On the "What as Why" Phenomenon in Japanese and Turkish

In quite a few languages, the *wh*-phrase corresponding to English 'what' can be used to ask for a reason, in addition to a canonical reason *wh*-phrase corresponding to English 'why': Japanese and Turkish are, among other languages, mainly considered in this paper. It has been reported that reason WHAT-words have more restrictions than WHY-words (e.g., Kurafuji 1996). Thus, the goal of this paper is, arguing (1a-b), to provide a unified analysis for the reason WHAT-words in the two languages. Also, it is shown that (1c) is obtained as a consequence of our analysis.

- (1) a. The reason WHAT-words have ordering restriction that is related to their Foc(us)-F(eature).
 - b. The reason WHAT-words should be treated as non-D-linked wh-phrases.
 - c. The reason WHAT-words are base-generated lower than the NegP; the WHY-words are higher than the NegP.

The relevant examples are in (2). There, Japanese *nani-o* 'what-Acc' and Turkish *ne* 'what' function as a reason *wh*-phrase, just like the canonical reason *wh*-phrase in these language *naze* 'why' and *neden* 'why', respectively.

(2) a. <u>Japanese</u> karera-wa nani-o/naze sawaide-i-ru no. b. <u>Turkish</u> Ne/Neden ağlıyorsun? they-Top what-Acc/why are making noise Q what/why you are crying 'Why are they making a noise?'

However, there exist crucial differences between the WHAT-words and the WHY-words in both these languages.

Firstly, unlike WHY-words in these languages, WHAT-words indicate a high degree of emotion, such as surprise, annoyance, or anger (e.g., Ochi 2004). Therefore, in (2), WHAT-questions are best uttered in a situation where the speaker is annoyed or upset.

Secondly, it has been pointed out that Japanese *nani-o* must linearly precede the objet in a transitive sentence as in (3) (e.g., Konno 2004). In this paper, I further report that Turkish reason WHAT-word *ne* also has an order restriction; and *ne* must appear right before the verb as in (4). On the other hand, WHY-words in these languages are not subject to the order restriction. To account for these properties of the reason WHAT-words in Japanese and Turkish, I propose (5).

- (3) a. **naze/nani-o** <u>henna uta bakari</u> utatte-i-ru no. b. <u>henna uta bakari</u> **naze/*nani-o** utatte-i-ru no. why/what-Acc funny song only are singing Q funny song only why/what-Acc are singing Q 'Why are you singing only funny songs?'
- (4) a. Kapıyı **neden/ne** <u>çalıyorsun</u>? b. **Neden/*Ne** kapıyı <u>çalıyorsun</u>? the door why/what you are knocking 'Why are you knocking on the door?'
- (5) The WHAT-words in Japanese and Turkish obligatorily bear a [Foc]-F when they are used as reason *wh*-phrases. Recall that the reason WHAT-words generally imply speaker's emotion such as anger or surprise. Thus, we assume the [Foc]-F in (5) to be a realization of this additional information, which is relevant to expressive contents in the sense of Potts (2003). Let us first consider Turkish *ne*, keeping in mind that languages use different means to encode focus including word order or morphology. Turkish has a specific focus position: the position immediately preceding the verb (Erguvanli 1979). Given (5), it then naturally follows that Turkish reason WHAT-word *ne* always appears in the focus position as in (4). At this point, it is important to note that the WHY-word *neden* can also appear in that position as in (4a), because *wh*-phrases typically signal information that is unknown and thus it is natural for them to occur in the focus position. However, the significant difference between *neden* and *ne* is that other elements can appear in the focus position in a *neden* sentence as in (4b) because *neden* does not always have to bear the obligatory [Foc]-F. Accordingly, given that the [Foc]-F of *ne* is always realized by the particular focus position in Turkish, the strict order restriction of *ne* in (4) naturally follows.

