

THE INTONOLOGY OF THE 80-ES

TATJANA NIKOLAYEVA

Institute of Slavistics and Balkanistics;
Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.
Moscow, USSR, 125040

The report sets out a brief review of main trends in intonology of the latest decade, reveals contradictions in methods of one and same field of science, and a great need in common metalanguage. Two types of sentence accent are put forward: neutral sentence stress which is obligatory and has communicative delimitative function and accents with special communicative and prosodic characteristics.

The idea of a prosodic dictionary is put forward. The problems of colloquial speech intonation and the intonation of a text as a whole are raised.

1. We would like to summarize some new features in the intonology of the late decade and to find something in common in the seemingly uncoordinated innovations (and to try also to determine the problems of future investigations).

2. The melody is the main parameter for intonologists as before. Yet the approach to the description of the melodic contour has changed. The contour was described before as a set of levels, configurations of levels or a global line corresponding to a certain sentence type or as a binomial phenomenon with only one relevant part (intonation centre).

The distinction of two frequency movements in the melodic contour is new. These are the "main, or the baseline" and something like a wavy like pattern superimposed on the base line, or canvas. They are called the "baseline" and the "peakline" /1/, the "nesycij ton" /2/, the main line and the line of frequency peaks /3/, etc. The new base notion of "declination" is connected with these distinctions. It turns out that the declination notion is perceptually conditioned. Thus of the two peaks that have an equal range, the second one

is perceived as intoned higher /4/, because the hearer is expecting the descent.

3. But the problem of the semantic relevance in this double contour is still open and is still discussed. For some investigators the "accent focus zones" are of importance /5/, for others it is the terminal zone /6/. Some investigators want to see the whole configuration /7/, others - some minimal units. On the acknowledgment of these different conceptions depends in fact the intonology as science. For example, I. Fónagy thinks that there is a limited set of "cliches melodiques" /8/. On the contrary, D. Bolinger considers the number of melodic contours to be an open set, because contours are combined by minimal unites - "profiles" in practically enumerable ways /9/.

I would like to draw your attention to N. D. Svetozarova's monography /10/, which to a great extent shows the Soviet intonology of the present day. The Russian intonation is described in this book as a given list of contours. But in the language these contours are given differently and this fact is very essential. They include both "loose" declarative sentences and high-cliches questions. Experimental data proved that the contour as such is important for the perception /11/. Thus the degree of the grammaticalization of contours is different and is functionally conditioned. All this doesn't annul the value of the intonation centre, i.e. the part of the contour which is usually singled out by acoustic parameters.

4. All said above refers to the plan of expression of sentence intonation. The problem of the so-called "sentence stress" has become a debating question in the intonology of the 80-ies. This problem is divided into a number of sub-problems, such as: "contrastive" versus "normal" stress, "nuclear sentence stress", "accent of power" and "accent of interest", "default accent", etc. Let us analyse them in a more detailed way. Only two decades ago there prevailed only one leading theory. This theory was so unshakable that its validity seemed to be undoubtful. Namely,

1/ In any sentence is one main stressed element.
2/ This element is usually located at the

end of the sentence.

3/ It can be located in some other place. It is then an index of some special prominence, underlining.

4/ The underlined elements are loud.

5/ Loudness is emphasis.

6/ The underlined element usually means contrast.

7/ Rheme is usually located at the sentence end.

8/ That's why Rheme is connected with the sentence stress.

9/ If the stress is removed, the Rheme is removed too.

10/ Where something is loud, it is Rheme.

11/ Rheme is connected with something new, indefinite and important.

12/ The important and indefinite is always accented and the old and Thematic is unaccented /12/.

The first blow was delivered to the idea of indispensable contrastivity of prominence. It turned out that there were sentences which had no contrastive elements but only an accent of prominence. Here are some Russian examples: *Mne očen' ponravilas' Vaša žena* (not - *ne-očen'*); *Ti-šč, babuška spit* (not *ne-babuška*); *Nado poiti v izdatel'stvo - Ja i chodil*; *Čital li Pet a roman Aitmatova?* - *Net, on ne čital set, joznych knig*, etc. It is quite evident, that the stressed element in these utterances is not new, important or indefinite.

