

On the edge: procedural vs. representational analyses of Ancient Greek

Adèle Jatteau || University of Lille

The specific phonological rules applying to proclitic=host in Ancient Greek (AG) have received various analyses in the literature: as a cyclic/stratal effect (Kiparsky 2003), or, within the Prosodic Hierarchy (Nespor & Vogel 1986), as a Clitic Group (Golston 1990), a Phonological Phrase (Golston 1995), or a recursive Prosodic Word (Agbayani & Golston 2010). This variety of approaches reflects a core challenge in studying the morphosyntax-phonology interface: the ambiguity in deciding between procedural and representational analyses (Bermúdez-Otero 2011). **The goal of this paper** is to provide a solution to the AG puzzle by arguing that both strata and recursive prosodic word structures are necessary. The arguments come from enlarging the investigation to the prefix-base boundary.

The phonology of prefix+base. In Ancient Greek, prefixes—defined as all morphemes preceding the root, including tense and aspect markers—exhibit a dual behaviour: they act like [1] independent words for some segmental processes (such as cluster phonotactics, partial resyllabification, /h/ distribution, a.o.), yet [2] display cohesion for others (nasal and laryngeal assimilation) (Threatte 1980, Lejeune 1972). While this [prefix[base]] structure is typologically common (Peperkamp 1997), what makes AG notable is its accentuation system. High tone marks the accented syllable, which is calculated within the final three syllables of the word. In morphologically complex words, this accent may fall on the prefix, but only within the limits of its final tone-bearing unit (Dieu 2022: 227).

- a. /para+dos/ → *parádos* ‘give’ Imp. 2sg., instead of ***párados*
b. /eks+e+agon/ → *ekséagon* → *eksé:gon* ‘lead’, Aor. 1sg., instead of ***éksē:gon*

I argue that this pattern requires a prosodic representation: the phonology must be able to see the prefix while also seeing the prefix+base *boundary* within the same computation. However, some degree of derivation is also needed: the accent pattern is opaque, as it needs to apply before hiatus resolution. The pattern requires both strata and prosodic representation, consistently with Stratal OT (Bermúdez-Otero 2018).

Back to the phonology of proclitic=host. Analysing the [prefix[base]] domain allows us to break the tie between the multiple analyses of the [proclitic[host]] domain. I propose that both structures instantiate a recursive prosodic word: [proclitic[host]] is subject to the same domain-edge processes as the [prefix[base]] in [1], and to the same domain-span processes in [2], pointing to a shared prosodic structure. Nonetheless, a key difference lies in accentuation: proclitics are independent words and cannot carry word accent. This asymmetry can be naturally explained by assuming that different phonological rules apply at the lexical and postlexical levels. I develop a full analysis of the Greek facts, compare it to an approach using an extended version of the Prosodic Hierarchy and to other procedural approaches, and argue that an analysis combining cyclic and prosodic domains such as Stratal OT allows for a more economical account of the Greek data.