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In this dissertation I propose a rank-ordering model of EVAL. This model differs from classic OT as follows: In classic OT, EVAL distinguishes the best candidate from the losers, but does not distinguish between different losers. I argue that EVAL imposes a harmonic rank-ordering on the complete candidate set, so that also the losers are ordered relative to each other. I show how this model of EVAL can account for non-categorical phenomena such as variation and phonological processing.

Variation. In variation there is more than one pronunciation for a single input. Grammar determines the possible variants and the relative frequency of the variants. I argue that EVAL imposes a harmonic rank-ordering on the entire candidate set, and that language users can access more than the best candidate from this rank-ordering. However, the accessibility of a candidate depends on its position in the rank-ordering. The higher a candidate appears, the more often it will be selected as output. The best candidate is then the most frequent variant, the second best candidate the second most
frequent variant, etc. I apply this model to vowel deletion in Latvian and Portuguese, and to [t, d]-deletion in English.

**Phonological processing.** Language users rely on grammar in word-likeness judgments and lexical decision tasks. The more well-formed a non-word, the more word-like language users will judge it to be. A more well-formed a non-word is considered more seriously as a possible word, and language users will be slower to reject it in a lexical decision task.

The rank-ordering model of EVAL accounts for this as follows: EVAL compares non-words and imposes a rank-ordering on them. The higher a non-word occurs in this rank-ordering, the more well-formed it is. Therefore, the higher a non-word occurs, the more word-like it will be judged to be, and the more slowly it will be rejected in lexical decision tasks.

I illustrate this by discussing two sets of experiments on how grammar influences phonological processing. The first set investigates the influence of the OCP on processing in Hebrew, and the second the influence of a constraint on [sCvC]-words in English.
# CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................. v

ABSTRACT ................................................................................. vi

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ................................................................. 1
   1. Theoretical preliminaries .................................................. 2
      1.1 On being a better (or a worse) loser: a rank-ordering model of EVAL .............................................. 3
      1.2 Extending the comparative powers of EVAL .......... 5
   2. Applying the rank-ordering model of EVAL to phonological variation ..................................................... 10
      2.1 [t, d]-deletion in Jamaican English ......................... 11
      2.2 Accounting for the Jamaican pattern in a rank-ordering model of EVAL ........................................... 12
         2.2.1 Intra-contextual variation ................................. 12
         2.2.2 Inter-contextual variation ............................... 16
         2.2.3 Limiting variation: the critical cut-off .......... 17
         2.2.4 Summary of proposal ...................................... 22
   3. Applying the rank-ordering model of EVAL to the phonological processing of non-words .................. 23
   4. Structure of the dissertation ........................................... 27

II. A RANK-ORDERING MODEL OF EVAL ................................. 29
   1. A rank-ordering model of EVAL ................................. 32
   2. EVAL and the ordering associated with individual constraints ............................................................... 36
      2.1 Characterization of constraints ............................... 36
      2.2 Ordering the candidates with respect to individual constraints ......................................................... 40
IV. VOWEL DELETION IN FAIALENSE PORTUGUESE ................. 133

1. The basic vocalic phonology of Faialense Portuguese .......... 135
   1.1 The oral vowels of Faialense Portuguese ................... 135
   1.2 Vowel reduction and deletion in unstressed syllables .......... 138

2. Vowel reduction in Faialense Portuguese ...................... 141
   2.1 The constraints ........................................ 142
      2.1.1 Ranking conservatism .................................. 147
   2.2 Low vowels ............................................. 147
   2.3 Back vowels ............................................. 149
   2.4 Schwa ................................................. 152
   2.5 The high front vowel .................................... 152
   2.6 The mid front vowels .................................... 153
   2.7 Summary ................................................. 155

3. The interaction of vowel reduction and deletion in Faialense Portuguese ........................................ 156
   3.1 The data ................................................. 157
   3.2 Variation between [u] and ∅ ................................ 164
      3.2.1 Non-final in a prosodic word: [u ¹ ∅] .................. 165
      3.2.2 Final in a prosodic word: [∅# ¹ û#] ..................... 169
   3.3 Variation between [ã] and ∅ ................................ 172
      3.3.1 Non-final in a prosodic word: [ã ¹ ∅] .................. 173
      3.3.2 Final in a prosodic word: [∅# ¹ ã#] ..................... 177
   3.4 Interim summary ......................................... 179
   3.5 Variation between [ĩ] and ∅ ................................ 181
   3.6 No variation: always [ã] .................................. 185
   3.7 Final summary ........................................... 189