We would now like to argue the main thesis of this theory which says that the sentence has only one stressed element, or only one stress focus. We think that there are two principally different phenomena. First, we have sentence stress, which has delimitative function, it makes a sentence complete and thus separates sentences one from the other. This stress is usually located at the sentence end and is not perceptually audible as a loud one. For example, *Eto novyj dom -> Eto novyj dom brata -> Eto novyj dom brata muža*, etc. These sentence stresses are organized in a set of communicative types: declaratives, questions, imperatives and so on. Many utterances have only this type of stress. In Russian, for example, these utterances are usually descriptive and correlated with the event as such /13/.

The second type of stress is parallel and independent of the first. We called it accent of prominence. The element under accent of prominence is to be prosodically emphasised, so it is audible, i.e. perceptually active. For example, *Eto moja žena* and *Eto moja žena*. In the last case we all hear the prominence of *eto*. Thus we are of the opinion that accent of prominence and sentence stress are parallel prosodic phenomena. How can we prove it? We have to evidently adopt some postulates. We consider these phenomena as different ones: 1/ if they are perceptually distinguished, 2/ if they can coexist (i.e. are

not in complementary distribution), 3/ if we can formulate its communicative specificity. We can conclude then that the first two conditions correlate with the expression plan, and the last one with the content plan.

Indeed, these phenomena are perceptually distinguishable. The sentence stress is unmarked, the accent of prominence is marked. *Segodn'a chododno* has no prominence; *Segodn'a chododno - segodn'a* is emphasised. Moreover, they can coexist: the accent of prominence does not liquidate the sentence stress (see, for example, the fundamental study of T.M. Nadeina- /14/). However, they can overlap, if the end is underlined: *Ja prošu pal'to - Ja prošu pal'to*. At last the third condition - they must have communicative differences. We can propose two specific features of prominence accent for discussion:

	Sentence stress	Accent of prominence
1. Is obligatory?	+	-
2. Is perceptually perceived?	-	+
3. Connected with norm?	+	-
4. Does create the communicative supplementary aura?	-	+

Both stresses can coexist.

Above accent of prominence was analysed as if it were only one type of phenomenon. In reality, there exist several types of it with different functional status. Here is a list of some of them and the reader is free to decide if the distinctive features mentioned above are really present.

1/ The contrast is the simplest kind of prominence. *Ja ne teb'a zvala*.
2/ The accent of appraisal. *Mne očen' ponravilas' a film; Ty absol'utno neprav*, etc. Sometimes only the fact of appraisal accent helps us to understand, if the described subject is big or small, frequent or rare. *On jezdit tuda každuju nedel'u* (i.e. very often); *Ja zaplatila p'atnadcat' rublej za eti perčatki* (i.e. they cost too much). And now we can see that there are also extra-normal situations and supplementary communicative aura.

3/ The accent of result. I resul'taty jest. ;Jezdil, jezdil, a uvidel krasavici; Ja podumal - i resil zadacu. In such cases the accent is usually located in the verb.

4/ The accent of negation. Dajte mne tort bez krema; Svobodnyh mest net!; Ne bylo ni vezlivosti, ni uvazeniya, etc. Here we also can see the deviation from presupposed normal situation.

5/ The accent of disagreement. Pochemu on ne izbavitsa ot svoich knig? - On citael ich; Vy ocen rezko temu otvetili. - Mne nraivitsa a byt rezkoj.

We suppose that the widely discussed "default accent" is also the accent of disagreement. Vitali Pet'a "Burannyj polustanok"? - Net, on ne ubit serjoznych knig. We have a disagreement with presupposed Pet'a's image and at the same time we expressed our opinion on high level of Aitmatov's novel.

