

Yoshihisa Kitagawa  
Indiana University

Some of the interpretive restrictions imposed on *naze* is examined with appropriate attention to prosody and semantics/pragmatics of Wh-questions in Japanese. It is concluded that the factual bases of the relevance of ECP in Japanese is not as firmly founded as claimed in the literature and its status in the context of the Japanese syntax must be seriously reconsidered.

## 1. Introduction

While some may still disagree, we may comfortably declare that a generative approach now is an established research method of linguistics as a subfield of ethology. Accordingly, grammar is regarded as an abstract form of language stored in our brain, and the linguists' task is to identify this abstract knowledge precisely and succinctly. While it is well-justified and perhaps necessary to regard grammar as an autonomous mental organ, we can access it only by way of the language users' actual linguistic performance and introspection, neither of which can escape the influences of extra-grammatical factors. Thus, we may consider that the language users' introspection on linguistics expressions can faithfully reflect our grammar only when we succeed in distilling grammaticality judgments from their acceptability judgments. Taking heed of this familiar but often disregarded warning, a significant number of researchers argued in their recent works that even the study of formal aspects of grammar should be conducted with much more careful attention to a larger context of language than usually exercised. In particular, it has been pointed out and argued that extra-syntactic/-grammatical factors such as prosody, information structure, pragmatics and processing have much more pervasive and significant influences on our grammaticality judgments than generally assumed.

In this paper, I would like to extend an approach along this line to the analysis of some interpretive restrictions imposed on the Wh-word *naze* 'why' in Japanese. In Section 2, I will summarize some recent research which serves as the backbone of my proposals.<sup>1</sup> In Section 3, I will reanalyze three interpretive puzzles involving *naze* and point out that they do not necessarily involve violations of syntactic constraints. This finding will urge us to reconsider the way these empirical phenomena are used in drawing the conclusion that the Empty Category Principle (ECP) is at work in Japanese.

## 2. Prosody and Scope of Wh-questions in Japanese - Subjacency revisited

First, Deguchi and Kitagawa (2002) (henceforth D & K) pointed out that Wh-questions in Tokyo/Standard Japanese (henceforth merely Japanese) is normally accompanied by what they call "Emphatic Prosody (EPD)," contrary to what Nishigauchi (1990) assumes. They argue further that a computational process associating a focused Wh-item and an interrogative COMP establishes one-to-one correspondence between a type of EPD and Wh-scope, as illustrated in (1)-(2). (Throughout this paper, the following notation will be adopted to indicate prosody on the example sentences: **BOLD CAPITALS** indicate an emphatic accent, *shade* indicates post-focal reduction of pitch, an upward arrow (↑) indicates an utterance-final interrogative rise, and © indicate that lexical or phrasal H tones there did not undergo post-focal reduction.)<sup>2</sup>

- (1) Hokenzyo-wa [ syokutyuudoku-kanzya-zenin-ga **NAni-o tabeta-ka** ] (su)guni  
 health.department-TOP food.poisoning-victim-all-NOM what-ACC ate-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> right.away  
 kakunin-sita.  
 confirmed.  
 'The Department of Health immediately confirmed [ what all of those who suffered from  
 food poisoning ate ].'

First, when EPD is local ("**Local EPD**"), spanning only a single clause as in (1), the involved Wh-phrase takes that clause (e.g., the subordinate CP in (1)) as its scope domain. Note that the post-focal reduction terminates at the **subordinate COMP** in (1), which is marked by the retention of the H tone in the matrix ((su)guni 'right.away'). When EPD is global ("**Global EPD**"), spanning more than one clause, on the other hand, the Wh-phrase in a subordinate clause takes a higher clause (e.g., the matrix CP in (2)) as its scope domain. Note that the post-focal reduction in (2) is spread out to the matrix COMP.

- (2) Hokenzyo-wa [ syokutyuudoku-kanzya-zenin-ga  
 health.department-TOP food.poisoning-victim-all-NOM  
**NAni-o tabeta-ka(dooka)** ] kakunin-siyoo-tositeiru-no↑?  
 what-ACC ate-COMP<sub>Whr</sub> trying.to.confirm-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'What<sub>i</sub> is such that the Department of Health is trying to confirm [ whether all of those who  
 suffered from food poisoning ate it<sub>i</sub> ]?'

It is very important that the readers judge the acceptability of these and other example sentences, assigning the prosodic patterns indicated there.<sup>3</sup> (See also Ishihara (2002) for a virtually identical claim.)

