

*Word-prosodic typology**

Larry M. Hyman

University of California, Berkeley

Numerous proposals have been advanced as to how prosodic systems should be typologised. In this paper I distinguish two prototype systems, tone and stress accent, which, unlike systems analysed as ‘pitch accent’, have two inviolable, definitional properties: (i) obligatoriness (every word has at least one stress accent); (ii) syllable-dependency (the stress-bearing unit is necessarily the syllable). In contrast, the oft-cited criterion of culminativity (every word has at most one tone/accents) not only includes tone/accents systems that are neither obligatory nor syllable-dependent, but also culminative non-prosodic features that are clearly not accentual. I argue that there is no one pitch-accent prototype. Instead, since tone and stress accent may co-occur, and since languages may ‘pick and choose’ between the non-definitional properties that tend to cluster within the tone *vs.* stress-accent prototypes, there is a range of intermediate (and possibly indeterminate) word-prosodic systems which may or may not be best seen as ‘types’.

If stress is monarchic, and length oligarchic, we
may say that tone is democratic.

(Greenberg & Kaschube 1976: 9)

1 Introduction

Over the past several decades, many linguists have made pronouncements on how prosodic systems should be typologised. While no other area of phonological typology has attracted as much attention, it is not clear how much consensus there is on where things currently stand. Linguists sometimes speak or write on the subject with great conviction, but the views that are expressed often conflict on both general and specific issues, e.g. whether all human languages must have ‘stress’, whether the prosodic system of Tokyo Japanese is ‘tonal’ *vs.* ‘accentual’, and so forth. In this paper I attempt to sort out some of the complexities of word-prosodic typology. I begin in §2 with a brief discussion of problems inherent in doing typology, particularly when applied to phonology. In the next two sections I give brief definitions of tone (§3) and stress accent (§4), followed

* This paper was first presented as an invited talk at the conference *Between Stress and Tone* (BeST). I would like to thank Bert Remijsen and Vincent van Heuven for the invitation and those in attendance for their helpful comments. I have particularly profited from extended discussions with Carlos Gussenhoven and José Hualde on the tone *vs.* accent question and good Bantu exchanges with David Odden and Gérard Philippson. I also would like to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their very thoughtful comments on the original manuscript.

by a longer section (§5) which addresses the more problematic notions of ‘accent’ and ‘pitch accent’. I argue that the highest-level typological cut consists of identifying two prototypes, one with stress accent, the other with tone. While it is possible to define these prototypes and establish a set of properties that typically co-occur in each, establishing a third pitch-accent prototype is more elusive. This is, in part, because languages which have been identified as pitch accent freely ‘pick and choose’ between the prototypical properties of stress-accent systems *vs.* tone systems. In other words, there are many intermediate word-prosodic systems which are not best seen as discrete types. While most of the discussion centres around typological issues resulting from structural or systemic difference, §6 addresses the role of phonetics in typologising prosodic systems. §7 provides a brief conclusion.

2 Typology

Since the concern of this study is to address the typology of word-prosodic systems, it seems appropriate to begin by asking the questions: What is typology? Phonological typology? Word-prosodic typology? Concerning the first question, Hagège (1992: 7) provides a traditional definition of typology as ‘a principled way of classifying the languages of the world by the most significant properties which distinguish one from another’. Vajda (2001) answers the second question in a similar fashion: ‘it is possible to classify languages according to the phonemes they contain ... typology is the study of structural features across languages. Phonological typology involves comparing languages according to the number or type of sounds they contain’. It is significant that the above definitions speak of classifying *languages* rather than subsystems of languages. In any case, only certain parameters impress linguists enough to establish language types: within phonology, there is a class of ‘click languages’, but not ‘implosive languages’, ‘open syllable languages’, but not ‘onset languages’ (meaning that every syllable has to have an onset). The question is whether there is any reality in classifying languages rather than analysing the properties of the relevant subsystems. This issue is particularly pronounced in the area of prosody, where the practice of distinguishing ‘stress languages’ from ‘tone languages’ is well established and has encouraged some to propose additional types: ‘pitch-accent language’, ‘restrictive tone language’ and so forth. However, as Greenberg (1974: 14) notes, ‘the same data can be utilized either for a typology of linguistic properties or a typology of individual languages’. A major aim of this study is to show that there is considerably more diversity in prosodic systems than such labels have thus far distinguished.

Most phonologists would probably agree that there is little, if any, difference between doing phonological typology and doing phonological theory. At the very least, it is unlikely that one can do insightful typology without addressing the same analytical issues that confront phonological

theory. In order to appreciate the complexity involved in doing proper typology, consider the question of what phonologists might seek to typologise. There are at least three dimensions to this issue:

(i) What are the properties to be typologised? Segments? Systems? Rules?

(ii) At what level should the properties be typologised? Underlying (morphophonemic)? Lexical (phonemic)? Surface (phonetic)?

(iii) Within what domain should the properties be typologised? The morpheme? Word? Phrase?

For many phonological properties, one will obtain quite different results depending on the answers to the above questions. In some languages, word-level prosody is predictable by rule (e.g. demarcative stress, morphological tone) and hence is not present in underlying representations (URs). In other languages, the prosodic properties are introduced only at the phrase level.

In this study I take the following approach to the above three questions:

(i) The properties to be typologised are linguistic systems. Since there is considerable room for interpretation, care must be taken to distinguish the descriptive 'facts' of linguistic systems from the analyses that attempt to account for them. On the other hand, a simple inventory is not a linguistic system.


(ii) Linguistic systems necessarily capture the relationship between underlying, lexical and phonetic representations. However, this study is primarily concerned with properties which are present at the lexical level, whether from URs or introduced by rule.

(iii) As seen in the title, this study is limited to prosodic properties which hold within the word domain *vs.* properties which make reference to the phrase or utterance levels.


Among the frequent assumptions underlying past attempts at phonological typology are: (i) EXHAUSTIVITY: all systems can be assigned to a type; (ii) UNIQUENESS: no system can be assigned to two types; (iii) DISCRETENESS: types do not overlap. By these criteria we arrive at the classic bi- and trifurcation of prosodic types in (1a, b).

(1) *Classic bi- and trifurcation of prosodic types*


a.



b.



c.



In (1a), prosodic systems are identified as either stress accent (SA) or tone (T), while (1b) allows a third category, pitch accent (PA). As indicated by the asterisk, the above assumptions do not condone (1c), where PA belongs simultaneously to two different types, the first with SA, the second with T.

As attractive as they are, all three assumptions are problematic. First, despite the discreteness of the putative types (SA, PA, T), prosodic systems may be ambiguous, i.e. analytically indeterminate. In languages such as Kinga (Schadeberg 1973) and Nubi (Gussenhoven 2006), every word must have one and only one high tone. Should such systems be categorised as 'restricted' T, as PA or as SA, where stress would be realised simply as H pitch? All three interpretations seem reasonable, perhaps not only to linguists but also to the native speakers. Given this indeterminacy, it may be that such languages provide the transitional 'pivot' for change from one type of system to another (cf. Salmons 1992, Gussenhoven 2006).

Besides ambiguity, a second issue is that prosodic systems may be mixed. In Saramaccan (Good 2004), in one class of words a single syllable is marked /H/, the remaining syllables being underlyingly toneless. On the other hand, in a second class of words, all syllables must be specified for tone (all H, all L or combinations of H and L). While Saramaccan has a stratified lexicon, which Good analyses as PA *vs.* T, the same words may have both properties in Cherokee. As analysed by Johnson (2005), a Cherokee word may or may not have a single L*H pitch accent. Whether or not it does, a non-accented syllable may also have a contrastive H or L tone. While Saramaccan and Cherokee combine PA and T, other languages combine SA and T (see §5). Whatever its usefulness, the three-way distinction between SA, PA and T cannot therefore be a discrete, non-overlapping one.¹

A final word before addressing SA, PA and T in more detail. The above discussion assumes that word-prosodic typology is limited to this trichotomy, or the properties it encodes. We have however not explicitly addressed the question of what counts as word prosody. Words are not only characterised by the classic three suprasegmentals of tone, length and stress (Lehiste 1970, Greenberg & Kaschube 1976), but also by various kinds of harmonies and quantitative/qualitative distributional constraints concerning minimum/maximum mora/syllable count, initial *vs.* final position restrictions, C/V combinatorics and so forth. If word-prosodic typology were to take all of these issues into account as well, the result would be an explosion of disparate prosodic word types, as indicated in (2).

¹ Another kind of mixed system has been occasionally proposed, based on different levels of representation. Although subject to other interpretations, McCawley (1978: 126) suggests that Luganda 'can be described as having a pitch-accent system in its deep phonology and a tonal system in its surface phonology'.

(2) *Different kinds of prosodic word?*

- a. *The demarcative word*
A property marks the beginning or end of the word.
- b. *The culminative word*
A property occurs only once per word.
- c. *The harmonic word*
A property is realised throughout the word.
- d. *The metrical word*
A word consists of hierarchically arrayed moras or syllables.
- e. *The minimum word*
A word must consist of a minimum number of moras or syllables.
- f. *The maximum word*
A word can consist of a maximum number of moras or syllables.
- g. *The phonotactic word*
A word permits only certain output segments/sequences.
- h. *The morphophonotactic word*
A word permits only certain input segments/sequences.

Beyond practicality there are legitimate reasons to group tone, length and stress together. First, there is the intuitive recognition of all three as overlaid suprasegmentals (Lehiste 1970), whose phonetic variations (F0, duration, intensity) can be realised not only in spoken language, but also on a musical instrument. Second, these three phonetic properties frequently interact, e.g. in the realisation of stress and intonation. Finally, tone, length and stress also share functional similarities, e.g. culminativity and rhythmic alternations.

For the above reasons, the present study on word-prosodic systems will be limited to T, SA and PA, and their manipulation of F0, duration and intensity. In the following sections, tone, stress and (pitch) accent are taken up in turn.

3 Tone

In order to establish prosodic types in a reasonably objective way, it is necessary to provide definitions for tone, stress and accent. I will assume the following as a working definition of tone (Hyman 2001a: 1367, slightly modified from Welmers 1959, 1973):

- (3) A language with tone is one in which an indication of pitch enters into the lexical realisation of at least some morphemes.

