

The english
compound of stress
assignment english
language essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In English, combination is a high degree systematic series of actions to make new words such as embarkation schools, eviction notice or province colleges. These Noun-noun compounds are classified as having emphasis either on the first component or on the 2nd. English compounds have a emphasis form that is different from that of phrases. While most compounds are stressed on the first portion, phrases are stressed on the concluding portion. The atomic emphasis regulation and compound emphasis regulation explains this systematic difference (Chomsky & A ; Halle1968: 17) .

Modern surveies have shown many different factors influence compound emphasis such as the morphology of the caput, and the semantic features of the compounds holding important effects. Plag (2009) explains that the emphasis prejudice in the constitutional households is important side by side with other important forecasters. Bell (2008) has recently suggests that constitutional household size has an influence on compound emphasis assignment (see besides Marchand 1969 for an earlier, similar attack) . She puts frontward the construct that there is a negative correlativity between the household size of a compound component and the proportion of emphasis on this component. When the component becomes more predictable, and therefore less enlightening, we stress on the component that appears less often. (see, for illustration, Ladd 1984 for treatment and illustrations) .

Hypothesis about compound emphasis assignment

Honestly speech production, there are four types of attack have been taken to account for the really confusing facts of different types of noun-noun

emphasis. The first is what Plag (2006) has called the 'structural hypothesis'. It is the hypothesis that bases chiefly on the argument-modifier differentiation. This hypothesis (e. g. Bloomfield 1933, Lees 1963, Marchand 1969, Payne and Huddleston 2002) affirms that compounds are on a regular basis left-stressed, and that word combinations with rightward emphasis can non be compounds. One natural possibility is to see such signifiers to be phrases but we need to hold standards to find whether something is a lexical entity (i. e. a compound) or a syntactic entity (i. e. a phrase) . Spencer (2003) besides argues that we find compounds with phrasal emphasis, and phrases with compound emphasis, and therefore that emphasis is more related to lexicalisation forms than to structural differences. Giegerich (2004) builds his theory harmonizing to the fact that English syntax complements follow the caput ; he argues that, due to the order of parts, complement-head constructions like truck driver can non be syntactic phrases, hence must be compounds, hence are left-stressed. Modifier-head constructions such as steel bridge show the same word order as fitting modifier-head phrases (californium. wooden bridge) , therefore are syntactic constructions and systematically right-stressed. These are considered as a consequence of lexicalisation. This means, nevertheless, that many being modifier-head constructions are in fact non stressed in the predicted manner, since they are left-stressed (e. g. opera spectacles, table fabric) . Such deviant behaviour is, harmonizing to Giegerich, the consequence of lexicalisation. The construct that there is a relationship between lexicalisation and stress assignment is old and has besides been supported by other writers. For illustration, Bauer (1983b: 51) references irregular stress assignment in English derived functions and Danish compounds as archetypal instances of (<https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

phonological) lexicalisation. And Adams (1973: 59) writes that `` in established NPs which are used often and over a period of clip the nucleus tends to switch from the 2nd to the first component although this does non ever go on `` (accent added) .

The 2nd attack is called a 'semantic hypotheses. A figure of bookmans have discussed that words with rightward emphasis `` are systematic exclusions to the compound emphasis regulation (e. g. Sampson 1980, Fudge 1984, Ladd 1984, Liberman and Sproat 1992, Sproat 1994, Olsen 2000, 2001, Spencer 2003) . Although these writers differ slimly in inside informations of their specific attacks, they all argue that rightward differentiation is restricted to merely a limited figure of more or less chiseled types of significance classs and relationships. Pertinent illustrations are copulative compounds like geologist-astronomer and scholaractivist (californium. Plag 2003: 146) , which are uncontroversially considered to be on a regular basis right-stressed. Other intending relationships that are frequently, if non typically, accompanied by rightward emphasis are temporal or locative (e. g. a summer night, the Boston marathon) , or causative, normally paraphrased as 'made of ' (as in aluminium foil, silk tie) or 'created by ' (as in a Shakespeare sonnet, a Mahler symphony) . It is, nevertheless, confounding how accurate the rank in a given semantic category can truly foretell the sort of emphasis. The leftward emphasis on summer school, summer cantonment or day occupation, for illustration,

Disregards Fudge 's (1984: 144ff.) generalisation that noun-noun assembles in which the first noun refers to a period or point of clip are right-stressed.

Furthermore, it is

<https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

ill-defined how many, and which, semantic categories should be set up to account for all the

putative exclusions to the compound emphasis regulation (see besides Bauer 1998: 71 on this point) . Finally, semantically really similar compounds can act otherwise in footings of emphasis assignment (Madison Street vs. Madison Avenue) . And once more, we have to province that, apart from the copulative compounds (see Olsen 2001) and compounds showing an writing relation (see Plag 2006) , elaborate and systematic empirical surveies are missing for the categories postulated to trip rightward emphasis because the advocates of the attack we label 'structural hypothesis ' have ne'er referred to that class, although this class might be considered 'structural ' (and 'semantic ' at the same clip) . makes usage of the semantic features of compound.