D & K further argue that the possibility of matrix Wh-scope in (2) indicates that scope extraction of a Wh-phrase out of a Wh-island does not necessarily give rise to Subjacency effects in Japanese when the sentence is accompanied by appropriate prosody. Kitagawa and Fodor (2003) and Kitagawa (To appear in 2005) also argue that a grammatically legitimate matrix scope interpretation as in (2) tends to be discouraged in many similar sentences because of the processing (and possibly production) bias toward the subordinate Wh-scope caused by a number of extra-syntactic factors. One such biasing factor is the semantics and pragmatics involved in the scope extraction out of Wh-islands. A typical Subjacency example like (3) below illustrates this phenomenon. The judgment indicated on the example is from its original source (Nishigauchi (1990: 31)).

- (3) \*Sato-kun-wa [ Suzuki-kun-ga **NAni-o tabeta-kadooka** ] oboete-imasu-ka↑?  
 Mr. Sato-TOP Mr. Suzuki-NOM what-ACC ate-COMP<sub>Whr</sub> remember-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'What<sub>i</sub> is such that Mr. Sato remembers [ whether or not Mr. Suzuki ate it<sub>i</sub> ]?'

It is fair to say that this sentence cannot be easily interpreted as a direct Wh-question even when we assign Global EPD. This intuition, in fact, is understandable since the semantics/pragmatics involved in the scope extraction out of a Wh-island in general is rather complex as described in (4) below and requires a somewhat more elaborate, specific type of pragmatic context than in the scope extraction out of a declarative clause.

- (4) (i) The speaker presupposes the existence of a specific item.  
(ii) The content of some eventuality is contingent on this item.  
(iii) The subject of the sentence holds some mental attitude toward the realization of this eventuality.  
(iv) The speaker is asking for the identity of this item.

If an informant is given the question in (3) without any context and asked for its acceptability judgment, it is not at all easy to imagine a sufficiently elaborate, suitable context for its matrix Wh-scope interpretation. Syntactic tests, however, are typically carried out in such a null discourse context. Accordingly, s/he is likely to be biased toward a subordinate Wh-scope interpretation, which is incompatible with the COMP *-kadooka* 'whether.' D & K point out that this ungrammaticality is the likely identity of the Subjacency effects in Japanese often reported in the literature.<sup>4</sup>

By controlling the semantics and pragmatics of a similar sentence as in our example (2) above, on the other hand, we can make the involved presuppositions much more effortlessly satisfiable, and make a matrix Wh-question interpretation quite naturally available. (In my informal survey through personal interviews and presentations involving over 50 speakers, this sentence has been comfortably accepted as a direct Wh-question by almost all of the speakers.) Sentence (5) below is another such example.

- (5) Tom-wa [ Jane-ga **DO**no otokonoko-ni denwashiteita-ka ] yataru kinishiteita-no<sup>↑</sup>?  
Tom-TOP Jane-NOM which boy-DAT calling-COMP<sub>Wthr</sub> badly worried-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'Which boy<sub>1</sub> is such that Tom was so anxious about if Jane was calling him<sub>1</sub>?'

The semantics and pragmatics involved in examples (5) and (2) make us naturally presuppose the existence of a rival boy in the former and some food item as the cause of food poisoning in the latter, and matrix Wh-scope is correspondingly easier to recognize in both examples. In short, generally speaking, even a grammatical sentence is difficult to interpret, and hence is low in acceptability, when a language user fails to imagine a pragmatic context in which it makes sense. Our cursory examination of (6)-(7) below also suggests that, as long as prosody and pragmatics are appropriately controlled, Subjacency effects need not be detected with other types of potential islands, either.

- (6) Adjunct island:

pro<sub>1</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> pro<sub>1</sub> ohirugohan-de [ ittai **NAni-o** ] tabeta ]-kara ]  
lunch.at on.earth what-ACC ate-because  
**guai-ga-waruku-natta-ndaroo-ka?**  
got.sick-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'I wonder what food that I ate at lunch made me sick.'

- (7) Complex NP island:

kono-urekko-sakka<sub>1</sub>-ga tugi-wa [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> pro<sub>1</sub> [ ittai **NAni-o** ] daizai-ni-sita ] **sakuhin** ]-o  
this-popular-writer-NOM next on.earth what-ACC worde.about work-ACC  
**happyoo-suru-ka** tanosimi-desune.  
make.public-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> look.forward.to  
'It is a big thrill to wonder what material this popular writer will take up in his next piece.'

