

1. はじめに

・ Prosodic Hierarchy (Selkirk 1984, Nespor and Vogel 1986, Ito and Mester 2012):

(1)	[]	Intonational Phrase (IntP)			
	φ{		φ{	Phonological Phrase (PhP)			
	ω()	ω()	ω()	Prosodic Word (PrW)
	Annemarie	can eat	the burger				

Q1: なぜ、機能語は韻律領域形成に際し非可視的か？ (Selkirk 1984; Chomsky and Halle 1968)

Q2: なぜ、Spell-Out の領域が PhP に対応しているのか？ (Kratzer and Selkirk 2007 など)

Q3: なぜ、「文」がイントネーションの領域になるのか？

← ラベルと外在化プロセスにおける解釈 (Chomsky 2013, 2015)

2. 統語理論と解釈

・ 初期ミニマリズム

(2) *Full Interpretation* (Chomsky 1995: 27 “Ch.1”):

“... there can be no superfluous symbols in representations”

(3) *Interpretability Requirement* (Chomsky 2000: 118 “MI”):

“Inclusiveness condition holds of narrow syntax, and each feature is interpreted at LF or associated with phonetic features by the phonological component.”

・ 素性と統語対象物 (Syntactic Objects SOs)

(4) *Labeling Algorithm* (Chomsky 2013: 43 “POP”):

“... there is a fixed labeling algorithm LA that licenses SOs so that they can be interpreted at the interfaces,”

3. ラベル付けアルゴリズム

(5) Chomsky (2013, 2015):

a. H is the label in {H, XP}

b. The label of YP is the label of K in (i):

(i) XP . . . {_K XP, YP}

c. The most prominent feature shared by XP and YP is the label of K in (ii):

(ii) {_K XP, YP}

(6) The man hit the thief.

- a. $\{v, \{\text{hit}, \{\text{the}, \text{thief}\}\}\}$ → **v** is the label: (5a).
- b. $\{\alpha \{\text{the}, \text{man}\}, \{v, \{\text{hit}, \{\text{the}, \text{thief}\}\}\}\}$ → **α** cannot be labeled at this point.
- c. $\{T, \{\alpha \{\text{the}, \text{man}\}, \{v, \{\text{hit}, \{\text{the}, \text{thief}\}\}\}\}\}$ → **T** is the label: (5a).
- d. $\{C, \{\beta \{\underline{\text{the}}, \underline{\text{man}}\}, \{T, \{\alpha \{\underline{\text{the}}, \underline{\text{man}}\}, \{v, \{\text{hit}, \{\text{the}, \text{thief}\}\}\}\}\}\}\}$
 - **v** is the label of **α**: (5b).
 - **<φ, φ>** is the label of **β**: (5c).
 - **C** is the label: (5a).

Labels in (6a):

(7) The first step in a derivation: $\{H, H\}$

- a. $\{H, H\}$ takes the form of $\{f, R\}$.
- b. *f* is a functional element that determines category.
- c. *R* is a root, which alone is too “weak” to serve as a label. (Chomsky 2013:47; 2015:8)

(8) “hit the thief”

- a. $\{n, R_{\text{thief}}\}$ --- **n** is the label.
- b. $\{\text{the}, \{n, R_{\text{thief}}\}\}$ --- **the** is the label.
- c. $\{R_{\text{hit}}, \{\text{the}, \{n, R_{\text{thief}}\}\}\}$ --- ??
- d. $\{v, \{R_{\text{hit}}, \{\text{the}, \{n, R_{\text{thief}}\}\}\}\}$ --- **v** is the label.

・これらのラベルは、外在化プロセスでどのように解釈されるのか？

4. 外在化における解釈

4.1 内容語と機能語

・外在化 (externalization) にラベルは必要か？

(9) Chomsky (2015: 6 “POP+”): “Since the same labeling is required at CI and for the processes of externalization (though not at SM, which has no relevant structure), it must take place at the phase level, as part of the Transfer operation.”

(10) Chomsky (1995: 243 “Ch.4”): “..., verbal and nominal elements are interpreted differently at LF and behave differently in the phonological component. K must therefore at least (and we assume at most) be of the form $\{\gamma, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$, where γ identifies the type to which K belongs, indicating its relevant properties. Call γ the *label* of K.”

(11) Nouns vs. Verbs: *record, present, protest, import, export, conduct,*

(12) {n, R_{record}} vs. {v, R_{record}}

- ・ 範疇の区別はどの程度必要？
- ・ 機能範疇の要素は、“post-lexical”レベルでは非可視的：

(13) *The Principle of the Categorical Invisibility of Function Words* (Selkirk 1984: 337)

“... rules making crucial appeal to the syntactic category of the constituents to which they apply are blind to the presence of function word constituents.”

(Cf. Truckenbrodt 1999, Sato and Dobashi 2016)

(14) Align (PrW, R; Lex, R): For any PrW in the representation, its Right edge must coincide with the Right edge of some Lex. (Selkirk 1995; McCarthy & Prince 1993)

(15)	$\iota[$		$]$	Intonational Phrase (IntP)	
	$\varphi\{$		$\}$	$\varphi\{$	$\}$
	$\omega($		$)$	$\omega($	$)$
	Annemarie	can eat	the burger		= (1)

- ・ Prosodic branching (Inkelas and Zec 1995)

(16) PhP binarity: { ω , ω }

(17) a. $\dot{\text{A}}\text{nnemarie}$ (in isolation)

b. { $\dot{\text{A}}\text{nnemarie}$ } { $\acute{\text{a}}\text{te sandwiches}$ } (Dobashi 2010)

c. { $\dot{\text{A}}\text{nnemarie áte}$ }

d. { $\dot{\text{A}}\text{nnemarie áte it}$ }

- ・ Heavy NP Shift (Shiobara 2010: 87, 89)

(18) A: What happened yesterday?

