

Sacrificial tragicomedy plots. A society is devastated following some greedy or arrogant act, usually regarding food, which violates the sanctity of nature and offends some deity. Famine or exile results, ending with a sacrifice and the resulting restoration of communal well-being.

Tragedy is a derivation of comedy, as when Juliet dies before the romantic tragi-comic pattern can be completed.

The most important property of prototypical narratives is emotional interest. Specifically, prototypical literary narratives contain prototype-eliciting conditions for emotions. These eliciting conditions are scenarios that prime or activate memories of personal experiences and their associated feelings (for example, reunion with a loved one or sorrow at the death of a loved one). Emotional prototypes help guide readers' decisions as to what sort of story is tellable and provide central structural principles for the story that partially guide its overall shape, outcome, tone, and so on.

For example, following are the three specific happiness goals that generate the three prototype story structures:

- for romantic tragicomedy, the goal of personal happiness resulting from romantic union. The corresponding sorrow prototype is the death of the beloved.
- for heroic tragicomedy, the goal of social happiness resulting from social and political power within the society. The corresponding sorrow prototype is the loss of social and political power through imprisonment or exile.
- for sacrificial tragicomedy, the goal of physical happiness resulting from material prosperity and abundance of food. The corresponding sorrow prototype is famine.

Further work on prototypes might include the possibility of other prototypical plot sequences in addition to those listed here; the possibility of other relevant contexts for happiness prototypes and the principles that might govern those contexts; and the extent to which emotional prototype theory can be extended to non-narrative literary genres, such as lyric poetry.

– Alan Palmer

WORKS CITED AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

- Branigan, Edward. 1992. *Narrative Comprehension and Film*. London: Routledge.
- Carroll, Noël. 1998. *A Philosophy of Mass Art*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Emmott, Catherine. 1997. *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1997. *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1982. "Frame semantics." In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, ed. In-Seok Yang, 111–37. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Fludernik, Monika. 1996. *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology*. London: Routledge.
- Frye, Northrop. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Herman, David. 1997. "Scripts, sequences, and stories: Elements of a postclassical narratology." *PMLA* 112.5: 1046–59.
- Hogan, Patrick Colm. 2003. *The Mind and Its Stories: Narrative Universals and Human Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahn, Manfred. 1997. "Frames, preferences, and the reading of third person narratives: Towards a cognitive narratology." *Poetics Today* 18.4: 441–68.

Palmer, Alan. 2004. *Fictional Minds*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Perry, Menakhem. 1979. "Literary dynamics: How the order of a text creates its meanings." *Poetics Today* 1.1/2: 35–64, 311–61.

Schank, Roger C. and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Turner, Mark. 1991. *Reading Minds: The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Werth, Paul. 1999. *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman.

STRESS

Stress is abstract, relative **PHONOLOGICAL** prominence that manifests **RHYTHMIC** groupings of phonological elements into constituents known as feet. The study of stress is also termed *metrical phonology* due to its relationship to (and the appropriation of terminology from) the study of poetic **METER**. The **PHONETIC** implementation of stress involves a combination of factors, including relative amplitude, duration, and fundamental frequency (Lehiste 1970; see **PITCH**). Phonological correlates of stress are quite varied; vowel reduction in unstressed **SYLLABLES** is perhaps the most important. Bruce Hayes (1995) gives a comprehensive survey of stress systems and metrical theory. Although *stress languages* (e.g., English, Russian) are often contrasted with **TONE languages** (e.g., Mandarin, Sukuma) and *pitch-accent languages* (e.g., Japanese, Basque), there is substantial evidence that tone and pitch-accent languages have the same kinds of metrical grouping structures that are found in pure stress languages (Duanmu 2007; Purnell 1997).

The position of stress within a **WORD** or phrase is generally predictable within a language. Some common locations for stress are initial, final, and penultimate, although almost all languages contain some exceptions to the dominant pattern. Languages with a great deal of idiosyncratic variation are commonly termed *free stress languages*, although more in-depth analyses reveal the more usual types, albeit obscured by the interaction with limited specification for grouping or prominence within the lexical underlying representation. Languages often display repeated rhythmical motifs for stress. Binary alternating patterns (trochaic Xx, iambic xX) are particularly common. Ternary patterns (dactylic Xxx, anapestic xxX), while less common, are also attested across diverse language groups. The existence of common ternary musical genres (e.g., minuet, waltz) also supports primitive groupings of three elements. It is now also well established that some elements can remain ungrouped (unparsed; see **PARSING**, **HUMAN**). Theories differ on whether they allow groupings with only a single element (unary feet) or groupings extending across arbitrarily large numbers of elements (unbounded feet). Some theories also allow more unusual foot types, such as headless (pyrrhic) feet or feet with two prominent syllables (spondees).