Note that scope extraction in these examples is possible whether or not *ittai* 'on earth' is added to the Wh-phrase, which suggests that the notion D-linking (at least in the way argued for in Pesetsky (1987) on the Japanese syntax) is irrelevant.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, D & K point out that the prosody-scope correlation holds also in multiple Wh-question in Japanese but in the form of the correspondence between the obligatorily assigned **Compound EPD** and a "pair-wise" interpretation of the multiple Wh-phrases. In Compound EPD, more than one EPD is compounded and ends at the same COMP. In (8a), Compound EPD ends at the subordinate COMP (as indicated by the combination of upper- and underlines) and both Wh-phrases must take subordinate scope, while in (8b-c), Compound EPD spans to the matrix COMP and both Wh-phrases must take matrix scope. (See footnote 3.)

(8)

- a. Keesatu-wa [ ano-ban DAre-ga DAre-to atteita-ka ] mi○-ni tazuneta-no↑  
 police-TOP that-night who-NOM who-WITH seeing-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> everyone-DAT asked-COMP<sub>YN</sub>  
 'Did the police ask everyone [ **who** was with **whom** that night ]?'
- b. Keesatu-wa [ ano-ban Mary-ga DAre-to atteitta-ka ] DAre-ni tazuneta-no↑  
 police-TOP that-night -NOM who-WITH seeing-COMP<sub>Wthr</sub> who-DAT asked-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'Who<sub>1</sub> are such that the police asked **whom** *whether* Mary was with him<sub>1</sub> that night?'
- c. Keesatu-wa [ ano-ban DAre-ga DAre-to atteitta-ka ] kimi-ni tazuneta-no↑  
 police-TOP that-night who-NOM who-WITH seeing-COMP<sub>Wthr</sub> you-DAT asked-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'Who<sub>1</sub> are such that the police asked you *whether* **he**<sub>1</sub> was with **whom** that night?'

### 3. The Mysteries of *Naze*

The approach summarized in Section 2 provides us with a fresh and useful view of not only Subjacency effects but also several interpretive restrictions observed on the adjunct Wh-item *naze* 'why.' I will take up and reanalyze three of such interpretive puzzles reported in the literature and argue that closer attention to prosody and semantics/pragmatics will urge us to reconsider the status of ECP and other related syntactic constraints in the context of the Japanese syntax.

#### 3.1. Scope Extraction of *Naze* out of an Island

In all the Wh-questions we have examined so far, we paid attention only to the scope of Wh-phrases that function as argument. Those involving the adjunct Wh-phrase *naze* 'why', however, are also claimed to induce various island effects as in (9)-(11). These examples and their judgments are from Saito (1994: 204-205), to which I have superimposed their natural prosody.

(9) Complex NP Island:

- \*John-wa [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> sono-hon-o NAze katta ] hito ]-o sagasiteru-no↑?  
 -TOP that-book-ACC why bought person-ACC looking.for-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'Why<sub>1</sub> is John looking for [ the *person* who bought that book t<sub>1</sub> ]?'

(10) Adjunct Island:

\*John-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mary-ga sono-hon-o **NAze** katta **kara** ] okotteru-**no**↑?  
-TOP -NOM that-book-ACC why bought since angry-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'Why<sub>1</sub> is John angry [ *because* Mary bought that book t<sub>1</sub> ]?'

(11) Wh-island:

\*Kimi-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mary-ga **NAze** sono-hon-o katta-**kadooka** ] siritai-**no**↑?  
you-TOP -NOM why that-book-ACC bought-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> want.to.know-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'Why<sub>1</sub> do you want to know [ *whether* Mary bought that book t<sub>1</sub> ]?'

Since Lasnik and Saito (1984), the alleged ungrammaticality of these and similar examples has been typically analyzed as involving an ECP violation, which is claimed to arise when *naze* is extracted out of an island at LF. Although Saito (1994: 234, footnote 16) seems to consider that these examples are straightforwardly and uniformly rejected by virtually every Japanese speaker as ungrammatical, this does not seem to be an entirely correct picture especially when we control the prosody and pragmatic contexts of the sentences.

Just as in the Subjacency examples discussed in Section 2 above, the semantics/pragmatics involved in the scope extraction out of an island are rather complex and require somewhat elaborate, specific types of pragmatic contexts, which are typically not provided in a null discourse context as in (9)-(11). When the embedded Wh-phrase questions about 'reasons,' the situation even worsens, as described in (12) below.

