Errata and comments

O'Grady et al., *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*
7th US Edition Text Book (978-1-319-03977-6),
Study Guide (978-1-319-04089-5), and
Instructor's Resource Manual (978-1-319-07732-7)

Carson T. Schütze
UCLA

Updated September 2024

Textbook

Inside back cover: [r] in transcription for *rouge* should be [ɹ];
According to p.36, *bird* should be transcribed [bɚd], not with syllabic [ɹ], and likewise for *early, hurt, stir, purr*; (cf. Table 2.16), but there is no entry on the back cover for [ɚ];
It seems odd to list "now" under [w] but rhyming "plow, bough" under [aw];
[ʔ] is used in transcription of *m-m* under syllabic m, but not listed as a consonant symbol

Chapter 2

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

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;
I am dubious of the implicit claim that nasals cannot be syllabic following a sonorant, e.g., *fallen, barren*;
"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 *perceive* to this list, making it unclear what the generalization is supposed to be and contradicting the textbook's "[ɹ̩] for syllabic *r* in unstressed syllables"; in any case "words like…" is of no help to students without some characterization. Moreover, employing both of these symbols violates the "one sound, one symbol" principle of the IPA

p.40: It would be useful if Table 2.13 did present (all) "the simple vowels and diphthongs of American English", as the text claims, complete with [ə] (and perhaps [ɚ]), rather than "**some**" of these vowels, as the Table header indicates

p.42, Figure 2.11 & Table 2.15: [ɚ] is missing, perhaps because it appears under "syllabic liquids" in Table 2.16 (see below). Ditto Table 2.17 on p.44.

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

p.44: It seems odd to list [ɚ] (as a syllabic liquid) in the consonant chart (Table 2.16) rather than the vowel charts, since it is a vowel symbol

p.53: The suggestion that there is nasal place assimilation in *An̲chorage* 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] in both columns;
tenth should begin with aspirated [t] in both columns

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

p.61: the text suggests that an "unstressed vowel" can be pronounced as [ʌ] as an alternative to [ə], but everywhere else the (only) distinction between these vowels is identified as [±stress]; the facts in question would be better described by saying that some speakers put (secondary) stress on the final vowel in e.g. *Canada*

p.62, last bullet: "[ɪ] and [ɛ] are lowered"—to what?
Also, the merger of [ɑ] and [ɔ] described here for Southern California repeats what was said at the bottom of p.61–top of p.62 for younger speakers

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

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, there is no process defined in section 9 that could turn non-syllabic *l* into syllabic *l*, as required in f) and k), and likewise for *r* in i);
i): the syllabic *r* is not in the environment specified on p.37 (i.e. at the end of a word)
k:) *Pam* should be transcribed with aspirated [p] in both columns, since aspiration is marked elsewhere (e.g., in f) and i));
Also, 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 student supposed to tell?

Chapter 3

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, so the text description in terms of "free variation" is too broad. (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.

p.85: Table 3.15 claims to contain **English** onsets, but /sɹ/ is not attested in native English words; By contrast, /ʃɹ/ is attested (e.g. *shred*) but does not appear in the chart.

p.86: In referring to "such complex syllables" just above the two bullet points, it is unclear whether reference is being made just to syllables that violate Binarity or also to those that violate the Sonority Requirement. In English, there are codas that violate the latter but not the former. The two bullet points do not apply to them. For example, the "extra" (non-sonority-conforming) consonant need not be a coronal and need not represent a separate morpheme (cf. *gasp, flask*). It therefore seems wrong to suggest, in the paragraph below the bullets, that sonority violations be "explained" with the same mechanism as binarity violations, namely the "appendix" position, since they are not subject to the same restrictions;

The appendix analysis fails to explain the property in the first bullet, viz. that (Binarity) violations are restricted to word edges. But that is just as well, since the claim is empirically false: *extreme* [ɛk.stɹim];

The claim that the extra coda consonant is always voiceless is also false: *folds* [fowldz];

The appendix analysis does not address violations of the sonority requirement, which was stated in terms of rising "before the nucleus" and decline "after the nucleus", not in terms of "within an onset/coda."