Let us see the "default accent" examples from papers of R.Ladd, A.Fuchs, A.Cutler et al./15/:

A. Has John read Slaughterhouse -Five?
B. No, John doesn't read books.

The disagreement here is doubtless. Thus we demonstrate quite another intonological credo: we ought to search for the "de-accenting" reasons not in deaccenting of words, but in the semantics of a sentence as a whole (that's what to my mind S.Schmerling thinks - /16/). So, "default accent" has always deep disagreement (what I call polemics) because it contradicts a global situation and does not contradict just one single notion within the sentence. In this case the verb is accented not because of de-accenting of terminal words, but because the verb has the property to be a situational centre. It is typologically remarkable that the English examples of "default accent" discussed in literature may be adequately translated into Russian though intonational systems of both languages are very different /17/. In the case of "accent of polemics" the semantics of identification may be. For example, A. U men'a bolit zub, nicego ne pomogaet. - B. Tak u nas chorošaja poliklinika naprotiv. - A. Ja i chodil tuda. Here we have a case of disagreement (with an idea of not going to see a dentist) and identification (the speaker was already in this clinic). I would like to say a few words about the function of the Russian particle i (and, even, too). It is, so to speak, the definite article for verbs in Russian: Vam nužno pozanimat'sa japonskim. - Ja i ucu jego, etc. To sum it up, we can say: Sentence stress and accents of prominence are parallel and co-existing. That's why in the sentence John doesn't read books we have both accents: the first on the read (accent of prominence) and the second - on the books (sentence stress).

That is why, in our opinion, there is no "de-accenting" at all.

6/ We called the sixth type of prominence "an extraordinary introduction to the situation". Here we have another typologically remarkable coincidence of utterances in intonationally different languages. Cf.: Tise! Papa spit!; Paul ruff!; Truman died!, etc. We think that there an inversion in the normal situation expressed. Yet this type of prominence is close to the disagreement accent (See the paper of Chr. Bonnot - I. Fougerson: Podézjam k Krymu - sneg ležit; Chotela uchodit - telefon zazvonil /18/). The prominence of sneg, telefon does not mean an opposition to something (not-sneg, not-telefon), but here situation as such is controversial to the normal situation, the one that we expect.

Thus, the typological feature of intonation in the 80-es is the interest to non-standard (non-trivial) prominences. Connected with this are some problems of expression form. Namely,

1/ How many prominences can there be in one sentence? What do they depend on?

2/ What namely is accented in the prominence cases? What is the extent of accented part? Does it depend on the language or only the sense?

Some intonologists suppose that the stressed syllable of the main word is only accented /19/. A more wide-spread idea is that the word is accented. There is a new hypothesis proposed by S.V. Kodzasov /20/, that the whole constituent may be accented. This constituent may consist of one word or of a few words which are accented altogether.

It is to propose that in "default accent" cases the whole verb-group is accented.

I would now like to ask English speaking linguists. How should one distinguish terminologically and conceptually two main notions: "accent" and "stress" (in a sentence)? I have tried to compare all the definitions in intonation papers in English. Sometimes they are quasi-synonymous and are used in one context. Cf.: R.Ladd: "Contrastive stress" also corresponds to the default accent...

Sometimes the "stress" is considered as a word property, and "accent" as a sentence property (A.Cutler). (In Russian we have a slightly different intonational terminology). It also becomes clear that "stress" and "accent" are distinct by acoustic properties. It is naive to think so to-day.

I invite you to discuss my suspicion that these two terms reflect two different oppositions (which are not contradictory):

1/ "Stress" is more abstract, metalinguistic notion, and "accent" is more concrete. "Stress" is more "morphological", so to speak.

2/ "Stress" designates the neutral sentence stress, which is obligatory for each

utterance; as to "accent" it designates underlining. However our colleagues do not overcome the psychology of one prominent-zone routine. E.Selkirk, to my mind, is more close to this double definition /21/. I would like to hear your opinion, if I am right.

4. So the debates around prominence is one of the most important features in intonology of the 80-es. With this is connected another feature: the absence of common metalanguage for the description of intonational systems. This fact explains why the intonology to-day gives so little to syntax and comparative intonology (accentology).

