

Class 14: Upward interfaces: phonology and syntax II

To do


- last homework, phrasal phonology, posted Friday, due March 9
- project: abstract due next week

Overview: Mostly we work on rest of handout from last time, then (this handout) more about alternatives to the edge-driven view.

1 Truckenbrodt 1999: WRAP-XP

- Tohono O’odham example (Uto-Aztecan, Mexico & USA, 14,000 speakers; Ethnologue & Gordon 2005), based on discussion in Truckenbrodt 2007
- How do you diagnose a p-phrase?
 - H tone from first word stress to last word stress of the p-phrase
 - L tone elsewhere
 - Except, 1 p-phrase must end with L tone even if attached to a stressed syllable (in T’s example, result is a falling tone on a long vowel)
 - We can imagine rules or constraints to enforce this pattern
- ? Take a minute to convince yourself that the tones are correct:

Truckenbrodt 2007, p. 439
 TP means “tone phrase”,
 which he takes to be the p-phrase.



? But what determines the p-phrase boundaries? Let’s try ALIGN...

- Truckenbrodt proposes WRAP-XP: “For each [lexical-projection] XP there must be a p-phrase that contains the XP” (p. 439)
- ⊗ Let’s try a tableau—remember, the IP doesn’t count as an XP for WRAP-XP.

- ⊗ If time, let’s also try this Catalan example from Prieto 2005. (P-phrase boundaries were diagnosed in Prieto’s corpus of speech by intonation criteria.)

Data

([Comprava [mapes]_{NP}]_{VP}) ϕ
 ‘I used to buy maps’

([Comprava] ϕ ([mapes [de Barcelona]_{PP}]_{NP}]_{VP}) ϕ
 ‘I used to buy maps of Barcelona’

([Comprava [mapes] ϕ ([de [la Barcelona antiga]_{AP}]_{PP}]_{NP}]_{VP}) ϕ
 ‘I used to buy maps of old Barcelona’

Constraints to rank—hint: first see if any of them is never violated

- WRAP-XP
- ALIGN(XP, __; P-phrase, __)
- MAX-BIN-End: the final p-phrase of the utterance [more precisely, the p-phrase bearing the main stress of the utterance] contains at most two p-words

2 Hayes 1990: precompiled phrasal phonology

- Proposes that alongside the normal operation of domains, there are some phrasal rules that operate more lexically.
- Start with something uncontroversial, such as syntax-sensitive allomorphy—example from Spanish (p. 93)

la torre (feminine)	‘the tower’
el agua (feminine, but starts with stressed [a])	‘the water’
la alta torre (fem., starts w/ stressed [a], but adj.)	‘the high tower’

lexical entry for feminine definite article

$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{el} / \text{___}[_N \text{ 'a}] \\ \text{la} \end{array} \right]$

- Expand the idea: allow “whole classes of words to acquire precompiled alternants” (p. 93)
- Example from Hausa: verb-final V shortens when followed by non-pronoun NP complement.
 - Hayes defines a “frame”, then has a lexical rule that refers to it

Frame 1 = $[_{VP} \text{ ___ NP } \dots]$ (NP \neq pronoun)

V: $\rightarrow V / [\dots \text{ ___ }]_{\text{[Frame 1]}}$

- Ideally, we’d see languages where multiple rules refer to the same frame
- Q: How is this different from just allowing phonological rules/constraints to refer to as much syntax as they want (rather than using domains as a bottleneck at the interface)?
 - A: These precompiled rules are lexical rules, which means they...
 - have to precede any postlexical rules
 - can’t introduce anything not in the phoneme inventory (“structure preservation”)
 - shouldn’t care about pauses and speaking rate

3 Kaisse 1985: fast-speech rules


- Kaisse proposes that some rules simply don’t care about domains: *fast-speech rules*.
- For example, English nasalization (p. 28):

I s̃aw Nora.
 I neither s̃aw nor heard him.
 Food you eat r̃aw needs careful preparation.
 The Shāh never left Egypt.
 He chose yōu, no doubt.

? What might Selkirk say about a rule like this?

- Kaisse claims that unlike rules that just happen to have large domains, fast-speech rules...
 - are sensitive to speech rate (rather than register)
 - are blocked by pauses (unlike, say, French liaison)

- The post-lexical component then has to be expanded:



(p. 20)

If time, four more models...