As indicated, the domain of tone is the morpheme. Depending on the language, morphemes with tone may be all, many or few. They can be

lexical or grammatical morphemes, including tonal morphemes which lack a segmental content. According to (3), the presence of tone is established on the basis of lexical realisation, i.e. the output of the lexical phonology. Tone may thus either be present in URs or be introduced by rule. If this latter occurs at the lexical level, rather than postlexically, this would count as tone by the above definition.

Tone is featural and paradigmatic: in a prototypical tone system such as Cantonese or Yoruba, one IDENTIFIES the tone of each tone-bearing unit (TBU). In other words, tone has a ‘distinctive function’ (Martinet 1960). The tone system may consist of a simple binary opposition, e.g. /H, L/, or involve more levels, contour tones and specific tones accompanied by phonation types (glottalisation, breathiness, etc.).

The definition in (3) refers to ‘an indication of pitch’ rather than pitch itself. This is intentional, and is designed to extract away from analytic preferences. For example, it was mentioned in §2 that Kinga and Nubi require exactly one H tone per lexical word. The question was also raised as to whether these systems should be thought of as SA, PA or T. They could thus be analysed with a /H/ tonal feature or an abstract accent, which could be said to be realised as [H] by a postlexical pitch-assignment rule. However, since only pitch is involved, it is clear that the abstract accent is nothing but ‘an indication of pitch’. By (3), Kinga and Nubi are tonal.

The question that is relevant in this context is whether we want to typologise according to the properties of prosodic systems or according to the analyses given to them by diverse linguists. This issue has arisen in a number of cases, the most prominent of which concerns Tokyo Japanese. As seen in (4), Tokyo Japanese has been analysed both accentually and tonally (Haraguchi 1977, McCawley 1978, Poser 1984, Pierrehumbert & Beckman 1988, etc.):

(4) <i>accentual</i>	maṽkura ga	kokoṽro ga	atamaṽ ga	sakana ga
<i>tonal</i>	makura ga	kokoro ga	atama ga	sakana ga
	H	H	H	
<i>output</i>	mákùrà gà	kókòrò gà	átámá gà	sákáná gà
<i>output</i>	mákùrà gà	kòkòrò gà	àtámá gà	sàkáná gà
<i>with %L</i>	‘pillow+NOM’	‘heart+NOM’	‘head+NOM’	‘fish+NOM’

In the accentual account in the first row, the mark ṽ indicates where a drop occurs between H and L. (Others have used a tick mark or asterisk.) The tonal analysis in the second row starts with a /H/ prelinked to the mora that precedes the pitch drop. The third and fourth rows show that moras following the accent or /H/ are L, while the remaining moras are H, except where an initial %L boundary tone affects the first mora.

A final note concerning the notion of ‘word tone’ (Donohue 1997, Mazaudon 2005). In the definition in (3) tone is identified with the

morpheme, and nothing is said about the TBU, which can be the syllable or the mora. In Tamang, Kukuya and a number of other languages, there is a fixed number of word- (or stem-) tone patterns independent of the number of syllables or moras (cf. the discussion of Skou in §5). For such systems it is sometimes suggested that the word takes precedence over the morpheme, or is even the TBU, rather than the domain determining the tone (cf. Garde's 1968: 12–13 distinction between '*unité accentuable*' and '*unité accentuelle*' applied to stress systems). Like Tokyo Japanese, there is a sense in which such languages diverge from what I have called prototypical tone systems. As in the case of vowel-harmony systems, such tone systems have a syntagmatic dimension which is lacking in Cantonese, Yoruba, etc., where tone contrasts paradigmatically on syllables.

4 Stress

Whereas tone has to do with pitch features, the general approach to stress has been that it has to do with metrical PROMINENCE. The definition I would propose for stress accent is given in (5).

- (5) A language with stress accent is one in which there is an indication of word-level metrical structure meeting the following two central criteria:
- a. OBLIGATORINESS: every lexical word has *at least* one syllable marked for the highest degree of metrical prominence (primary stress);
 - b. CULMINATIVITY: every lexical word has *at most* one syllable marked for the highest degree of metrical prominence.

In many characterisations of SA, the phrase 'one and only one' primary stress is used: 'every prosodic word contains one and only one head foot, which is the locus of main stress. The existence and uniqueness of the head foot are usually taken to be axiomatic – universal properties of GEN rather than violable constraints' (McCarthy 2003: 110). As indicated in (5), it is however fruitful to separate the phrase into two properties: obligatoriness and culminativity. Obligatoriness states that every lexical word has to have a primary stress. Although there is variation in the use of the term in the literature, culminativity is intended here to mean that a lexical word cannot have more than one primary stress.

In contrast to tone, which is featural and paradigmatic, stress is structural and syntagmatic. Prototypical tone has a distinctive function, while stress accent has a CONTRASTIVE function (Martinet 1960), even where minimal pairs are possible. Whereas one IDENTIFIES the T of each TBU, one LOCATES stress within the lexical word domain.

Of the two criteria in (5), obligatoriness is the more important. It is an absolute universal – DEFINITIONAL – of a SA system, which requires that an obligatorily headed metrical constituent be built at the word level. Rather than HEAD(PWd), 'which says that each phonological word must have a unique head and therefore exactly one accent' (McCarthy

2002: 78), and which thereby conflates obligatoriness and culminativity, I shall borrow from optimality syntax and refer to obligatoriness as OBLIGATORYHEAD (OBLHEAD).

Because of obligatoriness, no language fails to assign metrical stress to a word for lack of a specific phonological property. Thus OBLHEAD rules out stress systems such as the following:²

- (6) a. Stress the penultimate syllable; monosyllabic words are stressless.
- b. Stress the last heavy syllable; words that lack a heavy syllable are stressless.³
- c. Stress the initial syllable if it has an onset; words beginning with a vowel are stressless.
- d. Stress the leftmost syllable with /a/, otherwise stress the leftmost syllable containing /e/ or /o/; words with only /i/ or /u/ are stressless.
- e. Stress the last H tone; words lacking a H tone are stressless

What's wrong with the above systems is that they do not exercise default stress assignment in case stress-attracting phonological properties are lacking. Except for this property, (6a–e) would seem to be *a priori* reasonable, if not also grounded: stress is often avoided on light syllables, so why not on a word that consists solely of light syllables?

In fact, the above systems might be argued to be less 'crazy' than what we actually do find in the interaction between stress and phonological properties. In *Tukang Besi*, under appropriate conditions, 'gemination occurs ... on the [onset] consonant of the stressed (penultimate) syllable' (Donohue 1999: 34), as in (7a).

(7) *Tukang Besi* (Donohue 1999)

a.	top:áŋa	'cut branches'	motwt:úru	'sleepy'
	mɛ:lái	'far'	moʔom:úru	'hungry'
b.	ká:pɪ	'wing'		
	pá:ŋa	'branch'		
c.	é:kɑ	'climb'		
	é:lɑ	'tongue'		

However, Donohue goes on to state: 'if the stressed syllable is also the initial one (i.e., the word is di-syllabic), the gemination can jump one syllable forward'. As seen in the examples in (7b), where initial

² Cf. the Unstressable Word Syndrome of Hayes (1995: 110–113), who also treats alleged exceptions.

³ Dobrovolsky (1999) considers a possible counterexample in Chuvash, where stress is assigned to the last full vowel of a word. The question is whether stress is assigned to the first syllable of words lacking a full vowel, or whether such words are stressless. Based on a phonetic study of disyllabic words, Dobrovolsky concludes that 'there is something different about stress on reduced vowel words' (1999: 542) and hypothesises in favour of the interpretation that they are stressless. Thanks to Susannah Levi for reminding me of this paper.

gemination is prohibited, the onset of the post-stress syllable is geminated instead. The same is true in (7c), where the first syllable has no onset. It would appear that stress-based gemination is important to *Tukang Besi* speakers. Rather than suppressing gemination in (7b, c), they shift the syllable to guarantee gemination will occur. An otherwise reasonable option would be to restrict gemination to the onset of the stressed syllable, and block stress assignment to words such as *[kapi], *[paŋa], *[eka] and *[ɛla]. This, however, would violate OBLHEAD.

I suggest that word stress has this 'obligatory' property because stress accent is DEFINITIONAL of wordhood. A violation of OBLHEAD would imply that stressless words are not words. More generally; we observe that local phonology does not override higher levels of grammatical and prosodic organisation. Thus, in a language where all words must begin with a consonant, a word which is underlyingly vowel-initial will not fail to become a word. Instead, a default onset may be inserted or the vowel may be deleted. As will be seen in §5, prosodic systems which are exceptions to OBLHEAD invariably involve tone or length.

Returning to the definition in (5), a second definitional property of SA systems is that OBLHEAD obligatorily targets syllables. The same cannot be said for T systems or PA systems, in which the TBU may be either the syllable or mora. This property of SA systems makes two interesting predictions, which are borne out. First, a language which lacks syllables clearly cannot have SA, e.g. *Gokana* (Hyman 1985). Second, a language in which some words lack syllables cannot have SA. The reason for this is that it would violate OBLHEAD: words with syllables would have stress, while those which lack this phonological property wouldn't. According to Bagemihl (1991), in *Bella Coola* a syllable must contain a sonorant (as in most languages). A word consisting solely of obstruents contains no syllables, e.g. [ɛktsk^wɛ] 'he arrived'. *Bella Coola* thus provides the test case – the possibility that words with a sonorant (and hence a syllable) will have stress, while words lacking a sonorant won't. Newman (1947: 132) clearly states that in *Bella Coola* there is 'no phonemically significant phenomena of stress or pitch associated with syllables or words'. He continues: 'when two or more syllabics occur in a word or sentence, one can clearly hear different degrees of articulatory force. But these relative stresses in a sequence of acoustic syllables do not remain constant in repetitions of the utterance'. That *Gokana* and *Bella Coola* lack SA is thus predicted by the definition in (5).

