

Reading guide: Steriade (2001)

Here is a later paper by Steriade that addresses some of the same kinds of questions as the (1999) paper, but also brings up new questions.

- (1) What does Steriade mean by her statement that the P-map *projects correspondence constraints*?
- (2) What is the “Too-Many-Solutions Problem”? What is the P-map model's response to this problem? How successful do you think the P-map model is in this respect?
- (3) Howe & Pulleyblank (2001) draw a distinction between “integrated” and “modular” views of the phonology/phonetics interface. Previously, we saw Steriade (1999) distinguishing “cues” and “prosody”, and we’ve also seen Gordon talking about “phonetic effectiveness” vs. “phonological symmetry”.
 - (a) As Steriade presents her P-map model here, how does it relate to these kinds of distinctions?
 - (b) Can we imagine a P-map model that involves different assumptions about these distinctions? To what extent do the insights behind the P-map model depend on decisions about the categorical/gradient nature of phonology?
- (4) Is the P-map universal in Steriade's view? What differences might we expect between a universal P-map and a language-particular one?
- (5) Any comments concerning the last paragraph on p 43 (continued on p 44)?

Implications and extensions

- (6) What are the *formal* differences (i.e., in the assumptions made about the nature of the phonological model) between Steriade (1999) and Steriade (2001)?
- (7) Thinking back over examples we have seen where more phonetic or more abstract information seems to be needed to explain various patterns, are all the cases we have seen able to be expressed in a P-map model?

If so, what assumptions about the nature of possible/allowable/statable constraints are needed to make this work? Are there problematic predictions?