The whole discussion comes across as circular: (7) and (8) claim that their restrictions hold only of "basic syllables", for which no definition is provided, so apparent counterexamples can be evaded simply by labeling them as "nonbasic syllables", about which no sonority or binarity restriction has been asserted;

The appendix analysis also makes the wrong prediction for Pig Latin as defined in the grey box on p.82, which states that the Onset gets postposed: Figure 3.13 would lead one to expect the Pig Latin of [stɹim] to be *[simtɹ̥ej].

pp.87–88, Tables 3.16 and 3.18: These transcriptions should be in [brackets], not /slashes/, since they are not phonemic: syllabic sonorants (other than [ɹ]) are not English phonemes, [ej] is phonemically /e/, etc. (At the same time, not **all** phonetic details have been included, a fact that was admittedly warned about earlier, but is confusing to students.) See also next point.

p.87, 9): This stress rule interacts insidiously with the inconsistent use of syllabic sonorants: a word-final syllable transcribed as [fʊl] counts as heavy, but the same syllable transcribed as [fl̩] counts as light. On p.64, #16, these are described as 'careful' vs. 'rapid' pronunciations for the same word, implying that (if this had been a verb) stress would shift as a function of which pronunciation was chosen.

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) or Figure 3.17

(p.103), nor in the text on p.105. Thus, *plan* should be [pl̥æn]; *try* should be [tɹ̥aj]; *clean* should be [kl̥in];
All words should be marked for primary stress

p.91, 13): It is unclear as to whether lengthening requires the voiced obstruent to be immediately adjacent to the vowel, e.g., are there claimed to be length contrasts in *soared* vs. *sort*, *culled* vs. *cult*, *card* vs. *cart*, etc.? See also discussion of rule 17) below.

p.92, Figure 3.14: [ʔ] is missing from the top left quadrant, [h] is missing from the bottom left quadrant

p.92, Table 3.23: Under *Obstruents*, add [h] and [ʔ];
under *Stops/Affricates*, add [ʔ];
under *Fricatives*, add [h];
under *Voiceless obstruents*, add [h] and [ʔ];
under Voiceless stops/affricates, add [ʔ];
under *Voiceless fricatives*, add [h], and the feature matrix should be [–sonorant]
[+continuant]
[–voice]

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 or 3.30 for [ɾ] or [ɚ].

p.102, under §4.1: "we apply phonological rules to the underlying representation" is blatantly false, as Figure 3.17 crucially shows: the application of liquid devoicing requires the underlying schwa to have been deleted. Rather, a rule applies to the output of the preceding rule(s).

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 the former is correct: lengthening still applies when there are **two** following obstruents before the syllable boundary, e.g., *seeds* [siːdz]. (As discussed above, there are no data regarding whether a coda sequence of Liquid+Voiced Obstruent also triggers the rule.)

p.104, 2 lines above 19): standard pronunciation of *on* is [ɑ̃n]

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

p.105, rule 22): This rule would generate [tl̥idow] for *Toledo* and [dlajt] for *delight*, which are phonotactically impossible—it must be constrained not to create illegal onsets.

p.109, flowchart: Checking for near-minimal pairs should be incorporated.

p.110, 2nd paragraph: transcriptions of *rating/raiding* should contain [ɹ] in place of [r]

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.
Free variation should also arguably be incorporated into the decision chart on p.109: e.g., part of the "Recheck your work" step could be to check whether cases of overlapping distribution involve variant pronunciations of the same word (i.e., ones with the same gloss).

p.110, distribution diagrams for /t/ vs. /p/: it is unfortunate that these provide different environments for aspiration (including vs. excluding word-initial position)

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

p.112, #4, instructions: it would be useful to know that the unfamiliar symbol is a bilabial

p.114, # 8: asked and answered in the Study Guide (Practice 3.3 #2).

p.115, # 9: [ɨ] is central, not mid.

p.116, #11: (a), (b), (e), (j) are asked and answered in the Study Guide (Practice 3.12).

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

p.118, #17: reference of "these/the glides" is unclear; replace with "word-initial glides".

