Errata and comments
O'Grady et al., *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*
7th US Edition: 978-1-319-03977-6
Text Book, Study Guide (978-1-319-04089-5), and Instructor's Resource Manual

Carson T. Schütze
UCLA

December 2019

Textbook

Inside back cover: [r] in transcription for *rouge* should be [ɹ];
according to p.36, *bird* should be transcribed [bɚd], not with syllabic r, and likewise for *early, hurt, stir, purr*; (cf. Table 2.16), but there is no entry for [ɚ];
it seems odd to list "no<u>w</u>" under [w] but rhyming "pl<u>ow</u>, b<u>ough</u>" under [aw];
[ʔ] is used in transcription of *m-m* under syllabic m, but not listed as a consonant symbol

p.36, Table 2.11: *bird* should be [bɚd], *her* should be [hɚ], *teacher* should be [tʰiʧɹ]

p.37: The environment for syllabic liquids and nasals ("in an unstressed syllable at the end of a word…") provides no indication of how to transcribe unstressed non-word-final syllables.
The word-final and stressless restrictions are contradicted by the transcription of 'm-m' in Table 2.11, where the first syllabic *m* is non-final and in a stressed syllable.
Also, I am dubious of the implicit claim that nasals cannot be syllabic following a sonorant, e.g. *fallen, barren*.

Also, "We will use the symbol [ɚ] for *r* in words like *bird, earth,* and *girl*" is presumably intended to refer to stressed syllables or monosyllabic words, but Study Guide p.28 adds <u>per</u>*ceive* to this list, making it unclear what the generalization is supposed to be; in any case "words like…" is of no help to students without some characterization.

p.42: It would be useful if Fig 2.11 and Table 2.15 included [ɚ].

p.43: Since glottal stop is listed as an English consonant in Table 2.12, its absence from Table 2.16 and other lists is puzzling

p.44: It seems bizarre to list [ɚ] in the consonant chart (Table 2.16) rather than the vowel chart (Table 2.17).

p.53: The suggestion that there is nasal place assimilation in *A<u>n</u>chorage* seems to presuppose that the phoneme here is underlyingly /n/ rather than /ŋ/, for which I know of no synchronic evidence.

p.54, Table 2.25: *corrode* (slow speech) should be [kəˈɹowd]; *suppose* should be [səˈpʰowz]

p.55, Table. 2.26: *prince* should have [ɹ] instead of [r] both times; *tenth* should begin with aspirated [t] both times

p.56: "basic to the words in question": students have no idea what this means

p.65, #16 a): [r] should be [ɹ] in both columns

p.65, #16 k): Does the rapid speech form contain an affricate [ʧ] or a [t] followed by a [ʃ]? That is, is the process meant to be a place assimilation rule or an epenthesis rule? How is the reader supposed to tell?

p.65, #16: The inconsistent treatment of vowel nasality is puzzling to students: why is it marked in rapid speech in h), j), k), but not a)–e), and not at all in careful speech forms, although they are phonetically transcribed? Also, *Pam* should be transcribed with aspirated [p] in both columns, since aspiration is marked elsewhere (e.g., in f) and i)).

pp.74–5: The facts about Turkish seem to be that [ɛ] and [æ] are generally contrastive, although there are a few words like the one in Table 3.4 that show variation. (This recurs on p.46 of the Study Guide.)

p.75, Table 3.5: The Japanese transcriptions include the symbol [ɽ] without explanation, which doesn't even appear in the IPA chart on p.57.

p.78, Table 3.10: It is odd to transcribe *on* with /ɔ/ since most Americans don't have it as a phoneme distinct from /ɑ/. This recurs on p.104. Likewise for *applaud* on p.80, Table 3.12.

pp.87–88, Tables 3.16 and 3.18: These transcriptions should not be in slashes since they are not phonemic: syllabic nasals are not English phonemes, [ej] is phonemically /e/, etc.

p.89, Table 3.19: *try* should contain voiceless [ɹ], not [r];
it seems redundant to indicate aspiration both with [ʰ] and with the devoicing diacritic on a following liquid—note that this convention is not followed in ex. (15) and Figure 3.17 (p.103), nor in the text on p.105.

p.92, Figure 3.14: /h/ is missing from the bottom left quadrant

p.92, Table 3.23: Voiceless fricatives are [+continuant], not [–continuant]; /h/ is missing from all the natural classes to which it belongs.
Given that glottal stop is listed in Table 3.29, its absence from Figure 3.14 and Table 3.23 is mysterious.

