

Revisions: On the locality of vowel harmony over multi-tiered autosegmental representations

Eileen Blum

11/8/2018

(sec = section, p. = page, l. = line, ex. = example):

throughout the paper: change “adjacent” to “successive” when referring to features, remove “adjacent” when referring to vowels since vowels are not necessarily adjacent, remove reference to concatenation after it introduces set of possible representations in sec2.2 (ok when adding to this set for Turkish)

sec1: p.1, l.11 reword first sentence to clarify analysis of vh as phonotactic restriction, only surface ARs. **l.16** avoid derivational wording “vowel harmony patterns utilize surface ARs that can reflect either type of assimilation.”

sec1.1: p.3, l.111-119 add paragraph explicitly defining use of terms: assimilation, spreading, agreement “However, in this paper...”. **p.4, l.133** fix spelling of “analysis”

sec2.2: p.6, l.171 change “one element on a feature” to “one element on each feature tier”. **l.190-195** delete “adjacent” because vowels are not necessarily adjacent since they can be in a successor relation with consonants

sec2.3: p.8, l.239 add “used to define r_1-r_n ” to clarify what the constraint definition language is. **l.243-244** change “is thus a conjunction of surface markedness constraints” to “thus consists of the set of surface markedness constraints”

sec2.4: p.8, l.258-271 rearrange paragraph to explain previous account of assimilation process and explain terms with respect to surface representations. **p.9, l.273, ex.9** remove example 9b that shows concatenation and paragraph describing it

sec3.1.1: p. 11, l.350-351 remove reference to concatenation. **p.12, l.364-365** reword sentence to define locality “Here locality means...”. **l.366** fix spelling of “adjacent”

sec3.2: p.15, l.430, ex.20 change example to show that disagreement across transparent vowel is ungrammatical. **l.423** remove reference to concatenation, add mention of successor relation between back features. **l.437-440** add sentence explaining that ex.20b shows that disagreement across transparent vowel is ungrammatical

sec.3.2.1: p.16, l.442 remove reference to concatenation. **l.443-444** change “adjacent to a” to “in a successor relation with the intervening”. **l.454-455, ex.21** change example to shorter word with multiple transparent vowels. **l.468-469** split sentences so final sentence says “Thus Finnish vowel harmony demonstrates surface agreement and can be considered local”

sec.4.1: p.17, l.492 delete “For example”. **p.18. l.516** remove mention of concatenation, add “in a successor relation with each other”. **p.19, l.545** remove mention of concatenation, **l.549, ex.29** remove concatenation example. **p.20, l.551-560** change wording from “vowel closest to boundary” to “second vowel”, clarify that back harmony holds between vowels in diff suffixes and between root-final and a suffix vowel, add “with two suffixes” at end of paragraph. **p.22, l.603-605** add prediction of polysyllabic disharmonic suffixes **sec.4.1.1: p.22, l.611, 624, 627** change “adjacency” to “the successor relation”. **p.23, l.629** clarify “each language determines which primitives it makes use of”. **l.636** change that “Finnish uses ... primitives with morpheme boundary on segmental tier” to “Finnish does not utilize morpheme boundary primitives”

sec5.1: p.23, l.665 change “initial vowel” to “initial -low vowel”. **l.669** add “Following ex. 37” to connect ARs with transformation example. **p.24, l.672-673, ex.37** change input of Akan and SG examples to demonstrate difference between Akan and SG blocking on surface. **p.26, l.710** change [e] to [ɛ] and switch ATR feature values to make vowel feature representations accurate. **p.27, l.732, ex.44** switch ATR feature values, change [e] to [ɛ], and switch red ATR association line from first [ɪ] to last one, make association between first [ɪ] and -low black