- (12) a. (9): The speaker believes there is some specific reason such that John is looking for the person who bought the book for it (= that reason), and wants the hearer to identify the reason of which this is true.
- b. (10): The speaker believes there is some specific reason such that John is angry because Mary bought the book for it (= that reason), and wants the hearer to identify the reason of which this is true.
- c. (11): The speaker believes there is some specific reason such that the hearer wants to know if Mary bought the book for it (= that reason), and wants the hearer to identify the reason of which this is true.

The readers should try to imagine an appropriate pragmatic context for each case and feel how difficult a task it is. Among the three, the cases involving a complex NP island and a Wh-island are especially hard, which seems to be reflected in the difficulty of their intended interpretations. The speaker's presupposition of the existence of some specific reason worthy of note in each case perhaps is one of the main culprits of the difficulty, since a Wh-question seeking to identify a reason, especially with the use of *naze*, is usually asked without such a specific presupposition involved.

Though not an easy task, we can manage to improve similar Wh-questions significantly to many speakers by enriching the pragmatic context and adding appropriate prosody, i.e.,  
**Global EPD:**

(13) Complex NP island:

[ maitosi nannin-mono sensyu-ga puro-yakyuu-kai-o satte-ikimasuga, ]  
'Every year, numbers of players leave professional baseball,'  
[<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> **NAze** yameteiku ] **sensyu** ]-ga itiban-ooi-**ka** sitTEMASuka↑?  
why quit player-NOM most-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> do.you.know  
kega-desu-yo, kega.  
it.is.injury injury  
'Do you know for what reason the most number of players quit the team? It is injury!'

(14) Adjunct island:

[ mondai-wa nani-o sita-ka zyanakute naze sore-o sita-ka nandayo. ]  
'What is important is not what you did but why you did it.'  
[<sub>CP</sub> Omae-ga **NAze** sonna-koto-o sita-**kara** ] oyazi-ga annani **okotta-ka**  
you-NOM why such.a-thing-ACC did-since Dad-NOM that.much angry-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
Omae-ni-wa wakaruka?  
you-DAT-TOP understand-Q  
'Do you understand for what reason your dad is that much angry because you did such a thing for that reason?'

(15) Wh-island (+ Complex NP island + (Subject island)):

[ Context: A law professor lecturing on court cases says:  
ippan-teki-ni saiban-de-wa kagaisya-ga naze tumi-o okasitesimattano-ka-ga totemo  
zyuuyoona pointo-ni narimasu-ga, sono saiban-no syurui-ni-yotte donoyoona dooki-ga  
zyuuyoosi-sareru-ka-wa matimati-desu. tatoeba, **keezi**-saiban-dewa ... ]  
'Generally speaking, in any trial, why the assailant committed a crime becomes a very important point, though what kind of motive is considered to be the most important differs depending on the type of the trial. For instance, in criminal cases, ...'

< The lecture on criminal cases continues for a while ... >

dewa, **minzi**-saiban-de-wa [<sub>CP</sub> kagaisya-ga **NAze** tumi-o **okasitesimatta-ka** ]-ga  
then civil-case-in-TOP defendant-NOM why crime-ACC committed-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>-NOM  
**mottomo zyuuyoosi-sareru-ka** to-iimasuto ...  
most regarded.as.important-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> if.I.say  
'Then, what reason is regarded as most important if the defendant committed a crime for that reason? I would say ...'

Among over 40 speakers to whom these sentences were presented, the most popular reaction was that (14) is most naturally and immediately acceptable while interpreting (13) and (15) requires some pondering. There were some speakers, though, who remain to be uncomfortable with the use of *naze* in all of these contexts and would prefer to use an alternative adjunct expression *doo-yuu riyuu-de* 'for what kind of reason' instead. It probably is true that *doo-yuu riyuu-de* more perfectly and easily fits the presuppositions involved in these contexts as describe in (12) than *naze*. Probably, some additional pragmatic factor that we do not understand fully at this point is in effect here.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, it is important that many speakers come to accept at least some of the sentences that are alleged to involve island violations. While full-fledged discussion on ECP goes well beyond the scope of this work, these observations suggest that

some serious re-examination of the factual bases of the past work on this topic would be advisable.

