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1. how can we derive effects of (morpho)syntax on prosody without referring to it in the phonological computation?
2. what is the nature of input to phonology?
3. where is the connection between intonational contours and their meaning encoded?

GOAL: a modular account of syntax/phonology interaction

- **Focus and Topic** - privative features (F, T) on syntactic nodes
- **Features active in syntax:**
  - driving movement (e.g. Polish: Szczegielniak 2005, Hungarian: Kiss 1998, Serbian: Migdalski 2006),
  - being lexicalized as morpheme markers (e.g. Japanese: Yamato 2007, Kîîtharaka: Abels & Muriungi 2006)

- **also marked by prosodic phrasing (PPh)** (Truckenbrodt 1999 for Chichewa in (1))

1. a) [ V NP ] F T
   b) [ V ] F T

- **pitch accent and intonational contour** (Ladd 1996 and Büring 2007 for English in (2))

2. a) A: Well, what about FRED? What did HE eat?
   b) A: Well, what about the BEANS? Who ate THEM?

- **Focus and Topic** - multiple spell out

• **Contrastive Topic** -
  - features active in syntax:
    - phonological $\sigma$ (the underlying form),
    - syntactic
    - conceptual (encyclopedic knowledge)
  - also marked by
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