Chapter 4

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 (Table 4.6) but *próduct* is a noun (presumably *productive* is *prodúce+ive* with stem allomorphy but no stress shift); a better example would be *álternàte~altérnat-ive*

p.134, Figure 4.9: I question whether *over-ripe* contains the preposition *over*, as opposed to the prefix *over-*: it seems to lack any spatial meaning, instead expressing 'excessively'; compare *overcoat, overhang*

p.135, Figure 4.10: I do not 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*, and meaning can be derived by treating *digital* as a regular adjective

p.136: I do not think *craftsman* is (synchronically) a compound, since the second half is not pronounced [mæn] (like the word *man*) but rather [mən], cf. *milkm*[æ]*n*

p.143, Table 4.18: The German example should be changed: since the infinitive is *sein*, *sind* is arguably not suppletive (if it involves internal change), but *ist* definitely 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 of the original word—cf. *por.**n**o.gra.phy*, and ***b**log*, which contains the coda of the first syllable). More accurate would be "…by reducing the number of syllables, but may incorporate sounds from originally adjacent syllables."

p.147: *workaholic* is problematic as either a compound or a blend: although obviously related to *alcoholic*, its meaning does not involve the meaning of *alcohol*; rather, it seems that *alcohol-ic* has been reanalyzed as *alc-oholic* 'booze-addicted', only the second piece of which contributes to *work-aholic*.

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, #6: Zapotec is a language <u>family</u> containing many mutually unintelligible languages.

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

p.159, #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.165: I don't think the definition of *terminal wanderlust* on the right corresponds to a top-level compound structure: on that reading the most prominent stress is on *wander*; this contrasts with the definition on the left, which invokes the noun *terminal*, which receives most prominent stress

Chapter 5

p.173, Table 5.4: Students find it confusing that the first two examples of Degree words (*very* and *quite*) generally 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.174: The abbreviatory conventions make it impossible to define Spec and Comp hierarchically: both can now be sister of X, daughter of XP.

p.175, last paragraph: If Merge is supposed to follow the X-bar Schema, it could not combine a determiner with an N, only with an N-bar; the fact that this appears to be happening in tree *a*) is an unfortunate artefact of the abbreviatory convention noted in the previous point.

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. However, this will require further explanation on p.186: since there is no [+Q] feature in the embedded C, one would not have expected Inversion to apply anyway. Rather than say on p.185 that English has no separate morpheme that expresses [+Q], it should be stated that *whether* is such a morpheme. It remains problematic that p.185 stated "when there is no such morpheme, the feature ([+Q]) must attract another element to its position," from which one is led to infer that when there is such a morpheme, no other element is attracted, so again, *whether* is expected to block Inversion.

p.186, 24): The claim that in most dialects 24) is interpreted as an "indirect question" is obscure since that term is not defined. In fact the embedded clause in 24) would typically be interpreted as a ***quotation***; by contrast, an embedded interrogative interpretation is more likely in an example like *Mary wondered should she leave*, where one is likely to interpret *she* as *Mary*. Given that interpretation, the quotation would have been *Mary wondered should I leave?*

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.192, 32): The parameter should be stated in terms of *wh*-phrases, not *wh*-words, given the rule in 28).

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

p.194, below Fig. 5.23: "In English only ^**modal**^ auxiliary verbs occur in the T position"—this distinction was drawn on p.178;

"Like English, French can form a question by moving an auxiliary leftward" [Ex. (37) 'Have you tried?']: This is not predicted based on anything said so far: *have* is a **nonmodal** auxiliary, therefore does NOT occur in T, therefore cannot undergo Inversion. Also, the qualification "(when the subject is a pronoun)" applies only to French, so it is confusing that that the sentence begins "Like English,…"

p.195, below heading "Verb Raising in English": "This neatly accounts for the facts that we have considered so far"—No, it does not: The fact seen in 37) that English allows *Have you tried?* would not follow from English having no Verb Raising, given that, as stressed in §1.3, non-modal auxiliaries are not T heads. These problems are resolved on pp. 196–7.

p.198: (43), Fig 5.27 b: Up to this point there were no such things as Adverb Phrases, so their introduction should be acknowledged;

Also up to this point, Deg (e.g. *very*) could be the specifier only of A or P (cf. Table 5.4), so the new option of being specifier of Adv should be acknowledged;

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 CPs as complements (sister of X'). Also, the Fig 5.29 caption should say "the *wh* phrase moves", not "the *wh* word moves."

p.201: "the PP is attached to the lower VP, to the right of the verb's NP complement": Since no tree illustrates this, it remains unclear exactly where the *by*-phrase attaches (sister to V, adjoined to V', daughter of VP?)

