

Rhythmic Syncope and Strict Locality in Subregular Phonology

Dustin Bowers and Yiding Hao sync · stony BROOK, NY

university of arizona *·* yale university **December 1, 2018**

Introduction

Rhythmic Syncope

- (1) 1930s Ojibwe (Bowers, To appear)
	- a. [gtɪɡmɪngɪbnɑː-d] "If he rolls him"
	- b. [n-gutgumnAgbina:] "I roll him"

- (1) 1930s Ojibwe (Bowers, To appear)
	- a. [gtɪɡmmgɪbnɑː-d] "If he rolls him"
	- b. $[n-gotgumnAgbma:]'$ "I roll him"

- (1) 1930s Ojibwe (Bowers, To appear)
	- a. $\sqrt{\text{gutqummagrb} \text{m} \cdot \text{d}}$ "If he rolls him"
	- b. $/ni$ -gutigum max gibina: $/$ "I roll him"

Rhythmic Syncope

Definition

Assume an alphabet $\Sigma = C \cup V$, with $C \cap V = \emptyset$. The *rhythmic syncope function* is the function defined by

$$
\rho(c_0v_1c_1v_2c_2\ldots v_nc_n)=c_0v_1c_1c_2v_3c_3c_4\ldots c_n
$$

 \mathbf{w} here for each *i*, $\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathcal{C}^*$ and $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{V}$.

Rhythmic Syncope

Definition

Assume an alphabet $\Sigma = C \cup V$, with $C \cap V = \emptyset$. The *rhythmic syncope function* is the function defined by

$$
\rho(c_0v_1c_1v_2c_2\ldots v_nc_n)=c_0v_1c_1c_2v_3c_3c_4\ldots c_n
$$

 \mathbf{w} here for each *i*, $\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathcal{C}^*$ and $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{V}$.

$$
\rho(\text{CVCVCVCVC}) = \text{CVCCCVCUC}
$$

Outline

▶ Show that *ρ* is not *strictly local*.

Outline

- ▶ Show that *ρ* is not *strictly local*.
- \blacktriangleright Define a class of functions that includes ρ .

Outline

- ▶ Show that *ρ* is not *strictly local*.
- \blacktriangleright Define a class of functions that includes ρ .
- \blacktriangleright Discuss the theoretical consequences.

Strictly Local Functions

Subregular Phonology

What constitutes a possible phonological dependency?

▶ *Tier-based strictly local* dependencies (Heinz et al., 2011).

Subregular Phonology

- ▶ *Tier-based strictly local* dependencies (Heinz et al., 2011).
- \triangleright *NC: *np, *nt, *nk, *mp, *mt, *mk...

Subregular Phonology

- ▶ *Tier-based strictly local* dependencies (Heinz et al., 2011).
- \triangleright *NC: *np, *nt, *nk, *mp, *mt, *mk...
- \triangleright *CC: *pp, *pt, *pk, *bp, *bt, *bk...

- ▶ *Tier-based strictly local* dependencies (Heinz et al., 2011).
- \triangleright *NC: *np, *nt, *nk, *mp, *mt, *mk...
- \triangleright *CC: *pp, *pt, *pk, *bp, *bt, *bk...
- ▶ NoCoda: *p#, *t#, *k#, *b#, *d#. *g#...

- ▶ *Tier-based strictly local* dependencies (Heinz et al., 2011).
- \triangleright *NC: *np, *nt, *nk, *mp, *mt, *mk...
- \triangleright *CC: *pp, *pt, *pk, *bp, *bt, *bk...
- ▶ NoCoda: *p#, *t#, *k#, *b#, *d#. *g#...
- ▶ Vowel Harmony: *ea, *eı, *eu, *ae, *ai, *aü…

Tier-Based Strictly Local Languages

A language *L* is *k-strictly local on tier T* (TSL) if

Tier-Based Strictly Local Languages

A language *L* is *k-strictly local on tier T* (TSL) if

▶ there exists *S ⊆* Σ *∗* such that

Tier-Based Strictly Local Languages

A language *L* is *k-strictly local on tier T* (TSL) if

- ▶ there exists *S ⊆* Σ *∗* such that
- ▶ every string in *S* has length at most *k* and

A language *L* is *k-strictly local on tier T* (TSL) if

- ▶ there exists *S ⊆* Σ *∗* such that
- ▶ every string in *S* has length at most *k* and
- ▶ *x ∈ L* if and only if no element of *S* is a substring of *x*, ignoring symbols not in *T*.

▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\quad \blacktriangleright \text{ Example: } \varnothing \to u \; / \; \mathsf{C} \; \smallsetminus \; \left\{ \begin{matrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{matrix} \right\}
$$

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \begin{Bmatrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{Bmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \begin{Bmatrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{Bmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{~} \text{~} \text{Example:~} \varnothing \rightarrow u \text{ / } \text{C} \text{ } \begin{pmatrix} \text{C} \\ \text{\#} \end{pmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i s Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \begin{Bmatrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{Bmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i s u k Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \begin{Bmatrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{Bmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i s u k u r Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \left\{ \begin{matrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{matrix} \right\}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i s u k u r i Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _= } \begin{Bmatrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{Bmatrix}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu] Output: a i s u k u r i i Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _+} \!\!\left\{\begin{matrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{matrix}\right\}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu]

Output: a i s u k u r i i m Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

- ▶ TSL languages describe *phonotactic dependencies*.
- ▶ Phonological processes are described by *TSL functions*.

$$
\text{Example: } \varnothing \to u \text{ / } \mathsf{C} \text{ _+} \!\!\left\{\begin{matrix} \mathsf{C} \\ \# \end{matrix}\right\}
$$

Japanese /aiskriim/ *→* [aisukuriimu]

Output: a i s u k u r i i m u Input: $\#$ a i s k r i i m $\#$ *↑*

We make the following assumptions about phonological processes.

We make the following assumptions about phonological processes.

 \triangleright Streaming: The process scans the input string from left to right and produces part of the output at each time step.

We make the following assumptions about phonological processes.

- \triangleright Streaming: The process scans the input string from left to right and produces part of the output at each time step.
- ▶ Determinism: If the process *f* outputs *y* after reading *x*, then *y* is a *common prefix* of $\{f(\mathsf{x}z)|z\in \Sigma^*\}.$

We make the following assumptions about phonological processes.

- \triangleright Streaming: The process scans the input string from left to right and produces part of the output at each time step.
- \triangleright Determinism: If the process *f* outputs *y* after reading *x*, then *y* is a *common prefix* of $\{f(\mathsf{x}z)|z\in \Sigma^*\}.$

Definition

A *common prefix* of a set *A* is a string *p* such that every string in *A* begins with *p*.

We make the following assumptions about phonological processes.

- \triangleright Streaming: The process scans the input string from left to right and produces part of the output at each time step.
- \triangleright Determinism: If the process *f* outputs *y* after reading *x*, then *y* is a *common prefix* of $\{f(\mathsf{x}z)|z\in \Sigma^*\}.$

Definition

A *common prefix* of a set *A* is a string *p* such that every string in *A* begins with *p*.

Parsimony: This common prefix is the longest one possible.

Definition

For a function $f\colon \Sigma^*\to \Sigma^*$,

$$
\textbf{\textit{f}}^{\leftarrow}(x)=\text{lcp}(\{\textbf{\textit{f}}(xz)|z\in\Sigma^*\})
$$

and *f→*(*z, xz*) is the string such that

$$
f(xz) = f^{\leftarrow}(x)f^{\rightarrow}(z,xz).
$$

Definition

For a function $f\colon \Sigma^*\to \Sigma^*$,

$$
\textbf{\textit{f}}^{\leftarrow}(x)=\text{lcp}(\{\textbf{\textit{f}}(xz)|z\in\Sigma^*\})
$$

and $f^{\rightarrow}(z, x\overline{z})$ is the string such that

$$
f(xz) = f^{\leftarrow}(x)f^{\rightarrow}(z,xz).
$$

Definition

For a string $x \in \Sigma^*$, tier $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \Sigma$, and number k , suff ${}^k_\mathcal{T}(x)$ is the last k symbols of *x* on tier *T*.