p.99, Table 3.28: "[±round]" is incorrect: [–round] is not used in the representation of vowels (which unfortunately means there is no natural class of unrounded vowels in this system). This has further unfortunate consequences: the following feature matrix:
[DORSAL, –high, –low, +back, –tense, –reduced] is the full specification for [ʌ], but it is also the natural class for {ʌ, ɔ}!

pp. 100–101: There are no entries in Tables 3.29 & 3.30 for [ɾ] or [ɚ], respectively.

p.102, under 4.1: "we apply phonological rules to the <u>underlying</u> representation" is blatantly false, as Figure 3.17 crucially shows: the application of liquid devoicing requires the underlying schwa to have been deleted.

p.104, (17) and (18): These formulations do not express the environment described in the preceding prose ("before a voiced obstruent in the same syllable"); rather, they implement the prose that follows (17): "before a voiced obstruent at the end of a syllable". But of course lengthening still applies when there is no syllable boundary immediately following the triggering sound, e.g., *seeds* [si:dz].

p.104: in (19), the change should be [+nasal], not [nasal]; also, given that this rule is actually sensitive to tautosyllabicity just like the previous one, it is odd that this is not noted or formalized; also, it is unclear what is "particularly revealing" in the description.

p.105, rule (22): this rule would generate [tlidow] for *Toledo* and [dlajt] for *delight*, which are phonotactically impossible

p.110: It is odd that free variation is defined here but not when the concept is introduced on p.74, and that it is first defined in terms of a "single word" having multiple pronunciations, rather than two sounds not being in contrast. Students can wrongly conclude that pairs like *roof* [ɹuf]~[ɹʊf] are evidence for free variation between [u] and [ʊ] ***in general.*** The focus should first be on the discussion about word-final [p], which is clearly <u>not</u> about the pronunciation of a single word but holds throughout the language.

p.111, #2 instructions: diacritic indicates sound is lengthened, not "doubled".

p.112, #4, instructions: it could be mentioned that the unfamiliar symbol is a bilabial.

p.114: Problem 8 is answered in the Study Guide (pp.43–4 & 212).

p.115, Problem 9: [ɨ] is central, not mid.

p.116, Problem 11: the answers to (a) and (e) are found in the Study Guide (Practice 3.12)

p.116, Problem 13: Canadian French does not have trilled alveolar r's: [r] should not appear in these transcriptions.

p.117, Problem 14: Using syllabic [n] in a) and b) is confusing: this makes it appear that the <u>second</u> schwa in these words is deleting, which would violate the generalization that g) and h) are supposed to illustrate.

p.133, below Table 4.8: I'm not sure why /ŋ/ isn't listed among the final consonants that block *-en*; *wrongen* sounds as bad as the rest, and the generalization is presumably about sonorants vs. obstruents (as claimed on p.81 of the Study Guide).

p.133, Table 4.9: *productive* is not the right example to make this point: *-ive* attaches to verbs but *próduct* is a noun (presumably *productive* is *produce+ive* with stem allomorphy)

p.135, Figure 4.10: I don't think *Sunday night concert series* is one big compound, since the most prominent stress is on *concert*, not *Sunday*

p.135, Table 4.11: I do not think *digital detox* is a compound, since the most prominent stress is on *detox*

p.143, Table 4.18: The German example should be changed: since the infinitive is *sein*, *sind* is not suppletive, but *ist* is.

p.146, Clipping: "shortens a polysyllabic word by deleting one or more syllables" is false for many examples listed (*prof, psych, porn*, which all contain the onsets of the second syllable in the original word; *blog*, which contains the coda of the first syllable).

p.151, allomorphy of *in-*: since *irregular* and *illegal* do not phonetically contain the geminates that their spelling would suggest, it is unclear why the prefix allomorph in those words isn't just [ɪ] (see also comment on *immoral* below: Study Guide p.98)

p.156, Problem 6: Zapotec is a language <u>family</u> containing several mutually unintelligible languages.

p.157, Problem 9 i): *pre-* is not listed in Table 4.6

p.159, Problem 14 ii): The instructions concerning *mouth* are confusing. I assume the intent was to ask whether the <u>plural</u> of *mouth* sounds different from the plural of *loudmouth*, but the question seems to be asking about pronunciation of the singulars, where (as far as I know) there is no variation.

p.164: *vaccinated time travel* is a noun, not a verb: I don't think you can say *I will vaccinated time travel tomorrow*. Thus, the *time travel* inside it is presumably also a noun. (And based on stress placement, I don't think the whole thing is a compound: *vaccinated* is a separate adjective.)

