

Naze in Complex Noun Phrases

OGURO, Takeshi

It has been generally accepted in the generative literature that the behavior of *naze* is captured by assuming covert movement and the Empty Category Principle (hereafter, the ECP) (Huang (1982), Lasnik and Saito (1984, 1992), and Tsai (1994) among others). This idea comes from the observation according to which *naze* cannot be allowed in relative clauses and noun complement clauses. In this paper I would like to reexamine the observation and to show that the deragded cases involving *naze* can be excluded without recourse to covert movement and the ECP.

In section 1 I briefly show the previous observation of *naze* and its treatment. In section 2 I clarify the categorial status of relative clauses and noun complement clauses. In section 3 I show that *naze* in relative clauses can be excluded without recourse to LF movement and the ECP. In section 4 I argue that such theoretical assumptions are irrelevant in ruling out the adjunct in a noun complement clause. In section 5 I present grammatical cases involving *naze* in such contexts, which would be wrongly excluded in the approach based on LF movement and the ECP, and consider their theoretical implications. The final section concludes the paper.

1. Previous Studies of *Naze*: Its Behavior and the Accounts

There is a widely held consensus that the distribution of the WH-adjunct *naze* ‘why’ is more severely restricted than that of WH-arguments like *nani* ‘what’ or *dare* ‘who’. In this section we see how *naze* behaves and sketch how its behavior has been accounted for.

1.1 *Naze Disallowed in Complex Nouns*

It has been observed that there is an argument vs. adjunct asymmetry in WH-questions. As in the following contrasts, the argument *nani* ‘what’ can be contained in a relative clause and a noun complement clause, while the adjunct *naze* ‘why’ cannot:

- (1) a. Kimi-wa [NP [CP e_1 nani-o katta] hito₁]-o
you-Top what-Acc bought person-Acc
sagasite iru no?
looking-for Q
‘Q you are looking for [the person [that bought what]]?’
- b. * Kimi-wa [NP [CP e_1 naze sono hon-o katta] hito₁]-o
you-Top why that book-Acc bought person-Acc
sagasite iru no?
looking-for Q
‘Q you are looking for [the person [that bought that book why]]?’
(Lasnik and Saito (1992: 36))
- (2) a. Mary-wa [NP [CP John-ga nani-o nusunda] koto]-o
Mary-Top John-Nom what-Acc stole fact-Acc
mondai-ni siteiru no?

problem-to make Q

‘Q Mary is making an issue out of [the fact [John stole what]]?’

- b. * Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} John-ga naze sore-o nusunda] koto]-o
Mary-Top John-Nom why that-Acc stole fact-Acc
mondai-ni siteiru no?
problem-to make Q

‘Q Mary is making an issue out of [the fact [John stole it why]]?’

(Lasnik and Saito (1992: 22))

The contrast in (1) shows that the WH-argument *nani* can be contained in a relative clause, while the WH-adjunct *naze* cannot. The one in (2) shows that *nani* can appear inside a noun complement clause, whereas *naze* cannot. (I temporarily assume that both relative clauses and noun complement clauses are of the CP category. I examine their categorial status in detail later.) In the following subsection let us briefly review how this effect is handled in traditional terms.

1.2 A Covert Movement Approach

In the Government and Binding (GB, hereafter) era, the above contrasts were extensively discussed, since they were taken as the evidence for certain GB assumptions, which are shown in the following (See Chomsky (1981, 1986), Huang (1982), and Lasnik and Saito (1984, 1992) among others):

- (3) In-situ WH-phrases are raised at LF to satisfy their scopal properties.
- (4) The Empty Category Principle
Nonpronominal empty categories must be properly governed.
- (5) α properly governs β iff
 - a. α lexically governs β , or

- b. α antecedent-governs β
- (6) α lexically governs β , if
 - a. α c-commands β , and
 - b. α assigns Case or a θ -role to β .
- (7) α antecedent-governs β if
 - a. α binds β , and
 - b. there is no γ (γ an NP or CP) such that α c-commands γ and γ dominates β , unless β is the head of γ .