Definition (Chandlee et al., In prep)

A function $f\colon \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ is *k-strictly local on tier T* if for every $u,v \in \Sigma^*$, if $\mathsf{surf}^{k-1}_\mathcal{T}(u) = \mathsf{surf}^{k-1}_\mathcal{T}(v)$

and

$$
\text{suff}_\mathcal{T}^{k-1}(f^\leftarrow(u)) = \text{suff}_\mathcal{T}^{k-1}(f^\leftarrow(v)),
$$

then for all *w ∈* Σ *∗* we have

$$
f^{\rightarrow}(w, uw) = f^{\rightarrow}(w, vw).
$$

To show that *ρ* is *not k*-SL on tier *T*, we must find *u, v, w* such that

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\text{suff}_T^{k-1}(u) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(v) \\
\text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(u)) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(v)),\n\end{aligned}
$$

 $but \rho^{\rightarrow}(w, uw) \neq \rho^{\rightarrow}(w, vw).$

To show that *ρ* is *not k*-SL on tier *T*, we must find *u, v, w* such that

$$
\begin{aligned} \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(u) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(v) \\ \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^\leftarrow(u)) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^\leftarrow(v)), \end{aligned}
$$

 $\mathsf{but}\ \rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{uw})\neq\rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{vw}).$

 \blacktriangleright Let *a* be a vowel. $u = a^{4k}$, $v = a^{4k+1}$, $w = a$

To show that *ρ* is *not k*-SL on tier *T*, we must find *u, v, w* such that

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\text{suff}_T^{k-1}(u) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(v) \\
\text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(u)) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(v)),\n\end{aligned}
$$

 $\mathsf{but}\ \rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{uw})\neq\rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{vw}).$

 \blacktriangleright Let *a* be a vowel. $u = a^{4k}$, $v = a^{4k+1}$, $w = a$

$$
\blacktriangleright \rho^{\leftarrow}(u) = a^{2k}, \rho^{\leftarrow}(v) = a^{2k+1}
$$

To show that *ρ* is *not k*-SL on tier *T*, we must find *u, v, w* such that

$$
\begin{aligned} \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(u) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(v) \\ \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(u)) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(v)), \end{aligned}
$$

 $\mathsf{but}\ \rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{uw})\neq\rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{vw}).$

 \blacktriangleright Let *a* be a vowel. $u = a^{4k}$, $v = a^{4k+1}$, $w = a$

$$
\blacktriangleright \rho^{\leftarrow}(u) = a^{2k}, \rho^{\leftarrow}(v) = a^{2k+1}
$$

$$
\blacktriangleright \ \rho(uw) = a^{2k+1}, \rho(vw) = a^{2k+1}
$$

To show that *ρ* is *not k*-SL on tier *T*, we must find *u, v, w* such that

$$
\begin{aligned} \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(u) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(v) \\ \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(u)) &= \text{suff}_T^{k-1}(\rho^{\leftarrow}(v)), \end{aligned}
$$

 $\mathsf{but}\ \rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{uw})\neq\rho^{\rightarrow}(\mathsf{w},\mathsf{vw}).$ \blacktriangleright Let *a* be a vowel. $u = a^{4k}$, $v = a^{4k+1}$, $w = a$ ► $\rho^{\leftarrow}(u) = a^{2k}, \rho^{\leftarrow}(v) = a^{2k+1}$ $\rho(uw) = a^{2k+1}, \rho(vw) = a^{2k+1}$ $\rho \rightarrow (w, uw) = a, \rho \rightarrow (w, vw) = \varnothing$

Time Alignment

 \triangleright Do not delete the first vowel.