R.Ladd has compared types of intonation description with the description of an elephant by the blind people who can feel only one part of the elephant /22/. If it were so, we could simply summarize intonational descriptions. We have metalinguistic differences and theoretical differences which generate differences in the description, and not vice versa. How can we compare "intonational constructions" /IK/ introduced by E.A. Bryzgunova; by contour description by N.D. Svetozarova, "metrical grids" by Liberman-Prince (and E.Selkirk), low-high peak combinations by J.Pierrehumbert, "cliches melodiques" by I.Fonagy and D.Bolinger's "profiles"? To my mind, only a long co-laboration and discussion of this problem will permit to elaborate a common metalanguage and a common theory.

I would like to pay attention to the distinction of acoustic parameters in this sense. All emotional and conceptual divergencies are connected mainly with melodic (and less - with dynamic) parameter of intonation complex. Meanwhile we have rich data of temporal characteristics (Lehiste, Nooteboom, Krivnova et al.). The complement each other in a very interesting way and do not call for discussion. That is why we do not analyse the temporal aspect otherwise our paper from the problem searching will be reduced a review. But this difference of attitudes to different acoustic parameters has given me an idea of the existence of one more opposition in intonology. We have actually two types of orientation: essence and description. My opinion may be opposed that a successful description is always inseparable from the essence of phenomena. Yet we should draw one's attention to the tendency of linguistics to-day: to distinct the language facts and the facts of linguistics. Simple language phenomena may be complicated from the point of view of their linguistic status. Temporal characteristics seem to be closer to language, as melody descriptions - they are the domain of linguistics. Consequently there is much in common while describing duration, timing, etc, while there's more divergency in melody descrip-

tions.

But I want to say that in our linguistics little attention is paid to the formal possibilities of intonation description and phrase stresses gradualness. That is why "metrical grid" investigation ought to be popularized.

6. J.Pierrehumbert's works constitute, in my opinion, a significant phenomenon in the latest decade intonology /23/. It gives one also an idea as to how to study the transition from lexical tonal accents of archaic prosody to its amalgamation into the present specific "grammaticalized" melodic contours. Thus we suppose that supersegmental sentence phonetics has its autonomous history (evolution) as segmental phonetics has. And thus melodic contours grammaticalization is the fact of language evolution (See my section paper on the Congress). Going back to I.Fonagy's ideas of "cliches melodiques", I would like to emphasize that there are two kinds of intonation cliches:

1/ Grammaticalized intonation contours like in alternative questions, repeated questions, echo-questions, replikas and so on.
2/ Intonation "idioms". They occur in Russian when the whole sentence meaning do not correspond to its lexeme sum, but may even contradict to it. In that case the true sense of utterance can be recognised only through the special "idiomatic" intonation. For example, Nužna mne Vaša kniga! (i.e. I don't need your book); Tak ja vam i otvetila! (i.e. I will not answer), etc. If we replace "normal" intonation for this specific one, we will have an absolutely different sentence meaning, or the sentence will be senseless. Nu, ljudi! - sounds as an appraisal. Nu, ljudi, has no sense. Raboty! (i.e. there is much work). Raboty... has no sense. These observations were obtained from Russian data. It is interesting to know of other languages facts.

6. We have now many affirmations in intonological papers that intonation do not coincide with syntax and may even contradict it. (D.Bolinger speaks in such situations about "grammar" /24/). Now, in the 80-es the question arises: what syntax really is? It is not so far clear from intonological works. Moreover, I sometimes have an impression that syntax for intonologists is more archaic notion than for syntacticists themselves. There are some remarkable and important even to-day ideas expressed our academician L.V. Shcherba. Shcherba's syntagm is not only a prosodic unit, but also a sense unit. That is why the utterance can be divided into syntagms only in accordance with the speaker's intention. Owing to this division we can understand the communicative intentions of the speaker (Kaznit nel za pomilovat - Kaznit / nel za pomilovat). These rules of division into syntagms are equal for any language speaker. In fact, it is not neces-

