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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the phonology and certain of the morphological structures of the Hebrew of the Biblical period. Principal attention is focussed on the network of stress-related mutations of syllable structure. The SPE theory of phonological formalism, which abjures easy reference to the notion 'heavy syllable' is supported, as is the linear ordering of rules. The prosodic theory of Liberman (1975) is adapted to give insight into the stress-shifting phenomena of the language. The reduction and deletion phenomena which so markedly distinguish the language from Proto-North West Semitic (and from related languages such as Classical Arabic) are shown to devolve from a single rule of de-stressing that operates in an alternating fashion. The phonology of the construct state is shown to be very simply related to that of the rest of the language when it is understood that the entire aggregation of nouns forms a single phonological word, in the sense of SPE. Certain theses about exceptionality are advanced, and minor rules, operating in contexts created by syntactic rather than morphological combination, are shown to play a role in grammar.
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Prefatory Remarks

The language we shall be concerned with is the Hebrew of the Bible, especially that major portion of Biblical literature which was composed in the 600 year period preceding the Babylonian Exile of 587 B.C. This material was transmitted through antiquity in the form of a text written with the 22 consonant signs of the Hebrew alphabet. In the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. a group of Jewish scholars working in Tiberias, Palestine -- the Masoretes (transmitters) -- perfected an intricate system of diacritic markings designed to preserve, down to fine phonetic detail, the accepted manner of reading the language; these they interpolated the received consonantal text.

Masoretic Hebrew -- the Hebrew of the Bible as annotated by the Masoretes for vowels, accent, spirantization (and its lack), and gemination -- has the following sound system, according to the standard interpretation, as presented in e.g. Lambdin (1971) and Gesenius (1910):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
p & (f) & t & (\theta) & \ddot{t} & s & s & s & s & k & (x) & q & h & h \\
b & (v) & d & (\delta) & z & e & (\gamma) & ? \\
m & n & l & r \\
y & w \\
i & u & \ddot{i} & \ddot{u} \\
e & (a) & o & \ddot{e} & \ddot{o} \\
a & \ddot{a}
\end{array}
\]

Remarks: The non-emphatic stops /p t k b d g/ are spirantized in the env. V--. As this is the only source for these spirants, we follow traditional orthographic practice in writing them as the homorganic stop with an under- or over-line: \(\ddot{p} = f; \ddot{t} = \theta; \ddot{k} = x; \ddot{b} = v; \ddot{d} = \delta; \ddot{g} = \gamma\).
A straightforward analysis of the non-syllabic sonorants, using the features of Kean (1975) provides a grammatically adequate classification of them.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
& y & w & l & m & n & r & h & ? \\
son & + & + & + & + & + & + & + & + \\
cns & - & - & + & + & - & - & - & - \\
low & - & - & - & - & - & + & + & + \\
high & + & + & - & - & - & - & - & - \\
back & - & + & - & - & - & + & + & - \\
cor & - & - & + & - & + & - & - & - \\
\end{array}
\]

The abbreviation 'St,V,C.' refers to the feature [Stiff Vocal Cords]. [\(\ast\)Stiff Vocal Cords] signifies voicelessness.

The segments /h \(\hat{\alpha}\) h ?/ are the gutturals; /\(\hat{\alpha}\)/ is the voiced pharyngeal fricative and /h/ is its voiceless counterpart. They form the class [-syl, +son, +low]. They function as a class in a number of rules; their major effect upon neighboring vowels is lowering. A simple and very low level example of their influence is this: before a word-final guttural /h \(\hat{\alpha}\) h/, any non-low vowel picks up an a-off glide:

\[
(0) \quad \emptyset \quad \rightarrow \quad a \left/ \begin{array}{c}
\text{low}
\end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c}
+\text{son} \\
+\text{low} \\
+\text{cnt}
\end{array} \right] \#
\]

Characteristic instances of the rule are \(\hat{\alpha}s\)l\(\hat{\alpha}\)h, his\(\hat{\alpha}l\(\hat{\alpha}\), g\(\hat{\alpha}\)b\(\hat{\alpha}\)h. The exclusion of /?/ may be an orthographic artifact, since in a form written as y\(\hat{\alpha}s\)\(\hat{\alpha}\), the /?/ may well be phonetically absent. At any rate, the rule, which is totally universal in application, shows quite clearly the guttural affinity for lowness.
It may be that the feature [±low] should be replaced, or supplemented, with the feature [Constricted Pharynx]. However, it is not at all clear that /h ?/ involve pharyngeal constriction; but perfectly clear that they pattern with /h ê/ and that they tie in with lowness; so I shall use [±low] here.

The class [-syl, -cns, -hi] comprises the gutturals plus /r/, excluding /y w l m n/. This class functions in a centrally important rule of the language, given as rule (ii), chapter 2; this grouping-together has occasioned much comment over the years, but in the system of Kean (1975), where /r/ is treated as a glide, it is quite natural. The segments /h ê h ? r/ are just the non-high glides.

The so-called emphatic consonants /t s q/ provide problems in phonetic analysis which are essentially insoluble because of the nature of the data -- an orthographic record of a language long dead. The segments /t s/ obviously have some kind of secondary articulation in common, for an assimilation in this articulation regularly takes place in the Hitpael conjugation (its morphology is sketched immediately below). The /t/ of the hit- prefix metathesizes with a following coronal, and it assimilates in both voicing and 'emphasis' to that coronal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hit-</td>
<td>zakkêr</td>
<td>hisdakkêr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dabber</td>
<td>hiddabber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saddeq</td>
<td>hisṭaddeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tahêr</td>
<td>hittahêr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šammêr</td>
<td>hisṭammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I take this as evidence that /t s/ share a feature which non-emphatics like /t s/ lack. The exact character of this secondary articulation is unclear, and in a well-studied modern language which has this series of consonants -- Arabic -- it is the source of a traditionally heated controversy. The emphatics are variously held to be pharyngealized, velarized, or formed with tensing of the tongue-root (Brame 1970).

We have another source of structural information about /t q/. Unlike their non-emphatic counterparts /t k/, they do not undergo spirantization in the env. V-. This property they share with (ordinary) consonants that stand as the first member of a geminate cluster: contrast dābār 'word' with dibber 'he talked'. Geminates arise through derivation, suffixal inflection, and phonological assimilation; whatever the source, spirantization is blocked. What could be the motive for such recalcitrance?

Recall that Korean has a three-way distinction of consonant-types into aspirated, non-aspirated, and 'fortis'. Kim (1975) shows that any geminates arising through morphological combination become 'fortis'. This suggests the possibility that Hebrew geminates are 'fortis', that the emphatics are 'fortis' as well, and that spirantization does not apply to 'fortis' consonants. Now, Kim identifies 'fortis' with glottalization, i.e. the feature specification +Constricted Glottis, -Spread Glottis, and it may be that the Hebrew geminates should be glottalized by a phonological rule. But 'fortis' cannot be simply identified with 'emphatic': the sequence -tt- is never written -t- or -tt-; nor is -kk- written -q- or -qq-. So it seems that the secondary articulation of /t s/ is something other than 'fortis' or [+C.G.]. 'Fortis' may be a 'tertiary'
articulation of these segments, but there is no necessity that forces us to such a conclusion. Assuming glottalization of geminates, the class of segments which spirantize post-vocally can be characterized as \([-\text{son}, -\text{low}, -\text{C.G.}\)], taking \([+\text{low}]\) (perhaps better is \([+\text{C.P.}]\)) as the feature shared by /ṭ s q/.

The segment /s/, written with the letter sin, is evidently a palatalized /s/. Unfortunately, it participates in no alternations that would betray the details of its character; but its reflexes in related languages are /s/ (Aramaic) and /s/ (Arabic, Ethiopic, Akkadian), which makes /s\textsuperscript{V}/ a likely enough candidate.

The following table is offered as a rudimentary characterization of the phonetic composition of the non-sonorant articulations of Hebrew. Those features which are omitted may be assumed to enjoy their unmarked value in the segments at hand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t'</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.V.C.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morphological Preliminaries

Hebrew distinguishes two categories of inflection: the verbal and the nominal. There is a distinction in the nominal system (which includes nouns per se, adjectives, participles) between masculine and feminine, and between singular and plural. The old dual has fallen into desuetude, being used only in a narrow range of forms, such as nouns referring to paired body parts or expressions conventionally related to a certain positive integer (2, 200, 'twice', 'two years'). Adjectives are inflected to agree with the noun they modify (the plural being used when the noun is dual). The usual nominal inflections are displayed here attached to the adjective tob 'good'. (Like all adjectives, it may be used as a noun, signifying 'good one'.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>tob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>toba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feminine singular ending -a will prove (1.11 infra) to be /-at/ underlyingly. The plural endings are /-ot/ and /-Im/. The dual ending is -ayim, as in yad 'hand', yadayim '(2) hands'. Not all feminine nouns bear the mark — yad, for example, is feminine — and there is a bit of sexual criss-crossing in the plural, so that the plural of tah 'father' is tahot, the plural of shana 'year' (fem.) is shanim. The dual ending comes out as /aym/ once the phonology of chapter 1.3 is recognized, and this indicates a further resolution of the non-singular endings into /ay+m/, /I+m/. However, as it is my policy in this essay to mark by morpheme boundaries only the major units of structure unless more subtle division is strictly relevant to the
matter at hand, the reader will encounter /...im/ and so on.

Verbal inflection is almost equally simple. Two temporal categories are found, a perfective and an imperfective aspect. The perfect is inflected on the pattern of Perfect Stem--Affix, where the affix is chosen on the basis of person (1 2 3), gender (m f ), and number (s p). The imperfect displays a somewhat different set of suffixes, and more strikingly, prefixes chosen according to person and number (and in the third person plural, gender): it has the pattern Pref--Impf Stem--Suff. (Some of the suffixes are Ø) The shape of these morphemes will become apparent within the first few pages of the work itself.

Other verbal categories are the hortatory system (imperative, jussive), which is inflectionally related to the imperfect, the participles active and passive (an adjective), the infinitive (traditionally, 'infinitive construct'), and the 'infinitive absolute', which principally serves a kind of adverbial function (it corresponds to the surely in 'and you will surely die'). This latter will not be discussed, as it participates in no alternations. The imperative and the infinitive are treated in section 1.7; the participle surfaces in 1.5 and 2.3.

The finite verb thus has the inflectional structure (Pre) V (Suff). Now, it is not the case that just any amalgamation of vowels and consonants, arranged according to the phonological constraints of the language, will count as the term V in the formula. The V is in fact replete with internal structure. There are five frequent types of V, two of which have regular passives, giving rise to the seven major derived forms of the verb-stem (Hebrew name: binyanim). In the European
tradition these are called 'conjugations', a very misleading usage, since
in the grammar of familiar Indo-European tongues the term 'conjugation'
refers strictly to mode of inflection. The Hebrew verb has one mode of
inflection and many stem shapes to which these inflections attach. How-
ever, the customary term 'conjugation' will be used here in its
Semitic-grammatical sense of 'stem-category': caveat lector.

The morphologically simplest conjugation is called Qal, the
word 'qal' meaning 'light' or 'simple'. The perfect has the stem
/Ca C V₁ C/, where V₁ may be /e a o/, any one of the three short vowels;
the usual case is /a/. The imperfect has the stem /CV₁ C/, which is
the shape regularly assumed by three consonant stems when prefixed;
V₁ may again be any of the short vowels, and is usually /o/. (A more
accurate account of the vocalism is given in 1.7).

The other principal conjugations are formed chiefly by the
morphological processes of doubling-the-middle-consonant, and prefixation.
They are named after the form that the root PIL would assume in the
3rd person masculine singular of the perfect, if it appeared in the
conjugation. This naming, derived from the practice of Arab grammarians,
is doubly unfortunate: because in Hebrew the /I/ cannot appear doubled
on the surface, being always degeminated by a process discussed in 2.2;
and because English has no such letter to write with. My practice will
be to write the full of form of the name, using the character J in the
midst of the roman characters, disregarding the law of degemination, so
that the reader will be reminded of the morphology by the name.

The individual conjugations are associated with such notions as
'causative', 'intensive', 'medio-passive', and the like, but as is generally true of derivational processes, there is considerable lexicalization of meanings and no precise and uniform semantic analysis can be given.

The doubled conjugations are three in number: Pi_{f}l̄l, its passive Pu_{f}l̄l, and Hîtpa{l}l̄l. The Pi{l}l̄l is described as intensive, factitive, transitivizing. For example, the word gādāl 'big' is related to the Qal verb gādāl 'to be big', and to the Pi{l}l̄l verb giddēl, which means 'to grow (tr.), to bring up (a person), to extol', all connected with the central vague notion of 'making big'. Every Pi{l}l̄l has a Pu{l}l, e.g. guddāl, which is just the passive of whatever the Pi{l}l̄l verb signifies. The Hîtpa{l}l̄l has the same inner stem as the Pi{l}l̄l, the a-i alternation being predictable, accompanied by the prefix hit-, which can be further analysed into h- and t-. According to Lambdin (1971, p. 249), "Hîtpa{l}l̄l verbs are intransitive and often have a reciprocal or reflexive meaning...". The verb hitgaddēl means 'boast, show oneself great'; hîthallek means 'walk about'; hitpallel means 'pray'. In these the semantic indeterminacy of derivation is quite manifest.

The Nipil is intransitive, a kind of medio-passive. It is marked by an n- prefix; the imperfect has the shape yippa{l}l̄, where yī- is the 3ms inflectional prefix and the n has assimilated (regularly, vide 1.4) to the first root consonant. The basic stem -pāl̄l has a morphologically lengthened /ā/ (non-deletable) and is distinct in shape from other prefixed stems, which are always /CV/C/. This distinction can be attributed either to the double prefixation, on the outside by inflection, on the inside by derivation, or to the lengthening of the vowel. The
Nipal is in no sense a regular passive (or middle) of Qal, although some Nipal verbs stand in a passive or middle relation to some Qal verbs. For example, katab means 'to write' and niktjab means 'to be written', but nibhar means 'to be acceptable' where bahar means 'choose'; and a verb like niplah? 'to be wonderful, marvelous' has no Qal counterpart at all.

The prefix h- marks the Hipil and its passive counterpart Hipal. These conjugations are usually causative (with the range of semantic drifting which that entails), but there is in Hipil, interestingly, a stative subclass, as hilbin 'to be white', related to the adjective laban 'white.' Typical Hipil verbs are higdil 'to make something great, do a great thing' for, boast' and hismial 'proclaim, announce, summon, make or let someone hear', related to the Qal verb samael 'to hear'.

There are other rarer formations, such as Polel (not too uncommon), similar in use to Pilpel, and the reduplicated Pilpel (uncommon), but we shall not be much concerned with them.

This morphological system gives the sense of the triliteral root for which Semitic languages are famous. It is not just that word stems happen to have (in general) three consonants, or even that three-consonant groups have associated with them a kind of meaning; rather that the canonical morphological patterns of the language -- the very definition of what it takes to qualify as a word -- consist of rigidly fixed arrays in which three distinguished consonants are called for to fill the pattern.

Following Lambdin (1971), I will refer to the root consonants by number: I, II, III. A root like gdl can be described as I-g, a root like bhr as II-h, and so on.
1.1 **Elements of Stress and Deletion**

In words ending with a consonant, main stress falls on final syllable: for example, dābār 'word', dBārim 'words'. Among vowel-final words there is variation between final and penultimate stress. Consider the following paradigm, the perfect of the typical Qal verb kātāb 'to write'. (Verbs will be cited in the third person masculine singular of the perfect, the simplest form, and glossed with the English infinitive.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 m kātāb</td>
<td>kāṭb+ţ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f kāṭb+ţ</td>
<td>kāṭb+ţm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m kāṭāb+tā</td>
<td>ktab+tēm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f kāṭāb+t</td>
<td>ktab+tēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 kāṭāb+tī</td>
<td>kāṭāb+nū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stress is evidently penultimate only in those forms that end a suffix shaped +CV:+tā (2ms), +tī (1s), +nu (1p). Otherwise, if the word ends in a consonant, or if the suffix is wholly vocalic, +ā (3fs) and +u (3p), stress is final. We can
formulate this observation into rule (1),

\[ (1) \quad V + [+\text{stress}] / -C_0 ( + CV ) \#
\]

This rule, however, fails to deal correctly with monosyllabic verbs of the same conjugation (Qal). This is the perfect of qām 'to arise':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 m qām</td>
<td>qām+ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f qām+tā</td>
<td>qām+tém</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m qām+tā</td>
<td>qām+tén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l qām+tī</td>
<td>qām+nū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see that stress is penultimate whenever the form ends in a vowel; it goes by a less restricted rule:

\[ (2) \quad \underline{\text{Main Stress}} \quad V + [+\text{stress}] / -C_0 ( V ) \#
\]

These rules differ on the third person feminine: kātāb+ā/ qām+tā: and on the third person plural kātāb+ū/qām+ū. It is in just these forms that kātāb loses the vowel that would be stressed by rule (2). I say loses, for kātāb must possess its second stem vowel underlying. This is evident (1) from the
spirantization of the stem-final /b/ throughout the paradigm, which can only be occasioned by a preceding vowel, and (2) from the contrast with other verbs such as kabed 'to be heavy', qaton 'to be small', which shows that the vowel is not predictable.

These considerations motivate a rule of vowel deletion. Let us accept (2) as the stress rule of Hebrew. It will prove to be essentially the first rule of phonology, the root of the complex syllabic mutations. We order Vowel Deletion after Main Stress, associating with it a condition that whenever a stressed vowel is deleted, the stress re-appears on the next syllable to the right. (We return to the matter of implementing such a condition.) Derivations like these will result from the ordering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Stress</th>
<th>kātāb+ū</th>
<th>qām+ū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vowel Deletion</td>
<td>kāṭb+ū</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output:</td>
<td>kātbū</td>
<td>qāmū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same pattern of deletion and stress-shift appears in the Qal imperfect:
The exclamation-pointed forms are those where deletion has made a difference in the surface stress pattern. The -e-augment interposed between the stem and the -na f. pl. suffix is peculiar to imperfects with stem shape CVC (from 'hollow roots' like that of qām) or CVC\(_i\)C\(_i\) (from geminate roots in which radical II = radical III, e.g. sābāb 'to go around', t+subb+ē+nā 'they/you fp will go around'). The augment will prove to have the underlying shape /-ay-/.

Many of the consonant clusters produced by deletion will later in this essay broken up by schwa. The present purpose is to map the gross geography of syllable structure, and to this end we shall abstract away from the role of schwa.

The basic claim embodied in the embryonic two-rule system is this: main stress falls on a final vowel if and only if the penultimate vowel is deleted. There are numerous places in the inflection of the verb where this claim is put to the test. A survey of the relevant forms shows that it is indeed the case. Tabulated here is a representative sampling, to give the flavour of the phenomenon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>yi+kto̱b</td>
<td>ŷa+qum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ti+kto̱b</td>
<td>ṭa+qum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>ti+kto̱b</td>
<td>ṭa+qum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ti+kto̱b+ī</td>
<td>ṭa+qum+i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?e+kto̱b</td>
<td>?a+qum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugation/Asp.</td>
<td>3 ms.</td>
<td>Deletion/Final Str(3p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qal pf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / katāb</td>
<td>katb+u</td>
<td>katāb+tī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / qām</td>
<td></td>
<td>qām+ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yī+kṭōb</td>
<td>yī+kṭb+u</td>
<td>ti+kṭōb+na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+qūm</td>
<td></td>
<td>yā+qūm+ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+sōb</td>
<td></td>
<td>yā+sōb+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipīṭal pf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / nī+kṭāb</td>
<td>nī+kṭb+u</td>
<td>nī+kṭāb+tī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / nā+kūn</td>
<td></td>
<td>nā+kūn+ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / nā+sāb</td>
<td></td>
<td>nā+sāb+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yī+k+katāb</td>
<td>yī+k+katb+u</td>
<td>ti+k+katāb+na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yī+k+kūn</td>
<td></td>
<td>yī+k+kūn+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yī+s+sāb</td>
<td></td>
<td>yī+s+sāb+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭīṭel pf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / giddel</td>
<td>giddl+u</td>
<td>giddl+tī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+gaddel</td>
<td>yā+gaddl+u</td>
<td>t+gaddel+na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiplīl pf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / hī+ṣāmīd</td>
<td></td>
<td>hī+ṣāmīd+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / hē+qīm</td>
<td></td>
<td>hē+qīm+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / hē+sēb</td>
<td></td>
<td>hē+sēb+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+ṣāmīd</td>
<td></td>
<td>yā+ṣāmīd+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+qīm</td>
<td></td>
<td>yā+qīm+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- / yā+sēb</td>
<td></td>
<td>yā+sēb+u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is fair to conclude provisionally that rule (2) really is the main stress rule of the language, and that it interacts with a rule of Vowel Deletion to produce the characteristic patterns illustrated in the table.
What, then, is the nature of this rule of vowel deletion? Perusal of the data presented so far shows that the process occurs only in the env. --CV, never in the env. --CCV: contrast, for example, käṭob+ū with käṭab+tī. Notice also that in the form ktab+tem it is the first vowel of the stem /katab/ that suffers deletion, and not the second, which finds itself shut up in the env. --CC. For a vowel to delete, then, it is necessary, but not quite sufficient that it be located in an open syllable: yā+kōn+ū contrasts with yi+ktōb+ū (cf. yi+ktōb).

We observe, however, that the deletable vowels belong to a series in which there is alternation between short and long vowels in positions where the non-deletable vowels retain length.

In the Construct State:

\[
\begin{align*}
dābār & \quad \text{`word'} \\
\text{dābār ham-mélek} & \quad \text{`the word of the king'} \\
\text{dibār ham-mélek} & \quad \text{`the words of the king'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
pāqīd & \quad \text{`overseer'} \\
pqīd & \quad \text{`overseer of the people'} \\
pqīde & \quad \text{`overseers of the people'}
\end{align*}
\]

With certain suffixes

\[
\begin{align*}
yi+šmōr & \quad \text{`he will observe'} \\
yi+šmr+ū & \quad \text{`they will observe masc pl'} \\
yi+šmor+kā & \quad \text{`he will observe you'} \text{ (alternative form: yi+šmr+ēkkā)}
\end{align*}
\]
but: hi+smid 'he destroyed'
hi+smid+u 'they destroyed'
hi+smid+kə 'he destroyed you'

In Proclisis:
yi+ttėn 'he will give'
yi+tttn+u 'they will give'
yi+ttën#lī 'he will give to me'
lī = l- 'to' + ī 'me'

but: hi+ggid#lī 'he told me'

Among the theories suggested by this data, and the one we shall pursue, is that in the alternation ø - YPES - Ŷ, it is the short vowel that is underlying; and that the non-deleting, non-shortening (in the above environments) vowels are just those that are underlyingly long. This prima facie plausible theory will gain credence if the vowel-lengthening rules which it necessitates prove to be general in character and coherently integrable into the rest of the phonology.

We formulate these observations in a rule of Vowel Deletion:

(3) VD V + ø / --C V
    [-lng]

How does the rule VD apply? Does it delete every short vowel that lies in an open syllable? Up to this point, we've seen no evidence that would contradict this assumption; but
we shall see below (1.3) that the rule produces an alternating pattern when it applies to a sequence of short vowels in open syllables, as if it iterated from right to left. In the configuration V C V or V C V C of course, the short vowel will always go, no matter how the rule applies, simultaneously, leftward, rightward, or whatever.

The reader should perhaps be forewarned that VD is merely the larval form of the organism, that the rule will go through a couple of metamorphoses before we find out exactly what it does to vowels; but the inner sense of it, which we happen on in 1.3, will remain invariant throughout.

1.2 Some Rules of Quantity

Returning to the paradigm of kātab, we see that each of the stem vowels is susceptible to deletion: kātū/ kābtem. This implies that both are underlingly short: the verb stem must be /katab/.

The first stem vowel shows up long in all those forms in which the second stem vowel receives stress by rule (2). Here is the paradigm, repeated for convenience, with the surface forms matched to approximately underlying forms after Main Stress has applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>kātab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>kātaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sing. | Plural
---|---
2 m  | **kātabtā** /katab+ta/ | **ktabtem** /katab+tem/
| **kātabt** /katab+t/ | **ktabten** /katab+ten/
1  | **kātabtī** /katab+tī/ | **kātabnu** /katab+nū/

Evidently, vowels lengthen in pre-stress position: but, as the short a of ktabtem indicates, only in the env. --CV. The 3p form kātbū and the 3fs form kātba satisfy this open syllable restriction before VD applies, and fail to satisfy it afterwards. We therefore introduce the rule of Pre-Tonic Lengthening, ordered before VD:

(4) **PTL** | V $+$ [+lng] / -- C V

The mutations of the word dabār 'word, matter' make clear the existence of another lengthening rule, whose function is somewhat obscured by a peculiarity of verbal phonology. We can investigate the character of the vowels of dabār by affixing it so as to draw stress away from the stem. In the plural form dabār+īm the loss of the first vowel to VD shows that it is short underlyingly; its length in dabār is a result of PTL. Adding the 3mp pronominal suffix to the plural produces dibr̄+ē+hem 'their m words', a form in which the second stem vowel has succumbed to VD, showing that it too is short. (The appearance of i for a in the first syllable is treated below, 1.3.) Surface dabār must come from
underlying /dabar/. We posit, therefore, a rule lengthening vowels under stress:

$$\begin{align*}
(5) \text{Tone-Lengthening} \quad V \quad \rightarrow \quad [ + \text{long}] \\
\quad [ + \text{stress}] 
\end{align*}$$

The reader who labored dutifully through the Deletion/Stress table (p.21) will have in mind many instances where the operation of TL is apparent: e.g., in the Qal imperfect, we find yi-kšb--yi+ktb+u \ ti+ktb+nā, which requires /ktob/; in the Piilll imperfect, long under stress: y+gaddēl, t+gaddēl+nā; same vowel deleted t+gaddl+i, y+gaddl+ū; requiring /gaddel/.

The peculiarity alluded to is that nowhere in the verbal paradigm does stem-final a undergo TL, although, as we've seen, both e and o do so regularly. Typically, we have kātāb, yi+lmād, ni-ktāb, ġillāḥ, etc.

Now this had led some scholars to argue that in fact TL never does apply to any stem-final vowel in the verb. It happens that there is some external evidence, from the transliteration of Hebrew into Greek letters in Origen's Hexapla (ca. phps 3rd cent A.D.), that in some dialects of Hebrew (id est, the one Origen was listening to) all these vowels were short in the verb in stressed position: namely what the Masoretes write as ē (sērē) and o ( hôlem), which are elsewhere uniformly transcribed by eta and omega respectively, are in these positions regularly written with epsilon and omicron. However, the Masoretes had the orthographic resources
to record these distinctions (at least in the case of \( e \) (seghol) which can bear stress); that they did not, I take as evidence that in the dialect under consideration, /e o/ did show up long under stress in verbs.

Since the short stem vowels /e o/ in verb forms like \( \text{kabed} \), \( \text{yiktob} \) do undergo TL, the rule is ordered after VD, for its effect of lengthening does not block deletion. The correct forms are kabdu (like katbu), not kabdu, and yiktbu, not yiktobu (but yaqumu). We arrive, then, at the following order:

(6)  
   a. Stress  
   b. PTL  
   c. VD  
   d. TL

The ordering of PTL before VD, necessitated by the form katlu / *katbu, has a consequence which is quite unrelated to this motivating data: that pretonic vowels should be immune to the elidatory effects of VD. This is quite generally the case, as the typical word dbarim 'words' illustrates.

The following derivations should make clear the functioning of the posited rules.
The keen-eyed reader will be wondering why TL fails in katab+tem. Why not katab+tem? The exceptionality is just a property of the suffix, or rather of a class of suffixes to which it belongs. Immediately below (1.4) we shall attempt to characterize this class, after we look a bit more closely at suffixal morphology.

The 'hollow' verbs like qam—so called because of their apparent lack of a middle radical—must have a long stem vowel, for it does not undergo deletion, either in the perfect (qamû) or the imperfect (yaqûmû). Roots of this type originally had a glide, y or w, as a middle radical; cf. the Arabic qawmûn, verbal noun of the cognate word. In Arabic verbs fror. these roots undergo complex alternations of the stem vowel (explored in Brame (1970)), and the w or y is prominently displayed in verbal derivation. In Hebrew of the pre-Exilic period, on the other hand, the few stem-
vowel alternations are simple reflexes of transparently
general processes, and the historical glide is nowhere in
evidence in the verbal paradigm. (Forms like qiyyēm,
Piēl related to qām, only arise later, most likely under
Aramaic influence.) That is to say, evidence for an under-
lying glide is tantalizingly weak. However, even if a
slide is posited, the rules that map the stem-internal vowel
and glide combinations onto ̃V can be as early as possible,
and indeed must proceed VD so that stress is retained on
the stem (qāmū). Therefore, even if such rules exist, only
their output—the long vowel—is relevant to the present in-
quiry.

The stem vowel loses its length in the env. —CC:
qāmt, qamtēm contrast with qām, qāmū. We need, therefore,
a rule of shortening:

(7) Shortening $V + [-\text{long}] / -- C C$

This rule is not invoked in the imperfect, because the only
consonant-initial suffix, -nā (fp), attaches with a vocalic
augment (tiktōbnā, but tqūmenā). In the imperative, which
has the same endings, we find the following:

\begin{tabular}{lll}
  & \text{Sing.} & \text{Pl.} \\
\hline
m & qūm & qūmū \\
f & qūmī & qūmnā \\
\end{tabular}

The reader may have noticed that the rule TL, when it
applies to short vowels, has a non-high output: yiktōb,
gaddel are characteristic. Observe that in the imperative paradigm, the vowel appears non-high just where rule (7) would shorten it and TL would lengthen it:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Shortening} & \text{Main Str.} & \text{TL.} \\
\hline
/qum/ & /qum/ & /qum/ \\
\hline
\hline
\text{Output:} & /qum+na/ & /qum+na/ \\
\end{array}
\]

How is the lowering to be accomplished? In Chapter 2 it will be shown that there is a rule that makes short vowels non-high:

(8) Lowering \[ V \rightarrow [-\text{high}] [-\text{lng}] \]

The order is Shortening-Lowering-TL.

All final vowels are long, the only exceptions on the surface being those that arise from combination with y: yibné 'he will build' is at an earlier stage of derivation /yibnay/. The mysterious 'other' in the above derivation is the rule that insures this fact:

(9) V-final \[ V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] / ...# \]

Motivation for, and use of the rule will be found in 1.11.
These three rules (Shortening, Lowering, V-final) do not play a significant role in the deliberations of this chapter, and will therefore be essentially ignored. The characteristic alternations in the short and shortened vowels, i-e-e and u-o-o, will be studied in detail in Chapter 2. Here we shall focus on the laws of quantity and deletion.

1.2.1 Some Exceptions.

A kind of exceptionality that the system can tolerate fairly easily occurs when a vowel known to be short does not delete. If stressed, stress remains and does not shift. Examples of this sort are found in the paradigm of pronominal suffixation. The preposition la 'to' when suffixed with the 1p pronoun is: lánu 'to us'. But the vowel is deletable: lābār 'to a word'. But the appropriate underlying form /la+nu/ generates *lnu, just as /katab+ū/ generates kātbū. It turns out that vowels before -nu are quite generally [-VD]. In section 1.11.2, after the treatment of deletion phenomena has been deepened, or at least ramiculated, we return to the question of representing such cases.

A converse kind of exceptionality, in which stress shifts to the end off a vowel that doesn't delete, is more costly to express. This requires that a minor rule be added to the grammar, a rule that forms must be marked to undergo. In section 1.13 we find two words of this type (and only two): the pronouns ?anōkī 'I', ?attā 'you ms'.
1.2.2 A Restriction on TL

As the following table of typical forms shows, TL applies to any stressed /e o/ whatever, but fails to apply to /a/ in the env. --CC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>TL Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?&quot;att 'you fs'</td>
<td>'let them weep'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yebk</td>
<td>'you fs can'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamm+ū 'they are finished'</td>
<td>'they will go around'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qam+tī 'I arose'</td>
<td>'they m'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hemma</td>
<td>'arise! fp'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qom + nā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laylā 'night'</td>
<td>'they lead around'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesebb+ū</td>
<td>'write! fp'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāmma 'why'</td>
<td>t+gaddeī+na 'they/you fp grew s.t.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe that this configuration of data has nothing whatever to do with Shortening, rule (7), which affects all vowels and applies early, before TL is reached in the ordering.

The environments where TL does apply to /a/ are two: --C##, as in dabar /dabar/, and --CV, in open syllables, when VD (exceptionally) fails, as in lānū 'to us', ḫābanū katab+b+a+nū/ 'he wrote us'. These environments collapse into the following rule:

\[(10) \ a \rightarrow \ ~a \ / -- C \ ( V \ X ) \ #\#
\
[+str]

Use of the familiar subscripted-parentheses notation allows (10) to be combined with branch of TL that applies to non-low vowels:
(11) Tone-Lengthening

\[
V^{\text{+ stress}}_{(+\text{low})_a} \rightarrow [+\text{long}] / -- C ( (V)_b X ) \#
\]

Condition: \( a \ b \)

When (a) is met—when the affected vowel is [+low], i.e. /a/ -- rule (10) is generated by the implicational condition. When (a) is not met—when the affected vowel is from the set /e o/ -- the material in (b) is optional, and the rule is:

(12) \( V \rightarrow \tilde{V} / -- C ( (V) X ) \#
\)

The optional vowel imposes no restriction whatsoever; rule (12) is equivalent to

(13) \( V \rightarrow \tilde{V} / --C ( X ) \#
\)

which, given the structure of the language, says that any stressed vowel lengthens; just what should be said, once the [+low] case is factored out.

The rule TL, thus constrained, allows an understanding of an otherwise puzzling phenomenon. Among the monosyllables in /a/ we find those with the expected long vowel, like dām 'blood' yād 'hand', and those with a superficially unexpected short vowel, like cām 'people' ráb 'many' dāl 'poor'. The short vowel'd monosyllables uniformly show a doubled final consonant in suffixation, the long ones only the single consonant surfacedly
visible: ʕammīm 'peoples' rabbīm 'many pl.' dallīm 'poor pl.', as against dāmīm 'bloods' yādāyim '(two) hands'. This consonantal alternation evidences an underlying distinction between single and double consonants that is neutralized finally by degemination:

(14) Word Final Degemination

The underlying distinction serves to block TL, giving the noted distribution of data. Rule (14), WFD, therefore follows TL in the ordering.

As predicted, in the e-class of monosyllables, there is no surface distinction in vowel quantity between geminate tri-literal stems like ḥēs 'arrow' (pl. ḥissīm), ʔēm 'mother' (pl. ʔimmōt), ḥēb 'heart' (pl. libbōt), and truly biliteral stems like bēn 'son' (pl. bānīm, the ā is irreg.) and ʾēm (pl. ʾēmōt). Of monosyllables in /o/ there are no biliteral examples. The impossibility of finding any is guaranteed by a peculiarity of stem-final /o/ in nouns and adjectives; instead of pretonic lengthening, doubling of the final stem consonant is found, as ʾērōm 'naked', ʾērummīm 'pl.'