It appears that OBLHEAD and syllables are definitional properties of SA systems in two senses. First, all SA systems have these properties. Second, systems other than SA are not required to have these properties. Thus, there can be accentless words in many so-called PA languages (e.g. *Tokyo Japanese*, *Somali*), which are also free to target moras instead of syllables. Besides culminativity (to which we will return in §5), additional common properties of SA systems may or may not characterise non-SA systems. Here I mention four of these, since they have been occasionally cited as evidence that systems which I would identify as restricted T are

really PA: (i) PRIVATIVITY: stress is either present *vs.* absent on a given syllable; (ii) SUBORDINATION: one stress may be subordinated to another, as in compounding, focus marking, etc. (McCawley 1970, 1978); (iii) DEMARCATION: stress fixed on initial, final, etc., syllables can tell you where the word boundary is; (iv) RHYTHMICITY: echo-stresses frequently occur on every other syllable. With these additional properties identified, we can now move on to consider the nature of (pitch) accent.

5 Accent

There has been considerable terminological ambiguity as well as conceptual confusion concerning the notion of ‘accent’ (cf. Hyman 1977a, Clements & Goldsmith 1984a, Beckman 1986, Pulleyblank 1986, van der Hulst & Smith 1988a, Salmons 1992, Ladd 1996, van der Hulst 1999a, Odden 1999, Fox 2000, Gussenhoven 2004, among others). Some of the uses of the term ‘accent’ are indicated in (8).

(8) The term accent has been used to refer to the following:

- a. Prominence *tout court*: ‘an accent is simply an ‘abstract’ mark where a culmination of prosodic features occurs, thereby marking that syllable (or accent-bearing unit) with greater salience than surrounding syllables’ (Hyman 1977a: 4).
- b. A place of F₀ activity (cf. phrase-level ‘pitch accents’, e.g. English intonational H*L).
- c. A lexical diacritic (which is exceptional or unpredictable)
 - i. used to indicate a potential metrical head;
 - ii. used to indicate the alignment of a tone.
- d. A tone that allegedly acts like a stress (cf. ‘stress accent’ *vs.* ‘pitch accent’).

It is the last two uses that are most relevant to the definitions of tone and stress accent given in §§3 and 4. These are discussed in the next two subsections.


5.1 Diacritic accent

A representative case of diacritic accent appears in Donohue’s (2003) treatment of tone in Skou (New Guinea). As seen in the summary of tonal distributions in (9), Donohue analyses Skou as having five underlying tone melodies, which show two interesting properties.

(9) *Tonal distributions in Skou* (Donohue 2003)

tone melody	monosyllabic	disyllabic	trisyllabic
/H/	H	H-H	H-H-H
/L/	L	L-L	L-L-L
/LH/	—	L-H	L-H-H
/LHL/	—	L-HL	L-H-L
/HL/	HL	H-L, HL-L, H-HL	H-H-L, H-HL-L, H-H-HL

First, since Skou does not permit LH rising tones, /LH/ and /LHL/ do not exist on monosyllables. Second, /HL/ shows three different mapping possibilities on di- and trisyllabic words. Donohue’s solution is to indicate the prelinking of /HL/ tones by means of a diacritic accent, as in (10).



The /HL/ melody prelinks to the accented first syllable in (10a) *vs.* the accented second syllable in (10b). Where there is no accent, as in (10c), tones link to TBUs on a one-to-one basis.

Donohue (2003: 335) states that ‘an accent is an attractor for tonal units’ (cf. Goldsmith 1987). In Skou this accent is limited to either the final or penultimate syllable of a word. As seen in (11), the diacritic is also contrastive on /HL/ monosyllables.

(11) *Monosyllabic /HL/ and /HL/ words are indistinguishable in isolation, but differ in compounding*

- a. HL + L [H-L]
 kũ ta → kũ.tà ‘beard’ (cf. kũ ‘jaw’)
 ‘jaw’ ‘hair’
- b. HL + L [HL-L]
 hõ na → hõ.nà ‘sago flesh’ (cf. hõ ‘sago’)
 ‘sago’ ‘flesh’

The diacritic accent cannot co-occur with /LH/ and /LHL/ melodies, because of the prohibition against rising tones, or with /H/ and /L/ melodies, because it would have no effect (Donohue 2003: 336–337).

If it could be shown that Donohue’s diacritic marks a potential metrical head, we would have an argument that there is something accentual about the Skou tone system. However, it seems that his ‘accent’ is used only as a diacritic ‘indication of pitch’, as per the definition of tone in (3). The prelinked representations in (10a, b) could have been given without the indicated accents. Alternatively, the same outputs would be obtained if the L were prelinked to the first syllable in (10a), and the H to the second

syllable in (10b). The prosodic system of Skou is therefore exclusively tonal, but with an interesting complication in the mapping of /HL/ melody.

5.2 Pitch accent

If Skou is strictly tonal, what, then, is a ‘pitch-accent’ system? Several attempts at defining PA assume a syntagmatic accentual component and focus on its different realisation from stress accent:

(12) *Putative realisational differences between PA and SA*

- a. PA has a constant tonal realisation.

‘In a tonal or pitch-accent system (like Japanese, for instance), in addition to the abstract accent, there is a constant physical property [i.e. a tone] associated with the accent’ (Hyman 1977a: 4).

‘Pitch accent languages must satisfy the criterion of having INVARIANT TONAL CONTOURS on accented syllables, since tone is a lexical property. This is not so for pure stress languages, where the tonal contours of stressed syllables can vary freely, being determined postlexically by the intonational system’ (Hayes 1995: 49–50).

- b. SA has more than a tonal realisation.

‘Hypothesis: Stress accent differs phonetically from non-stress [pitch-] accent in that it uses to a greater extent material other than pitch’ (Beckman 1986: 1).

The above definitions attempt to distinguish PA from SA. It is also necessary to distinguish PA from T, since both employ pitch features at the word level. As stated by Bybee *et al.* (1998: 227), ‘a pitch accent system is one in which pitch is the primary correlate of prominence and there are significant constraints on the pitch patterns for words’. The classic example of Tokyo Japanese would be a case in point, since the distribution of output H and L tones is highly constrained. However, languages in which tones are sparsely distributed, e.g. one /H/ per word, have also been referred to as having a ‘restricted tone system’ (Schadeberg 1973, Voorhoeve 1973), a point argued specifically for Tokyo Japanese by Meeussen (1972). Since tone systems themselves differ in the degree to which their tones are distributionally restricted, Tokyo Japanese-type PA may simply be a tone system at one end of the restrictedness scale.

The claim of this paper is that pitch accent is not a coherent notion, rather a ‘pick and choose’ among the properties that characterise prototypical tone *vs.* stress-accent systems (Hyman 2001a, b: App.). Despite vague attempts such as in (12), because there is no single prototype of PA, it is not possible to give an explicit definition of PA, as one can for T (3) and SA (5). By PA linguists have generally meant one or more of the following properties:

(13) *'PA-like' properties*

- a. A system whose underlying prosody is abstractly different from surface realisations.
- b. A system which combines tone and stress.
- c. A system which has restricted, sparse or privative tone (e.g. /H/ vs. \emptyset).

A representative case of (13a) is Tonga, which Meeussen (1963) analyses with underlying 'determinant' vs. 'neutral' moras and the following general algorithm: (i) moras occurring between determinant moras are realised H; (ii) all other moras are realised L. While Goldsmith (1984) uses diacritic accents (asterisks) where Meeussen has determinants, Pulleyblank (1986) argues for a strictly tonal analysis with /H/. It should be clear that, as in Skou, these diacritics are 'indications of pitch' and not accentual in the SA sense in (5).

The property in (13b) refers to systems which combine tone and stress. Table I categorises languages which have been claimed to have lexical SA, lexical T, both or neither (cf. Hyman 1977a, Ladd 1996: 156, Fox 2000: 265):

	+stress accent	-stress accent
+tone	Ma'ya, Usarufa, Fasu, Serbo-Croatian, Swedish-Norwegian, Ayutla Mixtec, ...	Yoruba, Igbo, Kuki-Thaadow, Skou, ... (Tokyo Japanese, Somali, Western Basque, ...)
-tone	English, Russian, Turkish, Finnish, ...	Bella Coola, French, Tamazight, Bengali, ...

Table I

Classification of languages according to whether they have stress accent, tone, both or neither.

A quick glance at the languages listed in the upper left quadrant will establish that there is no single prosodic type consisting of T + SA. As summarised in (14), coexistent T and SA may have very different relations to each other (Hyman 1977a, van der Hulst & Smith 1988a, van der Hulst 1999a):

(14) *A PA type as T + SA is insufficient*

- a. {T, SA}: T and SA as independent systems
e.g. Ma'ya (Remijsen 2001, 2002): /H/ and /LH/ tones occur only on the final syllable, contrasting with \emptyset ; penultimate and final stress contrast on words with final /H/; stress is otherwise final.

- b. {T; SA}: SA dependent on T
e.g. Usarufa (Bee & Glasgow 1962): in words with a pitch drop, stress is assigned to a /H/ or /HL/ preceding a L, else to the first H of an all H word, else to the last L of an all-L word.
- c. {SA; T}: T dependent on SA
e.g. Fasu (May & Loeweke 1964): /H/ and /L/ contrast only on the stressed syllable; non-stressed syllables are toneless.
- d. {SA = T}: T and SA as co-dependent systems
e.g. the Neo-Štokavian dialect of Serbo-Croatian (Zec 1999): stress is assigned to a pre-/H/ syllable; words without /H/ receive initial stress, which in turn requires a H tone.

