### Overview

Last time we saw syntactic-edge-driven prosodic domains. This time, friendly amendments. Next time, proposals that don’t use edges, or don’t even use domains.

#### 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, a 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:

  ![Diagram](image)

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

- But what determines the p-phrase boundaries? Let’s try our parameters from last time (XP or X, L or R)

---

**To do**

- Read Pak & Friesner 2006 for this Thursday (Oct. 1). Ann Z. and Brice will present.
- Read Lloret 2004 for **next Thursday (Oct. 8)**
  - ____________________ : present Lloret’s data and analysis
  - ____________________ : present a Base-Derived Correspondence analysis of Lloret’s data (successful or not!)
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’

‘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) ‘the water’
  - `la alta torre` (fem.) ‘the high tower’

  *lexical entry for feminine definite article*

  ![el / __[N`a`]_]

- 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

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

  \[V : \rightarrow V / [ ... \_\_ ][\text{Frame } 1]\]

  - 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**

Before we hear about Kaisse’s theory of domains, there’s something else you should know about from the same book.

- Kaisse proposes that some rules simply don’t care about domains: *fast-speech rules*.
- For example, English nasalization (p. 28):
  - I sãw Nora.
  - I neither sãw nor heard him.
  - Food you eat rãw needs careful preparation.
  - The Shãh never left Egypt.
  - He chose yõu, 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:

4. **Looking forward**

• Next time, we’ll see some recursion-heavy approaches where syntactic structure is reflected more directly in the prosodic structure
• We’ll also see the proposal that some rules don’t care about prosodic structure at all

5. **A theory that relies on c-command: Kaisse 1985 (student presentations)**
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