### 3.2. Anti-superiority with *Naze*

A contrast as in (16) below is also reported in the literature concerning the use of *naze* in multiple Wh-questions. The examples and their judgments are from Saito (1994: 195), and again we have superimposed their natural prosody.<sup>7</sup> As seems to have been the case in the literature, we pay attention solely to multiple-pair (or pair-list) interpretations at least for the time being:

- (16)
- a. John-wa NAni-o NAze katta-no?  
       -TOP what-ACC why bought-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
       'What did John buy for what reason?'
- b. \*John-wa NAze NAni-o katta-no?  
       why what-ACC  
       'For what reason did John buy what?'

Saito (1982) and Watanabe (1992) both consider that the alleged ungrammaticality in (16b) arises due to an ECP violation induced by some theorematic condition. This condition, which Saito calls 'rigidity condition' and A. Watanabe calls 'anti-superiority,' has the effect of requiring the c-command relation between the two Wh-phrases to be inherited from overt syntax to covert syntax, and eventually disallows the LF-trace of *naze* from being antecedent-governed in (16b).

The judgment reported here, however, is notoriously varied and unstable, which is often referred to as "idiolectal variation."<sup>8</sup> In fact, we can improve similar multiple Wh-questions significantly by appropriately controlling pragmatics and prosody (in this case with **Compound EPD**), as in (17).

- (17)
- itiryuuno kyattyaawa-wa [ siai-no-naka-de NAze DOnoyoona tama-o yookyuusita-ka ]  
 first-rate catcher-TOP game-in why what.kind.of ball-ACC required-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 subete kioku-siteiru-monodesu.  
 all remember  
 'A first-rate catcher would remember why he required the pitcher to throw what ball for every pitch in the game.'

Perhaps as Kuno and Takami (1993: 115-118) and S. Watanabe (2000) point out, speakers detect awkwardness in a multiple Wh-question like (16b) when they have difficulty to imagine any appropriate pragmatic context in which purchased items are sorted out on the basis of the reasons for which they were purchased. When such difficulty is overcome and *naze* can be interpreted as "sorting key" naturally, and Compound EPD is appropriately assigned as in (17), the sentence becomes straightforwardly acceptable to many speakers including those who find some contrast between the two sentences in (16), which suggests that we are dealing with something more than mere idiolectal variation. Note that a sensible catcher in the baseball does often think of the hitter's weakness and then determines what type of ball he should require the

pitcher to throw. In this context, a reason can be naturally regarded as a sorting key for a type of ball.

As the following examples indicate, *naze* can also appear comfortably in a position higher than another Wh-phrase when a multiple Wh-question can exhibit a clear single-pair interpretation:

- (18) [ A conversation at CIA: kinoo siryoositu-kara issyun-no-suki-o-tuite nanika-o nusumooto-siteita KGB-no supai-o tukamaeta-soodana. ]  
 'I heard that we captured a spy from KGB yesterday, who tried to steal something from our record room in a very brief unattended moment.' ]

soitu-ga NAze NAni-o nusumooto-siteita-ka goomon-ni-kakete hakasero.  
 that.brat-NOM why what-ACC tried.to.steal-COMP<sub>Wh</sub> torture.and make.confess  
 'Torture him and make him confess why he was stealing what.'

- (19) [ In a detective story, a detective says: ]

mondai-wa  
 question.is  
 (ittai) NAze DAre-ga kono-heya-ni sinobikomu hituyoo-ga attano-ka  
 what.on.earth why who-NOM this-room-into sneak.in need-NOM existed-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 toyuu-koto-desu.  
 fact.that  
 'The question is for what reason who needed to sneak into this room?'

Thus, we should consider that the pragmatic restriction in question is imposed not just on "sorting keys" for multiple-pair interpretations but on the "anchor" information denoted by the first Wh-phrase on which the interpretation of the second Wh-phrases is contingent in both multiple- and single-pair readings of multiple Wh-questions.<sup>9</sup> Again, these observations suggest that some serious re-examination of the factual bases of the past work on the anti-superiority effect would be advisable. We should especially investigate the nature of idiolectal variation in grammaticality judgment allegedly involved in this phenomenon.<sup>10</sup>

### 3.3. Higher-Wh effect and *Naze*

Finally, Saito (1994: 204-206) also reports that there is a contrast as indicated between the pair of sentences in (20)-(22).