Turning to the properties in (13c), systems in which tones are sparse, ultimately limited to a single occurrence per word, have often been identified as PA. However, as seen in the upper right quadrant in Table I, I have interpreted Tokyo Japanese, Somali and Western Basque as [+T, -SA]. They clearly meet the definition in (3) for T. While some of their properties may be reminiscent of SA, they do not meet the definition for SA in (5). Thus, from the point of view of the T *vs.* SA dichotomy proposed in §§3 and 4, they, like Skou and Tonga, are strictly tonal. In §4 we claimed that if a system is SA, it will satisfy OBLHEAD and culminativity, and it may exhibit additional properties of metrical systems (subordination, demarcation, rhythm). To classify Tokyo Japanese, Somali, Basque, etc. as PA represents a reversal of the antecedent and consequence of the condition: if a tone is obligatory, culminative, privative, subordinative, demarcative or rhythmic, then it must be PA (by analogy with SA). Any one of these properties can and has been cited as evidence that some language is ‘accentual’. While these are important and interesting sub-properties of prosodic systems, the question is whether any property other than OBLHEAD suffices to characterise a tone as an accent.

Consider, for example, the culminative property. Some alleged PA languages have culminative, but not obligatory, underlying accent/tone. As exemplified in (4), in Tokyo Japanese, there is one or no /H/ per word, following which there is a drop to L. In Western Basque, there is similarly one or no /H/ per word, with a drop to L afterwards (Hualde 1991, 1999). In Somali, a word may have a single /H/, which is assigned to the final or penultimate vowel according to morphological rules. Subject nouns and finite verbs in main clauses are toneless (Hyman 1981, Banti 1988, Saeed 1999). In Iraqw, /H/ is assigned mostly by the morphology to the final syllable of some words. However, ‘the overall majority of nouns are low throughout’ (Mous 1993: 21). It is significant that these systems, which do not require that every word carry an overt lexical mark, are as easily analysed in strictly tonal terms – an option which is not available in the case of such SA languages as English, Russian and so forth.

The condition ‘if culminative, then accent’ is also suspect for the conclusions it forces us to draw concerning non-tonal features. In Cuzco

Quechua, a language with penultimate stress, glottalised and aspirated consonants have the properties in (15).

(15) *Culminative glottalised and aspirated consonants in Cuzco Quechua*
(Parker 1997: 2)

- a. Root-controlled: occur only in roots, never in suffixes.
- b. Non-obligatory: occur in some roots, not in all.
- c. Culminative: may occur only once per root.

*T^hV^hT^hV, *T^hV^hT^hV, *T^hV^hT^hV, *T^hV^hT^hV

- d. Directional: only occur on first stop of root.

T^hV^hT^hV, T^hV^hT^hV vs. *T^hV^hT^hV, *T^hV^hT^hV

(C' and C^h occur only in onset position of the syllable, never in codas.)

On the basis of its culminative nature and the restriction of glottality to prominent positions (roots, onsets), should one conclude that Cuzco Quechua is a 'glottal accent' (GA) language?

A similar example concerning vowel length is seen in Mam (Mayan). As stated by Willard (2004: 7), 'only one long vowel is allowed per word. In addition, the presence of a long vowel in a word disallows the presence of a glottalised vowel in the same word'. Willard argues that besides being culminative, Mam vowel length shows dominance effects, another property which is frequently identified with SA. As seen in the examples in (16), a suffix may be dominant or recessive, independent of whether it has a long or short vowel itself:

(16) *Dominant/recessive vowel length in Mam*

- a. *recessive short suffix*

/ooq'-b'il/ → ooq'-b'il 'sth. which causes crying'

- b. *recessive long suffix*

/b'iitz-oo-/ → b'iitz-a- 'sing'

- c. *dominant short suffix*

/q'ooj-le'n/ → q'oj-le'n 'state of fighting'

- d. *dominant long suffix*

/liich'-ich'iin/ → lich'-ich'iin 'breakable'

When a suffix is recessive, as in (16a, b), length is preserved on the preceding root. If both the recessive suffix and the root have a long vowel, as in (16b), the culminative condition requires that the former be shortened. On the other hand, when a suffix is dominant, as in (16c, d), length is lost on the root. While the shortening seen in (16d) can also be attributed to culminativity, that in (16c) cannot be: the dominant short-vowel suffix imposes a short vowel on the root as well. Should one then talk of a 'quantity accent' (QA) in Mam?

An argument militating against GA and QA interpretations of Cuzco Quechua and Mam respectively is that each language has an independent

SA system. Stress is penultimate in Cuzco Quechua, and is assigned in Mam according to the following hierarchy:

(17) *Stress hierarchy in Mam* (England 1983, Willard 2004)

VV >> V_P >> VC >> V

- | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|
| a. stress a long vowel | a.'q'uuntl | 'work' |
| b. stress the rightmost vowel closed by
a glottal stop | puʔ.'laʔ | 'dipper' |
| c. stress the rightmost vowel closed by
a consonant | xpi.'chaq | 'raccoon' |
| d. stress the penultimate syllable | 'spi.kj'a | 'clear' |

While length is implicated in stress assignment in Mam, length and stress must be considered two separate systems.

Unless we are to proliferate accents to include GA, QA, etc., and allow for languages to have several competing accentual systems at the same time, it should be clear that culminativity is not a sufficient criterion for establishing PA. As we have seen, features other than tone can be culminative, even demarcative. As seen in Cuzco Quechua and Mam, such culminative systems can be independent of SA, and of each other. Thus, culminative H tone and culminative vowel length occur in different positions in phrasal outputs in Chimwiini (Kisseberth 2005). The features of glottality, length and tone can have very stress-like qualities, but crucially not obligatoriness – unless they are in fact implicated in the realisation of SA. As far as I know, no language has been reported with two independent obligatory-culminative systems, that is, where every word obligatorily has two of the following properties: SA, PA, GA, QA (others?). The reason for this should be clear: given the definition of SA in §4, only one system can meet the OBLHEAD requirement or there would be conflicting definitions of the metrical word.

One can easily imagine hypothetical prosodic systems with independent, obligatory SA and PA, e.g. one with penultimate stress and a single obligatory /H/ which can occur on different syllables. In quest of such a system, consider the class of Bantu languages which have been analysed with privative /H/ *vs.* \emptyset tone. A subset of these which have lost the historical *V/*V: opposition are reported to have penultimate SA, realised typically as vowel lengthening (Hyman 1977a, 1989, Odden 1999, Kisseberth & Odden 2003, Downing 2004). A different, smaller subset of /H/ *vs.* \emptyset Bantu languages has imposed obligatoriness on the /H/ tone. However, such 'restricted tone' systems as found in Kinga (Schadeberg 1973) and Bena (Odden 1988) have kept the vowel-length opposition, and do not show evidence of penultimate stress. Other languages such as Chimwiini (Kisseberth & Abasheikh 1974) have retained the historical vowel-length opposition underlyingly, but restrict surface long vowels to one per word (or phrase), typically either the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable. In these languages, if there is no underlying long vowel,

output vowels will all surface as short. I have to date not found a single Bantu language which has two *independent* accentual properties in sense of OBLHEAD, e.g. obligatory culminative /H/ and obligatory culminative vowel length.⁴

In summary, where languages have been reported to have two accent-like systems, one or both of these fail to meet the OBLHEAD requirement. In Maya (§5.2) stress is obligatory and restricted to the final or penultimate syllable. The /H/ and /LH/ tones which are restricted to the final syllable are culminative, but not obligatory (words may lack tone altogether). In Cherokee (§2), neither T nor the culminative L*H PA are obligatory (words may lack both), and so forth.

There appear to be two ways to interpret the results thus far. The first, which we have been assuming, would be to impose a Unique Obligatory Head Constraint which would prohibit words from exhibiting more than one obligatory ‘accentual’ property. The second interpretation would be to assert that only SA can meet the OBLHEAD requirement – and therefore, any prosody properties which meets OBLHEAD must be SA by definition. This would include obligatory vowel lengthening and obligatory /H/ tone. Assuming that a word cannot have two SA systems (cf. §6), no language would have two accent-like systems meeting the obligatoriness requirement. Note that this interpretation has the effect of labelling the obligatory /H/ of languages such as Nubi (Gussenhoven 2006) as SA, although it also seems to meet the definition of T in (3). Gussenhoven (2006) appropriately suggests that the Nubi prosodic system is ‘pivotal’ in that its obligatory one-H-syllable-per-word may be interpreted either as SA or restricted T. While Nubi has one and only one H tone syllable per word, both Safwa and Kinga exhibit an obligatory one-H-mora-per-word system, as seen in the realisation of antepenultimate H tone in (18).⁵

(18) *Antepenultimate /H/ in two obligatory-/H/ Bantu languages*

- a. *Safwa* (Voorhoeve 1973)
- | | |
|------------|--------------------|
| ʃilihu | ‘which one (CL 7)’ |
| amáfuko | ‘bags’ |
| amíina | ‘holes’ |
| tuúbale | ‘let us go’ |
| bahwiitiha | ‘they believe’ |

⁴ Gérard Philippon (personal communication) points out that some Makonde dialects which have penultimate lengthening come close to requiring a H on every word. The Comorian language Ngazidja appears to be another case where obligatory /H/ is in the process of being imposed – at least at the phrase level. Whether a metrical account is adopted, as in Cassimjee & Kisseberth (1989), or a tonal domains account, as in Cassimjee & Kisseberth (1998), words do not require both /H/ and SA.

⁵ Voorhoeve (1973: 1) is non-committal as to whether the H pitch which co-occurs with greater amplitude is a tone or stress.

- b. *Kinga* (Schadeberg 1973)
- | | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| ukóheka | ‘to laugh’ |
| ukóvala | ‘to count’ |
| ukugéenda | ‘to go’ |
| ukugeendélela | ‘to walk around’ |
| ukuhwaánana | ‘to become similar’ |

In §4 it was required that SA target syllables. Since Safwa and Kinga assign their obligatory /H/ by mora, their obligatory /H/ cannot be SA. As Voorhoeve and Schadeberg propose, they can be appropriately viewed as ‘restricted tone systems’. Their prosodic systems are thus less ‘pivotal’ than Nubi’s, showing again that languages ‘pick and choose’ between the prototypical properties of T *vs.* SA systems. More evidence for this will be seen in the next subsection.

