## Assignment 2 (due Thursday, February 21 in class)

## I. /l/-vocalization in London English

In many dialects of English, $/ 1 /$ is phonetically realized as [ $w$ ] in certain phonological contexts. This phenomenon is often referred to as "/l/vocalization", since the resulting allophone $[\mathrm{w}]$ is more vowel-like.
A. The following data illustrate the pattern of / //-vocalization in London English. What determines the distribution of the allophones [l] and [w] in this variety? Your answer should be stated in terms of syllable structure.
[1]: live, loud, play, glow, lady, feeling, filler, goalie
[w]: belt, fold , bull , girl, Charles, feel , goal , filter, bottle
B. Consider next the following data:

## [1]: tell us , pull over, feel it, goal up

[w]: tell Joe, pull through, feel bad, goal down
How might we account for the distribution of [l] and [w] seen here? Clearly state any necessary additional assumptions. Then, briefly explain how your proposal accounts for the difference between feel $[1]$ it and feel $[\mathrm{w}]$ bad.

## II. [j] in American English and British English (2 pages)

As we briefly saw in class, one feature that distinguishes American English from British English is the distribution of [j]. In particular, [j] may appear after the alveolar consonants [t, d, n, s, l] in British English, but not in American English:

American: tune [tun], dupe [dup], news [nuz], suit [sut], lute [lut], lurid [lurid] British: tune [tjun] , dune [djup], news [njuz] , suit [sjut] , lute [ljut] , lurid [ljurid]
A. In British English, [j] cannot occur after [1] in the following words:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { fluid } & \text { fluid], *[fljuid] } \\
\text { glue } & \text { plumage [plumı, } \overline{\mathrm{d} 3}],{ }^{*}[\mathrm{glju}]
\end{array}
$$

Do our current assumptions regarding the structure of English syllables account for this restriction? If, so then briefly explain why the ungrammatical [j]-pronunciations for these words are ruled out.

## II. [j] in American English and British English (continued)

B. In British English, $[\mathrm{j}]$ does occur after $[\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{l}]$ in the following words:
stupid [stjupid] slew [slju] sleuth [slju日]
Does the appearance of [j] in these words support the analysis of [s]-initial syllable onsets that we developed in class? If so, then briefly say how it does.

## III. Exploring the English Syllable Template: The Rhyme

The following data illustrate certain restrictions (i.e., phonotactic constraints) governing possible diphthong + consonant sequences in the English rhyme.
$\left.\begin{array}{llll} & \begin{array}{l}\text { dime } \\ \text { type }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { dine } \\ \text { tight }\end{array} & { }^{*} \text { [dary] } \\ \text { tyke }\end{array}\right]$

Provide precise prose descriptions for all of the phonotactic constraints that you can identify in the above data. Wherever possible, try to state these constraints in terms of natural classes of speech sounds.

## IV. Consonant Cluster Reduction in African American English

Under certain circumstances, word-final consonant sequences in African American English undergo reduction, which results in the omission of the final consonant. In the following words, this reduction process has affected the wordfinal consonant sequences:

| st | [pos] (vs. [post]) | band [bæn] (vs. [bænd]) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wasp | [was] (vs. [wasp]) | raised [rez] (vs. [rezd]) |
|  | [grf] (vs. [gift]) |  |
| adopt | [ədap](vs. [ədapt]) | pound [paun] (vs. [paund]) |
| picked | [pik] (vs. [pikt]) |  |

In the following words, the word-final consonant sequences are not affected by this reduction process:

| paint | [pent] | pink | [pigk] | bark | [bark] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| jump | $[\overline{\mathrm{d}} \wedge \mathrm{mp}]$ | belt | $[\mathrm{bslt}]$ |  |  |

A. What is the relevant difference between those word-final consonant sequences that undergo reduction and those that do not?
B. Recall that sonority places a crucial role in determing whether a particular sequence of sounds constitutes a possible English syllable:

Table 6.1 Sonority scale

| Oral stops |  | Fricatives |  | Nasals | Liquids |  | Semivowels | Vowels |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voiceless | Voiced | Voiceless | Voiced |  |  |  | High | Low |
| p | b | f | v | m |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| t | d | $\theta$ | ð | n |  |  | j | i | a |
| k | g | s | z | 1 | 1 | r | w | u | a |
| sonority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

How might the relative sonority of the consonants determine whether a particular word-final consonant sequence will undergo reduction?