- (20) Complex NP Island:

- a. ??John-wa [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> NAni-o NAze katta] *hito*] -o sagasiteru-**no**↑  
 -TOP what-ACC why bought person-ACC looking.for-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'What<sub>1</sub> is John looking for [ the *person* that bought it<sub>1</sub> for what reason ]?'  
 b. \*John-wa [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> NAze NAni-o katta] *hito*] -o sagasiteru-**no**↑?  
 -TOP why what-ACC bought person-ACC looking.for-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
 'With respect to what reason is John looking for [ the *person* that bought what for that reason ]?'

(21) Adjunct Island:

- a. ?John-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mary-ga NA<sub>ni</sub>-o NA<sub>ze</sub> katta ]-kara ] okotteru-**no**↑?  
-TOP -NOM what-ACC why bought-since angry-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'What<sub>i</sub> is John angry [ *because* Mary bought it<sub>i</sub> for what reason ]?'  
b. \*John-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mary-ga NA<sub>ze</sub> NA<sub>ni</sub>-o katta ]-kara ] okotteru-**no**↑?  
-TOP -NOM why what-ACC bought-since angry-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'With respect to what reason is John angry [ *because* Mary bought what for that reason ]?'

(22) Wh-island:

- a. ??Kimi-wa [<sub>CP</sub> DA<sub>re</sub>-ga NA<sub>ze</sub> sono-hon-o katta-kadooka ] siritai -**no**↑?  
you-TOP who-NOM why that-book-ACC bought-COMP<sub>Wthr</sub> want.to.know-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'Who<sub>i</sub> do you want to know [ *whether* (s)he<sub>i</sub> bought that book for what reason ]?'  
b. \*Kimi-wa [<sub>CP</sub> NA<sub>ze</sub> DA<sub>re</sub>-ga sono-hon-o katta-kadooka ] siritai -**no**↑?  
you-TOP why who-NOM that-book-ACC bought-COMP<sub>Wthr</sub> want.to.know-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'With respect to what reason do you want to know [ *whether* who bought that book for that reason ]?'

Here, *naze* 'why' located within an island in each of (20a)-(22a) is claimed to be immune from an ECP violation because of an additional higher Wh-phrase. In sentences (20b)-(22b), on the other hand, this "higher-Wh effect" is claimed to be suppressed due to a rigidity-induced ECP violation (with *naze* 'why' as a higher Wh-phrase).<sup>11</sup> Again, grammaticality judgment involved in (20)-(22) is reported to involve idiolectal variation.

All sentences in (20)-(22) involve scope extraction of *naze* out of an island, and those in (20b)-(22b) additionally involve *naze* as a higher Wh-phrase in multiple Wh-questions. The judgments reported on these sentences therefore are quite understandable, given that sentences are presented here with quite meager pragmatic contexts. First, they are all somewhat difficult to interpret because the situation involved in these questions is rather uncommon — the speaker presupposes the existence of a specific reason-object pair, where the identity of one is contingent on the other. The subject of the matrix clause in turn holds a mental attitude toward some object, cause, or eventuality whose identity or content is contingent on this reason-object pair. The speaker now is asking for the identity of this reason-object pair. Second, (20b)-(22b) are somewhat harder to interpret than (20a)-(22a), since interpreting a reason-denoting *naze* as an "anchor" Wh-phrase and interpreting another Wh-phrase contingent on it is pragmatically quite limited. The "higher-Wh effect" with *nani* 'what' in (20a)-(22a) is also understandable, since the interpretation of *naze* now comes to be contingent on that of an object-denoting *nani* as the anchor in these examples, which is pragmatically much more common than the opposite direction of identity (i.e. from reason to object).

Again, we expect sentences similar to (20b)-(22b) to improve with appropriate control of prosody and pragmatics as in (23)-(25), and this seems to be true. (See also the example in (19).)

(23) Complex NP island:

[ A sports broadcaster interviewing the catcher of a winning baseball club says: ]  
kyoo-no-siai-no-naka-de [NP [IP pittyyaa-ni  
today's-game.in pitcher-DAT

NAze DONna-tama-o yookyuu-sita ] *daseki* ]-ga itiban-no pointo-desita-ka?  
why what-ball-ACC required at.bat-NOM biggest point-was-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'In today's game, with respect to what reason was the at-bat on which you required  
the pitcher to throw what kind of ball the biggest point?'

(24) Adjunct island:

[ At the beginning of a broadcast of an ongoing baseball game, an announcer says: ]  
goran-noyooni, hudan-nara raito-o mamotte-iru Itiroo-sensyu-ga kantoku-ni totyuu-kootai-sase-  
rare, sudeni benti-ni hikkode-imasu.  
'As you can see, Ichiro, who is usually at the right field has been already taken out of the game  
by the manager and is sitting in the dugout.'

