## Anderson 1984, ch. 10<sup>1</sup> study questions (pp. 137-151, 159-165 only!)

## **Notes**

- **pp. 138-139**: The definition of "linear order" given here is confusing. Because  $(x_i R x_i)$  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 [?] 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 $^{j}$ ] 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/ $\rightarrow$  [aseveq+a/ $\rightarrow$  [asever+a] (why does the /q/ $\rightarrow$ [r] rule of fn. 13 apply?) /qayaq/ $\rightarrow$  [qayaq]; /qayaq=pik/ $\rightarrow$  [qaya=pik]; /qayaq=pik+a/ $\rightarrow$  [qaya=pig+a] /atq/ $\rightarrow$  [ateq]; /atq+a/ $\rightarrow$  [att+a] /qimugte/ $\rightarrow$  [qimugte]; /qimugte+ $\rightarrow$  [qimugte+ $\rightarrow$  [qimugte+ $\rightarrow$  [qimugte+ $\rightarrow$ ]; /qimugte+ $\rightarrow$ ]; /qimugte+ $\rightarrow$ ] [qimugte+ $\rightarrow$ ] [qimugte
- **p. 163**: tanegurraanka: q-deletion counterbleeds epenthesis!

## **Questions**

1. Go to the CCLE page and take the online quiz till you get 100%.

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

2.	Give <u>failed</u> derivations for Icelandic to show why neither syncope always preceding umlaut nor the reverse works.
2	
3.	Give successful derivations for atema and tanegurramta (p. 164) under Anderson's proposed grammar.