As this phenomenon is quite general, let us record it:

(15) O-Closure

\[ S.D. \quad \circ \ C \mid \text{stem of N,A} \]
\[ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \]

\[ S.C. \quad 1 \ 2 \ 2 \ 3 \]
Note that the presence of an affix need not be required. Because TL is unrestricted for /o/, a form /šerom/, will lead to šerom (via WFD) as surely as /šerom/ will. Rule (15) functions, like Shortening, as a very early adjustment.

Some derivations to illustrate these principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/dam/</th>
<th>/šamm/</th>
<th>/hess/</th>
<th>/šerom/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-Closure</td>
<td>šam</td>
<td>šerom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Stress</td>
<td>šam</td>
<td>šerom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>šam</td>
<td>šerom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFD</td>
<td>šam</td>
<td>šerom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output:</td>
<td>šam</td>
<td>šerom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule (14), WFD, was written intentionally with a single word boundary (#) at the right extremity. Consider the alternations of the preposition ?et- 'with': ?et#Dawid 'with David', but ?itt+a+nü 'with us'. Clearly the word ends in a geminate underlyingly. The reader will recall that SPE provides for only one word boundary between preposition and NP object (cf. also Selkirk 1972, 1974).

Forms like gmall+īm 'camels', gmall+ē+hēm 'their m camels' indicate that there is a minor rule of pre-suffixal gemination; minor, because it applies to small number of forms, unpredictably; a rule, because a putative base-form */gamall/ neither meets the constraint of triliterality nor falls into a derivational pattern (like the tetra-consonantal
Piarge stem, for example). Therefore, the unaffixed form gamal with its long stressed vowel, is not a counterexample to the proposed restriction on TL. Also to be treated this way is the alternation yam -- yammim 'sea--seas'. (This is near to history for gamal, cf Arabic gamal\textsuperscript{un}, not so for yam, Arabic yamm\textsuperscript{un}).

(16) Minor Doubling \quad S.D. \quad C +
\[ \begin{array}{c}
1 & 2 \\
\end{array} \]
\[
S.C. \quad 1 \ 1 \ 2
\]

The doubling in gmallim is often described as kind of consonantal version of Pre-Tonic Lengthening (see, for example, Blake 1952), the intuition being that the pre-tonic syllable must be heavy, and that this restriction is implemented either by PTL or by doubling (which of course excludes PTL). However, forms like gmallehem, in which doubling regularly occurs at some remove from the stress, show that the desideratum is, as rule (16) requires, suffixation, not proximity to stress. The phenomenon has nothing to do with PTL.

1.3 Segholates and the Mode of Vowel Deletion

There is a class of nouns which show penultimate stress: e.g. melek 'king' sefer 'book' qodes 'holiness'. The traditional account mirrors history in regarding these forms as underlyingly monosyllabic -- /malk/ /sef/ /qod/ -- so that
stress falls upon the stem vowel, and then is made to appear penultimate by a later rule of epenthesis. This analysis is well-supported. To take such forms as underlyingly bisyllabic would not only require a complication of the otherwise limpid stress rule, it would also require enriching the segmental inventory to include a special /e/ that (1) could be distinguished as the vowel to be skipped over in the stress rule, and (2) could provide a lengthening-immune source for the stressed-short [e] of melek that alternates with [a], as malki, 'my king'. Further, the quality of the final unstressed vowel is with 2 or 3 exceptions, predictable: it is usually [e] (Hebrew name: seghol), but appears as [a] when abutted on either side by any one of the gutturals /? h h /, as nafar 'boy', pesah 'passover', poalal 'work'.

A crushing argument for the insertion analysis can be garnered from the behaviour of verbs with a 'weak' third root consonant (historically /y w/ ). Verbs of this root type in the imperfect of all conjugations end in -e, e.g., tipnē (from tipnay) 'she will turn'. To form the jussive of the unsuffixed forms, these verbs strip off the final vowel, yielding, in this case, tepen 'let her turn', from /tipn/ via TL (and Lowering). It is revealing that in certain verbs the vowel insertion fails to take place, for example, yebk 'let him weep' from yibke, an irregularity which clearly displays the jussive formation process as a truncation. There
is no intelligible way to read the /e/ into the underlying form of the imperfect: not only would such a move require a special rule to get rid of the /e/ in forms like yebk, but, more seriously, it would rupture the canonical pattern CCVC which is assumed by tri-consonantal stems after all prefixes of derivation and inflexion.

Noting that these nouns appear in their monosyllabic guise before pronominal suffixes, as in malkî 'my king', sipri 'my book', qodsi 'my holiness', we postulate the following rule of insertion:

(17) Segholation $\emptyset \rightarrow e / C -- C$

Another rule is needed to describe the a-e alternation found in words like melek $\rightarrow$ malki. We propose rule (18), consequent to Segholation:

(18) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \rightarrow e / -- C \\
\text{[-lng]} & \rightarrow \text{C} \\
\text{[+str]} & \rightarrow \text{[-gutt]}
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that in the underlying /e/ and /o/ stems, the stem vowel surfaces long due to the effect of TL: sepe, qode: but in the /a/ stems, the basic vowel, whether mutated to [e] or not, appears short: melek, nafar. This is obviously a consequence of the single-consonant restriction on the tone lengthening of /a/. Segholation therefore follows TL in the ordering. In pause, the single consonant restriction is usually lifted, and we find for lebed, ֔ašed, confirming
both the choice of /a/ as the underlying vowel in such forms, and the [-long] restriction in rule (18).

There are no segholated forms in which the last two consonants are identical: from /ʕamm/ comes ʕam, never ʕemem. When in the course of derivation such a configuration arises, degemination occurs, not segholation. So from yiṭṭē 'he will extend', we get yēt 'let him extend'. Segholation therefore follows Word Final Degemination, which destroys its two-consonant environment.

This gives an ordering WFD--Segholation. Recall that one of the results of 1.2.2 was the ordering TL-WFD. By transitivity of ordering, these two orderings go together to force the linear arrangement TL--WFD--Segholation. Thus the ordering TL--Segholation, necessary to insure the shortness of the stressed vowel in melek, nāfar, is predicted by independent considerations.

The plural of melek is not, as one might guess, *malkīm, with the plural affix attached directly to the underlying stem, but mlākīm, in which a new vowel has dramatically appeared inside the stem-final consonant cluster. This vowel does not appear in all surface forms of the plural stem: e.g., malke 'kings of ...', malkehem 'their m kings': but its one-time residence in the spot is revealed by spirantization of the /k/, as observed by Aronoff (1971).

I assume, then, a morphological rule epenthesizing /a/ --short because deletable--into the stem-final cluster in all
plural forms:

(19) Plural Breaking $\emptyset + a$ / C $-$ C + Plural

The inserted vowel should be expected to come and go in accordance with the rule of Vowel Deletion. The following range of forms is found:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mlakim} & \rightarrow \text{malak+im} /'\text{kings}' & \text{sparim} & \rightarrow \text{separ+im} /'\text{books}' & \text{qmasim} & \rightarrow \text{qomas+im} /'\text{handfuls}' \\
\text{malkehem} & \rightarrow \text{malak+e+hem} & \text{siprehem} & \rightarrow \text{separ+e+hem} & \text{qomsehem} & \rightarrow \text{qomas+e+hem} \\
\end{align*}
\]

What is remarkable is the preservation of the underlying stem vowel in the forms on the second line. This implies that the rule VD applies in an alternating fashion, chopping out every other vowel in a string of weak syllables; deletion of the plural infix then precludes deletion of the stem vowel.

A complication appears when we examine the same forms of an ordinary bisyllabic noun like dabar.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dbarim} & \rightarrow \text{daba+im} /'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dbarehem} & \rightarrow \text{dabar+e+hem} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here the stem vowel is not preserved. Looking at this form alone, and it is representative, one might wish to conclude that both vowels are in fact effaced and the initial 3 consonant cluster is broken up by a rule of epenthesis. Indeed, such a rule will come to light in 1.6. However, this view is
incompatible with the data of stem mutations in the plural
segholates, which demands an alternating mode of deletion.
Further, there is a scattering of exceptions to the pattern--
for example, kanāp 'wing' has kanpēhem/*kinpēhem, and zanāb
'tail' has zanbēhem/*zinbēhem -- in which the underlying
vowel is preserved. These data suggest we admit the follow-
ing rule:

(20) A to I a + i / #C -- CC

(When we consider the segmental system in detail, we shall see
that a rule like this is involved in a number of character-
istic alternations in the verb: e.g. giddēl -- ygaddēl,
yi-ktōb--yā-qum, ni-kṭāb -- nākōn, etc.)

With rule (12) in the grammar, we should expect that
the plural forms of melek, since they are based on the stem
malak--, should conform in every respect to those of dābār.
The point of difference -- preservation of the stem vowel in
its underlying form in malkehem/*milkehem -- we must
attribute to a lexical marking of melek as being [ -AI].

In addition to the three major classes of segholates --
the melek type with the characteristic stem-vowel alternation
e/a, the sēper type ṣ/i, and the qōdeš type o/o -- there is a
fourth, hybrid type e/i, seen for example in the word qēber
'grave', qibrī 'my grave'. That the stem-vowel surfaces as
short e under stress suggests that it comes from /a/ (cf. /malk/),
as does the pausal (sentence-final) form qaber. It might appear from these data that qeber is distinguished from melek only in that qeber undergoes the rule A-to-I when it is suffixed, whereas melek does not; hence qibrîm from the putative source /qabr+a+m/, contrasting with malkám /malk+a+m/. However, many of the qeber-type e/i have doublets in e/i; e.g. seter/sêter/ 'hiding place', nêbel/nêbel 'harp', nêder/nêder 'vow'. Even those with such doublets show a in pause: sater, nader, nabel. This suggests an underlying shape /qebër/ etc., with an early rule turning e to a under stress; the rule is evidently ordered before TL. We shall adduce such a rule in Chapter 2, on independent grounds. (It is the synchronic reflex of Philippi's Law.)

Removing qeber and its look-alikes from the A-to-I nexus clears the way for the following generalization: no member of the segholate class - no morpheme shaped /CVCC/ -- undergoes the rule A-to-I. While exceptionality is not to be applauded, in this case it can be seen to follow its own strict law.

1.3.1 Two Further Remarks on Segholation

(I) There is a class of forms which never undergoes Segholation: those created by suffixation of the 2fs morpheme /-t/. Always found is kātabt 'you fs wrote', never **kâtebet, apparently from /katab+t/. The 2fs of
the perfect has another peculiarity, in that WFD, rule (10), never simplifies a final geminate cluster produced by inflection: so in the verb karat 'to cut (off), to make (a covenant, brit)', we find karatt 'you fs cut off', evidently from /karat+t/.

The root of this pair of idiosyncrasies becomes apparent when the 2fs perfect is pronominally suffixed:

ktabím 'you fs wrote them m', krattín 'you fs cut them m off'.

Contrast the 2ms forms ktabtám, krattám, which show that the suffix is just -m: /katab+ta+m/, /karat+ta+m/.

From the suffixed forms it appears that the 2fs morpheme is really /-tī/. If such were the case on the surface, neither Segholation nor WFD would get a shot at 2fs perfect forms like *katabti, *karatti. We therefore posit a late rule of truncation, following Segholation and WFD, which removes the suffix vowel word-finally.

Further analysis can be performed on the suffix /-tī/. Recall that the 2fs imperfect ending is /ī/, as in tikthī, taqumī. It appears, then, that the 2fs morpheme for the verb as a whole is /ī/, and that the perfect is specially marked by a stem-augment /-t-/ in the second person and first person singular. The ultimate underlying form of katabt is /katab+t+ī/.

We posit the following rule:

(21) 2fs Truncation ì → ø+t+ -- # / 2fs
(Note that the rule does not apply to the phonologically identical 1s form kātabti.) Rule (21) is also responsible for the preservation of the final geminate in the 2fs subject pronoun ?ätt /?an+t+i/. We return to the matter of suffixes immediately below (1.4).

Observe that rule (21) truncates a specific morpheme, which it must name. Aronoff (1976) postulates that rules of truncation that depend on morphological information can only remove whole morphemes, not parts thereof; the present case is consistent with his constraint. Note too that although the rule depends on morphological information—that it is in some sense a rule of morphology—it is ordered into the phonology, and rather late at that.

(II) The vowel epenthesized by Segholation appears as i when it follows y. The base /bayt/ leads to phonetic bayt. A low-level adjustment suffices to correct the output of Segholation:

\[
\text{(22) Y-Adjust } \quad e \rightarrow i/y --
\]

Rule (22) is also operative, as would be expected, in words like ?ōyibka /?ōyeb+e+ka/ 'your ms enemy', related to ?ōyeb 'enemy', where the affected e is a survivor from the lexicon, not an inserted element. (See 1.4 on the morphological analysis.)
1.3.2 **Remark on Plural Breaking**

Plural Breaking must be constrained not to disrupt a sequence of two identical consonants: rabbīm /*rbābīm 'many pl.' From this it might be argued that the ordering argument placing WFD before Segholation is artifactual, since there may be a general constraint against separating identical consonants. However, where the constraint against forms like *rēbeb is absolute, the constraint on plural breaking has a few exceptions, as šel 'shadow', slālīm 'shadows'. It is fitting, then, that the two similar constraints be differently implemented in the grammar.
1.4 Pronouns and Suffixes

Pronominal suffixes attach to the noun to indicate possession, to verb and preposition as object, to the infinitive as subject or object. In this excursion we shall explore the basic morphology of these suffixes, tracing the network of relationships between the free (subject) forms of the pronouns, the pronominal suffixes, and the inflectional suffixes of the perfect verb.

The 2nd person possessive suffixes provide interesting problems to start with. Here are two typical nouns, a masculine and a feminine, suffixed with the 2nd person possessors of both singular and plural.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dābār 'word'</td>
<td></td>
<td>tōrā 'law'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>dārkā</td>
<td>dārkēm</td>
<td>tōrātkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>dārēk</td>
<td>dārēkēn</td>
<td>tōrātēk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The properties of the feminine affix /-at/ are taken up in 1.11: the feminine noun is cited here merely to illustrate its conformity to the pattern seen in the masculine -- non-derived -- noun-class.

The suffixes are evidently -kā (ms), -ēk (fs), -kem (mp) -ken (fp). Several features of this paradigm are remarkable: (1) stress in final on -kā even though it ends in a vowel, (2) the vowel in the syllable preceding -kā is long.
even though it is separated from the stress by two consonants, (3) the /k/ shared by these formatives is always spirantized, but no vowel stands before it, (4) the vowel of the plural suffixes is short even though it is stressed. Let us defer an account of (4) until we look at the third person, which shows the same behaviour.

The triple cluster of apparently aberrant properties (1), (2), (3) will make coherent sense, given the rule-system we have motivated, if it's assumed that there is underlyingly a linking vowel that joins these endings to the stems they attach to. Since e shows up in the feminine singular, let us take /e/ as the Bindevokal. Derivations like these will produce the surface forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/dabar+e+ka/</th>
<th>/dabar+e+k/</th>
<th>/dabar+e+kem/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spir, V-Final</td>
<td>dabar+e+ka</td>
<td>dabar+e+k</td>
<td>dabar+e+kem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Stress</td>
<td>dabar+e+ka</td>
<td>dabar+e+k</td>
<td>dabar+e+kem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VD</td>
<td>dobar+o+ka</td>
<td>dobar+e+k</td>
<td>dobar+o+kem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>dbar+e+k</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>dbar+ka</td>
<td>dbar+ek</td>
<td>dbar+kem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe the crucial role played by the alternating character of VD in generating the word dbar+kem.

This solution has a cost attached to it, evident in the third column: the linking vowel /-e-/ must be marked
[-PTL] so that VD will be able to remove it. Nevertheless, this exceptionality -- which can perhaps be resolved upon deeper understanding of the relevant morphology -- should not obscure the fact that the three rather disparate idiosyncrasies follow from the linking-vowel hypothesis.

In the case of -kem/-ken the proposed solution is abstract in that the linking vowel never appears phonetically in propria persona; in the case of -êk it is of course there for all to see; in the case of -kâ it makes an appearance at the end of sentences, in the pausal form, where deletion of stressed vowels is inhibited (vide 1.13): here we find dêrêkâ. Here the linking vowel appears under stress, and does not lengthen; it must be exceptional to TL in the 2ms: note, however, that this peculiarity is overt in the data, and must occasion discomfort in any account.

When the plural noun is suffixed with these pronouns, it looks like this:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dbarîm} & \quad \text{'words'} \\
\text{s.} & \\
\text{m.} & \quad \text{dêrêkê} \\
\text{f.} & \quad \text{dêrâyik} \\
\text{P.} & \\
\text{dibrekêm} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here the plural morpheme -îm is evidently supplanted by some sort of augment. (The exact mechanism of replacement is investigated in 1.12: for the present, we can accept it as a fait accompli.) The fs form is obviously /dabar+ay+k/, with
Segholation (17) and Y-Adjustment (22) applying to give the surface form of the suffix. Only slightly less obviously, the plural pronouns are connected by the same augment: /dabar+ay+kem/, /dabar+ay+ken/. Diphtongs _ay, _aw, when unstressed, regularly turn to _e, _o (respectively) in the env. --C. This uniformly regular alternation is seen, for example, in báyít 'house' -- bētkā 'your ms house', záyít 'olive tree' -- zētim 'olive trees'. Under stress, the diphthong is preserved: báyṭā /bayt+a/ 'to a house', where /a/ is the directional suffix. The general rule is then:

(23) De-Diphthongization-I  āy, āw + ē, ŏ / --[+cns]

(The rule is more carefully formulated as (5) of Chapter 2.)

What, then, of the short stressed e that links /-ka/ to the stem? All other things being equal, we'd expect -áykā in the 2ms slot, phonetically parallel to báyṭā. The reader who is familiar with the language will recall that the /y/ is actually present in the orthography, the consonantal spelling of dbarékā being DBRYK. However, the /y/ is not pointed with a schwa-sign, the necessary marker of pronounced syllable-final consonants inside words, and therefore could not have been regarded by the Masoretes as phonetically manifest. Recall too that /y/ is orthographically present throughout the entire paradigm of plural noun + suffixes, a clear case of morphophonemic spelling.
A special rule is required to handle the case of stressed /ay/, perhaps rather a special clause of rule (32). It is dependent on boundary information, for although base forms like /bayt+a/ and /dabar+ay+ka/ share the relevant feature of purely segmental make-up, a diphthong destined to bear stress, they are readily distinguishable in terms of morphological structure. The rule must look like this:

\[(13a) \text{De-Diphth. II} \quad \hat{a}y + e / \_\_ \_ + CV\]

The rule DD-II clarifies the underlying shape of the augment -e- that we noticed above (1.1) in certain imperfects: tqumēnā 'they/you fp will arise', tsubbēnā 'they/you fp will go around. It is /-ay-/, and behaves exactly like the morpheme we are looking at.

DD-II must be ordered after VD, so that the underlying glide protects the vowel from deletion.

Turning now to the first person, we find the following:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{dābār} + \text{suff.} & \text{dābārim} + \text{suff.} & \text{/dabar+ay/} \\
\text{S.} & \text{P.} & \text{S.} & \text{P.} \\
\text{dābarī} & \text{dābārenū} & \text{dābāray} & \text{dābārenū} \\
\end{array}
\]

The augments we found in the 2nd person paradigm are discernible, through a little phonology. The form dābarī appears strange, because a vocalic final bears stress; the form dābāray appears to lack a pronoun altogether. If we assume that the 1s ending is /-y/, then the augments we saw in the
2nd person will get us close to the surface forms: /dabar+e+y/, /dabar+ay+y/. The /y/ functions as a final consonant, insuring final stress; the plural form comes out of the rules we've seen, since Word-Final Degemination will simplify the final geminate. The singular demands a rule taking /e+y/ to ī; this hints that the vowel we are representing as /e/, which is the short front vowel of the language, should perhaps be represented most deeply as /i/, from which it descended historically. I shall persist with /e/, since it is this vowel that participates in the quantity alternations which are germane to the subject of the overall investigation. In Chapter 2, this detail of representation will be sorted out. For the present, we postulate the following:

(23b) High Glide e y + ī / -- #

From the plural form (on the plural noun) /dabar+ay+nū/, we expect *dbārāynū, or rather, through the effects of DD-II, *dbārēnū, with the stressed vowel short. Evidently, the rule DD-I,(32), disregards in this case the [-stress] condition that preserves the diphthong in e.g. bāyta.

On the singular noun, from /dabar+e+nū/, we should get by VD *dbārnū. What actually happens is preservation of the augment and consequent lengthening of it by the normal action of TL: dbārēnū. This (as opposed to the appearance of the long vowel ā in the plural) is the reflex of a significant sub-regularity among the suffixes: of those shaped +CV
only /-ka/ serves as a context for VD. In 1.11 an integrative account of the fact is given. Recognizing this, and factoring it out, the form dārēnū 'our word' supports choosing /e/ as the linking vowel attached to the singular noun.

At this point, we have reached the following analysis of suffixation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S.</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-AUG + y</td>
<td>-AUG + nū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>-AUG + ka</td>
<td>-AUG + kem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>-AUG + k</td>
<td>-AUG + ken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The character of AUG is determined by the number of the noun; singular, it is /e/, in the plural /ay/.

Clearly the /k/ that is constant throughout the 2nd person stands as a morpheme on its own. With this in mind, recall the look of the 2nd person inflection of the perfect:

| 2m | kāṭābta | ktabtem |
| 2f | kāṭābt /t+ī/ | ktaben |

The inflectional affixes parallel the pronouns point-for-point: -ta/-ka (ms); -t/-k (fs); -tem/-kem (mp); -ten/-ken (fp). Recall that the underlying /-ī/ termination of the f.s. is a feature of the inflected verb per se, appearing in the imperfect (and imperative) as well. Based on this parallelism, we can further analyze the 2nd person affix as a structure C+M, where C = /k/ or /t/ depending on syntactic category, and M varies with the number and gender of the pronoun.
The subject pronouns of the first and second persons have this form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are based on a stem /?an/. Full progressive assimilation of /n/ is the norm in the language, and it explains the doubling of the /t/ in the second person.

(N-A Assimilation) \[ n \rightarrow C_i / -- C_i \]

The rule operates across a morpheme boundary in the Nipîl imperfect, producing e.g. yikkâtēb from /ya+n+Kateb/; across a single word boundary optionally with the preposition min-'from', as mibbâyit or min-bâyit 'from a house' (though perhaps the optionality is to be located in a rule weakening the word boundary in a string like min#bayit); and stem internally in e.g. yîtēn /ya+nten/ 'he will give', hîggîd/ he+ngîd/ (Hipîl). The rule has wrinkles: across a boundary /n/ will assimilate to anything; inside a stem, it does not assimilate to gutturals (2 exceptions), as a form
like yinhál 'he will obtain (property)' illustrates; furthermore, in the verb, a stem-final /n/ will not assimilate: nākontā /na+kōn+ta/ 'you ms stood firm' (Nipľal) is the regular case. The verb nātan 'to give' is the only exception to the last provision, always assimilating at both ends whenever possible: nātāttā /natan+ta/ 'you ms. gave'.

The fs pronoun ?ātt does not indicate, as might be thought, that N-assimilation precedes WFD, but rather that the pronoun, like the verb-suffix, ends in /-i/, being therefore /?an+t+î/. In other cases where N-assimilation interacts with WFD, degemination always occurs. Consider the jussive yēt 'let him extend', truncated from yittē /ya+n+ta+y/; compare yēbk 'let him weep' truncated from yibkē /ya+bkay/.

Now, if we took the suffixes we found above and attached them to the stem /?an/, we'd get the following underlying forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>?an+y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>?an+t+a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>?an+t+ī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ls form demands a rule of glide vocalization, and an early one, so that stress can be shifted onto the vocalized glide by VD (the a of ?ānī is due to the initial
guttural, cf. rule (44), section 1.6 'Schwa-to-A'). Such a rule of vocalization will in fact be motivated quite independently in 1.9.

The lp form given needs the infix -ah- to underly ?anahnū. This morpheme makes no other appearance in the language. Note the failure of PTL; *?anahnū is certainly the expected form.

The 2ms form ?attz should of course be penultimately stressed, but is so only in sentence-final position. A minor rule is at hand; cf. 1.13 where sentence-final forms are discussed.

The characteristic 2nd person consonant t/k can now be seen for what it is. The /t/ appears as the inflection expressing the notion 'subject of the finite verb'; the /k/ elsewhere, as possessor on nouns, object on verbs, subject or object of the infinitive.

Turning now to the third person, a slightly different situation presents itself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dābār</th>
<th>dbrārīm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>dbara</td>
<td>dbrām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>dbara</td>
<td>dbrān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>dbaraw</td>
<td>dbrēhem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>dbara</td>
<td>dbrēhen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the plural pronouns, we see repeated the use of /m/ in the masculine, /n/ in feminine, establishing
these as separate morphemes. The augment on the singular noun, where it is obvious, is /a/, not the /e/ of the other person.

The feminine plural pronoun is clearly /ha/. Being of the form CV, like /ka/, it is susceptible to DD II, and the short vowel is indeed what's there. In the singular only the /h/ remains. This is no feature of the singular noun, but a reflex of a-augmentation. On the verb, for example, in the imperfect, the augment is /e/, and the full form of the pronoun remains: yišmreha /ya+šmor+e+ha/ 'he will guard her'. In the perfect, when an /a/ precedes, the form is just /h/: šmarah /šamar+ a+ha/ 'he guarded her', where the /a/ is an augment; šmartah /šamar+ta+ha/ 'you ms guarded her; where the /a/ is part of the 2ms inflection. Note too šmartiha /šamar+t+I+ha/, where a non-a vowel precedes.

These forms indicate that there is a rule chopping off /a/:

(25) A-After-A \( a + \emptyset / a + C -- \# \)

It is instructive to look at the subject forms for the 3rd person.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{s.} & \text{p.} \\
\text{m.} & \text{hū} & \text{hem, hemmā} \\
\text{f.} & \text{hī} & \text{hennā} \\
\end{array}
\]
Clearly, the 3rd person pronouns are based on the stem /h-/.
Subtracting this in the plural leaves a remainder that is very similar to what's left when the /t/ or /k/ is stripped from the 2 plural forms.

Observe that the plural forms, when extended with /-a/,- show a geminate consonant: hemma, henna (?attēnā is an alternate form for the 2fp ?attēn). This implies that in hēm, and by extension, -hem, -hen, -kem, -ken, -ten, -tem, the final nasal is geminated. Is it then the case that the masculine morpheme is really -mm-, the feminine -nn-? This cannot be correct, because in dbārām the stressed vowel is lengthened. I suggest rather that we see the augment /-en-/ interposed between the pronominal consonant and the gender marker: the 3 mp is /h+en+m/, the 3 fp is /h+en+n/. The rule of nasal assimilation, (33), will produce the geminates, the rule WFD, (14), will simplify them when abut a word boundary.

The augment /-en-/ functions elsewhere in the system. To the imperfect there are two species of pronominal attach-
ment, one mediated by /-e-/, the other by /-en-. As well as yišmorkā /ya+smor+e+ka/, there is yišmrēkkā; beside yišmrenū, there is yišmrēnnū /ya+šmor+en+nū/.

Observe that, in the imperfect examples, the vowel of the augment fails to lengthen under stress. This, then, is the root of the exceptionality to TL that bedevils all affixes related to the 2 and 3 pl. pronouns. The morpheme /-en-/ is exceptional to TL: but only when it is not the first
syllable of a word, as ḥēm, hēnā illustrate.

The organization of the (non-1st person) plural pronouns emerges as PERS-en- GEN, where PERS is a single consonant -- h for 3rd person, k/t for the 2nd -- and GEN is m for masculine, n for remine.

Now, the masculine singular suffixes -ō and -āw do not stand in a totally perspicious relationship to the free subject pronoun hū 'he', but the relationship is not impenetrable either. The form hū does make regular appearances in the paradigm of suffixation. One may say either šmārō' or šmārahū, meaning 'he guarded him'; one may say either šmartihū or šmartīw, if one means 'I guarded him'. The last example suggests a derivational path:/ay+hū+/ay+w/ →/aw+w/. The last is an appropriate source for -āw. Degemination will simplify the final cluster, TL will lengthen the vowel. But! says the keen-eyed reader: the vowel is followed by a cluster, and should not lengthen; just as it does not lengthen in the 1st person /-ay+y/. True enough, but /w/ does not count in the blocking of TL: contrast mawet /mawt/ 'death' with bayit 'house'. A truly final version of TL would record this.

Since the rules relating the alternants of the 3ms suffix are of very narrow scope, and since the type of machinery they use is of a familiar sort, I am not going to elaborate them.

Observe finally in the fs pronoun hī /h+ī/ the morpheme /ī/ that we have seen in the verb and on the pronoun 2fs. The fs object suffix cannot be /k+ī/ because Segholation
occurs on the plural noun: dbærâyik. Contrast the failure of Segholation in kätab+t+t+I/. The distribution of this /t/ is thus parallel to the distribution of the /t/ in the 2nd person: it shows up only in inflection that refers to the subject of finite verbs.

The results of the excursus can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the noun, the augment before the suffixes is /ay/ in the plural; in the singular it is /e/ for the 1st and 2nd persons, /a/ for the 3rd.

I have led this rather brisk sight-seeing tour through the gates and alleys of pronominal morphology to clarify the geography of suffixation in the language; and to show how certain phonological correlates of suffixation, particularly of the 2nd person suffixes (-ka, -kem) find a reasonable explanation in terms of the rule-set developed so far, within an
analysis of the morphology that provides a general account of the structural regularities of the system.

This done, I shall not represent the ultimate results of the analysis in every cited underlying form, e.g. /dabar+ay+h+en+m/; for purposes of clarity, I will use boundaries to mark the major divisions, as between stem and suffix, augment and pronoun.
1.5 On the correct formulation of PTL

1.5.1 Let us turn now to a variety of deletion which is not dealt with correctly in the system developed so far.

The non-low vowels /e o/, when they appear in the env. ČV--CV or VCC--CV -- when they lie after a heavy syllable--regularly suffer deletion. According to the present rules, however, when they appear in the env. --CV, they should lengthen by PTL, and therefore be immune to VD. Only /a/ behaves in the predicted way. These examples present the facts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ČV--CV</th>
<th>VCC--CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/šōpet/</td>
<td>/ma+qaddeš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fōlām/</td>
<td>/ma+špat/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/šōpet/</td>
<td>/mqaddēš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fōlām/</td>
<td>/mišpat/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/šōptim/</td>
<td>/mqaddēšim/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fōlātim/</td>
<td>/mišpatim/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(šōpet: a judge; fōlām: eternity; mqaddēš: sanctifying (part. Pifṭel); mišpat: judgment)

The same contrast between /e o/ and /a/ is found in the forms of the imperfect verb when it is suffixed with object pronouns. Consider what happens when the suffix -ēnī 'me' is attached to the m.s.:

/ya+šmor/       yišmor       yišmrenī       'he will guard/me'
/ya+nten/       yitten       yittnenī       'he will give/me'
/ya+šmal/       yišmalī      yišmaṭenī       'he will hear/me'
The total progressive assimilation of the stem-initial \( n \) of yitten is absolutely regular; the process was touched on in 1.4.

Traditionally, this phenomenon has been thought to imply the existence of another rule of vowel deletion, operating in the env. \( \{VC\} \cdot C--CV \). Aronoff (1971) orders the rule early, before PTL has a chance to lengthen the vowels.

If this approach is correct, then a key feature of the SPE theory stands in need of revision. Eschewing direct representation of the notion 'syllable', SPE only allows reference to concatenations of segments. This restricted mode of analysis characterizes \( \bar{VC} \)--the weak syllable--as a natural element in phonological description, because it is expressible as a simple concatenation. But the two disjuncts of the notion 'heavy syllable'-- to be 'heavy' is either to contain a long vowel or to be closed with a consonant-- do not coalesce into one entity in SPE theory. To express 'heaviness' requires a clumsy list, braced together, as we've just seen in stating the environment for the alleged Hebrew process. Great success has been attained in eliminating the 'heavy syllable' from the analysis of stress-phonology, where it has been a touchstone in traditional description. The theory of disjunction allows it to be treated as the (unstated) complement of the natural unit 'weak syllable'. For example, consider a not unusual stress-assignment situation: main stress falls on
the last syllable if it contains a long vowel or if it has the shape VCC; otherwise, stress falls on the penult. We write:

\[(26) \quad \text{V} \rightarrow [\text{+stress}] / - - C_o \ (\text{V} \ (\text{C}) \ ) \ #\]

This notation says: stress the penult if the final syllable consists of a short vowel followed by at most one consonant; otherwise, stress the final syllable. But the difference is not merely verbal. The SPE theory entails that natural languages will manifest only such patterns as are expressible in this fashion. The present example of deletion seems to demand positive reference to a heavy syllable, and thus constitutes an interesting challenge to the SPE claim.

In terms of the Hebrew rule-system, too, there is good ground for suspicion. A new, early rule of Post-Heavy Syllable-Deletion (PHD) repeats essential respects of the richly motivated VD, since it applies like VD only to short vowels in open syllables. Because of this, if the vowels under consideration do not undergo PTL, the rule of VD as given will remove them, all by itself.

Let us turn the question around, then, and ask not where /e o/ delete, but where they lengthen pre-tonically. There are really only two environments, as the following table illustrates:
These two environments can be collapsed readily in an SPE-type notation (See Vergnaud 1974; Halle, Prince, & Vergnaud 1975 for details):

\[(27)\]  
\[V^{+}[+\text{long}] /\#\#(X \tilde{V}) C -- C \tilde{V}^{[-\text{low}]}

The words ben 'son' and šem 'name' are peculiar in that they lose their stem vowel before pronominal suffixes: bṇah 'her son', šmāh 'her name'. That this is a peculiarity, not a phonological condition on the rule, is shown by the tabulated form ġ̄esah 'her tree', in which lengthening does take place. Apparently the two words are subject to a condition that can be expressed in a minor rule of exception-feature assignment:

\[(28)\]  
\[/\ddot{\text{e}}\text{m}/, /\ddot{\text{e}}\text{n}/ \rightarrow [-\text{PTL}] / \rightarrow \text{Pron}

The specialized rule of PTL for non-low vowels fits into the less restricted rule that applies to /a/:

\[(29)\]  
\[\text{PTL} \quad V^{+}[+\text{long}] /\#\# (X (\tilde{V}^\text{a})_b ) C -- C \tilde{V}^{[-\text{lo}_a]} \quad \text{Condition: } a \vdash b\]
When (a) is satisfied, the condition generates rule (27).
When (a) is not satisfied—when PTL applies to a [+low] vowel—, the following rule emerges:

(30) \[ V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] /## (X (V)) C \rightarrow C \hat{V} \]

As with TL, the parenthesized vowel places no restriction, since it abuts a variable. The rule is equivalent to

(31) \[ V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] /## (X) C \rightarrow C \hat{V} \]

which says that lengthening occurs wherever the right-hand environment is met; exactly what we want to say, once /e o/ are removed from consideration.

The unwieldy notion of a heavy syllable thus proves to be replaceable by its readily expressible complement, the light syllable, with a minimum of conditional decoration.