[<sub>CP</sub> NAze DONna-puree-o sita-(*ka*)ra ] kaerarete-simatta-no-ka  
why what.kind.of-play-ACC did-since was.replaced-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
kyoo-no komenteetaa-no Egawa-san-ni kaisetusi-temorai-masyoo.  
today's commentator-GEN Mr. Egawa-DAT let.explain  
'Let's ask today's commentator Mr. Egawa to explain for what reason he was taken out  
because he had done what kind of play for that reason.'

(25) Wh-island:

[ Context: To-aruu seeyaku-gaisya-no syain-ga tazuneta: ]  
'An employee at some pharmaceutical company asked:'  
utino syatyoo-wa  
our company.president-TOP

NAzeDONno-syoohin-ga koosee-syoo-no-oikari-ni-hure-yasinai-ka ] sinpai-siteiru-no↑?  
why which-product-NOM may.make.ministry.of.welfare.angry-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>worried-COMP<sub>Wh</sub>  
'For what reason is our company president feared lest the Ministry of Welfare should  
become angry at which merchandize of ours for that reason?'

Among these, Wh-islands seem to require us the most efforts to imagine any appropriate pragmatic context, in which the speaker presupposes the existence of a specific reason-object pair, where the identity of the latter is contingent on the former. The subject of the matrix clause in turn holds a mental attitude toward the eventuality whose content is contingent on this reason-object pair. The speaker now is asking for the identity of this reason-object pair. Such a pragmatic situation in fact is difficult enough to imagine even when we reverse the order of *naze* 'why' and *dono syoohin* 'which merchandise' in (25).<sup>12</sup>

## 4. Conclusions

I hope that the investigations above have made it clear that the factual bases for ECP violations and related matters in Japanese are not exactly undisputable, but should be subject to serious re-examination. I also believe that we must make sure to pay close attention to prosody and pragmatics in such re-examination, which may be the key to the true understanding of what has been left obscured with an appeal to the notion "idiolectal variation."<sup>13</sup>

### Footnotes

\* I would like to show here my deepest respect for Prof. Heizo Nakajima's unique, important and continuous contribution to the development of the theory of language. I also personally owe him, at least partly, my decision to pursue linguistics as my profession when I almost gave it up. I am grateful to Leslie Gabriele and Satoshi Tomioka for their useful comments. The research in this work has been partially supported by COAS Grants-in-Aid and Faculty Research Incentive Fund at Indiana University.

<sup>1</sup> Kitagawa (To appear in 2005) provides much more comprehensive descriptions of the approach summarized here.

<sup>2</sup> I will also indicate each distinct function of complementizers in Japanese as COMP<sub>Wh</sub> (Wh-scope maker), COMP<sub>Whr</sub> (a polar-question complementizer), COMP<sub>Y/N</sub> (yes/no question marker) or COMP<sub>That</sub> (declarative complementizer).

<sup>3</sup> Recordings of relevant prosodic patterns (assigned to distinct but similar examples) can be listened to by visiting "<http://www.iub.edu/~ykling/SoundGallery/EL/index.html>". The prosodic patterns there correspond to those in this paper as follows: (4b) on the website → (1) in this paper; (5b) → (2); (18a) → (8a); (18b) → (8b); (18c) → (8c).

<sup>4</sup> See Kitagawa and Fodor (2003) and Kitagawa (To appear in 2005) for other extra-syntactic factors that bias parsers toward subordinate Wh-scope in this construction.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, despite a popular assumption of the field, *ittai* is not necessarily an anti-D-linking indicator to begin with, as the possibility of *ittai dotira* 'which of the two on earth' indicates. Nonetheless, since it emphasizes the total ignorance or the lack of clue on the speaker's part as to what would be a likely answer to the question (Kitagawa and Tomioka (2004)), we must ensure a pragmatic context suitable for asking such a question. Again, a typical null discourse context as when sentences are presented for judgment often fails to meet such a requirement. This is a likely source of the Subjacency effects involving *ittai* reported in the literature.

<sup>6</sup> Possibly, this pragmatic factor is related to some core idea of D-linking, though it does not seem to be simply translated into the absence of movement, contra Pesetsky (1987). See (6) and (7) above and also (19). Lasnik and Saito (1993) consider that both *ittai*-Wh and *naze* are adjuncts and induce ECP violations. The contrast between (6)-(7) and (13)-(15), however, suggests otherwise.