Given the assumption of LF WH-movement, the above examples would have LF structures like the following (order irrelevant):

- (1') a. [CP nani₂ [IP John-wa [NP [CP e₁ t₂-O katta] hito₁]-o sagasite iru] no]
- b. * [CP naze₂ [IP John-wa [NP [CP e₁ t₂ sono hon-o katta] hito]-o sagasite iru] no]
- (2') a. [CP nani₂ [IP Mary-wa [NP [CP John-ga t₂-O nusunda] koto]-o mondai-ni siteiru] no]
- b. * [CP naze₂ [IP John-wa [NP [CP Mary-ga t₂ sore-o nusunda] koto]-o mondai-ni siteiru] no]

In each of the structures in (1'a) and (2'a), nani 'what' is covertly raised, and its trace is lexically governed by the verb *katta* 'bought' or *nusunda* 'stole', the proper government requirement being satisfied. In (1'b) and (2'b), however, the trace left behind by the covertly raised adjunct *naze* 'why' fails to be properly governed. It cannot be lexically governed by the verb, because it is not assigned Case or a θ -role. It also fails to be antecedent-governed by the raised adjunct, with the NP intervening between them. Since the ECP is

violated, the examples are extremely degraded.

One of the advantages with this mechanism is that it can treat the above contrast on a par with the one below:

- (8) a. ??What do you believe [_{NP} the claim [_{CP} that John bought *t*]]
b. * Why do you believe [_{NP} the claim [_{CP} that John left *t*]]
(Lasnik and Saito (1992: 22))

The (a) example, which involves movement of an argument out of a complex NP, is marginal to begin with, but it is far better than the (b) example, where the adjunct *why* is raised. This clear contrast can be accounted for in terms of the ECP. The trace in the former example satisfies the ECP, since it is lexically governed by the verb *bought*, while the one in the latter fails to do so, because the antecedent government, which is necessary for the licensing of adjunct traces in general, cannot be attained, due to the presence of the intervening noun phrase. Thus the moved *why* and the in-situ *naze*, which display very similar behavior, can be treated in the same way if we assume the LF movement of in-situ WH-phrases and the ECP.

A question arises regarding the contrast between the perfect examples in (1a) and (2a), on one hand, where the in-situ WH-phrase stays inside an NP, and the marginal (8a), on the other, where overt WH-movement takes place out of the NP. Huang (1982) makes a rather paradoxical suggestion that if a WH-phrase is raised overtly, its movement is subject to the constraint on movement, but it is not if it is raised covertly.

Tsai (1994) suggests a way to do away with Huang's paradoxical hypothesis under the minimalist approach according to which covert movement as well as overt movement is subject to the constraint on movement. He suggests that in-situ argument WH-phrases have their scopal properties satisfied without recourse to movement. Specifically he proposes that in-situ argumental

WH-phrases are interpreted by being bound by an unselective binder of some sort, which entails that they do not need to be raised. Then the lack of the subjacency effect in the (a) examples in (1)-(4) is elegantly captured.

2. On the Categorical Status of Relative Clauses and Noun Complement Clauses

Before reexamining the behavior of *naze*, it is necessary to clarify the categorial status of relative clauses and noun complement clauses. In the previous section it was assumed, without any discussion, that these clauses are invariably CPs. There are, however, reasons to think that this simple assumption is undesirable, as we see in this section.

2.1 The IP Hypothesis

There have been studies, including Murasugi (1991, 1993, 2000a, 2000b), Murasugi and Saito (1994), Saito (1985, 1987), and Sakai (1994), that assume that the clauses under discussion are of the category IP rather than of the category CP. One strong piece of evidence for this assumption is the observation that an overt complementizer cannot appear in these clauses. This is illustrated in the following:

- (9) a. [[Mary-ga John-ni e_1 watasita] (*to/no)] hon₁
 Mary-Nom John-Dat handed book
 ‘the book Mary handed to John’
- b. [[John-ga sono hon-o nusunda] (*to/no)] syooko
 John-Nom that book-Acc stole evidence
 ‘the evidence that John stole the book’
 (Murasugi and Saito (1994: 303))

These examples show that an overt complementizer *to* or *no* cannot appear in a relative clause or a complement clause. This is quite natural under the assumption that these clauses are of the category IP.

One might wonder if it is possible that noun complement clauses in Japanese are necessarily headed by a null complementizer. This idea is not likely, given the following:

- (10) a. the claim [*(that) [Mary handed the book to John]]
b. the evidence [*(that) [John stole the book]]
(Murasugi and Saito (1994: 304))

In English, the presence of the complementizer *that* is necessarily required, which indicates that noun complement clauses in English are invariably CPs and that noun complement clauses are not headed by null complementizers. Given this, noun complement clauses in Japanese, which we have seen do not allow the presence of an overt complementizer, do not involve null counterpart as well, which in turn shows that they are invariably IPs. Murasugi (2000b) argues that relative clauses should be treated on a par with noun complement clauses. So assuming, relative clauses are also IPs.

