Prince & Smolensky 1993, chs. 1-4 study questions (last ones!)
To be turned in Tuesday, Dec. 7 in class

- If you are pressed for time and already know some OT, focus on pp. 1-23.
- I’m emailing you John McCarthy’s annotated version of the Berber section.
- I hope you’ll experience some self-satisfaction as you see all the citations of papers you’ve read this quarter and understand their relevance to P&S’s discussion.

Notes
p. 2: By ‘analysis’ here, P&S mean something like ‘potential surface form (output) of the underlying form (input) in question’.

p. 3: By the way, requiring the grammar to impose a stratified ordering on candidate analyses (for any pair, either they have the same harmony or you know which is more harmonic) is not a logical necessity. A key feature of Colin Wilson’s theory of targeted constraints, for example, is that the requirements on harmonic orderings are looser.

p. 4: (2) illustrates two functions. In words: “The function Gen applied to an input In_k [the underlying form] produces the set of candidate outputs \{Out_1, Out_2, ...\}, where each output contains information telling you what the input was. The function H-eval applied to that set of candidates produces a single output, Out_real [the actual surface form].”

You may worry about how H-eval can possibly deal with an infinite set of candidates. We won’t talk about it in this class, but most computational proposals for dealing with infinite candidate sets use regular expressions (like \(ab*a\), the set of all strings consisting of an \(a\) followed by zero or more \(b\)s followed by an \(a\)), which are themselves finite but can represent infinite sets.

Don’t worry too much for now about this idea that all the structure of the input is retained (even if not pronounced) in each output—it was abandoned soon after by most OT phonologists in favor of a different way of encoding the input-output relationship.

p. 12: ‘Margin’ here means a syllable onset or coda—i.e., whatever is not the nucleus.

p. 24: The idea that an epenthetic segment is just an empty segment slot, and it’s up to a post-phonology component to decide how to pronounce it, has also largely been abandoned. Most OT phonologists now assume that the candidate set for /al-qalam+u/ includes also *[talqalamu], *[palqalamu], etc., and that it is up to the grammar to select *[Palqalamu] as optimal.

p. 25: For those of you who know OT, FILL is roughly today’s DEP.

p. 30: By ‘coalescence’, I think P&S mean putting a long vowel in a single syllable.

---

p. 34: The claim about Austronesian infixes always being VC (and the implication that in a language with a VC infix there could be no VC prefixes) has been challenged by Blevins, Yu, Kaufman, and probably others.

p. 36: [g-um-radwet] is actually possible (try a Google search for “gumraduate”!). Various people, including me, have reanalyzed Tagalog infixation in recent years.

p. 40: Typo in (41): the first candidate should get an exclamation mark in its PK-PROM cell.

p. 50: PARSE is roughly today’s MAX.

p. 51: In (62), the fact that there is no foot or prosodic-word structure on the first candidate means that it is unpronounceable—it’s silent. This tableau is claiming that in Latin, it would be better to say nothing at all than to have a non-binary foot. There have subsequently been other approaches to this problem of ineffability. (Another morphological example from English: if to make something red or to become red is to redden, and to make white is to whiten, what is to make green? to make grey?)

p. 57: *ceteris paribus*, an expression common in the OT literature, exemplifies one of my two favorite constructions in Latin—the ablative absolute. Literally it’s “other equal”, both in the ablative plural. An ablative noun phrase in Latin can act adverbially on the whole sentence. Anyway, *ceteris paribus* means “all else being equal,” which is a very important concept in OT. (My other favorite construction is the gerundive, illustrated—along with the ablative absolute again—in *mutatis mutandis*, which you may also run into in OT literature.)

p. 57: Notice that English speakers who say *pōlice* use the long vowel [ou], not short [ɔ], so for them the initial syllable is heavy.

Something to think about: How does the analysis of Latin stress do on the enclitic examples mentioned by Kager?

**Questions**

1. In your own words, why is it hard to analyze Tongan step-by-step—that is, without looking ahead to final outputs? (As P&S say on p. 31, “it is important to have the entire structural analysis present at the time of evaluation.”.)
2. Find an example of a constraint triggering a rule that we’ve seen this quarter, and think of it in terms of an interaction between two constraints. Give a mini-tableau illustrating the ranking of those two constraints, and say what the language is and where the example comes from (e.g., which reading, class handout, or assignment).

3. Do the same for a case of a constraint blocking a rule.