p.173, Table 5.4: Students find it confusing that the first two examples of Degree words (*very* and *quite*) systematically fail to combine with prepositions. Also, see below (p.198) for the need to add the fact that Deg can be a Spec of Adv.

p.181, Fig. 5.13: students are confused by this since the presence of two complements is not consistent with the template on p.172.

p.185, (21): Inversion should be restricted to apply only when C contains +Q.

p.187, Table 5.10: The final entry should indicate that *how* is also a Deg when it occurs with an adverb, as in *How quickly can they run?*, assuming Deg as Spec of Adv is added to Table 5.4.

p.191, Fig 5.21: The fact that T does not raise to C here seems to violate the claim on p.185 that the +Q feature must attract another element to its position; the absence of motivation for stipulating the contrary here is unfortunate.

p.194, Figure 5.23: In both trees, AdvP in Spec-VP is an error: it should be just Adv

p.198: (43), Fig 5.27 b: Up until this point there were no such things as Adverb Phrases, so their introduction should be acknowledged. Also up until this point, Deg (e.g. *very*) could only

be the specifier of A or P (cf. Table 5.4), so the new option of being specifier of Adv should be acknowledged.

p.198, Fig. 5.27: Although the text immediately above states that modifiers are "lower than specifiers but higher than complements", the (b) tree in the Figure shows the AdvP modifier at exactly the same height as a specifier: daughter of XP, sister of X'. This is of course also inconsistent with the (a) tree, where the modifier is daughter of X', sister of X'.

p.199, Fig 5.28 and 5.29: Although the text immediately above states that relative clauses are modifiers, the trees in these figures attach the relative CP as a complement (sister of N), unlike the modifier in Fig 5.27a.

pp.202–3: In Figures 5.32, 5.34 and 5.35, *was/are* should undergo Verb Raising to T.

p.210, box: "Every T has an NP specifier" is contradicted by Figures 5.36 and 5.37.

p.242: In ex. (37) the use of the name *Alexis* is unfortunate since this can be a male name.

pp.242–4: It is unfortunate that none of the trees in this section explicitly illustrate the "in the same clause" portion of the Principles.

Study Guide

Inside front cover: It would be useful if tense/lax were indicated in the vowel chart; it would be helpful if [j] were moved to the right in its box to reflect it being voiced; [ʧ] and [ʤ] are in the wrong font; there should be a dark line separating glottals from Dorsals

Inside back cover: same issues as textbook

p.18: the "explanation" for aspiration ("there is not enough time…") wrongly suggests that word-initial voiceless stops should have to be universally aspirated, and that they should be aspirated at the beginning of stressless syllables;
why voiceless [s] <u>before</u> the stop should provide 'more time' to start vocal cord vibration <u>after</u> the stop is mysterious.
Since both of these properties are specific to English, trying to suggest a physical explanation for them is misguided.

p.20: "Liquids…are syllabic when they ~~can~~ form the nucleus of a syllable."

p.21: "An *r*-colored schwa occurs in one-syllable words…" contradicts the text (p.37) suggestion that it is used (in placed of syllabic *r*) in all stressed syllables.

p.28: The suggestion that *r*-colored schwa should be used to transcribe *perceive* contradicts both the Study Guide and Text statements about its distribution noted under p.21 above, since there it is in an unstressed syllable in a polysyllabic word

p.29: the distribution of aspiration on voiceless stops contradicts the text (p.90) statement that they also occur in unstressed <u>word-initial</u> syllables.

p.33, Assimilation box: the terms "palatalization" and "homorganic" are not defined here or in the corresponding text chapter.

p.34, Deletion box: [sapowz] should be [səpʰowz]

p.35, Practice 2.23: transcriptions of *collards* should have aspiration on the [k]; transcriptions of *walrus* should contain [ɑ] in place of [a]

p.36, Problem 4: j): *transcription* should contain [ɹ] in place of [r]
      m): *articulatory* has two errors, should be [ɑɹtʰɪkjələt̪ʰɔɹi]

p.37, Problem 6: *kitchen* should begin with an aspirated [k]

p.40: The example from Hungarian is a terrible example of a near-minimal pair: the lengthening of the vowel could be triggered by the voicing of the following fricative, as in English. A near-minimal pair should not differ in the sounds immediately adjacent to the allegedly contrasting sounds. Thus the definition itself is misleading: ideally, the immediate environments for the target segments should be completely identical; beyond that is where a non-minimal can (more) safely differ.