2.2 The CP Hypothesis: Fukui (1988)

There are studies which do not take the IP hypothesis. Representative is the one by Fukui (1988), who claims that the clauses in question are CPs. Let us see the relevant points of his claim.

Recall that the IP hypothesis is based on the observation that the clauses under consideration do not allow the presence of a complementizer. Fukui argues for the CP hypothesis, observing cases where the presence of a complementizer is indeed allowed. He gives the following:

- (11) [NP [CP [IP Taroo-ga sore-o te-ni ireta] toyuu] koto]
 Taroo-Nom it-Acc obtained Comp fact
 ‘the fact that John obtained it’
 (Fukui (1988: 513))

He assumes that *toyuu*, which is comprised of a complementizer *to* ‘that’ and the verb *yuu* ‘say’, is actually a complementizer, based on the plausible insight that *toyuu* behaves as a syntactically unseparable unit. This approach assumes that in this example the head noun *koto* takes a CP as its clausal complement.

As in the following, *toyuu* can be dropped:

- (12) [NP [CP [IP Taroo-ga sore-o te-ni ireta] e] koto]
 Taroo-Nom it-Acc obtained fact
 ‘the fact that John obtained it’
 (Fukui (1988: 513))

This example can be analyzed as the head noun having a CP, if we assume that the head C of the CP is syntactically present but phonologically null. His analysis suggests that nouns like *koto* always take a CP as their clausal complement.

He also presents another interesting case, where the complementizer must be phonetically present:

- (13) [NP [CP [IP Taroo-ga sore-o te-ni ireta] toyuu/*e] uwasa]
 Taroo-Nom it-Acc obtained Comp rumor
 ‘the rumor that John obtained it’
 (Fukui (1988: 513))

This example shows that the clause associated with *uwasa* ‘rumor’ must be

accompanied by *toyuu*. This case is a clear piece of evidence against the IP hypothesis.

2.3 The Examination of the Two Hypotheses

Having reviewed the two hypotheses, we are now in a position to ask what would be the correct generalization to capture the facts in Japanese. The difference between the two views concerns the presence or absence of a complementizer. The IP hypothesis assumes that a complementizer is not allowed, while the CP hypothesis requires its presence. Recall that Fukui's (1988) argument relies crucially on the complementizer *toyuu*. It would be in order to investigate the distribution of the element.

Fukui's argument is based on the cases with *koto* 'fact' or *uwasa* 'rumor,' where the presence of *toyuu* is possible or obligatory. There are cases, however, where the complementizer *toyuu* is not permitted. Let us observe the following example:

- (14) [NP [[IP Taroo-ga kaita e_i] to yuu] hon_i]
 Taroo-Nom wrote Comp say book
 'the book which they say that Taroo wrote'

This example, which has a relative clause followed by *toyuu*, is fine, but the interpretation is different from the intended one. It does not imply that Taroo wrote the book, but it only means that people say that he wrote it. Thus, as shown in the gloss, in this example the string *to yuu* is not a complementizer, but it is comprised of two separate items, one being the complementizer *to*, the other the verb *yuu* 'say'. Thus, the clause *Taroo-ga kaita e_i* is embedded in a larger clause, which is the true relative clause. Note that the true relative clause does not have a complementizer. Then it must be that relative clauses

[_{CP} Kobe-ni iku *(te)] John-ga yuuta
 Kobe-to go Comp John-Nom said
 (Saito (1987: 312))

As in the (a) example, Osaka Japanese permits the omission of the complementizer *te* if the clause which it heads is in the complement position. The (b) example, where the complement clause is scrambled to sentence initial position, shows that the omission is possible only when the clause remains in the complement position.

It is also important to note that the paradigm in (17) lends support to Fukui's (1988) account for the obligatory presence of *toyuu* with the clause associated with the noun *uwasa* 'rumor' as shown in (13) repeated here:

- (13) [_{NP} [_{CP} [_{IP} Taroo-ga sore-o te-ni ireta] toyuu/*e] uwasa]
 Taroo-Nom it-Acc obtained Comp rumor
 'the rumor that John obtained it'

Fukui assumes that the clause associated with *uwasa* is not a complement but is appositive, which makes the presence of *toyuu* obligatory. He offers theoretical consideration, but he fails to provide empirical evidence. The contrast in (19) gives his account what it needs.

