

Anderson 1984, ch. 10¹ study questions (pp. 137-151, 160-165 only)!

due Oct. 27

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 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_ɪ] 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_i]. Lightner’s (1968) “minor rules” (using an idea from Lakoff 1965, apparently) are require their targets to be [+RULE_i] 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+lq/ → [qimugte+lq]; /qimugte+lq+a/ → [qimugte+lra]

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.

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

3. What are the “natural” orders for Anderson, and how are natural and unnatural orders treated differently by the grammar?
4. What’s the difference, for Anderson, between absolute and contingent ordering restrictions?
5. Give successful derivations for *atema* and *tanegurramta* (p. 164) under Anderson’s proposed grammar.