Hidden compounds in English

Darin Flynn, University of Calgary

Plag et al. (2011) report that primary and secondary stress syllables are differentiated solely by pitch accents in English: left-prominent words such as *víolàte* and *níghtingàle* receive one pitch accent, whereas right-prominent words such as *vìolátion* and *kàngaróo* receive two accents – a prenuclear accent on the first stressed syllable and a nuclear accent on the second stressed syllable. Plag et al. observe that the same pattern is reported for compounds: left-prominent compounds such as *ý-rày* and *ápple càke* receive one pitch accent, whereas right-prominent compounds such as *èx-Ráy* and *àpple píe* are doubly-accented (Kunter 2010; see also Farnetani et al. 1988). They conclude, "one could even claim that, phonologically, the difference between primary and secondary stress in accented words is the same as that in compounds" (p. 372).

This claim, which was first made by Vanderslice and Ladefoged (1972) and most recently by Gussenhoven (to appear), raises the possibility that certain words with primary and secondary stress syllables are better understood as (pseudo) compounds. For instance, (1) and (2) illustrate a large class of words assumed to be single phonological words (PW) in spite of having medial unstressed syllables which behave allophonically as if they are PW-initial — Withgott's (1982) paradox.

(1)	*Máni*[tʰ]*owòc*	*Pélo*[pʰ]*onnèse*	(2)	*Mèdi*[tʰ]*erranéan*	*Wînne*[pʰ]*esáukee*
	Póco[tʰ]*opàug*	*Álla*[h]*abàd*		*àbra*[kʰ]*adábra*	*mùja*[h]*idéen*

This paradox disappears if these words are in fact phonological compounds, i.e. Composite Groups (CG) in Vogel's (2009) terms: [[*Máni*]$_{PW}$[*towòc*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$, [[*Mèdi*]$_{PW}$[*terránean*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$, etc.

I assume that the words in (1–2) are broken up in this way in order to avoid PW-internal stress lapses: *[*Mánitowòc*]$_{PW}$, *[*Mèditerránean*]$_{PW}$, etc. English phonology is much more tolerant of adjacent unstressed syllables at levels above PW (Selkirk 1996:195), e.g., [*a* [*balóney*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$ vs. *[*abalóne*]$_{PW}$ (cf. [*àbalóne*]$_{PW}$). In optimality-theoretic terms: *LAPSE/PW ≫ *LAPSE/CG (Gordon 2002:502; Alber 2005:500; cf. Selkirk's 1984 'Anti-Lapse Filter').

Crucially, "the Composite Group, which includes constructions with clitics as well as compounds" (Vogel 2009:41) is independently motivated (Nespor & Vogel 1986; Hayes 1989:207–211, 237ff. et seq.) and its constituency is on hand to facilitate the break up of words like (1–2) – so much so that phonologists complain of "the frequent overlap of the CG with the PW" (Vogel 2009:18).

My presentation will highlight other advantages to analyzing (1–2) as complex CGs. Notably, my analysis resolves the intractable "*Luxipalilla* problem" (Pater 2000:269; Collie 2007:319–326) – why can't *Luxipalilla*, *Hardecanute*, etc. be footed *[(*Lùx*)(*ìpa*)(*lílla*)], *[(*Hàr*)(*dèca*)(*núte*)]? My answer is that a CG-internal PW-boundary intervenes in such cases: [[*Lùxi*]$_{PW}$[*palílla*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$, [[*Hàrde*]$_{PW}$[*canúte*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$. (Observe the PW-initial allophony here, too: …[pʰ]*alílla*, …[kʰ]*anúte*.)

Finally, I present independent evidence for complex CGs in English words. For instance, the allophony of words like *càpi*[ɾ]*alístic* suggests that a PW-final lapse may carry over into a related word — a paradigmatic uniformity (PU) effect: [*cápital*]$_{PW}$ → [[*càpita*]$_{PW}$[*lístic*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$; cf. [tʰ], not [ɾ], in [[*mìli*]$_{PW}$[*tarístic*]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$. To make sense of this effect without complex CGs, Davis (2005) is forced to posit extraordinary metrical feet: a ternary foot carries over from [(*cápital*)$_{Ft}$]$_{PW}$ in the case of [(*càpita*)$_{Ft}$(*lístic*)$_{Ft}$]$_{PW}$, whereas [(*mìli*)$_{Ft}$(*ta*(*rístic*)$_{Ft}$)$_{Ft'}$]$_{PW}$ involves a recursive superfoot. No such feet are needed if [(*cápi*)$_{Ft}$*tal*]$_{PW}$ carries over into [[(*càpi*)$_{Ft}$*ta*]$_{PW}$[(*lístic*)$_{Ft}$]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$ — a PU effect — whereas [[(*mìli*)$_{Ft}$]$_{PW}$[*ta*(*rístic*)$_{Ft}$]$_{PW}$]$_{CG}$ follows the PW-lapse-avoiding pattern in (1–2).

References:

Alber, Birgit. 2005. Clash, lapse and directionality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23(3). 485–542. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-004-0482-1

Collie, Sarah. 2007. *English stress preservation and Stratal Optimality Theory*. Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh dissertation

Davis, Stuart. 2005. *Capitalistic* v. *militaristic*: the paradigm uniformity effect reconsidered. In Laura J. Downing, T. A. Hall & Renate Raffelsiefen (eds.), *Paradigms in phonological theory*, 107–121. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267712.003.0005

Farnetani, Edda, Carol Taylor Torsello & Piero Cosi. 1988. English compound versus non-compound noun phrases in discourse: an acoustic and perceptual study. *Language and Speech* 31(2). 157–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/002383098803100204

Gordon, Matthew. 2002. A factorial typology of quantity-insensitive stress. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20(3). 491–552. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015810531699

Gussenhoven, Carlos. to appear. Just how metrical is the Autosegmental-Metrical model? Evidence from sentential pitch accents in Nubi, Persian,and English. In Haruo Kubozono, Junko Ito & Armin Mester (eds.), *Prosody and prosodic interfaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hayes, Bruce. 1989. The prosodic hierarchy in meter. In Paul Kiparsky & Gilbert Youmans (eds.), *Rhythm and meter*, 201–260. Orlando, FL: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/C2013-0-07406-3

Kunter, Gero. 2010. *Compound stress in English: The phonetics and phonology of prosodic prominence*. Tuebingen: Niemeyer. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110254709

Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.

Pater, Joe. 2000. Non-uniformity in English secondary stress: the role of ranked and lexically specific constraints. *Phonology* 17(2). 237–274. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952675700003900

Plag, Ingo, Gero Kunter & Mareile Schramm. 2011. Acoustic correlates of primary and secondary stress in North American English. *Journal of Phonetics* 39(3). 362–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2011.03.004

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: the relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1996. The prosodic structure of function words. In James L. Morgan & Katherine Demuth (eds.), *Signal to syntax: Bootstrapping from speech to grammar in early acquisition*, 187–214. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315806822

Vanderslice, Ralph & Peter Ladefoged. 1972. Binary suprasegmental features and transformational word-accentuation rules. *Language* 48(4). 819-838. https://doi.org/10.2307/411990

Vogel, Irene. 2009. The status of the Clitic Group. In Janet Grijzenhout & Barış Kabak (eds.), *Phonological domains: universals and deviations*, 15–46. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110217100.1.15

Withgott, Mary Margaret. 1982. *Segmental evidence for phonological constituents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas dissertation