This effect is independently found in English:

- (19) a. Many people believe [_{CP} (that) Mary is smart]
 b. [_{CP} *(That) Mary is smart] is believed by many people

The contrast also shows that the complementizer *that* is deletable only when the clause it heads is in the complement position. In this connection, recall (10), repeated here:

- (10) a. the claim [_•*(that) [Mary handed the book to John]]
 b. the evidence [*(that) [John stole the book]]

The obligatory presence of the complementizer in these examples suggest that the so-called noun complement clauses in English are in fact appositive clauses, on a par with the clause associated with *uwasa* ‘rumor’ in Japanese, which supports Fukui’s view.

Given these facts, it seems fair to say that the clauses without *toyuu* which is associated with *koto* or *zizitu* are not IPs but CPs, whose heads are allowed to be phonologically null in a certain context, which is contrary to Murasugi and Saito’s assumption.

The discussion so far indicates that both the IP hypothesis and the CP hypothesis are only partially correct, because they assume that all the clauses are necessarily of the same category. The investigation of the distribution of the complementizer *toyuu* leads to the following generalization in Japanese:

- (20) a. Relative clauses are IPs.
 b. Noun complement clauses are CPs.

With this generalization in mind, let us reexamine the behavior of *naze*.

3. *Naze* in Relative Clauses

In the previous section we have seen that relative clauses in Japanese are of the IP category. Given this, the structure of the example would be like the following:

- (1’’b) * Kimi-wa [_{NP} [_{IP} *e*₁ naze sono hon-o katta] hito_i]-o
 you-Top why that book-Acc bought person-Acc

sagasite iru no?

looking-for Q

‘Q you are looking for [the person [that bought that book why]]?’

In this structure, the relative clause which contains *naze* in it is of the IP category.

It is independently pointed out that *why*, the English equivalent of *naze*, requires a CP projection.

- (21) a. Why do you believe [_{CP} John is crazy *t*]?
b. * Why do you believe [_{IP} John to be crazy *t*]
(Lin (1992: 301))

These two questions equally ask the reason for John’s being crazy, but only the (a) question is allowed, where the embedded clause containing the trace of the adjunct of the CP category. The (b) question, which involves an ECM construction, where the embedded clause which the adjunct originates in is IP, is ungrammatical. This contrast shows that the smallest clause containing *why* must be of the CP category. In this section I would like to show that *naze* also requires a CP projection.

3.1 Yooni(to) Clauses

First observe the following example:

- (22) John-wa Bill-ni [sono syoo-o zitai-suru yooni] itta
John-Top Bill-Dat the prize-Acc urn down Comp told
‘John told Bill to turn down the prize.’

Nemoto (1991) examines *yooni* clauses like the one shown above and claims that they are defective CPs headed by *yooni*, lacking the IP node, as in the following:

(23) [CP [VP ...] *yooni*]

Uchibori (1997) presents an alternative analysis, according to which *yooni* is not a complementizer. This comes from the observation that it can be followed by *to*, a clear complementizer:

(24) Kootyoo-ga sensee_i-ni [CP *e*₁ dare-o home-ru
 principal-Nom teacher-Dat who-Acc praise-Nonpast
 yoo(ni(-to))] meezi/motome/susume-ta no?
 Comp order/require/urge-Past Q
 ‘Who did the principal order/require/urge the teachers to praise?’
 (Uchibori (1997: 407))

The claim is further supported by the following example:

(25) Hon-o takusan yomu yoo(ni) (*-to)
 book-Acc many read Modal Comp
 ‘You should many books.’
 (Uchibori (1997: 407))

This is a root sentence, as shown by the obligatory absence of the complementizer *to*. That *yooni* appears in the main clause shows that it is not a subordinate marker. Since it is part of a complex of a verb and inflectional suffixes on a par with a negative suffix and tense suffix and so on, Uchibori takes it to be a modal auxiliary. Let us accept her argument and assume that

yooni clauses are IPs and do not involve the CP projection, whereas *yoonito* clauses do.

Let us get back to the behavior of *naze*. It is observed that *naze* is not allowed in *yooni* clauses:

- (26) * John-wa Bill-ni [_{IP} naze [sono syoo-o zitai-suru yooni]
 John-Top Bill-Dat why the prize-Acc turn down Modal
 itta no?
 told Q
 ‘Q John told Bill [to turn down the prize why]?’
 (Nemoto (1991: 355))

As in the structural notation, we assume that the clause under discussion is of the IP category, lacking the CP projection. That is to say, *naze* is disallowed if the smallest clause containing it does not project to CP.

