

(7)		/[betu-[se-kai]]/L	*Struc(σ)L	CrispEdge	*Struc(σ)
	a.	betu-se-kai	****!		****
	b.	𠄎 bes-se-kai	***	*	***

Prespecification maintains that exceptional properties are encoded in the lexical representation. The difficulty is that there is no effective way to encode the exceptional CVC shape. One obvious possibility is encoding the final C as moraic (i.e., /CVC_μ/). But, as shown in (8), the same Sino-Japanese stems as in (6) exhibit regular behavior in simple stem compounds. They surface in [CVCV] forms unless gemination applies. Moreover, (9) shows that the same stems resist gemination in other complex compounds. Hence, prespecification fails to elucidate why exceptional stems behave regularly elsewhere. This problem arises since the irregularity is locally encoded as if a certain morpheme were responsible for exceptionality.

(8)		<i>Stems</i>	<i>Compounds</i>	<i>Gloss</i>	<i>Compounds</i>	<i>Gloss</i>
	a.	[bet(u)]	bek-keN beɸ-ɸi bet-taku	different matter different paper second house	betu-ziN betu-mee betu-biN	different person different name separate shipping
	b.	[zit(u)]	ziɸ-ɸi zik-keN zip-pi	implementation experiment actual cost	zitu-geN zitu-zai zitu-eN	realization actual existence actual performance
(9)		<i>Stems</i>	<i>Compounds</i>	<i>Gloss</i>		
	a.	[bet(u)]	[betu-[kai-kee]] [betu-[koo-doo]]	*[bek-[kai-kee]] *[bek-[koo-doo]]	separate payment separate behavior	
	b.	[zit(u)]	[zitu-[koo-ɸoo]] [zitu-[soo-zoku]]	*[zik-[koo-ɸoo]] *[zis-[soo-zoku]]	actual negotiation actual inheritance	

/CVC/ prespecification is undesirable in another respect. V₂ is highly predictable (see (1)), so several previous works assume /CVC/ for disyllabic stems (Sakai 1994; Itô & Mester 1996). Given the examples as in (10) that disobey the generalization in (1), Kurisu (2000) argues that both /CVC/ and /CVCV/ are viable inputs. Analytical details differ, but all of these analyses agree that non-exceptional stems may take /CVC/. It then follows that /CVC/ cannot be reserved specifically for exceptional stems. This leads to an important finding that prespecification does not succeed even if prespecified C_μ is viewed as a property of a whole compound rather than that of a certain stem. No matter what the pertaining ranking is, the mora specification in /CVC_μ/ is lost in regular forms when gemination is blocked. The same constraint ranking should deprive the prespecified mora of exceptional forms too. Hence, I conclude that the prespecification approach fails whether prespecification is a property of particular stems or compounds.

(10)	a.	<i>t-stems</i>	<i>Gloss</i>	b.	<i>k-stems</i>	<i>Gloss</i>
		niti	day		ziku	pivot
		kiti	luck		tiku	bamboo
		rati	bound		niku	meat

Cophonology postulates multiple constraint rankings in a grammar, and each item or a class of items picks a certain ranking. As summarized in (11), two rankings coexist for the case at hand. The examples in (6) choose the ranking in (11b) while (11a) is selected by non-exceptional ones. But this cophonology analysis is conceptually problematic. The problem is that it cannot explain why the ranking in (11a) is the default. This is because the choice of (11a) and that of (11b) are equally expected. Unlike the sonority hierarchy or any other phonetically grounded scales, there is no intrinsic reason for a particular ranking between CrispEdge and *Struc(σ). Otherwise, the two constraint rankings in (11) would be contradictory. In lexical indexation, indexed *Struc(σ)L is more specific and marked than *Struc(σ). It follows that the ranking CrispEdge » *Struc(σ) is the default, so gemination is normally blocked across a word boundary.

(11)	a. <i>Regular ranking:</i>	CrispEdge » *Struc(σ)	b. <i>Exceptional ranking:</i>	*Struc(σ) » CrispEdge
------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

In summary, the lexical indexation approach effectively handles the exceptional examples in (6), but prespecification and cophonology do not. Examples of the kind provided in (6) present a serious empirical challenge to prespecification because it is inefficient in differentiating regular and exceptional examples. Furthermore, cophonology is unsatisfactory too since it is unable to explain why regular and exceptional cases are as they are. This is a general problem with the cophonology approach to exceptionality.