McCarthy 1986\textsuperscript{1} study questions
To be turned in Tuesday, Nov. 15 in class

Notes
This is a long and detailed article. Focus your energy on the first 4 sections (up through p. 245).

If you’re feeling confused by the OCP, the beginning of this paper is a nice summary.

p. 207 The ‘+’ after a tone means that there could be a bunch of syllables in a row with that tone.

p. 207 autosegmental spreading (in case you’re reading this before we talk about autosegmentalism in class) of a tone is when a tone becomes associated with more than one syllable—the tone behaves like an independent entity, not like a feature of a vowel.

p. 210 A binyan (plural binyanim) is a morphological pattern like Hebrew’s hitCaCeC, which forms reflexives or reciprocals; the Cs are filled in by the consonants of the verb root.

p. 210 tautomorphemic = belonging to the same morpheme

p. 211 There is some new notation in (6): Normally a schema with angled brackets abbreviates a pair of rules, one that includes all the material in the brackets and one that doesn’t include any of that material. But McCarthy is using the ‘condition’ statement to say something more complicated: if there is a V at the left edge of the environment, then no 3 in the result. (6) abbreviates the following rules (check for yourself how it works in (5)):

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \ C V C V \rightarrow 1 \ 2 \ 4 \ 5 \\
1 & \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
C & \ V C V \rightarrow 3 \ 2 \ 4 \ 5 \\
2 & \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 
\end{align*}
\]

If you’re still confused by transformational notation, see pp. 369-377 in K&K.

p. 215 Here the condition of (18) means that if the first V is high, the rule applies only if the second V is also high. But if the first V is nonhigh, then the height of the second V doesn’t matter. I don’t know why there is [±back] for 2.

p. 218 Distinctive quantity = a contrast between long and short vowels or between long and short consonants.

p. 233 cyclicity of \textit{a-Umlaut}: \textit{a-Umlaut} applies to the unsuffixed form, giving päre, then a suffix is added and you get päréga, with the first vowel still umlauted even though it is no longer stressed (remind you of anything?)

\textsuperscript{1} McCarthy, John (1986). OCP effects: gemination and anti-gemination. \textit{Linguistic Inquiry} 17: 207-263.
Why should “any rule that is cyclic [...] be expected to apply before Tier Conflation”? Because Tier Conflation is something that happens late in the morphological derivation (see p. 228), whereas the cyclic rule has to happen at various points during that derivation.

p. 240 Here again is the idea that different rules apply at different levels of derivation.

p. 240 *two-sided open syllable* = syllable whose vowel is in the environment VC__CV

p. 242 The dots under the consonants here mean ‘pharyngealized’ (IPA C\(^5\)).

p. 242 You might not find this figurative sense of *modulo* in the dictionary but you see it a lot in linguistics. In arithmetic, you can say “\(x = y \pmod{n}\)” if dividing \(x\) or \(y\) by \(n\) yields the same remainder. For example, \(51 = 71 \pmod{10}\) (remainder is 1 when you divide either 51 or 71 by 10). You could also say “51 and 71 are congruent modulo 10”, or that 51 mod 10 = 71 mod 10 = 1.

Outside of math, when someone says that two cases are equivalent modulo something, they mean that the cases are equivalent if you factor out that something, just like 51 and 71 are equivalent if you get rid of the multiples of 10 that they contain.

You could paraphrase McCarthy’s sentence as “it further follows that OCP effects on vowel syncope will occur regardless of differences in the values of these two features”.

The capital Ts in (73) represent all the features of a coronal stop except for [voice] and [CP], which are put into a different tier.

p. 245 All morphological information is erased before postlexical rules apply; therefore, postlexical rules can’t be sensitive to morphology.

p. 246 *rule of allomorphy* = rule that selects among lexically listed allomorphs of a morpheme (i.e., what K&K were arguing against for Russian final devoicing). Such rules would apply very early in the derivation, before the true phonological rules.

p. 249 *DNA* = “does not apply”

**Questions**

1. Think back to Myers 1991. If the OCP were expressed a persistent rule instead of a filter that can block rule application, would the Afar analysis work? (Explain why or why not.)
2. **Briefly** explain what tier conflation is supposed to buy us.