The two theories, however, are not mere notational variants. Recall that the Heavy Syllable Theory require an order PHD--PTL(--VD), so that the deleted vowel of e.g. \( \text{ sóptə̈im} \) \( /\text{šopə̈t+ǐm}/ \) is gone before PTL has a chance to preserve it. This ordering raises the possibility that two vowels in a row could be deleted, one by PHD, one by VD, which follows it. In the Weak Syllable Theory here expounded, this is an out-and-out impossibility; there being just one rule of vowel deletion (VD), a rule which applies in an alternating fashion, never doing two-in-a-row. The crucial examples exist. Suppose
we affix a Qal imperfect like yismor /ya+šmor/ or a Pielfel perfect like giddel /gaddel/ with the 2ms object pronoun +e+ka. Forms like /ya+šmor+e+ka/, /gaddel+e+ka/ have the requisite two-vowel line-up, the non-low stem vowels occuring after a heavy syllable, and the vocalic augment +e+ being subject to VD. What happens is preservation, not deletion, of the stem vowels, as predicted by the Weak Syllable or VD-only theory.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{/ya+šmor+e+ka/} \\
\text{Spir,V-Final} & \tilde{k}_a \\
\text{Main Stress} & ya\tilde{š}mor+\tilde{e}+\tilde{k}_a \\
\text{PTL} & -- \\
\text{VD} & ya\tilde{š}mor+\ddot{o}+\tilde{k}_a \\
\text{A-to-I} & yi\tilde{š}mor+ \tilde{k}_a \\
\text{Output:} & yismorka
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{/gaddel+e+ka/} 'he brought you up' \\
\text{Spir,V-Final} & \tilde{k}_a \\
\text{Main Stress} & gaddel+\tilde{e}+\tilde{k}_a \\
\text{PTL} & -- \\
\text{VD} & giddel+\ddot{o}+\tilde{k}_a \\
\text{A-to-I} & giddel+ \tilde{k}_a \\
\text{Output:} & giddelka
\end{array}
\]

The most general version of Heavy Syllable Theory predicts the unheard-of forms **yismrkā, **giddlkā. The VD-only theory not only accords with SPE; it has the virtue of being right.

It may be instructive to derive the same verb forms affixed with the other incarnation of the 2ms pronoun, -ekka /en+ka/.
1.5.2 Countermoves

Against the proposal to restrict PTL rather than introduce a new rule of deletion along the lines of PHD, there are at least two clear lines of argument.

(I) It might be alleged that in an overzealous pursuit of regularity, all occurrences of -kā as a noun and verb suffix have been reduced to -e + ka, thereby artifactually creating a complex situation which arises in no other way. The proper tonic for this excess would be a realism that posits -kā where it sees -ka: yismorka is just /yismor + ka/, and the " is short simply because it never occurs -- C V. In this view the allomorphs of the 2ms pronominal suffix when attached to the imperfect are -ekkā /en+ka/ and -ka /ka/.

This proposal is tested by the behaviour of verbs with imperfects in /a/, such as šālāḥ 'to send', impf. yislāḥ. The realistic theory that posits /ka/ (and attendant mechanisms to get the stress final) predicts that the a-stem vowel will remain short, as the environment for PTL is not met in a string
like /yaːlāh+kā/. The theory that uses /+e+ka/ will, on the other hand, predict lengthening by PTL of the low stem-vowel in /yaːlāh+e+ka/, there being no restriction on the pre-tonic lengthening of /a/.

Lengthening occurs: yislāhəkā is the attested form. (The raised a is a predictable concomitant of the guttural: see 1.6 infra: a short, unstressed echo). This is strong evidence for /-e+ka/, strong evidence against the mere /-kā/.

Now, in Piṭṭēl it happens that this lengthening does not take place: from šillāh 'to send' (same root), impf. yšallāh, comes šillāhəkā, yšallāhəkā 'he sent/ will send you'. (Cf. Qal šmārkā /šamar+e+ka/ 'he guarded you', šlāhəkā /šalah+e+ka/ 'he sent you', with the expected lengthening). This failure of PTL in Piṭṭēl occurs uniformly before all pronominal suffixes, not just before -e+ka, and in both perfect and imperfect. With the ls suffix (impf.) -enī, for example, we find yšallāhenī 'he will send me'. Here, failure of PTL has meant loss of the stem-vowel via VD. Contrast the Qal version yšlāhenī, where the expected pre-tonic lengthening is evident.

Why does /a/ behave peculiarly in Piṭṭēl? More fundamentally, one might ask: what is /a/ doing in the Piṭṭēl anyway? The characteristic vowel of the Piṭṭēl, as the name suggests, is /e/, as in giddēl 'to grow, raise (tr)', bigqēs
'to seek', qillēl 'to curse' (same root, qll, as Qal), hillel 'to praise', qiddēš 'to sanctify'. Evidently the characteristic vowel turns to /a/ before gutturals, as in slaught, but behaves like /e/ with respect to PTL, failing to lengthen after VCC--. This indicates that the requisite rule follows PTL. It is simplest to order it before TL, so that the general prohibition against lengthening /a/ under stress in verbs can be invoked to explain the quantity properties; after TL, the simplest rule, a mere lowering (and backing) would map ̅ onto ̅.

The story does not end here, however. Many Pillēl verbs allow an alternate perfect in /a/, regardless of the character of the final consonant: so qiddēš may also be vocalized qiddāš, sillem 'make whole' as sillām, berek /berrek/ 'bless' as berāk, and so on. (Vide Ch. 2 for the first syllable vocalism of berek). This alternation, or equivocation, seems to be by-and-large optional, though some verbs, e.g. limmad 'to teach', apparently only allow /a/. This phenomenon only occurs in the perfect; all other forms -- imperfect, participle, infinitive, imperative -- take /e/ with total uniformity: e.g. ylammed 'he will teach'. The guttural-final stems show /a/ everywhere (yašallāh) except in the participle, which is mašalleh /ma+šalleh/.

Two rules are at hand, then, one which uniformly affects /e/ before gutturals in verbs (not adjectives, like
the participle), another which affects /e/ in the PiPiel perfect. Both are ordered between PTL and TL, because the vowel they affect acts like /e/ with respect to PTL and /a/ with respect to TL.

(32) Verb-Guttural 
\[ e \rightarrow a / \text{--G#} / \text{in verbs} \]

(33) PiPiel-A 
\[ e \rightarrow a / \text{--C#} / \text{in PiPiel perfect} \]

Rule (33) is either optional or minor, perhaps both, depending on the actual distribution of /a/ and /e/ in the verbs of the language, a kind of fact that may be lost in the folds of time.

Both rules are ordered so as to effect a kind of paradigmatic regularity. The /a/ of PiPiel, whether it arise through guttural influence or through the option of rule (33), mimics the basic e-vowel of the conjugation in deletability and pre-tonic lengthen-ability. A form like qiddaška parallels qiddeška more perfectly than the *qiddaška one might expect on general grounds, looking at ktaḥka, dbārkā, or yilbaška.

The PiPiel data, then, give no comfort to the proposal that the 2ms suffix -ka is attached directly in the imperfect, without its linking vowel. Quite the contrary: the deletion before other suffixes, such as in šillhām/ *šillāḥām is explicable by the same principles that secure retention of the vowel as short in e.g. qiddaška, šillahā'ka.
The surfacist who denies -ka its linking vowel forfeits an understanding of the behaviour of PiTel verbs before suffixes, and at the same time misses an explanation of the difference in PTL-properties between e.g. yilbaška (long vowel, Qal) and qiddaška (short vowel, PiTel).

(II) The proposal I am making is that PTL be restricted in its application to non-low vowels, with VD responsible for all deletions; call this the Restriction Hypothesis (RH). The most obvious counterproposal, based on traditional accounts, would hold that PTL is unlimited and adduce a separate, earlier (before VD) rule of deletion, PHD, that elides non-low vowels (short ones) after a heavy syllable; call this the Heavy Syllable Theory (HST). It is possible to construct an argument for the Heavy Syllable Theory, based on a kind of data that is dealt with very clumsily in the Restriction Hypothesis. The argument has a rather subtle coloration: it urges the existence of the rule PHD because there are forms that are exceptional to it; in HST they can be treated as simple exceptions, but in the RH which I propose, a special minor rule must be concocted. This mode of argument may seem a bit rarified, but I think it's important to pursue it, since it is based on a clear empirical difference between the two theories and not many such differences can be found. The counterargument will show (1) that when HST is elaborated to the point where
it works (gets facts like non-deletion in yismorka, discussed above), significant generalizations about the language are inexpressible in it, and (2) that very similar data require a minor rule treatment in HST, anyway. The counterargument will vindicate the RH offered above, and with it the SPE theory of natural phonological elements.

The difficult data arises in the derivation of certain feminine nouns from Qal participles. Participles Qal of ordinary triliteral verbs are, in the masculine singular, shaped /CoCeC/, as in kōtēb 'writing ms', kōtēbīm 'mp'. Observe, in the plural form, the regular deletion (rather than lengthening) of the pre-tonic /e/. The participial feminine is formed in the singular by affixation of /-t/ instead of the usual fs morpheme /-at/ (cf. 1.11): kōtēbēt /kōteb+t/. (The shortness of the stressed vowel is due to Philippi's Law, Ch. 2). In the plural, affixation of the fp morpheme /-ōt/ produces, as expected, kōtēbōt.

So far, no wrinkles. But a small number of nouns are formed by affixation of the full fs ending /-at/ to the participial stem. Examples are yōlēdā /yōlēd+at/ 'woman in travail', related to the verb yālād 'to give birth', and tōfēbā /tōfēb+at/ 'abominable thing', from the root tīb. In these words, strikingly, the /e/ is not only retained, but lengthened. If PTL is restricted to apply to non-low vowels only in the environment (X V) C--CV, it cannot possibly
lengthen the underlying short stem vowel of yolēda. However, in HST, the word class Participle Stem+/at/ can be regarded as simply exceptional to PHD, as a consequence of which the unrestricted rule of PTL will lengthen the surviving vowel. In the RH some special rule must be created to lengthen the pre-tonic vowel in just these cases.

Before the argument can be evaluated, the HST has got to be explicitly formulated, and in such a way that it handles the central body of regular data. Observe that if the rule PHD is constructed to be inapplicable to the preserved non-low stem vowels in yišmorka /ya+šmor+e+ka/, giddelka /gaddel+e+ka/, then PTL must still be constrained from applying to them; the Restriction Hypothesis re-surfaces. This problem breaks into two parts, there being two relevant vowels: the treatment of /o/ and the treatment of /e/.

As for /o/, it can be excluded from PTL altogether, since there are no forms in the ordinary language that require it to be lengthened pre-tonically. This is because, as we noted above, stems ending -oC# always geminate the consonant, due to rule (15), as in ḥayom 'afraid' -- ḥayummim 'pl.'. In his exhaustive survey of the treatment of pre-tonic vowels, F. R. Blake is able to come up with only two cases (JNES, 1950): (1) the word gbōhīm 'high', singular: gābōah, (2) before the archaic imperfect affixes -ūn 2 & 3 m pl, for -ū, and -īn 2 f sing, for -ī. Example (1) is,
alas, irrelevant: from the expected geminated plural form /gəbohh+īm/ would come, by a general process discussed in Ch. 2, the observed gbohīm, with its long vowel. Example (2) can be brushed off as archaism operating outside the normal patterns of the language. Supporting this view is the fact that these cases should be susceptible to the syncopatory action of Post-Heavy Syllable Deletion: yiktōbūn, tiktōbūn, tiktōbīn. Gesenius (par. 47m) notes that these occur mainly in pause, where the usual forms are yiktōbū, tiktōbū, tiktōbī; this suggests a conscious archaizing, perhaps distorted by hypercorrection. Finally, there simply are no stems /CoCVC/ in the language, an arbitrary restriction on canonical form. Therefore, in HST, we exclude /o/ from PTL, allowing the rule to apply only to the non-round vowels /e a/.

This done, it becomes clear that PHD need not (and must not) apply to /o/ either. Since the round vowel never lengthens by PTL, the deletion evident in a word like yišmrem /ya+šmor+e+m/ 'he will guard them m' is accomplished by VD; it's not necessary to invoke PHD. And in yišmorkā /ya+šmor+e+ka/ the vowel that lies after the heavy syllable is preserved: VD may not delete it, because it deletes the augment -e-; PHD cannot be allowed to delete it either. The rule PHD therefore applies only to /e/.
The vowel /e/ cannot be denied pre-tonic lengthening: recall examples like zqènka /zaqen+e+ka/, šèmot /šem+ôt/.

However, once the rule PHD is constrained from deleting /o/, once it is allowed to delete, in fact, only one vowel, it is a small matter to see the e of giddelkā or šømerkā /šømer+e+ka/ 'your ms guardian' as being epenthesized to break up the four-consonant cluster that results from deletion in adjacent syllables. An observationally satisfactory version of HST thus requires the following system of rules:

(34)  

a. PHD \[ e \rightarrow \emptyset \begin{cases} VC \end{cases} \begin{array}{c} {\text{C}} \end{array} \rightarrow CV \]

b. PTL' \[ V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] \ egin{array}{c} {\text{C}} \end{array} \ egin{array}{c} {\text{v}} \end{array} \ egin{array}{c} {\text{[-round]}} \end{array} \]

c. VD, as above, rule (3)

d. e-Insertion

e. TL, as above, rule (11)

(The rule of e-Insertion may seem damagingly ad-hoc, but within the revised system we present below (1.6) something very like it is motivated.)

These rules would function in derivation like this:
Although this solution is observationally adequate, and not totally implausible, it is not very acceptable. Leaving aside the fact that rules (34a, b) are more discursive than the restricted version of PTL, rule (29), observe that the exclusion of /o/ from PHD and PTL' is an ad-hoc measure aimed at forms of the yismorka class. Under the Restriction Hypothesis, there is no need to accord /o/ special status in the rules: the properties of /o/ are consequent upon the peculiarities of its distribution, which must be stated in any grammar. In the Heavy Syllable Theory, /o/ has the same set of distributional restrictions in morphemes, but their effects must be redundantly re-specified in the phonological rules; and specified twice, independently in each relevant rule (PHD, PTL').
Returning to the data of the argument, note that
the plural of yōleḏā is yōldōt /yōleḏ+ōt/, which is regular;
the plural of toieḇā is toīeḇōt, which is exceptional in the
same way as the singular. These data are not particularly
illuminating. But if we look at the derivational class
/ma+CCeC/, we find a similarly widespread and erratic excep-
tionality. Consider the word masseḇā /ma+nṣeḇ+at/ 'standing-
stone', in which the pre-tonic vowel is lengthened exception-
ally, not deleted. The plural masseḇōt, like toīeḇōt, but
when pronominal suffixes are added to draw the accent away,
eliminating the possibility of PTL, the long ĕ remains:
masseḇōṭēḥēm /ma+nṣeḇ+ōt+ay+hemm/, masseḇōṭēḵā /ma+nṣeḇ+ōt+ay+ka/.
The same situation prevails in e.g. maggēpā /ma+ngep+at/
'plague', plural suffixed, maggēpōṭāy /ma+ngep+ōt+ay+y/ 'my
plagues'. We know the surface ĕ is short underlying (1) on
general grounds, since these forms are clearly derived by
/-at/-affixation from the stem /ma+CCeC/, which is quite
regular in the masculine, e.g. mizḇēʿaḥ 'altar', pl. mizbhōt,
and (2) at least some of the members of this class show de-
letion in the construct state, e.g. massbāṭ, massbōt 'stand-
ing-stone(s) of'. (See 1.12 for an account of construct
phonology).

Consequently, any theory is doomed to a minor rule
lengthening these vowels in variety of morphological circum-
stances, which vary for each individual word. Some undergo
the rule uniformly in all inflections (maggēpā), some
everywhere but in the construct state (masseḇā). And there
is no reason not to invoke this rule in the yöledä-type of case, which displays an exactly similar kind of irregularity.

To conclude: we have seen that only the solution embodied in rule (29), the annotated version of PTL, can explain both the quantity and the deletion properties of /e o/ in terms of a single restriction, the limitation of the rule to the env. ## (X V) C -- CVV when it applies to non-low vowels. The Heavy Syllable Theory can be elaborated to the point of observational adequacy, but it must impose two independent restrictions on the processing of /o/, one in PTL', one in PHD, both aimed ad hoc at the yišmorkä-type of case. The single restriction in the RH is, on the other hand, motivated independently of the behaviour of /o/ by facts like the sopet/soptim alternation; and, because of this, in the RH the distributional restrictions on /o/ in morphemes (and the rule of 0-Closure (15)) provide a real explanation for the character of its surface alternants.

On a more crassly empirical level, we found that the data upon which the argument for the HST was based could easily be subsumed under a minor rule that must be an appurtenance of any grammar of the language.
1.6 Schwas, Spirantization, Silence

The discussion so far has been eased by a simplification: where standard grammars transcribe schwa, I have omitted indication of a vowel. In Lambdin (1971) for example, there is found dabārīm for my dbārīm, kātābū for kātbū, yikṭābū for yikṭbū. Two issues present themselves, one phonetic, the other phonological: (1) to what extent is the standard transcription justified, and (2) to that extent, what is the role of schwa in the system of Hebrew grammar.

The phonetic issue arises because the Masoretes used one diacritic to mark both vowellessness and schwa. This sign, a vertically oriented pair of dots, is placed under consonants in basically two environments, like this: ġCV, ġC#. Our examples thus appear: ḍbārīm kāṭbū yikṭbū. Word-final two consonant clusters arise regularly through truncation in the 2fs (vide supra 1.4), e.g. ḥatt 'you fs', napālt 'you fs fell'; and appear irregularly in such forms as yeḥek 'let him weep' (truncated from yibke).

The transcription we have used comes out of the orthography via the simple principle of ignoring the schwa-sign. Traditional grammar distinguishes the quiescent schwa, ə, marking the end of the syllable, from the vocal schwa, ə, the reduced vowel. According to the view of Lambdin (1971) and Gesenius (1910), which is ultimately based upon that
expressed in R. David Qimhi's Mikhlol, an important mid-1200's compilation of the results of 3 centuries of grammatical research, the schwa is vocal in three contexts: #C---, V C C---, V V C---; that is, everywhere except after a weak syllable V C --

This view deserves skepticism because it is the child of two theories, neither of which is acceptable. First, that spirantization of the unemphatic stops /b g d k p t/ occurs after surface - manifest vowels. If vocal schwas are not hypothesized, then in each of our examples -- ḏḇäṟi̱m, ḵā̱ḇū̱, yiḵṯḇū̱ -- known spirants will occur post-consonantally. In a theory with rule ordering, this evidence does not carry weight; and besides, the raw data of the language refutes the statement of distribution: in malke 'kings of ...', malkehem'their m. kings', as we discovered in our discussion of the segholate nouns, the root final consonant is spirantized because of the underlying presence of a vowel-- the infixed plural marker /-a-/ -- which even under the standard theory of schwa is completely absent phonetically. (Apparently there were some die-hard surfacists among the earlier medieval grammarians who urged the pronunciation maḻe̱ḵe̱, etc., just to obtain the transparency of spirantization. ref: W. Chomsky). Second is Qimhi's theory that unstressed long vowels could only occur in open syllables (again, on the surface), so that ḏḇá̱rḵā̱ 'your m.s. word' must be in the relevant respect vocalized as ḏḇā̱rḵā̱. But there
is no good reason to accept this as an accurate generalization about Hebrew structure, and indeed certain other grammarians, among them Ben Asher, Ibn Balīam, and Ibn Ezra, did not work with it. (W. Chomsky p. 44, n. 19). All the grammarians agree that schwa is vocal in the env. V C C--C.

There is, however, evidence from outside the grammatical tradition which bears on the point. Transliterations of Hebrew words into Greek letters in the Hexapla (2-3 c. A.D.) and the Septuagint (2nd c. B.C.), a translation of the Bible into Greek prepared for the Jews of Alexandria, clearly show vocalization of certain schwa-signs. In the LXX, we find the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>šmū?ēl</td>
<td>Σαμουήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodom</td>
<td>šdōm</td>
<td>Ζώδομα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cherubim</td>
<td>krūbīm</td>
<td>Χερουβίμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>šlōmō</td>
<td>Σαλωμών</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These transliterations clearly support the view that word-initial schwa was actually pronounced. (They also evidence assimilations of schwa to the following vowel, even more extensive than is provided for in Qimhi (par. 4 b-d), a level of detail that is not recoverable from Masoretic orthography.)

The antepenultimate stress in the Greek of Sodom (sōdoma) is presumably the result of applying to it the Greek principle
of recessive accent (cf. Kiparsky 1973). (The word does look like a neuter.) The initial of 'cherub' does not indicate spirantization, but rather that Hebrew k was perceived as being closer to the aspirated \( \text{chi} = k^h \) than the unaspirated \( \text{kappa} = k \). This is not the place to take up the philological issues in serious detail: the interested reader is directed to M. L. Margolis, AJSL. XXVI, p. 62 ff. and to Einar Brønno, Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes.

Another argument that schwa was in some cases vocalized, pointed out by T. O. Lambdin (pers. comm.), comes from the character of the consonantal text. Between two identical consonants, according to the standard view, a reduced vowel is retained always: so, from \( \text{sābāb} \) 'go around' we get \( \text{sābābū} \) 'they went around', from \( \text{sēl} \) 'shadow' we get \( \text{ṣālālim} \) 'shadows', \( \text{silālē} \) 'shadows of ...'. In the consonantal text, \( \text{sābābū} \) appears as \( \text{SBBW} \), \( \text{ṣilālē} \) as \( \text{SLLY} \). It is crucial that in examples like this the consonant is written twice: phonetic geminates are always written with a single letter, so \( \text{sabbōtem} / \text{sabbōtemm} \) / 'you mp went around' is \( \text{SBWTM} \), and \( \text{ṣillī} / \text{ṣillī+y} \) / 'my shadow' is \( \text{SLY} \). The consonants themselves, which are certifiably ancient, testify that a vowel was pronounced in these syllables where we hypothesize VD to operate.
Let us assume, then, that schwa is pronounced in the env. #C--C and V CC--C. I am going to assume, with Ibn Ezra, silence after V(--C, but this decision is arbitrary and could be reversed in the system to be proposed by the addition of one feature to one rule. At any rate, nothing much should ride upon details of this type, which can certainly be expected to vary widely from place to place and time to time.

Can the rule of VD be maintained, supplemented with a late rule of schwa-insertion? The appearance of schwa, not Ø, between identical consonants in the output of VD shows this to be untenable, for after VD has applied, it is impossible to distinguish between sille /selal+ay/ 'shadows of' and silli /sell+a+y/ 'my shadow', yet sille must be schwa-inserted to produce the surface output sillee. The rule VD is therefore reconceived as accomplishing a reduction to schwa:

\[(35)\] Vowel Reduction \[V \rightarrow \emptyset /--C V\] [-1ng]

To tailor the output of VR to accord with the pattern of schwa - Ø distribution we have accepted, we need a rule to make appropriate eliminations:

\[(36)\] Schwa-Deletion \[\emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset /VC_a--C_b\] Condition \[C_a \neq C_b\]

Initial consonant clusters are broken up by schwa.

Does this phonetic generalization entail a rule of schwa-
insertion? The nouns do not provide a clear answer: words like barāḵa, previously cited as brāḵa, 'blessing' need not be lexicalized as brak + at/; an underlying vowel can be hypothesized, say /barak+at/, and VR would supply the schwa. Indeed, as we shall see at 2.1, CCVC is not a possible stem shape for an unaffixed noun. That it appears on the surface before the feminine affix -at can be ascribed to the effects of phonology on the combination of canonically-shaped morphemes, /CVCVC/ plus /VC/. On the other hand, nouns like gabūl 'boundary', barīt 'covenant', show no vowel but schwa in the first syllable, and there is no general process in the language to reduce a vowel that might be underlyingly present in the first syllable. The frame CCVC can, without loss, be stipulated as a canonical stem-form. However, the historical provenance of gabūl and words like it from either *gibūl or *qubūl via a rule of reduction that wiped out /i u/ (= our /e o/) in the env. #C--C V left a gaping hole in the lexicon, and the canonical pattern CCVC could be 'derived' by re-instating the historical forms and the historical rule, i.e. the grammar of Hebrew.

The behavior of the Qal infinitive, however, shows that #CC clusters must be dealt with in the phonology. The following forms are relevant:
i. katōb  'to write' / ktob /

ii. liktōb  'to write' / la+ ktob/ la = to (inf. marker)

iii. biktōb  'when writing' /ba# ktob / ba = in

All Qal infinitives of ordinary tri-literal stems follow the same pattern.

Looking at form (i), katōb, one might suspect an underlying initial vowel that does not behave properly with regard to PTL. The nonspirant /t/ of form (ii), liktōb, is inconsistent with such a hypothesis, if the disappearance of the vowel comes about through the offices of the reduction and deletion rules already in the grammar, for they do not interfere with spirantization. Nailing down the nonexistence of an early rule of (complete) syncope will take us deep into details, and we shall put it off briefly until the outlines of the basic system become somewhat clearer.

Under present assumptions, then, forms (i, ii) evidence a rule inserting schwa into initial consonant clusters:

\[(37) \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset / \#C--C\]

Rule (37) closely resembles Segholation, rule (37). It is not improbable, in fact, that the vowel written e that appears unstressed in segholates had the phonetic value or schwa; if it did, the Masoretic orthography would have had no direct way to indicate it, the schwa-sign itself being used to mark final clusters, and writing e would be a satisfactory compromise, phonetically not far distant
and easy to interpret. If it did not, we need a trivial 
low-level adjustment. So let us dispense with Segholation, 
and using the mirror image convention generalize rule (37) 
to break up both initial and final clusters:

(38) Cluster Break-Up  \( \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset /\#C--C \)

Form (iii), bik\(\tilde{t}o\)b, with its spirantized \(\tilde{t}\), shows that Cluster Break-Up applies to the inner word \(\#ktob\) of /ba#ktob/, sparking Spirantization, after which Schwa-Deletion removes the inserted schwa. The infinitive as object of a true preposition, occurring in a structure

\[ [PP^# P[NP \#N]^#] \]

retains its integrity as a word (as the syntax predicts), and only differs from the free form k\(\tilde{t}o\)b because the preposition provides the context for Schwa-Deletion.

This array of data thus compells the ordering:

Cluster Break Up (schwa insertion)
Spirantization
Schwa Deletion

There's a slight wrinkle here: this rule-system will delete all schwas inserted by the segholation clause of Cluster Break-Up; the schwa of mel\(\tilde{a}\)k is certainly in the env. VC--. This falsification can be amended by ordering a rule of adjustment before Schwa-Deletion, bleeding it:
(39) Segholate Adjustment $\emptyset + e / C -- C \#$

However, if it is true, as I suggested, that the unstressed e of melek is an orthographic dodge for representing a schwa-quality vowel, then Segholate Adjustment is artifactual. Surely too, a vowel like that epenthesized into the final clusters of segholates, being unstressed, is liable to great dialectal variation. (Think of the multitudinous phonations of reduced vowels in English.) I am hesitant, therefore, to make a detail of its value (+back) a principal desideratum of surface word-shape. Schwa-Deletion is easily amended to cover the case:

(40) Schwa-Deletion $\emptyset + \emptyset / VC_a -- C_b V$

Condition $C_a \neq C_b$

(The environment of rule (40) recalls the notion 'doubly open syllable' of Kuroda 1967.)

A question arises as to the correct form of the preposition b- 'in', whether it is /ba/ or just /b/. Of the infinitive marker l- we can be sure, because its vocalism alternates regularly, li- before --CC, lā- before --C ĕ, as lāšēbet /la + ĕ + b + t/ 'to sit or dwell', root yēb. The real prepositions l- 'to', b- 'in', k- 'like' never display the ĕ-vocalism before nouns in the env.--C ĕ, except for l- in a few fixed phrases (see Gesenius, p. 299ff-i
for a list of them). Before certain pronominal suffixes, the /a/ shows up, as lakēm bākēm kākēm 'to, in, like you mp'. This does stand as evidence for la, ba, ka. To get this to work, VR must be allowed to operate across a single word-boundary. PTL as it is stated in rule (13) does not apply across #, so that in strings like /la#amm/ 'to a people', VR outputs l#am. If these prepositions are to be analyzed as merely consonantal, a rule will be needed to turn schwa to /i/ in the env. --CC; and indeed such a rule is motivated by alternations in the paradigm of the Qal imperative:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>Write!</td>
<td>pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>kātōb</td>
<td>kētbī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ktob/</td>
<td>/ktob + u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>kitbī</td>
<td>kātobnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ktob + ī/</td>
<td>/ktob + na/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paradigm also gives evidence for Cluster Break-Up, because the i-vowel in the fs and mp has no plausible source in either /a/ or /e/, as both undergo PTL in the env. #C-CV with regularity. Consequently, the i-vowel can have no other source than the inserted schwa which gets trapped behind two consonants. We require, therefore, rule (41):

\[(41) \text{Schwa-to-I} \quad \Rightarrow \quad i / --CC\]

The relationship of rule (41) to the rule of A-to-I operating in essentially the same environment will be explored
in detail when we turn to examine the segmental alterna-
tions. Rule (41) follows Schwa Deletion, being fed by it.
A derivation may clarify the operation of the rule system
thus far developed.

\[ / \text{kto} + \bar{u}/ \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>/ktob + \bar{u}/</th>
<th>/la+kt\bar{b}/</th>
<th>ba#kt\bar{b}/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>la+kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>ba#kt\bar{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ba#kt\bar{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>la+kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>ba#kt\bar{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Break-Up</td>
<td>k t\bar{b}</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ba#k\bar{t}b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spir</td>
<td>k t\bar{b}</td>
<td>la+kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>ba#k\bar{t}b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwa-Del</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ba#k\bar{t}b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-to-I, Schwa-to-I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>li+kt\bar{b}</td>
<td>bi#kt\bar{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>ka\bar{t}b</td>
<td>likt\bar{b}</td>
<td>bikt\bar{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis has several features worthy of comment.

First, in relation to problems of lexical structure and canonical form of underlying representations, it obviates the necessity for positing a vocalic source for first syllable schwas that alternate only with $\emptyset$, as $g\bar{b}\ddot{u}l$ 'boundary', ligbül 'to a boundary'; or only with $\emptyset$ and /i/, as $b\bar{r}\ddot{a}k\ddot{a}$ 'blessing', birkōtāy 'my blessings', kibrākā 'like a blessing'. Underlying forms like /gēbūl/ or /gobūl/, can be abandoned in favor of /gbūl/, in which the $\emptyset$ alternate is chosen as base, without altering the output: the rules dealing with schwa that are in the grammar to describe alternations in other morphological categories would treat these base forms properly. This fact of course does not decide the question of underlying form in these cases, but it shows that the decision is without phonological content.

Similarly, the schwa-/i/ alternation in the vocalism of the monocoronal prepositions b- l- k- could be treated as reflex of vowel-lessness without modifying any rules.

Second, in relation to the structure of the rule-system, observe that the ordering of Schwa-Deletion and Spirantization was discovered by examining only forms like biktōb where the crucial schwa -- the one that spirantizes the t -- is inserted by rule. This ordering predicts that all underlying vowels will induce spirantization of immediately following stops, because the syncope of reduced vowels is accomplished by the same rule that deletes inserted
schwas. Not only is this prediction borne out, as forms like malkēhem /mal-a-k + ay + hemm/ 'their m. kings' and kanpēhem /kanap + ay + hemm/ attest, but for the situation to be otherwise would necessitate a complication of the grammar. Recall that the treatment of VR-VD as reduction-to-schwa rather than outright deletion is motivated by the identical consonant facts -- sābabu/*sabbu/ -- and thus a Hebrew in which the correct forms were *kanpēhēm and *malkēhēm would have another rule of schwa deletion, identical to the first, but ordered before spirantization.

It is significant that the system of early reduction and late deletion receives this kind of empirical support, for the rule of Spirantization runs into serious ordering problems in the first grammar we proposed, with VD, rule (3), accomplishing complete syncope.

For purposes of discussion, let's assume the distribution of schwa could be handled by late rules of insertion, and return to the VD-Grammar we started out with, attempting to place Spirantization with respect to the other rules, whose order has been successfully determined.

Observe first that Spirantization must be early, must in fact precede VD. Forms like kanpēhēm /kanap+ay+hemm/ and katbu /katab+ū/ have a vowel deleted which is never replaced by schwa; yet the consonant that follows the deleted vowel is spirantized. Spirantization must occur before the
conditioning vowel is removed by VD. The order is:

Spirantization
VD

Segholation, rule (17), feeds Spirantization: from /malk/ we get melek, never ***mélek. Therefore, Segholation precedes Spirantization. But Segholation is rather late among the rules presented. It must follow Word-Final Degemination, rule (14), so that from a base form /rabb/ we obtain rāb, not **rēbeb. Word-Final Degemination applies after TL, rule (11), so that /rabb/ leads to rāb, with a short vowel because of the terminal cluster, not *rāb, which has the shape assumed by biconsonantal words like đam /dam/.

Transitivity of ordering gives

TL

WFD

Segholation

Spirantization.

We know on other grounds that Segholation must follow TL, since the final cluster in, e.g., /malk/, /nāfr/ inhibits lengthening of a, giving mélek, nāfar with short stressed vowels.

But, as we argued above (1.2), VD comes before TL. If it did not, TL would apply to a form like /kabēd+ū/, producing /kabēd+ū/, and the lengthened stem-vowel should
remain; but it's gone: kābdū, not *kābēdū, is found on the surface. This gives

VD

TL.

This ordered pair is the link that allows us to chain all the rules mentioned into one linear order:

Spirantization

VD

TL

WFD

Segholation

Spirantization

A nasty result.

A simpler and therefore more devastating paradox arises in the phonology of gutturals. When a guttural /ʔ h ŋ h/ closer an unstressed syllable, i.e. occurs as G in the context V G C, a (short) copy of the vowel appears after the guttural on the surface. Typically, we find naʕarām

/naʕr+a+m/ 'their m boy', noʕorām /noʕr+a+m/ 'their m early life', yaʕabūd /yaʕbod/ 'he will work'. In the orthography, these copied vowels are written with special signs, called ḥātep's (henceforth: hateph), which consist of the ordinary sign for /a e o/ flanked on the right by the schwa-sign. Traditional grammars set these apart from the non-reduced vowels, describing them as ultra-short, murmured, a species
of schwa. Since the hateph signs are used only in the env.--C V, the peculiar quality of these vowels should be ascribed to their being short vowels in unstressed open syllables. No third degree of length (or shortness) need be taken as primitive, and we identify them completely with the ordinary short vowels they are semiotically cognate to.

It's clear that the hateh vowel in e.g. nošorām has no place in the underlying string; is inserted by rule. The bare bones of the process look like this:

(42) Hateph Formation

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{S.D.} & \text{V} & \text{G} & \text{C} \\
\text{-str} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{S.C.} & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, in the first grammar proposed, the rule VD will create the sequence V G C when it deletes a vowel lying between the G and the C. These sequences are broken up by Hateph Formation. Consider the word pošal, meaning 'work', a segholate noun like mélek, but with an a in the second syllable because of the č. The stem /pošal/ is augmented in the plural by rule (19) to /pošal/, just as /malk/ becomes /malak/. Adding the 3 mp suffix to the plural form looses VD on the inserted vowel, yielding malkēhém and -- pošolēhém, from the intermediate form /pošolēhem/. Similarly, a disyllabic like nāhār 'river' gives nāhārōtēhém from the intermediate vowel-deleted form /nahr+ōt+ē+hem/.
Hateph Formation must follow VD.