Much of the work in metrical phonology has examined questions of representation, foot size, foot-internal prominence, and parameterized typologies. George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith (1951) emphasized the relative nature of stress, recognizing four levels of stress. Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle (1968) employed scalar feature values for stress, whereas their other distinctive features were binary valued. Mark Liberman (1975)

introduced two new representational systems for stress: trees and grids and computed stress contours using both. A consensus quickly emerged that this combination of devices was overly powerful, and Alan Prince (1983) argued for a grid-only theory, eschewing any representation of grouping. Halle and Jean-Roger Vergnaud (1987, 63–5) argued for the necessity of grouping from the consistency of stress shift under vowel deletion. For example, in Tiberian Hebrew, stress is trochaic, assigned to the penultimate syllable, and is visible there in pausal forms: [ba:ʔá:ðu] “they cheated *pausal*.” In contextual forms, the penultimate vowel is lost but the stress stays within the foot, shifting onto the next vowel: [ba:ʔðu:] “they wrote *contextual*.” A theory with grouping predicts stress shift within the foot; theories without grouping would have to invoke additional mechanisms to explain the direction of stress shift. As a consequence, representations using impoverished trees (Hammond 1984) or *bracketed grids* (Halle and Vergnaud 1987) became standard. These were later simplified to require only a single juncture to indicate metrical grouping (Halle and Idsardi 1995).

The regular rhythmic patterns are often interrupted by heavy syllables (those containing two *moras*, that is, syllables with branching nuclei, or rimes), which in many languages must receive stress (the *weight-to-stress principle*). For example, in Malayalam, stress falls on the second syllable if the first syllable is light and the second syllable is heavy; otherwise, it falls on the first syllable. The interaction between the weight-to-stress principle and the other aspects of stress has been a particularly lively area of debate. One view emphasizes theoretical symmetry, allowing metrical attributes to combine freely and so predicting full cross-classification for weight-to-stress effects and headedness. The other view emphasizes the incomplete distribution of attested languages (the *iambic-trochaic law*; Hayes 1995), in particular the cross-linguistic paucity of languages with right-headed feet that are insensitive to syllable weight. However, recent work on Osage (Altshuler 2009) convincingly completes the attested **TYPOLOGY** and demonstrates that the symmetric view is correct.

Metrical theory is the area of phonology that shows the most influence of the **PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS** approach to grammar (Chomsky 1981). All current metrical theories incorporate parameters or constraints for foot size, headedness, quantity sensitivity, the direction and iterativity of foot construction, and special edge of domain effects (e.g., extrametricality). The parameterization of the system yields a relatively small finite space of possible languages, which is advantageous for the acquisition of stress systems by language learners (Dresher and Kaye 1990; Archibald 1993). More recent work has emphasized the relation between parameterized stress theories and computability and learning results for finite-state automata (Heinz 2008; Idsardi 2009).

– William J. Idsardi

WORKS CITED AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

- Altshuler, Daniel. 2009. “Quantity insensitive iambs in Osage.” *International Journal of American Linguistics*.
 Archibald, John. 1993. *Language Learnability and L2 Phonology: The Acquisition of Metrical Parameters*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris.
 Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. 1968. *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
 Dresher, B. Elan, and Jonathan Kaye. 1990. “A computational learning model for metrical phonology.” *Cognition* 34: 137–95.
 Duanmu, San. 2007. *The Phonology of Standard Chinese*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Halle, Morris, and William J. Idsardi. 1995. “General properties of stress and metrical structure.” In *A Handbook of Phonological Theory*, ed. John Goldsmith, 403–43. Oxford: Blackwell.
 Halle, Morris, and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1987. *An Essay on Stress*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Hammond, Michael. 1984. “Constraining metrical theory: A modular theory of stressing and destressing.” Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
 Hayes, Bruce. 1995. *Metrical Stress Theory: Principles and Case Studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Heinz, Jeffrey. 2008. “Learning unbounded stress systems via local inference.” In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 261–74. Charleston, SC: BookSurge.
 Idsardi, William J. 2009. “Calculating metrical structure.” In *Contemporary Views on Architecture and Representations in Phonology*. Ed. Eric Raimy and Charles Cairns, 191–212. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Lehiste, Ilse. 1970. *Suprasegmentals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Liberman, Mark. 1975. “The intonational system of English.” Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Prince, Alan. 1983. “Relating to the grid.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 19–100.
 Purnell, Thomas. C. 1997. “Principles and parameters of phonological rules: Evidence from tone languages.” Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware.
 Trager, George L., and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. 1951. *An Outline of English Structure*. Norman, OK: Battenburg.

STRUCTURALISM

The linguist who is considered to be the founder of European linguistic structuralism used the word *system* rather than *structure*. The linguistic theories of Ferdinand de Saussure are known mainly in incomplete form from his posthumously edited lecture notes (Saussure [1916] 1983) which contain the basic notions on which early structuralism would be built. Arguably it was Saussure who first fully demonstrated the significance of considering language to function as a system (i.e. a structure in which a change to any part will change the whole). According to Saussure, modern linguistics should concern itself with a synchronic (simultaneous) rather than a diachronic (historical) approach (**SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY**), and with *langue* (the language system) rather than *parole* (speech, **PERFORMANCE**); the linguistic sign, made up of *signifiant* (signifier) and *signifié* (signified), is a unit of form, not of substance. Criticisms of Saussure’s approach include the accusation that he has a reductionist view of language, that he leaves out the process and considers only the system, neglecting discourse and the social context, as well as being antihistorical (this last criticism is articulated particularly by Roman Jakobson). Many of these “omissions” are due to the conditions under which his *Course in General Linguistics* was published. Subsequently discovered manuscript writings go some way to meeting these criticisms (Saussure [2002] 2006).