

## Overview of the prosodic hierarchy

A fairly “mainstream” version of the prosodic hierarchy (see, e.g., Selkirk 1978, 1986; Nespor & Vogel 1986; Beckman & Pierrehumbert 1986; Pierrehumbert & Beckman 1988)

<i>largest category</i>		
<b>U (Utt)</b>	utterance	not too thoroughly studied as a prosodic category
<b>IP</b>	intonational phrase	most evidence is intonational (boundary tones) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• important in syntax/phonology interface</li> </ul>
<b>PhP</b>  (MaP, MiP)  (iP, AP)	phonological phrase	intonational and segmental evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• domain of phrasal stress, phrasal boundary tones</li> <li>• important in syntax/phonology interface</li> </ul> <p>Sometimes two levels are recognized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▸ major vs. minor phrase (Selkirk &amp; Tateishi 1988)</li> <li>▸ intermediate vs. accentual phrase (B&amp;P '86; P&amp;B '88)</li> </ul>
<b>PrWd</b> ( $\omega$ )	prosodic word	intonational and segmental evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• domain of word stress</li> <li>• important in prosodic morphology</li> </ul> <p>Also known as <i>phonological word</i> Related idea: <i>clitic group</i> (Hayes 1989b, Nespor &amp; Vogel 1986)</p>
<b>Ft</b> (F, $\phi$ )	foot	intonational/stress and segmental evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• domain of (secondary) stress, bounded stress</li> <li>• important in prosodic morphology</li> </ul>
$\sigma$	syllable	evidence from phonotactics, stress assignment <p>What is a syllable? “I know it when I see it...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▸ local sonority peak?</li> <li>▸ a “syndrome”? best defined phonologically?</li> </ul>
$\mu$	mora	tonal and segmental/phonotactic evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unit of syllable weight and/or segment length</li> </ul>
	segment?	does the segment belong to the prosodic hierarchy?
<i>smallest category</i>		

**Classic assumptions about the PH** (reviewed by Selkirk 1995: 443) — are any violable?

- Layeredness — No PCat dominates a PCat from a higher level in the hierarchy
- Recursivity — No PCat dominates a PCat of the same level (no “adjunction”)
- Headedness — Every PCat has a head, a PCat of the next lower level which it dominates
- Exhaustivity — Every PCat dominates only PCats of the *next* lower level (no skipping)

### **Some questions we will be pursuing in this course:**

- (1) What kinds of evidence have been used to motivate these prosodic categories?
- (2) Must there be prosodic constituents? What alternatives are there?
- (3) What can we learn about fundamental questions in phonological theory by studying phonological representations and OT constraints related to prosodic categories and their alternatives?

### **A selection of classic readings about aspects of the prosodic hierarchy**

#### ***Small prosodic categories ( $\sigma$ , $\mu$ , (Ft)) — see also reading list for Part I of course***

- Hayes, Bruce. 1989a. Compensatory lengthening in moraic phonology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 253-306.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1995. *Metrical Stress Theory: Principles and Case Studies*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1985. *A Theory of Phonological Weight*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Zec, Draga. 1988. *Sonority Constraints on Prosodic Structure*. PhD dissertation, Stanford. [New York: Garland, 1994].

#### ***Large prosodic categories (Ft and above)***

- Beckman, Mary, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 1986. Intonational structure in Japanese and English. *Phonology* 3: 255-309.
- Chen, Matthew. 1987. The syntax of Xiamen tone sandhi. *Phonology* 4: 109-149.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1989b. The prosodic hierarchy in meter. In Paul Kiparsky and Gilbert Youmans, eds., *Rhythm and Meter*. Orlando: Academic Press, 201-260.
- Inkelas, Sharon, and Draga Zec, eds. 1990. *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon, and Draga Zec. 1995. Syntax-phonology interface. In John Goldsmith, ed., *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 535-549.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1982. Prosodic domains of external sandhi rules. In Harry van der Hulst and Norval Smith, eds., *The Structure of Phonological Representations*. Dordrecht: Foris, 225-265.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1983. Prosodic structure above the word. In Anne Cutler and D. Robert Ladd, eds., *Prosody: Models and Measurements*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 123-140.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1980. *The Phonetics and Phonology of English Intonation*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet, and Mary Beckman. 1988. *Japanese Tone Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1978. On prosodic structure and its relation to syntactic structure. In T. Fretheim, ed., *Nordic Prosody II*. Trondheim: TAPIR, 111-140.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1980. Prosodic domains in phonology: Sanskrit revisited. In Mark Aronoff and Marie-Louise Kean, eds., *Juncture*. Saratoga, CA: Anma Libri, 107-29.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1986. On derived domains in sentence phonology. *Phonology* 3: 371-405.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1995. The prosodic structure of function words. In Jill N. Beckman, Laura Walsh Dickey, and Suzanne Urbanczyk, eds., *Papers in Optimality Theory*. UMOF 18. Amherst: GLSA, 439-469.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O., and Koichi Tateishi. 1988. Constraints on Minor Phrase formation in Japanese. *CLS* 24: 316-336.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1999. On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 219-255.
- Zec, Draga, and Sharon Inkelas. 1990. Prosodically constrained syntax. In Sharon Inkelas and Draga Zec, eds., *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 365-378.