p.43, #1b) and p.44 #2b): The sentence "Think about whether the words…have different meanings" is odd: The questions state that the sounds at issue are allophones, which means the answer must be No. The following sentence, "Determine which sound can occur…" would be a presupposition failure if you could in fact use more than one of the sounds in these environments.

p.45, Problem 3: The Japanese transcriptions include the symbol [ɽ] without explanation, which doesn't even appear in the IPA chart on p.57 of the text.

p.46, top: The logical setup of the question is flawed: there is no way to conclude whether [ɛ] and [æ] contrast in Turkish on the basis of two alternate pronunciations of the word 'I': it is conceivable, for example, that these vowels are contrastive but the contrast is neutralized before [n], much as it is in most English dialects before [ɹ] as shown on p.28. (There are also no answers for this problem in the Answer Key at the back.)

pp.52–3, Practice 3.8: The Mon data in #1 and #2 seem inconsistent: word 6 in question 2 shows that schwa-insertion is compatible with diphthongization, a fact that question (b) draws attention to, so it is mysterious why none of the other words in question 2 show diphthongization. Indeed, the original web source claims the same six vowels trigger both processes, but the forms have been reproduced accurately except for word 3 in question 2, which should be /pe/ → [pəe], completing the paradigm.

p.53, Problem 3: #3 'to run away' should be [gʊdʒe], not [gʊddʒe]; also Hausa does not have an [a]/[ɑ] contrast (standard transcription uses [a]), so probably only one of those symbols should be appearing, and in #1 the first vowel should be long in both columns

p.60, Problem 2 (Larike): #10 should be [ʔɪntudo], not [ʔntudo] (cf. p.93 of Laidig)

p.66, Derivations: Rules: "only occurs when the structural description…is found in the *underlying representation*" [emphasis added]: this is incorrect: what matters is whether the description is met at the point in the derivation when the rule attempts to apply.

p.67, top: In the derivation, the URs should be surrounded with slashes, not number signs

p.67, Practice 3.15 #1: In form 2, I suspect [y] should be [j], but no source for this data is cited.

p.68, #2: The use of [r] in the transcriptions is inaccurate: most of them are taps, not trills.

pp.77–79: morpheme boundaries are absent from many of the word trees

p.88, Quick reminder: there are English prefixes that change category, e.g. the *en-* of *enrich, ensure* (A→V) and the *de-* of *defrost* (N→V) (which appears, problematically, in 28 just above this statement)

p.90: Definition of Blending is inconsistent with that given in the text (which requires the pieces not to be morphemes).

p.93, Practice 4.12, Problem 3, #10: Translating the reduplicated form as 'dough' is confusing, particularly for non-native English speakers: it cannot refer to the raw material of bread, it is just a more casual/slangy way of referring to money.

p.96, Problem 1: To match the answer key, "abstract noun" should be labeled part "d."

p.97, REMINDERS box: "bound affixes" is redundant—affixes are bound by definition; "root words" should probably just be "roots."

p.98, Problem 1, #7: *immoral* [ɪmɔɹḷ] cannot contain /ɪm-/, since the /m/ is part of *moral* (unless degemination is invoked); alternatively, as suggested above (text p.151), there is a fourth allomorph of the negative prefix, /ɪ-/, also found in *illegal, irregular*, etc.

p.101, Problem 3, 2nd bullet: 'tomorrow' does not appear in any of the glosses; part (a) would be more straightforward if the morpheme for 'you' were requested.

p.119, under Move: "to a position with^in^ a CP". But this is falsified by NP Movement a few pages later, which does not target CP.

p.120: "If a Move operation has taken place, then the deep and surface structure are ~~usually~~ not the same." [Strikeout "usually"; they are by definition not the same.]

p.120: "Move transforms an existing structure (e.g., a statement) into another type of structure (e.g., a question)." This is false. Statements contain C[–Q], questions contain C[+Q] at D-structure, Move cannot change these features, therefore it cannot transform a statement into a question.

p.120: Inversion should be defined as "Move T to C[+Q]"

p.121, two bullets: This wrongly implies that these are the only two positions from which WH-Movement can originate, which would make #5 of Practice 5.9 on the next page impossible.

p.123: "Nonmodal auxiliaries… *Mary is happy*, or *John has a cat*"—neither of these examples contains an auxiliary: the first contains a copula, the second contains main verb (possessive) *have*.
The next sentence is false: auxiliaries DO take (only) VP complements, by definition; it's the copula and the possessive *have* that take NP, AP, or PP complements.
The statements about inversion immediately below are misleading because they do not apply to possessive *have* ("nonmodal auxiliaries can be inverted," "Nonmodal auxiliaries…must be moved from V to T"), only to true auxiliaries and the copula.

