

Anderson 1984, ch. 10<sup>1</sup> study questions (pp. 137-151, 160-165 only!)

due Oct. 26

Notes

**pp. 138-139:** The definition of “linear order” given here is confusing. Because  $(x_i R x_i)$  is not allowed by irreflexivity, it can never be the case that, in part (c),  $x_i = x_j$ . So it would be clearer to replace (c), antisymmetry, with *asymmetry*:

1c'. Asymmetry: There are no  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  in  $X$  such that  $(x_i R x_j)$  and  $(x_j R x_i)$ .

2c'. Asymmetry: No rule can both precede and follow another rule.

And connectedness is not strictly appropriate here, since the relation is irreflexive. We should instead require something like “For all  $x_i, x_j$  in  $X$  **such that  $i \neq j$** , either  $(x_i R x_j)$  or  $(x_j R x_i)$ .” Call it “irreflexive connectedness”.

**pp. 144-145:** I.e., [ö] derived from /a/ is allowed to rhyme with [a].

**p. 148:** [h] and [ʔ] are treated here as [-cons] (i.e., as “glides”).

In case you read the Greek discussion (you don’t have to!):

**p. 151** [x,] means palatalized [x] ([x<sup>j</sup>] in IPA).

**p. 152** “secondary” in this case means derived from some other underlying vowel

**p. 162:** The idea in (28) is that a besides phonological features, a morpheme’s underlying representation can include “diacritic” features like [+DELETING]. A major (normal) rule will apply to all morphemes except those marked [-RULE<sub>i</sub>]. Lightner’s (1968) “minor rules” (using an idea from Lakoff 1965, apparently) require their targets to be [+RULE<sub>i</sub>] and thus apply only to exceptional morphemes. Words can even get these diacritic features from their lexical entries, or, when exceptionality is partly predictable, from a rule, such as Lightner’s Russian rule marking “roots in *u i* followed by a sonorant” (p. 71) as [+o-nominalization].

**p. 162.:** /aseveq/ → [aseveq]; /aseveq+a/ → [asever+a] (why does the /q/ → [r] rule of fn. 13 apply?)

/qayaq/ → [qayaq]; /qayaq=pik/ → [qaya=pik]; /qayaq=pik+a/ → [qaya=pig+a]

/atq/ → [ateq]; /atq+a/ → [att+a]

/qimugte/ → [qimugte]; /qimugte+!q/ → [qimugte+!eq]; /qimugte+!q+a/ → [qimugte+!r+a]

**p. 163:** *tanegurraanka*: *q*-deletion counterbleeds epenthesis!

Questions

1. Go to the CCLE page and take the online quiz till you get 100%.
2. Give failed derivations for Icelandic to show why neither syncope always preceding umlaut nor the reverse works.

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, Steven (1984). *The Organization of Phonology*. New York: Academic Press. Ch. 10: pp. 137-165.