B: #[(Kay) (donated) (to the library)] [(her collection) (of novels) (by Mishima)]

(19) A: What happened yesterday?

B: [(Kay) (donated) (to the library)] [(five) (hundred) (Canadian) (dollars)
(and her collection) (of novels) (by Mishima)]

- ・ 外在化プロセスでは、{ f , R}において、 f ではなく、Rの方が“解釈”されている。Cf. Embick (2015).
- ・ しかし、LA では、 f がラベルとして選ばれる。

(20) a. R alone is too “weak” to serve as a label. = (7c)
b. f is the label in { f , R}.

◎ 提案：「解釈における統語音韻非対称性」

(21) Syntactically inert elements receive interpretation in the processes of externalization.

(22) R is syntactically inert since it is unlabelable.

• Cf. Nasukawa and Backley (2015): structural head vs. informational head.

(23) a. ‘drink coffee’: *drink* is the syntactic head while *coffee* is more prominent in phonology.

b. ‘the garden’: *the* is the syntactic head while *garden* is more prominent in phonology.

(24) Align (PWd, R; Lex, R), where Lex = an unlabelable syntactic terminal element.

(25) *Extended Full Interpretation*:

Syntactic objects must be interpreted at least at either of the interfaces.

• T も unlabelable? (Cf. Chomsky 2015)

4.2 Phonological Phrase と Intonational Phrase

• Phonological Phrase:

(26) The domain of Spell-Out is a phonological phrase. (See Dobashi 2014.)

• なぜ Spell-Out Domain = Phonological Phrase ?

(27) Phase-Impenetrability Condition PIC (Chomsky 2000):

The domain of head H is not accessible to operations outside strong phase HP; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

(28) The domain of Spell-Out is syntactically inert.

• Intonational Phrase:

(29) [The boy hit the thief]

• なぜ 「文」 = Intonational Phrase (IntP) ?

→ 文全体は統語計算の対象の単位にはなっていない。

- その他の Intonational Phrases (Nespor and Vogel 1986: 188):

- (30) a. Lions [as you know] are dangerous.
 b. My brother [who absolutely loves animals] just bought himself an exotic tropical bird.
 c. That's Theodore's cat [isn't it?]
 d. [Clarence] I'd like you to meet Mr. Smith.
 e. [Good heavens] there's a bear in the back yard.
 f. They are so cute [those Australian koalas].

4. 今後の課題など

- Ito and Mester (2012): The Prosodic Hierarchy is universally three-layered.

- “Lexical” vs. “Post-lexical” rules:

- LPM-OT (Lexical Phonology and Morphology-OT: Kiparsky 2000)
- DOT (Derivational Optimality Theory: Rubach 2000)
- Phonological rules in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Matushansky 2006)

- “Lexical” rules require category distinction while “Postlexical” rules do not.

- 外在化の全体像

(31) Narrow Syntax

↓

Spell-Out (“Lexical” rules)

↓

Prosodic Computation (“Postlexical” rules)

[Cf. Yim and Dobashi 2016]

- 線状化との関係 (Dobashi 2013)

- “Intermediate projections” and their interpretation.

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Mass.: MIT Press
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework, In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by step*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 89-155.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130: 33-49.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2015. Problems of projection: Extensions. In E. Di Domenico, C. Hamann, and S. Matteini (eds.), *Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3-16
- Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row/ Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dobashi, Yoshihito. 2010. Computational efficiency in the syntax-phonology interface. *The Linguistic Review* 27(3): 241-260.
- Dobashi, Yoshihito. 2013. Autonomy of prosody and prosodic domain formation: A derivational approach. *Linguistic Analysis*, 38(3-4): 331-335.
- Dobashi, Yoshihito. 2014. Prosodic domains and the syntax-phonology interface,” In Andrew Carnie, Yosuke Sato, and Daniel Siddiqi (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Syntax*, London: Routledge, 365-387.
- Embick, David. 2015. *The Morpheme: A Theoretical Introduction*. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Halle, Morris and Ora Matushansky 2006. The morphophonology of Russian adjectival inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37(3): 351-404.
- Ito, Junko and Armin Mester. 2012. Recursive prosodic phrasing in Japanese. In Toni Borowsky, Shigeto Kawahara, Tokahito Shinya and Mariko Sugahara (eds.) *Prosody matters: Essays in honor of Elisabeth Selkirk*, London: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 280-303.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2000. Opacity and cyclicity. *The Linguistic Review* 17: 351-65.
- McCarthy, John and Alan Prince. 1993. Generalized alignment. In Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 79-153
- Nasukawa, Kuniya and Phillip Backley. 2015. Heads and complements in phonology: A case of role reversal? *Phonological Studies* 18: 67-74.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rubach, Jerzy. 2000. Glide and glottal stop insertion in Slavic languages. A DOT analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31 (2): 271-317.
- Sato, Yosuke and Yoshihito Dobashi. 2016. Prosodic phrasing and the *that*-trace effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47(2): 333-349.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1995. ‘The Prosodic Structure of Function Words’, in J. Beckman, L. Walsh-Dickey, and S. Urbanczyk (eds), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 439-469.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Shiobara, Kayono. 2010. *Derivational Linearization at the Syntax-Prosody Interface*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert 1999. ‘On the Relation between Syntactic Phrases and Phonological Phrases’, *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 219-255.
- Yim, Changguk, and Yoshihito Dobashi 2016. A prosodic account of *-yo* attachment in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 25(3): 213-241.