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Iskarous

Claim: position on the sonority hierarchy is derived from energy transmission in a tube model of the vocal tract

stop > nasal > vowel

Q1: can we derive more detailed aspects of ‘sonority’ from energy logic? For example, the difference between strident and non-strident fricatives.
Q2: how does this model deal with dynamic segments vs. segments that have relatively steady states?

For example, in a stop, where the closure, release, and VOT (if present) phases may have very different properties?

What is the sonority of a stop, and in what sense is it a single segment?
Iskarous

Q3: How does energy transmission help explain the sequencing of segments within and across syllables, for which the sonority hierarchy is often invoked?

Many sonority phenomena have *perceptual* explanations (e.g., Henke et al. 2012)
- e.g., preference for stop-stop among plateaux

In an affricate, stop-fricative is the preferred sequencing, but within an onset cluster, fricative-stop is more common cross-linguistically.

A released vs. unreleased stop may have very different distributional properties (e.g. Jun 1995)
Shaw

Distinct coordination relations correspond to the segmental affiliation of gestures.

Japanese: vowel devoicing (CVC) or vowel deletion (CC) are both possible

Q1: Does this mean Japanese speakers are commanding two discrete representations?

Q2: What in the grammar causes or allows for a distinction between devoicing and deletion, particularly since this is non-contrastive? Or is deletion better conceptualized as more extreme reduction?
Shaw

Why do segment internal timing relations and segmental sequencing relations differ in just this way?

Q3: If onset-target coordination is diagnostic of a segmental sequence vs. a complex segment, do we know why this would be so?

Q4: Are there any examples of segment-internal timing patterns that contrast in this way?
Are the vocabularies (metaphors) of AP and q-theory reconcilable, should we be

(a) Looking for a way to translate q-theory and AP into one another

(b) Looking for a ways to extend q-theory and AP in their own terms to phenomena which are outside the scope of what has been typically examined in these frameworks?

(c) ?
Q theory and AP

How do the little q’s map to articulation?

Within AP, a ‘segment’ results from coordination of multiple gestures, each of which has internal structure

Consider a prenasalized affricate:
AP and Q theory: aims and data

Different theories or methodologies often focus on explaining different kinds of data, making them hard to compare directly to one another.

Within abstract phonology
- Typological asymmetries in the frequency of phonological structures
- Behavioral data on nonce words, either in production, perception, or metalinguistic tasks

Articulatory phonology
- Typological asymmetries in the frequency of phonological structures
- Topology of gestures deriving from articulatory patterns