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

pp.207–8: Students wonder why P plus its NP complement immediately formed a PP, whereas N plus its complement only formed an N'; to make these choices one would have had to "look ahead" to see that NP was going to contain a Spec while PP was not.

p.209: Although the idea that every TP is embedded in a CP, with declaratives headed by C[-Q], this has been ignored in several examples until it re-appears in Figure 5.45. Only at the bottom of p.210 is it acknowledged that the CP layer "is sometimes not represented for reasons of space."

p.210, box: “Every T has an NP specifier” is contradicted by Figures 5.36 and 5.37, and even for English does not hold at D-structure given the analysis of Passive.

Chapter 6

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

pp. 244–5: The discussion of Principle B should include an explanation of how the option to interpret *her* as someone not mentioned in the sentence in 37a) is consistent with it (i.e., that a pronominal does not require an (intrasentential) antecedent at all).

p.259, Trees (1A) & (1B): do not match the way trees were drawn in the syntax chapter. E.g., the category for determiners is Det, not A (and is missing in (1B)); NP' should be N'; *old* should have a category label

p.260, Tree (2A): *sawed-off* should have a category label;
Tree (3B): XP-adjunction has not been introduced

Chapter 8

p.316, 4): V, S and O are misaligned with the words below, they need to shift rightward one word

Chapter 10

p.403: Fig 10.5 does not illustrate Verb Raising: the verb has not raised

p.423, # 8: The intended answer re: *He is frequently late* is apparently that *be* undergoes Verb Raising in English. However, that is not needed to explain this word order: *frequently late* could be an AP containing an adverb modifier/specifier, which *be* takes as its complement. Moreover, the reference to Chapter 5 is not helpful, since there the claim is that **auxiliaries** undergo Verb Raising in English, but this use of *be* is **copular**. (Auxiliaries are defined in chapter 5 as verbs that take **VP** complements.) While it is true that copular *be* undergoes Verb Raising, that is neither stated nor illustrated in Chapter 5 and cannot be shown using adverb placement; one must use negation or Inversion.

Chapter 13

p.492, Figure 13.4: It is unfortunate that this map does not contain the labels of several regions referred to in the preceding paragraphs, e.g. Midwest, Northeast, North Midland. Also, some regions on this map are much larger than their namesakes in Figure 13.3.

p.496, Figure 13.6: The change involving [ɔ] (3) is not described in the text.

p.496, Figure 13.7: The merger of [ɑ] and [ɔ] described in the text is not shown.

Study Guide[1]

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 inside back cover

Chapter 2

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] before the stop should provide 'more time' to start vocal cord vibration after 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…" is narrower than the textbook (p.37) edict that it will be 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 Textbook statements about its distribution noted under p.21 above, since there it is in an unstressed syllable in a polysyllabic word. Ditto the appearance of [ɚ] in the title of Practice 2.15 on p.29, and other transcriptions throughout.

p.29: The distribution of aspiration on voiceless stops contradicts the textbook (p.90) statement that they also occur in unstressed word-initial syllables.

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

[1] Cases where the Study Guide echoes problematic material from the Textbook have not been systematically noted.

p.36, Problem 4: j): *transcription* should contain [ɹ] in place of [r];
m): *articulatory* should be [ɑ͡ɹtʰɪkjələt͡ʰɔɹi];
there are several violations of the environments stated on p.28 for syllabic consonants: those in c), k), l) are not at the end of a word

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

Chapter 3

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 pair can (more) safely differ.

p.43, #1: The distribution chart contradicts the text at the bottom of p.42 with regard to which allophone occurs at the beginning of a word-initial stressless syllable: p. 42 says it is [p] but in the distribution chart *police* is listed under [pʰ].

p.43, #1b) and p.44 #2b): The instruction "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.

p.44, #2a): the environment "at the beginning of a word" would only be distinguishable from the environment "in the onset of stressed syllable" in cases where word-initial /l/ introduces an unstressed syllable, but there are no such words among the data on p.43

p.45, #3 and chart near bottom of page: The Japanese transcriptions include the symbol [ɽ] without explanation, which doesn't even appear in the IPA chart on p.57 of the text (cf. note on text p.75)

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; (see Text note re: p.74);
Logically, the same would apply to the English data if we knew nothing else about the language: e.g., vowel length might be contrastive in other environments but neutralized in open syllables (or word-finally)

p.47, Flowchart: See Textbook notes (pp. 109–10).

p.48, #3: Although not relevant to the problem, the following have vowel length mistranscribed: 1. [naχ] → [na:χ], 2. [çemi] → [çemiː]

