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In this paper, the focus is on vowel epenthesis and vowel deletion in English. The first phenomenon can be observed, among other things, in loan phonology. In order to accommodate foreign word-initial clusters that do not obey the well-formedness conditions on English syllable structure, native speakers may either break up the cluster through the deletion of the initial consonant or, alternatively, through vowel epenthesis as in, for instance, *Gdansk [gadęnsk] ~ [daęnsk] or they may preserve the cluster pronouncing *Gdansk as [gdęnsk].

With respect to vowel elision, a distinction is generally made between pre-stress vowel dropping (e.g. *parade ~ [‘preid]) and post-stress vowel deletion (e.g. *memory ~ [‘memr]). A further distinction that needs to be made (cf. Hooper (1978) depends on whether or not the elision of the vowel is complete, given that in many cases two alternative pronunciations are possible: one in which, after vowel dropping the initial sequences in police and please, for instance, become completely homophonous and one in which they do not (that is in which /l/ in police is not devoiced as it is in please). Here the devoicing of /l/ (and the lack of it) may serve to differentiate the two cases. Within an OT framework, Kager (1997) refers to these two possibilities as categorical versus gradient vowel deletion.

Our goal in this paper is twofold. The first one is more descriptive: providing an OT-analysis of the above cases of English vowel epenthesis and deletion. The second is more theory-internal. Kager’s (1997) distinction between gradient and complete deletion appears, contrary to fact, to predict that the latter is not possible in words like potato or together, but only instances such as police or parade. This is so because complete deletion destroys the syllabicry of the vowel and creates ill-formed onsets predicted to be governed by phonotactic considerations. Given that [pl] and [pr] are permissible onset clusters, but [tg] is not, schwa deletion in together cannot be categorical. Furthermore, the co-existence of vowel elision, by which Canadian [kaneidian] is realized as [‘kneidian], and vowel insertion, by which /kn/ in Knesset is broken up by an epenthetic vowel, leads, from an OT-perspective, to opacity. We will discuss this issue and the various ways OT offers to account for it.