (2014) Onsets contribute to syllable weight: Statistical evidence from stress and meter. <i>Language</i> 90: 309-341.

		Phonology-morphology interface	
13	Apr 6, 8	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. (skim)
		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.
		Variation	
14	Apr 13	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.
			Pater, J. (2009) Weighted constraints in generative linguistics. <i>Cognitive Science</i> 33: 999-1035. (skim)
		Patterned exceptions	Zuraw, K. (2010) A model of lexical variation and the grammar with application to Tagalog nasal substitution. <i>Natural Language & Linguistic Theory</i> 28: 417-472. (skim)

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.