

Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session

Volume 18

Article 7

1974

A note on English plural formation

Richard Rhodes SIL-UND

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers

Part of the Linguistics Commons

Recommended Citation

Rhodes, Richard (1974) "A note on English plural formation," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 18, Article 7. DOI: 10.31356/silwp.vol18.07 Available at: https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol18/iss1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commons@library.und.edu.

Rich Rhodes

The kind of allomorphy present in the singular versus plural forms of words like <u>man men</u>, <u>foot feet</u>, <u>woman women</u>, etc. is well documented if not well understood. However, there is one quirk related to the pair <u>man men</u> that I would like to document here. When <u>man</u> appears as a suffixal element it generally retains its irregular plural form <u>men</u>; however, careful attention to the phonetics of such plural forms reveals an interesting asymmetry. Consider the forms in (1).

(1)	workman	[warkm±n] [warkmen]
	workmen	[wárkmen]

In careful speech the second vowel of the plural <u>workmen</u> receives some reduced stress. In my dialect this is approximately the same as in the famous Chomsky and Halle (1968) pair <u>torrent</u> versus <u>torment</u> (as a noun).

(2)	No stress		Weak stress	
	torrent	[torint]	torment	[tormint]
	workman	[wirkmin]	workmen	[workmen]

Now the function of this stress is clear. Without the stress the vowel would be reduced obscuring or neutralizing the distinction between the singular and plural form. The mechanism for getting the stress onto that vowel, however, is not so clear. My best guess at the moment is that the suffix <u>-man</u> has underlying stress and is marked as irregularly allowing stress reduction. This reduction is then blocked in careful speech, presumably, by a transderivational constraint which recognizes the potential ambiguity that would arise from stress reduction.

Footnote:

1. In casual speech the stress on the second vowel is absent and the form is pronounced as [workmun]. Now this form is in clear and obvious contrast with the singular [workmin], i.e. the difference is <u>not</u> neutralized, but for English speakers this contrast between unstressed <u>±</u> and unstressed <u>t</u> is hard to hear. So with respect to the phenomenon under discussion this "near" neutralization counts as neutralization. Why it should be the case that there are contrasts which native speakers consistently make, but can hardly hear is a total mystery to me.