

## The Relationship between Here/Now and There/Then: Synchrony and Diachrony in Peninsular Scandinavian Pitch Accent

Two primary themes that run through the recent literature on Scandinavian pitch accent are: 1) the nature of the original contrastive pitch accent and 2) how contrastive pitch accent evolved from one original system into the various systems found at different periods and locations. A secondary concern is the development of an economical synchronic analysis for each observed pattern that is independent of diachrony and that makes use of tools motivated by similar phonetic, phonological and morphological phenomena found cross-linguistically. In this talk, we shift the focus from diachrony to synchrony and use both formal and functional approaches to argue for a novel synchronic account of Peninsular Scandinavian pitch accent. We then use that account to straightforwardly relate different accentual systems through time and space.

This talk starts from the premise that the diachronic issues of “origin” and “evolution” can only be addressed satisfactorily once we have a thorough understanding of how pitch accent works synchronically. In addition to a number of theoretical arguments in support of this position (e.g. I-language versus E-language approaches to language), there is central methodological motivation for focusing on synchrony. A diachronic analysis involves the *simultaneous* development of three distinct components: detailed historical descriptions (reconstructions), a model of language change, and theoretical analyses/tools for the given phenomena in question. This leads to uncertainty regarding whether particular problems should be addressed via modifications to one or more of these components. In contrast, a synchronic approach looks only at the descriptive facts and develops a theory to account for those facts - independent of a model of change and without reconstructed or hypothesized data.

In this talk, we consider the phonetic facts from a large number of individual Scandinavian dialects and develop a natural and economical synchronic account of those facts by applying functional and formal tools used to explain similar phenomena in other languages (specifically, recent developments on the relationship between the phonetics and phonology of Asian tones and work on Scandinavian pitch accent typology).

The specific claims are as follows: 1) Not every tonal domain must have an associated tone (e.g. moras/syllables/words may be toneless). 2) Not every systematic fluctuation in pitch maps to a phonological tone (e.g. M and sometimes L are not needed). 3) What is usually called Accent 1 is strictly a combination of a H prominence tone associated with the head syllable (sometimes head mora of the head syllable), a toneless TBU and/or a H or L boundary tone (depending on the dialect). 4) The components of Accent 2 are identical to those of Accent 1, with the addition of a H lexical tone. 5) Boundary tones are predictably assigned to the edges of supra-segmental constituents and cannot phonologically re-associate. 6) Prominence tones are always H, are predictably assigned to a prosodically defined prominent position, and cannot phonologically re-associate. 7) Lexical tones are always H in Peninsular Scandinavian, are specified in the underlying representation, and may re-associate on the surface to a variety of locations depending on conditioning factors. 8) The major dialect split within Scandinavia is not phonologically defined via one-peak/two-peak (Gårding and Lindblad 1973), early-peak/late-peak (*ibid.*), or lexical H versus lexical L (Lorentz 1995). Rather, it is the choice between H or L right-boundary tone. This choice has significant implications for the placement of both prominence and lexical tones.

Finally, we show that our simple, unified and synchronic structural account of Peninsular Scandinavian pitch accent has concrete suggestions for how to answer diachronic questions relating to pitch accent origin and dialect relatedness.