5.3 Rhythmic accent

The definition of SA in (5) refers to obligatory metrical structure. A SA system necessarily identifies an obligatory head syllable for each word. The assumption is that SA languages hierarchise syllables into a metrical word constituent whose most prominent syllable receives primary stress. However, metrical properties not observing OBLHEAD should not be confused with SA. Independent of its head-defining function, metrical phonology has a well-known counting function used to locate or assign phonological properties within a string. This is particularly clear in the case of rhythmic alternations. To show that this counting or rhythmic function need not be an expression of SA, consider the alternation of H tones in Kirundi in (19).

(19) *Alternation of H tones in Kirundi* (Goldsmith & Sabimana 1986)

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| a. ku-sab-a | -sab- | ‘ask for (INF)’ |
| ku-bi-sab-a | -bi- | ‘them’ |
| ku-bí-mu-sáb-a | -mu- | ‘(to) him’ |
| ku-bí-mu-kú-sab-ir-a | -ku- | ‘(for) you’ |
| ku-há-bi-mú-ku-sáb-ir-a | -ha- | ‘there’ |
| ‘to ask him (for) them for you there’ | | |
| b. ku-báz-a | -báz- | ‘ask (question) (INF)’ |
| ku-bí-baz-a | -bi- | ‘them’ |
| ku-bí-mu-báz-a | -mu- | ‘(to) him’ |
| ku-bí-mu-kú-bar-iz-a | -ku- | ‘(for) you’ |
| ku-há-bi-mú-ku-bár-iz-a | -ha- | ‘there’ |
| ‘to ask him (for) them for you there’ | | |

As indicated, the verb root /-sab-/ is toneless, as are the infinitive prefix /ku-/ and the final inflectional vowel /-a/. The form [ku-bi-sab-a] ‘to ask for them’ shows that when a single object marker (OM) is present, it too is toneless. It would therefore appear that the /H/ of /-báz-/ has undergone anticipatory shifting onto the OM in [ku-bí-baz-a] ‘to ask them’. The full pattern of alternating Hs is seen in forms with two or more OMs. From comparative evidence we know that a second (third, fourth) OM carries a /H/ tone. From the Kirundi point of view, however, all that can be said is that combinations of OMs introduce a /H/. The generalisation is that if there is at least one /H/, the span consisting of the OMs + verb root will receive a H on every other mora. As seen, H tone is neither obligatory nor culminative in Kirundi. Thus, while Goldsmith & Sabimana (1989) construct binary s-w feet for the purpose of distributing the H tones, it should be clear that this rhythmic pattern in Kirundi has nothing to do with the definition of SA in (5).⁶

The above illustration raises the question of whether there is a necessary relationship between metrical feet and SA. Two non-canonical prosodic systems which have been covered in the stress literature (e.g. Prince 1983, Halle & Vergnaud 1987, Hayes 1995) are Creek ‘tonal accent’ and Seneca ‘accent’, which I consider briefly below.

As described by Haas (1977), Creek /H/ obeys OBLHEAD but not culminativity. Haas points out that ‘fixed’ accents may result in two H tones in the same word, e.g. /náfka:kís/ ‘they are hitting him’. Otherwise /H/ tones are mostly predictable, as Haas states in (20).

(20) *Predictable tonal accent in Creek*

- a. ‘In any string of L[ight] syllables containing no fixed accents the tonal accent will be placed on the last even-numbered syllable’: /hicíta/ ‘one to see one’, /ahicitá/ ‘one to look after, watch one’ (Haas 1977: 202–203).
- b. ‘If the penult is a H[eavy] syllable and the ultima a L[ight] one, the tonal accent will be placed on the penult’: /cá:lo/ ‘trout, bass’, /sókca/ ‘sack, bag’, /ałakkóycka/ ‘appreciation’ (Haas 1977: 203).
- c. ‘However, if the ultima is a H[eavy] syllable, then the placement of the tonal accent is no longer automatic. Instead morphological rules come into play’: /hátki:/ ‘white’, /hoktí:/ ‘woman’ (Haas 1977: 204).

While the distribution is based on metrical principles, both the constant H-tone realisation and the violation of culminativity make Creek ‘tonal accent’ different from a prototypical SA system.

⁶ Re the possibility of ‘tonal feet’, see Leben (2002).

The placement of alternating ‘accent’ in Seneca also follows metrical principles. While Chafe (1977, 1996) presents an iambic analysis, the following trochaic account is based on Melinger’s (2002) reanalysis:

(21) *Trochaic analysis of Seneca*

- a. Mark the first syllable extrametrical.
- b. Build disyllabic trochees left-to-right.
- c. Assign H tones (i) to the initial syllable of each trochee if closed; (ii) to the initial syllable of each trochee if light, but followed by a closed syllable.

As indicated, Melinger proposes to mark off the first syllable and build trochees left to right. While she goes on to propose metrical structure above the foot, there does not seem to be a need for a metrical word tree. Instead, as I have indicated in (21c), H tones are assigned to the first (head) syllable of each trochee that contains a closed syllable. As schematised in (22), three out of the four possible combinations of open and closed syllable trochees will result in an initial H tone, while one will result in no H tone being assigned:

(22) *Seneca violates OBLHEAD* (Prince 1983, Hayes 1995)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>H on the first syllable</i> closed-closed [CVC.CVC] closed-open [CVC.CV] open-closed [CV.CVC] | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> b. <i>no H</i> open-open [CV.CV] |
|--|---|

Examples are given in (23), from Melinger (2002).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (23) a. <a> (ge ga)(jéʔ oħ)
+OBLHEAD, +culminativity b. <de> (wá geʔ)(njo da)(géʔ oħ)
+OBLHEAD, –culminativity c. <de> (ga de)(nje o) deʔ
–OBLHEAD, –culminativity | <p>‘I’m willing’</p> <p>‘I’m busy’</p> <p>‘I’ll put a necktie on’</p> |
|--|---|

Only the second foot in (23a) has a closed syllable (in fact, two), so the single H assigned to this word satisfies both OBLHEAD and culminativity. In (23b), both the first and third feet contain a closed syllable (the latter, two). Two H tones are therefore assigned, in violation of culminativity. The form in (23c) receives no H tone, because its footed syllables are all open. (The last, left-over syllable does not get footed.) It therefore violates both OBLHEAD and culminativity.

In his comprehensive and thoughtful survey of accentual phenomena, van der Hulst (1999a: 94) states that ‘it remains mysterious ... why a weight-sensitive accent rule (which assigns accents to syllables rather than moras) cannot produce accents that get a tonal interpretation’. But that appears to be what is going on in both Creek and Seneca. In Creek,

the assignment of H is sensitive to syllable weight, and in Seneca it is sensitive to open *vs.* closed syllables. Seneca is unusual not only in targeting closed syllables, but especially in not caring whether the closed syllable is initial or final in its trochee. It is as if Seneca distinguishes heavy *vs.* light trochees (Wallace Chafe, personal communication).

Having considered Creek and Seneca, we are now in a position to complete Table II.

	+culminative	-culminative
+obligatory	Kinga	Creek
-obligatory	Somali	Seneca

Table II

Restricted H-tone systems attest all four combinations of obligatoriness and culminativity.

As indicated, prosodic systems which have been variously referred to as ‘accent’, ‘pitch accent’, ‘tonal accent’ or ‘restricted tone’ attest all four combinations of obligatoriness and culminativity. Words have exactly one H mora in Kinga. In Somali words may have at most one H mora, but can also be toneless. Words must have one H syllable in Creek, but may have more than one. Finally, in Seneca words can have one, more than one or no syllable with H tone. While we could give a name to each of these feature combinations, there is no reason to think they are distinct ‘types’. Rather, they simply share one *vs.* two *vs.* neither of the properties required of SA but not T. In other words, the fact that we obtain all four feature combinations shows that a hierarchical tree model of prosodic types will not be possible, e.g. where the highest cut is accent *vs.* tone, based, say, on culminative *vs.* non-culminative, and then only culminative systems are further broken down into obligatory *vs.* non-obligatory. We could call all four systems ‘accent’ or ‘pitch accent’, but how would we capture the intuition that of the four, languages like Kinga, Safwa and Nubi are the most SA-like? My suggestion is that prosodic typology address the properties of SA and T prototypes directly, rather than ‘classifying’ systems by name.⁷

6 Phonetics

There has been a long-standing tension between typologising prosodic systems by their linguistic function *vs.* their phonetic realisation (cf. Hyman 1977b: 38–40). Phonologists have been mostly concerned with

⁷ Table II considers only languages which assign a single feature, here /H/. An expansion of the set would have to include systems where there are two (more?) restricted tones or tonal melodies, e.g. /H/ *vs.* /L/ in Fasu (May & Loeweke 1964), /H/ *vs.* /LH/ in Ma’ya (Remijsen 2001, 2002).

functional or structural properties of prosodic systems. For example, Hayes identifies stress accent in terms of rhythm: ‘in stress languages, every utterance has a rhythmic structure’ (Hayes 1995: 8). Non-stress accent, on the other hand, is often identified in terms of culminativity: ‘a word may contain several accented morphemes, but only one accent may surface in a word domain’ (Hualde 1999: 962). The problems discussed in preceding sections have had to do with cases where such notions run into difficulty: not all rhythmic phenomena indicate SA, not all so-called PA languages respect culminativity, etc. We have claimed that the unique defining feature of SA is OBLHEAD, while the unique defining feature of T is ‘an indication of pitch’ at the output of the lexical phonology.

Lost in much of this is the role of phonetics. In (12) I presented some of the views on how SA and PA might be distinguished on the basis of the phonetic realisations: like T, the realisation of PA is primarily pitch, whereas the realisation of SA may involve different phonetic features. Attempts to provide a phonetic characterisation of prosodic differences are not contradictory, but rather should follow from functional definitions. T is analysed in terms of phonological features for which one should expect relatively constant phonetic analogues. SA, on the other hand, is an abstract or underlying mental construct (Weinreich 1954: 2, Lehiste 1970: 150). It should therefore not be surprising if languages and speakers vary in how they realise abstract SA in the output. As instrumental studies have shown, the phonetic correlates of stress can be quite subtle – even absent on syllables that one ‘feels’ are really stressed. Given this, the functional basis of stress in actual speech may have less to do with aiding the listener to segment words (as is often proposed) than with helping the speaker organise phonetic material for his own purposes.