4 Zec & Inkelas 1990: arboreal mapping—this one already doesn’t use edges

- Hausa example (Afro-Asiatic; Nigeria, Niger, Burkina Faso & more; 25 million speakers plus many millions of L2 speakers; Ethnologue & Gordon 2005)
- Emphatic particle *fa* cliticizes to end of p-phrase (p. 369):

(Audu **fa**)φ (ya tafi)φ ‘Audu left’
 Audu fa he leave

(Ya sayi **fa**)φ (babban tebur)φ ‘He bought a big table’
 he bought fa big table

*Ya sayi **fa** teburin unless *teburin* is “intonationally emphasized” [i.e., focus?]
 he bought fa table

? Ideas for what rules out the last one?

? Whatever we came up with probably won’t explain why this is ruled out too:

*Ya sayi **fa** teburin jiya
 he bought fa table yesterday


- Z&I argue that it’s all about *branchingness* (algorithm from p. 370, originally from Inkelas 1988)
 - intonationally emphasized item gets its own p-phrase
 - “from the bottom up”, a branching node gets its own p-phrase
 - a p-phrase can’t contain an XP boundary unless it includes all the material from each XP

? Let’s apply it to the four sentences above

- Inkelas & Zec 1995 acknowledge that this approach doesn’t work well for all languages (“cases in which branchingness is not relevant for phrasing”, p. 542). Moreover, the algorithm above was specific to Hausa.
 - To me, this suggests an OT translation

5 Wagner 2005: relational domains

- Main idea: syntactic relations matter, rather than edges (Chen 1990 is an important precursor)
- No different labels for domains (p-phrase, intonational phrase, etc.)
- Rather, domains are just bigger or smaller—result is a grid whose rows don’t have labels, like so:




(p. 190)

- The lines are a way of representing bracketing, i.e.
 - (x)(x x)(x x x x) 3 big constituents
 - (x)(x)(x)(x)(x x x) 5 smaller ones
 - (x)(x)(x)(x)(x)(x x) 6 even smaller ones
 - (x)(x)(x)(x)(x)(x)(x) 7 of the smallest ones

A or B or C and D

? Just for practice, draw the prosodic tree.




- The above is for the phrase *A or B or (C and D)*. Syntactically:
- How do we get from the syntactic tree to the prosodic tree?
 - Build a prosodic constituent for each syntactic cycle
 - An “associative domain” (series of *ors*, series of *ands*) is a cycle
 - Thus, *(C and D)* is a cycle
 - *A or B or (C and D)* is another cycle
 - Here’s how structure-building works within a single cycle

start




First merge



Second merge




Spell-out: adds a new grid line



(pp. 74-75)

- Adding A to an already-spelled-out cycle B C:



(p. ?), then fill in space at bottom of column, then add another row on top at the end of the cycle

- The result (I think this is a result, and not an additional principle), is...
 “Scopally Determined Boundary Rank (SBR):
 If Boundary Rank at a given level of embedding is n , the rank of the boundaries between constituents of the next higher level is $n+1$ ” (p. 109)
- For example (p. 163—numbers on the right indicate boundary rank):

	A	B	C	D
1 A or B or C or D	1	1	1	
2 A or (B and C) or D	2	1	2	
3 A or B or (C and D)	2	2	1	
4 (A and B) or C or D	1	2	2	
5 (A and B) or (C or D)	1	2	1	
6 (A and B and C) or D	1	1	2	
7 A or (B and C and D)	2	1	1	
8 ((A or B) and C) or D	1	2	3	
9 (A and (B or C)) or D	2	1	3	
10 A or ((B or C) and D)	3	1	2	
11 A or (B and (C or D))	3	2	1	


Note the non-local effects: compare A-B boundaries in #7 and #11

6 Kentner & Féry 2013: Proximity/Similarity model

- Proximity: weaken prosodic boundary after a terminal x if (1) x is not a child of the root node and (2) x is followed by a sister that either is a terminal or dominates a terminal
- Anti-proximity: strengthen boundary after x if the following terminal y is not x 's sister (p. 282)
- Similarity: strengthen boundary after x if it has a complex sister


- ? Let's try it on these items (German). K&F assume ternary branching for the first one.
- (9) 3.1 N1 N2 N3 *Nino oder Willi oder Mila*
 - 3.2 (N1 N2) N3 *(Nino und Willi) oder Mila*
 - 3.3 N1 (N2 N3) *Nino oder (Willi und Mila)* (p. 284)

