Anderson 1984, ch. 10 study questions (pp. 137-151, 159-165 only!)

Notes

**pp. 138-139:** The definition of “linear order” given here is confusing. Because \((x_i R x_j)\) 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 [?] 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 \([x]\) ([x̌] 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 [–RULEi]. Lightner’s (1968) “minor rules” (using an idea from Lakoff 1965, apparently) require their targets to be [+RULEi] 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+łq/ → [qimugte+leq]; /qimugte+łq+a/ → [qimugte+łr+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.

3. Give successful derivations for _atema_ and _tanegurramta_ (p. 164) under Anderson’s proposed grammar.