

Pitch accents and pitch range: LT does not have an inventory of intonational Pitch Accents the way that English does. Instead of supplying the pitch contour with particular tonal elements, the intonational module of LT grammar modifies the height of the accent peak (*H) associated with the stressed syllable. The pitch range is boosted in α P containing focused and emphasized items, as well as new topics.

This view of LT intonation can help explain several phenomena that have been observed in this language. Denwood (1999) reports that when verbs are placed in narrow focus, some syllables of the stem (those which *may* carry H-tone) are pronounced in high pitch. On the other hand, according to Denwood as well as Sprigg (1954), topics placed after the verb, i.e. right-dislocated arguments, are pronounced in low flat pitch. Having conducted my own investigation, I conclude that tonal distinctions are preserved in right-dislocated arguments but the pitch range is contracted sharply after focus. According to my observations, old preverbal topics also peak low and have limited tonal range. I interpret these findings as indicating that even though these items form their own α Ps, either no pitch accent is assigned to their metrically prominent syllables or a kind of pitch accent that contracts the range of the peak instead of boosting it (indicated by the H with * in parenthesis).

5. a) (α P_{Foc} ji gi - tan- gi- rɛ:) b) (α P_{Pre-Foc}ji gi - tɛ-da) (α P_{Foc} tan- gi -rɛ:) c) (α P_{Foc} tan-gi- rɛ?) (α P_{PostFoc} ji gi:)
- $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \quad | \\ L_{lex} *H(L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \quad | \\ L_{lex} (*H(L)) \quad (L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \\ H_{lex} *H(L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \\ H_{lex} *H(L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \\ L_{lex} (*H) \quad (L) \end{array}$
- letter-ABS. send-LINK.-AUX. letter-ABS.DEF.-TOP. send-LINK.-AUX. send-LINK.-AUX. letter-ABS.
 “(He)’ll send the letter” “(He)’ll SEND the letter” “(He)’ll SEND (it), the letter”

We can account similarly for the differences between realization of tonal contour in polar and wh-questions. In (6a) the wh-pronoun is in focus while the predicator is postfocal. At the same time (6b) is a polar question with the verb in focus. This difference is correspondingly reflected in the focal PA being assigned to the wh-word in (6a) but to the predicator in (6b).

6. a) (α P_{PreFoc} p^hu -ti) (α P_{Foc} k^ha rɛ) (α P_{PostFoc} ci - gi - dɔ:)? b) (α P_{Pre-Foc}ji gi - tɛ - da) (α P_{Foc} tan -gi -rɛ -bɛ:)?
- $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \\ L_{lex} *H(L) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \\ L_{lex} *H \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \\ L_{lex} (*H(L)) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \quad | \\ L_{lex} (*H(L)) \quad (L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} | \quad | \\ H_{lex} *H(L) \quad (L) \end{array}$
- boy.THIS what do-LINK.-AUX. letter-DEF.-TOP. send-LINK.-AUX.-INTERR.
 "What does the boy do?" "Did (he) SEND the letter?"

Summary: I advocate the position that tonal contour of an LT sentence is produced by interaction of several components. Leaving aside the question of boundary tones, I was able to identify the following contributing factors: 1) LT has a 2-value lexical tone system; 2) metrical prominence in a word is cued in with an H-tone; 3) a lexical item may be "dephrased" by merging into the phonological domain to its left (provided certain syntactic conditions are observed); 4) intonational pitch accents may boost or contract the tonal peaks based on the informational structure of the sentence. My current work is aimed to verify empirically the hypothesis advanced here and to flesh out the details in more precise theoretical terms.

REFERENCES

- Denwood, Philip.** 1999. *Tibetan*. London Oriental and African Language Library. John Benjamin's Publishing Co., Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. **Jun, Sun-Ah.** 1993. The phonetics and phonology of Korean prosody. PhD thesis, Ohio State University. **Kjellin, Olle.** 1977. Observations on consonant types and "tone" in Tibetan. *Journal of Phonetics* 5, 317-38. **Meredith, Scott.** 1990. *Issues in the Phonology of Prominence*. PhD thesis, MIT. Cambridge, Mass. **Pierrehumbert, Janet & Beckman, Mary.** 1988. Japanese Tone Structure. MIT Press, Cambridge. **Sprigg, Richard Keith.** 1954. Verbal Phrases in Lhasa Tibetan--I. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16.1:134-156.