Today's objective:

- **Practice with phonological analysis in OT**

Background preparation:

- McCarthy (2008), sec 2.3–2.7

0. Today's key points

- Practice with OT analysis
  - Informative losing candidates
  - Valid ranking arguments
- Some techniques for defining constraints
- OT skills / concepts — Exercises in McCarthy (2008)

1. OT analysis practice

Data set: English loanwords in Korean

- Spot-check question: Ranking MAX and DEP with respect to NOCODA
  - What is an informative loser?
  - What ranking(s) can be **proven**?

- What **additional** rankings can we prove, based on this data set?

1. OT analysis practice

Data set: English loanwords in Korean

- Does the canddiate [k^hɯɾi] violate NoCoda?

- Why does our method of looking at **W/L marks** work? (What is the situation that this technique helps us identify?)

2. More on constraint definitions

- McCarthy's recommendation:

  "Assign one violation for every…"

- Assess the constraint definitions given in Zec (2007)
  - Are there any we might like to revise?

2. More on constraint definitions

Data set: English loanwords in Korean

- Does our current constraint ranking account for the forms in Part C?
  - How can we check this / demonstrate it?
- Do we need to …
  - change the current ranking?
  - add a new constraint?

2. More on constraint definitions

- Faithfulness constraints depend on identifying the “same” segment in input/output…we’ll look at this in more depth soon

3. OT skills and concepts

Exercises in McCarthy (2008), sec 2.1–2.7

- Ex 6 (p 40), parts (a), (c) | *Generalization to analysis*
  - Express these “process” descriptions as interactions between two or more constraints (define new constraints as needed)
- Related questions to consider:
  - Why are these descriptions not very good as single markedness constraints?
  - What is good practice in defining a new (markedness) constraint?

3. OT skills and concepts

Exercises in McCarthy (2008), sec 2.1–2.7

- Ex 19 (pp 71–72) | *Valid constraint rankings*
  - Why can no ranking be proven in these tableaus?

- Related questions to consider:
  - Try Ex 20 as well: can we add an informative loser to each of the tableaus?

3. OT skills and concepts

Exercises in McCarthy (2008), sec 2.1–2.7

- Add ex 14 (p 52) | *More practice with valid rankings*
  - Which rankings (if any) are proven here?
  - Draw Hasse diagrams if possible, or explain why not
- Related questions to consider:
  - Ex 15 is a little abstract — but it might be good practice on your own

    (This exercise doesn't resemble anything we would do in actual phonological analysis, but it's good for testing our understanding of OT tableaus and ranking arguments.)

3. OT skills and concepts

Exercises in McCarthy (2008), sec 2.1–2.7

- Ex 24 (p 83) | *Harmonic bounding*
  - Invent candidates as specified
  - Note that the verb used in this technical term is ***to bound***, not ***to bind*** — *to bound* means 'to impose a boundary or limit on'
- Related questions to consider:
  - Can you find the relationship between *harmonic bounding* and constraints in a *stringency relation*?
    - Consider IDENT([voice]), IDENT*Onset*([voice]) (§2.4)

3. OT skills and concepts

Exercises in McCarthy (2008), sec 2.1–2.7

- Ex 25 (p 87) | *Identifying relevant constraints*
  - This requires a look at the data in exercise 21
  - Can a discussion of MAX$_{stem\text{-}final}$ be omitted?

- Related questions to consider:
  - What kind of constraint is MAX$_{stem\text{-}final}$? What is a little different about this? Does this raise any questions about possible constraints?