But Hateph Formation, like all rules inserting vowels, feeds and thus precedes Spirantization: consider yafabod /ya + ūbod/ 'he will labor' hefēbir /he + ūbir/ 'he led across'. Spirantization does not pass across gutturals, as is shown by samalti /samatitī/ 'I heard', which does not meet the SD of Hateph Formation because of stress, and by tehdar /te+hdar/ 'you m.s. will favor', which is simply exceptional with regard to HF.

So Spirantization, which precedes VD, must apply to the output of HF, which follows VD.

Spirantization

VD

Hateph Formation

Spirantization

The paradox is simple, and inescapable.
These data might set one to thinking of global rules, of local ordering, or -- of dividing VD into an early reduction and a late deletion. We have seen that the last alternative is abundantly supported by considerations entirely unrelated to the paradoxes at hand.

At this point it might be instructive to see how the new grammar with Vowel Reduction replacing Vowel Deletion handles the phenomenon of the hateph vowels.

Actually, there's no possibility of a serious problem developing. Although Schwa-Deletion in a string V GĈ C V would create an environment for Hateph Formation, it's not necessary to wait for Schwa-Deletion to come along: the rule Hateph Formation can be expanded to affect schwa as well as Ø, assimilating schwa to the preceding vowel, replacing Ø with a copy of the vowel.

\[
\text{(43) Hateph Formation} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|}
\text{S.D.} & V & G & (Ø) & C \\
\hline
\text{[-str]} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{S.C.} & 1 & 2 & 1 & 4
\end{array}
\]

There is another rule in the grammar that deals with schwa following a guttural: whereas dāḇār gives rise to pl. dāḇārīm, ?ādām 'man has pl. ?ādāmīm; where mélek has mālākīm, ṭēḇēd 'servant' has ṭāḇādīm. The vowels written
ā are spelt with the hateph-sign. Evidently, where schwa is generally predicted, a preceding guttural induces an a-quality vowel; an assimilation, since the gutturals are low sonorants.

The phenomenon is not restricted to initial position. Qal participles like kōteb/kōteb/ 'writing' lose the short vowel in the plural due to the limitation on PTL: kōtbīm/kōteb+īm/. In a verb II-guttural, like sāfāq 'cry out', participle sōfēq, the vowel reduces as expected but instead of going all the way to Ø, it survives as a: ṣōfāqīm.

These facts evidence a rule lowering post-guttural schwas:

(44) **Schwa-to-A** \( \emptyset + a \rightarrow G -- \)

Rule (44) precedes Schwa-Deletion, robbing it of schwas to delete. It must follow Hateph Formation, rule (43), since whenever the two conflict, Hateph Formation wins.

In the form pofolehem /poʃ-a-1+ay+hemm/, for example, the o-hateph is a descendent of a VR created schwa; if Schwa-to-A had first crack, the form would be *poʃalehem. In fact, if Schwa-to-A preceded HF, there would be no motivation for the new schwa-clause in HF, since all schwas would be sent to a in the environment V G -- C.

The rule Schwa-to-A also plays a role in determining the vocalism of segholatās. A base form like /CVGC/ undergoes Cluster Break-Up, becoming CVGC; Schwa-to-A applies,
outputting CVGaC. This is, of course, correct: a base like /noiFr/ yields noifar.

The ordering presupposed, Cluster Break-Up -- Schwa-to-A, is confirmed by the behaviour of forms with initial clusters. Infinitives and imperatives from roots I-guttural (except /?/ show the a-hateph: Šabod /šbod/, ḥazaq /ḥzaq/ 'be strong'. The roots I-? have e in the parallel forms, e.g. ṭekol /ṭkol/ 'to eat'; this is due to a rather specialized rule affecting schwa between ֔ and ֓ (vide Ch. 2). Words from underlying /CCVC/, like barīt 'covenant', when they begin with a guttural, also conform to the expected pattern: ḥazīr /ḥzīr/.

The order of the various rules relating to schwas is as follows:

```
VR
HF  Cluster Break-Up
    Schwa-to-A
    Schwa-Deletion
```

As a final flourish, let us formulate the rule in its detail:

(45) Spirantization [−son] , [+cnt] / [−cns] [+vol] / [−cor]
The [-low] restriction excludes the emphatics /t q/. The environment is intended to include all vowels and the glides /y w/ but not /? hr/. Observe habbaytā 'homeward' /ha#bayt+ ā/ and yehdar 'he will favor' /ya + hdar/. I know of only five exceptions to the rule, which is not a bad record for a rule that is in Kiparsky's sense opaque—one whose conditioning environment is not always visible on the surface. Not applying where expected: kaspēhēm /kas-a-p+ay+hemm/ ; their m. money (pl.''), birkāt /barak+at/ 'blessing of ...'. Here there is nothing to say but that certain plural forms of kēsep /kasp/ 'money, silver' are built on the singular stem; and the construct state of is based irregularly on a truncated form of the stem. Applying to consonant not post-vocalic: kaspēnū (kasp + ēnū) 'our money (sing)', bigdi (bigd+i) 'my garment', yiqbe'kā (yiqb + e + ka)' your m.s. wine-vat'. These anomalies can be rendered tractable by attaching the pronominal suffix with a word boundary, #, rather than the usual morpheme-weight boundary, + : kasp#enū, bigd#ī, yiqb#e+ka. They are now liable to Cluster Break-Up, which inserts a schwa into the cluster, causing spirantization. Unlike the ordinary case of segholation, the inserted schwa now appears in the env. VC-CV, and is therefore removed by Schwa-Deletion. Only spirantization is left as a trace of its brief existence inside the cluster.
1.7 The Remaining Deletion and Reduction Cases

The infinitive and imperative Qal have in their unaffixed forms the underlying shape C C V C: katōb 'you m.s. write!', katōb 'to write'; bahār 'you m.s. choose!', bahār 'to choose'. Now it happens that this word-shape is not found elsewhere in the verbal system; indeed it is not found in the lexicon at all, with a couple of exceptions (daḇaš 'honey', šokem 'shoulder' are the ones I am aware of). Words like zaʔeḇ 'wolf', beʔer 'well' are not real exceptions, for as D. Guttman (1970) observes, there are no segholates CēʔaC, the expected surface reflex of /CeʔC/; apparently an early metathesis turns e.g. /zeʔb/ into /zʔeb/. This metathesis enables us to clear the dictionary of nouns /CCVC/, and provides another set of forms for which Cluster Break-Up is necessary.

The shape C C V C is universally assumed by three-consonant stems when they are singly prefixed in the course of derivation or inflection. The prefixes of the imperfect, y-, t-, ?-, n-; the verbal derivational prefixes, n- (Nipṭal), h- (HiʾṬīl, Hopṭal), m- (participial); the nominal prefixes m-, t-; all of these attach to the same stem shape. When the stem has four consonants, due to a derivational process such as doubling the middle radical or reduplication, or because the root is one of the very rare quadrilaterals, the stem shape remains invariant under prefixation: in Piʾīl, for example, we find characteristically giddeł (pf.), yagaddel
(impf.), m gaddeī (part.). The four consonants are always arrayed CVCCVC.

Now it also happens to be the case that the imperative mirrors the imperfect due to minutiae: it has the same pattern of reduction, modulo initial cluster phenomena, and, even more strikingly, it has the same stem-vowel. And the stem-vowel of the imperfect is not always predictable. Usually it is /o/: yiktōb. When a guttural is the second or third root-consonant, it is /a/: yishāq 'he will laugh'; yišmaʕ 'he will hear'. When the perfect has /e/ or /o/, it is /a/: qaṭon 'he is small', impf. yiqtān; kābēd 'he is heavy', impf. yiḳbād. When the verb is stative, it is /a/: ḥāzaq 'he is strong', impf. yehezaq. But the vowel is unpredictably /a/ in a handful of cases, e.g. lāmad 'to learn', impf. yilmād; ar unpredictably /e/ in yitten 'he will give', impf. of nātan.

In all these cases, whether the stem-vowel is predictable or idiosyncratic, the imperative follows the imperfect: kōtōb sōḥaq, šōmaʕ; lāmād, tēn.

Contrast the imperative and the imperfect in inflection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Pers Imperf.</th>
<th>Imper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.s.</td>
<td>tiktōb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.p.</td>
<td>tiktabū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.s.</td>
<td>tiktōbī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.p.</td>
<td>tiktōbnā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These considerations suggest that the Imperative is literally derived from the Imperfect by truncation of the inflectional prefix, explaining in one blow the vocalism, inflection, and peculiar stem-shape. (This idea about the imperative has, not surprisingly, been around for a while. Its most recent appearance in the modern tradition is in Gutman (1970)).

Using a rule of prefix-removal to get the imperative opens the way to explain certain features of the derived conjugations. In Pi'el, the imperfect has the shape illustrated in יָגַדְדֵל: if we assume here the same stem /gaddel/, the rule א-ו-י will operate on the first syllable to produce the observed form. The imperative is gaddel. If it's assumed to come simply from /gaddel/, it is unclear why it should not follow the perfect in vocalism, being equally liable to א-ו-י. But if it's derived from an imperfect-like form /tä+gaddel/, the rule that takes away the prefix can be ordered after א-ו-י, which only applies to first syllables. The vocalic parallellism between imperfect and imperative will thus be attributed to the same source, prefixation.

In Hip'el, the characteristic h-prefix is quite visible in the perfect: e.g. הִしかも 'they destroyed'. Not so in the imperfect: יָ carbohydr. But it reappears in the imperfect (and in the infinitive); הַしかも 'destroy!' If we assume that it is underlyingly present in the imperfect, and
obscured by loss of the h-, then the prefix a-vocalism (where i is found elsewhere in the verb) follows from the restriction of A-to-I to the env. #C-CC; and the form of the infinitive, with its a-vocalism and h-prefix, follows from the existence of the rule removing prefixes.

What of the infinitive? Surely it is senseless to encumber it at any stage with person-number prefixes, and if we must stipulate its form, the argument for truncation in the imperative is correspondingly weakened. But there is a prefix waiting in the wings: to wit, la-, which is similar to and historically derived from the ordinary preposition l-'to'.

The infinitive marker can be readily distinguished from the related preposition on both syntactic and phonological grounds. The unmarked infinitive, which may appear with subject, object, and other clausal accoutrements, has essentially the distribution of a noun: it may function as subject of a sentence, as in "man's being by himself is not good" (Gen.2.18); as adjunct to a noun, as in "a time to mourn and a time to dance"; as object of a preposition, resulting in structures best given periphrastic clausal translations, "because, until, when, as, after, than . . . " (The bare infinitive may also appear as complement to verbs like know(how), begin, be able, etc.). For present purposes the
most relevant of these uses is the prepositional construction, specifically the idiom in which the monosyllabic prepositions, b- 'in', k- 'like', l- 'to', take the infinitive, producing a temporal clause translatable with when, as, while and the like. (This is easily the most common way of forming such clauses.) The prepositions b-, k- are used more frequently than l- for this purpose, but there are a number of clear instances of l- in this temporal usage. Gesenius (p. 348, n.1) cites Dt 23.12, Ex. 14.27, Ju 19.26; and 2 S 18.29. The reader who is diligent enough to pursue the references will find that the first three involve the phrase lānēh + noun referring to time of day, meaning 'as it became e.g. morning'; the last is an authentic temporal clause, 'when (l-) Joab sent (infinitive) the king's servant and your servant (= me).'

Contrasting with this is the infinitive marked with l-: it appears as complement to equi-type verbs like be able, begin, cease, finish, be willing to, desire, refuse, expect, hasten, continue, learn (how), understand how, know how; it appears in adverbial and ad-verb-phrasal complements of purpose and result; and it is used in certain locutions with the verb 'to be' and its equivalents to express the modal notions of incipience, possibility, and obligation. It seems to be the case that the l-marked infinitive does not allow the expression of an overt subject, a fact which has evidently gone unnoticed. By the time of Mishnaic Hebrew, first attested 400 - 300 B.C.,
at least five hundred years after the mid-point of the period we are focusing on, the infinitive was always marked with $l$-. Concomitantly, all of the constructions of the bare, nominal infinitive had disappeared. It is interesting, then, that Segal (1927) remarks: "the pronominal suffixes attached to this [Mishnaic infinitive prefixed with $l$-] are however ... always of an objective force." It seems that in fact the syntactic situation in Mishnaic Hebrew is simply a direct continuation of that in Biblical Hebrew, and the differences are attributable to loss of the bare infinitive, with its noun-like distribution and sentence-like structure.

The phonological distinction is equally clearly marked, as we saw above. There is a contrast in spirantization between the $l$- prefixed infinitive and the infinitive that follows a real preposition: liktōb with [t], vs. biktōb with [t]. The infinitive as prepositional object has the spirantization properties of the bare infinitive; the prefixed case is like the imperfect yiktōb: we conclude therefore that the prefix is attached with a morpheme boundary, $+$, and the preposition with a word boundary, $. Of course, these boundary assignments follow from the general principles of the theory, once we note that $l$- is a true prefix, distinct from its cognate preposition. A further distinction in vocalism has been noted above: the prefix $l$- shows the alternation la-/li-, as lāšēbet/liktōb, where šēbet is the infinitive of yāšāb 'dwell' formed by
processes we discuss below; but the preposition b-, l-, k-
show an alternation between [ə] and [i] in parallel circum-
stances: bādabar/bidbarīm. In the rule-system we have
developed, this also falls out from the morpho-syntactic
distinction of boundary-type.

The result of these lucubrations is that the infini-
tive has a prefix that behaves in every phonological respect
like the inflectional prefixes on the imperfect. We there-
fore attribute the infinitive stem shape CCVC to the existence
and character of this prefix, just as we attribute the other
regular occurrences of this stem-shape to prefixation. The
direct way to model this observation is to take the prefix
to be part of the underlying form of every infinitive and
remove i: by rule when appropriate, parallel to the removal
of the person-number prefix to form the imperative from the
imperfect. When is appropriate? A crude formulation, sug-
gested by our brief review of infinitive syntax is: (1) when-
ever it serves a noun-like function, and (2) optionally after
verbs of which it is the complement. It is quite striking that
the environment for the proposed deletion is basically syntac-
tic rather than morphological; the same is true of the imper-
ative, perhaps less obviously. If the prefix-truncation
proposal is correct, then the imperative is just a kind of 2nd
person variant of the imperfect in a certain syntactic environ-
ment: observe that the imperfect is also used with commandatory
force: yiktōb can mean 'let him write'. Further, the imperative per se appears only in positive commands; after negatives, the full, prefixed imperfect is used. The rule of imperfect prefix truncation, if there be such, must be constrained from applying in negative sentences. The rule looks like this:

(46) Prefix Stripping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th># CV +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>1 Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: Constrained syntactically and morphologically as described

We might pursue the question of stem-shape a bit further and ask how it comes about that post-prefixal stems assume the form CCVC. Two general approaches to modeling phenomena of this type suggest themselves: one we may designate 'interpretive', like that of Halle (1973), in which a positive condition is placed upon the lexicon requiring the structure CV+CCVC stem for all prefixed items; the other, which we may term 'generative', more closely analogous to familiar phonological modes of thinking, in which one stem form is taken as basic and a battery of rules apply to mold it to its various environments. Let us look at the phonological consequences of one way of developing the generative approach.

Observing an alternation in stem form such as that between the perfect katab /katab/ 'he wrote' and the imperfect
yiktōb /ya+ktob/, it is plausible to take the form as base and posit a simple rule to take out the stem-initial vowel, a rule which we know to be quite general:

(47) 3-Syllable Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S.D.} \\
\text{CV + C V C V C \text{stem}} \\
\hline
1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{S.C.} \\
1 & \emptyset & 3
\end{array}
\]

Such an account will, of course, be supplemented with the various rules of ablaut whose effects we briefly discussed above.

The possibility of the 3-Syllable Rule is important at this point because it fulfills the portentous description found in the discussion of Schwa-Insertion (37): an early rule of complete syncope. This opens the way to a new analysis of the initial cluster data. If we order Prefix Stripping before the 3-Syllable Rule, then both bare infinitives and imperatives are going to have two stem vowels, the first of which could underly schwa, /i/, or any other initial vowel, thus eliminating the need for the posited rule of schwa-insertion (37). Some complex and unexpected data from the behavior of the infinitive when suffixed pronominally might seem to give a measure of support to such a move. The entire paradigm runs as follows:
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suff.</th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>kotb-î</td>
<td>kotb-ênu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m. a.</td>
<td>kotobkà</td>
<td>kotobkêm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>kotb-àka</td>
<td>kotb-akêm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>kotb-ôk</td>
<td>kotb-àken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kotb-ô</td>
<td>kotb-àken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>kotb-ôh</td>
<td>kotb-ân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>kotb-àh</td>
<td>kotb-ân</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is often the case with individual lexical items, not every form given here actually appears in the text: those which do not are projected from citations of phonologically parallel words. The 2nd person feminine plural forms are projected directly from the 2nd person masculine plural forms; although there are no citations of these forms at all, there is no reason to expect that they would diverge from the elsewhere (on nouns) always parallel masculine form. More important to our analysis are the (b) forms of the 2nd person masculine. The crucial point is the non-spirantization of the third root consonant, which contrasts markedly to its spirantization elsewhere in the paradigm. These forms of kàtáb do not appear in the Bible. But this projection is supported by the forms like bâ?ospàkà 'when thou m. hast gathered', Ex.23.16, and bâ?ospàkêm 'when ye have gathered', Lev.23.39, from the verb ?asâp 'gather'. Gesenius (p. 162 par.61a) says "... before -ka and -kem also the syllable is completely
closed ... " where by 'complete closure' he means merely to indicate the failure of spirantization. Other supporting evidence known to me is the occurrence of šokbškā 'when thou m. liest down' from sākāb, at Dt 6.7 and twice elsewhere. The form 2m(a) pl. is supported by Gesenius' authority and by ?akolkem 'your eating' from ?ākal, Gen. 3.5.

I have tarried over these details because they are significant in the argument. The non-spirantization in the 2m(b) forms show that they do not arise from the operation of VR as we know it; they evidence a rule of metathesis which applies optionally, and early, to 2nd person forms.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC. 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occasional maverick form from other persons, like hopk-ī 'my overturning' from hāpāk, or nogp-ō 'his striking' from nāğāp (Ex.12.27), suggests that this rule may apply sporadically outside its proper domain. This rule is an early adjustment, applying before VR.

Let us now examine the paradigm without the (b) forms, which are handled correctly and completely by the rule 2nd Person Metathesis. The remaining stem mutations are just those that would arise from application of the rules to a base /kotob/, given that PTL does not apply.
What this observation suggests is that the infinitive stem be set up as /kotob/; when prefixed, /la+kotob/ goes to /la+krob/ by the 3-syllable Rule; unprefixed, the vowel remains to partake of the alternations observed, granting the non-applicability of PTL.

The proposal to employ the 3-Syllable Rule in this fashion loses plausibility when it is realized that the suffixed infinitive has the same form whether or not it is marked with 1ː kotb İ / lakoṭb İ 'to write me'. This proposal predicts, on the contrary, *liktabi, parallel to the authentic tikτabi 'you f.s. will write' from /ta+kτob+ı/. Of course, the 3-Syllable Rule could be altered ad hoc to not apply to suffixed infinitives, a strange restriction for a rule of such generality to exhibit.
Rather than seeing the infinitive stem alternations as the result of lacunae in otherwise general processes -- PTL, the 3-Syllable Rule -- I propose a special rule that copies the stem vowel into the initial cluster of suffixed forms:

(49) Echo S.D. C C V Ç + Pron.
(First Version) 1 2 3 4
S.C. 1 2 3 4

To what categories does this rule apply? Clearly, not to the imperfect: we have seen yismor-kə 'he will guard you', not *y somr kə. In the imperative, however, interesting data is found. Displayed here are the relevant forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imper. m.s.</th>
<th>t.l.s. suff</th>
<th>Imper. m.p.</th>
<th>t.l.s. suff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šomor</td>
<td>somr-enī</td>
<td>šimru</td>
<td>šimru-nī 'guard (me)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šmaI</td>
<td>šmaI-enī</td>
<td>šimu</td>
<td>šmaI-nī 'hear (me)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrast these data with the parallel forms of the imperfect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impf. m.s.</th>
<th>Impf. m.p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tišmor</td>
<td>tišmar-enī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tišmaI</td>
<td>tišmaI-enī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarkably, the fate of the stem vowel is imperfect and imperative is point-for-point identical, modulo deletion of schwa.

Under the analysis developed above, the fate of the stem vowel in the pronominally suffixed forms is determined by
the applicability of PTL, since stress happens to fall always on the immediately post-stem syllable. In the imperfect, the fact that non-initial Pre-Tonic lengthening of /e o/ is limited to the env. V C --C V means that /e o/ will remain short and be subsequently reduced, where stem -vowel /a/ will be lengthened and preserved. In the imperative, what guarantees the same patterning? If Prefix-Stripping follows PTL, then the imperative will inherit the quantity, and hence reduction, properties of the parent imperfect, since they are formally identical until beyond the point where quantity differences relevant to reduction are introduced. Observe that the same ordering explains the shortness of the preserved vowel in katóbkā, if it comes from /la + ktob + e + ka/.

Other approaches might be imagined, though. It will not do to allege that PTL simply doesn't apply to /o/, because imperatives in /e/ have identical reduction properties. For example, ten, 'give' from nətān (we discuss its aberrant stem shape below) shows tənū-nī 'you all m. give me' and tən-ēnī 'you m.s. give me!' It might be suggested that PTL is restricted in the env. # C C --, that is, that it only applies to word initial non-low vowels in the env. # C --. Now there can be evidence against this only if there are underlying #CC sequences in the lexicon other than those of the imperative/ infinitive. Words like nābelā 'corpse' can be pointed to, where an underlying /nbel + at/ produces
correct surface forms. (The /e/ is deletable, as in niblat, 'corpses of'). Of course, an underlying form like /nabel + at/ works equally well in terms of the present system, is preferable in terms of the restrictions on canonical form of 2.1, and so it does not provide much of a case.

Returning to the main theme, observe that the rule of Echo has applied to the pronominally suffixed form of the m.s. imperative: šomr-enî 'guard me', not as we might expect, *šimr-enî parallel to simrû-nî (pl.). The rule does not apply to the plural form, but then there is no reason to expect that it should, because its shape, CCVC+V+Pron, does not satisfy the S.D. of the Echo rule, which is CCVC+Pron. This rather subtle detail provides confirmation for the view that analogical relations between categories must be developed through rules defined over elements of structure, not through the exploitation of gross correspondences.

The appearance of the echo phenomenon in imperative inflection gives clear evidence that a rule is operating, that we are not merely witnessing the emergence into daylight of an underlying stem vowel usually suppressed. If the imperative had such a stem vowel, $V_1$ in a proposed base like /kV_1 tob/, it would have to be able to modulate to /i/ upon deletion of the second stem vowel, as in the mp. kitbû and the f.s. kitbû. Plausible candidates are /a/ and /e/, certainly not /o/. If basic imperative/imperfect stems
like /katob/ or /ketob/ are set up, with the 3 Syllable Rule used to trim them in the presence of prefixes, the rule Echo could easily be re-stated as an assimilation of the first vowel to the second, rather than a copying. But we should expect phonetic kātōb or kētōb for the bare m.s. imperative, not the observed kātōb. Thus, attempting to use the 3-Syllable Rule to account for alternations in stem-shape in the imperative and infinitive leads to postulating a variety of irregularities: in the 3-Syllable Rule itself, with regard to the suffixed infinitive which is marked with 1-, discussed above; and in the operation of PTL upon the hypothesized stem vowel, I conclude therefore that, for purposes of phonology, there never is a vowel between $C_1$ and $C_2$ in the imperative/imperfect/infinitive stem $C_1C_2VC_3$. The implicit promise in the discussion of schwa-insertion, to nail down the non-existence of an early phonological rule of complete syncope, has been met. The 3-Syllable Rule, if it exists, plays no role in phonology; the internal workings of morphology remain as inscrutable as activity inside the En-Soph.

Where does the rule Echo fit into the phonology? If the stem-initial CC cluster is to play a crucial role in inhibiting PTL in the infinitive and imperative, Echo, which breaks up this cluster, must apply after PTL. This necessitates a slight complication of the rule, for it cannot copy the pre-tonically lengthened /a/ of šamaเยnī; it would wrongly output
If Echo applied before PTL, no such problem would arise: the copied (short, /a/) would always be liable to reduction. Ordering Echo after PTL, as we must, three equally complex possible corrections of Echo come to mind: (1) restrict the vowel to be copied to be [+round], i.e. /o/; (2) restrict the vowel to be copied to be [-long], ultimately another way of referring to /o/ in this environment; (3) leave the S.D. general, but make the copy [-long], so that a copied /ā/ goes to /a/ and thence to schwa. At this point I have found no way to decide between the alternatives; I shall arbitrarily accept possibility (2) in formulating the rule.

The fact that Echo does occur in prefixed infinitives must be stipulated. A direct approach gives us this rule:

\[(50a)\text{Echo (A) S.D.} \quad \# (C V +) \quad \underline{a} \quad C \quad C \quad V \quad C + \text{Pron} \]

\[\underline{[-\text{long}] \quad v} \]

S.C. \quad 1 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4

Condition: a only if form is infinitive

However, the S.D. of the rule can be simplified by excluding the imperfect rather than letting in the infinitive:

\[(50b)\text{Echo (B) S.D.} \quad V-\text{stem} \quad \underline{C \quad C \quad V \quad C + \text{Pron}} \]

\[\underline{[-\text{long}] \quad v} \]

S.C. \quad 1 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4

Condition: does not apply to imperfect.
The (A) form of the rule must be ordered after prefix-stripping so that the imperative will meet its S.D. The (B) form need not; since the rule of prefix stripping is obligatory in the imperative, no forms like *takotbēm 'write them!' will be generated. Since prefix-stripping is not universal in its application to infinitives, both kotbām and ləkotbām will emerge. Since the (A) version redundantly repeats the condition on the infinitive, I opt for (B).

Let us derive a few forms to illustrate the operation of the rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>PTL</th>
<th>Pref. Strip</th>
<th>Echo</th>
<th>VR</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>Cluster B-U</th>
<th>Spir</th>
<th>Schwa-Del</th>
<th>Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/la+ktob+a+m/</td>
<td>/ta+ktob+e+m/</td>
<td>/ta+šlah+e+m/</td>
<td>la+ktob+a+m</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>(declined)</td>
<td>la+kotob+a+m</td>
<td>kətob+e+m</td>
<td>kotəb+e+m</td>
<td>ləkotbām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ta+ktob+e+m/</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>/ta+šlah+e+m/</td>
<td>ta+ktob+e+m</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>kotob+e+m</td>
<td>kotəb+e+m</td>
<td>kotəb+e+m</td>
<td>kotbēm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ta+šlah+e+m/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šlāh+e+m</td>
<td></td>
<td>šlāhēm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gloss: to write them m, write ms then m!, send ms them m!)
To complete our discussion of imperative/infinitive phonology, we deal first with two relatively minor matters of detail and then turn to a problem of some interest in 1.8.

(I) Infinitives in /a/. A small group of regular triliteral stems takes /a/, not /o/, in the imperfect/imperative: predictably, verbs with non-ā perfects like kābēd 'be heavy', qātōn 'be small'; unpredictably, a handful comprising lāmad 'learn', rākāb 'ride', šākāb 'lie down'. The infinitives for this class are very poorly attested: the question is, whether there is an infinitive form in /a/ and how it behaves with regard to the Echo-ing process we have explored. Of the verbs with non-ā perfects, neither kābēd nor qātōn has an infinitive cited, but the phonologically similar verbs yāsen 'sleep', yārē 'fear', šānē 'hate' all exhibit regular infinitives: yēsōn, yārō?, šānō? I conclude that the non-ā perfects (and its allied class of stative verbs like qārāb 'be near') take /o/ in the infinitive.

Of those unpredictablyā in the imperfect, rākāb has only the form lirkōb attested, which is perfectly ordinary: lāmad has only lomād-ī, again ordinary; but sākāb has šākāb/ the type we have been seeking. With suffixes, we find šīkāb-āḥ 'her lying down' and šokēšākā 'your m.s. lying down'. Observe that, because of the non-spirantized /b/, both forms have been subjected to the early rule we have termed '2nd Person Metathesis'; the first apparently coming from a stem /škāb/, the
second from /škob/. Further evidence that a regular /o/ infinitive exists is the attested proclitic form liškob-,
which is, as it happens, the end of our information about this verb. Of the behaviour of /a/ before suffixes we have no evidence. I conclude tentatively that, although an /a/ form did exist, every verb could have a regular /o/ form.

(II) Extended Imperatives. The affix -ā can be added to m.s. imperatives and 1st person imperfects with imperative force: ñektōb, ñektōb ā 'let me write'; niṅtōb, niṅtōb ā 'let us write'; kātōb, kōtāb ā 'write, you m.s.' . In the imperative the Echo phenomenon is quite visible suggesting that we extend the Echo rule to apply before this suffix as well. What of a-imperatives? According to Lambdin (1971), these show not o but i: šālah, šilhā 'send'; šākāb, šikbā 'lie down'. This is just what we'd expect if Echo copied the /a/, for it would go to /i/ regularly in the env #C--CC by A-to-I; on the other hand, it is also just what we'd expect if Echo didn't copy /a/, but Schwa-to-I (rule 41). There is no illumination of the proper constraint on Echo to be found here.
1.8 'Short' Imperatives and Infinitives in /t/

Two classes of verbs have 'short', that is, biconsonantal, imperatives: (1) verbs I-y with /e/-stem vowel in the imperfect, such as yāšāb 'dwell', imperfect yešeb /ye+šeb/, imperative: šeb, šabu etc., from the stem /šeb/; (2) verbs I-n with /a e/ in the imperfect, such as nāsāf 'set out on a journey', imperfect yissāf /ya+nasf/, imperative sāf, sāfū etc.; or nātān 'give', imperfect yittēn/ya+ntēn/, imperative tēn, tēnu.

Y-loss in class (1) is due to a rule of tremendous antiquity. It appears in Brame's thesis as 'W-Occultation', relating e.g. waṭaba 'he dwelt' to yaṭibu 'he will dwell' /ya+ṭibu/. T. O. Lambdin reports (pers. comm.) that there are alternations of this type in Egyptian. At any rate, the rule is quite limited in scope, and we shall simply assume that its output is available to the phonology we are studying.

Shortening in Class (2) is clearly mediated by the assimilation of root-initial n to the following consonant. If we allow the rule of Prefix-Stripping to apply to the assimilated forms, we'd get *ttēn, *ssaf, and so on. But there are no initial geminates in the language, as there are no final geminates: the rule of Word-Final DeGemination can be easily generalized by the mirror-image convention to accommodate these cases:

(51) Degem. at Word Boundary $C_i C_i \rightarrow C_i$
Not all verbs I-n follow this pattern. Those with o-imperfects, such as nāpal 'fall', impf. yippōl, have regular triconsonantal imperatives derived from the non-assimilated underlying stem: nāpol, niplu. A simple and direct way to handle this is to mark these verbs [-assimilation] in the imperative.

Surveying just this range of data, it appears that a satisfactory solution to the I-n short imperative phenomenon has been found; with no new rules and with one exception featureassigned by clear principle, the shpae of the imperative has been related to the assimilation observed in the imperfect. The I-n verbs with ordinary imperatives, such as nāpol 'fall!' and nādōr 'vow!' from nādar, have ordinary infinitives and the n remains unassimilated even when they are prefixed: linpōl, lindōr. (Note the regular lack of spirantization.). This is perfectly consistent with the prefix-stripping hypothesis, and shows that the marking of these verbs as [-assimilation] is general over both imperative and infinitive, thus supporting the proposal that they are to be treated as exceptions.

In the Mishnaic period, the system of short infinitives was lost as prefix-stripping no longer applied to the infinitive marker, and the infinitive was brought into perfect parallelism with the imperfect. Concomitant with the disappearance of forms like nāpol, nādōr in the imperative was the regularization of the infinitive to lippōl, liddōr. This is exactly
what you'd expect if the change was, as suggested, loss of exceptionality in the application of N-assimilation. The short infinitives from I-y stems were replaced by forms like lešeb /le+seb/, which mirror exactly the structure of the imperfect yešeb /ye+še/. Presumably the rules applying in the env. of the imperfect prefixes were simply generalized to apply equally to the infinitive prefix.

Confirmation of the general drift of the analysis, that the o-impefects are irregular rather than the a,e ones, comes from the historical development of the system into the Mishnaic period, in which all assimilated imperfects have a short imperative: pól/*napól. In our terms this state of uniformity was attained by eliminating a peculiarity in the treatment of the o-class.

However, a complication enters the theoretical picture when the infinitives associated with the I-n and I-y verbs are taken into account. The infinitive of yašab is not the expected yešab, but šebet, suffixed šibt-ı. This form behaves exactly like the segholate noun of the qeber-type; evidently the /t/ is a derivational suffix added to the stem common to the imperfect and imperative, giving a phonologically relevant base form /šeb+t/. In parallel fashion the shortening I-n verbs allow an infinitive in -t formed from the biconsonantal stem: têt /ten+t/, suffixed titt -ı /ten+t+c+y/, of nātan; safat /saf+t/, saft-ı, from nasaf.
(The I-n verbs also allow a regular infinitive: ṇə̂tōn (not common), nə̂sə́q). The generalization governing the -t infinitives is evidently this: if a verb has a short imperative, then it has a short infinitive formed on the short imperative stem. This is not limited to the regular I-n and I-y cases; the occasional maverick which imitates them also falls under this law: hālāk 'go' has impf. yēlēk /ye+lek/, imper. lēk, inf. lēket /lek+t/; laqāḥ 'take' has impf. yiqqāḥ, with irregular assimilation, giving rise to imper. qāḥ, inf. qāḥat. But the notion short imperative -- one with stem-structure CVC -- is not clearly represented at the underlying level, but only at the surface level after N-assimilation, Prefix-Stripping, and, crucially, Degemination have rather extensively modified the imperative base.

Idiosyncrasies of N-assimilation are mirrored clearly in infinitive formation. Thus the stem-initial n generally fails to assimilate to a following guttural: nāḥāl 'obtain property' has impf. yinhāl, and due to this failure, imper. nāḥāl, inf. nāḥōl. Thus the short imperative is not simply a feature of verbs I-n with a,e-imperfects, but is conditional upon assimilation, as the analysis working via Degemination predicts.

One way to approach the problem, preserving the phonological account of shortness, is to impose a 'global trans-derivational constraint' in the sense of Siegel (1971) upon the operation of t-affixation, stating the rule may apply to a
verb only if, on the surface, the shape of the imperative stem is CVC. This drastic and clumsy measure fails, however. For nātān, it allows the underlying infinitive form /la+nten+t/, because of imper. tēn. Given free operation of the rules, this comes out *littēt, an impossible form: correct is lātēt, evidently from /la+ten+t/. The short infinitive, shockingly, behaves under prefixation as if it had but one initial consonant; as if it was formed from a stem that had undergone already the phonological rules of N-assimilation and Degemination.

