

Syntax-Prosody Interface of Wh-Q Dependency in Tokyo Japanese:
Right-Dislocation/Scrambling (A)Symmetries

A number of recent works (Deguchi & Kitagawa 2002 (*NELS32*), Ishihara 2002 (*WCCFL21*), Kitagawa 2005 (*EL22:2*), Hirofumi 2005 (UMass diss.), among many others) have shown that prosody plays a pivotal role in accounting for the nature of Wh-phrases in Tokyo Japanese, arguing that these exhibits (A) **Focus Intonation** (FI) and (B) **Prosody-Scope Correspondence** (PSC).

(A) **Focus Intonation**: (i) **Wh-phrases must be accompanied by F⁰-boosting**, (ii) followed by the F⁰-compression between **Wh-phrases** and *the O-particle* (which license the Wh-phrase).

Dare-ga nomiya-de ramu-o non-da no?

Wh-NOM bar-at rum-ACC drink-TNS Q ‘Who drank rum at the bar?’

(B) **Prosody-Scope Correspondence**: The scope of Wh-phrases is determined/indicated by the F⁰-compression between **Wh-phrases** and *the O-particle* (which license the Wh-phrase).

What is crucial is that PSC dictates that potentially ambiguous Wh-Q dependency/relation (e.g., cases involving a single Wh-phrase and the two Q-particles (Q1, Q2); [... [... Wh ... Q1] ... Q2]) can be prosodically disambiguated via FI, as in (1) (Takahashi 1993: (4a), Ishihara 2002: (13a, b)).

(1) Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?^{Fn.1}
 I.-NOM M.-NOM Wh-ACC bar-at drink-TNS Q1 Y.-DAT tell-TNS Q2

a. Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Matrix/Q2 Scope) ‘What_i did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

b. Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Embedded/Q1 Scope) ‘Did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [what_i Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

Thus, to the extent that FI can be properly formed, the surface position of Wh-phrase and/or the distance between the Wh-phrase and Q-particles does not affect the possible interpretation, and it can be disambiguated via FI and conforms to PSC. For example, scrambling variants of (1), i.e., (2) and (3) (in the former, Wh-phrase alone is scrambled long-distance, and in the latter, CP containing the Wh-Q1 dependency is scrambled), remains ambiguous and is disambiguated via the indicated FI and shows PSC is at work.

(2) Scrambling of Wh-phrase (ambiguous) (Ishihara 2002: (20))

Nani-o_i Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga nomiya-de t_i non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 Wh-ACC I.-NOM M.-NOM bar-at drink-TNS Q1 Y.-DAT tell-TNS Q2

a. **Nani-o_i** Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga nomiya-de t_i non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Matrix/Q2 Scope) ‘What_i did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

b. **Nani-o_i** Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga nomiya-de t_i non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Embedded/Q1 Scope) ‘Did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [what_i Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

(3) Scrambling of CP containing “Wh-Q1 dependency” (**ambiguous**)

[_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] Ichiro-ga t_{CP} (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 M.-NOM Wh-ACC bar-at drink-TNS Q1 I.-NOM Y.-DAT tell-TN Q2

a. [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] Ichiro-ga t_{CP} (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Matrix/Q2 Scope) ‘What_i did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

b. [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] Ichiro-ga t_{CP} (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no?
 (Embedded/Q1 Scope) ‘Did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [what_i Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’

What I would like to present is to provide further support for the general line of research that takes syntax-prosody interface of Wh-questions into consideration seriously (see the references cited above), by providing hitherto unnoticed and novel evidence involving right-dislocation (RD) in Japanese, which shows some striking and interesting (a)symmetries with scrambling.

^{Fn.1} When (1) is embedded, Q2 is realized as *ka*, and can optionally be Case-marked (see (6)).