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 (2b) 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, #3, 3. 'to run away' should be [gʊʤe], not [gʊddʒe];
Hausa does not have an [a]/[ɑ] contrast (standard transcription uses [a]), so probably only one of those symbols should be appearing;
In line 1 the first vowel should be long in both columns

p.56, "Complex Syllables": The convention of attaching an "appendix" directly to the syllable node is described in the text as something that "some linguists" do, but is here presented as if it is the only allowable way to draw syllables. Unfortunately, the Study Guide's own answers to problems are inconsistent in this regard (see below), making it challenging for students to master either system.

p.58, #3: The data as presented are incompatible with the prose description of syllable types. The /r/ in a) and the /n/ in b should be marked with the syllabic diacritic, as per the solutions, where these are nuclei.

p.58, #4: The form in c) requires that a glide be a permissible onset, contra the prose description.

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

p.61, 1st bullet: "Natural classes…sound system" is problematic. It confounds the definition (in terms of shared features) with the empirical hypothesis (patterning together). It also fails to make clear that a set of sounds that share feature values is not a natural class if it does not include **all** sounds that share those feature values (e.g., in English, {[m],[ŋ]} is not a natural class).

p.61, 2nd bullet: "one property…the only feature" wrongly implies that sounds do not contrast if they differ by more than one distinctive feature.

p.63, bottom: The characterization of allophones ("rule", "predictable") does not apply in cases of free variation.

p.64, 2nd bullet: We never want students to write rules this way (i.e., using sounds where features could be used).
4th bullet: The rule does not explicitly say what's in quotes; it would only if written in terms of features.

p.65, Practice 3.14, #1: Since this rule will change one phoneme into another phoneme, it counterexemplifies the claim on p.64 (3rd bullet) that rules "link the phonemic and phonetic levels"

p.66, Derivations: Rules: "only occurs when the structural description…is found in the underlying representation": this is incorrect (cf. note on textbook p.102)—what matters is whether the description is met *at the point in the derivation when the rule attempts to apply*.

p.66, last paragraph: "Recall…syllable" is inaccurate: the devoicing rule applies only after a voiceless stop at the beginning of a stressed syllable (and perhaps word-initially)

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, [y] should be [j] (not relevant to the solution).

p.68, #2: The use of [r] in the transcriptions is inaccurate: except for word 3, they are taps, not trills.

p.71, #7a), 2nd bullet: Should state that liquid+obstruent is also a possible coda, otherwise the underlying representation to which the rule is meant to apply (with coda /ls/ in word 2) will not be legal.

7c): "economical" has not been defined and will be obscure to many students.

Chapter 4

pp.77–79: morpheme boundaries (denoted by spaces) are absent from many of the word trees

p.79, *unlockable*: It would be helpful to state the meanings corresponding to the two structures ('able to be unlocked' vs. 'not able to be locked'), and observe that *un-* has different meanings when attaching to V vs. A ('reverse/undo' vs. 'not'), which means the ambiguity is not purely structural but partly lexical.

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 textbook (which requires the pieces not to be morphemes).

p.93, Practice 4.12, #3, word 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.

word 11: the adjective should be *kriminal*

p.95, Practice 4.14, #1: some glosses are problematic. E.g., 'to be learned or scholarly' is not equivalent to 'to do science'; 'abstract noun' is not a meaning, should be 'the property of being [Adjective]'.

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; "prefixes, suffixes, and affixes" doesn't make sense: the third should probably be "infixes"; "root words" should probably just be "roots," given that roots can be bound.

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

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

p.104, #6a: Characterizing the 2PL morpheme as 'you all' is not helpful since this never appears in the word glosses.

Chapter 5

p.109, 2nd paragraph: "When these are used…" wrongly suggests that only pronouns and proper names can form possessive noun phrases, which is counterexemplified by c. below; It seems misleading to characterize *Bob's* or *boy's* as simply a "head noun", as if *'s* were invisible.

p.110, above first REMINDER box: "the car" should be italicized.

p.112, #3: The instructions should acknowledge that there is no substitution test available for some of the phrases (the APs).

p.113, X-bar schema: "specifier" and "complement" should be parenthesized, "head" should not.

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." [The **structures** are by definition not the same, though the **string** might not have changed.]

p.120: "Move transforms an existing structure (e.g., a statement) into another type of structure (e.g., a question)." This is false. Questions but not statements contain C[+Q] at D-structure, and 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, 2nd paragraph: "*Wh* Movement is normally preceded by Inversion" is false: e.g., there is no Inversion in relative clauses (or embedded questions, not covered), and it is stipulated (in the Textbook) not to occur in matrix subject questions, as in the bottom right box on this page.