It is clearly undesirable to abandon the natural phonological account of the form of an imperative like tēn, deriving it from /ta+nten/ via the sequence ta+nten→ ta+tten → tten → tēn, in which each step has a measure of independent motivation. The alternative is to posit a set of morphological rules that would mirror the effects of the phonology that is already in the grammar. Yet the infinitive form requires a rule to do exactly that, removing the initial /n/ to form a stem shaped CVC that is liable to /-t/ affixation, opening the prefix syllable of lātēt /la+ten+t/, so that PTL can affect it. And PTL is an early rule, much earlier than the rule Degemination, which might be revised ad hoc to simplify the geminate cluster after the infinitive prefix /la-/.
So: the present rule-system (and the theory of phonology and morphology behind it) provides insight into the apparently aberrant imperatives like tēn by deriving them from base forms like /ta+nten/, which are the same as those of any 'regular' imperative, e.g. kātōb /ta+kōtōb/. But the approach fails with infinitives like tēt, because a base /la+nten+t/ leads to *littēt. It would seem that we require for the imperative the morphological rules we avoided in the imperative; and the effect of the rules is to make the infinitive look like the imperative on the surface, even though their derivations are not parallel. Up to this point we have succeeded in explaining the striking similarities between infinitive and imperative on the basis of underlying structural parallelism; here we seem to find underlying disparity-- /la+ten+t/ vs. /ta+nten/ -- mapped by special rules into surface parallelism. This result does not disconfirm the analysis of the imperative, but indicates a shortcoming in our understanding, either of the rules of Hebrew or of the character of morphological processes.

* * *

This is the end of our excursion into the complexities of infinitive/imperative phonology. The major systematic goal has been to demonstrate the existence of a #CC structure
relevant to phonology, supporting the rule Cluster Break-Up (38) and therefore the conclusions that follow from it about the treatment of schwa in the grammar. Other results have been (1) the irrelevance of the 3-Syllable Rule to phonological alternation, (2) the relevance of the rule Prefix-Stripping, which is constrained by morphological and syntactic information, and (3) the problematic quasi-phonological quasi-morphological character of imperative/infinitive formation in verbs I-n.
1.9 **The Nature of Vowel Reduction**

There is a small class of nouns -- perhaps 20 to 30 members--which have, unsuffixed, the shape C V C i where V is schwa, a reflex thereof, or /o/. Characteristic examples from the schwa family are tabulated here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Pausal Form</th>
<th>Sing+Pron Suff</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PL + Suff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peri</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>peri</td>
<td>piry-o, piry-am (3m.p.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peryoka, peryokem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perihem (3m.p.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kali</td>
<td>utensil</td>
<td>kali</td>
<td>kely-o</td>
<td>keim</td>
<td>keim-y (ls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kel-e (ip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kel-e (2 mp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibi</td>
<td>captivity</td>
<td>sibi</td>
<td>shibyo (3ms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shoby-oka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sibi-kem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>hai</td>
<td>hesy-o, hesy-ah (3fs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hesy-enu, hesy-am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the entries in column 1, it might be surmised that these arise from underlying CCI; however, the pausal forms show a vowel intruding in the initial cluster, and not a predictable one: note hesi vs. kali. Furthermore, there is the plural kelim, evidently from /kel+im/, a form in which truncation of the stem-final segment (y or i) should not blind us to the preservation of the vowel.
The alternations in the suffixed forms, though virtually limited to this class of words, show obvious regularities. The \( \ddot{i} \) shows up as \( \ddot{y} \) before vowels, including those that reduce to schwa: contrast piry-\( \ddot{i} \), pery-\( \ddot{\text{k}} \) with pərī-hé̱m and \( \ddot{\text{b}}\text{i}-\text{kém} \) (here the Bindevokal has truncated, as it regularly does after vowels). This suggests either glide-formation, if the \( \ddot{i} \) is underlying, or vocalization, if the \( \ddot{y} \) is. General considerations of lexical structure suggest that the \( \ddot{y} \) must be the third root consonant missing in phonetic \( \text{CV}\dddot{i} \); the base /CVC\( \dddot{y} \)/ is thus a subtype of the familiar segholate stem shape /CVCC/.

(Glide Vocalization: \( \ddot{y} \rightarrow \ddot{i} /C--(C X ) \) #

Leaving aside ḥasi, where the guttural damps alternation, we see that the stem vowel is \( i \) in the env. --Cy\( \ddot{v} \), \( e \) in the env. --Cy\( \ddot{\nu} \); and schwa where it should be by the laws of reduction we have expounded. What stem vowel should be set up? The alternations discussed could happen to either \( e \) or \( a \); the lack of lengthening in the pausal forms when the vowel is stressed suggests \( a \), as in mélek; but the plural kēlīm needs \( e \). To minimize irregularity, let us set up /pary/, /s'aby/, /kely/ -- which is [-TL]. The word ḥasi is clearly /hesy/ because of the long vowel in the pausal form.

Now if Glide Vocalization is early, the current rule system produces exactly the correct forms:
The smoothness with which these somewhat odd looking forms can be integrated into the grammar is a measure of confirmation for the proposed rule system. However, the round vowel forms pose something of a problem. They look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>S.+Suff.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
<th>Pl+Suff</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>holi</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td>holi key-o</td>
<td>holayim holayenu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?oni</td>
<td>affliction</td>
<td>?oni key-i</td>
<td>?onyeik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?oni</td>
<td>fleet</td>
<td>?oniyya 'ship'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*yopi</td>
<td>branch</td>
<td>*yopayim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ro?i</td>
<td>appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*yopi</td>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>*yopi yopi-o</td>
<td>cstr. yopi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sor?i</td>
<td>a resin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also usri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domi</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cstr. domi (lx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dol?i</td>
<td>bucket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doly-aw</td>
<td></td>
<td>(this form is dual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philology: * means the form isn't attested. The form *yopayim is noted by Masoretes as the correct reading (Qare?) for what is
written (Kotib): ḫopāʾîm

Of these, only the last is well-behaved: the underlying o reduces to schwa in the unaffixed form, just as it should. In the others o persists through the entire paradigm, regardless of the syllable structure. Now, in a form like ḥolāyîm, the o could be regarded as just exceptional to Vowel Reduction. (Note the regular segholate type of plural formation, clearly evidencing an underlying /hol/ with /y/.) Such a move is inadequate for ḥoli, because the stress has shifted onto the final vowel, an effect which is supposedly concomitant upon application of Vowel Reduction. This threatens the integrity of VR-Stress Shift in a rather serious way, showing a kind of independence in the two processes.

Resistance of o to deletion is fairly widespread. In segholates of the type /CoCC/, the plural is quite frequently CoCaCîm, rather than the expected CoCaCîm. For example, qodeš 'holiness', hodeš 'month', goren 'threshing floor', ḥoḥasîm, have qodāšîm, Αgorānim, respectively. T. O. Lambdin has suggested speculatively (pers. comm.) that the apparent retention might possibly be due not to simple preservation of o, but rather to an indirect process whereby the o causes labialization of the preceding segment, so that qodeš is actually q̂одеš; then, when reduction takes place, the result, q̂oḥasîm, either becomes, or is written approximately as, qoḥasîm. This suggestion would gain plausibility if a specific phonetic class of segments were affected by the
hypothesized mediating rule of labialization. It is un-
fortunate, and remarkable, that the greatest potential
source of evidence, the reduction in the Qal imperfect
(yiktōb --yiktōbu'), never shows retention of o. This
morphologically general source lacking, we are left to
the vagaries of the lexicon, where uniformity is scarce.

It striking that of the 8 problematic nouns listed above,
5 commence with gutturals or /r/--back consonants. But
the others cannot be erased (coronals, /y/). A similar
preference for backness is evident among the o-class ordi-
ary segholates which don't reduce to schwa, and it is strik-
ing that bōger 'morning' and pōral 'work' do exhibit re-
duction, labials plausibly being resistant to labialization.
However, šōreš 'root' has for plural šorāšim; and beside
qodeš, there is qomeš 'handful' pl. qōmasim. I conclude
that although o-retention may have a phonetic basis, at the
state of the language we are examining, it is essentially
an option of lexical items. Observe that if it were
mediated phonetically in the way Lambdin suggests, there
would be no problem with the rule VR. However, the failure
of o-retention in the imperfect essentially proves that it
cannot be mediated by a simple phonetic process.

The solution to the dilemma lies in a more care-
ful consideration of the nature of vowel reduction. The
rule has been written as if its principal effect were to
adjust the quality of certain eligible vowels, making them nonround, back, nonlow, nonhigh. But reduction also signifies a de-stressing of the affected vowel, and the stress-differential between reduced and non-reduced vowels has not been explicitly represented. Similarly, in discussing the hateph-vowels we observed that their 'reduced' character was due to their being short, unstressed vowels in open syllables, but again no account was offered of how the hateph's neighbors came to bear a secondary, or relatively-greater-zero, stress-level.

The essential feature of the rule VR, then, is that it indicates where the totally stressless vowels lie. The rule of Hateph-Formation inserts un-stressed vowels. All other vowels in the word bear, in comparison, a modicum of stress. The stress facts can be modelled quite directly, preserving the rule structure we have articulated, if it is assumed that all underlying vowels are [+stress]. The rule VR is re-conceived as a rule of simple de-stressing. Non-stressed short vowels either delete by the principles discussed above, or they turn to schwa and its reflexes, except for certain lexically marked cases of /o/. It is thus to the process of shift-to-schwa that certain rounded vowels are exceptional, and not to the early, and phonologically central processing of de-stressing.
Now, an alternating pattern of stresses such as the one implemented by VR is usually approached from the opposite conceptual direction: it is assumed that all vowels are underlyingly [-stress], and therefore that the observed stresses must be placed in the string by rule. Should VR be turned inside out and re-fashioned as a rule of secondary stressing?

There is, of course, no problem with stating the class of vowels Secondary Stress would apply to: (1) every long vowel (underlying or lengthened by PTL), (2) every vowel in the env. --CC (closed syllables), and (3) in a string of weak syllables ... VC VC VC V C V ... , the even ones, counting back from the stress: ... VC VC VC V C V. Readers of contemporary phonological literature will recognize this as the archetypical rule of alternating stress: stress all heavy syllables, and alternate across stretches of weak syllables. The superficially disparate provisions of the rule can be brought under one generalization if we assume moraic representation of long vowels (V_i = V_i V_i). The rule of alternating stress then becomes

\[(5a) \text{Alternating Stress } V^{+[\text{stress}]} / -- C_0^{+[\text{seg}]} C(V) V^{/}\]

The rule is presumed to apply iteratively left-ward.

The term (V) in the rule AS means that stress appears 2 moras back from a stressed syllable, not a stressed mora.
The input dabaarím must yield output dabáarím, not dabaárím, in which every other mora is stressed without regard to its place in the syllable.

The term [+seg] is the mora that is skipped over. It may be a vowel, or it may be a consonant in the env. --C, i.e. a syllable-closing consonant.

\[
\text{m a l k á m} \quad \text{"their m king"} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad --[+seg]C \ V
\]

\[
\text{d a b a r é m} \quad \text{"your mp word"} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad -- \ C \ [+seg]C \ V
\]

\[
\text{d a b a a r i i m} \quad \text{"words"} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad --[+seg] \ C \ V \ V
\]

Rather than explore the issues of representation and formalism that are associated with a rule like AS, let us inquire into the (for us) more fundamental issue of its appropriateness to the present nexus of problems. In favor of such a 'positive' reformulation of VR, it might be pointed out that there is some evidence in the text for a rule of alternating stress. If it is the same as (29), then surely that counts as evidence for it over VR.

The evidence comes from the placement of diacritic 'metheg', which Gesenius treats as marking, in part, the 'counter-tone' or secondary stress. He gives the following
description of its use in this capacity (p.64, par.16d)

[It appears] as a rule in the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. ha\textbar a\textbar dam ['the man'] (cf. also such cases as m\textbar ellek\textbar s\textbar or ['king of Tyre']); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. ha\textbar ar\textbar bal\textbar im ['the forty'] (also such cases as l\textbar eb\textbar ed\textbar h\textbar am\textbar mel\textbar ek ['the king's servant']), and when the third is not suitable for it, even in the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This Metheg may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. y\textbar ab\textbar ul\textbar ot\textbar ek\textbar imb ['your mp. weeks'].

This metheg is used to mark vowels which occur in open syllables before main stress. A simple rule can be given, covering his cases, iterating leftward:

$$(S\text{46}) \text{ Metheg Placement: } V \longrightarrow [+\text{metheg}] / \begin{array}{c} C \end{array} \begin{array}{c} -\text{metheg} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{[-main stress]} \end{array} \end{array}$$

This is an orthographic rule, describing the basic practice of the Masoretic editors.

Is it really a stress rule? The issue is unfortunately clouded by the other principal use of the metheg, which is to specially mark long vowels that occur where they might not be expected. Basically, this means in the env. --CC: so in ?\textbar ak\textbar l\textbar ā 'she ate' (from ?\textbar ak\textbar l 'eat'), the first vowel carries a metheg, which contrasts it visibly with ?\textbar ok\textbar l\textbar ā 'food', which is otherwise graphically identical. Hence the name accorded it by medieval grammarians: ma\textbar r\textbar i\textbar k 'lengthener'. It might be argued that the cases mentioned by Gesenius fall into this category as well; in ha\textbar a\textbar dam, say, the first ā deserves a mark because it's so far from main stress, and in an open syllable, where schwa or a reflex of schwa is phonetically expected. However, this does not explain the phrasal cases adduced by Gesenius (m\textbar ellek\textbar s\textbar or, l\textbar eb\textbar ed\textbar h\textbar am\textbar mel\textbar ek), in which length is not of the issue.
Here, metheg is used to mark secondary stress. And the
alternating pattern marked in \( \text{sabu} \text{rōte} \text{kem} \) cannot be ex-
plained in a simple 'length-marker' hypothesis.

Even if it is granted that metheg marks stress in
some uses -- and granted that those uses can be identified --
the pattern of its occurrence simply does not accord with
the output of Alternating Stress. AS places stress on all
strong syllables, open with a long vowel, closed with a
short; Metheg Placement puts methegs only on open syllables,
and not on every one, but alternatingly. Further, and per-
haps more damaging to any attempt at conflation, the two
rules disagree on what weak syllables get stress: given an
input \( \text{dabar} \text{im} \), AS outputs \( \text{dabar} \text{im} \), but Metheg Placement
outputs \( \text{dabar} \text{im} \), a form which is unsuitable as input to
the rule taking unstressed short vowels to schwa.

I conclude, therefore, that Metheg Placement cannot
be identified with the early rule that determines the stress
pattern of words. If it really is a rule pertaining to
stress, then it is a low-level rhythm rule adjusting the
relative levels of stresses whose positions are determined
much earlier in derivation.

The rule of Secondary Stress thus functions solely
as the dual counterpart of VR, and cannot subsume the rhythmic
phenomena signaled by the metheg.
This gives us clear and substantial grounds for preferring VR to Secondary Stressing: the generalization with which this essay began, that the simple, motivated rule of reduction, applying freely, affected the main-stressed vowel just in the cases where a stress-shift occurred. A theory of secondary stressing can in principle have nothing to say about this 'coincidence'; but in a theory of stress-removal, loss of the main stress from certain positions is a predicted result.

How is the re-appearance of main stress one syllable to the right to be accounted for, preserving its organic connection with loss of stress? Current theorizing offers two main avenues of approach, which we may designate the tonological and the metrical. The tonological line is essentially that of Halle's (1973) description of Russian and Kiparsky's (1973) of Greek, Skt., and Lithuanian: it is assumed that the word is assigned a two-level tonal contour, say M M M H H, one tone per syllable, where the point of level-shift (Tonbruch) -- the first H bordering an M -- marks the place where the accent will be perceived. The accent rules determine the syllable where the Tonbruch lies. Suppose that the accented syllable is deleted, or that its H-tone is otherwise removed: our model word M M M H H becomes M M M H H, or M M M M H. In such a case the Tonbruch automatically moves one syllable to the right,
causing the accent to appear there. Observe that a high-
nonhigh contour, say H H H M M, would be associated with a
shift in the opposite direction. Clearly, this kind of
technology can be adapted to the case at hand. It fits
easiest into a scheme where there is complete deletion,
the type of system we started out with; a deleted vowel,
in this view, takes its tone with it, and accent-shift is
the consequence. It has been shown, however, that the rule
originally treated as deletion must rather accomplish a de-
stressing of the affected vowels. The problem thus has
two dimensions, non-orthogonal, one being the disposition
of the feature [+stress] (this is the dimension of vowel
reduction), the other being the disposition of the tonal
feature [+H] (stress-shift). Now, the stress-category is
already partly subsumed in the tone category by the concept
of Tonbruch, which locates main stress. It is technically
a small step to go all the way: let us assume that the rule
VR assigns L, low tone. The rule we have called Stress
locates the Tonbruch; the basic Hebrew melody we assume to be
M H. Consider the fate of a word like /dabar+e+ka/:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dabar+e+ka} \\
\text{Stress} & \quad * \\
\text{(Interprets as:)} & \quad \ddot{\text{dabar}}+\text{e+ka} \\
\text{PTL} & \quad \ddot{\text{a}} \\
\text{VD-VR} & \quad \ddot{\text{dabar}}+\text{e+ka} \\
& \quad L \ M \ L \ H
\end{align*}
\]
Main stress is determined by the same principle of Tonbruch: 
\[ V \rightarrow \{\text{stress}\} / \stackrel{\text{VC}}{\text{[+H]}} \quad \underline{\text{[-H]}} \quad _{-} \].

Low tone vowels are interpreted as stressless, and are accorded the appropriate treatment.

This formally successful resolution of the problem is rendered suspect by substantive aspects of tone rules. Alternating de-stressing is well-attested: but alternating tonal contours are not. (Recitativo or chant, rather than yodeling, is the preferred mode of laryngeal activity). Again, reduction to schwa is widely associated with lack of stress, but with low tone?

Another range of possibilities is suggested by recent work of my colleague Liberman (1975): the metrical. Hebrew is evidently a stress-timed language, witness the fact of extensive vowel reduction. (Observe the terrace-tone languages do not admit vowel reduction; or so goes the current lore). Liberman proposes that apparent stress-timing is correlate to the imposition of a metrical pattern, basically a tree-structure composed of S's and W's. The basic rule is that S must dominate a stressed syllable. In his work such a structure mediates between stress-assignment and tone-contour assignment. For our purposes we need to posit a basic metrical pattern \((W) S\), where \(S\) comprehends the last two syllables of a (polysyllabic) word.
Thus, the 'big' S breaks into S W -- penultimate stress-- or W S -- final stress; the rule of Main Stress determines which, as in these examples:

```
  R
 S
 W S
 W
 d o b a r i m
```

```
  R
 S
 W
 S W
 h i s m i d u
```

The idea is that the 'big' S always takes two syllables, if there are two, and the most highly stressed of those gets the lowest S. Main stress can be determined by following the chain of S's down from the root, R. When VD-VR affects the prominent vowel, de-stressing it, relations inside the big S are readjusted, by a convention of universal import.

Let us make the idea precise. Following Liberman (1975), we need (1) a principle that determines the basic geometry of the metrical tree, and (2) a principle that determines the assignment of S (strong position) and W (weak position) to the nodes of the tree whose shape is given by (1).

The essential fact of tree-structure is binary branching. If N is a node in the tree, it either dominates a vowel (or syllable), or it dominates a pair of nodes. The essential fact of labelling is that in a structure
one of the sister nodes $N_1, N_2$ must be $S$ and the other $W$.
The sense of this is that metrical structure is inherently
relational; each metrically significant unit consists of two
parts, one of which is relatively stronger than the other.
The abstract notion of 'strength' plays a central role in
formally reconstructing intuitive perception of degrees of
stress, in assigning intonational contours, and in determin-
ing rhythm and timing. (This is the matter of Liberman 1975).

Individual languages impose more specific constraints
on metrical tree shape, within the basic binary plan. Our
proposal will be that in Hebrew the last two syllables
always form a single metrical constituent (there being more
than one syllable), so that the tree is built up in a right-branching fashion like this:

(55) Hebrew Tree Structure
How do the nodes get their labels? We convert the observation encoded in Main Stress, rule (2), originally couched as a statement about segments, into a statement about metrical nodes.

(56) Node Labelling. In a metrical configuration [M N], where M, N are sister nodes in the metrical tree, N is S, unless it directly dominates V#.

The principle is phrased so that it can be applied to every node in the tree. It means that the right hand node of every pair will be S (generating the pattern W S), except for the lowest, rightmost pair when the word ends in a vowel.

In order to get the W's into the tree, we state the following convention:

(67) Principle of Relation. In a metrical configuration [M N], where

M, N are sisters, if M is S, then N is W; if N is S, then M is W.

Applying these three principles (Hebrew Tree Structure, the rule of Node Labelling, and the universal Principle of Relation) to examples which are familiar will generate the following representations:

```
       R
      / \    
     W   S
    / \   / \
   d   W b a r i m
```
What is the relationship between $S$ and the segmental feature [+stress]? Although clever manipulation of the metrical system could undoubtedly eliminate the segmental feature, Liberman shows that this is inappropriate, that the notion 'degree of stress' is properly in the domain of metrical representation and that the distinction stressed-stressless is properly represented on segments, and implemented by segmental rather than metrical rules.

Nevertheless (and obviously) the two notions are not independent, or orthogonal, to use the language of linear algebra. Metrical $S$ may directly dominate only vowels which are [+stress]. Since we are assuming all vowels in Hebrew to be underlyingly stressed, the metrical representations given just above are well-formed.

The rule that we have called VR, in its new form as a rule of de-stressing, is a segmental rule that wipes out stresses, including those which occupy the strong (S) metrical position. When this happens, the $S$ is replaced by $W$, evidently; this indicates that the relationship between $S$ and [+stress] must hold at all levels of representation,
throughout derivation. When a phonological rule disrupts
the connection, as by removing stress, the metrical pattern
is automatically re-adjusted. Let us specify this property
as follows:

(58) Weakening Convention. The metrical category
label S must dominate a vowel that is [+stress].
If in the course of derivation a vowel dominated
directly by S is marked [-stress], that S is
turned to W.

Taken together with a suitable interpretation of the
Principle of Relation, the Weakening Convention entails that
in a metrical unit [S W], if the S is weakened concomitant to
des-tressing, the W will automatically be re-interpreted as
S, converting the unit to an iamb [W S].

This gives us exactly the desired description of the
stress-shifting phenomenon we have studied, the change from
/katāb+ū/ to/kātab+ū/ that is consequent upon the operation
of the general de-stressing process we treated first as VD
and VR. The only real enrichment of Liberman's theory
that we have introduced is the Weakening Convention, and that
is not so much an accretion as a making-precise of how the
theory is to treat a situation that did not arise in the
(English) data he is concerned with.
Further evidence that is indeed the correct theory of Hebrew stress phenomena comes from the regular retraction of stress in certain syntactic uses of the verb. The jussive (indirect imperative) is used after the conjunction wa-'and' to express \textit{perfect} aspect in narration. In this use of the conjunction (only), the initial consonant of the verb is doubled: \textit{\textit{wayyikt}əb /\textit{\textit{wa}#ya+ktob/ 'and he wrote}}. The conjunction wa+doubling is called 'waw-consecutive', 'waw' being the name of the consonant /\textit{\textit{w}/ which is the root of the conjunction. In the regular or 'sound' triliteral Qal verb, the jussive is identical to the imperfect (\textit{\textit{yikt}əb} = 'he will write' or 'let him write'), and consequently traditional grammars (e.g. Gesenius) refer to this construction as the 'converted imperfect'. However, in certain places in the verbal system there is a distinction: Qal hollows -- \textit{\textit{yaq}əm /\textit{ya+qum}/ 'he will arise'}, but \textit{\textit{yaq}əm /\textit{ya+qom}/ 'let him arise'}; Verbs III-\textit{\textit{w,y -- tιp}nə /\textit{\textit{ta}+pnay/ 'she will turn'}, but \textit{\textit{tep}n /\textit{te+pn}/ (by the truncation mentioned in 1.3) 'let her turn'}; in the conjugation Hip\texti{\textit{il -- yasm}əd /\textit{y+ha+\textit{sm}əd/ 'he will destroy'}, but \textit{\textit{ya\textit{\textit{m}əd /y+ha+\textit{\textit{sm}əd/ 'let him destroy}}. In all these cases it is the unmistakable jussive that shows up after waw-consecutive: \textit{\textit{wattep}n, \textit{\textit{wayya}məd, \textit{\textit{wayyaq}əm.}}

Hence we shall say 'converted jussive'.

Certain of the converted jussives, as the last example cited shows, are susceptible to a rule of stress
retraction when they do not immediately precede a major sentence boundary (occur 'in pause', vide 1.13). The form that this rule would take in conventional description where vowels are assumed to be underlingly stressless and the features [+ stress] is used to represent the prosodic peak of the word, would be approximately the following:

\[(59) \text{Consecutive Retraction S.D. V C V C}_o \#\# \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{S.C.} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
[+\text{str}] & [-\text{str}] \\
\end{array}
\]

The rule is responsible for alternations like:

\[
\text{yāqom/wayyāqom, } \text{yešēb/wayyēšeb (from } \text{yāsāb 'to sit down, dwell'}, \text{ impf. and jussive } \text{yešēb } /\text{ye+šeb/).}
\]

It is striking, in the context of the present discussion, that Consecutive Retraction pulls stress back exactly one syllable, just as stress shifts one syllable forward under the influence of VR. The overarching generalization is that stress remains on the last two syllables.

In the metrical theory proposed here this is a consequence of what we have called Hebrew Tree Structure, by virtue of which the last two syllables form a metrical unit. Consecutive Retraction, in our view, accomplishes a simple de-stressing of the final syllable, and the
re-appearance of main-stress, along with the place of its appearance, is explained in terms of the general principles of Libermanesque metrical theory. The rule now becomes:

(60) Consecutive De-Stressing S.D. same as above
     S.C. 3 \rightarrow [-stress]

This rule marks a tremendous advance over the Preliminary Version. The PV had to make simultaneous changes in two parts of the input string, failing utterly to reflect the fact that the two changes are intrinsically related, one in fact being a necessary correlate of the other, failing as well to reflect that the locus of re-stressing (term 1 in the S.D.) is not arbitrary. The PV is nothing but a descriptive patch-up job.

Observe that Consecutive De-Stressing is a rule of word level phonology. It must precede TL, for the vowel from which stress is withdrawn appears short. It must follow PTL: the prefix vowel in e.g. wayyaqom must be lengthened by PTL so that it will not be debilitated by VR; recall that TL does not protect vowels from reduction, being ordered after the reduction (=de-stressing) process VR. Derivation therefore precedes like this:
Further evidence supporting the metrical theory comes from the two phrasal rules of stress-movement that are found in the language.

The first, called Nâsog ?Ahor by the grammarians, closely resembles the so-called 'thirteen men' rule of English, treated at length in Liberman (1975). As in English (for example, the word for 13 is pronounced thirteen phrase finally, but thirteen as a modifier in e.g. thirteen men, so in Hebrew a word like tōkāl 'she will eat' appears with penultimate stress in close connection: tōkāl lehem 'she will eat bread'. Under traditional assumptions the rule must be formulated in the following unrevealing complexity:
Here, again, the main stress goes back one syllable; and here again, the given rule is subject to the kind of criticism that was leveled against the preliminary version of Consecutive Retraction.

Nasog ?Ahôr is not really a rule of segmental de-stressing; like its English counterpart it accomplishes re-distribution of primary and secondary stresses on the phrasal. Note ?ökèl lehem 'eater of bread', where the lengthened è of /?ökèl/ remains. The rule therefore pertains to metrical structure; this is an approximate version:

(62)  Nàsóg ?Ahôr  S.D.  S  S  V  C  O  V  C  O  #  ( # )  C  O  V  

(Term 1 of the S.D. is meant to signify that the S affected must be on the lowest rank of the tree.)

The second phrasal rule moves stress forward one syllable in the 2ms perfect when it is used after wa- (no doubling) to express imperfective aspect in narration: /wa/ plus /katab+ta/ comes out wákàtabtà 'and you will write'. Observe that the vocalism of the verb is exactly
that which it assumes elsewhere: kāṭāḇtā 'you wrote'. Here again, a (late) rule of metrical weakening is the optimal representation of the process.

(63) 2ms-Forward S. S / in 2ms perfect after wa-

l

S.C.  l + W

To summarize the results of the present excursion: the 'reduced' vowels of Hebrew, the 'half-vowels' of Gesen-
ius, -- schwas and hatephs -- are unstressed short vowels occurring in open syllables, and these properties account for their being traditionally described as 'extra-short', 'murmured', 'indistinct'. For example, the second vowel in the word naharōṯāy 'my rivers' falls into this category. But the first vowel does not, although it is short and in an open syllable. The notion of reduction thus demands a contrast: not only must the second vowel be [-stress], the first must be [+stress]. The most uniform way to implement the necessary contrast is to provide all non-reduced vowels with stress. It has been argued here that the correct way to achieve this pattern is to regard all vowels as under-
lyingly stressed, destressing certain of them according to the principle behind the rules VD and VR. This rule of alternating de-stressing, which supplants VR in the grammar, has this final form:

(64) Alternating De-Stressing V + [-stress] / -- C V

[-long]
Heuristically, the rule may be conceived of as iterating leftward, although the proposals of Halle, Prince, Vergnaud 1975 allow its expression with the constraint of simultaneous application. As the rule is of the standard type that does not distinguish the iterative and (revised) simultaneous theories, I shall not urge the matter of exact formalization.

Coupled with the metrical theory, the rule AD permits an explanation of both the occurrence and the direction of stress shift. A metrical theory, based on that expounded in Liberman (1975), was articulated and argued for on grounds both descriptive and explanatory: namely, that by preserving the generalization that stress must fall on the last two syllables of the Hebrew word, it allowed significant clarification of all rules effecting movement of main stress; and that this simplification eliminated the need for 'two-operation' rules in this area, supporting the general claim that such rules do not exist.
1.10. **Cumulative Rule Census**

The adoption of Alternating De-Stressing compels the introduction of a rule mapping short stressless vowels onto schwa.

(65) **Ultimate Reduction**

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[-\text{lng}] & \\
[-\text{str}] &
\end{align*}
\]

Where does this fit in the ordering? The end is a likely spot: earlier rules affecting schwa could be rephrased to affect short, stressless vowels. But we know there are rules that produce or affect short stressless vowels -- Mataph Formation (43), Schwa-t-A (44) -- and the output of these rules is not reduced to schwa, although it meets the S.D. of Ultimate Reduction. Minimally, the new rule UR must precede Schwa-t-A, so that the stressless \([a]\)'s produced by that rule don't get reduced.

Note that if UR did follow HF and Schwa-to-A, it would completely undo their effects. Under the Elsewhere Convention, proposed by Kiparsky (1973), this kind of relation between rules entails disjuntivity between them, and UR then could be the last rule of grammar. This actually opens a number of possibilities for reanalyzing the system of late rules dealing with inserted vowels: instead of schwa, an i-quality vowel might be inserted by Cluster Break-Up; the rule of Schwa Deletion could be refashioned as Short-Vowel Deletion, and have
as a side clause that those short unstressed vowels that are not deleted, turn (in the env. -- CV) to the real schwa. This certainly deserves close scrutiny, as it bears on the interesting questions raised by Kiparsky (1973). For the present, however, we shall remain with the ordering solution.

At this point, we have accumulated a fair number of rules. So that the reader may be able to better evaluate the system, I pause here to present them in their order. I divide them into three classes heuristically.

(Table on next page.)
(I) Early Adjustments

Plural Breaking (19), p. 4
2nd Person Metathesis (48), p. 111
O-Closure (15), p. 35

(II) Node Labelling (56), p. 143

(III) Phonology Proper

Shortening (7), p. 30
Lowering (8), p. 31
Glide Voc. (53), p. 129

Nas. Assim. (24), p. 54
PTL (29), p. 65
Echo (50), p. 117
AD (64), p. 151

A-to-I (20), p. 42 [see comment below]

TL (11), p. 34
Prefix-Strip (46), p. 108

Ult. Red. (65), p. 153
DeGem (51), p. 121

HF (43), p. 97
Cluster Break-Up (38), p. 87

Schwa-to-A (44), p. 98
Spir (45), p. 99

Y-Adjust (22), p. 45

Schwa Del. (40), p. 88
Y + e (18), p. 39

Schwa-to-I (41), p. 89
26s Trunc. (21), p. 44
The central spine of rules under (III) is linearly ordered; the arrows show the other ordering relations that arguments exist for. The partial order represented here could easily be collapsed into (one of several equivalent) strict linear orders; I have shown it as above to make clear where ordering arguments exist.

One aspect of the ordering that deserves comment is the placement of A-to-I. The rule we first posited as (20) cannot fit there, for it is fed by Schwa-Deletion, one of the last rules. Yet the rule must precede Prefix-Stripping, if facts like the stem-vowel alternation in giddēl-y gaddēl-gaddēl are to be handled by it: presence of the underlying prefix in the imperative inhibits the rule (vide 1.7).

The rule must also precede TL. Truncation of an imperfect like yibke /ya+bkay/ 'he will weep' puts main stress on the prefix vowel, and it lengthens by TL: yebl . The non-high quality of the vowel suggests that the rule really should take /a/ to /e/. In Chapter 2, discussing this and related phenomena, we shall see that this occasions no complication of the grammar.

Now, it is not really necessary to postpone A-to-I (perhaps I should say A-to-E) all the way to the end. After AD has applied, those forms to which A-to-E applies are clearly distinguishable from all others: they have the structure #C--CC[-str]. The feature [-str] is, of course, implanted by the rule AD; but it is also an underlying
feature of all consonants. (This mode of analysis is developed with care in Vergnaud 1974, from which I borrow the idea.)

The final version of the rule will then be:

(66) A-to-E \( a \rightarrow e \) / #C \(-\text{stress}\)
1.11 Residual Matters

(I) The ordinary feminine singular affix is clearly /at/, on the noun, on the adjective, on the 3rd person of the perfect verb. These are its characteristic alternations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Citation Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>+Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>?em-a</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>?emat</td>
<td>?emat-o 'his ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?emat-at-kem 'your m.p. ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>t'a</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>tobat</td>
<td>tob-at-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tob-at-kem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>katab-a</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>katab-at-am '... them mp.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qam-a</td>
<td>arise</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The peculiarities of the f.s. verb with suffixes are the subject of (III) below.)

Glancing over this table, one sees that the 3fs. ending's vocalism is just that of an underlying short a. It lengthens pretonically, shows up short in the env. --CC, otherwise lengthens under main stress. It also shows up long when final, as in qama; it shares this property with all other word final a's, as for example the a of -ka and -ta in pika 'your mouth', katabta 'you ms. wrote'; the directional ending -a, as qars-ā 'to the land'; the irregular vocalic final of
lāylā 'night'. Clearly, a lengthening is at hand:

(67) \( a \vdash [+\text{long}] \) --#

But this is just a sub-clause of rule (9), V-final, which insures that all word-final vowels are long.

The most striking feature of the paradigm is the disappearance of the /t/ from the free form. Assuming that the construct state is marked by just one word boundary (justified below), the appropriate rule is simply

(68) T-Drop \( t \rightarrow \emptyset / +a --## \)

It is necessary to spell out the +a, because other \( _-t's \) do not delete, as for example the truncated form of this very affix visible in such forms as šenī-t 'second f.', masc: šēnī; and the third root consonant of kārat 'cut off'.