Note that *yooni* can be accompanied by the complementizer *to*, acquiring the CP status. It is extremely interesting to note that *naze* is allowed in such an environment:

- (27) John-wa Bill-ni [_{CP} [_{IP} naze [sono syoo-o zitai-suru
 John-Top Bill-Dat why the prize-Acc turn down
 yooni] to] itta no?
 Modal Comp told Q
 ‘Q John told Bill [to turn down the prize why]?’

The judgement might be subtle, but this example sounds far better than the previous one without *to*.

3.2 Interrogative Clauses without the Question Marker

That the smallest clause containing *naze* must project to CP is confirmed by the following consideration regarding the presence of the question marker. Observe first the following contrast:

- (28) a. [CP [IP John-wa nani-o kaimasita] (ka)]?
 John-Top what-Acc bought Q
 ‘(Q) John bought what?’
- [CP [IP John-wa naze sore-o kaimasita] *(ka)]?
 John-wa why it-Acc bought Q
 ‘(Q) John bought it why?’

The (a) example shows that the question marker *ka* can be dropped if the questioned element is an argument. As shown in the (b) example, however, the marker drop is impossible or marginal at best, where *naze* is asked. This contrast is well expected under (37), if we assume, as seems reasonable, that *ka* is a complementizer and that in a root sentence, the absence of a complementizer implies the absence of the CP projection. (As cited in Cho (1998), this effect is independently observed in Yoshida and Yoshida (1997). Their work, however, has not been available to me.) Interestingly this contrast does not show up when *naze* is contained in an embedded clause:

- (29) a. Kimi-wa [CP John-ga nani-o katta to] omoimasu (ka)
 you-Top John-Nom what-Acc bought Comp think Q
 Kimi-wa [CP John-ga naze sore-o katta to] omoimasu (ka)
 you-Top John-Nom why it-Acc bought Comp think Q

There is no contrast here. Thus what we have seen in this subsection also supports the claim that the smallest clause containing *naze* must be CP.

3.3 *Naze in Relative Clauses*

Given what we have seen in the previous subsections, it is quite clear why *naze* in a relative clause leads to deviance. Since relative clauses in Japanese are IPs, they cannot contain *why*, which requires CP. Thus, both LF movement and the ECP are totally irrelevant in this case.

4. *Naze in Noun Complement Clauses*

In the previous section we have seen that *naze* in relative clauses can be excluded without recourse to LF movement or the ECP. In this section we deal with *naze* in noun complement clauses. In particular, we scrutinize (2b), repeated here:

- (2b) * Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} John-ga naze sore-o nusunda] koto]-o
 Mary-Top John-Nom why that-Acc stole fact-Acc
 mondai-ni siteiru no?
 problem-to make Q
 ‘Q Mary is making an issue out of [the fact [John stole it why]]?’

Questions like this have been judged to be seriously degraded. I also find them to be deviant, but, to be exact, they sound interpretively weird to me.

It is important to note that the head noun is *koto* ‘fact’. This means that the complement clause is factive. The notion of factivity might help find a clue here. Comorovski (1996) discusses an interpretive peculiarity displayed by factive clauses. Consider the following contrast, which she attributes to

Barbara Partee:

- (30) a. Who does(n't) Sue know that John is married to?
b. Who does Sue believe that John is married to?
(Comorovski (1996: 174))

Partee observes that the (a) question, which involves *know*, a factive verb, is odd, which comes from the implication that John is married to more than one person. In other words, the question presupposes that Sue knows that John is married to some woman, say, Mary, but does not know that he is married to some other woman, say, Jane, which is anomalous in the context of monogamy. In contrast, the (b) question, where the matrix verb is *believe*, a non-factive verb, does not sound awkward, because it only implicates that there is more than one individual such that possibly Sue believes that John is married to that person. That is to say, the presupposition here is that Sue believes that John is married to Mary, but does not believe that he is married to Jane, which is not at all contradictory. Comorovski (1996) claims that questioning out of a factive clause yields acceptable results if and only if both speaker and hearer know that there is more than one individual who satisfies the open sentence denoted by the clause. This presuppositional condition may well be the key to the deviance detected in (2b).

