

Comments on Hyun Kyung Hwang's “*Wh*-intonation and Information Structure in South Kyeongsang Korean, Fukuoka Japanese and Tokyo Japanese”

Shinichiro Ishihara (University of Potsdam)

Sept. 14, 2008, UCL IS Workshop

Introduction

1. Prosodic effects of New/Given distinction
2. Experiment Design/Methodology
3. Experimental results in Ishihara (2004, 2005) and alternative explanations

1 Prosodic Effects of New/Given Distinction

- Clear data on context effects (FOCUS > New > Given).
- Definitions of ‘focus’, ‘new’, and ‘given’ are different among researchers, e.g.:
 - Rooth (1992): Focus triggers focus semantic value based on an alternative set.
 - Selkirk (2002, 2003): Contrastive FOCUS vs. Presentational *focus*.
 - Schwarzschild (1999): Focus ↔ Given (i.e. there is no non-given, non-F-marked element.)
- Recently, several proposals have been made regarding the prosodic effects of givenness (Sugahara 2003, Féry and Samek-Lodovici 2006, Selkirk 2006, Féry and Kügler im press). The results in Hwang’s experiment support this line of analysis.

- Sugahara (2003)
 - FOCUS raises the f0 of the focused phrase and lowers the f0 post-focally (post-focal reduction).
 - Givenness lowers f0 (in addition to post-focal reduction)
- Féry and Samek-Lodovici (2006), Selkirk (2006)
 - Focus (F-marking)
 - Given (G-marking)
 - New (formerly often categorized as *focus*) as unmarked default
- 3-way distinction (FOCUS / New / Given), or interaction of 2 independent factors (\pm FOCUS / \pm Given, $2 \times 2 = 4$ combinations)?
 - Realization of phrases that are FOCUSED *and* given at the same time.
 - If FOCUS effect and Givenness effect are both detected, it would support the second hypothesis. (e.g. *Second Occurrence Focus*, Féry and Ishihara 2008, Büring in preparation)
 - If [+FOCUS, +Given] behaves in the same way as [+FOCUS, –Given], it could either mean that the first analysis is correct, or the FOCUS effect suppresses the givenness effect.

2 Methodology

2.1 *Wh*-intonation and Focus Intonation in FJ/SKK

- *Wh*-intonation and Focus Intonation are realized differently.
 - In TJ, two effects (wh/focus) cannot be distinguished.
- Words lose their lexical pitch accents in the *wh*-intonation domain.
 - Existence/absence of accent indicates the *wh*-intonation domain.
 - *Wh*-phrase triggers a flat f0-plateau, but does not trigger an extra prominence.

2.2 Methodology

Hwang's (2008) experimental design does not fully take advantage of the prosodic properties of SKK/FJ.

- Examining maximum and minimum f0 does not reflect the landmark property of effect *wh*-intonation in SKK/FJ, i.e. accent deletion.
- In the results, no indication of *wh*-intonation effect (even in TJ).
 - If there is no sign of *wh*-intonation, it is natural that we do not find any significant effect at the target (matrix dative phrase), either.
 - The data does not support the claim that *wh*-intonation only appears up to the embedded clause Comp.
- In order to support the claim, the following should be shown
 1. Existence of post-*wh* accent deletion in the embedded clause (and the lack of it in the non-*wh*-question.)
 2. Lack of such an effect on the matrix dative phrase (i.e. target).

3 Ishihara (2004, 2005)

- (1) a. *Observation in Ishihara (2002), Kitagawa and Fodor (2003)*

[CP WH [TP ... [CP [TP ... *t*_{WH} ...] **ka**] α ...]

↑
Pitch reset

- b. *Experimental result in Ishihara (2004, 2005)*

[CP WH [TP ... [CP [TP ... *t*_{WH} ...] **ka**] α ...]

↑
f0-reduction

- c. *Hwang's (2008) proposal*

(2b') reduction by wh- reduction by Givenness

nani-o Naoya-wa [Mari-ga nonda-ka] Imademo oboeteru-~~o~~?

- In Hwang's proposal, it is still unclear why such Givenness effect only appears in the scrambled *wh*-phrase but not in the scrambled non-*wh*-phrase.
- Two potential alternative accounts:
 1. Post-focal reduction triggered by an extra focus on a scrambled *wh*-phrase.
 2. Mismatch between production rules and perception principles.

3.1 Extra focus on the scrambled *wh*-phrase

- A scrambled *wh*-phrase bears an extra FOCUS. Neither a non-scrambled *wh*-phrase nor a scrambled non-*wh*-phrase has it.