The above problem becomes particularly acute in cases where there is a question about whether a language has stress at all. Researchers who operate under the assumption that all languages have SA may read stress into the phonetic variations they hear or observe instrumentally. Since many tone systems are adequately described with no mention of SA, I am less inclined to posit SA in non-tonal languages which make it so hard to find evidence of stress, e.g. Bella Coola (§4), some variants of Berber and a number of languages of Ethiopia and the Indian subcontinent (Hyman 1977b). In other words, we might say: if word-stress is so hard to find, perhaps it is not there at all.⁸

On the other hand, some linguists seem to apply the flip side of this motto: if it sounds like stress, it must be stress! The result has been to posit stress features that are quite different from what we normally think

⁸ An interesting case pointed out by the guest editors concerns Indonesian. Whereas Cohn (1989) reported weight-sensitive, word-level stress, subsequent acoustic studies and experiments by van Zanten & van Heuven (1998) and van Zanten *et al.* (2003) have shown that the language only has intonational ‘pitch accents’, realised near the right edge of the phrase.

of as SA. Kähler-Meyer (1962: 257–258) identifies a ‘*Dehnungsakzent*’, which lengthens a penultimate vowel in Chasu (Kipare), as in many other Bantu languages (§5.2). The lengthened penult also receives the ‘*Druckakzent*’ (stress), with one exception: as seen in (24a), a phrase-final L that derives from the /H/ of a /L-H/ sequence instead receives the stress:

(24) *Alleged stressed vs. non-stressed final L in Chasu*

- a. /mì-tí/ → [mì:'tì] ‘trees’ (cf. [mitì 'mí:ŋgi] ‘many trees’)
 b. /mì-sì/ → ['mì:sì] ‘pestles’

As seen, the two ‘*Akzente*’ do not line up in (24a), whereas they do in (24b), where the final L from /L/ is not stressed. Whatever the difference is between final 'L and L (which Kähler-Meyer says is hard to hear), it is likely to be a slight difference in the F₀ contour, as occurs in Chaga, Rimi, Bemba and elsewhere in Bantu (Hyman 1977a: 16–17). Thus, treating final 'L in terms of stress rather than tone is suspect. It also brings us close to the situation rejected in §5.2, wherein a language would have two different obligatory word-accent systems, here QA and SA.⁹

In other cases, claims of two independent SA systems are also dubious. In the Mixtec dialects/languages stems are generally disyllabic (‘couplets’), with stress on their first syllable. Such stem-initial stress often conditions lengthening of the first vowel or second consonant. Certain dialects, however, have been claimed to have potentially two stresses per stem or word. According to Pike & Oram (1976), a second unpredictable stress occurs on the second syllable of some, but not all, stems in Diuxi Mixtec – specifically on those for which a final *ʔ has been reconstructed. Just as final 'L in Chasu is suspect, the alleged stem-final stresses in Diuxi have been reanalysed in terms of tone (Daly 1978).

Another potential case of multiple stresses arises in Ayutla Mixtec. Pankratz & Pike (1967) analyse Ayutla dialect as having tone-dependent stress, as in (25) (wording from Mortensen 2005).

(25) *Tone-dependent stress in Ayutla Mixtec*

- Within the stem + suffix domain, stress the leftmost H-toned syllable immediately followed by the L-toned syllable, else stress the leftmost M-toned syllable immediately followed by a L-toned syllable, else stress the leftmost H-toned syllable, else stress the leftmost syllable.

However, as Mortensen (2005: 2) points out, ‘the couplet-initial prominence seems to be a much better candidate for stress than pitch prominence (which isn’t present in some [monosyllabic] words and is confounded by the ‘allotonic’ variations in pitch described by [Pankratz & Pike]’.

⁹ The prohibition in question concerns two obligatory word-level accentual systems. Kähler-Meyer’s accentual indications suggest that both penultimate lengthening and final H → L take place phrase-finally.

Assuming that the stem-initial syllable is stressed would account for the preaspiration of voiceless stops and the lengthening of sonorants when occurring in the second consonant position of CVCV stems. It also would explain why /k/, /tʃ/ and /v/ undergo optional weakening in post-stem, but not stem-internal position. The tone-dependent stress algorithm in (25) often results in stress coinciding with the first stem syllable. Where it doesn't (e.g. L-H stems, L-L stems + H suffix), it is not clear that stress is involved at all. What would be convincing would be if the second-consonant effects were absent in the case of L-'H stems, and if the suffix C were instead preaspirated or lengthened if L-'H stems were followed by a L suffix. If we were to posit both Pankratz & Pike's tone-dependent stress *and* stem-initial stress, we would still have to choose between two interpretations. The first – and undesirable – one would be that a word could have two stresses, i.e. 'L-'H, 'L-L + 'H. The second is that stress is initially assigned stem-initially, where it conditions the post-stress consonant effects, but is subsequently attracted away when the most prominent tone is found later in the stem + suffix domain.¹⁰ As Mortensen suggests, it seems more likely that Pankratz & Pike's tone-dependent stress is simply phonetic pitch prominence.¹¹

The logical endpoint of a system claimed to have multiple stress would be one where stress fulfils the same distinctive function as segmental and tonal features. Gilley (2004: 100) has recently claimed that 'stress in Nilotic is privative, a feature with binary opposition. ... a word may be stressed or not. The stress in itself may function as a morpheme in some

¹⁰ If the disyllabic stem (couplet) = a foot, preaspiration and lengthening could be interpreted as strictly foot-based processes. Tone-dependent stress, on other hand, is assigned within the stem + suffix domain. A general issue not addressed in the present study is how to interpret positionally restricted distributions and realisations. For example, in a number of Northwest Bantu, Bantoid and Cross-River languages, voiceless stops are found only stem-initially (Hyman 1990, in press), e.g. Koyo /ɔ-tétó/, /è-kúkí/ → [ɔ-téró] 'basket', [è-kúgi] 'door'. While such phenomena are occasionally cited as evidence for stem-initial accent, it is significant that reduplications typically produce exceptions (e.g. [ɔ-tété] 'spark', [i-kákàni] 'legend'). Whether one treats these latter as having two stems with initial consonant correspondence or by some other means, if voicelessness = accent, then these words would have two (demarcative) accents. SA can have such effects, but I do not take the presence of such effects to unambiguously indicate accent.

¹¹ There have been a number of recent instrumental investigations into the realisation of stress in tone languages. Remijsen & van Heuven (2005), for example, study both the phonological properties and phonetic realisation of stress in Curaçao Papiamentu, which also has an independent privative tone contrast. On the other hand, earlier reports of non-restricted tone systems with tone-dependent stress are often less satisfying, either describing the phonetic effects of stress in impressionistic terms, or, as in the case of the alleged SA system in Usarufa summarised in (14b), not indicating the effects or realisation of stress at all. What is typically missing is phonological evidence. It would be impressive, for example, if the alleged stressed syllable of Usarufa provided the reference point for building iterative stress-fee, or if it constituted the locus for categorical segmental rules, e.g. a stressed onset stop is aspirated, a post-stress consonant is geminated, a stressed mid vowel is diphthongised, etc. While I have long been sceptical, if SA can be assigned as claimed in Usarufa, Ayutla Mixtec and many more non-restricted tone systems, such phonological evidence should be forthcoming.

cases and stress may occur on any of the three level tones'. Examples from Shilluk are seen in (26).

(26) *Alleged distinctive stress in Shilluk* (Gilley 2004: 113)

	<i>singular</i>	<i>plural</i>	
a.	'dít	diêṭ	'bird'
	'tòòk	tóók	'mouth'
b.	álàṭ	á'lêṭ	'cloth'
	pèèṃ	'pèém	'chest'

In (26a) singulars are said to be stressed, while in (26b) the plurals are stressed. As seen in the first example of each set, the presence *vs.* absence of stress may also be accompanied by segmental changes. There are, however, at least four reasons why this is not stress in the usual sense. First, a word can lack stress in violation of OBLHEAD. Second, a word can have more than one stress, in violation of culminativity, e.g. /á-'cámm^h-'á/ (PAST.EVIDENTIAL-eat AGGRESSIVE MOOD.REPEATED ACTION). Third, the phonetic effect on vowel length is the opposite of what one expects: 'phonetically, stress in these Nilotic languages is characterized by a shortening of vowel length, and by an increased intensity or level of force on the syllable' (Gilley 2004: 117). Finally, native speakers consider the 'unstressed' syllables to be the marked member of the opposition. This correlates with the apparent historical origin of the opposition: 'suffixes were lost, but the timing unit of the suffix remained and was incorporated into the root. ... This analysis concludes that the normal unmarked form is the shorter or "stressed" word' (Gilley 2004: 111). As in the case of the alleged 'multiple stresses' of Campa (Pike & Kindberg 1956, Pike 1974), the distinctive syllable properties in question should not be identified with SA.

Most of the discussion in this section has concerned claims of stress in languages which have unrestricted tone systems. As expressed in the binary typological distinction between SA and T in (1a), it was once thought that stress and tone were two mutually exclusive prosodic systems: since F0 is an important phonetic factor in the realisation of SA, it seemed reasonable to assume that a language in which tonal oppositions are realised solely in terms of F0 would not be able to support an independent SA system. While we now know that this is false, the question still remains as to whether SA has access to the same range of phonetic exponents in languages with *vs.* without T. In fact, there is some reason to think that SA may have different properties when co-occurring with T. A case in point is Pirahã (Everett 1998), which, based on the hierarchy in (27), assigns stress to the heaviest syllable within a final three-syllable window (C = voiceless; G = voiced):

(27) *Unusual syllable weight hierarchy in Pirahã*

CVV >> GVV >> VV >> CV >> GV

As expected, long vowels are heavier than short vowels. Not expected, however, is that onsets contribute to syllable weight – and that voiceless onsets attract stress over voiced onsets. Reminiscent of the Shilluk data in (26), Everett (1998: 114) finds that ‘the vowels of unstressed syllables have a significantly greater duration than the vowels of stressed syllables’. However, this may be a compensatory adjustment to the fact that onsets are significantly lengthened under stress:

The primary acoustic correlates of stress in Pirahã are amplitude and duration. The vowels of stressed syllables have significantly greater amplitude. In addition, stressed syllables have a significantly greater duration. The greater duration of stressed syllables is the result of the greater duration of the onsets of stressed syllables. Finally, the F0 and formant frequencies of F1 and F2 were not significantly different in the vowels of the stressed and unstressed syllables (Everett 1998: 121).