The rule T-Drop evidently precedes and feeds V-final.

But where does T-Drop stand in relation to Main Stress? In nouns and adjectives, the feminine suffix, when final, bears main stress, as if it ended in a consonant.

In verbs, the 3fs of the perfect is penultimately stressed, as if the ending were vocalic when Main Stress applies. Adjectives and nouns evidence the order Main Stress, then T-Drop; verbs, just the opposite.

There are two basic lines of approach to resolving the dilemma: (1) w.r.t T-Drop, (a) order the rule differently
depending on the category to which it applies (b) split it into Verbal T-Drop and Non-Verbal T-Drop, ordered before and after Stress; (2) w.r.t. Main Stress, (a) if T-Drop follows, complicate the rule to let /+at/ be skipped over, (b) if T-Drop precedes, disallow the parenthesized V of Stress from analyzing the nominal f.s. ending.

Line (1) is out: (a) is not possible in current theory, (b) amounts to dropping the obvious generalization about the f.s. affix. Line (2a) portrays as coincidental the fact that all regular penultimately stressed words end in vowels; the rule T-Drop just happens to make /+at/ conform to general case. If T-Drop is early, the penultimate stress of the 3fs perfect is because the form is vowel final. This leaves (2b); stipulating that nominal /at/ may not count as a vocalic final for purposes of stress.

If this argument is correct, then certain morphological adjustments (e.g. T-drop) must take place before the rule of Node-Labelling, which replaces Main Stress, can be allowed to work on phonological strings.

(II) There are some cases where stress-shift fails to occur although the environment for Alternate Deletion is met: (1) with certain pronominal suffixes, (2) with the directional affix /-a/, (3) in nouns like ?ahû 'reeds', 어요 'swimming', (4) in the 3rd person fem. sing of the perfect, suffixed: _AESÁRÁ TAM 'she guarded them m.'. (Case 4 falls under the next topic).
The characteristics of the pronominal suffixes are most clearly revealed in the imperfect, where the relevant morphology is quite simple. Two paradigms of attachment are available: one, irrelevant to the present issue, in which the suffixes are linked to the stem by the augment /-en-/; one in which the suffixes are linked by the vowel /-e-/.

The second looks like this:

yišmör + pron. suff. 'he will guard ...'

```
Pers/Gen | Sing.        | Pl.
--------|-------------|-------------
1        | yišmör-e-nī | yišmör-e-nū |
2 m      | yišmor-kā   | --          |
f        | yišmör-e-k  | --          |
3 m      | yišmör-e-hū | yišmör-e-m  |
f        | yišmör-e-hā | yišmör-e-n  |
```

(The 2nd person pl. suffixes do not attach to the verb.)

The paradigm speaks for itself. Of those suffixes which should occasion AD--namely, -nī (1s), -nū (1p), -hū (3ms), -ha (3fs), -ka (2ms) -- it is -ka alone that allows it.

This pattern repeats itself whenever the morphology sets up the right conditions. In the perfect, šemārkā /samar+e+ka/ contrasts with šemār-ā-hū, šemār-ā-nū, šemār-ā-nī, (with an idiosyncratically short a). On the singular noun, dēbār-kā contrasts with dēbār-ē-nū. On the prepositions l- 'to, b- 'in', lākā, bēkā contrast with lā-nū, bā-nū.
(Forms not cited from other persons are rendered irrelevant by rules of morphological combination.)

A direct way to represent these data, given that AD applies in the env. --CV, is to lexically mark the non-2nd person suffixes as [-stress]. With this formulation of the environment of AD -- necessary if the rule is iterative, not so if simultaneous -- a lexical mark [-stress] comes to signify [-stressable]. Such a division of affixes into intrinsically stressed and intrinsically unstressed is familiar from the work of Halle and Kiparsky on Indo-European accentuation (Halle, Kiparsky, in preparation).

When AD fails to apply, TL lengthens the persistent main-stressed vowel, outputting the correct quantity, as this derivation illustrates:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lexical Stress:} & \quad + + + + + \\
\text{Main Stress} & \quad + + + - \\
\text{PTL} & \quad Šamārā+hū \\
\text{AD} & \quad - + + - \\
\text{TL} & \quad šā \\
\text{UltRed} & \quad ø \\
\text{Spir} & \quad Ŵ _ { Ŵ } \\
\text{Output:} & \quad Šemārāhū \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lexical Stress:} & \quad + + + + + \\
\text{Main Stress} & \quad + + + - \\
\text{PTL} & \quad dabār+ē+nu \\
\text{AD} & \quad - + + - \\
\text{TL} & \quad ē \\
\text{UltRed} & \quad ø \\
\text{Spir} & \quad Ŵ _ { Ŵ } \\
\text{Output:} & \quad dabārenu
\end{align*}
\]
A similar remark holds for the directional suffix -a: midbáras 'wilderness', midbára 'to the wilderness'; témán 'south', témáná 'southward' — not *midbára, *témna, as we'd expect under the most general assumptions. It's not possible to posit a word boundary separating affix from stem, for segholates show non-spirantized root final consonants: negeb 'Negev', negba: Cluster Break-Up would certainly occur at a word boundary, and the results of such schwa-insertion would be clearly visible as spirantization. (The vocalism of the form is puzzling, but irrelevant; nagba is expected.)

Nouns ending in -u are few in number and rare in occurrence: ?ahú 'reeds' — 3x, šahu 'swimming' — 1x, tóhú 'confusion, nothingness', bóhú — always in the phrase tóhú wabóhú 'chaos'; maybe some others. Furthermore, they do not appear suffixed or in construct and therefore display no alternations that might give evidence about their inner form. Because of the replacement of the third root consonant by a long vowel — just like the pori, holī type —, and because of the relationship to the class of vowel final verbs, the example being šahá 'to swim', paralleling pará 'to be fruitful' related to pori 'fruit', it can be concluded that these should be w-final underlying. This rule Glide Vocalization (53) can be generalized to apply to w; if the words are listed as exceptional to AD, the correct forms
result. Another possibility is that derivation proceeds without glide vocalization: tohw $\rightarrow$ tohw $\rightarrow$ tohaw, which then goes to tohū by a rule $\omega w \rightarrow \ddot{u}$. However, those with stem vowel $a$ apparently do not follow the mélek pattern: *ʔehū, *ʔeḥū. As a final counter-quibble on this tiny point, it should be noted that the one occurrence of šaḥū, at Ezech. 47.5, bears the accent Zāqēp Qāṭōn, indicating that it ends the first half of the second hemistich of the verse, meaning that it may well be a pausal form, and thus regular, like qāber, ḫābed, hesī for qēber, ḫābed, ḫaṣī.

At any rate, the solution via generalization of rule (53) and lexical exceptionality does the observational job, and the skimpy evidence certainly supports no enrichment of the grammar.

(III) The paradigm of the 3fs perfect plus pronominal suffixes displays several surprising features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers/Gen</th>
<th>Sing</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>šēmārāt-nī</td>
<td>šēmārāt-mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>šēmārāt-ka (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>šēmārāt-ek (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>šēmārāt-hū</td>
<td>šēmārāt-am (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šēmārāt-tū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>šēmārāt-tā</td>
<td>šēmārāt-an (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A regular feature that we have not seen before is the assimilation retrogressively of $h$ across a morpheme boundary: optional apparently in 3ms, obligatory elsewhere.

\[(67) \text{H-Assimil.} \quad h + C_i / C_i + --\]

The operation of the rule is visible in the augmented imperfect endings -ennū /en+hū/ 'him', -enna /en+ha/ 'her', and in the suffixing of the preposition min 'from' with pronouns: mimmēnnū /min+min+hū/ 'from him', mimmēnnā /min+min+ha/ 'from her' (the reduplication is idiosyncratic but obvious). In this last case, N-assimilation obviously occurs as well. The rule of H-Assimilation should be ordered before spirantization, as a non-spirantized element is copied.

Viewed as a self-contained unit, the paradigm appears severely regular. Stress falls always on the inflectional affix -at. The only stem-alternation in the paradigm is in the length of the vowel in -at, again completely regular: it's long in the env. --C V, short in the env. --C C.

This regularity is purchased, however, at the cost of considerable divergence from the phonological norms of the language. The consonant final forms should be finally stressed; they are penultimately stressed: ṣēmārātek, ṣēmārātam, ṣēmārātan. Some sort of special rule is needed to accomplish this stressing, and it must certainly be early,
for PTL, which applies to the same vowel throughout the paradigm, depends on the -at being stressed. Furthermore, in just these cases, the rule AD should apply to destress the -at being stressed. Furthermore, in just these cases, the rule AD should apply to destress the -at, fating its vowel to an eventual deletion which never happens. The morpheme -at must apparently be marked [-AD]. (Observe that this is the only morphological environment in which -at is susceptible to reduction.)

The form šomarrātkā is also problematic. If it comes from /šamar+at+e+ka/, then the stressed vowel should be long, since it occurs in a syllable open at the time TL applies. Further, such a form contravenes the proposed generalization, not challenged by the consonant-final forms, that stress falls always on one of the last two syllables. If it comes from /šamar+at+ka/, then the stress and length properties are normal, but the /k/ of the pronoun should remain un-spirantized.

The historical provenance of the situation is relatively clear. In Proto-North-West-Semitic -- Proto-Hebrew, the paradigm must have looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers/Gen</th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>šamarāt-nī</td>
<td>šamarāt-nū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>šamarāt-ka</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>šamarāt-ki</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>šamarāt-hū</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>šamarāt-ha</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuming a Classical-Arabic type of accent rule -- accent the first heavy syllable from the end, skipping the last syllable -- or even the rule we have found in the later language, stress is always penultimate, on the -at.

The 2nd and 3rd person plural pronominal suffixes are reconstructable roughly as *kimm, *kinn, *himm, *hinn. The 3rd person form shows up in the independent pronoun: hem 'ils', hennā 'elles'; after certain prepositions, lāhem, lāhen 'to them'; and on the plural noun, e.g. dībr-e-hem, -hēn. Elsewhere it is /am, an/: on the singular noun, dēbār-ām, -ān; on the perfect verb, ūmār-ē-m, -ēn; on the imperfect, with truncation, yišmār-e-m, -ēn.

Now, in the Biblical period of the language, no 2nd person plural object pronouns are ever affixed to the verb; when a 2nd person pronoun is a verbal object, the free (object) form is always found. Because of this, I have left their position in the table b ank, making the not implausible assumption that the Biblical situation accurately reflects Proto-Hebrew. Since the ur-3 pl. pronouns (*himm, *himm) have the same shape as the ur-2 pl pronouns (*kimm, *kinn), and since the Hebrew 3 pl. verbal suffixes (-am, -an) do not descend directly from these ur-forms, I assume that at some point both the 2nd and the 3rd pl. suffixes were banned from the verb, presumably for some phonological reason now obscure (stress?).
After the endings /am, an/ developed in the nominal system by phonological reduction involving the case-ending /a/ (acc.) plus /himm, hinn/, we can speculate that the new 3 pl endings (am, an) were introduced into the verbal system; thereby reintroducing the once excluded category of 3rd person plural object suffixes. Since all the available forms were stressed on the at, this feature was apparently maintained. If the stress had been normalized, considerable disruption of the stem would have followed: from /šamar+at+am/, the usual rules give šimrātam, just as from /dabar+ē+hem/, with the same structure, there comes dibrēhem.

Similarly, in the 2nd person fem., samaratki, when the ending -ki was replaced by -ik or -ek everywhere, the original stress was maintained, producing šomarātek, not šimrātek. This form cannot be derived from /šamar+at+k/, for although the e would be inserted properly, the stressed vowel would not lengthen, since it's in the env. --C C, and the output would have to be *šomārētek, like mēlek /malk/.

In the 2nd person masc., nothing much happened—except that the k of -ka was spirantized, regardless of the fact that no vowel ever stood before it. This paradigm is the one place in the entire language where the pronominal suffixes were preceded by a consonant; elsewhere they followed the case-endings (-u nom., -i gen., -a accusative), or vocalic endings on the verbs, some of which were lost when final short
vowels dropped. Can it be said that -ka was simply re-analysed everywhere as -e+ka? Of the three consequences of such re-analysis, -stress-shift onto ka, lengthening of the vowel in -at and spirantization of the /k/, -only the last is visible, suggesting rather that the /k/ was simply spirantized to make the ending look like its other occurrences.

Rather than explore any of the various ad hoc mechanisms which can be concocted to force this paradigm into the rest of the grammar, I am going to let it stand as problematic, waiting for a real illumination of the something that is going on here.
1.12 The Construct State

A genitival relationship is expressed by concatenation:

a. qol han-nabi? 'the voice of the prophet'
b. qolot han-nabi? 'the voices of the prophet'
c. yad han-nabi? 'the hand of the prophet'
d. benot han-nabi?im 'the daughters of the prophets'
e. dobar ham-melek 'the word of the king'
f. dobar melek 'a word of a king'
g. nahar ham-melek 'the river of the king'
h. melek han-nahar 'the king of the river'
i. nahar ham-melakim 'the river of the kings'
j. malke han-nahar 'the kings of the river'
k. dibre melakim 'words of kings'
l. ben Dawid 'the son of David'
m. ben- Dawid 'the son of David'

n. dibre lebed bene Yisra?el 'the words of the servant of the sons of Israel'
o. somer hat-tora 'one who observes the Law'
p. torat Yisra?el 'the law of Israel'
q. hoq Dawid 'the statute of David'
r. hoq- Dawid 'the statute of David'
s. huqq? Dawid 'the statutes of David'
t. dobar bene ha?elohim han-nabi? 'the word of the sons of the prophet of the Lord'
u. ?arsa konaf?an 'to the land of Canaan'
Every noun in the chain but the last is said to be in the **construct state**; the last is said to be in the **absolute state**, meaning that its form is just that which it assumes alone. The definiteness of each noun in the phrase is the same, and is determined by the definiteness of the last noun. Only the last noun, the noun in the absolute state may bear the definite article. Adjectives in Hebrew follow the noun they modify, but any adjective associated with a noun in construct must follow the whole phrase, and only one noun in a phrase may be modified. If a noun is intrinsically definite—a personal name, for example—the whole phrase is definite, as in exs. l-n,p-s,u. A genitival phrase with mixed definiteness—'a son of David', 'a horse of the king'—must be expressed periphrastically with the preposition 'to', as, literally, 'horse to the king', 'son to David'. Similar constraints on definiteness hold true of the genitive in English, when it is expressed with a case-ending ('s), rather than a prepositional phrase; 'the king's horse' is *the horse of the king*, 'the king's cousin's army' is *the army of the cousin of the king*, 'my mother's piano' is *the piano of my mother*; 'a king's horse' is *a horse of a king*, and so on.

The chief morphological feature of the construct state is the replacement of the (predominantly) masculine plural ending -īm by ō, which proves to be /ay/. This replacement also occurs when an -īm plural is suffixed, as in dibr-ō-hem
'their m. books' = /dabar+ım/ + /hemm/.

The masoretic system of textual accents (ṭōfinīm) is quite detailed enough to indicate that the principal stress of the phrase falls on the last member, the word-stress of nouns in construct being subordinated to that of the noun in absolute; sometimes, when marked by a dash, to the point of complete loss, as in exs. (m), (r).

Perhaps the most striking difference between the absolute and the construct state lies in the realm of syllable structure: dabăr shows up in construct as dabär, bānim 'sons' as bānē, dēbara'im as dibrē, tōrā (a feminine) as tōrāt. Let us distinguish two classes of phonological characteristics: (1) the shape of the last syllable, and (2) the pattern of reductions.

In the last syllable of a word in construct, underlying short a appears short; but underlying e and o are lengthened as usual under the principal word stress: dabăr (short), as against šōmer (example o.), bēn (l.), ḫōq (q.). Underlyingly long vowels remain long, as in qōl (a.), qōlot /qōl+ōt/ (b.). As noted above (1.11), the feminine singular ending /-at/ retains its t.

Reduction of vowels in the construct state affects the same class of segments as the processes we have studied so far—vowels which are underlyingly short: note the contrast between exs. (b.) and (d.), qōlot /qōl+ōt/ vs. bānōt /ban+ōt/ Further, it operates in the same basic environment, --CV, and in the same alternating manner, producing stem mutations that
are already familiar to us: dibre (cstr.), from /dabar+ay/, recalls dibrehem, from /dabar+ay+hemm/; dabar (cstr.) recalls dabarka and dabarkem. Evidently, the same network of de-stressing-reduction-deletion rules is at work here, but different segments are affected: and the difference is quite straightforward. Where in the absolute state PTL removes pre-tonic vowels from the grasp of the reduction processes, in the construct state PTL simply does not apply and those same vowels now start the alternating chain of reduction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dabar (cstr)</th>
<th>dabar (abs)</th>
<th>dabar+ay (cstr)</th>
<th>dabar+im (abs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lex.Str)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St</td>
<td>+ S</td>
<td>+ S</td>
<td>++ S</td>
<td>++ S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>á</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>á</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>- S</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>+ - S</td>
<td>- + S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>dabar</td>
<td>dabar'</td>
<td>dibre</td>
<td>dabar'im</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes in the rule system are needed to model this diversity of facts?

Let us suppose that the nouns in the construct chain are separated by a single word boundary, so that, for example, dabar Dawid 'the word of David' is underlyingly ##dabar#Dawid##. The import of such representation is that the whole phrase is analysed by the phonology as a single word. The rules we have discussed apply to words, hence to the construct phrase as a word, not to the individual nouns which make it up:
except for one rule, Main Stress, which must locate the peak stress of each constituent noun, even if that peak stress ultimately comes to have only secondary prominence in the entire phrase. Main Stress is thus a #-level, rather than ##-level rule. Note that both final and penultimate options are evidenced: דָּבָּר הַמֶּלֶךְ (e), ?אֶרְסָּא קַנָּאָן (u).

The first consequence of this mode of representation is that the last syllable length facts -- a vs. ē ĕ -- are predicted by the rule of TL we have already established. Recall that whereas /e o/ lengthened under principal word stress without condition, /a/ lengthened only in the env --C## and --C V. This restriction was written into rule (11), page 341, of which we repeat the relevant subrule dealing with a:

\[(70) \quad \text{TL}(a) \quad a \rightarrow \ddot{a} / \; (-- (V X) ##) \; S\]

The 'S' is meant to indicate that the affected vowel must occupy a 'strong' prosodic position, i.e. be under a principal word stress.

Now, it is quite clear that the main-stressed vowel of דָּבָּר in a phrase like ##דָּבָּר#הַמֶּלֶךְ## does not satisfy the environmental conditions for the rule TL. It is not in the env. --C##, since only one word boundary follows; and it is not in the env. -- C V, nor can it ever be since (1) all words begin with a consonant or glide, and (2) even so, the env. -- C V does not allow a word-boundary to intervene
between the C and the V. Thus, the shortness of a in dabər is controlled by the same principle that governs the shortness of the stressed vowel in such words as katəbtɨ 'I wrote', Şam 'people', melek 'king'. There is in fact no elegant re-formulation of (70) to suspend the restriction in the construct; the best that could be done would be to re-write the env. as --C( V X ) ##, a monstrosity. The quantity situation in the final syllable of words in construct is actually a reflex of the situation in the language at large.

What of the pattern of reductions in the construct state? It was noted that if PTL does not apply to construct forms, the observed pattern falls out of the motivated rules. But, of course, PTL applies in the absolute state. The rule could be restricted to apply to the last word in the phrase by adding on to the r.h.s. of the Structural Description, like so, --C V Q ##, where the interpretation of the Q-variable (see Haïle, Vergnaud, Prince, 1975; Prince 1975 ms.) is such that only the nearest main-stressed vowel to the end of the phonological word (= construct chain) can satisfy the SD. However, this very vowel is independently identified as the peak stress of the whole super-word. If the rule PTL is modified as suggested, then it is portrayed as a grammatical accident that PTL is conditioned only by the principal stress of the entire phonological word: PTL happens to apply in the absolute state only, and peak-stress happens to fall on the absolute noun. Let us eliminate this 'coincidence' -- and maintain the
simplicity of PTL -- by conditioning PTL upon a ##-peak stress and not just a locally strong one.

How is this peak to be located? Let us articulate the Libermanesque 'metrical' theory presented above. The prosidid structure of a phrase like *dab'ar Dawîd* at a point before any rules apply, according to the principles given, would be:

\[
\text{Root} \\
N \quad N \\
N \quad N \\
W \quad S \\
## d a b a r # D a w î d ##
\]

The rule of Main Stress places final stress on the constituent words by labeling the metrical nodes as follows:

\[
\text{Root} \\
N \quad N \\
W \quad S \\
W \quad W \\
## d a b a r # D a w î d ##
\]

To complete the labelling of the tree, a W must be assigned on the left, an S on the right.
What principle stands behind this assignment? Recall the principle of node labelling that functions in the #-domain:

(71) In a metrical configuration \([M N]\), where \(M, N\) are sister nodes in the metrical tree, \(N\) is \(S\), unless it dominates \(V\#\).

This was be stated in the familiar format for phonological rules as:

(72) Node Labelling \(N + S /-- (N)_{V\#}\)

(The left-bracket in the rule represents the end of metrical 'foot', and the rule applies 'cyclically', i.e. it determines the relationship between sisters, insuring that each foot is either WS or SW.)

Now, this principle, unless further articulated, gives exactly the correct assignment of labels; for the node \(N\) above Daw\(\ddot{\text{I}}\)d directly dominates a pair of metrical codes, not \(V\#\), and therefore, as the rightmost of the pair, it receives the designation \(S\).

Main Stress, as in 1.9, is determined by following the
S's down from the root.

Thus, under the rather obviously necessary assumption that a phonological word forms a metrical unit, the pattern of the construct state appears as the simplest projection of the #-word pattern, requiring no enrichment of the principle of main-stress assignment (node-labelling). If this result is correct, then it provides strong support for the general hypothesis of metrical structure, and for the particular way we have chosen of expressing node-labelling, via the parenthesis-disjunction formalism of SPE.

At this point, a little notation is needed to permit direct reference to the peak stress. Let us use the symbol $S_{\text{max}}$ with a vowel to indicate that it is dominated in prosodic structure by a maximal chain of S's -- maximal within the domain of application of the rule. We may now state a final version of PTL:

(44) Pre-Peak Lengthening

$$V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] / \#\#C_{O} \ (X \ (V) \ b_{C}--C \ y \ \ \downarrow \ S_{\text{max}}$$

Condition: $a \geq b$

Under these assumptions, the construct chain derives like this:
The phonology of the construct chain emerges from its inner architecture. A string of nouns separated by single word boundaries, it is treated as a single word. The boundary structure entails the failure of TL to apply to a inside the chain. It does not entail the restriction on PTL, that it apply only before main stress of the phonological word (defined by ##), but it provides the necessary context for expressing the restriction. Its being a single word is compatible with allowing the principle of node-labelling for lexical items to determine its stress pattern; perhaps the theory should be enriched so that this is a necessary consequence of the ##-word representation, not just a plausible happenstance. Thus the use of single word boundaries (#)
to separate members of the construct chain provides a successful reconstruction of the descriptive notions 'close connection' and 'partial proclisis', and, through a single refinement in the rule PTL, allows construct phonology to be understood as a principled reflex of the situation in the language at large.

Those cases where word stress on the construct noun is completely absent, such as ben-Dāwīd (m.), hoq-Dāwīd (r.), the cases of real procliticization, might be marked by reduction of the original ## all the way to +. Thus the construct nouns would lose their right to the S assigned to the last two syllables of all independent words (p.143), and no cycle takes place on them. As these words have no S position, TL cannot apply to them, and underlying short vowels appear short. Another possibility is that the boundaries remain constant but that a special rule of proclisis optionally applies to wipe out all S's from the word in construct. Evidence that this approach is to be preferred comes from the behaviour of underlyingly long vowels such as the one in hod /hōd/ 'glory'. They remain long even under proclitic S-loss, but, as we saw above (1.2), long vowels shorten in the env. --C+C. In a phrase like hōd-?ēl 'the glory of God', retention on the long vowel militates against a representation ##hōd?ēl##. On the basis of this evidence, then, we reject the reduction to +-boundary solution, and adduce a rule of proclitic
destressing that may optionally apply in the construct state. We leave the exact formulation of the rule open. A natural constraint on rules of boundary adjustment would be that \#\# can be weakened only one step to \# and no further. This would rule out the +-boundary solution in principle, setting a limit on the extent to which syntactic juxtaposition can affect the phonological integrity of words. The failure of the +-boundary solution in this instance supports such a constraint.

The boundary structure of the construct chain provides an unambiguous environment for certain processes of suppletion. The most general, mentioned above, is the replacement of the plural suffix /-\im/ by /ay/. This occurs as well when the plural is pronominally suffixed, most clearly see in the 2fs.

| 41 barayik /dabar+ay+k/ 'your words' = /dabar+\im/ + /k/.

Interestingly, the feminine plural ending /-\ot/ is supplemented by /ay/ before the suffixes, e.g. töröt-\ayik /tör+\ot+ay+k/ 'you- fs. laws' = /töröt/ + /k/. This suggests that rather than simple replacement of \im in a certain environment, we have first insertion of the augment -ay-, then truncation of -\im:

(74) Plural Augmentation

\[ \emptyset \rightarrow +/ \begin{array}{c}
\text{[plural]} \\
\text{(+fem)}_a \\
\text{(-seg)}_b \\
\text{(+seg)}_c
\end{array} \]

Condition a \supset b

(75) Emasculation

\[ \\im + \emptyset / - + \]
The condition on rule (74) states that $ot$ is augmented before $+$ but not $\#$, i.e. before pronominal suffixes, not in the construct state. Rule (74) need not mention $ay$ specifically, because this is the one place in the language where $Im$ is followed by a morpheme boundary. The rules work like this:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pl. Aug.} & : & \#dabar+\overset{i}{m}\#malk# & \#dabar+\overset{i}{m}+k# & \#t\overset{r}{o}\overset{r}{t}+\overset{o}{t}+k# \\
\text{Emasc.} & : & \#dabar+ ay+malk# & \#dabar+ ay+malk# & \#t\overset{r}{o}\overset{r}{t}+ay+k# & \#t\overset{r}{o}\overset{r}{t}+ay+k#
\end{align*}
\]

The forms are then input to the phonology we have described.

This example raises a couple of points of some theoretical interest. For one thing, it illustrates the existence of a natural class of single unit boundaries $\#, +$, showing that the boundaries are not each primitive, but are sub-classified among themselves along the lines suggested by the SPE feature analysis. For another, it gives clear evidence that rules of morpheme truncation are a necessary part of the descriptive apparatus made available to the language learner by the theory of grammar. The evidence is not only grammar-internal but comes as well from the historical development of the distributional data just presented.

Originally -- or rather, as far back as we need to go -- the language had the following system of case endings:
These endings were added on to the bare stem of the masculine, e.g. *dabar-\text{u}, and onto the derivational ending of the feminine, -\text{at} in the singular and dual, -\text{-\text{at}} in the plural, as in *nabil\text{-\text{atu}}, *nabil\text{-\text{atu}} 'corpse, corpses nom.'. In addition to the case-system, Proto North-West Semitic distinguished between bound and unbound forms of the noun: a noun was bound if pronominally suffixed or if in the construct state, unbound otherwise. Unbound forms were marked with mem\text{-ation} (or nun\text{-ation}), a suffix added on to the case ending, consisting of an m (or n) plus V, where V = a or i depending on category of case, no., gender: *dabar\text{-u}ma 'word nom.', *dabar\text{-mi} 'two words nom.', *dabar\text{-\text{u}ma} 'words nom.', *dabar\text{-\text{ima}ma} 'words gen-acc.'

Then the language was rent by change. Final short vowels drop everywhere, wreaking havoc with the case system. Furthermore, the mem\text{-ated forms of words that ended in short vowels (all singul}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{Sing.} & \textbf{Dual} & \textbf{Pl.} \\
\hline
Nom. & u & \textbar & \textbar \textbar & u \\
Gen. & i & & & \\
Acc. & a & ay & i & i
\end{tabular}
system of the unpossessed noun can be maintained only in the
dual (-ā nom., -ay gen-acc.) and the masculine plural
(-ū nom., -ī gen. -acc.). However, a contrast between
dabarū(m) and dabari(m) does not last long, and it is re-
solved in favor of the oblique form in both dual and plural,
yielding the system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bound</th>
<th>unbound</th>
<th>bound</th>
<th>unbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. dabar</td>
<td>dabaray</td>
<td>dabaraym</td>
<td>dabarī</td>
<td>dabarīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nabilat</td>
<td>nabilatay</td>
<td>nabilataym</td>
<td>nabilāt(i)</td>
<td>nabilāt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final change that brings the masculine noun into direct
ancestry of Hebrew is the replacement of the plural bound form
in -ī by the dual in -ay; this yields ultimately constructs
like dibre/dabar+ay/ and suffixed forms like dabarayik/dabar+ay+k/
and dibrehem/dabar+ay+hemm/. What of the feminine?

It is clear that no such replacement of the plural by
the dual took place in the feminine bound forms; otherwise
the feminine plural construct would come from e.g. nabilatay,
leading to the incorrect nibliťe /nabel+at+ay/. The actual
form is, of course, niblot /nabel+ot/, from the historical
plural bound form nabilāt. Similarly, if such a replacement
had taken place, the suffixed feminine plural would be in
Hebrew niblātayik /nabel+at+ay+k/, from the historical nabilatayk.
The actual form, niblotayik /nabel+ot+ay+k/ cannot descend
from nabilatayk, but only from a form based on the authentic
plural nabilātayk (long a in the feminine morpheme).
The question is, how did the -ay- morpheme get attached to the fem. pl. -āt in pre-suffixal position? The feminine dual uses -ay- as a straightforward number marker, and therefore provides no source for an 'empty' augment. But the new masculine plural pre-suffixal form, dabaray-, shows the morpheme in a way that demands special interpretation, since it is not dual and since the free plural form looks quite different: dabarīm. Suppose that a suffixal form like *dabarayk (pl.) is analyzed as coming from *dabarīm +ay+k (by the speaker-learner) via a process of truncation. This means that the -ay- is here interpreted as the augment of the pronoun bears when it suffixes plurals. The interpretation is reinforced by the fact that pronouns are augmented (by selected remains of the case endings) on the singular noun, suggesting a canonical form stem+augment+pronoun. The next step is to generalize the augment -ay- to all plurals, masculine and feminine, producing the necessary ancestor (nabilātāyk).

It should be noted that there is no plausible analogical source for the innovation. A proportion dabarīm: dabarayk :: nabilāt: x solves as x= nabilāyk. Only when the analysis is mediated by special rule of -īm truncation does the re-interpretation of -ay- begin to make sense.
Certain other processes also take place in the phonological environment of the construct chain. Quite regularly, feminine nouns of the shape CVCCVC+at undergo truncation of the suffixal vowel: so mamlākā /ma+mlak+at/ 'kingdom' has for the construct mamālek, transparently derived from /ma+mlak+t/ by the same route that mēlek comes from /malk/.

This truncation is apparent also in the pronominally suffixed forms: mamlakti /ma+mlak+t+i/ 'my kingdom'. This means that there is an early rule of adjustment:

(76) Fem.Sing.Syncop: \( a + \emptyset/C V C C V C+ t \) [-seg][+seg]

Other examples of this type are mįspāhā /ma+spah+at/, cstr. mįspāhat, suff. mįspāhtĩ; milhāmā /ma+lham+at/ 'war', cstr. milhēmet, suřf. milhamtĩ. Observe in rule (76) the appearance of the class 'single boundary' (+ or #), which accurately defines the notion 'bound form', inssofar as it is relevant to the grammar.

Some words assume a different underlying stem shape in the construct state: yarek /yarek/ 'thigh' has cstr. yērek /yark/; kātep /katep/ 'shoulder', cstr. kētep /katp/; ĕarel /ĕarel/ 'uncircumcised', cstr. ĕrel /ĕarl/; sēlaﬁ /selaﬁ/ 'rib', cstr. sēlaﬁ /selaﬁ/. Evidently these forms are susceptible to a minor rule — a rule that applies only to specially marked forms — that syncopates the 2nd stem vowel in the construct state. (The suffixed forms are regular, e.g. yērekĩ 'my thigh' /yarek+Ĩ/). There seems to be some sort of curious
redundancy involving body parts, or crucial reference there-to.

(77) Minor Surgery \( V + \emptyset / \rightarrow C \# C \)
\[ +D \]

This phenomenon provides evidence for having phonological minor rules, rather than only a collection of allomorphy statements in the lexicon. For 'construct state' is not a lexical category, but a syntactic one; to list the construct stems in the lexicon involves senseless duplication, as the vast majority of construct stems are either identical to or directly projectable from the absolute stems. Being in the construct state means being in a certain simple syntactico-phonological environment; therefore, direct reference can be made to the environment without a mediating notion \([+\text{construct}]\). But since the environment results from syntactic combination, it cannot be stated inside the lexicon, referring to single items. Therefore, the features of the construct state that are not otherwise predictable, as for example, the truncations just discussed, must be represented through phonological rules, both of the regular type, like Fem. Sing. syncope and of the type suitable to expressing exceptionality, like Minor Surgery.

The real interest of the example is that it shows a minor rule doing something besides making corrections in the
output of derivational morphology. Aronoff (1976) argues for elimination of the diacritic feature-minor rule apparatus in favor of what he calls rules of allomorphy, which are basically morpheme-specific rules of adjustment limited in domain to the lexical word. For example, he argues that the relationship between nouns in ism, e.g. formalism, and adjectives in -istic, e.g. formalistic/*formalismic, should be expressed as an allomorphy rule replacing ism by ist (actually m by t) in the env. -ic. Although Aronoff's theory may well be suitable for the area of morphology it is aimed at, i.e. derivational, it does not extend to the type of case dealt with the rule Minor Surgery, for which the minor rule device is well-motivated, --cases involving the phonological rather than the lexical word. Further, Aronoff's theory, with its rules specifying the shape of a single morpheme, predicts no relation between the suppletive processes that apply to different morpheme; the minor rule theory favors cases like the present one in which irregularities can be subsumed under a structural generalization.

Halle (1973) notices that although the output of the rules inflecting Russian words for case and number are by-and-large regular, there are occasional idiosyncrasies; so word W (for example) is exceptional to rule N but only in the inessive singular. Halle suggests that each and every form produced by inflection be listed in the dictionary so that
the entry for the inessive case of \( W \) has the annotation \([-\text{rule N}]\). The Halleic principle of full disclosure is only necessary if it's hypothesized that rule features are simply listed with each entry; if we assume greater richness in the structure of an entry, allowing implicational conditions, say, we could enter the observation \([+\text{instr}] \Rightarrow [-\text{rule N}]\) beside the word \( W \). Now the case at hand falls under the narrow conception of entry-form, since, as has been shown, it is incorrect to assume a feature \([+\text{cstr}]\) that would play a role in a conditional \([+\text{cstr}] \Rightarrow \text{[rule 48]}\). (Note that this would allow a slight simplification of rule (77); the environment need only be --C#, not -- C#C). The environmental condition on rule (48) permits a simple listing of the feature \([+\text{rule MS}]\) in the entry for a word like yārēk.