The second bullet is independently misleading: "Before moving from T to C, they must first be moved from V to T" implies that V to T happens only when T to C will subsequently happen, which is false. (For the same reason, the table on the bottom of p.124 is incomplete: it does not tell students how to diagnose Verb Raising in the absence of Inversion.)

p.126: "The modifier phrase is the sister of X' (not of the head)." This is directly contradicted on p.127, where the relative clause **is** the sister of the head N.

p.127, below trees: "subject of the sentence" → "subject of the clause"

p.127: "The presence of +Q in C triggers *Wh* Movement during the formation of *wh* questions." That cannot work: the very same +Q is present in Yes/No questions, where there is no *Wh*-Movement.

p.128: Both S-structures are incorrect: *was/are* should have moved to T.

p.141: "A noun phrase c-commands another noun phrase if it is found in the following structure." Given the accompanying figure, this is a misleading statement: there are lots of other structures in which it is also true that NP_a c-commands NP_b (with more nodes intervening between A and NP_b). None of the trees illustrating c-command in the text look like this tree.

p.141, Principles A and B: The sentences beginning with "Essentially" are false in both cases since they omit reference to being in the same TP. Why follow a precise statement with an imprecise statement?

p.199: References to Practice 3.7 are actually for Practice 3.8.

p.199, Practice 3.11 #2: The correct title is *Phonological Studies in Four Languages of Maluku*

p.210, Practice 2.17: Why is 18 the only word where [o] isn't an alternative to [ɔ]?

p.210, Practice 2.18: #2 violates the statement (p.28) that syllabic liquids must be preceded by a consonant; #10 should be [kɹow]; #11 should be [kʰawntɹ̩].

p.210, Practice 2.19: #12 violates the edit that [ɚ] is restricted to stressed syllables or monosyllabic words.

p.210, Practice 2.20: #7 could also be *suite*

p.210, Practice 2.22: #1 should be [ˈskɔɹnd];
#2 should be [dɪˈskʌvɹ̩];
in #5 the first syllable should have secondary stress;
in #7 first version probably should be [ˈdɪkˌtʰejt]
in #8 the final syllable should have secondary stress: [ˈɑkjəˌpʰajd]
in #10 the final syllable should have secondary stress: [ajˈdɑləˌtɹi]

p.211, Review Exercise 5, #5: the environment for flapping (intervocalic) is not met in [mɛɽ]
#22: initial [p] should be aspirated

p.212, Practice 3.1, #3: Answer should be "neither", for the same reason as #7.

9

p.212, Practice 3.1, #4: It is unclear why this doesn't count as a near minimal pair given the definition on p.40: [s] and [ʃ] both occur word-initially followed by [i], so the segments ARE in "nearly identical environments"; apparently the definition should be sensitive to the fact that outside the immediate environment, four segments differ between the words.

p.213, Practice 3.5, #2: "[ð] occurs after a vowel" is not verifiable: there are no examples showing which allophone occurs word-finally following a vowel.

p.213, Practice 3.5, #4: 4 & 10 are not a near-minimal pair: in one the stop is word-initial, in the other it is intervocalic.

p.215, Practice 3.9: The question asks for phonemic representations, which is what the slashes should indicate, but these cannot be such, because syllabic liquids and nasals are included and they are not phonemes of English. Likewise, [ɚ] has never been listed as a phoneme of English (although it probably should be);
                    #8 should be /tɹaj.ǽŋ.gəl/

p.215, Practice 3.10, #1: in *publish*, [b] should be in the second onset, not the first coda;
                    answers for (a) and (b) are swapped;
                    the question also asked for the orthographies (*publish, trombone, sprightly*), which are missing.

p.216, #3: the [r] in a) and [n] in b) should bear the syllabic diacritic.

p.216, #4: in (d) the [m] should be in the onset: although this violates sonority (as does the [mb] onset shown in (c)), the question states that nasal+C+glide is a possible <u>onset</u> in this language.

p.216, #5: (b) should contain [ɒ] in place of [ɑ]

p.217, Practice 3.12, #3: (a) should be "glides and glottals"

p.217, Practice 3.12, #4. (a) could also be [ʤ] [–DR]; (b) could also be [b] [+son] or [w] [+cons]; (c) could also be [n] [–nasal]; (d) could also be [æ] [–low]

p.219, Practice 3.13, #1 (a): [–delayed release] must be added to the target matrix to exclude affricates.