ssary to be a "mind reader" in order to understand a sentence-division correctly. It is quite enough to know the language. Moreover, Shcherba's ideas are also significant because they bring to the conception of the "intonation syntax" (not only "syntax intonation"). In other words the arrangement of syntagmas, the length of the pauses, the melodic types of syntagmas, etc. are meaningful themselves /25/. The punctuation is to be to a certain extent parallel to it. However punctuation systems are so different in different countries not for prosodic reasons /26/. In Russian syntax we have many constructions without conjunctions. It is only a "intonation syntax" that determines the sense. For example, *Les rub at shchepki let at* (the enumeration); *Les rub at shchepki let at* (the condition); *Les rub at shchepki let at* (the explanation). In all such cases correlations of the acoustic parameters are regular and well described. I suppose that this approach to "intonation syntax" can be very interesting for intonologists even to day. That is why, in my opinion, it is senseless to say that intonation is independent of syntax, or to say that syntax is independent of intonation. They cannot be separated being both products of communication activity with their own sense units. They may "work" in different directions but they can disperse too. It is out of date now to treat syntax as IC-structure or as a set of sentence types.

7. One of the interesting features of intonology to-day is the conversion to the intonation of colloquial speech. At present we have enough data /27/. The remarkable feature is a striking similarity of colloquial speech intonation in different languages (Russian and English, for example). The investigators have proved that colloquial speech intonation has a specific organization such as short syntagmas, indistinctness, "slurring" of melodic contour structure, an abundance of prominent words, a frequent prominence of the beginning (even if it contain auxiliary words) absence of regular meaningful pause duration we have discussed above. The common colloquial syntax data in comparison with literary syntax codified: an iconic word order, ill-formed structures, etc. draw us to the interesting hypothesis put forward by T. Givón and his colleagues /28/ about the existence of the primary "pragmatic code" and its later "syntactization". In this relation colloquial speech data are much closer to this primary code than literary data. The proximity of colloquial speech intonation models is understandable; according to Givón, at the "pragmatic code" stages languages are closer to each other. But, in a paradoxical way, it is the colloquial speech and its intonation that represents a storehouse of relicts and an innovation arena at the same time.

8. The new feature in intonology is the introduction of lexics into the intonological analysis. At present two main sets of facts are outlined. First of all, it turns out that certain lexemes (or lexeme classes) are inclined to attract the accent of prominence. It concerns some types of adjectives /29/, intensifying adverbs like *očen' absolutno, nevozmožno, etc.* There is another class of lexeme that are inclined to be prosodically weak, not-prominent, their segmental structure according to these prosodic reasons may be modified.

In the second place words may have distinct prosodic coloring. The distinction is connected with words pragmatic connotations. For example, words with semantics of "big" have a different intonation than words with semantics of "small" /30/.

The appraisal component of word is important too: words with the so-called "bad" semantics have a different pronunciation from those with "good" semantics. Thus there arises a new idea: to compose a dictionary of prosodical potentiality of lexemes (their prominence and phonation possibility). It is very important to know the degree of universality in such dictionaries.

9. The last point of my paper is devoted to the text intonation (of course, the list of problems is still open). We know now that the connected and integral text has its own intonation structure /31/. This intonological sphere has much in common with phonosyllistics and communication units syntax (see I.G. Torsuyeva paper in this Symposium).

