

# 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, remove reference to concatenation after sec2.2 (ok when adding morpheme boundary 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...”

**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”.

**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 then explain terms with respect to surface representations. **p.9, l.273, ex.9** remove example 9b that shows concatenation and paragraph describing it

**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** 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.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** add “in a successor relation with each other”. **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. **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