- Production study, looking at duration and pitch:



(p. 288)


- An example where this makes different predictions from Wagner's SBR:
 - N1 or N2 or (N3 and N4)
 - We've already seen what the SBR predicts (first boundary = second boundary > third boundary). How about Similarity/Proximity?
 - Here are the results—is there a clear winner? (note that both theories predict all three boundaries are of equal strength for condition 4.1, so we can use that as a baseline to compare 4.2 to)



(p. 290)


7 Elfner 2015: direct mapping of syntactic constituency to phonological constituency

- Connemara Irish: p-phrase begins with LH, ends with HL



(p. 6)

- Every p-phrase ends with HL
- ...but it begins with LH only if that p-phrase dominates another p-phrase



(p. 10)

- Wait, what? A p-phrase dominating another p-phrase?
 - Selkirk (1984) originally proposed the Strict Layer Hypothesis, which includes the requirement that no prosodic category can dominate a node of the same category
 - On the cusp of OT, Ito & Mester (1992) proposed exploding this into a number of violable constraints
 - So, a p-phrase that dominates another p-phrase violates NORECURSION (Selkirk 1996), but depending on that constraint's ranking, that could be OK.
 - MATCH-PHRASE: For every XP, there must be a p-phrase that dominates all and only that XP's terminal nodes (pp. 9-10)
 - BINARY-MINIMUM(ϕ): a p-phrase must dominate at least two p-words (p. 12)
- 🔍 Let's check the example above.
- This is in line with a proposal by Ito & Mester (2006, and some later papers): the grammar can refer to the lowest in a recursive chain of p-phrases (or any category), or the highest.
 - Those would be minimal and maximal p-phrases
 - In this case, the grammar needs to refer to _____.
- 🔍 Elfner gives tableaux to show that a theory with ALIGN and WRAP can't rule out (V (DP) (DP))—let's try it.

To sum up this week

- We've seen quite an array of proposals for how prosodic domains could be derived.
- Note that some of our domains have what we think of as prosodic signatures
 - final lengthening, postlexical tones
- But others are posited only to serve as domains of segmental rules
- Ideally, a few segmental rules will line up with each intonational domain, and with each non-intonational domain too
- Worst-case scenario: different rules require contradictory domains!

Next week: "sideways" interfaces

- Phonology vs. the lexicon
- Phonology vs. processing

References

- Chen, Matthew. 1990. What must phonology know about syntax. In Sharon Inkelas & Draga Zec (eds.), *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*, 19–46. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elfner, Emily. 2015. Recursion in prosodic phrasing: evidence from Connemara Irish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. 1–40. doi:10.1007/s11049-014-9281-5.
- Ethnologue & Raymond G. Gordon. 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Fifteenth edition.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1990. Precompiled phrasal phonology. In Sharon Inkelas & Draga Zec (eds.), *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*, 85–108. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon. 1988. Prosodic effects on syntax: Hausa fa. In Hagit Borer (ed.), *The Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 7*, 375–388. Stanford: Stanford Linguistic Association.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Draga Zec. 1995. Syntax-phonology interface. In John A Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 535–549. Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Ito, Junko & Armin Mester. 1992. *Weak layering and word binarity*. Santa Cruz, CA.
- Ito, Junko & Armin Mester. 2006. Prosodic adjunction in Japanese compounds. *Proceedings of FAJL 4*. Osaka: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1985. *Connected Speech: The Interaction of Syntax and Phonology*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Kentner, Gerrit & Caroline Féry. 2013. A new approach to prosodic grouping. *The Linguistic Review* 30(2). 277–311.
- Prieto, Pilar. 2005. Syntactic and eurhythmic constraints on phrasing decisions in Catalan*. *Studia Linguistica* 59(2–3). 194–222. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9582.2005.00126.x.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1996. The prosodic structure of function words. In James L Morgan, Katherine Demuth, James L Morgan & Katherine Demuth (eds.), *Signal to Syntax: Bootstrapping from Speech to Grammar in Early Acquisition*, 187–214. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1999. On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 219–256.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2007. The syntax-phonology interface. In Paul de Lacy (ed.), *The handbook of phonology*, 435–456. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, Michael. 2005. Prosody and recursion. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Zec, Draga & Sharon Inkelas. 1990. Prosodically constrained syntax. In Sharon Inkelas & Draga Zec (eds.), *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*, 365–378. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.