The 3rd attack assumes that stress assignment is normally based on analogy to bing NN buildings in the mental vocabulary. Plag (2003: 139) references the text edition illustrations of street vs. avenue compounds as a clear instance of analogy. All street names affecting street as their right-hand component, form likewise in holding leftward emphasis (e. g. _ Oxford Street, M_ain Street, F_ourth Street) , while all combinations with, for illustration, avenue as right-hand member form likewise in holding rightward emphasis (e. g. Fifth _ Avenue, Madison _ Avenue) . Along similar lines, Spencer (2003: 331) suggests that emphasis theoretical accounts are in many instances determined by (true vague) semantic buildings. Schmerling (1971: 56) is an early advocator of an analogical attack, discoursing that many compounds choose their emphasis theoretical account in analogy to <https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

combinations that have the same caput, i. e. rightward member. Liberman & A ; Sproat (1992) extend this proposal to both components of the compound. As we mentioned earlier, we found that all the mentioned writers do n't explicate how far such an analogical attack can make. A 4th attack to intensify stress assignment makes mention to the figure of compounds in a given constitutional household. Bell 's and Marchand 's hypotheses boil down to a negative correlativity between household size and emphasis. The larger the right household, the smaller the proportion of right-stressed compounds among the compounds with that right component and frailty versa. Ladd (1984: 260) explains that with increasing type frequency, the given component becomes more predictable and therefore less enlightening which so leads to emphasize on the more enlightening component.

In a production experiment with native talkers, Bell (2008) nods grounds in her informations (taken from the BNC Demographic Corpus) there is a big left household for universe with a bulk of right-stressed compounds (as in universe title-holder, universe council, universe cup, universe leader) , and the opposite consequence for the really frequent right component line, as in apparels line, aid line, production line, travel line. Bell besides points out that there are clear counterexamples, such as the right component pie, which has a big household, but all pertinent compounds (with the exclusion of lexicalized and opaque honey-pie) are right-stressed (californium. apple pie, lemon pie

meringue pie, mince pie, etc.) . Obviously, there seem to be viing forces at work, in this instance possibly the constitutional household emphasis <https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

prejudice, or the semantic relation ('N1 is an component of N2 '), which is changeless across the household and normally goes together with rightward emphasis.

It is therefore non cognize how far the household size attack can take us in explicating different types of compound emphasis in English. Furthermore, it is ill-defined how the supposed consequence would pass on with other factors that influence compound emphasis assignment. Is the household size consequence stronger, weaker, or non found at all?

Hypothesis and anticipations

The household size hypothesis makes the undermentioned anticipations:

(Prediction 1: The larger the left constitutional household of a given compound, the smaller the opportunities of leftward emphasis. Prediction 2:

The larger the right component household of a given compound,

the smaller the chances of rightward emphasis. Prediction 3: The household size is an independent forecaster of compound emphasis, side by side with other forecasters. Given that our arrested development theoretical accounts decidedly predict the possibility of merely one effects (i. e. either leftward or rightward emphasis) , we need to interpret these anticipations into

anticipations that make mention to merely one type of emphasis. Using the possibility of rightward emphasis as the value to be predicted, we can develop once more the anticipations as follows: Prediction 1: The larger the left constitutional household of a given compound, the higher the possibility of rightward emphasis in that household. Prediction 2: The larger the right

component household of a given compound, the lower the possibility of
<https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

rightward emphasis in that household. Prediction 3: Family size is a liberated forecaster of compound emphasis, side by side with other forecasters. In order to prove anticipation 3, we present theoretical accounts that include other known important forecasters (i. e. structural, semantic, and analogical 1s). If the anticipation is right, household size should originate as important even in those theoretical accounts that incorporate besides other factors that influence the distribution of emphasis in English compounds.

Drumhead and treatment

This research investigated the compound emphasis assignment and phrasal emphasis. It discusses the four attacks of emphasis the size consequence of the right household was important. we have collected really strong proves for a position that the semantics is the most of import factor in the anticipation of the emphasis types of a given compound. The structural hypothesis has been shown to underdetermine stress assignment. Contra to the hypothesis, and heedless of lexicalisation, merely certain subsets of the modifier-head compounds tend towards rightward emphasis. The coincident analysis of all factors besides showed a important, but merely instead little, lexicalisation consequence which did non pass on with argument construction. The anticipation of the structural hypothesis refering lexicalisation is hence besides partly proved false, in that we find a general consequence of spelling and frequence, and non an consequence that is restricted to modifier-head constructions. We so investigated whether the ascertained household size effects persisted if other different types suspected of act uponing compound emphasis assignment were factored in.

In add-on, we found an interaction of size and prejudice, in that for left <https://assignbuster.com/the-english-compound-of-stress-assignment-english-language-essay/>

components with a prejudice towards rightward emphasis, an addition in left household size leads to an even more marked inclination towards rightward emphasis. In other words, increasing household size strengthens the pertinent emphasis prejudice. This means that for the left household, household size plants in the predicted way, but merely chiefly as a modifier of the much stronger household prejudice. There was no interaction between size and prejudice for the right household, but a lessening of the possibility of rightward emphasis with increasing right household sizes across the board. This can be taken as grounds for the being of an independent household size consequence, but not a really strong one. We have seen that increasing household size increases the opportunity of rightward emphasis for households that have a household prejudice towards rightward emphasis. For households that have a household prejudice towards leftward emphasis, increasing household size either has no consequence whatsoever on the possibility of rightward emphasis (peculiarly true for celex) , or decreases the possibility of rightward emphasis (peculiarly true for the Boston Corpus) . Here, the chance of rightward emphasis decreases with increasing household size in general, irrespective of the household prejudice (at least, household prejudice is not significantly interacting with size) . What do these consequences mean for an information-based attack to intensify emphasis, and for an history of compound emphasis in general? Overall, our analyses have found small grounds for a general consequence of household size, if other factors are taken into history. We think that the difference between compound word emphasis and syntactic phrase is clear now.