Notes—ch. 8
p. 291: I think that by “partially ordered rules” K&K are referring to cases in which the order of two or more rules is unknowable (because the rules don’t interact), not that it is ever crucial for the rules to be unordered with respect to each other. In other words, a partial ordering like

```
Rule 1
     /|
  Rule 2  Rule 3
     /|
  Rule 4
```

means here that we have no way of knowing the order of 2 vs. 3, not that they apply simultaneously or that their order varies.

By the way, in mathspeak something like

```
Rule 1
    /|
  Rule 2
    /|
  Rule 3
```

, where the ordering is actually total, can still be called a partial ordering (all total orderings are partial orderings, but not all partial orderings are total). So “partial” really means “not necessarily total (but could be total)”. If you want to specify that a partial ordering is not total, you can call it a “strict partial ordering”.

Questions
1. (ch. 8) For each of the two alternatives to linear rule ordering that K&K discuss (DMH and FRH), say whether it can handle each of the four types of rule interaction listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DMH</th>
<th>FRH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counterfeeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counterbleeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes—ch. 9 (pp. 331-339, 379-383)

Ponder well the point made on pp. 338-339 about conciseness vs. naturalness. Where this is leading is that the evaluation metric can’t depend on conciseness alone. Or, if it does, we need to find a way to allow natural rules to be made concise even when they’re structurally similar to unnatural rules.

To follow the Cuna discussion, go back to pp. 163-167.

2. (ch. 9) Discuss how the conventions of rule application allow Russian final devoicing to be described more concisely than the collection of rules in (7).

3. List the general types of evidence for rule unity that K&K discuss.