These findings are important because they suggest that the phonetic realisation of SA may indeed be partly determined by the phonological inventory of a language. Pirahã has T and contrasting vowel length, placing a damper on both F0 and vowel duration as ideal phonetic cues of SA. Instead, onsets not only attract stress, but also undergo significant modification, e.g. increase in length, when occurring under stress. It thus seems that an alternative to resisting SA in a language with T is to incorporate SA in a way that minimises interference with the relevant tone (and length) contrasts.¹²

7 Conclusion

This paper has dealt with various aspects of word-prosodic typology. I began with a quotation from Greenberg & Kaschube (1976: 9). Stress, they said, is ‘monarchic’: a monarchy must have one and only one king or queen. This corresponds to OBLHEAD, a definitional requirement placed on SA. At the other end, tone is ‘democratic’: in a non-restricted tone system, there can be more than one H tone per word. Although I have not treated length separately in this study, Greenberg & Kaschube give it the intermediate characterisation ‘oligarchic’, as (vowel) length can be culminative, restricted to one occurrence per word (cf. Mam in §5.2). Their – and my – characterisations have focused on structural and functional aspects of word prosody. As implied in §6, it is also possible to typologise on the basis of ‘substance’, e.g. how is SA realised in different languages? What role does F0 play in different languages? The variety and overlap of phonetic realisations no doubt contribute to the

¹² For more discussion of languages with onset-sensitive stress placement, see Gordon (2005).

difficulties characterising the study of prosody. As Odden (1999: 189) puts it:

Modern phonological research is strongly grounded in the idea that the categories of phonological analysis are phonetically based, and therefore if a language is analyzed as making active use of a given feature, it is assumed that this feature has a certain element of phonetic reality. Thus, for example, the opposition between [u] and [ɨ] would be accounted for in terms of rounding, and never nasalization, since linguists have shared assumptions about the phonetic meaning of 'rounding' versus 'nasalization'. The question is whether there is ever any hope of being able to hear a difference between tone and stress: the answer seems to be that there is not.

A major problem, therefore, is that one cannot go directly from the phonetic signal to the phonological analysis. By following well-established methods, linguists will in most cases be ultimately convinced as to whether a *surface* contrast should be characterised in terms of F0 or something else. However, this is only the beginning: we must now characterise the system *underlying* the surface contrast. Should Odden's [u] *vs.* [ɨ] be analysed as /u/ *vs.* /ɨ/, /u/ *vs.* /V/ or /ɨ/ *vs.* /ɨ/ ^w? In other words, does the phonetic difference in rounding correspond to an opposition which is binary ([±round]), privative (Round *vs.* ∅), or prosodic (^w *vs.* ∅)? Similarly, should a [H-L] sequence be analysed as /H-L/, /H-∅/ or /∅-∅/^{HL}? Or should it be analysed as (s-w), (*-°) etc.? Maybe there are more possibilities and more ambiguities in the area of prosodic systems, but, to my knowledge, this has not been demonstrated. Instead, I contend that the lack of clarity and the controversy that seem sometimes evident in the identification of word-prosodic systems can be overcome by applying the same methods of analysis and argumentation to prosody that routinely apply to segmental phonology.

The history of word-prosodic typology has been characterised by vagueness and disagreement, and yet great conviction on the part of different scholars. In this study I have not cited every past proposal nor considered every logical possibility. I have proposed that the most significant typological cut concerns prosodic systems which do *vs.* those which do not satisfy the OBLHEAD property. Aside from a few ambiguous systems such as Kinga and Nubi, this separates SA systems from the rest (whether they co-occur with tone or not). A reviewer has, however, pointed out that a different result would obtain if the culminative property provided the first cut. Accent systems would be those which meet the culminative requirement, further differentiated into those which satisfy OBLHEAD (SA) *vs.* those which do not (PA). The result is the tripartite typology (1c) which I rejected: SA and PA satisfy culminativity while PA and T satisfy the tonal definition given in (3). Under this scheme, as the reviewer further points out, Kinga and Safwa would have SA, despite the fact that they count moras rather than syllables in assigning H tones.

Tokyo Japanese would have PA, while Creek and Seneca become non-accentual tone systems even though their H tones are assigned by metrical principles. There are of course many more ways to taxonomise prosodic systems, some of which are not entirely counterintuitive (e.g. by whether prosodic oppositions are unary, binary or involve multiple features, whether they are fixed *vs.* free, and so forth). However, I would argue that the ‘deepest’ typological cuts should be based on properties which make the strongest predictions about the systems in question. As was seen in §4, the OBLHEAD property is a very restricted one, in that it does not apply to features, rather to structure. It predicts that stressless major category words will never occur in a SA language, which also will never require that a second phonological property occur on all words (e.g. H tone, vowel length, glottalisation, aspiration). It also turns out that all SA systems assign prosody to syllables rather than moras. However, in §5.2 we saw that the notion of culminativity has not been restricted to a culmination of structure, but has in addition been applied to various prosodic and non-prosodic features. Under the reviewer’s proposal, Cuzco Quechua, which allows only one glottalised or aspirated consonant per word, presumably has a ‘glottal accent’. Consider also the Bantu language Punu, which has the five underlying vowels /i ε u ɔ a/, but restricts /ε ɔ/ to the first root syllable (Fontaney 1980, Kwenzi Mikala 1980). Since a word has at most one /ε/ or /ɔ/, mid vowel height has the culminative property. However, would we want to say that Punu has a ‘mid accent’? We avoid all these problems if we start with the OBLHEAD property: Punu does not require every word to have a mid vowel, any more than Cuzco Quechua requires every word to have a glottalised or aspirated consonant. Such systems, I would claim, do not exist. Concerning word-prosodic systems, the primary typological questions are whether a prosodic system has tone (‘an indication of pitch enters into the lexical realisation of at least some morphemes’) and/or stress accent (‘every lexical word has *at least* one syllable marked for the highest degree of metrical prominence’).

In both segmental and prosodic phonology there is a paradox concerning the role of theory. On the one hand theory is absolutely essential in doing typology – which, recall from §2, does not simply aim to establish inventories that vary across languages. On the other hand, we need to extract away from the particulars of theories and ‘normalise’ the data to be sure that our typologies are based on the properties of prosodic systems rather than the interpretations given to them by different analysts – or by even the same analyst on different occasions. Finally, theory/typology should be based on as complete a range of what is (potentially) attested in languages as possible. As stated by Hayes (1995: 403): ‘Phonological studies, which have access to perhaps the greatest breadth of language data, have shown that individual languages may develop an amazing variety of rich and idiosyncratic formal systems. Only broad typological work can establish which traits are properties of Language, and which are properties of individual languages’. Lehiste (1970: i) once observed that

'a certain degree of vagueness seems to characterize most discussions of prosodic features'. We have learned a lot since 1970, and although I hope that the above proposals will help clarify some of the complexities facing word-prosodic typology, there is much more to discover!

REFERENCES

- Bagemihl, Bruce (1991). Syllable structure in Bella Coola. *LI* 22. 589–646.
- Banti, Giorgio (1988). Two Cushitic systems: Somali and Oromo nouns. In van der Hulst & Smith (1988b). 11–49.
- Beckman, Mary E. (1986). *Stress and non-stress accent*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bee, Darlene & Kathleen Barker Glasgow (1962). Usarufa tone and segmental phonology. In James C. Dean (ed.) *Studies in New Guinea linguistics*. Sydney: University of Sydney. 111–127.
- Bybee, Joan, Paromita Chakraborti, Dagmar Jung & Joanne Scheibman (1998). Prosody and segmental effect: some paths of evolution for word stress. *Studies in Language* 22. 267–314.
- Cassimjee, Farida & Charles W. Kisseberth (1989). Shingazidja nominal accent. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 19. 33–61.
- Cassimjee, Farida & Charles W. Kisseberth (1998). Optimality Domains Theory and Bantu tonology: a case study from Isixhosa and Shingazidja. In Larry M. Hyman & Charles W. Kisseberth (eds.) *Theoretical aspects of Bantu tone*. Stanford: CSLI. 33–132.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1977). Accent and related phenomena in the Five Nations Iroquois languages. In Hyman (1977c). 169–181.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1996). Sketch of Seneca, an Iroquoian language. In Ives Goddard (ed.) *Languages* (Vol. 17 of *Handbook of North American Indians*). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. 551–579.
- Clements, G. N. & John Goldsmith (1984a). Autosegmental studies in Bantu tone: introduction. In Clements & Goldsmith (1984b). 1–17.
- Clements, G. N. & John Goldsmith (eds.) (1984b). *Autosegmental studies in Bantu tone*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cohn, Abigail (1989). Stress in Indonesian and bracketing paradoxes. *NLLT* 7. 167–216.
- Daly, John P. (1978). Notes on Diuxi Mixtec tone. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota* 22. 98–113.
- Dobrovolsky, Michael (1999). The phonetics of Chuvash stress: implications for phonology. In John J. Ohala, Yoko Hasegawa, Manjari Ohala, Daniel Granville & Ashlee C. Bailey (eds.) *Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*. Vol. 1. Berkeley: University of California. 539–542.
- Donohue, Mark (1997). Tone in New Guinea. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 347–386.
- Donohue, Mark (1999). *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donohue, Mark (2003). The tonal system of Skou, New Guinea. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.) *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena: historical development, phonetics of tone, and descriptive studies*. Tokyo: ILCAA. 329–364.
- Downing, Laura J. (2004). What African languages tell us about accent typology. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 37. 101–136.
- England, Nora C. (1983). *A grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Everett, Keren Madora (1998). The acoustic correlates of stress in Pirahã. *Journal of Amazonian Languages* 1:2. 104–162.
- Fontaney, Louise (1980). Le verbe. In Nsuka-Nkutsi (1980). 51–114.