However, the example does undermine a kind of intuition that Halle's proposal appeals to: that exceptionality is a property of items in themselves, rather than of items in context. Since the inessive case of \( W, W_i \), a surface word, is irregular, from this point of view \( Wi \) must be an autonomous item in the lexicon, not just a function of \( W \) in the context \([+\text{instr}]\). In the interests of uniformity, all inessives must be listed, and indeed, all case forms. The construct state is clearly not a lexical category -- as [INESSIVE] may be thought to be -- but rather a phonological reflex of syntactic structure; yet it is the locus of a certain amount
of irregularity, showing that idiosyncrasy can creep into, or be preserved in, surface as well as deep categories. Given this, it would seem that since \( W_i \) is a surface word, it can suffer irregularity; and it is not necessary to read it back into the dictionary as a full entry -- a deep word -- in order to give grounds for its exceptionality. Real uniformity of treatment can be obtained through the minor rule mechanism, perhaps extended to assign rule-features as well, so that our word \( W \) would have in its entry \([+\text{minor rule } M]\), where rule \( M \) says something like \([+\text{infl.}] \rightarrow [-\text{rule N}]\) just as \( \text{yārēk} \) has in its entry \([+\text{Minor Surgery}]\), a rule which also applies in a syntactically given environment.
1.13 The Pausal Forms

In a series of coruscating essays, J. W. Bresnan has argued that the Nuclear Stress Rule of English -- the rule that locates the phrasal peak stress -- applies as the last rule of the syntactic cycle. The most elegant implementation of this idea would have the other rules of word and phase stress (MSR, CSR) apply with the NSR, so that the NSR functions to re-shape their output directly, marking as prominent phrasally a syllable that has already been singled out for prominence in a narrower domain. This formulation is not, of course, logically necessary, for one could easily concoct an accounting system in which the NSR marked not words (or rather syllables in words) but phrase nodes, these marks being stored throughout the syntactic derivation; then at the surface after the other stress rules run through their own cycle assigning local prominence, the results of the NSR calculation, tabulated on phrase nodes, could be transferred onto the appropriate segmental location.

Let us explore the first alternative, which is more native to the genius of Bresnan's proposal. The syntactic cycle and the phonological cycle are identified; grammar is a single movement from part to whole. Starting from the smallest bracketed domain, in which only the rules of word stress apply, the grammar advances to the lowest cyclic nodes, where first the syntax and then the phonological rules of
prosody accomplish their processing; thence upward to the root, in the same fashion. At the surface, the cycle completed, the rules of word-level phonology confront a string of segments punctuated only by boundaries: +,#,#,. These rules do not apply cyclically, do not refer to bracketting, and concomitantly, do not refer to lexical category type (noun, verb ... ), as prosodic rules may.

This picture is rather different from the one limned by the authors of S.P.E. For them, all phonology must await the end of syntax, after which it re-begins the cycle, defined this time on the bracketting of surface structure. The word-level rules fall in the middle of this cycle, applying when the boundary sequence # # comes into the expanding purview of the phonology. Such an organization has as an important consequence that phonology has no access to the inner workings of syntax, the deeper stages of derivation whose geometry may be all but lost in the spare architecture of the surface. This proposition could not be sustained, and J. W. Bresnan demonstrated the syntactic configurations to which the NSR is sensitive are exactly those which obtain at the end of a cycle; hence the Ordering Hypothesis.

Now, the Ordering Hypothesis -- and its articulation into what might be called Unified Cycle Theory -- entails that a certain amount of phonological information will be available as syntactic processing is under way. Why then do
transformations never refer to phonological properties? Actually, the question is ill-conceived; even under the earlier, bi-cyclic view, lexical insertion involved phonological material -- underlying forms -- and yet transformations could not depend on any phonological feature that a lexical item might possess. It is simply the case that the vocabulary in which syntactic rules are couched does not contain expressions that refer to phonological entities, just as it does not contain expressions referring to semantic or pragmatic entities. We should no more expect a rule of syntax to depend on nasality or stress-prominence than we should expect it to depend on co-reference or speaker-attitude.

A more interesting consequence of the distribution of information within the Unified Cycle Theory is this: since the word-level rules apply after all prosodic processing has been completed, they should be able to refer to aspects of phrasal prosody and not merely to the word-internal accentual information to which SPE theory limited them. In short, we should expect to find cases where the segmental form of a word varies lawfully with its position in phrase and clause. Does morphophonemics have access to phrasal information? In the Unified Cycle Theory there can be no good reason why not, since the phrasal information is both available and of the type the rules refer to anyway. The question thus provides
a useful demarcation between the two theories: if it is answered affirmatively, the S.P.E. theory is basically dis-
confirmed; if negatively, the Unified Cycle Theory must be modified ad hoc to meet the facts, i.e. to accommodate what SPE effortlessly predicts.

In Hebrew, words which lie immediately before a major phrase boundary -- usually a sentence (clause) -- are said to be in pause, and they undergo certain modifications there, producing what are known as pausal forms. In terms of the rule system developed in this essay, the principal pause effects are two in number: (1) the condition on lengthening of a under stress is suspended, so that all a's, even those in closed syllables, may be lengthened by TL; (2) the rule A.D. does not destress any vowel which bears peak word stress, so that no stress-shift occurs in pause. Characteristic examples of these phenomena look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Underlying Form</th>
<th>Sentence-Final (Pausal) Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) katabta</td>
<td>you m.s. wrote</td>
<td>/katab+ta/</td>
<td>katabta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>/famm/</td>
<td>fam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayim</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>/may+m/</td>
<td>mayim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?eres</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>/?ars/</td>
<td>?ares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ktabu</td>
<td>they wrote</td>
<td>/katab+u/</td>
<td>katabu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zagnu</td>
<td>they're old</td>
<td>/zaqen+u/</td>
<td>zaqenu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yiktobu</td>
<td>they m. will write</td>
<td>/ya+ktob+u/</td>
<td>yiktobu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
<td>Underlying Form</td>
<td>Sentence-Final (Pausal) Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pari</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>/pary/</td>
<td>peri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ħasi</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>/hesy/</td>
<td>hesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥoli</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td>/holy/</td>
<td>holi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dābarka</td>
<td>your m.s. word</td>
<td>/dabar+e+ka/</td>
<td>dabareka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yišmorka</td>
<td>he will guard you</td>
<td>/ya+šmor+e+ka/</td>
<td>yišmareka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third effect of the "pause" is to inhibit the retraction of stress in the converted jussive (given as rule (32), p. 64), evoking a contrast like that between wayyamot Ʌadām 'and Adam died', with retraction, and wayyamot: 'and he died:', without retraction because the word ends a sentence.

What is it about clause-final position that could produce this constellation of effects? The traditional answer is that pausal phenomena are reflexes of the peak stress associated with the last word in a clause. This strikes me as a highly plausible account: first, because the type of phenomenon -- lengthening, resistance to stress removal (by A.D. and by rule (32), Consecutive Retraction) -- are characteristic correlates of high stress; secondly, because it is reasonable to believe that the clausal prosodic prominence really did fall at the end -- this is because it is a usual pattern (English has it, essentially), and because it accords with the end-stressing clearly visible in the lexical word and in the construct state.

Notice too that the restitutions in pause (see (2) on the table) are neither random nor superficial -- the full
vowels of the pausal forms which stand where schwas and zeroes do in non-pausal forms cannot be inserted late, for they are not surface-predictable; they faithfully reflect the character of the underlying representation.

Under the reasonable assumption that the pausal alternations are stress-conditioned, we are presented with a clear case of word phonology (A.D., T.L., Consec. Retraction) being dependent upon phrasal prosodic information of exactly the type that Unified Cycle Theory predicts should be available. A more compelling and systematic exploitation of the theory's resources could hardly be hoped for.

It might be argued that the data is not to be taken seriously, that it is a literary artifact, the result of distortions introduced by exaggerated liturgical cantillation of the text, and perhaps further ramified by the corrective activities of regularity-mad grammarians. This argument is not deep. To effectively discredit the pausal data, it must assume that the pausal forms were literally invented, begotten from the normal forms by essentially extra-linguistic (oratorical, cantillatory) pressures. For even if the present text contains a somewhat regularized and extended -- literarified -- version of a true earlier phenomenon, there remains the earlier phenomenon, which must have been in the same mode of phrasal influence on word-shape as the pausal data found in the text. But on the face of things, it would seem unlikely
that the pausal forms could have been projected from the ordinary forms by a desire to restore reduced vowels when they should bear stress: for in such a case we would expect a simple law of replacement, operating on the surface, a rule uniformly replacing penultimate schwas with some favored vowel, like ā or ō. What we find, of course, is morphophonemics. Looking more carefully into the full range of forms, we find a certain amount of irregularity in both the distribution and the phonological shape of pausal items, and it is the kind of non-uniformity that indicates the moiled grain of reality, not mere lacunae in the smooth pages of the grammarians.

For example, the word mélek retains its vocalism in pause, never becoming mâlek. Certain verbs with a perfect show up occasionally with e in pause: qārab 'to be near', qārebā 'she is near'; ġadāl 'to be big', ġādelā 'she is big'; šāmāf 'to hear', šāmeṭū 'they heard'. Why? Because these verbs originally had e (actually *i) perfects, cf. Arabic samīfa 'hear', and the relic forms are preserved in pause. Verbs which were originally III-y restore the archaic glide in pause: for ḥasū 'they sought refuge', ḥāsāyu (Dt 32.37); this must of course be represented in the consonantal text, and can hardly be ascribed to the vowelling of the masoretes. And the 2nd person masculine pronominal suffix -ka usually
shows itself as -ekā, in pause, but on the prepositions l-, b- it attaches as in lāk, bāk, for ordinary lākā, bākā, rather than the lekā, bekā which might easily be expected.

A more considered line of counter-argumentation would concentrate on the assumption that it is stress per se that conditions the pausal effects. Perhaps it is the syntactic position alone that determines the distribution of pausal forms; the feature + pause, then, is not a correlate of + Clause Peak Stress, but functions more like + accusative, say, and is implanted by a syntactic rule before phonology, in the SPE manner, begins on surface structure. In this view it is a mere coincidence that the chief phrasal stress falls also on the word marked [+Pause]; and a coincidence that the pausal effects are by-and-large of the type induced by high stress.

There are important empirical differences between the syntactic and the phonological approaches: no language is so rigid as to not allow some variety in the patterns of clausal stressing; if the occurrence of pausal forms is stress-determined, we might expect them to turn up non-finally where stress has been wrenched from its normal course by emphasis or parallelism, and not to occur finally in just those circumstances. Now, according to Gesenius, there is great regularity under the two major accents Sillūq (at verse-end) and ?Atnāḥ (mid-point), optionality with the lesser accents marking further subdivisions of the verse (Sōgōltā, Zaqēp Qātōn, Rabī′āf), dwindling to infrequency (Paštā, Tiphā, Gereš, even Pāzer).
It may well be that the pattern of 'optionality' can be explained in terms of stress; but I have not made a serious inquiry into this complex area, and I shall have to leave the issue open, contenting myself and the indulgent reader with an outline of the logic of the situation and a pointer to the data that may decide.

Ultimately, however, it's hard to imagine that phenomena of the pause could have arisen any other way than through the phonological influence of stress. If this is correct, then at some stage the full descriptive resources of Unified Cycle Theory were called upon as phrasal prosodic structure played a direct role in morphophonemics. Of course, that was in another country and the language is dead; no details are forthcoming. But the character of the available data suggests that the Unified Cycle Theory deserves serious consideration.

Formal note 1: Both sides of the binary distinction phrase-peak --non-phrase-peak play a role in rules. The negative side is apparent in the three major phenomena. The rule AD must be re-written as:

\[(7\theta)\] \( AD \ \begin{array}{c} V \\ [-\text{long}] \\ [-\text{P}] \end{array} \rightarrow [\text{stress}] / \quad \begin{array}{c} \quad C \\ \quad \begin{array}{c} V \\ [+\text{str}] \end{array} \end{array} \)

The rule TL as

\[(7\gamma)\] \( \begin{array}{c} V \\ [-\text{long}] \\ \langle \text{low} \\ \Gamma \rangle \ a \end{array} \rightarrow [+\text{long}] / \quad \begin{array}{c} \quad C \ \langle (V)_{b} x \rangle \# \# \\ \quad \text{Condition: } a \cap b \end{array} \)

The rule Consecutive Retraction as

\[(8\theta)\] \( \begin{array}{c} V \\ [-\text{long} \\ \omega] \\ [-\text{P}] \end{array} \rightarrow [-\text{stress}] / \quad \begin{array}{c} \quad V C \quad \begin{array}{c} \quad C \# \# \end{array} \end{array} \)
The import of these revisions is that AD and CH apply only to non-peaks, and the condition on the tone-lengthening of a holds only when the relevant a is not under maximal phrase stress.

The notion \([+P]\) functions in some rules of smaller scope. For example, in Hitpaqtel, the stem final \(\ddot{e}\) shows up in pause as \(\ddot{a}\), e.g. yithallak /y+hi+t+hallek/ 'he will walk about' (Jb 18.8). This can be accommodated in an early rule:

\[ (\ddagger) \text{ Hitpaqtel Pause } \ V \rightarrow a / \quad \text{-C #} / \quad \text{in Hitpaqtel} \]

Two words show stress peculiarity: ?\(\ddot{a}n\ddot{oki}\) 'I' (archaic, majestic, divine) is pausally ?\(\ddot{a}n\ddot{oki}\); ?\(\ddot{a}tt\ddot{a}\) 'you m.s.', ?\(\ddot{i}t\ddot{ti}\). Notice that it is really the non-pausal forms that are peculiar; the pausal penultimate pattern is what's expected in both cases. Evidently these two words are subject to their own rule of forward stress (in our metrical terms, penultimate de-stressing), which rule, like AD --which is mimics-- is inhibited in pause. This rule follows PTL, hence the always long first vowel of ?\(\ddot{a}n\ddot{oki}\).

\[ (\ddagger\ddagger) \text{ Minor Movement } \ V \rightarrow [-\text{stress}] / \quad \text{-C o V} \]

This is the kind of 'pernicious' stress-shifting, which would if it were widespread disconfirm the assertion that stress-shift is a concomitant of AD, since neither form meets the SD of AD, /\(\ddot{a}n\ddot{oki}\)/ having a long vowel penultimate, /\(\ddot{a}tt\ddot{a}\)/ having a closed penultimate syllable.

Formal Note 2: The relic forms in pause require a suppletory apparatus to relate them to their non-pausal incarnations. Here, as with the construct state, we are dealing with an obviously non-lexical category, and the device of minor rules is similarly appropriate.
Retrospective Glance

At this point all the stress-related alternations in syllable structure have been discussed. The method of exposition has been to call upon particular fields of data as they are relevant to the working of a posited rule or system of rules. This stands in contrast to the traditional, pedagogically motivated manner of progressing through the form-classes of the language, exploring each in detail, giving many rules of rather narrow scope, often limited to a morphological or syntactic class. Behind our method is the hypothesis that the morphologically diverse alternations reflect the interaction of a few general principles. In order to better fix in mind the look of the territory covered, let us for a moment change our focus from the inner form to the outer articulation of the data.

A more-or-less traditional account of deletion-reduction phenomena would distinguish the following cases:

1. **Propretonic Reduction.** i.e. of short vowels in open syllables 2 (or more) syllables before the stress, as dābār--dābārīm

2. **Post-Heavy Syllable Reduction.** Of non-low vowels after VCC or VC, as ṣōpēt--ṣōptīm,

3. **Verbal Vowel Reduction**
   (a) in the perfect and imperfect: kāṭāb--kāṭū; yiktōb--yiktābū
(b) In the imperative: kätö̇b--kitbū, tēn--tanū

(4) Infinitive with Suffixes: kätö̇b--kothi̇

(5) Weak Segholates: pərī̇ -- peryəkə̇ -- pərī̇

(6) The Construct State

This welter of mutations is generated by a single rule, Alternating De-Stressing, as it interacts with the stress pattern and with pre-tonic lengthening. A certain amount of morphologically conditioned variation feeds into the crucial AD-PTL nexus -- differential treatment of /-at/ in nouns and verbs, amplification of imperatives and infinitives by the rule Echo, the distinction between -ka and the other pronominal suffixes -- and the real character of these phenomena is illuminated by the central principles we have studied.

The regular cases where main-stress has undergone some kind of movement are these:

(1) The Verb: katbū, yiktəbū, kitbū

(2) The Weak Segholates: holi̇, parī̇

(3) The Pronominal Suffix -ka: dəbarkə, šəmərkə, yišmorkə

(4) Consecutive Retraction: wayyamət vs. yəmət ('and he died ...' vs. let him die)

(5) Nasoq ?Ahɔr: tōkal lehem → tōkal lehem 'she will eat bread

(6) 2ms-Forward: kātabta vs. wākātabta
The last two syllables of a word are grouped into a single prosodic unit by the principle of right-branching we called Hebrew Tree Structure (1.9). In terms of the general theory we elaborated, based on the work of Liberman (1975), a de-stressing or a metrical weakening of either one of the last two syllables automatically puts the other into prominence. An immediate consequence is that cases (1), (2), and (3) are governed by the same principle that determines the location of reduced vowels. Cases (4), (5), and (6) require rules of their own; the rules are simple de-stressings or weakenings rather than complex and uninsightful two-change transformations. Both the direction of shift and the distance travelled by the shifting stress (one syllable) follow from the character of the tree-structure under general principles of metrical theory.

Successful integration of data of this degree of categorial diversity into a grammar of phonological rules basically confirms the hypothesis of generality that has guided the investigation.
Chapter 2

Segmental Issues

2.1 Geometry of the Vowel System

The canonical form of Hebrew lexical items is severely limited. The simple noun or adjective, unadorned by affixes, unreduplicated, has three consonants in it, arrayed CVCC (mēlek), CVCC (gōḇul), or CVCVC (dāḇar).

Holding the consonant frame constant and allowing the vowel(s) to vary will trace the basic dimensions of the underlying vowel-system. If there are n vowels, we expect there to be (at most) n monosyllable types, \( n^2 \) bisyllable types, and so on.

In the segholates (CVCC) we have seen three basic types: (i) mēlek -- malk-ī, (ii) seper -- sipr-ī (iii) qōdeš -- qods-ī. We know these to be underlyingly short, first because of their reducibility (pl. mōlāḵīm, sōpārīm), secondly because of the general restriction on morpheme structure that allows only short vowels in the env. -- C C. So this subclassification of the segholates argues for a three member short-vowel set. There is, as it happens, a fourth alternation type, a kind of hybrid of (i) and (ii), that goes like šēdq -- šidq-ī. We shall look into the matter below, finding a phonological rule rather than an underlying distinction; the segholates like
sedeq will prove to be vagrants from type (ii).

In monosyllables CVC\_C\_i, a perfectly parallel typology is manifest: (i) r\'ab--rabbim,(ii)?em -- ?imm-\'i, (iii) h\'og -- huqq\'im. Again, a fourth, mixed type shows up, as s\'ap -- sipp\'im 'thresh-hold, sing. and pl.', s\'ad -- sidd\'im 'side'.

These typologies point toward a triangular short vowel system, but do not suffice to establish the exact quality of the two non-low vowels. Let us represent them expositionally as I, U, as we investigate which of /i,e/ and /u,o/ should be chosen.

The type CCVC, in native words, has always a long vowel, and the classification, as among the short vowels, is tripartite: (i) h\'az\'ir 'swine' (ii) g\'abal 'boundary) (iii) h\'am\'or 'ass:Equus asinus'. Recall that the a of examples (i) and (ii) is a reflex of schwa after gutturals. These vowels are demonstrably long because they neither reduce under the influence of AD, nor appear short in enclisis. This form-type clearly suggests a long vowel system /Î–Î·Î·/. There are a very few words which display an /â/ that is sturdily constant in shape, neither reducing nor shortening, like k\'et\'ab 'book', but they are pretty obviously loan-words from Aramic.

With a tripartite short vowel system -- a, I, U -- and a tripartite long vowel system -- Î–Î·Î· -- the canon CVCVC
should beget 36 fully-vowelled subclasses; but the number of possibilities is substantially smaller. In the frame CaCVC, however, substitution is free, and there are as expected six instances, three long, three short:

(1) /a/  dābār /o/ gādōl 'big' 
/a/ zaqēn /I/ paqīd 'overseer' 
/ū/ ḥayōm 'afraid' /ū/ ḥārūm 'subtil'

Of the remaining 30 possibilities, only 5 are realized, and most of these rather scantily:

(2) /I/-/a/ lēbāb 'heart' /I/-/ū/ qītōr 'smoke' 
šēkār 'beer' /ū/-/a/ šulāl 'goat' 
šēfār 'hair' qunāb 'pipe' 
šēnāb 'grape bunch' /ū/-/ā/ šōlām 'eternity' 
šēlāl 'rib' šōpār 'ram’s horn' 
/o/-/I/ šōpēt 'judge' + Qal particip.

The lists here are not meant to be exhaustive, but suggestive of relative size. Of these classes only the ō-I series, which is characteristic of Qal participles and of the agentive nouns related to them, is heavily populated. The other long-vowel classes are indeed rather undernourished. The question of frequency is not identical with the question of phonological possibility, and it might be asked, what sort of general patterns are reflected in the range of admissible word shapes.
Observe that /a/ retains popularity as a second vowel. A rule of distributional thumb might be: _a_ goes with everything (a-V), everything goes with _a_ (V-a). The second clause needs emendation: (1) there are no types /CUCVC/ (2) the type ì-a is not attested, (3) the type ì-ò is, (4) Qal participles have ì, not a in the second syllable.

Now, the vowel pattern of the Qal participle (and its nominal derivatives) must be specified by a rule of Ablaut or its equivalent, so we can rule it out of consideration as we focus on the patterning of underived nouns (and adjectives). Of the other 3 restrictions, only (1) carries much weight; except for the Qal participle type, the others shaped CVCVC are quite rare, and it can be considered accidental that ì-ò is in and ì-a is (apparently) out. The central formal requirements can thus be expressed in two clauses:

\[ C \, V_1 \, C \, V_2 \, C \]

(3) Either \( V_1 = /a/ \) or \( V_2 = /a/ \)

(4) \( V_1 \neq /U/ \)

Most important for the present inquiry is the fact that the range of forms CVCVC falls well within that predicted by assuming an essentially tripartite division within the short and long vowels. This gives us the geometry of the system, leaving open the question of the exact location of the underlying vowels. The short vowel system has its
complexities, so let us first explore the simplicities of the long vowels.

The long vowels present two issues: (I) can you really get away with just 3? (II) is o really a, from which it came?

(I) The appearance of /ā/ in a few loan words like kāṭāb /ktāb/ and in a few anomalous native forms like ḥārāš 'artificer', which has pl. cstr. ḥārāšē /harraš+ay/ rather than *haršē, shows merely that there is an ā marginally present in the lexicon, and indeed that it is not integrated into the mainstream of the language.

A little more problematic is the appearance of ē in a certain few words: ṭēḏ 'witness', ṭēḏ 'companion', ḥēq 'bosom, lap', ṭēḏ 'final disaster', perhaps some others. This ē is non-deletable, non-shortenable; hence long. It stands out, because the other irreducible ē's of the language occur as a reflex of -ay-, which de-diphthongizes when it does not bear main-stress. The forms of bāyit 'house' tell the story:

bāyit 'house' bēt-ī 'my house'
habiṭā 'to the house' bēt hammelek 'the king's house'

Parallel facts obtain with underlying -aw-. Compare māweț 'death', mōt-ī 'my death'. A diphthongal sequence does not undergo the rule if it is followed by a glide or a vowel, as in ḥayyūm 'life', ḥawwa 'tent-camp', ħāya 'to live'. The
rule thus takes the form:

(5) Coalesence \[ \text{SC.} \begin{bmatrix} +\text{back} \\ -\text{hi} \\ +\text{hi} \\ -\text{cns} \\ +\text{cns} \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \]

SD. \[ \begin{bmatrix} +\text{back} \\ -\text{lo} \\ +\text{long} \end{bmatrix} \]

Condition: 1 is not \text{S}_{\text{max}}\text{'}, i.e. is dominated at some level by \text{W} in metrical structure.

The effects of rule (5) are regularly felt in words like \( ?\text{ema} /\text{aym}+\text{at/ 'fear'}, \) clearly related to \(?\text{ay}\text{y} \text{m} '\text{afraid}'\), where the diphthong is always coalesced, and in derivationally prefixed forms beginning with \( \text{y} \) or \( \text{w} \), as \( \text{h\text{ol}d} '\text{he begat' /ha+w\text{l}d/ h\text{etib} 'he did good to' /ha+y\text{tib/}.} \)

Apparently, rule (5) overshoots the mark in certain cases, disregarding the stipulation that the affected vowel not bear main-stress. So we find \( \text{s\text{or} 'ox' taking segholate-type broken plural f\text{aw\text{ar}im, clearly pointing to an underlying form /s\text{awr/}.} \) Noting that the word \( \text{h\text{el} 'outer bulwark' is clearly related to the noun h\text{ayil 'power'}, we can hypothesize that the cases of /e/ under stress are due to the same over-application, or relaxation, of rule (5) that produces \( \text{s\text{or from /s\text{awr/}}.} \)

(II) About 1500 B.C., in the land of Canaan, speakers commenced to say \( \bar{o} \) where their fathers and grandfathers, mothers and grandmothers had said simply \( \bar{a} \). To eastward the wandering Aramaeans paid no heed (hence \text{ket\text{ab}}).
Did this new mode of phonation force a change in the underlying vowel system, from the maximally simple and unmarked /ɪ ə ū/ to the marked /i ə ū/? The answer to the question depends essentially on theoretical assumptions about lexical complexity: if simplicity of the segmental paradigm is granted ascendency, held to be a goal worth a little phonological complexity, then it can be argued: there's nothing to stop you but the marginal cost of an early rule ā→ō; on the other hand, if it's assumed that divergences between the underlying and superficial segment repertory must be justified in language-specific terms, there exists very little in Hebrew sound structure that argues for maintaining the archaic analysis.

There is one alternation that is mediated by the historical 'Canaanite Shift'. Among verbs I-? there is a small class which do not form the imperfect in a perfectly straightforward fashion. From ?āmār 'to say', we'd expect something like ya?amār /ya+amār/ 'he will say'; what we find is yōmār. The a-stem vowel, though marked and unpredictable, is found elsewhere; what's surprising is the coalescence of the prefix vowel and the stem-initial /ʔ/ to form ō. Evidently this coalescence took place before the Canaanite Shift, producing the natural outcome ā, which fell together with all the other ā's of the language, and like them was rounded and raised when the time came. In synchronic terms however there
is no reason not to collapse the process into a single step:

\[ (6) \quad \text{I-} \; \text{Shift} \quad SC \cdot a + ? C \: [-\text{round}] \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
SD & 12 & \delta \\
\end{array}
\]

Condition: 1 belongs to an imperfect prefix

The rule is written to apply only to no -u imperfects; the following table of forms illustrates the restriction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pf.</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Impf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ākāl</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>yōkāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?āmār</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>yōmār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ābād</td>
<td>perish</td>
<td>yōbād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?āsār</td>
<td>bind</td>
<td>yeʔesōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ahāz</td>
<td>hold</td>
<td>{yeʔehōz, yōhēz (n.b.)}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only other verbs to which rule (6) regularly applies are ?āpā 'to bake', ?ābā 'to be willing'. The verb ?āhāb 'to love' has an a-imperfect, but shows mixed forms: ?ōhāb 'I will love' /ʔa+ʔhab/, yeʔehāb 'he will love' /ya+ʔhab/. It is optionally exceptional to rule (6).

The prefix vocalism of the o-imperfects -- e rather than the a expected before gutturals -- is due to a late rule, applying even after Schwa Deletion, so that yeʔesōr 'he will bind' contrasts with yaʔasrū /ya+ʔsor +ū/ 'they will bind'; the rule depends on the presence of an o in the following syllable.
This narrowly circumscribed a-ō alternation does not provide the grounds for symmetrizing the vowel system by taking /ō/ to be deeply /ā/.
2.2 Short Vowels

It is the short vowels that take part in the major vocalic alternations of the language, and which therefore provide the most interesting problem for analysis. The vowel /a/ behaves in a straightforward fashion, lengthening and shortening in accord with the principles of Chapter 1. But the non-low vowels alternate between high and non-high variants in a way that wants a little scrutiny.

The underlying three-way distinction gives rise to a surface series of five distinct vowels (disregarding schwa): [i e a o u]. Due to the effects of the rules of lengthening, reduction, and deletion, these vowels appear mostly in the environment -- C C, i. e., in closed syllables. The principal exceptions to the generalization are the reflexes of schwa in a guttural environment (halōm 'dream', never **həlōm) and at word-end in segholates (mélek), the hateph vowels (yeḥēzaq), the o's that fail to reduce (qodāšīm). These 'exceptions' fall under rules of their own.

The distribution of the round vowel's alternants is quite clear, and has been frequently noted in the literature: u appears before geminate consonants, o elsewhere. Consider, for example, the fate of the passive marker - u:
There's a few exceptions, like sulḥān 'table', but they have apparently no systematic import.

The distribution of i-e is not so transparent, but it is in the main lawful. As ṭ is, so is ṭ necessary before geminates: qisī 'my end' ṭimm-ī 'my mother, ḥāsibbōtēm 'you m.p. make s.t. go around', ṭikkātēb 'I will be written'.

The high front vowel appears elsewhere as well: initially in closed syllables (of course, unstressed) as in siprī 'my book', yiktōb 'he will write', dibrēhēm 'their m. words'; medially, in the underlying environment -- C+C as yālidṭēn 'you f.p. gave birth' /yālid+ten/, ṭābīrt-ī 'my mistress' /ṭbīr+t+ī/. Observe that the surface env. --C+C is not appropriate, for as typified by ṣōmerkā /ṣōmer+e+ka/ 'your ms guardian', the non-high e is found there. Gutturals -- low sonorants / ṭ ṭ / discourage the high vowel: ṭ never shows in the env. -- G C, only e as yehēzaq 'he will be strong' (the ē being a hateph, introduced by rule (43), ch. 1.); further, in the env. G--C C, the non-high variant usually shows: ṭexr-ī 'my help', ṭektōb 'I will write', with just a couple of exceptions: ṭīmq-ī 'my valley', ḥizq-ī 'my strong one'.

Observe that the selection of high variants before geminates triumphs over the guttural restriction: ṭikkātēb 'I will be
written', ñin'be 'grapes of' (irreg. construct plural of ñin'áby 'grapes').

We may summarize the discussion in four statements of distribution:

(7) a. i,u in the env. -- C_1 C_i

b. i in the env. # C_1 -- C_2 C, where C_2 is never C_1 almost never guttural

c. i in the env. -- C + C (underlying)

d. e,o elsewhere

These distributional properties do not enforce a choice of underlying system, but they do rather suggest one. Since it is the high variants that occur in natural, positively characterizable environments, it is a small matter to raise the non-high /e o/ in just these positions. Actually, there's a technical way to duck this argument: instead of writing e.g.:

(8) o → u / -- C_1 C_i

one could write

(9) a. u → u / -- C_i C_i

b. o / elsewhere

In fact, rule (9ab) can be compactly expressed in SPE-type notation as
Rule (10), by feature counting, is no more complex than rule (8), which only makes reference to the natural environment 'before a geminate'. Rule (10) manages to sneak in the complementary notion 'everywhere except before a geminate' as the environment for the non-vacuous part of the rule.

A priori, the device of vacuity and disjunction used in rule (10) is undesirable because it allows a tremendous range of descriptive license; a posteriori, it simply does not accord with the wealth of phonological practice to identify in complexity the notions 'natural environment' and 'complement of natural environment'. The notion of complement may have its uses (vide Kiparsky 1973, Halle, Prince, Vergnaud 1975), but the sheer infrequency with which an environmental complement is significant (outside, perhaps, of stress rules) argues that the complement notion, if admitted, involves a complexity not present in a simple positive statement. Although a principled resolution of the issue is well worth seeking, ad hoc prohibition of sub-rules that are always vacuous improves the theory, eliminating (10) from the canon of possible rules.

Assuming, therefore, that the facts of distribution do imply a direction of derivation from /e o/ to /i u/, it does
not follow that /e o/ are underlying, only that the short vowels must be non-high at the stage of derivation when the rules of distribution apply. At the latest, this is just prior to schwa-deletion, which collapses the pronominal ending structure +V+C ... with the inflectioal ending structure +C..., thus obscuring the relevant distinction between, for example, +ten (yālidtēn) and +e+ka (gaddelkā).

To probe the earlier stages of derivation, working back toward the lexicon, we must examine the character and effects of the centrally important rules that lengthen vowels.

It is the effect of TL, when it applies to vowels underlying short, to output non-high vowels /ē ā ō/.

The following table registers the typical facts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products of TL</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Short Occurrence</th>
<th>Reduced Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ē ?ēm</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>?imm-ī 'my ...'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kābed</td>
<td>he's heavy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>kābdū 'they're ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giddel</td>
<td>he raised (grew)</td>
<td>giddelā '... you ms'</td>
<td>giddēlu 'they ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seper</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>sīpr-ī 'my...'</td>
<td>sāparim 'books'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yèbh</td>
<td>let him weep</td>
<td>yibkē 'he will...'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōg</td>
<td>statute</td>
<td>huqqīm 'statutes'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?āyom</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>?āyummim 'pl.'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qodeš</td>
<td>holiness</td>
<td>qodsā-ī 'my...'</td>
<td>qodasim 'pl.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sōb</td>
<td>go around (inf.)</td>
<td>subb-ī 'for me to...'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yiktōb</td>
<td>he will write</td>
<td>yiktob-ā '...you m.s.'</td>
<td>yiktōbu 'they m. ...'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data suggest that at the time of TL the short vowels are /e a o/. If not -- if the non-low vowels are /i u/ -- a special lowering clause must be written into TL.

The rule PTL outputs the same class of segments as TL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>şem+ot</td>
<td>names</td>
<td>şimka</td>
<td>your ms.</td>
<td>şmot</td>
<td>names of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lebab</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>lebabot</td>
<td></td>
<td>hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yedaľ</td>
<td>he will know</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>yedaľeha</td>
<td></td>
<td>he'll know her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above (1.5), the vowel u-o never occurs in the environment of pretonic lengthening, because (1) it doesn't occur in stems C-CCVC, and (2) even when it occurs in the env. CVC-C, the final consonant is doubled by O-Closure, thereby ousting the round vowel from the --C V configuration demanded by PTL.