- \triangleright Do not delete the first vowel.
- \blacktriangleright If the most recent vowel was deleted, do not delete this vowel.

- \triangleright Do not delete the first vowel.
- \blacktriangleright If the most recent vowel was deleted, do not delete this vowel.
- \blacktriangleright If the most recent vowel was not deleted, delete this vowel.

- ▶ Do not delete the first vowel.
- \blacktriangleright If the most recent vowel was deleted, do not delete this vowel.
- \blacktriangleright If the most recent vowel was not deleted, delete this vowel.

Deletion destroys evidence.

Existing OT analyses address this problem.

▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints
- ▶ McCarthy (2008): Harmonic Serialism

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints
- ▶ McCarthy (2008): Harmonic Serialism
	- \triangleright CVCVCVCV

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints
- ▶ McCarthy (2008): Harmonic Serialism
	- \triangleright CVCVCVCV
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.CV)(CV.CV)

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints
- ▶ McCarthy (2008): Harmonic Serialism
	- ▶ CVCVCVCV
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.CV)(CV.CV)
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.CV)(CV.CV)

- ▶ Kager (1997): *V → •* instead of *V →* ∅
- ▶ Blumenfeld (2006): IO-markedness constraints
- ▶ McCarthy (2008): Harmonic Serialism
	- ▶ CVCVCVCV
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.CV)(CV.CV)
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.CV)(CV.CV)
	- \blacktriangleright (CV.C)(CV.C)

Time-Aligned TSL Functions

Definition

Let $f\colon \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ and $\mathsf{x} = \mathsf{x}_1\mathsf{x}_2\dots\mathsf{x}_n \in \Sigma^*.$ The *ith most recent action of* f *on x* is the pair $\big\langle x_{n-i+1}, f_i^\leftarrow(x) \big\rangle$, where $f_i^\leftarrow(x)$ is the string such that

$$
f^{\leftarrow}(x_1x_2...x_{n-i+1})=f^{\leftarrow}(x_1x_2...x_{n-i})f_i^{\leftarrow}(x).
$$

For *T ⊆* Σ *∗* , the *ith most recent action of f on x on tier T* is the action denoted

$$
\left\langle x_{i,T},f_{i,T}^{\leftarrow}(x)\right\rangle :=\left\langle x_{n-j+1},f_{n-j+1}^{\leftarrow}(x)\right\rangle,
$$

where *j* is the *i*th largest index such that *xn−j*+1 *∈ T* and *f← ⁿ−j*+1(*x*) *[∈] ^T ∗* .

Time-Aligned TSL Functions

Definition

Let *f* : Σ*[∗] →* Σ *[∗]* and *T ⊆* Σ. For *k ∈* N, *f* is *time-aligned k-strictly local on tier T* if for all $u, v \in \Sigma$, if

$$
\left\langle u_{i,T},f_{i,T}^{\leftarrow}(u)\right\rangle = \left\langle v_{i,T},f_{i,T}^{\leftarrow}(V)\right\rangle
$$

for $1\leq i\leq k,$ then for all $\pmb{w}\in \Sigma^*,$

$$
f^{\rightarrow}(w, uw) = f^{\rightarrow}(w, vw).
$$

ρ is 1-TATSL on tier *V*.

ρ is 1-TATSL on tier *V*.

$$
\blacktriangleright \ \rho_{1,V}^{\leftarrow}(c_0v_1c_1v_2c_2\ldots v_{2m}c_{2m}) = \varnothing
$$

ρ is TATSL

ρ is 1-TATSL on tier *V*.

$$
\blacktriangleright \ \rho_{1,V}^{\leftarrow}(c_0v_1c_1v_2c_2\ldots v_{2m}c_{2m}) = \varnothing
$$

 \triangleright $\rho_{1,\mathsf{V}}^{\leftarrow}(\mathsf{c}_0\mathsf{v}_1\mathsf{c}_1\mathsf{v}_2\mathsf{c}_2\dots\mathsf{v}_{2m+1}\mathsf{c}_{2m+1}) = \mathsf{v}_{2m+1}$

Conclusion

▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \blacktriangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.