References

- /1/ D. Gibbon, "Intonation as an adaptive process", *Intonation, Accent and Rhythm*, B.-N.Y., 1984, p. 172.
- /2/ O.F. Krivnova, "Sostavljajuščaja nesuščego tona v strukture melodičeskoj křivoj", *Issledovanija po strukturnoj i prikladnoj lingvistiky*, Publikacija OSIPL MGU, vyp. 7, M., 1975.
- /3/ A. Cutler, "Stress and accent in language production and understanding", *Intonation, Accent and Rhythm*.
- /4/ A. Di Cristo, "De la microprosodie à l'intonosyntaxe", t. 2? Aix-en-Provence, 1985, p. 537.
- /5/ E. Selkirk, "Phonology and syntax", *Cambr. Mass.-L.*, 1984.
- /6/ D. Bolinger, "Intonations and its parts. Melody in spoken English", *Stanford, California*, 1986, p. 25.
- /7/ N.D. Svetozarova, "Intonacionnaja sistema russkogo jazyka", L., 1982.
- /8/ I. Fonagy, E. Berard, J. Fonagy, "Clichés melodiques", *Folia linguistica*, 1983, t. 17.
- /9/ D. Bolinger, *Op. cit.*
- /10/ N.D. Svetozarova, *Op. cit.*
- /11/ M.G. Radijevskaja, N.D. Svetozarova, "O strukture intonacionnogo kontura v russkom jazyke", *Experimental no-foneti-*

- českij analiz reči, L., 1984, p. 148.
- /12/ See in detail: T.M. Nikolayeva, "Semantika akcentnogo vydelenija", M., 1982.
 - /13/ T.M. Nikolayeva, "Kategorial no-grammatičeskaja cel nost vyskazyvanja i jeho pragmatičeskij aspekt", *Izvestija AN SSSR, Serija literatury i jazyka*, 1981, t. 40, N 1.
 - /14/ T.M. Nadeina, "Akcentnaja struktura vyskazyvanija v russkom jazyke", *Avtoreferat kand. diss.*, M., 1986.
 - /15/ R.D. Ladd, "Light and shadow. A study of the Syntax and Semantics of Sentence Accent in English", *Contributions to grammatical studies*, Leiden, 1979; A. Fuchs, "Deaccenting" and "default accent", *Intonation, Accent and Rhythm*.
 - /16/ S.F. Schmerling, "Aspects of English sentence stress", *Austin, L.*, 1976.
 - /17/ It is interesting to analyse these accent similarities in detail.
 - /18/ Chr. Bonnot, I. Fougerson, "Accent de phrase non final et relations internonciatives en Russe moderne", *Revue des études slaves*, 1983, t. LV, N 4.
 - /19/ D. Bolinger, "Intonation and its parts", p. 10.
 - /20/ S.V. Kodzasov, "Tonal'naja emfaza" (see his paper on this Symposium).
 - /21/ E. Selkirk, "Phonology and syntax" (NSR - Nuclear Stress Rule, PAR - Pitch Accent prominence Rule).
 - /22/ R.D. Ladd, "Light and shadow", p. 102.
 - /23/ J. Breckenbridge-Pierrehumbert, "The phonology and phonetics of English intonation". D. of Ph. Dissertation, MIT, 1980.
 - /24/ D. Bolinger, *Op. cit.* and other works.
 - /25/ See: T.M. Nikolayeva, "Semantika akcentnogo vydelenija".
 - /26/ See: I. et J. Fonagy, "L'intonation et l'organisation de discours", *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, t. LXXVIII, fasc. 1, 1983.
 - /27/ See books and papers of "Razgovornaja rec" group in Institute of Russian language of Academy of Sciences USSR. The recent work is also from IGU group: N. I. Geilman, "Razgovornaja proiznositel'naja norma i var'irovanije fonetičeskich oboloček slov", *Voprosy normy i realizacii jazykovych sfedstv*, Gor'kij, 1984.
 - /28/ T. Givón, "Universals of discourse structure", *Language universals and second language acquisition*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1984.
 - /29/ T.P. Skorikova, "Funkcional'nyje vozmožnosti intonacionnogo oformlenija slovosočetanija v potoke reči", *Avoreferat kand. diss. M.*, 1982.
 - /30/ S.V. Kodzasov, O.F. Krivnova, "Fonetičeskije vozmožnosti gortani i ich ispolzivanije v russkoj reči", *Problemy teoretičeskoj i eksperimental'noj lingvistiki*. Publ. OSIPL MGU, vyp. 8, M., 1977.

/31/ See papers of special conference: "Prosodiya teksta", *Sbornik naučnych trudov MGPIIJA im. M. Torea*, 1982, vyp. 169.