She also gives a similar contrast, which is cited from Baker (1967):

- (31) a. Who does John most regret having as a first cousin?
b. * Who does Edmund regret having as a natural father?
(Comorovski (1996: 175))

In this set the matrix verb is *regret*, a typical factive verb. Here the same effect is observed. The (a) question here presupposes that John has more than

one cousin, and it is a fine question, while the (b) question presupposes that Edmund has more than one natural father, which leads to contradiction. Given these sets of facts, let us assume this presuppositional condition on asking out of a factive clause.

Notice that this condition is motivated in Japanese as well. Consider the following:

- (32) * Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} dare-ga John-no umi-no haha
 you-Top who-Nom John-Gen natural mother
 dearu] koto]-o sitteimasu ka?
 be fact-Acc know Q
 ‘Q Mary knows the fact that who is John's natural mother?’

This question sounds contradictory exactly like the corresponding English question in that it presupposes that there is more than one natural mother for John. This shows that the condition works in Japanese as well.

In (2b), the required presupposition would be that there are various facts, each of which is that John stole it for some reason, that is, the situation where John stole it several times, and each time he stole it, he did it for different reasons. It is quite hard, however, to imagine such a situation. In fact, to describe such a situation would lead to anomaly, as illustrated in the following:

- (33) % Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} John-ga e_1 yoi mono da kara]
 Mary-Top John-Nom good item be because
 sore₁-o nusunda] koto]-o mondai-ni siteimasu.
 it-Acc stole fact problem-to make
 Sikasi, kanozyo-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} kare-ga [e_1 takakatta
 but she-Top he-Nom expensive-was
 kara] sore₁-o nusunda] koto]-wa mondai-ni

because it-Acc stole fact-Top problem-to
siteimasen.

make-Neg

‘Mary is making an issue out of the fact that John stole it because it was a good item, but she is not making an issue out of the fact that he stole it because it was expensive.’

This example sounds contradictory, indicating that the presupposition required for (2b) cannot be obtained. In other words, asking the question in (2b) implies the contradictory presupposition, which is what makes the question degraded. Thus, what is wrong with (2b) is that the required presuppositional condition cannot be met, which is shown by the anomaly found in (33).

Let us return to (2a), which is a fine example, and see what kind of presupposition it has, which is provided below:

(2a) Mary-wa [NP [CP John-ga nani-o nusunda] koto]-o
Mary-Top John-Nom what-Acc stole fact-Acc
mondai-ni siteiru no?
problem-to make Q

‘Q Mary is making an issue out of [the fact [John stole what]]?’

(34) Mary-wa [NP [CP John-ga hon-o nusunda] koto]-o
Mary-Top John-Nom bookt-Acc stole fact-Acc
mondai-ni siteimasu.

Shikashi, kanojo-wa [NP [CP kare_i-ga empitsu-o
but she-Top he-Nom pencil-Acc
nusunda] koto]-wa mondai-ni siteimasen.
stole fact-Top problem-to make-Neg

‘Mary is making an issue out of the fact that John stole a book, but she is not making an issue out of the fact that he stole a

pencil.’

(Lasnik and Saito (1992: 22))

The presupposition in (34) does not sound contradictory at all, so it is natural that the question in (2a) is not anomalous.

The anomaly in (33) tells us another thing. It shows that asking the reason for John’s stealing it leads to interpretative deviance, no matter how it is asked. In Japanese, employing *naze* is not the only way of asking reasons. There are, for example, *nan-no tame-ni* ‘for what’, and *dooyuu riyuu-de* ‘with what (kind of) reason’ as alternatives for *naze*. It is expected that the deviance remains in (2b) when *naze* is replaced by either of these phrases. Let us see if this is so:

- (35) * Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} John-ga nan-no tame-ni/dooyuu riyuu-de
Mary-Top John-Nom for what/with what (kind of) reason
sore-o nusunda] koto]-o mondai-ni siteiru no?
that-Acc stole fact-Acc problem-to make Q
‘Q Mary is making an issue out of [the fact [John stole for
what/for what (kind of) reason]]?’

As is expected, the replacement does not save the example. The effect seems to be observed more clearly in the following example:

- (36) * Mary-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} John-ga nan-no tame-ni/dooyuu riyuu-de
Mary-Top John-Nom for what/with what (kind of) reason
sore-o nusunda] koto]-o shitteiru no?
that-Acc stole fact-Acc know Q
‘Q Mary knows [the fact [John stole it for what/for what (kind
of) reason]]?’

