

Syllabus

Time	Monday 4-7 pm
Place	2-320
Office Hours	TBA (office: 3-407)
E-mail/ Phone	jongho@snu.ac.kr / 880-6169

Prerequisite: Phonology I from last semester (or any comparable courses)

Some basic knowledge of Optimality Theory is necessary.

Description & Goals

This is the second half of an introduction to the graduate level phonology. In the first half, we discussed several different phonological theories beginning from the early generative phonology model proposed in Chomsky & Halle's (1968) *The Sound Pattern of English*: syllable theory, autosegmental phonology, metrical stress theories, underspecification theories, Optimality Theory (OT) and **MaxEnt HG**.

In this course over the past ten years or so, we discussed topics like morphology-phonology interactions (**Lexical phonology** and **Prosodic Morphology**), exceptions in phonology (phonological opacity and Non-Derived Environment Blocking effects), correspondence between surface forms (**output-to-output correspondence**, **paradigm uniformity**, inflection dependence and agreement by correspondence), phonological variation/change and harmonic serialism.

In this semester, we will be mainly concerned with phonotactics, focusing on the discussion of "learning phonotactic distributions". The topic of "learning phonotactic distributions" will be taught by Professor Adam Albright (MIT) who will be here in SNU from Oct 14 through 18. (We need to find out the class times during that period.)

In this portion of the course, we will consider a variety of models for calculating the phonotactic acceptability of a string. We will compare models that differ in a number of important respects. We will compare models that calculate similarity to existing items against those that identify properties of substrings. We will then compare models that generate words vs. those that distinguish grammatical/probable from ungrammatical/improbable words. Next, we will take on the question of whether phonotactic restrictions must be built in, or whether they can be induced from distributions in the data. We will also compare models that aim to capture statistical distributions in the lexicon vs. those that have additional objectives (priors), such as simplicity, or phonological "naturalness". Finally, time permitting, we will consider cumulative effects of phonotactic restrictions.

Requirements

- Lead discussion of one paper in the required reading list (30%)
- A final term paper and its presentation (50%)
- Readings and class participation (20%)

Final term paper

- Select topic and meet with me by Nov. 5.
- Submit a one-page outline of the paper by Nov. 18.
- Paper Presentation: Last week (Dec. 9)
- Paper Due: Dec. 13

Tentative Class Schedule

Week	Topics	Readings
1. 9/2	Syllabus	
2. 9/9	maxent stochastic OT	Hayes and Wilson (2008) Coetzee & Pater (2011) Boersma and Hayes (2001)
3. 9/16	minimal generalization learner	Albright and Hayes (2003) *Bailey and Hahn (2001)
4. 9/23	feature-based generalization	*Albright (2009) *Guskova and Gallapher (2019),
5. 9/30	learning bias	*Albright & Hayes (2006) Wilson (2006) *White (2017)
6. 10/7	super additivity effects	Albright (2008 ms); *Green and Davis (2014)
7. 10/14	Wordlikeness, acceptability, and phonotactics (exemplar models, phonotactic models)	Bailey and Hahn (2001); Albright and Hayes (2003)
8. 10/15	Phonotactic probability Rule and constraint induction	Hayes and Wilson (2008); Albright (2009), Gouskova and Gallagher (2019)
9. 10/16	Priors: Simplicity, perceptual similarity, and beyond (Regularization in MaxEnt; Bayesian priors)	Albright and Hayes (2006), Wilson (2006), White (2017)
10. 10/17	JK satellite workshop	
11. 10/18	cumulative effects/ganging up	Albright (2008), Green and Davis (2014)
12. 11/18	(tentative) Non-native sequence perception/production	Dupoux et al. (1999), Peperkamp et al. (2008), Berent et al. (2007, 2008, 2009)
13. 11/25	(tentative) Gradient phonotactic acceptability and the lexicon	Ernestus & Bayeen (2003), Becker et al. (2011)
14. 12/2	(tentative) sonority projection effects	Hayes (2011), Daland et al. (2011)
15. 12/9	Paper presentation	
	Paper Due (12/13)	

Bibliography

- Albright, A. (2008 ms.) Cumulative violations and complexity thresholds.
Albright, A. (2009). Feature-based generalization as a source of gradient acceptability.
Phonology, 26:9–41.

