

**Prosodic domains for segmental processes?
Evidence from some Austronesian languages**

Kie Zuraw, UCLA

Describing a phonological process generally requires specifying the domain within which it applies; for example, “stress the last syllable of a word”, or “demote a stress when it clashes with a following stress in the same phrase”. Selkirk (1980 & ff.), Nespor & Vogel 1986, and others argued for a model of syntax-phonology interaction in which syntactic structure projects phonological domains belonging to a set hierarchy, and each phonological process refers to a specific level of that hierarchy.

This model has had much empirical success (e.g., Kaisse 1985, Inkelas 1990, Inkelas & Zec 1990, Truckenbrodt 1995, Peperkamp 1997, Hall & Kleinhenz 1999, Kager & Zonneveld 1999, Ito & Mester to appear, and many others), but has its challengers too. Bickel, Hildebrandt, and Schiering (2007) argue that the idea of the p-word (phonological word or prosodic word) as a domain for phonological processes is undermined by the widespread existence of languages in which more than one domain needs to be defined somewhere between the foot and the phonological phrase—that is, where difference processes seem to require slightly different domains. In their sample of 62 languages, the modal number of domains needed was 2, with 3 not far behind (the mode was even higher if patterns were not required to be lexically general). Raffelsiefen 1999 proposes that the p-word, at least, is a domain for prosodic phenomena only, such as syllabification, footing, and stress, and not for purely segmental phenomena, such as vowel harmony or place assimilation.

This talk aims to make an empirical contribution to the debate by reviewing phenomena with apparently word-sized domains in Palauan, Tagalog, Samoan, Malagasy, and Javanese, with attention to (i) whether each language can be characterized as having a single p-word domain, (ii) whether there are any truly segmental phenomena with the p-word as their domain, and (iii) how many phenomena alternative analyses are available for.

The phenomena to be considered are prefix allomorphy, nasal substitution (drawing on Finer 1985), and OCP phenomena (drawing on Łubowicz to appear) in Palauan; tapping (work with Kevin Ryan), vowel height, [ʔ]/∅ alternations (work with James Pannacciulli), and prefix stress in Tagalog; stress, diphthongization, and vowel coalescence in Samoan (all work with Robyn Orfitelli and Kristine Yu), as well as vowel raising in Samoan; vowel coalescence, stress, and vowel raising in Malagasy (all drawing on Albrow 2005, and also Martin 2005 for stress); and vowel alternations in Javanese (drawing on Tang to appear).

The overall conclusion will be that these languages, at least, are fairly well-behaved: their p-word domain is consistent—which, given Bickel et al.’s findings, makes them typological outliers—although often subject to frequency or lexicalization effects. And although few of the phenomena can be characterized as purely segmental, at least some can. Many of the phenomena are subject to analyses involving derivational levels or output-output correspondence—rather than a prosodic domain—but not all are.

References

- Albro, Dan. 2005. Reduplication in Optimality Theory: Computation and Analysis. UCLA dissertation.
- Bickel, B., K. Hildebrandt & R. Schiering, 2007. The Distribution of Phonological Word Domains: A Probabilistic Typology. Ms. U Leipzig.
- Finer, Dan. 1985. Reduplication and verbal morphology in Palauan. *The Linguistic Review* 6: 99-130.
- Hall, T. Alan & Ursula Kleinhenz, eds. 1999. *Studies on the Phonological Word*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Draga Zec, eds. 1990. *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon. 1990. *Prosodic Constituency in the Lexicon*. New York: Garland.
- Itô, Junko & Armin Mester. To appear. The onset of the prosodic word. In Steve Parker, ed. *Phonological Argumentation: Essays on Evidence and Motivation*. London: Equinox.
- Kager, René & Wim Zonneveld, eds. 1999. *Phrasal Phonology*. Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.
- Kaisse, Ellen. 1985. *Connected Speech: The Interaction of Syntax and Phonology*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Łubowicz, Anna. To appear. Infixation as Morpheme Absorption. In Steve Parker (ed.) *Phonological Argumentation: Essays on Evidence and Motivation*. London: Equinox.
- Martin, Andy. 2005. Loanwords as pseudo-compounds in Malagasy. In Jeffrey Heinz and Dimitris Ntelitheos (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*.
- Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Peperkamp, Sharon. 1997. *Prosodic Words*. Den Haag: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Raffelsiefen, Renate. 1999. Diagnostics for prosodic words revisited: The case of historically prefixed words in English. In T. Alan Hall & Ursula Kleinhenz (eds.) *Studies on the Phonological Word*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1980. Prosodic domains in phonology: Sanskrit revisited. In Mark Aronoff & Mary-Louise Kean (eds.) *Juncture*. Saratoga, CA: Anma Libri.
- Tang, Katrina Schack. To appear. Phonological evidence for the structure of Javanese compounds. *Proceedings of AFLA XIV*.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1995. Phonological Phrases: their relation to syntax, focus, and prominence. MIT dissertation.