p.220, Practice 3.13, #2 b) "voiceless fricatives" is inaccurate since [h] is not included; need to add [+consonantal] or "non-glottal".

p.221: In the derivations (1 and 2e), the URs should be in slashes and the PRs in brackets, instead of "#"s;
    In (2a–b), the environment [+contin] predicts that frication occurs following laterals, fricatives and glides; while the data contain no relevant examples, this is incorrect.
    (2c) is missing the slash in the rule (after the Ø);
    (2e) fails to note that frication crucially precedes [ð]-deletion, otherwise there would be nothing for the latter to delete.

p.222, #5: 2 & 14 are not a near-minimal pair: in the former the target is intervocalic while in the latter it is word-final; 2/5 & 15 are more plausible near-minimal pairs since the target is always intervocalic

p.224, Practice 4.5 (1d): We cannot tell whether *-able* here is Class I or Class II.

p.226, Practice 4.6 #2b: *presidential election* does not have the stress expected of an A-N compound, these appear to be separate words

p.226, Practice 4.6 #2c: *under* has not been identified as a prefix in the textbook, and there is little reason not to treat *undertake* as a compound, given that treatment of *oversight* on the previous page

p.226, Practice 4.8 #10: *-i-* should be *-i* (suffix, not infix)

p.227, Practice 4.10 #8: this *-er* is derivational, not inflectional, since it changes category

p.228, #28: This use of *de-* is not the one listed in the textbook (which combines with V bases)

p.230, Practice 4.12, Problem 1: #9 should be **zero** derivation/conversion.

p.232, Practice 4.14, #3: The glottal plural suffix (answer to (b)) should be kept separate from the subject markers in a) 4–9; the answer to a) 9 should thus be the same as a) 5, and there is every reason to analyze it as a prefix, i.e. *Ø-*.

p.233, Review Exercise #3, (a): #7 is a root, so should not contain a hyphen

p.234, #4: the preceding hyphens should be deleted from 'is/are', 'not', 'like', 'come from', and the second 'not';
The statement in (e) does not make sense: if [m] is the result of place assimilation then there is just one negative morpheme with two allomorphs—all the instances of [n] negation precede "y", presumably a coronal, consistent with this analysis.

p.234, Problem 5, #4.: There must additionally be (suffixal) derivation, since *-ese* is not part of the city's name (the source should be listed as *Peking*)

p.243, #7: Verb Raising should have applied: *are* should have raised to T.

p.245, #12: Verb Raising should have applied: *is* should have raised to T.

p.246, #14: Verb Raising should have applied: *was* should have raised to T.

p.247, #18: Verb Raising should have applied: *are* should have raised to T.

p.255, #5: There should be a V above *has*.

p.256, #6: There should be a V above *was*.

p.256, #8: Verb Raising should have applied: *has* should have raised to T.

p.257, #10: There should be a V above *were*.

p.258, #13 & p.259, #15: Verb Raising should have applied: *was* should have raised to T.

Instructor's Resource Manual

p.19, Problems 3 & 4: [±voice] as a binary-valued feature is not introduced until chapter 3.

p.21, Problem 11: The suggestion of [ʌ] in place of [ə] would violate the edict that [ʌ] does not occur in stressless syllables (e.g., Study Guide p.29).

p.27, Problem 7, (d)/(f): The notation for diphthongs contrasts with the Study Guide (e.g., p.215), where each segment has an association line, such that the nucleus branches.
    (e): the coda [pθ] violates the sonority requirement (two obstruents), so [θ] cannot be in the coda.

p.28, Problem 8, iii): the C∅ in the environment serves absolutely no function.

p.31, Problem 13 ii): While the data also support a more general laxing rule via the distribution of [o] vs. [ɔ], the rule would also apply to [a] in the word [grimas], and it is not clear what vowel would result. Perhaps the rule should be restricted to [–low] vowels.

p.32, Problem 15, c): missing slash preceding underscore

p.38, Problem 17, f): I see no argument against treating the *-s* of *has* as 3sg present inflection.

p.76, #7 d) the change from [ɛ:] to [e:] is attributed to the GEVS, but according to p.310 in the text, [ɛ:] became [i:], not [e:], in the GEVS. (In fact [e:] represents an intermediate stage in the eventual shift to [i:], but students have no way of knowing that.)