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 is the copula and the possessive *have* that take NP, AP, or PP complements;

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.)

The example immediately above the boxed trees is misleading in that it illustrates not only Verb Raising but also Inversion, and fails to note that only auxiliary/copular V can move to T (as is partially acknowledged on p.124).

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, bullet 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.

Chapter 6

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 textbook 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?

Chapter 8

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

p.199, Practice 3.11 #2: The correct title is *Phonological Studies <u>in</u> Four Languages of Mal<u>u</u>ku*

Answer Key

p.209, Practice 2.15 #13: violates the requirement that a syllabic nasal be preceded by an obstruent (cf. p.28)

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

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 [k^{h}awnt̩]

p.210, Practice 2.19: #12 violates the edict 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 [dɪˈskʌvɻ];
in #5 the first syllable should have secondary stress;
#7 first version probably should be [ˈdɪkˌt^{h}ejt];
in #8 the final syllable should have secondary stress: [ˈɑkjəˌp^{h}ajd]
in #10 the final syllable should have secondary stress: [ajˈdɑləˌtɪi]

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

p.212, Practice 3.1, #3: Answer should be "neither", for the same reason as #7.
#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.
#4: 4 & 10 are not a near-minimal pair: in one the stop is word-initial, in the other it is intervocalic.

p.213, Practice 3.6, #3: One can provide more precise evidence: 4 & 5 constitute a near-minimal pair (both sounds occur in the environment [a] C u __ #).

[+son]
[–nas]

1 & 6 constitute a near-minimal pair (both occur in the environment s i __ #).
More generally, both sounds precede and follow all vowels: [i], [a], and [u].

p.214, Practice 3.6, #4: The *elsewhere* allophone [g] should appear on the right in the diagram.

p.215, Practice 3.8, #1b: Should be “back round vowels”, to exclude [a];
#2a: Assuming the correction noted above, /e/ should be added. However, there is no data indicating whether /a/ triggers schwa-insertion, so the generalization is underdetermined.

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; ditto the diphthongization of [ej]. Likewise, [ɚ] has never been listed as a phoneme of English (although it probably should be);
#8 should be /tɹaj.æ̱ŋ.gəl/

pp.215–16, Practice 3.10:
#1: in *publish*, [b] should be in the second onset, not the first coda;
Answers for (a) and (b) are swapped;
#1c) is drawn following the hypothesis that “non-basic” syllables have segments attached directly to the syllable node;
The question also asked for the orthographies (*publish, trombone, sprightly*), which are missing;
#3: As noted above, [r] in (a) and [n] in (b) should be syllabic;
#4c): is drawn ignoring the increasing sonority requirement on onsets, whereas (4d) respects that requirement;
#5b): 2nd vowel should be [ɒ]

pp.217–18, Practice 3.12:
#3: (a) should be “glides and glottals”;
#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];
#5: If the instruction is construed as “state the feature that distinguishes that natural class from the other sounds, then in d) there is no answer for {f, z, ʧ}: [–son] is all they have in common, but {b,d,g} also have that specification; the feature system does not make fricatives and affricates a natural class to the exclusion of stops.

pp.219–20, Practice 3.13, #1(a): [–delayed release] must be added to the target matrix to exclude affricates;
#1 d), e): schwa = V[+reduced];
#1 e): Unless we assume the rule is restricted to English, we cannot assume the phones [p] and [l] exhaust the classes specified. The environment should be specified featurally as / C [LABIAL, –cont, –DR, –vce] __ C [+son, +lat, +vce];
#2b): Since [h] is a fricative, the target should be “voiceless nonglottal/consonantal fricatives” to exclude it.

p.220, Practice 3.14, #1: [–DR] should be added to the target matrix;
#3: Given just the data presented, one could have written the opposite rule, i.e., alveolar affricates become stops before [+back] vowels. The crucial missing information for choosing between the two rules is which allophone occurs word-finally, that is, when there is no vowel to trigger a rule. That must be the elsewhere allophone.

p.221, Practice 3.15:

#1 & #2e): In the derivations the URs should be in slashes and the PRs in square brackets;