Note that these WH-phrases, unlike *naze*, are allowed to be inside a relative clause:

- (37) Kimi-wa [_{NP} [_{IP} *e*₁ nan-no tame-ni/dooyuu riyuu-de
 you-Top for what/with what (kind of) reason
 sono hon-o katta] hito_i-o sagasite iru no?
 that book-Acc bought person-Acc looking-for Q

This shows that *nan-no tame-ni* and *dooyuu riyuu-de* are not subject to the structural condition which *naze* is subject to. As in (35), however, they display the same effect that *naze* does, which means that the degraded status in (35) comes from the non-syntactic consideration. Thus the example in (35) lends support to the proposed account for the deviance in (2b), which draws on the presuppositional condition on questioning out of a factive clause suggested in Comorovski (1996).

5. *Naze* in Complex Nouns

We have seen that *naze* in relative clauses and in noun complement clauses can be excluded without resorting to LF movement and the ECP. The former case is ruled out because relative clauses lack the CP projection, the presence of which is crucial to the occurrence of *naze*. The latter case yields deviance because *naze* is contained in a factive clause.

Now the question arises as to the cases where *naze* is found in contexts which do not involve the above mentioned properties. The approach based on LF movement and the ECP would predict such cases to be degraded because *naze* would move at LF to scope taking position, crossing the NP node, with the trace left behind failing to satisfy the ECP. In this section we examine such cases and consider their theoretical implications.

5.1 Naze in Relative Clauses

We have seen that *naze* in a relative clause leads to deviance due to its categorial status. Let us consider what happens if the adjunct is embedded in CP which is in turn inside a relative clause:

- (38) a. [NP [CP [IP Sono syusyoo-ga naze sikyo-si-ta to]
the prime minister-Nom why pass away-do-Past Comp
omotteiru] isi]-ga itiban ooi desu ka?
think doctor-Nom most many be Q
‘Q [Doctors [who think [that the prime minister passed away why]]
are the largest in number?’
Sono gakkai-wa [NP [CP [IP kyooryuu-ga naze zetumetu sita
the society-Top dinosaurs why extinction did
to] syutyoo sita] gakusya]-o jomee simasita ka?
Comp claim did scholar]-Acc expel did Q
‘Q the scientific society expelled [the scholar [that claimed [that
dinosaurs became extinct why]]]?’

These examples are bit complicated, but they sound much better than (1b’), which is repeated here:

- (1b’’) * Kimi-wa [NP [CP e_1 naze sono hon-o katta] hito₁]-o
you-Top why that book-Acc bought person-Acc
sagaside iru no?
looking-for Q
‘Q you are looking for [the person [that bought that book why]]?’

The fine status of the examples in (38) is surprising under the approach based on LF movement and the ECP.

5.2 *Naze in Noun Complement Clauses*

We have seen that *naze* is disallowed in the clausal complement of the noun *koto* ‘fact’ due to factivity. Let us see cases where the noun complement clauses are not factive:

- (39) a. Nihon-no keeki1-wa kare-no iken niyoruto
 Japan-Gen business-Top he-Gen opinion according to
 [_{NP} [_{CP} *e*₁ naze waruku natta (toyuu)] kanoosee]-ga
 why bad became Comp possibility-Nom
 itiban takai desu ka?
 first high be Q
 ‘Q As for the business in Japan, according to his opinion, [the possibility [that it became dull why]] is the highest?’
- b. Sono supootukisya-wa [_{NP} [_{CP} sono tiimu-ga naze
 the sportswriter-Top the team-Nom why
 yuusyoo-si-ta toyuu] setu]-o yuuryokusi-simasita ka?
 win-do-Past Comp opiniono-Acc find convincing-did Q
 ‘Q the sportswriter found [the opinion [that the team won the championship why]] convincing?’

Each of these examples, which are fine, involves a noun whose complement clause is not factive. Here again the approach based on LF movement and the ECP would wrongly predict these examples to be severely degraded.

5.3 Theoretical Implications

In this subsection, I would like to consider some of the theoretical implications of what we have seen so far. The cases which have been assumed to be captured by LF movement and the ECP can be ruled out on quite independently motivated grounds, which suggests that such theoretical mechanism is irrelevant. What is more, the new examples presented in this section show that the approach based on covert movement and the ECP makes wrong predictions about some cases involving *naze* inside relative clauses and noun complement clauses.

