

According to the conventions of SPE, though not according to our conventions, (83) stands for the following sequence:

- (84) (a) (i) YZX:K
 (ii) YX:K
 (b) (i) YZXW:K
 (ii) YXW:K

(84a) and (84b) are conjunctively ordered. Within each of (84a) and (84b) the two subcases (i) and (ii) are said by Chomsky and Halle to be disjunctively ordered (see Footnote 67, p. 114 of SPE, where a preliminary formulation of the rule is discussed). Contrary to what they imply, however, it is far from evident that only disjunctive ordering would yield the correct results. One can show formally that (84a) can be applied either disjunctively or conjunctively with no difference in effect on any logically possible input. The following derivation illustrates what happens:

- rodAmAntēd (*rodomontide*; A is some lax vowel)
- 1 (main stress rule; the word is apparently an exception to the alternating stress rule)
 - 2 (84a.i)

Even if (84a) is a conjunctive sequence, case (ii) cannot now apply because the word cannot be matched to the structural description in any way. In particular, the second vowel is not subject to the rule because it is preceded in the word by a stressed segment.

(84b) will indeed treat certain inputs differently depending on the way it is applied. A hypothetical example will illustrate how this might happen:

- winAtætAmAgöcī (?*Wimmetatamagouchi*; A is some lax vowel)
- 1 (main stress rule)
 - 2 (84b.i)
 - 2 (84b.ii)

Both of the last two steps are taken if (84b) applies conjunctively, but the third step is omitted if (84b) applies disjunctively. To decide whether (84b) should be conjunctive or disjunctive one

would have to consider some long English word whose canonical form was similar to that of our hypothetical example. In discussing the rule (SPE, pp. 114-15), Chomsky and Halle consider only shorter words that prove nothing either way. One of these words is *Winnepesaukee*, whose stress pattern is derived as follows:

- winApAsāki (underlying form; A a lax vowel)
- 1 (main stress rule)
 - 2 (84b.i)

Even if (84b) is a conjunctive sequence, case (ii) is now inapplicable because of its structural description. Thus, in particular, the second vowel of the word cannot be touched because it is now preceded somewhere by a stressed segment.

It would seem, then, that disjunctive ordering is a principle of highly limited scope, being clearly required only by certain rules of primary accentuation. Furthermore, if we assume that all stress rules introduce either a -stress or an integer-valued stress, but never a +stress as such, then even many rules of primary stress placement cannot be applied disjunctively. For example, if we recast the Southern Paiute rule (47) so as to introduce a 1 stress instead of a +stress, we want to obtain *tuk¹wāpaiyu*, not **tuk¹wāpaiyu*. It may be a further fact that disjunctive application of a primary stress rule and weakening of previously present stresses always go together; at least this is true of the English stress rules. These considerations lead us to propose the conventions of (85).

- (85) (a) The stress feature may have the coefficient 0 as well as - and positive integers. However, no underlying representation may contain a 0 stress vowel.
 (b) The definition of subrule is revised as follows. P → Q/R-S is a subrule of G:X if and only if P → Q/R-S is subsumed under X and RPS contains no 0 stress vowel. Q, however, may contain such a vowel.
 (c) Let Q be the result of applying a rule N to the input string P. If Q contains at least one 0 stress vowel,