#2 a–b): Other feature matrices will work for the target (Spanish has no [ʤ], so [-son, -cont, +vce, COR] would suffice). Note that specifying the preceding sound as just [+cont] will include much more than the prose description '[r] and vowels': it will include all fricatives, liquids ([l] and [ʎ]) and glides. In case those do not trigger the rule ([l] certainly does not), we could expand the matrix to C [+son, +cont, –lat];

#2 c): The rule should be [r] → Ø / ___ σ;

#2 d): The C above the feature matrix is redundant;

#2 e): Should note that frication crucially precedes [ð]-deletion, otherwise there would be nothing for the latter to delete.

p.222, Review exercise #2: Of course one minimal pair only shows that [e] and [ẽ] are contrastive, not that all nasal/oral vowel pairs are. The data are not sufficient to make a strong argument for other vowel pairs.

p.222, Review exercise #3: The evidence would be strengthened by supplying near-minimal pairs illustrating additional environments, e.g., 4 vs. 6.

p.222, Review exercise #5: 2 & 14 are not a near-minimal pair: the immediately following environments differ. But one could strengthen the case by noting additional environments where both occur, e.g., word-finally and intervocalically.

p.223, Practice 4.1, #2: The answer could be 2 if one assumes *memor* is a bound root (cf. *memor-ial, memor-able*) and *-y* a noun-forming suffix.

p.223, Practice 4.2, #9: The answer could be 5 if one assumes *nat* is a bound root (cf. *nat-ive*) combining with *-tion.*

p.224–5, Practice 4.5, #1, c): Another plausible solution: *electr* is a bound root (as in *electr-on*) that combines with the adjectival suffix *-ic*;

#1, (d): We cannot tell whether *-able* here is Class I or Class II (and it is not listed as either in the tables in the Textbook);

#2, word 5: Semantically, *organize* does not seem to contain the root *organ*, therefore *-ize* is not an affix here.

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

#2 c): *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.227–9, Practice 4.10, #8: this *-er* is derivational, not inflectional, since it changes category;
#12: label above *-ing* should be Af, not A;
#15: label above *attract* should be V, not N;
#28: This use of *de-* is not the one listed in the Textbook (which combines with V bases).

p.230, Practice 4.12, #1: word 9 should be conversion/**zero** derivation;
#2: I do not think *outside* is synchronically a compound: it does not seem to contain the meaning of *side*;
#2: I am not sure how *enthused* can be treated as simply a backformation, unless one can motivate all the potential affixes that must be removed to yield the stem *enthus*: *enthus-i-ast-ic*; perhaps Clipping should also be invoked;
#2: Additional forms not listed: *scuba lesson, med student, CAT scan, laser surgery:* compounding; *remote:* conversion (A→N)

p.232, Practice 4.14, #3: A more elegant answer would separate the plural (number) suffix and treat third person as uniformly Ø(-).

p.233, Review Exercise #3, (a): item 7 is a root, so should not contain a hyphen; the affix for 'you' is -[aːn]

p.234, Review Exercise #4: the preceding hyphens should be deleted from 'is/are', 'not' (both instances), 'like', 'come from';
The statement in (e) seems problematic: 'not' is [m]- before labials but is "n-" before "y", which is [j]: that would be a [CORONAL] nasal preceding a [DORSAL]. But this is an artefact of the orthography: "n" is used for both [n] and [ɲ].

p.234, Review Exercise #5, word 4: There must also be (suffixal) derivation, since *-ese* is not part of the city's name; this may obviate the need for eponymy.

p.234, Review Exercise #6 b): More precisely, the 2nd vowel of the stem deletes.

p.240, Practice 5.6, #1, 1.: *panic* arguably takes a PP complement (headed by *over/at/about*).

pp.243–259: Once Verb Raising is introduced for English, it should be shown in the following trees: p.243 #7, p.245 #12, p.246 #14, p.247 #18, p.256 #8 & #13, p.259 #15.

p.247, Practice 5.8, #18: *fun* could also be an A(P).

pp.255–7: The following trees are missing a "V" label above the inverted auxiliary: #5, #6, #10.

p.267, Practice 6.6, #1, a–b): The two statements "*Janice's sister* c-commands *her(self)*" need to be augmented with "and is in the same clause" in order for the conclusions to follow;
d) There are two possible antecedents for *she*: *Janice* and *Janice's sister*; neither is within the same clause, so both are allowed under Principle B. C-command is not relevant, but it is false that *Janice* c-commands *she*.