Naze has been extensively discussed in the literature because of its behavior, which can be taken to support the assumption of LF movement and the ECP. It seems quite clear now, however, that this ECP based approach is undesirable in describing the behavior of *naze*. This is a welcome move because the ECP involves the notion of government, which should be discarded in the minimalist approach due to its conceptually unnatural character. Thus our reexamination of *naze* lends support to minimalism. (See Wu (1999) for an attempt to remove the assumption of LF movement, dealing with Chinese, which is a WH-in-situ language as well as Japanese.)

Our findings raise a question regarding the scope taking strategy available to *naze*. As we have seen, the adjunct can be contained in complex nouns. It must be that *naze* does not resort to LF movement to satisfy its scope properties. The question to ask now is how *naze* has its scope related properties satisfied without being raised.

As for *naze* in the matrix clause, we may assume, following Lin (1992), that the adjunct originates in [Spec, CP] and stays there. In this case there is no movement involved. Let us turn to *naze* in the embedded context. Recall Tsai's (1994) claim, according to which argument in-situ WH-phrases can take scope

with the help of unselective binding. Recall also that, in the fine cases with *naze* seen in the previous subsections, the adjunct is inside an argument CP. I would like to suggest that *naze* can satisfy its scopal properties indirectly with the help of the argument CP containing it, which is to be unselectively bound by Comp. This way, *naze* can take scope without recourse to the movement strategy.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined the behavior of *naze* and shown that the cases which have been excluded as violating the ECP can be ruled out on independent grounds. I also presented cases which question the traditional approach to the distribution of the adjunct, the covert movement approach, and suggested that it can have its scopal properties satisfied indirectly by resorting to the argument CP containing it, to which the unselective binding is available.

* I would like to express my gratitude to Warren Elliott, who suggested stylistic improvements. Any remaining inadequacies, however, are my own.

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. Lee (1967) "A Class of Semantically Deviant Questions," ms.
Cho, Eun "Why, Contrastive Topic, and LF movement," *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 8, 403-415.
Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Chomsky, Noam (1998) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," Ms., MIT.
Comorovski, Ileana (1996) *Interrogative Phrases and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, Kluwer, Dordrecht/Boston/London.

- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990) *Types of A'-Dependencies*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Fukui, Naoki (1988) "LF Extraction of Naze: Some Theoretical Implications," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 503-526.
- Huang, C.-T. James (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1984) "On the Nature of Proper Government," *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 235-289.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1992) *Move α : Conditions on Its Application and Output*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Lin, Jo-Wang (1992) "The Syntax of *Zenmeyang* 'how' and *Weishenme* 'why' in Mandarin Chinese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 293-331.
- Murasugi, Keiko (1991) *Noun Phrases in Japanese and English: a Study in Syntax, Learnability, and Acquisition*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.
- Murasugi, Keiko (1993) "The Generalized Transformation Analysis of Relative Clauses," *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 15, 113-123.
- Murasugi, Keiko (2000a) "Japanese Complex Noun Phrases and the Antisymmetry Theory," *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Martin, Roger, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 211-234, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Murasugi, Keiko (2000b) "An Antisymmetry Analysis of Japanese Relative Clauses," *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, ed. by Alexiadou, Artemis, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger, and Chris Wilder, 231-263, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Nemoto, Noriko (1991) "Scrambling and Conditions on A-Movement," *WCCFL* 10, 349-358.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (1990) *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Saito, Mamoru (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Saito, Mamoru (1987) "Three Notes on Syntactic Movement in Japanese," *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Imai, Takashi and Mamoru Saito, 301-350, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Sakai, Hiromu (1994) "Complex NP Constraint and Case-Conversion in Japanese," *Current Topics in English and Japanese*, ed. by Masaru Nakamura, 179-203, Hituzi Syoboo, Tokyo, Japan.
- Teramura, Hideo (1980) "Meisi Syuusyokubu No Hikaku," in T. Kunihiro ed. *Niti-Eigo Hikaku Koza*, vol. 2, 221-266, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan (1994) *On Economizing the Theory of A-Bar Dependencies*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Uchibori, Asako (1997) "Opacity and Subjunctive Complements in Japanese,"

Japanese/Korean Linguistics 6, 399-414.

Yoshida, Keiko and Yoshida Tomoyuki (1997) "Question Marker Drop in Japanese,"
ICU Language Research Bulletin.

Wu, Jianxin (1999) *Syntax and Semantics of Quantification in Chinese*, University of
Maryland, College Park.