<sup>7</sup> See also Lasnik and Saito (1984) and Lasnik and Saito (1993) for some earlier observations and analyses of this phenomenon.

<sup>8</sup> For instance, Saito (1994: 233, footnote 1) states "There seem to be equally many people who accept examples like (1b) and (2b) [= examples like (16b) above]. I will basically ignore this idiolect in the discussion in the text but will come back to it from time to time in footnotes, simply to show that its existence does not necessarily affect the main conclusions of this paper." Takahashi (1993: 666, footnote 8) apparently finds no problem with an example involving the same hierarchical order between *naze* 'why' and *nani* 'what.' Some speakers apparently find even

(16a) somewhat difficult to interpret. For instance, Watanabe (1992: 266) adds one question mark to a sentence similar to (16a).

<sup>9</sup> When a multiple-pair interpretation is intended, it is somewhat difficult to try to interpret even *naze* in a position lower than another Wh-phrase as the "sorted" (rather than "sorting") information. Watanabe's (1992) question mark on (16a) possibly reflects this tendency.

<sup>10</sup> Variation may arise in the way speakers associate sentences with pragmatic contexts. That is, some speakers may attempt to imagine some specific and suitable pragmatic context for a sentence quite thoroughly before pinning down their acceptability judgments while others do not.

<sup>11</sup> To account for the reported contrast, Saito (1994: 206-207) proposes an analysis in which *naze* in a lower position (as in (20a)-(22a)) adjoins *nani* in a higher position at LF and gets a free ride to Spec-CP, leaving behind only the trace of the Wh-cluster as a whole, which is an argument trace rather than an adjunct trace.

<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, any multiple-pair interpretation seems to be prohibited in this context. See Kitagawa, et al. (2004) for the observations and the analysis of this phenomenon.

<sup>13</sup> I would also like to point out that the widely recognized detection of ECP violations in the languages involving overt Wh-movement does not necessarily force or justify our assimilating Wh-in-situ languages to those languages. To the contrary, Wh-movement languages do involve an extra factor of transferring phonetic features from one position to another, and hence may involve some extra complication **in addition** to the semantic/ pragmatics restrictions we have discussed in this section. If we decide to respect and pursue a sharper split of PF and LF under the Minimalist Program, we should probably be more careful in pursuing the research strategy of assimilating Wh-in-situ languages like Japanese to the overt Wh-movement in languages like English.

## References

- Deguchi, Masanori and Yoshihisa Kitagawa. 2002. Prosody and Wh-questions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-second Annual Meeting of the North-Eastern Linguistic Society*, 73-92. GLSA, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2002. Invisible but Audible Wh-scope Marking: Wh-constructions and Deaccenting in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-first West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 180-193. Cascadilla Press.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. To appear in 2005. Prosody, Syntax and Pragmatics of Wh-questions in Japanese. *English Linguistics*.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa and Janet Dean Fodor. 2003. Default Prosody Explains Neglected Syntactic Analyses of Japanese. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 12*, 267-279. CSLI Publication.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa Dorian Roehrs and Satoshi Tomioka. 2004. Multiple Wh-Interpretations. In *Generative Grammar in a Broader Perspective: Proceedings of the 4th GLOW in Asia 2003*, 209-233. Hankook.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa and Satoshi Tomioka. 2004. Masked Island Effects in Japanese. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 46: Proceedings of the Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics I*, 315-329.
- Kuno, Susumu and Ken-ichi Takami. 1993. *Grammar and Discourse Principles: Functional Syntax and GB Theory*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1984. On the Nature of Proper Government. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 15: 235-289.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1993. *Move alpha - Conditions on Its Application and Output*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-Situ: Movement and Unselective Binding. In *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, ed. ter Meulen, A. G. B, 98-129. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1982. Scrambling, Topicalization, and Strong Crossover. ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1994. Additional-WH Effects and the Adjunction Site Theory. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*. 3: 195-240.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1993. Movement of Wh-Phrases in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 11: 655-678.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1992. Subjacency and S-structure Movement of WH-in-situ. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*. 1: 255-291.
- Watanabe, Shin. 2000. Naze 'why' in Japanese Multiple Wh-questions and the Sorting Key Hypothesis: A Preliminary Account. In *Imi to Katachi no Intaafeesu (An Interface between Meanings and Forms)*, ed. Takeda, Shuuichi et al., 561-570. Tokyo: Kuroshio.