- Albright, A. and Hayes, B. (2003). Rules vs. analogy in English past tenses: A computational/experimental study. *Cognition*, 90:119–161.
- Albright, A. and Hayes, B. (2006). Modeling productivity with the Gradual Learning Algorithm: The problem of accidentally exceptionless generalizations. In Fanselow, G., Féry, C., Vogel, R., and Schlesewsky, M., editors, *Gradience in Grammar: Generative Perspectives*, pages 185–204. Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, T. M. and Hahn, U. (2001). Determinants of wordlikeness: Phonotactics or lexical neighborhoods? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 44:568–591.
- Becker, Michael, Nihan Ketrez, and Andrew Nevins. 2011. The surfeit of the stimulus: Grammatical biases filter lexical statistics in Turkish voicing deneutralization. *Language* 87:84–125.
- Berent, I; D. Steriade; T. Lennertz, and V. Vaknin (2007) What we know about what we have never heard: evidence from perceptual illusion. *Cognition* **104**.
 (Peperkamp, Sharon (2007) Do we have innate knowledge about phonological markedness? Comments on Berent, Steriade, Lennertz, and Vaknin, *Cognition* 104, 631-637.)
 (Berent, Iris and Tracy Lennertz (2007) What we know about what we have never heard before: Beyond phonetics, Reply to Peperkamp, *Cognition* 104, 638-643.)
- Berent, Iris, Tracy Lennertz, Jongho Jun, Miguel A. Moreno, and Paul Smolensky (2008) Language universals in human brains. In *PNAS* 105.14: 5321-5325.
- Berent, Iris, Tracy Lennertz, Paul Smolensky & Vered Vaknin-Nusbaum (2009) Listeners' knowledge of phonological universals: evidence from nasal clusters. *Phonology* 26.1, 75-108.
- Daland, Robert et al. (2011) Explaining sonority projection. In *Phonology* 28, 197-234.
- Dupoux, E., Kakehi, K., Hirose, Y., Pallier, C., & Mehler, J. (1999). Epenthetic vowels in Japanese: A perceptual illusion?. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 25, 1568–1578.
- Ernestus, M. and Baayen, R. H. (2003) Predicting the unpredictable: Interpreting neutralized segments in Dutch, *Language*, 70, 5-38.
- Gouskova, M. and G. Gallagher (2019). Inducing nonlocal constraints from baseline phonotactics. *NLLT*.
- Green, C. and S. Davis (2014) Superadditivity and limitations on syllable complexity in Bambara words. In Ashley W. Farris-Trimble and Jessica Barlow (Eds.), *Perspectives on phonology, theory, and acquisition: Papers in honor of Daniel A. Dinnsen*. 223-247.
- Hayes, Bruce (2011) Interpreting sonority-projection experiments: the role of phonotactic modeling. *Proceedings of the 2011 ICPHS*, Hong Kong, pp. 835-838.
- Hayes, B. & White, J. (2013). Phonological naturalness and phonotactic learning. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 44(1), 45–75.
- Hayes, B. & C. Wilson (2008) A maximum entropy model of phonotactics and phonotactic learning. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39. 379–440.
- Peperkamp, Sharon, Inga Vendelin & Kimihiro Nakamura (2008) On the perceptual origin of loanword adaptations: experimental evidence from Japanese. *Phonology* 25.1.
- White, J. (2017). Accounting for the learnability of saltation in phonological theory: A maximum entropy model with a P-map bias. *Language*, 93(1), 1–36. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/~ucjtcwh/index_files/White_ModelingSaltation.pdf
- Wilson, C. (2006). Learning phonology with substantive bias: An experimental and computational study of velar palatalization. *Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 30: 945–982.