Here again the non-high output militates for a non-high input, /e o/ rather than /i u/. If we hold on to /i u/, we are stuck for an account of why both PTL and TL accomplish a lowering: to write lowering into each rule is to claim a merely accidental resemblance. And this is an accident which is all the more striking because the surface distributional facts imply that short vowels are basically non-high, only in special circumstances. The generalization that seems to be emerging is this: for purposes of phonology, short vowels -- lengthened or not -- behave as if they were non-high.
There is in the grammar of Hebrew yet a third rule of lengthening. The gutturals -- /? h h c r / -- may not stand geminated at the surface. Whenever the grammar produces a doubled guttural, there is simplification; and if the geminate is not word final, there is lengthening (compensatory one might say) of the preceding vowel. Such clusters arise (1) when gemination of the 2nd radical is used as a derivational device: in the conjugations Pi’el, Pufal, Hitpa’el; in the nomina opificum, as gannâb 'thief' from gañâb 'to steal'; in the adjectives of defect, as gibbênh 'hump-backed'; (2) when n assimilates to a following consonant: as in the verbs I-n like nāpāl, impf. yippōl /ya+npol/; with the preposition min- 'with' (optionally), as mibbâyıt 'from a house' /min#bayt/; in the imperfect Nip’al, e.g. yikkâteb 'it will be written' from /ya+n+kâteb/, where the n- is the marker of the conjugation; (3) in roots where the second and third consonants are identical, as rbb, which is connected with a verb râb 'to be numerous' (3 pl. râbbû), and adjective râb (pl. râbbîm), and nouns râbâbâ 'myriad', râb 'captain, chief (great one)' (pl. râbbîm); (4) after certain grammatical particles, most prominently the definite article ha-, as habbâyıt 'the house' and the conjugation wa- in the convert-d jussive construction wayyiktâb 'and he wrote'. (Geminates also arise through morpheme concatenation, as in kârattî 'I cut' /kârat+tî/, but since no suffixes begin with gutturals, this
configuration never produces relevant material.) In all these categories there are cases where the consonant geminated is guttural. The results are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Expected Form</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piel CG-</td>
<td>m?n</td>
<td>*mi??en</td>
<td>me?en</td>
<td>he refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brk</td>
<td>*birrâk</td>
<td>bôrâk</td>
<td>he blessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bîr</td>
<td>*bîlîr</td>
<td>bîlîr</td>
<td>he burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pual CG-</td>
<td>brk</td>
<td>*burrâk</td>
<td>bôrâk</td>
<td>he was blessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupael CG-</td>
<td>brk</td>
<td>*hitbarrek</td>
<td>hitbârek</td>
<td>he called himself happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Op.</td>
<td>prš</td>
<td>*parraš</td>
<td>paraš</td>
<td>horseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Def.</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>*hirres</td>
<td>heres</td>
<td>deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb 1-n</td>
<td>nht</td>
<td>*yin hat</td>
<td>yehat</td>
<td>he marched down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*yihhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphal CG-</td>
<td>?mn</td>
<td>*yi??amen</td>
<td>ye?amen</td>
<td>he will be trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nhm</td>
<td>*ninham</td>
<td>nihám</td>
<td>he was sorry (/na+nham/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min + ...</td>
<td>fbd</td>
<td>*mîlîbed</td>
<td>mîlebed</td>
<td>from a servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem. Root</td>
<td>rîf</td>
<td>*ralîf</td>
<td>râlîf</td>
<td>evil, or 'he is evil'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ralîlim</td>
<td>râlim</td>
<td>evil ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ralîu</td>
<td>râlu</td>
<td>they are evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ralîotem</td>
<td>râlotem</td>
<td>you m.p. are evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gram. Part.</td>
<td>*wâ?ektob</td>
<td>wâ?ektob</td>
<td>and I wrote (/wâ?a+ktob/)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gram. Part</td>
<td></td>
<td>*halîr</td>
<td>halîr</td>
<td>the city (/ha?îr/)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data testify to the existence of a rule like this:
\[(11) \text{Guttural Lengthening} \quad \text{S.C.} \quad V \begin{bmatrix} + \text{C.P.}\{ + \text{C.I.}\{ + \text{son}\{ + \text{son}\{ \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{lll} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{array} \]

Condition: 2=3 \quad \text{S.D.} \text{a.1} \rightarrow [+\text{long}], \text{b.} \text{2} \rightarrow \emptyset

The rule must be ordered after Degemination (rule 1.51). The doubled guttural of \(\text{ra}^\text{C} \text{ 'evil'} /\text{ra}^\text{C} \text{f}/\) does not induce lengthening: indeed, like any other two consonant sequence word-final guttural geminates thus does not proceed by Guttural Lengthening; and application of WFD to a form like \(/\text{ra}^\text{C} \text{f}/\) destroys the crucial geminate context in which lengthening occurs. It is advantageous to order Guttural Lengthening before Hateph-Formation, because H.F. in its most general form (\(\bar{V} \text{G} \text{C} \rightarrow \text{V} \text{G} \text{V} \text{C}\)) would disrupt the environment for Guttural Lengthening. A form like \(\text{**ra}^\text{C} \text{fG} \text{im}\) is totally impossible; this is expressible without complication of the rules by ordering the loss of geminate gutturals before H.F. (Observe that, if the opposite order is permitted, and HF allowed to apply to geminate guttural forms, the S.D. of Guttural Lengthening must be complicated to \(\bar{V} \text{G} \text{i} \rightarrow \text{V} \text{G} \text{G} \text{i}\), where the first three terms are mapped onto \(\bar{V}\); the optionality of the 3rd term is required because in a form like \(\text{ra}^\text{C} \text{fG} \text{u}\), H.F. would never apply to the stressed vowel: yet the output is \(\text{ra} \text{fG} \text{u}\).)
Most pertinent to the present inquiry is the character of the rule's output: the non-high vowels /e a o/. This means that there are three widely separated and formally dissimilar rules in the grammar which accomplish the same mapping of short vowels onto non-high long vowels. Taken with the distributional evidence, the behaviour of the three rules, PTL, TL, and GL virtually demonstrates that the short vowels of the language are /e a o/ at the quite early point of derivation when PTL applies. The question then arises, whether there is any motivation for an early lowering rule: whether in fact the underlying system is not simply /e a o/.

Before we turn to tighten the garrotte of ratiocination around the neck of this question, let us look a little harder at the phenomenon and the rule of Guttural Lengthening.

In the doubled conjugations (piṭṭal, puṭṭal, hitpaffer), there is a considerable amount of exceptionality to the lengthening provision of GL. In the table, the verb biṭṭer 'burn' was presented as a characteristic example. The rule seems to be (cf. Lambdin 1971, p. 195) that r always causes lengthening but that with the others /? h h ʕ/) there is a free choice which is made consistently for each verb. Thus meʾēn undergoes the rule in all persons, numbers, tenses; niʾēs 'spurn' undergoes the rule in none of them. (Exception to generalization: root nhl, which gives rise to nēḥēl 'he
guided' in the perfect, but yanahēl /ya-nahēl/ 'he will
guide' in the imperfect, for expected *yānāhel; part. mānahēl
/ma+nahhel/, *mānahēl.) Patterns of exceptionality give
evidence about the organization of the lexicon; this one
supports the view, put forward by Aronoff (1976) among
others, that exception features adhere to the morpheme -- in
this case to the stem morpheme of the doubled conjugations.

Regarding exceptionality as an intrinsic property of
morphemes -- formally allowing simple exception features
[-R₁] to be attached lexically to morphemes rather than seg-
ments or polymorphemic words-- predicts that any exceptionality
not so definable is of greater complexity, therefore less
likely to be found, more likely to be regularized, and so
on. Contextual exceptionality -- such as that of a word in
the construct state, a syntactic environment; or of a word
in certain case; or of a morpheme when it abuts another
morpheme -- is relegated to the mechanism of minor rules, which
is appropriately unwieldy and feature-consuming. Following
the proposal of chapter 1, if a word W is exceptional to a
phonological rule R in a (morphological or syntactic) context
C, let us stipulate that this is expressed by a minor rule of
feature assignment of the form (12).

(12) [ +D ] + [ -R ] / --C
where $+[D]$ is an ad hoc diacritic mark entered with W in the lexicon. Any exceptionality displayed by a polymorphemic complex thus eats up a considerable number of features in being expressed.

It is not surprising, then, that when the context for Guttural Lengthening is supplied by combination of morphemes, the rule is uniformly regular. In the Nip̄fal imperfect, which has the structure Prefix-n-Stem, the rule always applies when assimilation of the conjugation marker n to a stem-initial guttural creates the context: as in the given example ye?āmen, from /ya+n+?āmen/. With the preposition min- 'from', when the optional assimilation of the final n produces a geminate guttural, the word takes the form mē always, as in mēhabbāyit 'from the house' /min#hābayt/. Without assimilation, you get min-habbāyit, of course, since the rule is simply not invoked. The conjunction wa- always shows up as wā before the 1 pers. sing. jussive, the only form which begins with a guttural: wā?ektōb /wa#?a+ktōb/, where the prefix ?a-signifies ego.

The situation with the definite article ha- is a little more complicated, but still revealing. Since ha- causes gemination of the word-initial consonant that follows it (and all words begin with a consonant), the form ha is expected to occur uniformly before words beginning gutturally. This is not the case. Lambdin summarizes the article's alternations as follows (1971, p. 8):
a. Before ? and r the article is ha-

?is a man hā?is the man

raifāb a famine hāraifāb the famine

b. Before T the article is normally ha-, but if the

T is followed by an unaccented a, the article is he-

Tīr a city hāTīr the city

Tārīm cities heTārīm the cities

Tāpar dust hēTāpar the dust

c. Before h and h the article is normally ha- [short a].

But if h is followed by an unaccented a, or if h is followed by an accented or unaccented a, the article is he-

hekal a palace hāhekal the palace

hēreb a sword hāhēreb the sword

hākām a wise man hāhākām the wise man

hārīm mountains hēhārīm the mountains

The reference to the accented-unaccented distinction can be eliminated in favor of a special rule dealing with the accented (for the most part monosyllabic) cases. Monosyllables—even those which end in two consonants, like gān /gann/ 'garden', ṭām /ṭamm/ 'people' -- generally take on a long vowel when prefixed with the definite article, contrary to the usual restriction on TL: haggān, hāṭām. Correlate to this is the appearance of a in the article where it's not expected, i.e., before h, which never induces lengthening of the article's
vowel, and before ꞓa, where dissimilation to e should occur.

Characteristic examples of the phenomenon are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Expected Def.</th>
<th>Real Def.</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ꞓam</td>
<td>*he ꞓam</td>
<td>h défini</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hár</td>
<td>*he hár</td>
<td>h défini</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꞓará</td>
<td>*he hará</td>
<td>h défini</td>
<td>to a/the mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥág</td>
<td>=real</td>
<td>h défini</td>
<td>festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that ḥ is resistant to this assimilation of quantity.

Let us leave open the exact formulation of the rule: it may be a rule unto itself, or a rider on Guttural Lengthening.

These cases handled appropriately, we can reformulate Lambdin's description without reference to stress:

(1) Word initial ḥ, ḥ *never* cause lengthening in the article.

(ii) The article ha- is he- before surface words shaped #Gā ..., where G=h, ḥ, ꞓ, ꞓ.

(iii) Elsewhere before a guttural, the article is h défini-The dissimilation (ii) occurs elsewhere in the grammar.

There is a minor rule that apparently doubles ḥ in certain words, just when it occurs before word stress:

(13) Minor ḥ Doubling ḥ + hh /-h / in certain forms

The rule is visible in the plural of ?aḥ /?ah/ 'brother', which is ?aḥım /?ahhım/, where the doubling inhibits PTL.
When the pronominal suffixes are added, this is what happens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sing</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?ahāy, pause: ?ehāy</td>
<td>?aḥēnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>?ehāw [ʔahāw]</td>
<td>?aḥēhēm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>?aḥēhā</td>
<td>?aḥēhēm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the orthography that before stress only a short vowel appears; and when the stress does not immediately follow the h, a reduced vowel, a schwa-reflex, is written, indicating that doubling has never taken place. Of interest to the present discussion is the 1 pers sing. pausal form ?ehāy, and the 3 pers. m. sing. form ?ehāw, in which the underlying /a/ has dissimilated in exactly the same environment that the process occurs in the definite article. The numeral ?ehād 'one' appears as ?ahād in the construct state, indicating that to the underlying form /ʔahād/ the rule (13) applies. In construct, the final /a/ is not lengthened, so no dissimilation occurs. The forms evidence a rule of this form:

(14) Guttural Dissimilation  \( a \rightarrow e \) \(-- G_1 G_1 \)  

There are certain problems in building rule (14) into the grammar, mainly due to the ambidextrous character of ʔ. Concentraining on other gutturals /ʔ r h h/, it is efficacious to order Guttural Dissimilation after Guttural Lengthening. Since GD applies to short vowels, it functions to pick up
the pieces—the unlengthened exceptions—left behind by Guttural Lengthening. This ordering explains why there are no he- type articles before ?r: because GL is totally successful before them, always outputting ha-, which is not susceptible to GD by virtue of its long vowel. This ordering accords as well with the data from the plural of ?āh: since the morpheme is exceptional to GL, it provides material for dissimilation. The opposite situation, a non-exceptionality that would produce *?āḥāy from /?āḥhay/, along with a pausal form, ?eḥāy, does not occur, as the ordering predicts.

But ḡ stands in the middle: whereas /h ḡ/ associate shortness and dissimilation, /? r/ length and non-dissimilation, before ḡ, ha- either lengthens or dissimilates, never surfacing with a short a. Compare these derivations under the GL-GD hypothesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>/ha#ādam/</th>
<th>/ha#fir/</th>
<th>/ha#fārim/</th>
<th>/ha#hakam/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Rules</td>
<td>ha??ādam</td>
<td>hāfir</td>
<td>hāfārim</td>
<td>hāḥakām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutt. Length.</td>
<td>hā??ādam</td>
<td>hāfir</td>
<td>hāfārim</td>
<td>hāḥakām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutt. Diss.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*hebākām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>ḡā?ādam</td>
<td>hāfir</td>
<td>**hēfārim</td>
<td>hehākām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correct form, of course, is hefārim 'the cities'. Various possible modifications come to mind, all deficient. Inverting the order of the rules (1) drops the explanation for non-dissimilation before /? r/, necessitating an ad hoc complication of GD to exclude them, and (2) leaves one wondering why the form is not *hefārim, with the dissimilated vowel
lengthening. Keeping the order GL-GD requipes either a special restriction on GL to the effect that lengthening is blocked before ġ just in case the environment for dissimilation is met, an egregious pleonasm, or a complication of GD so that it takes ā to ē but only before ġ, and only when the following vowel is unstressed—i.e., when the ħā has not arisen from the special rule dealing with ħābār, ħāfām.

Even without resolving the problem, however, we can perceive the salient features of the phenomenon. It seems likely that there were historically two principal stages of simplification: the first, affecting mainly /? r ġ/, accomplished a compensatory lengthening; the second simply and thoroughly degeminated all remaining double geminates, without lengthening, leaving the vowel structure as it was. In between the two events dissimilation occurred at those places where failure of the first compensating simplification had left a short vowel in the appropriate environment. The morpheme-internal exceptionality so abundant in the doubled conjugations is a testament to the somewhat sporadic character of the first change. But all such testimony is absent from the morpheme-concatenatory environment of definite article-plus-noun. Here the effects of the change have been completely regularized, and the regularized alternations of the definite article have been cast in entirely phonological terms. Under the proposal advanced here, any contextual
exceptionality would have to be expressed in the format

(15) \[ \text{ha} \rightarrow [-R_i]/--W, \ W - \text{a word.} \]

Rule (15) says that for the particular word \( W \), its definite form \( \text{ha}\#W \) fails to undergo the Rule \( R_i \) (which would be either GL or GD). Any word that displayed peculiarity would be associated with one such rule; a tremendous cost. This stands opposed to a theory which allows features like \( [\text{-context } R_i] \) to indicate that a certain morpheme or segment does not condition \( R_i \); it also stands opposed to a theory which would list every definite form in the dictionary, allowing the form to bear a simple exception feature \([-R_i]\). The proposal at hand is essentially equivalent to putting only non-predictable material in the lexicon, and charging for it -- the classical idea that the lexicon is the repository of idiosyncrasy. What is interesting is that the idea has actual predictive power, and that the predictions are borne out in data of some complexity.

We have seen a variety of forms in which Guttural Lengthening fails to take place, but none in which by consequence a guttural appears on the surface geminated. There is, evidently, a rule that simplifies all doubled gutturals.
By the logic of parsimony used above in reference to GL, rule (k3) must precede Hateph-Formation. It follows, GL, cleaning up after it.

Rule (13) is the synchronic image of the second historical stage of loss. Under current assumptions about phonological structure, it obviates the necessity for rule (1lb), the deletion of 1/2 of Guttural Lengthening which accomplishes degemination. Guttural Lengthening is therefore merely a lengthening, and not a combination of two correlative processes. This accords with the claim of Chapter I that phonological rules are limited to making but one 'change'.

However, there was, if the historical account given is correct, a period before Gutt. Simp. entered the language during which Guttural Lengthening was operative in its original form, as a rule of degemination-and-compensatory lengthening. In this period no bifurcation of function could be maintained, for those doubled gutturals that did not degeminate-and-lengthen apparently remained in the language in geminate form. To posit two separate single-change rules for this stage compels marking the survivor geminates exceptional to both rules, missing the point. (The point being that degemination occurred if and only if lengthening did.) This does not imply that we must loosen our control of the formalism, but rather that we should improve our grasp of phonological structure.

Under this laudable aegis, then, let us indulge in a little speculation.

(A) Assume that any (tautosyllabic?) sequence
of two identical short vowels is, according to universal convention, analysable as a single long vowel. The rule GL can be reconceived as a rule of total assimilation:

(14) Gutt. Assimil. S.D. \( V \ G \ G \)
    1 2 3 Cond. 2=3
    S.C. 2 + 1

From an input \( V_j G_i G_i \), the rule outputs \( V_j V_j G_i \), and the convention allows \( V_j V_j \) to be interpreted as \( \tilde{V}_j \), even though the language does not otherwise make use of 'moras' in the rules we have studied. The basic empirical claim of an approach like this is that rules of compensatory lengthening will be constrained by the notion 'possible assimilation'.

In the case at hand, assimilation is not wildly unthinkable, since gutturals are, like vowels, sonorant and non-consonantal. Unexplained, perhaps, is why the rule should affect only geminate gutturals, and not just any guttural in the environment \( V -- C \).

(b) Assume that the syllable is a unit of phonological organization, and further that syllables are given a hierarchical structure along the often suggested lines:
(Syllable, Head, Tail, Nucleus, End). In this conception length is regarded not as an intrinsic property of segments, but as structural property given by the syllable tree: a long vowel holds down two slots, a short vowel but one. Suppose that the rule of Guttural Lengthening consists in deleting the first of a sequence of two identical gutturals, without altering the syllable structure. This leaves a structure like this:

```
    S
   / \  
  H   T  N
 / \   / \ 
C   E   V
```

What could such a configuration signify? A plausible interpretation is that E is to be associated with the material under its sister node N. The vowel V thus 'expands' to occupy both slots under T, making it long.

This approach associates compensatory lengthening with thy class of natural deletions, perhaps also with re-syllabifications.
2.3 The Short Vowels Analyzed

To return to the theme of the investigation: we have assembled what amounts to proof that, for purposes of phonology, short vowels must be treated as non-high. Evidence has come from two conceptually distinct areas. We saw first that the distribution of high and non-high variants could be naturally expressed by taking the non-high vowels /e o/ as (relatively) basic and raising them in a certain few environments. Second, we reviewed the phonological lengthening rules of the language and found that they all output non-high vowels, a generalization that should not be scattered among the various rules as a (coincidentally) repeated stipulation.

Assuming a non-high input, then, let us formulate the rules of distribution implicit in (7) above. Raising occurs universally before geminates:

(17) Pre-Geminate Raising

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \quad \longrightarrow \quad [+hi] \quad / -- C_C C_i \\
[+low] & \quad -- [-lng]
\end{align*}
\]

Rule (17) can be quite tightly ordered in the grammar. It must follow Guttural Lengthening, rule (11); otherwise Guttural Lengthening would output not bóra‘k 'he was blessed', from /borra‘k/, but **burak. And it must precede Gutt. Simp., rule (16), because geminate gutturals, even though simplified on the surface, induce raising, as in words like bilir /bilir/ 'he burned'.

The high-vowel ï is seen in the env. --G+C; cf. yəlidten/ *y ledten; g birtî/*gobertil from gəberet /gəbər+t/. These contrast, as noted above, with forms in which the two-consonant cluster is created by pronominal suffixation: şömerka /şömer+e+ka/. Since the pronominal suffixes are
attached with a linking vowel (Ch. 1.4), such clusters are brought about only through the process of Schwa-Deletion.

We therefore posit rule (18), ordered anywhere before Schwa-Deletion:

(18) Pre-Suffixal Raising \( e \rightarrow i \) / \(-C + C\)

Rule (18) is not quite as universal as rule (17); the word šaken /šaken/ 'neighbor, inhabitant', when derivationally feminized and subsequently affixed, shows šakintah 'her woman neighbor', for expected *vakintah, from /šaken+t/ plus /a+ha/.

In closed initial syllables, /i/ appears.

(19) Initial Raising \( e \rightarrow i \) / \(/C -- C\) (preliminary)

The feature \([-\text{gutt}\] \) is, of course, an abbreviation for \([-\text{son}\] \). Restricting the rule in this way means that e.g. tehdar 'she will favor', rather than *tihdar, will be output. As noted above, there are some exceptions when the first consonant is guttural: timqi 'my valley', hizqi 'my strong one'. Exceptions when the second consonant is guttural are found in the imperfect inflection of the verbs haya 'to be', haya 'to live': yihye, ydye.

This pattern of exceptionality suggests that we purify Initial Raising of its restrictions, and introduce a rule to deal with the guttural phenomena.

(20) Guttural-E \( i \rightarrow e \) / \(/\#\) \([*\text{son} / a - [*\text{son} / b] [-\text{sy}]\)  

Condition: a or b

Rule (19) then appears as:

(21) Initial Raising \( e \rightarrow i \) / \(/\#\) -- C -- C
Now, the rule Initial Raising (in either version) is virtually identical to Schwa-to-I, rule (41) of chapter 1, and indeed falls in the same place in the ordering, since both are fed by Schwa-Deletion.

We therefore combine the two rules:

\[(22) \text{Initial Raising } \begin{bmatrix} +\text{syl} \\ -\text{rnd} \\ -\text{lo} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} +\text{hi} \\ / \end{bmatrix} / # \begin{bmatrix} -\text{syl} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} -\text{syl} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\text{syl} \end{bmatrix} \]

The obvious question raised by rule (22) is whether it can be identified with the rule responsible for raising the vowel in dibrehem /dabar+ay+hemm/, yittob /ya+ktob/ and in cases of that ilk, the rule first identified as A-to-I (rule (20), chapter 1). Let us briefly defer this question until we've completed the analysis of short vowels.

Is there an early rule lowering short vowels? The evidence for such a rule comes from the shortening of any underlying long vowels which end up in the env. --CC due to processes of derivation or inflection. This is quite palpably visible in the Hollow verbs like qam, in which the morphologically lengthened a of the stem appears short whenever a consonant-initial affix is attached, e.g. qamtem, qamti.

The question then becomes: what happens to the high long vowels $\sqrt{1} \tilde{u}$ when they are shortened. Do they fall into the paradigm of the underlying short vowels, behaving as non-high with respect to the lengthening and distribution processes, or do they retain an identity of their own? The answer is, as foreshadowed in 1.2, that they merge completely with the short vowels. We reviewed some of the data of $\sqrt{u}$ in 1.2; here let us look at $\sqrt{i}$ data, of which there is an abundance in the Hif'il.

First, observe that when geminate roots $(C_1 CO_2 C_2)$ are mapped onto a stem that is prefixed, they never adopt the otherwise universal shape
CCVC. In the Qal imperfect, for example, instead of **yisbob (from sabab 'to go around'), the correct form is yasob /ya+sobb/. Evidently, a general rule of metathesis re-arranges any such configurations that would be created by the morphology:

(23) Like-Cns Metath. 

S.D. C C V C

1 2 3 4

S.C. 1 3 2 4

The rule applies, of course, in Hiphil, and the surface result for the same root is hōsebh (3ms), which has hōsebbū (3p) and hasibbōti (is), where the ō is a linking vowel regularly interpolated after stems that are not 'normal', i.e., shaped -CCVC-, namely hollows (haqimōtī) and geminates. Note the short i that appears when main stress does not lie on the stem vowel.

These data find an explanation if the rule of Lowering (Ch. rule 8), is accepted in the grammar.

(24) Lowering

\[ V \rightarrow [-low] \]

The rule necessarily precedes TL, which depends crucially on its output to function correctly (hōsebbū). With a rule like (24) in the grammar, it becomes quite moot phonologically whether the underlying short vowels are /i u/ or /e o/, or any combination thereof. (If they are /i u/, then Lowering must precede BTL).

For convenience, I re-state the rule of Shortening:

(25) Shortening

\[ V \rightarrow [-long] / \rightarrow C C \]

Further evidence for the operation of the rule is seen in the paradigm of the Hiphil perfect:
hišmīd 'destroy'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>2m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>hišmīd</td>
<td>hišmīd</td>
<td>hišmādta</td>
<td>hišmādta</td>
<td>hišmādta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hišmīdū</td>
<td>hišmīdū</td>
<td>hišmādtem</td>
<td>hišmādtem</td>
<td>hišmādtem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everywhere but in the 3rd person, the inflection affix begins with a consonant, and the vowel appears short.

What of the quality change? A quite general process in the language, prominent especially in verbal inflection, produces /a/ in the env. --C+C. A similar alternation is found in Qal verbs like kābēd 'to be heavy', and in those conjugations (PiPēl, Hitpēl) which regularly have e-perfects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kābēd</th>
<th>giddēl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>kābēd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>kābdā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>kābdāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>kābdēt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>kābdētī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data call for a rule that looks like this:

(26) Philippi's Law  [−rnd]  →  a  /  --C+C

The morpheme boundary is necessary to keep the rule from applying in geminate roots, as in hēsēbū, hasibōtēm.
The rule is not limited in domain to the inflected verb. Qal participles are formed from a stem /k̇oteb/, transparently visible in the unaffixed masculine singular k̇oteb. To form the feminine singular, the affix /-t/ is attached, yielding k̇otebet /k̇oteb+t/. It can only be the intervention of Philippi's Law that produces the short stressed vowel; otherwise, we should expect *k̇otebet, like sepher, rather than k̇otebet, like melekh.

This result is consistent with the ordering necessitated by the finite-verbal data. Philippi's Law must precede TL, because the /a/ it outputs remains short, as the low-vowel restriction on TL would predict.

The forms that we cited to motivate Pre-Suffixal raising, rule (18), are exceptional to Philippi's Law: ỵalidten should be ỵaladten. They are relics left over from original form of the rule (as it was actually proposed by Philippi in the 19th century), in which it applied only to stressed vowels. It was generalized in the verb to the form it has in (26), regularizing the paradigm. In the participle, too, it attained freedom from the exigencies of stress-placement: the participle ỵoledet 'giving birth', used nominally (agentively) can be suffixed, and comes out, e.g., ỵoledtō /yoleþt+aþu/. The appearance of /a/ under suffixation confirms the proposal to invoke Philippi's Law in ỵoledet, showing that after the application of the rule, the feminine participle merges with the melekh /malk/ class of segholates.

However, there are scraps of the old stress-dependency left in the language. Derivation of infinitives by affixation of /-t/, discussed in 1.8, sets up the context for Philippi's Law, and it does apply, netting us šebet (rather than *šebet) 'to dwell', where the imperative from the
same stem is \( \tilde{seb} \). Suffixed pronominally we find \( \tilde{sihtam} /seb\tilde{t}a+m/ \) 'for
them m. to dwell', where Philippi's Law is passed by when stress is
drawn away.

Again, the noun \( g\tilde{beret} \) 'mistress' is derived from the noun
\( g\tilde{bir} \) 'master' by affixation of \(-t/\). A form like \( gb\tilde{r}t/ \) will undergo
shortening, but without the intervention of Philippi's Law, the stem vowel
would be lengthened to \( \tilde{e} \) under stress by TL, to produce \( gb\tilde{beret} \). Suffixed,
the high front vowel shows its colours: \( gb\tilde{rito} \) 'his mistress', the stress
falling on the ending.

Finally, if our discussion of the hybrid class of segholates
(\( q\tilde{ber} - qibram \) in 1.3) is correct, then in these forms we are witnessing
application of a rule very like the Philippi's Law we have seen in the
t-infinitives and nouns, a rule that turns \(/e/ \) (or \(/i/\) to \(/a/ \) under
stress, before TL. This rule differs from TL in that it doesn't require
a morpheme boundary to separate the consonants of the conditioning cluster;
and, of course, in that it is minor, since forms must be marked to
undergo it. But these are mere fine-print riders: the rule is the same
as the ordinary rule of Philippi's Law in its effects, its environment
(stressed, closed syllable), and in its ordering. Therefore, we enrich
rule (26), the first statement of Philippi's Law, to comprehend this
range of collateral phenomena.

\[
(27) \quad \text{Philippi's Law (Annotated)} \quad \text{[(+Str)]} \quad \text{[(+low)]} \quad \text{[+low]} \quad \text{[(+Str)]} \quad \text{[(+Str)]} \quad \text{[+low]} \quad \text{[(+Str)]} \quad \text{[(+Str)]} \\
\text{Conditions:} \quad a \rightarrow c
\]

(2) In nouns and infinitives, b.
The diacritic [+D] is to be assigned to those nouns like qeber /qebr/ which undergo the rule.

There are certain words like yiggaš (root ngā) 'he will approach' (no perfect), which have an imperative in /a/: gaš 'approach! m.s.' Even these participate in the e-i vowel alternation in the infinitive gešet-gištī. If we assumed that the imperative stem vowel persists in the infinitive, we'd expect *gaštī. Now, the infinitive vowel of the regular katob -type is /o/ even when the imperfect/imperative axis uses /a/ (vide supra 1.8), showing that the infinitive stem-vowel cannot be simply associated with that of the imperf.-imperative. Similarly, we may stipulate that infinitivs in /-t/-stem-shape CVC -- must always take /e/.

One might attempt to account for forms like gištī by invoking the rule of A-to-I. However, if the i-a alternations occasioned by prefixation --as in biddēl-yigaddēl --are to form a basis for explaining the vocalism of imperatives (gaddēl) and infinitives (gaddēl), as was proposed in 1.7, then the rule of prefix-stripping must crucially follow A-to-I, since the underlying prefixes block application of the rule. Now, gištī is an infinitive, and therefore prefixed underlingly, and that prefix removes the possibility of A-to-I just as it does in gaddēl /la+gaddel/. So we settle on the first solution, stipulating /e/ for the 'short' infinitive, noting that this is supported by the fact of a parallel type of stipulation in the regular triliteral infinitives.

This necessary ordering A-to-I -- Prefix Stripping effectively isolates A-to-I from the similar process of Initial Raising. Prefix-Stripping must precede Cluster Break-Up, so that the initial cluster it
reveals (tiktob → ktob) can be schwa-inserted. But Initial Raising affects some of these inserted schwas (kitbī), and so must follow the insertion rule. If Initial Raising is generalized to affect /a/ as well, it will undo all the good work that Prefix Stripping accomplished, for the /a/ of gaddēl, yašmīd /yhašmīd/, and so on, will no longer be protected from the rule.

As was pointed out in 1.10 (when we re-named the rule A-to-I), there is yet another force that stands between the proposed rule A-to-I and its confirere Initial Raising, and that is TL. For the i-vowel of the imperfect-jussive prefixes can come to bear stress, and when it does, it often lengthens just like any other vowel. The process of truncating the last syllable to form jussives in verbs III-y (vocalic endings on the surface) exposes the prefix vowel to main-stress, so from yibkē 'he will weep', comes yebk 'let him weep'. The transmutation from underlying /ya/ must come before TL. And TL is right in the middle of the ordering, whereas as Initial Raising is at the bottom. (The reader is invited to re-access the chart in 1.10 so that these structural matters may be clearer.)

An alternative choice of /ye/ as a basic, with a rule turning it to /ya/ in the env. -- C V, loses the connection with the gaddēl-ygaddēl and the dāḥār-dibrehem phenomena, and makes initial syllable vocalism even more conspiratorial than does the separation of A-to-I and Initial Raising.

The final statement of the rule A-to-I given at 1.10 was this:

(28) a → e / # C -- C [-stress]

It is unfortunate that the rule cannot be ordered on principled grounds
before Lowering. Lacking such a principle, it becomes coincidental that
the rule outputs a non-high vowel, suitable for lengthening by TL. In
terms of the present proposal, it could just as well output /i/, giving
*yīb, which is clearly not possible. And, in fact, if we do ultimately
opt for /i u/ as the short non-low vowel system, Lowering must precede
PTL; but A-to-I has to follow AD, since its environment is crucially
determined by the operation of the de-stressing rule. In such a grammar,
there is no way that A-to-I could be placed before Lowering.

These considerations indicate that there is still thinking to be
done about the system of rules that handles the short vowels. The
principle that the lengthening rules must non-vacuously output /e a o/
is almost, but not quite, captured by introducing the rule Lowering.
The fact that rules of raising fail to intercede before the lengthenings
must, in present system, be regarded as a providential accident; but
the feel of the language is that this failure is a necessity, a defining
feature of the lengthening system.

The rule A-to-I does not leave its mark when a guttural is the
first root consonant: contrast yaḥam od 'he will stand' with yiktōb
'he will write'. Is this due to a restriction written into the rule?
There is actually a rule in the grammar that accomplishes a lowering in
the env. -- G C#. It is visible in Hiḥēl, if you play your radicals
right. Pick a geminate root where the last two consonants are guttural,
like rīf 'pertaining to evil'; in Hiḥēl it comes cut hērāf /hē+rīf/
'to do evil' (represented after Like-Consonant Metathesis). All other
things equal, we'd expect *hērāf, but apparently the vowel, once
shortened, is lowered; recall the similar process at work in Piṭṭel.
producing e.g. šillāh for *šilēāh. That it only applies to short vowels is evident from roots where only one guttural follows the I-stem vowel, as in hismī‘āf 'cause to hear: announce'. We therefore revise rule (32), chapter 1.5, to accord with the Hipīl data:

(29) Guttural Lowering \( e \rightarrow a / -G(C)#\)

This rule can easily be expanded to accommodate the yašanād cases:

(30) Gutt. Low \( e \rightarrow a / -+(+)aG (C X)_b(C)#\)

Condition: b̃a

The condition is necessary because the rule doesn't operate inside morphemes, such as, for example, the Pīmidd stem. Found are bērēḵ or bīfer, not bērēk or bāfer (in the perfect). This rule can be fitted in between A-to-I and TL. It must precede TL so that the a-vowel of šillāh is kept short.)

What then of the forms where A-to-I has apparently applied to verbs I-guttural: those like yehezaq, tehdar, which have e-prefix vocalism throughout the paradigm? The central fact about these verbs is that they always have a-imperfects. This suggests a dissimilation of the prefix vowel, over-riding the guttural preference for lowness expressed in rules like (30). And indeed we have seen just such a dissimilation in the definite article, given above as rule (14), Guttural Dissimilation. There is a distinction between the two cases, in that the definite article requires a long a in the next syllable to occasion the dissimilation, and the verbal prefix never even catches sight of a long ā, but this a mere detail, a morphological dependency can easily be encoded, in the spirit of reckoning the obvious
generality of the process and maintaining the non-essential details in a subordinate position.

(31) Gutt. Dissim. \( a \rightarrow e \) /\( -g \) (#)\(_a\)C \((+\text{ing})_b\)

Condition: \( a \succ b \)
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