Objectives:

- **Find informative losers**
- **Distinguish markedness and faithfulness constraints**

Background preparation:

- *Consider other "goals" for English VCCV*

0. Today's plan

- Quick review: Where we are with OT

- Return to slides from last time: Formalizing priorities among goals

- Informative losing candidates

- Comparative tableau notation

- Practice with W/L notation

- Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- Assign W/L marks to these new informative losers

/æklejm/	NoCodA	NoOnsetCluster
(→)(a) [ə.klejm]	*	*
(b) [ə<u>k</u>.lejm]	** W	L
× (c) [ə.k<u>ə</u>.lejm]	*	L
× (d) [ə.lejm]	*	L

- Which candidate(s) will the grammar pick here?
  - The grammar currently picks (c) and (d), *not* (a)!

- **What constraints** could make (c) and (d) lose?

/æklejm/	NoCₒᴅᴀ	NoOɴsᴇᴛCʟᴜsᴛᴇʀ
(→)(a) [ə.klejm]	*	*
(b) [ə<u>k</u>.lejm]	** **W**	**L**
✗ (c) [ə.k<u>ə</u>.lejm]	*	**L**
✗ (d) [ə.lejm]	*	**L**

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- **What constraints** could make (c) and (d) lose?
  - We need a constraint **against deletion**
  - We need a constraint **against epenthesis**

NoDELETION   Assign one * for every segment in the input that is not in the output

NoEPENTHESIS   Assign one * for every segment in the output that is not in the input

- Are these plausible constraints?
  - Is avoiding deletion/epenthesis a plausible goal?

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- Are these plausible constraints?

  - Is avoiding deletion/epenthesis a plausible goal?

- Having the **output** (SR) **be like the input** (UR)
  is a plausible goal

  - It should make it easier to find the UR in your
    lexicon on hearing the SR if the two are identical

  - Epenthesis and deletion are two ways for SRs
    not to look like URs

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- Constraints requiring outputs to be **identical** to inputs (in some way) are **faithfulness constraints**

  - NoEpenthesis and NoDeletion are faithfulness constraints

- Constraints evaluating only **properties of outputs** (surface forms) are **markedness constraints**

  - Markedness constraints are often justified based on phonetic or typological evidence

- Handout - Markedness and faithfulness constraints

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- How do NOEPENTHESIS, NODELETION assign violations? How are W/L assigned here?

/æklejm/	NOEPENTH	NODEL	NOCODA	NOONSCL
→ (a) [ə.klejm]			*	*
(b) [ək.lejm]			** W	L
(c) [ə.kə.lejm]			*	
(d) [ə.lejm]			*	

Note: Aspiration is not transcribed in the tableau, for simplicity

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- How do NoEpenthesis, NoDeletion assign violations? How are W/L assigned here?

/æklejm/	NoEpenth	NoDel	NoCoda	NoOnsCl
→ (a) [ə.klejm]			*	*
(b) [ək.lejm]			** W	L
(c) [ə.kə.lejm]	* W		*	L
(d) [ə.lejm]		* W	*	L

- What constraint rankings can we prove?

6. Markedness and faithfulness constraints

- How do NOEPENTHESIS, NODELETION assign violations? How are W/L assigned here?

/æklejm/	NOEPENTH	NODEL	NOCODA	NOONSCL
→ (a) [ə.klejm]			*	*
(b) [ək.lejm]			** W	L
(c) [ə.kə.lejm]	* W		*	L
(d) [ə.lejm]		* W	*	L

- What constraint rankings can we prove?

- What is our overall ranking (so far)?

    - NOCODA » NOONSETCLUSTER

    - NOEPENTHESIS » NOONSETCLUSTER

    - NODELETION » NOONSETCLUSTER

- Note that we have no information (yet?) about the ranking among NOEPENTHESIS, NODELETION, AND NOCODA

    - It is not always possible to rank all constraints

    - Are there additional informative losers?

    - Sometimes, looking at a different input (a different form from the data set) will help find more rankings

11

7. For next time

- Next class, we will focus on

  - Practice with finding informative losers
  - Practice with making valid ranking arguments
  - More constraints involving syllable structure