4. Variation across contexts .............................................. 191
   4.1 Vowel quality ............................................ 192
      4.1.1 The non-undergoers .................................... 193
2. The preceding phonological context ........................................... 263
   2.1 The data .............................................................................. 263
   2.2 The analysis ........................................................................ 273
     2.2.1 The constraints ................................................................. 273
     2.2.2 Accounting for the observed patterns ......................... 278
       2.2.2.1 Intra-contextual variation ................................. 278
       2.2.2.2 Inter-contextual variation ................................. 282
     2.2.3 Factorial typology – what are the possible dialects? .................. 284
       2.2.3.1 Conditions for variation .................................. 285
       2.2.3.2 Possible deletion patterns ................................ 286
       2.2.3.3 Impossible deletion patterns ............................ 293
     2.2.4 Two outstanding questions ............................................ 297
       2.2.4.1 What about [p, b] and [k, g]? ........................... 297
       2.2.4.2 What about [t, d] preceded by a vowel? ............... 301

3. Considering alternatives ............................................................. 302
   3.1 Conceptual problems ............................................................ 306
   3.2 Practical problems ................................................................ 309

Appendix: Factorial typologies .......................................................... 314

VI. WELL-FORMEDNESS JUDGMENTS AND LEXICAL DECISION ........................................... 330
1. Preliminary considerations .......................................................... 332
   1.1 Well-formedness and lexical decision in a
       rank-ordering model of EVAL ...................................... 333
   1.2 Factors in the processing of non-words ............................ 336
     1.2.1 Lexical statistics ......................................................... 337
     1.2.2 Grammar .................................................................. 344

2. The OCP in the processing of non-words in Hebrew ............... 348
   2.1 Restrictions on identity in roots ........................................ 349
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Bi-consonantal roots</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>From bi-consonantal roots to tri-consonantal stems</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>The OCP: banning identical consonants</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.1</td>
<td>No identical consonants in the surface realization of the root</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.2</td>
<td>Avoiding identical consonants in the stem</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>The critical cut-off</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>Lexicon optimization</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>The processing of non-words</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Word-likeness and lexical decision in Hebrew</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Well-formedness judgment experiments</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
<td>Gradient well-formedness judgment experiments</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2</td>
<td>Comparative well-formedness judgment experiments</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Lexical decision experiments</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Restrictions on [sCvC]-words</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>A basic OT analysis</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>The critical cut-off</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.2</td>
<td>Interim summary</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Motivation of analysis</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.1</td>
<td>The place harmony scale</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.2</td>
<td>Constraints against the co-occurrence of homorganic voiceless stops</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.3</td>
<td>On the markedness of [s+stop]-structures</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.4</td>
<td>*sCvC-constraints as local conjunctions</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.3 The processing of non-words of the form \[sCvC\] ........................................... 420

3.2 Word-likeness and lexical decision in English ................. 423

3.2.1 Well-formedness judgment experiments ............. 426

3.2.1.1 Gradient well-formedness judgment experiment .................. 426
3.2.1.2 Comparative well-formedness judgment experiment .......... 433

3.2.2 Lexical decision experiment ......................... 440

3.2.2.1 Experimental design ......................... 441
3.2.2.2 Results ................................ 443

4. Considering alternatives ........................................... 446

4.1 Grammar or lexical statistics? ................................. 447

4.1.1 Hebrew and the OCP ........................................ 447
4.1.2 \[sCvC\]-forms in English ............................... 451

4.2 Alternative grammatical analyses .............................. 453

4.2.1 Classic OT ........................................... 454
4.2.2 Stochastic OT ......................................... 456
4.2.3 Crucially unranked constraints ......................... 464

5. Concluding remarks ............................................... 468

Appendix: Tokens used in \[sCvC\]-experiments ......................... 471

BIBLIOGRAPHY ......................................................... 475

xiv