

The paper discusses the interaction among word order, scope relation, and prosodic phrasing. I claim that the default Major Phrase (MaP) structure is a mapping of Spell-Out (Chomsky, 2001) domain onto prosody. I also claim that focus intonation (FI) modifies the default MaP phrasing and derives/blocks certain scope relation in a principled way.

Data: Miyagawa (2003) observes that the partial negation reading, which is unavailable in (1a), becomes available in (1b), where the object scrambles above the subject.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (1) | a. | zen'in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta | 'All did not take that test.' |
| | | all-NOM that test-ACC take-NEG-PST | *not \gg all, all \gg not |
| | b. | sono tesuto-o zen'in-ga uke-nakat-ta | 'That test, all didn't take.' |
| | | that test-ACC all-NOM take-NEG-PST | not \gg all, (all \gg not) |

If we look at the most neutral intonation of these sentences, we can make a new generalization about the scope interaction. If a negation (*-nakat-*) and the quantifier (*zen'in* 'all') are included in a single Major Phrase (MaP), the negation can take a higher scope than the quantifier.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--|--------------------------------|
| (2) | a. | (zen'in-ga) (sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta) | *not \gg all, all \gg not |
| | b. | (sono tesuto-o) (zen'in-ga uke-nakat-ta) | not \gg all, (all \gg not) |

When the phrasing is modified by focus, interpretation changes as in (3). Again, the generalization holds. From these facts, I postulate the *Scope-MaP Generalization* in (4).

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--|-------------------------------|
| (3) | a. | (zen'in _F -ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta) | not \gg all, all \gg not |
| | b. | (sono tesuto-o) (zen'in-ga) (uke-nakat-ta _F) | *not \gg all, all \gg not |
- (4) **Scope-MaP Generalization:** When α precedes β , and β takes a wide scope over α , then α and β are in the same prosodic phrase.

Data 2: Based on the experimental data, I will show that a negative polarity item (NPI) and a negation are included in a single prosodic phrase. If such a phrasing is interrupted by a narrow focus (e.g., *wh*-phrase), the sentence cannot be interpreted (Tomioka, 2004). This means that what has been analyzed as LF intervention effect (Beck and Kim, 1997) can be reinterpreted as a violation of (4). The intervening focused phrase breaks the MaP containing the NPI and the negation into two.

Analysis: I propose that MaP boundary is created at each Spell-Out (i.e., VP and TP). This proposal makes a different prediction from previously proposed syntax-prosody mapping analyses such as Selkirk and Tateishi (1991). In addition, it has been claimed that FI is also created at relevant Spell-Out domains (Ishihara, 2003). The combination of these two analyses explain the phenomena above in a uniform fashion. Syntactic structure, i.e., c-command relation, is mapped onto prosody as MaP phrasing. Left edges of Spell-Out domains (VP, TP) are marked by MaP boundaries. MaP boundaries thus indicates the c-command relation. If two elements are in a single MaP, the phrase-heads (e.g., V, Neg) c-commands the other. When an FI is superimposed onto this default MaP phrasing, it creates a new prosodic phrasing which contains a focused phrase and its scopally-related item. This new phrasing allows a scope relation that is unavailable with the default MaP phrasing.

References

- Beck, Sigrid, and Shin-Sook Kim. 1997. On wh- and operator scope in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6:339–384.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2003. Intonation and interface conditions. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2003. A-movement scrambling and options without optionality. In *Word order and scrambling*, ed. Simin Karimi, 177–200. Blackwell.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth, and Koichi Tateishi. 1991. Syntax and downstep in Japanese. In *Interdisciplinary approaches to language: Essays in honor of S.-Y. Kuroda*, ed. Carol Georgopoulos and Roberta Ishihara, 519–543. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tomioka, Satoshi. 2004. Pragmatics of LF intervention effects: Wh-interrogatives in Japanese and Korean. Unpublished ms., University of Delaware.