Although Japanese is strictly head-final, it is nonetheless possible to place elements in the post-verbal position, i.e., right-dislocation (RD) is a licit option (e.g., *Ichiro-ga ec_i non-da yo, sake-o_i*. ‘Ichiro drank ec_i, sake_i.’). What is of interest here is that although *it is possible for the embedded CP (containing Wh-phrase and Q1 (but not Q2)) in (1) to undergo RD as in (4), which however results in allowing only the embedded/Q1 scope reading*. This sharply contrasts with (leftward) scrambling of the embedded CP (3), which is ambiguous and gets disambiguated via FI, and is in accord with PSC. That RD (but not scrambling) of CP containing the “Wh-Q dependency” precludes the matrix/Q2 reading arguably follows from the FI and PSC, together with the intrinsic property of RD. Due to RD, the embedded CP is placed after the Q2-particle heading the matrix clause, which marks the right edge/end point of intonational phrase. Because of this, the necessary FI to induce the matrix/Q2 scope reading will not be available. Scrambling, which does not necessarily dissociate the intonational phrase boundary between the Wh-phrase and Q2 and Q1, is free from this problem, and thus able to assign FI in two ways corresponding to the ambiguous reading. Note crucially that *it is not RD per se that prevents the “matrix/Q2 scope” reading*. When (1) as a whole (which contains a Wh-phrase, Q1, and Q2) is subordinated (Fn.1), and RDed (5), the scope of Wh-phrase remains ambiguous and disambiguated via FI, on a par with its scrambling counterpart (6). This is expected, since the dependencies between Wh-phrase and Q2 (as well as Q1), in terms of both syntax (Harada’s 1972 Wh-Q binding constraints) and prosody (FIP), is retained within the RDed (and scrambled) constituent, which enables to properly form FI, which in turn assigns the proper interpretation exhibiting PSC.

- (4) RD of CP containing “Wh-Q1 dependency” (**unambiguous**: the embedded/most local scope)
- Ichiro-ga ec_{CP} (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no, [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka]?
 I.-NOM Y.-DAT tell-TNS Q2 M.-NOM Wh-ACC bar-at drink-TNS Q1
- a. *(Q2 Scope) ‘What_i did Ichiro tell (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i at the bar]?’
- b. Ichiro-ga ec_{CP} (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta no, [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** ... nomiya-de non-da ... ka]?
 (Q1 Scope) ‘Did Ichiro tell (Yumi) ec_{CP}, [what_i Mari drank t_i at the bar]_{RD}?’
- (5) RD of (1)/CP containing “Wh-Q1-Q2 dependency” (**ambiguous**)
- Ken-wa ec_{CP} shiritagatteiru yo, [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de
 K.-TOP want:to:know SFP I.-NOM M.-NOM Wh-ACC bar-at
 non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka](-o).
 drink-TNS Q1 Y.-DAT tell-TNS Q2(-ACC) ‘[Ken wants to know ec_{a/b}], {a./b.}_{RD}.’
- a. ..., [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka].
 (Q2 Scope) ‘..., [_{RDedCP(=1)} what_i Ichiro told (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i ...]]?’
- b. ..., [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka].
 (Q1 Scope) ‘..., [_{RDedCP(=1)} whether Ichiro told (Yumi) [what_i Mari drank t_i ...]]?’
- (6) Scrambling of (1)/CP containing “Wh-Q1-Q2 dependency” (**ambiguous**)
- [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka]
 I.-NOM M.-NOM Wh-ACC bar-at drink-TNS Q1 Y.-DAT tell-TNS Q2
 (-o) Ken-wa t_{CP} shiritagatteiru.
 (ACC) K.-TOP want:to:know ‘{a./b.}, Ken wants to know t_{a/b}.)’
- a. [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** ... nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka]
 (Q2 Scope) ‘... [_{CP(=1)} what_i Ichiro told (Yumi) [whether Mari drank t_i at the bar]]?’
- b. [_{CP(=1)} Ichiro-ga [_{CP} Mari-ga **nani-o** ... nomiya-de non-da ka] (Yumi-ni) tsutae-ta ka]
 (Q1 Scope) ‘... [_{CP(=1)} whether Ichiro told (Yumi) [what_i Mari drank t_i at the bar]]?’

Building on the hitherto unnoticed RD/scrambling (a)symmetries on Wh-interpretation, I have argued that the prosodic factors are necessary and indispensable for the proper understanding of Wh-questions in Tokyo Japanese, calling for the necessity of “syntax-prosody” approach.