- Fox, Anthony (2000). *Prosodic features and prosodic structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garde, Paul (1968). *L'accent*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Gilley, Leoma (2004). The feature of stress in Nilotic. In Rose-Juliet Anyanwu (ed.) *Stress and tone: the African experience*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 99–120.
- Goldsmith, John (1984). Tone and accent in Tonga. In Clements & Goldsmith (1984b). 19–51.
- Goldsmith, John (1987). Tone and accent, and getting the two together. *BLS* **13**. 88–104.
- Goldsmith, John & Firmard Sabimana (1989). The Kirundi verb. In Francis Jouannet (ed.) *Modèles en tonologie (kirundi et kinyarwanda)*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS. 19–62.
- Good, Jeff (2004). Tone and accent in Saramaccan: charting a deep split in the phonology of a language. *Lingua* **114**. 575–619.
- Gordon, Matthew (2005). A perceptually-driven account of onset-sensitive stress. *NLLT* **23**. 595–653.
- Greenberg, Joseph (1974). *Language typology: a historical and analytic overview*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Greenberg, Joseph & Dorothea Kaschube (1976). Word prosodic systems: a preliminary report. *Working Papers on Language Universals* **20**. 1–18.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos (2004). *The phonology of tone and intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos (2006). The prosody of Nubi between stress and tone. *Phonology* **23**. 193–223 (this issue).
- Haas, Mary R. (1977). Tonal accent in Creek. In Hyman (1977c). 195–208.
- Hagège, Claude (1992). Morphological typology. In William Bright (ed.) *International encyclopedia of linguistics*. Vol. 3. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press. 7–8.
- Halle, Morris & Jean-Roger Vergnaud (1987). *An essay on stress*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Haraguchi, Shosuke (1977). *The tone pattern of Japanese: an autosegmental theory of tonology*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hayes, Bruce (1995). *Metrical stress theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hualde, José, Ignacio (1991). *Basque phonology*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hualde, José Ignacio (1999). Basque accentuation. In van der Hulst (1999b). 947–993.
- Hulst, Harry van der (1999a). Word accent. In van der Hulst (1999b). 3–115.
- Hulst, Harry van der (ed.) (1999b). *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hulst, Harry van der & Norval Smith (1988a). The variety of pitch accent systems: introduction. In van der Hulst & Smith (1988b). ix–xxiv.
- Hulst, Harry van der & Norval Smith (eds.) (1988b). *Autosegmental studies on pitch accent*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1977a). Tone and/or accent. In D. J. Napoli (ed.) *Elements of tone, stress and intonation*. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1–20.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1977b). On the nature of linguistic stress. In Hyman (1977c). 37–82.
- Hyman, Larry M. (ed.) (1977c). *Studies in stress and accent*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1981). Tonal accent in Somali. *Studies in African Linguistics* **12**. 169–203.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1985). *A theory of phonological weight*. Dordrecht: Foris. Reprinted 2003 with an introduction, Stanford: CSLI.

- Hyman, Larry M. (1989). Accent in Bantu: an appraisal. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 19. 115–134.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1990). Non-exhaustive syllabification: evidence from Nigeria and Cameroon. *CLS* 26:2. 175–195.
- Hyman, Larry M. (2001a). Tone systems. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.) *Language typology and language universals: an international handbook*. Vol. 2. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 1367–1380.
- Hyman, Larry M. (2001b). Privative tone in Bantu. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.) *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena: tonogenesis, Japanese accentology, and other topics*. Tokyo: ILCAA. 237–257.
- Hyman, Larry M. (in press). Directional asymmetries in the morphology and phonology of words, with special reference to Bantu. *Linguistics* 45.
- Johnson, Keith (2005). Tone and pitch accent in Cherokee nouns. Available (April 2006) at http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/phonlab/annual_report/2005/johnson1-48.pdf.
- Kaji, Shigeki (ed.) (2005). *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena: historical development, tone-syntax interface, and descriptive studies*. Tokyo: ILCAA.
- Kähler-Meyer, E. (1962). Studien zur tonalen Struktur der Bantusprachen. II: Chasu. *Afrika und Übersee* 46. 250–295.
- Kisseberth, Charles (2005). Accent and phrasing in Chimwiini. In Kaji (2005). 129–145.
- Kisseberth, Charles & Mohammad Imam Abasheikh (1974). Vowel length in Chi-Mwiini: a case study of the role of grammar in phonology. In Anthony Bruck, Robert A. Fox & Michael W. La Galy (eds.) *Papers from the parasession on natural phonology*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 193–209.
- Kisseberth, Charles & David Odden (2003). Tone. In Derek Nurse & Gérard Philippson (eds.) *The Bantu languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 59–70.
- Kwenzi Mikala, Jérôme (1980). Esquisse phonologique du punu. In Nsuka-Nkutsi (1980). 7–18.
- Ladd, D. Robert (1996). *Intonational phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leben, William R. (2002). Tonal feet. In Ulrike Gut & Dafydd Gibbon (eds.) *Typology of African prosodic systems*. Bielefeld: University of Bielefeld. 27–40.
- Lehiste, Ilse (1970). *Suprasegmentals*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- McCarthy, John J. (2002). *A thematic guide to Optimality Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John J. (2003). OT constraints are categorical. *Phonology* 20. 75–138.
- McCawley, James D. (1970). Some tonal systems that come close to being pitch accent systems but don't quite make it. *CLS* 6. 526–531.
- McCawley, James D. (1978). What is a tone language? In Victoria Fromkin (ed.) *Tone: a linguistic survey*. New York: Academic Press. 113–131.
- Martinet, André (1960). *Éléments de linguistique générale*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.
- May, Jean & Eunice Loeweke (1964). The phonological hierarchy in Fasu. *Anthropological Linguistics* 7:5. 89–97.
- Mazaudon, Martine (2005). On tone in Tamang and neighbouring languages: synchrony and diachrony. In Kaji (2005). 79–96.
- Meeussen, A. E. (1963). Morphotonology of the Tonga verb. *Journal of African Languages* 2. 72–92.
- Meeussen, A. E. (1972). Japanese accentuation as a restricted tone system. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 1. 267–270.
- Melinger, Alissa (2002). Foot structure and accent in Seneca. *IJAL* 68. 287–315.

- Mortensen, David (2005). Ayutla Mixtec tone. Handout from seminar presentation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Mous, Maarten (1993). *A grammar of Iraqw*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Newman, Stanley (1947). Bella Coola I: phonology. *IJAL* **13**. 129–134.
- Nsuka-Nkutsi, François (ed.) (1980). *Éléments de description du punu*. Lyon: CRLS, Université Lyon II.
- Odden, David (1988). Predictable tone systems in Bantu. In van der Hulst & Smith (1988). 225–251.
- Odden, David (1999). Typological issues in tone and stress in Bantu. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.) *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena: tonogenesis, typology, and related topics*. Tokyo: ILCAA. 187–215.
- Pankratz, Leo & Eunice V. Pike (1967). Phonology and morphotonemics of Ayutla Mixtec. *IJAL* **33**. 287–299.
- Parker, Steve (1977). An OT account of laryngealization in Cuzco Quechua. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota* **41**. 1–11.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. & Mary E. Beckman (1988). *Japanese tone structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pike, Eunice V. (1974). A multiple stress system versus a tone system. *IJAL* **40**. 169–175.
- Pike, Eunice V. & Joy Oram (1976). Stress and tone in the phonology of Diuxi Mixtec. *Phonetica* **33**. 321–333.
- Pike, Kenneth L. & Willard Kindberg (1956). A problem in multiple stresses. *Word* **12**. 415–428.
- Poser, William J. (1984). *The phonetics and phonology of tone and intonation in Japanese*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Prince, Alan (1983). Relating to the grid. *LI* **14**. 19–100.
- Pulleyblank, Douglas (1986). *Tone in Lexical Phonology*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Remijsen, Bert (2001). *Word-prosodic systems of Raja Ampat languages*. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Remijsen, Bert (2002). Lexically contrastive stress accent and lexical tone in Ma'ya. In Carlos Gussenhoven & Natasha Warner (eds.) *Laboratory phonology 7*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 585–614.
- Remijsen, Bert & Vincent J. van Heuven (2005). Stress, tone and discourse prominence in the Curaçao dialect of Papiamentu. *Phonology* **22**. 205–235.
- Saeed, John (1999). *Somali*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Salmons, Joe (1992). *Accentual change and language contact: comparative study and a case study of early northern Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. (1973). Kinga: a restricted tone system. *Studies in African Linguistics* **4**. 23–48.
- Vajda, Edward (2001). Materials for Linguistics 201, Western Washington University. Available (May 2006) at <http://pandora.cii.wvu.edu/vajda/ling201/test2materials/phonology3.htm>.
- Voorhoeve, Jan (1973). Safwa as restricted tone system. *Studies in African Linguistics* **4**. 1–21.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1954). Stress and word structure in Yiddish. In Uriel Weinreich (ed.) *The field of Yiddish: studies in Yiddish language, folklore, and literature*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York. 1–27.
- Welmers, William E. (1959). Tonemics, morphotonemics, and tonal morphemes. *General Linguistics* **4**. 1–9.
- Welmers, William E. (1973). *African language structures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Willard, E. Rainbow (2004). Dominance effects in a dialect of Mam Maya. Ms, University of California, Berkeley.

- Zanten, Ellen van, Rob Goedemans & Jos Pacilly (2003). The status of word stress in Indonesian. In Jeroen van de Weijer, Vincent J. van Heuven & Harry van der Hulst (eds.) *The phonological spectrum*. Vol. 2: *Suprasegmental structure*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. 151–175.
- Zanten, Ellen van & Vincent J. van Heuven (1998). Word stress in Indonesian: its communicative relevance. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* **154**. 129–149.
- Zec, Draga (1999). Footed tones and tonal feet: rhythmic constituency in a pitch-accent language. *Phonology* **16**. 225–264.