Instructor's Resource Manual

Chapter 2

p.19, #3 & 4: [±voice] as a binary-valued feature is not introduced until chapter 3; answers should be "voiced" or "voiceless"

p.20, #10: a) should be [ɹtʃ]

p.21, #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);
Since the exercise is focused on aspiration, it is odd that its manifestation as liquid/glide devoicing is not indicated (e.g. *pure, clinical*)

p.21, #12b): Presumably each syllable should be associated with some tone, so *over* should have two links to L.

p.21, #13: e) *anecdote* should have 2ndary stress on last syllable;
o): if this is one word it can have only one primary stress; independently, most people do feel these stresses are not equal and would prefer ˌ*New York* ˈ*Mets*

pp.22–3, #16:
h) As noted under Textbook above (p.65), regressive nasalization of vowels occurs in careful as well as casual speech, so it is odd to treat this as a change, and inconsistent for nasalization not to be marked in even the rapid speech transcriptions of *in my, balloons, see him/them, within, sit down, Pam*;
j) Why is "n" underlined in the second step, where it does not change?
k) Is "affrication" a separate process? If [t] becomes alveopalatal, what outcome other than [tʃ] could there be (in English)? Furthermore, "affrication" is not introduced in the chapter;
f), i), k): "syllabification" is not a process introduced in the chapter

Chapter 3

p.24, #2 i) (f): weird open colon symbols instead of [ː]

p.25, #4: i) The near-minimality would be highlighted if it were noted that all the members of the near-minimal contrasts involve **word-initial** occurrences, as is mentioned further down in the second bullet;
In the second and third bullets it is not obvious why "both front and back" are mentioned, but not high/mid/low or tense/lax: none of these seems a priori more likely to be relevant to breathiness.

p.26, #5: delete two instances of "IPA";
"a continuant…in which air flows through the **vocal tract**": *continuant* is defined as involving uninterrupted airflow through the **mouth/oral cavity** only; if "vocal tract" were correct, nasals would be [+continuant]

p.27, #6 ii): [–voice] in the target is redundant

p.27, #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 (according to one interpretation thereof—see Text comments)

p.28, #8 iii): the CØ in the environment serves no function.

p.28, #9: [–voice] in the target is redundant

p.29, #10 b): ŋ should not be boldfaced

p.31, #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.31, #14: The syllable boundary is redundant

p.31, #15 a): [+sonorant] in the environment is redundant;
c): missing slash preceding underscore

p.32, #17: "any front/back vowel (here, all word-initial)" is misleading: the data contain plenty of noninitial front or back rounded vowels that are not preceded by glides: glide insertion is purely a word-initial process

Chapter 4

p.38, #17: "suppletion and replacement" is redundant: these refer to the same process. Change to "suppletion and internal change" in order to exclude the stem allomorphy in *bitten* (from *bite*: [aj]→[ɪ]);
c): inexpensive would entail the existence of a root *expen* and a suffix *-sive*. It would be best to avoid this example altogether, since the only possible correct answer would seem to be inexpensive, but *expense* is a noun, and *-ive* and *in-* do not attach to nouns;
f): I see no argument against treating the *-s* of *has* as 3sg present inflection (it happens to be accompanied by stem suppletion: *have* → *ha*)

Chapter 5

p.46, #6 e): *will* should not be boldfaced

p.60, #13 c): "suddenly" could also be an AdvP, in which case a recursive V' must be added.

Chapter 6

p.68, #11 a): "only the cars are yellow" is not accurate (nothing precludes some of the motorcycles being yellow): better would be "the cars are yellow, the motorcycles could be any color"

Chapter 8

p.75, #4 ii): the first change should be [+nasal] to make its assimilatory nature transparent

p.75, #5 ii): the feature is [–voice], not [–voiced]

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

Chapter 10

p.84, #8: See discussion under Textbook p.423 above for why the question doesn't make sense. The word orders given here do not unambiguously show Verb Raising: e.g., [*always doing that*] could be the VP complement to auxiliary *be*.

Chapter 11

p.86, #2 a): "constituent morphemes": as opposed to non-constituent morphemes? I think the intention was to identify morphemes that don't form whole words; a more precise answer could suggest that a root/base/stem and its (inflectional) affix have independent status;

c) It would be helpful to explain why this cannot be a phoneme error, i.e., why one must crucially appeal to a feature, viz. because /z/ and /p/ are not part of the target utterance.