

20

Minor 2
HUL-350

Answer all questions. Most non-optimal options have [-ve] marks of varying strength depending on the degree of illogicality. Rate each of the options on a scale of 4 to 0. (4 being most likely and 0 being not possible/false/irrelevant). You can give the same score to more than one option.

Agreement pattern in verbs

Old High German (700-1050 AD)

A 1sg 2sg 3sg 1pl 2pl 3pl
issu issist issit essem esset essent

1. Assuming the verb root for 'eat' is [ess-], rate the following statements. [3]	
a. The vowel in the verb root changes to match the vowel properties of the suffix.	4/3
b. The suffixal vowel changes to match the properties of the root vowel.	0
c. Singular forms are [+high]	3
d. Plural forms are [-high]	3

2. Assuming the verb root for 'eat' is [iss-], rate the following statements. [3]	
a. The vowel in the verb root changes to match the vowel properties of the suffix.	4
b. The suffixal vowel changes to match the properties of the root vowel.	0
c. Singular forms are [+high]	3
d. Plural forms are [-high]	3

3. Here, the language has alternating phonological forms of the verb roots. Suggest a possible strategy to improve the paradigm? [3]

One possible strategy is to fix the verb root and don't change the root under any circumstances, and allow the affix to assimilate with the vowel of the present in verb root completely. (That is changing the affix vowel to the vowel in verb root)

Example: Root is "ess"

1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
esse	esset	esset	essem	esset	essent

Middle High German (1050-1400 AD)

B 1sg 2sg 3sg 1pl 2pl 3pl
isse isset isset essen esset essent

4. Which of these generalizations, a child learning MHG in 1300 AD would most likely make? [3]	
a. All suffixes should be [-high]	(3)
b. The vowel in the verb root should change to match the vowel in the suffix in case of plurals.	(4)
c. Singular verb roots should be [+high]	(3)
d. The vowel in the verb root should change to match the vowel in the suffix.	(0)

5. Between OHG and MHG, the morphological paradigm of High German changed slightly. How does this change fare with respect to the strategy that you suggested for making the paradigm optimal? [2]

If you compare MHG and the one I proposed, both of them are giving rise to similar problems like 3sg and 2pl have same form. But when you compare the strategies my strategy is very easy and less complex than MHG strategy. So, the change from OHG and MHG is better but not best. Rather my strategy gives results with some problem like 3sg = 2pl which are fair enough. → Having two different forms for "sing" and "plural" is little difficult for language learners.

G.V. Ramakanth Reddy
2012 ME10664
Group: 2

Early New High German (1400-1650 AD)

C	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
	isse/esse	isst	isst	essen	esst	essen

6. Suppose you have invented a time machine and are observing a child learning High German in 1600 AD. Which of these generalizations would she most likely make? [3]

a.	With singular agreement there is only a two-way distinction between self and non-self.	4
b.	The vowel in the verb root changes to match the vowel properties of the suffix.	0
c.	Singular verb roots should be [+high]	0
d.	With singular agreement there is a three-way distinction between 1person, 2person and 3person.	0
e.	Plural is always [essen], with 2pl as an exception.	4

7. Between MHG and ENHG, the morphological paradigm adjusted further. How do these compare with respect to the strategy that you suggested for making the paradigm optimal? [2]

The strategy in ENHG is complicated than that of MHG.

The conclusion drawn (in above question) looks simple but the way how strategy works is looking difficult. Because one need to explain how he removed 'E' in 3pl. I mean how the consonants in suffixes have got changed. so just by looking we might feel this better but if we think

about the strategy it is difficult. The one I proposed was little easy but again it results in some problems

as i pointed previously (3sg = 2pl). If one can check that then my strategy will be simpler to implement.

New High German (1650 AD- present)

D	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
	esse	isst	isst	essen	esst	essen

8. If you bring this child from 1600 AD with you to the present, and she hears the NHG, which of the generalizations she had made earlier would she have to revise? [1]

From a question: a, e are true + no need to revise. 'd' is false and no need to revise. But now, 'c' becomes definitely false and child will not take sing. roots as (high) Also, 'b' now will become true + child will take this generalization true. (always)
(This also in some cases can be given 1; bcz. if some removes 'ese' from 'esse' then this is true)
(in some cases this can be given 1; because some might not consider 'esse')
(little true)