

Introduction to Linguistics — Assignment #1

1	COLUMN I	COLUMN II	COLUMN III
(1)	Alongside <i>amorous</i> ,	we have <i>amorousness</i>	as well as <i>amorosity</i> .
(2)	Alongside <i>atrocious</i> ,	we have <i>atrociousness</i>	as well as <i>atrocidity</i> .
(3)	Alongside <i>curious</i> ,	we have <i>curiousness</i>	as well as <i>curiosity</i> .
(4)	Alongside <i>felicitous</i> ,	we have <i>felicitousness</i>	as well as <i>felicity</i> .
(5)	Alongside <i>generous</i> ,	we have <i>generousness</i>	as well as <i>generosity</i> .
(6)	Alongside <i>meticulous</i> ,	we have <i>meticulousness</i>	as well as <i>meticulosity</i> .
(7)	Alongside <i>monstrous</i> ,	we have <i>monstrousness</i>	as well as <i>monstrosity</i> .
(8)	Alongside <i>pompous</i> ,	we have <i>pompousness</i>	as well as <i>pomposity</i> .
(9)	Alongside <i>porous</i> ,	we have <i>porousness</i>	as well as <i>porosity</i> .
(10)	Alongside <i>specious</i> ,	we have <i>speciousness</i>	as well as <i>speciosity</i> .
(11)	Alongside <i>arduous</i> ,	we have <i>arduousness</i>	but not <i>*arduosity</i> .
(12)	Alongside <i>delicious</i> ,	we have <i>deliciousness</i>	but not <i>*delicity</i> .
(13)	Alongside <i>furious</i> ,	we have <i>furiousness</i>	but not <i>*furiosity</i> .
(14)	Alongside <i>glamorous</i> ,	we have <i>glamorousness</i>	but not <i>*glamorosity</i> .
(15)	Alongside <i>glorious</i> ,	we have <i>gloriousness</i>	but not <i>*gloriosity</i> .
(16)	Alongside <i>gracious</i> ,	we have <i>graciousness</i>	but not <i>*graciosity</i> .
(17)	Alongside <i>libellous</i> ,	we have <i>libellousness</i>	but not <i>*libelosity</i> .
(18)	Alongside <i>marvellous</i> ,	we have <i>marvellousness</i>	but not <i>*marvelosity</i> .
(19)	Alongside <i>rebellious</i> ,	we have <i>rebelliousness</i>	but not <i>*rebelliosity</i> .
(20)	Alongside <i>spacious</i> ,	we have <i>spaciiousness</i>	but not <i>*spaciosity</i> .

- a. What is the lexical category of the words in COLUMN I, and what is the lexical category of the words in the other two columns?
 - b. When you look at the stress patterns of the words in COLUMN II, what do you notice when you compare them to the stress patterns of the words in COLUMN I? Does addition of *-ness* to the host affect the stress pattern of the host?
 - c. When you look at the words in COLUMN III in (1)–(10), is there a generalisation that covers the way in which they are morphologically derived, or the placement of main stress?
 - d. How could the fact that the simple, underived words *glory* and *fury* exist help explain the absence of **gloriosity* and **furiosity*? Can an explanation along these lines cover all the examples in (11)–(20)?
 - e. Why does *marvel* ‘block’ **marvelosity* while *monster* does not ‘block’ *monstrosity*?
 - f. How do *conscious*, *hideous*, *obvious*, and *serious* fit into the pattern emerging from the above examples?
- 2 English monosyllabic adjectives generally form their comparative and superlative forms by suffixation of *-er* and *-est*, respectively: *big~bigger~biggest* rather than **more/most big*.
- a. In current varieties of British English, words like *mired*, *tired* and *wired* are monosyllables; yet they do not generally accept *-er* and *-est* in their comparative and superlative (**Donald is mireder in scandal than Billary is*), resorting to periphrasis with *more* and *most* instead. Think of at least one way in which one can account for this.

- b. Even the simplest monosyllabic adjectives obligatorily form their comparative with *-er* under one specific circumstance, illustrated by *this car is more big than comfortable* (where *bigger* will not work). How would you characterise the difference between this example and *this car is bigger than that one* (where *more big* does not work)?

3 Spencer (1991:77–78) gives the following generalisation regarding the verb-forming suffix *-en* seen in the examples below: *-en* ‘only attaches to monosyllabic stems and, moreover, only if they end in an obstruent [i.e., a stop or a fricative], optionally preceded by a sonorant [i.e., *l, r, nasals*]’

(1)	quicken	(2)	*slowen
	redde		*greenen
	roughen		*apten
	shorten		*laxen

- a. The words in (3) appear to be exceptions to this generalisation: the monosyllabic roots for these words end in a /t/ (an obstruent) preceded here by /f, s/, which are not sonorants. But the output words /fɑ:sn/, /mɔɪsn/ and /sɒfn/ *do* comply with the generalisation. Discuss this by considering what kind of rule we need in order to arrive at these outputs, and how that rule can make suffixation of *-en* legitimate in the cases in (3).

(3)	fasten
	moisten
	soften

- b. The adverb *often* is variably pronounced with or without a /t/. Can the pronunciation /ɒfn/ be the result of the rule you formulated in 3a to account for the *-en* suffixation cases in (3)? Discuss.