

# Can accentual phrase boundaries influence lexical access in French?

Mariapaola D’Imperio\*, Amandine Michelas\* and Joël Pynte\*\*

\*Laboratoire Parole et Langage, CNRS & Aix-Marseille I, Aix-en-Provence, FRANCE


\*\*Laboratoire de Psychologie et Neurosciences Cognitives, CNRS, Paris, France

[mariapaola.dimperio@lpl-aix.fr](mailto:mariapaola.dimperio@lpl-aix.fr); [amandine.michelas@lpl-aix.fr](mailto:amandine.michelas@lpl-aix.fr); [pynte@up.univ-aix.fr](mailto:pynte@up.univ-aix.fr)

In French, the initial phoneme sequence (up to the syllable /vo/) of complex noun phrases such as *cerf volant* /sɛʁvolɑ̃/ “kite” and *cerf vorace* /sɛʁvoras/ “voracious deer” can yield a temporarily ambiguous parse between *cerveau* /sɛʁvo/ “brain” and *cerf* /sɛʁ/ “deer”. It has recently been proposed that the prosodic organization of speech might interact with this type of ambiguity and hence be crucial for lexical access strategies in French (Christophe *et al.* 2004). Specifically, Christophe and colleagues found that phonological phrase (PP) boundaries can remove temporary ambiguity in otherwise ambiguous noun phrases, while this ambiguity would remain within the PP, even across prosodic word (PW) boundaries.

Note that Christophe *et al.* base their predictions on the syntax-based approach of classic Prosodic Phonology (Selkirk, 1984; Nespor & Vogel, 1986), while according to the autosegmental-metrical of intonation (Pierrehumbert, 1980; Ladd, 1996) there exists an Accentual Phrase (AP) in French, which is the domain of primary stress (Jun and Fougeron 2000, 2002) and which is hierarchically higher than the prosodic word. Specifically, this unit is characterized by an obligatory final accentual rise (LH\*), an optional initial rise (LHi). AP and PP boundaries do not need to overlap (as in Fig. 1, right panel) since AP boundaries strictly depend on the number of final rises (LH\*).

Tonal cues and other phonetic/phonological properties of the auditory stimuli do appear to have an impact on lexical access in French (cf. Spinelli *et al.*, 2007), though this is still a quite understudied area. We specifically predicted that: 1. the target sequence would yield ambiguity only within (see Fig. 1, left) and not across (see Fig. 1, right) an AP domain; 2. lexical access of the target word (e.g., *pins*) would be faster if immediately adjacent to an AP boundary.



**Fig. 1** F0 curve for the target sequence *des pins somptueux* excised from two utterances of the sentence *Je crois que Marie t’a parlé des pins somptueux de cette forêt* “I think that Mary told you about the sumptuous pine trees of this forest”, produced with either 1 AP (left) or 2 APs (right).

24 pairs of sentences were presented to 40 French listeners in two cross modal word-monitoring tasks. While Experiment I was simply meant to replicate the findings of Christophe *et al.*’s study concerning temporary ambiguity and PP boundary effect, in Experiment II we manipulated the presence or absence of an AP boundary, within a PP.

Different from Christophe et al.'s study, when looking at absolute reaction time data from target word onset, neither local ambiguity nor the presence of a prosodic boundary significantly affected the results in both experiments. However, given the target acoustic duration differences, subjects responses were relatively faster in the boundary conditions, irrelevant of ambiguity, since a conspicuous number of responses was obtained before or right at target word offset. This is in line with Christophe et al.'s main findings suggesting that prosodic structure might influence lexical activation online. Crucially, AP boundaries appear to behave similarly to PP boundaries in speeding up lexical activation, independent of the presence of a syntactic constituent boundary. This suggests that tonal cues to prosody need to be controlled separately from syntactic structure to assess the role of phrasing in lexical access strategies and supports the hypothesis of an active role of fine phonetic detail in candidate activation mediated by rich lexical representations.

## References

- Christophe, A., Peperkamp, S., Pallier, C., Block, E., Mehler, J. (2004). «Phonological phrase boundaries constrain lexical access I. Adult data », *Journal of Memory Language*, 51, 523-547.
- Jun S.-A. & Fougeron C. (2000). A Phonological model of French intonation. In A. Botinis (ed.) *Intonation: Analysis, Modeling and Technology*. Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers. 209-242.
- Jun S.A. & Fougeron C. (2002). The Realizations of the Accentual Phrase in French Intonation, *Pobus* 14: 147-172, a special issue on *Intonation in the Romance Languages*. Ed. by J. Hualde.
- Ladd, D. R. (1996). *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nespor, M. & Vogel, I. (1986). *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht : Foris.
- Pierrehumbert, J. (1980). The phonetics and phonology of English intonation. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Selkirk, E. O. (1984). *Phonology and Syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.
- Spinelli, E., Welby, P. & Schaeffgen, A.L. (2007). Fine-grained access to targets and competitors in phonemically ambiguous spoken sequences : the case of French Elision. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 22(6), 828-859.