Lecture #8

UNDERLYING AND SURFACE REPRESENTATIONS

When morphemes exhibit alternations that are *rule governed*, one must determine the *underlying* or *abstract* representation of each morpheme and the rules needed to derive *all* alternations from the underlying representation.

Under	rlying representations may be different from the derived ones:
UR	/pɛn/
PR	[pʰ̃ɛ̃n]
Why do we assume that there are two levels of representation: an <i>underlying</i> and a <i>surface</i> one?	
There are three arguments:	
1.	<i>Economy</i> : Allophonic information can be stated by phonological rules; allophones are predictable – why should this information be stored in the lexicon???
2.	Relatedness of morpheme alternants can only be expressed with two levels of representation.
3.	Generalizations: most generalizations can only be explained at the underlying level.
	Study the examples illustrating the three arguments from the book (pp. 51-53)!
Turkish Vowel Harmony:	
	-lar/-ler (Plural allomorph)
Which form is the underlying representation?	
	/-lEr/
/E/ r	epresents <u>a</u> and <u>e</u>

1

ARCHIPHONEME: A separate phonological unit that is set up to represent the properties shared by two phonemes. It is a "theoretical segment which is only partially specified for phonetic properties, omitting some properties ... which may be determined by rule". (D. Odden, 2005).

Hungarian Vowel Harmony:

-nak/-nek (Dative allomorphs)

Which form is the underlying representation?

/-nEk/

/E/ represents <u>a</u> and <u>e</u>.

Why /E/?

Independent evidence:

nek+em (to me) nek+ed (to you) nek+i (to him/her)

etc.

Problems of neutralization:

In German /t/ and /d/ are separate phonemes:

leiten [t] to lead POSITION OF leiden [d] to suffer RELEVANCE

Rat [t] advice POSITION OF

Rad [t] wheel NEUTRALIZATION

Question: How the final [t] of *Rat* and *Rad* should be analyzed?

The final [t] of these words cannot be analyzed as /t/, since unlike its counterpart in intervocalic position, it cannot stand opposed to /d/. Therefore an archiphoneme would be set up.

Can the underlying representation of both *advice* and *wheel* be /raT/ where /T/ is specified [o voice]?

Argument: When two phonemes are neutralized in a given position, it is the *unmarked* member of the opposition which is found phonetically.

BUT: there is an argument for /D/ as being the underlying segment: when there is an alternation between word-final voiced and voiceless stops, the voiced stop is the underlying form because of the phonological process involved here: devoicing word-finally!

There may be cases when the alternants must be derived from an underlying form which coincides with *none* of the phonetic representation forms.

Yawelmani (a dialect of the Yokuts language, California)

Vowel Harmony Rule:

$$\begin{array}{c}
V \\
+\text{high} \\
-\text{back}
\end{array}
\rightarrow [+\text{round}] / \left(\begin{array}{c}
+\text{high} \\
+\text{round}
\end{array}\right) \text{ Co + Co } \underline{\hspace{1cm}}$$

What about #9 and #10?

There are two kinds of long o:

- (1) Those which behave like $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ and cause rounding harmony,
- (2) Those that behave like \underline{o} and do not cause rounding harmony.

In Yawelmani only

Long *u*: is lacking!

Suffix harmony suggests that those occurrences of o: which behave like high rounded vowels are actually derived from <u>underlying u</u>:

Consequently, the underlying form for the stem 'steal' must be /?u:t?/, and we need a rule that lowers long high vowels:

$$\begin{array}{c} V \\ + \text{ high} \\ + \text{ back} \\ + \text{ long} \end{array} \rightarrow \text{ [-high]}$$

The environment is <u>not</u> specified, because all PRs of the /u:/ will undergo this rule.

(Note: an underlying short <u>u</u> is never lowered, e.g. *mut* 'swear')

Abstract underlying representations have an explanatory function. What on the surface may appear to be an irregularity, has an explanation at the abstract level.