- (2)
- a. *Non-scrambled wh-phrase*
 $[CP \quad [TP \dots [CP [TP \dots \boxed{WH_{WH}} \dots] \mathbf{ka}_{WH}] \alpha \dots (\mathbf{Comp})]$
- b. *Scrambled wh-phrase*
 $[CP \boxed{WH_{WH,F}} [TP \dots [CP [TP \dots t_{WH} \dots] \mathbf{ka}_{WH}] \alpha \dots (\mathbf{Comp}_F)]$
- c. *Scrambled non-wh-phrase*
 $[CP \quad DP_{\emptyset} \quad [TP \dots [CP [TP \dots t_{DP} \dots] \mathbf{to}_{\emptyset}] \alpha \dots (\mathbf{Comp}_{\emptyset})]$

3.2 Mismatch between Production and Perception

In a(n unnatural) configuration like (1), a mismatch takes place between what production rules would produce, and what perception principles require.

- Production: Multiple Spell-Out Model (Ishihara 2004, 2005) — creates (1b)
- Perception: Prosody-Scope Correspondence (cf. Hirotsu 2005) — prefers (1a)
- This mismatch is the source of disagreement among researchers (between (1a) and (1b)).
- In a **production experiment**, with less attention to the prosody-scope correspondence (perception principle), sentences are produced according to the production rule (= (1b)).
- In a **grammatical judgement**, with special attention to the prosody-scope correspondence, speaker would find the sentence more natural with a *wh*-intonation only up to the end of the embedded clause (i.e. *wh*-scope).
- This mismatch is the source of unnaturalness or degraded judgements reported in the literature. Also, in an ambiguous configuration below, the mismatch creates a bias toward the matrix *wh*-scope reading in the scrambling case (3b).

(3) *One wh-phrase, Two Q-particles:* (Takahashi 1993, Ishihara 2002)

- a. *Wh-in-situ: Ambiguous*
 $[CP \quad [TP \dots [CP [TP \dots \boxed{WH_{WH}} \dots] \mathbf{ka}] \alpha \dots \mathbf{no}]$
-

- b. *Scrambled wh-phrase: Matrix reading only*

[CP WH [TP ... [CP [TP ... t_{WH} ...] **ka**] α ... **no**]

- Note that Takahashi (1993) only reported the matrix reading for (3b). This is because this reading does not induce a mismatch between production and perception. If one produces this configuration, the production rule would produce a *wh*-intonation that matches with the matrix *wh*-scope reading. The embedded reading can be drawn only when the prosody-scope correspondence is (forcefully) maintained, by changing the contour.

References

- Büring, Daniel. in preparation. Been there, marked that — A theory of second occurrence focus. In *t.b.a.*, ed. Makoto Kanazawa and Christopher Tancredi.
- Féry, Caroline, and Shinichiro Ishihara. 2008. The phonology of second occurrence focus. Resubmitted.
- Féry, Caroline, and Frank Kügler. im press. Pitch accent scaling in German. *Journal of Phonetics* .
- Féry, Caroline, and Vieri Samek-Lodovici. 2006. Focus projection and prosodic prominence in nested foci. *Language* 82:131–150.
- Hirotsani, Masako. 2005. Prosody and LF: Processing Japanese *wh*-questions. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Hwang, Hyun Kyung. 2008. *Wh*-intonation and information structure in South Kyeongsang Korean, Fukuoka Japanese and Tokyo Japanese. Paper presented at UCL Information Structure Workshop.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2002. Invisible but audible *wh*-scope marking: *Wh*-constructions and deaccenting in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 21st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 21)*, ed. Line Mikkelsen and Chris Potts, 180–193. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2004. Prosody by phase: Evidence from focus intonation–*wh*-scope correspondence in Japanese. In *Working papers of the SFB 632*, ed. Shinichiro Ishihara, Michaela Schmitz, and Anne Schwarz, volume 1 of *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure*, 77–119. Universität Potsdam.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2005. Prosody-scope match and mismatch in Tokyo Japanese *Wh*-questions. *English Linguistics* 22:347–379.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa, and Janet Dean Fodor. 2003. Default prosody explains neglected syntactic analysis in Japanese. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, ed. William McClure, volume 12, 267–279. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. GIVENNESS, AVOIDF and other constraints on the placement of accent. *Natural Language Semantics* 7:141–177.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2002. Contrastive *FOCUS* vs. presentational *focus*: Prosodic evidence from right node raising in English. In *Speech Prosody 2002*. Aix-en-Provence, France.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2003. Bengali intonation revisited: An optimality theoretic analysis in which FOCUS stress prominence drives FOCUS phrasing. In *Papers in optimality theory II*, ed. A. Carpenter, A. Coetzee, and P. de Lacy, volume 26 of *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers (UMOP)*. Amherst, Mass.: GSLA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2006. Bengali intonation revisited: An optimality theoretic analysis in which FOCUS stress prominence drives FOCUS phrasing. In *Topic and focus: Cross-linguistic perspectives on meaning and intonation*, ed. Chungmin Lee, Matthew Gordon, and Daniel Büring, 215–244. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sugahara, Mariko. 2003. Downtrends and post-FOCUS intonation in Japanese. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1993. Movement of wh-phrases in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:655–678.