

Imdlawn Tashlhiyt Berber allows a wide variety of segments to serve as syllabic nuclei. What constraints and rankings explain the syllabification?

	UR	Syllabification	Gloss
a.	/t-rks/	tṛ.kṣ	‘she hid’
b.	/ra-t-kti/	ra.tṛ.ki	‘she will remember’
c.	/bd-dl/	bḍ.dl	‘exchange’
d.	/t-rba/	tṛ.ba	‘she carried on her back’
e.	/i-saul/	i.sa.wl	‘he spoke’
f.	/i-haul-tn/	i.ha.wl.tn	‘he made them(m.) plentiful’
g.	/t-rgl-t/	tṛ.glt	‘you locked’
h.	/ra-t-rgl-t/	ra.tṛ.glt	‘you will lock’
i.	/t-xzn-t/	tṣ.znt	‘you stored’
j.	/t-msx-t/	tṃ.sxt	‘you transformed’
k.	/t-ftk-t/	tḞ.tkt	‘you sprained’
l.	/t-izrual-in/	ti.zṛ.wa.lin	‘those(f.) from Tazrwalt’
m.	/rks-nt/	ṛk.snt	‘they hid’
n.	/bain-n/	ba.jn	‘they(m.) appear’
o.	/iattui/	jat.tuj	‘it is high’
p.	/t-lur-tn-t/	tlur.tnt	‘she gave them(f.) back’
q.	/dum-x/	dumx	‘I last’
r.	/ra-t-lul-t/	rat.lult	‘you will be born’
s.	/t-zmt/	tzmt	‘it(f.) is stiffing’

Q: What is the basic generalization for this data?

Some possible constraints:

- Onset – When is this violated?
- NoCoda – When is this violated?
- Max, Dep – Are these ever violated?
- Ident(syllabic) – When is this violated?
- Nuclear Sonority: *stop » *fric » *lat » *rhot » *hiV » *loV
- Where in this scale should the constraint *nḁ go?
- Sonority Sequencing Principle (SSP) – What does this do?

UR:									
a.									
b.									
c.									
d.									
e.									
f.									
g.									

UR:									
a.									
b.									
c.									
d.									
e.									
f.									
g.									

UR:									
a.									
b.									
c.									
d.									
e.									
f.									
g.									

- The analysis of this set of data presented by Dell and Elmedlaoui (1985):
 1. Scanning left to right, create (onset)-nucleus syllables whose nucleus is a low vowel. If there is no preceding segment, the syllable is onsetless.
 2. Respecting the syllables already formed, scan left to right to create (onset)-nucleus syllables whose nucleus is a high vowel.
 - 3-8. Follow the same procedure for liquids, then nasals, then voiced fricatives, then voiceless fricatives, then voiced stops, then voiceless stops.
 9. Make any stray segments into onsets.
 10. Make [-continuant] initial nuclei into onsets.
 11. Make [-sonorant] final nuclei into codas.

More (international) conspiracies and constraints: (from Walker 2005)

Q: What constraints are at play in the following seven Romance dialects and how does the ranking vary from language to language?

- Assume that the alternations here are representative for the various vowels.
- If no data is given for stem-internal **a**, assume that it does not alternate.

1. **Foggiano** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ)

a.	kjéa	‘full(f.)’	kjínu	‘full(m.)’
b.	péte	‘foot’	píti	‘feet’
c.	móffja	‘soft(f.)’	múffju	‘soft(m.)’
d.	gróssa	‘big(f.)’	grússu	‘big(m.)’

2. **Veneto** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ)

a.	védo	‘I see’	te vídi	‘you see’
b.	préte	‘priest’	préti	‘priests’
c.	bélo	‘beautiful(m.sg.)’	béli	‘beautiful(m.pl.)’
d.	kóro	‘I run’	te kúri	‘you run’
e.	módo	‘way’	módi	‘ways’
f.	gáto	‘cat’	gáti	‘cats’

3. **S. Umbro** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ)

a.	vérde	‘green(sg.)’	vírdi	‘green(pl.)’
b.	péde	‘foot’	pédi	‘feet’
c.	tjéka	‘blind(f.)’	tjéku	‘blind(m.)’
d.	róssa	‘red(f.)’	rússu	‘red(m.)’
e.	nóva	‘new(f.)’	nóvu	‘new(m.)’
f.	nóstra	‘our(f.)’	nóstru	‘our(m.)’

4. **Salentino** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ)

a.	mése	‘month’	mísi	‘months’
b.	péte	‘foot’	piéti	‘feet’
c.	lénta	‘slow(f.)’	liéntu	‘slow(m.)’
d.	pilósa	‘hairy(f.)’	pilúsu	‘hairy(m.)’
e.	fórte	‘strong(sg.)’	fuérti	‘strong(pl.)’
f.	mórta	‘dead(f.)’	muértu	‘dead(m.)’

5. **Calvello** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ)

a.	mése	‘month’	mísi	‘months’
b.	péte	‘foot’	piéri	‘feet’
c.	kavróne	‘carbon’	kabrúni	‘carbons’
d.	móvo	‘I move’	múovi	‘you move’

6. **Lena** (i,e,a,u,o)

a.	fía	‘daughter’	fíu	‘son’
b.	néna	‘child(f.)’	nínu	‘child(m.)’
c.	kabéθa	‘head(f.)’	kabíθu	‘head(m.)’
d.	tsóba	‘wolf(f.)’	tsúbu	‘wolf(m.)’
e.	gáta	‘cat(f.)’	gétu	‘cat(m.)’

7. **Teramo** (i,e,ε,a,u,o,ɔ) – these are **fake** data that illustrate the pattern

a.	védo	‘I see’	vídi	‘you see’
b.	préte	‘priest’	príti	‘priests’
c.	gáto	‘cat’	gíti	‘cats’
d.	kóro	‘I run’	kúri	‘you run’
e.	módo	‘way’	múdi	‘ways’

Q: Is there a natural analysis of this data in terms of triggering and blocking constraints along with (possibly persistent) repair rules?

Q: How does a rule-based analysis compare with the Optimality Theoretic account of these patterns in terms of typological predictiveness?