Theoretical Consequences

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \triangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.
- ▶ However, Bowers (To appear) suggests that rhythmic syncope may not be diachronically robust.

Theoretical Consequences

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \triangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.
- \triangleright However, Bowers (To appear) suggests that rhythmic syncope may not be diachronically robust.
	- ▶ 1930s: /ɡʊtɪɡʊmɪnʌgɪbɪnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪngɪbnɑː-d]

Theoretical Consequences

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \triangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.
- \triangleright However, Bowers (To appear) suggests that rhythmic syncope may not be diachronically robust.
	- ▶ 1930s: /ɡʊtɪɡʊmɪnʌgɪbɪnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪngɪbnɑː-d]
	- ▶ Today: /ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d]

Theoretical Consequences

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \triangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.
- \triangleright However, Bowers (To appear) suggests that rhythmic syncope may not be diachronically robust.
	- ▶ 1930s: /ɡʊtɪɡʊmɪnʌgɪbɪnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪngɪbnɑː-d]
	- ▶ Today: /ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d]
- \triangleright Modern speakers understand the 1930s forms but do not use them.

Theoretical Consequences

- ▶ Chandlee's (2014) goal is to describe *all* phonological processes.
- \triangleright This talk suggests that TSL is not the right answer.
- \triangleright However, Bowers (To appear) suggests that rhythmic syncope may not be diachronically robust.
	- ▶ 1930s: /ɡʊtɪɡʊmɪnʌgɪbɪnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪngɪbnɑː-d]
	- ▶ Today: /ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d/ *→* [ɡtɪɡmɪŋɪbnɑː-d]
- \triangleright Modern speakers understand the 1930s forms but do not use them.
- ▶ Similar phenomena have been observed in Old Russian (Isacenko, 1970) and Old Irish (McManus, 1983).

Conclusion

▶ Rhythmic syncope is not TSL.

Conclusion

- ▶ Rhythmic syncope is not TSL.
- \triangleright The time-aligned TSL functions incorporate rhythmic syncope.

Conclusion

- ▶ Rhythmic syncope is not TSL.
- \triangleright The time-aligned TSL functions incorporate rhythmic syncope.
- \triangleright Rejection of rhythmic syncope by child learners would constitute evidence for the TSL hypothesis.

References

Blumenfeld, Lev A. 2006. Constraints on Phonological Interactions. Stanford, CA: Stanford University PhD Dissertation.

Bowers, Dustin. To appear. The Nishnaabemwin Restructuring Controversy: New Empirical Evidence. Phonology .

- Chandlee, Jane. 2014. Strictly Local Phonological Processes. Newark, DE: University of Delaware PhD Dissertation.
- Chandlee, Jane, Rémi Eyraud & Jeffrey Heinz. In prep. Input–output strictly local functions and their efficient learnability.
- Heinz, Jeffrey, Chetan Rawal & Herbert G. Tanner. 2011. Tier-based Strictly Local Constraints for Phonology. In Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, 58–64. Portland, OR: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Isacenko, Alexander. 1970. East Slavic morphophonemics and the treatment of the jers in Russian: A revision of Havlík's law. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics 13. 73–124.
- Kager, René. 1997. Rhythmic vowel deletion in Optimality Theory. In Iggy Roca (ed.), Derivations and Constraints in Phonology, 463–499. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press.
- McCarthy, John J. 2008. The serial interaction of stress and syncope. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 26(3). 499–546. doi:10.1007/s11049-008-9051-3.
- McManus, Damian. 1983. A Chronology of the Latin Loan-Words in Early Irish. Ériu 34. 21–71.