As for Japanese *nani-o*, following Iida (2011), I assume here that a *nani-o* question always contains another phrase that bears a [Foc]-F, in addition to *nani-o*. This is because a *nani-o* question becomes more acceptable when it contains an intensifier like *sonnani* 'such a', or when the object has a focus particle like *bakari* 'only' as in (3). Eventually, a *nani-o* sentence contains two phrases with a [Foc]-Fs: in (3a), *nani-o* and the object *henna uta bakari*. However, this configuration faces the intervention effect (IE), as depicted in (3a)'s base structure (6). There, the [Foc]-F of the object cannot establish the legitimate Agree relation with the Foc, due to the closer [Foc]-F. (Here, we assume that *nani-o* is base-generated in the VP-adjoined position (Ochi 1999) and that *nani-o* is accompanied by an empty *wh* Op(erator), which moves up to the CP (Watanabe 1992).)

(6) $[_{CP} |_{FocP} |_{Foc}]$ $[_{VP} |_{DP} |_{OP} |_{O$

To avoid this undesirable configuration (6), I adopt Iida's (2011) derivations, in which *nani-o* is left-adjoined to the raised object with a [Foc]-F. This *nani-o*'s adjunction operation creates a focus cluster, and the Foc checks two [Foc]-Fs simultaneously as a whole cluster (e.g., Sabel and Wolfgang 2001). The derivations are illustrated in (7), and notice that the focus cluster has the desirable word order: *nani-o* precedes the object.

(7) a. $[CP | FocP | Foc | Pop_1 | Pop_1 | Pop_1 | Pop_1 | Pop_2 | Po$

A third similarity between *nani-o* and *ne* is that these reason WHAT-words cannot be used with the negation, unlike the WHY-word *naze* and *neden*. As Kurafuji (1996) points out with (8), Japanese *nani-o* induces ungrammaticality when the negation appears. In this paper, I report that, with the negation, Turkish *ne* only allows a rhetorical question reading, which, for example, suggests the hearer should beat the donkey in (9).

- (8) a. * karera-wa nani-o sawaide-i-**nai** no. b. karera-wa naze sawaide-i-**nai** no. they-Top what-Acc are clamoring-**Neg** Q 'Why aren't they clamoring?' b. karera-wa naze sawaide-i-**nai** no. they-Top why are clamoring-**Neg** Q 'Why aren't they clamoring?' (Kurafuji 1996: 87)
- (9) **Ne** dövmüyorsun eşeğ-i?
 what you are not beating donkey-Acc
 * 'Why aren't you beating the donkey?' [car
 - 'Why aren't you beating the donkey?' [canonical question]
 'Why don't you beat the donkey?' [rhetorical question]

As Kurafuji claims, the grammatical difference in (8) can be accounted for via the Inner Island Effect, with the assumption that *naze* is base-generated higher than the NegP, while *nani-o* is lower than the NegP. Our analysis, in fact, can correctly rule out (8a) because, as shown in (7), we assume *nani-o* to be base-generated in the VP-adjoining position and thus the Op-movement of *nani-o* eventually induces the Inner Island Effect, jumping over the NegP located under the TP. As for *naze*, we assume that it first appears in the [Spec, CP] (e.g., Ko 2005). It is worth noting here that this type of reasoning cannot be held by Nakao's (2009: 244) structure in (10), where *nani-o* is base-generated in the F(unctional)P(rojection) in the CP area. Unlike our analysis, much more needs to be said to explain the fact in (8) to maintain this structure.

(10) [CP [FP nani-o [IP kare-wa [VP sawai] dei-ru] F] no] what-Acc he-Top make noise Prog-Pres Q

Returning to Turkish examples in (9), the forced rhetorical reading of a *ne* sentence reminds us of the asymmetry between D(iscourse)-linked and non-D-linked *wh*-phrases, since only the latter are forced to have a rhetorical reading once the negation appears. To see this point, consider Endo's (2007: 32) English examples below.

- (11) a. Which professor didn't you invite for the party?
 - b. ?? Who {the hell/in the world} didn't you invite for the party?

Although the D-linked *wh*-phrase *which professor* can jump over the negation to obtain a canonical *wh*-question reading in (11a), the aggressively non-D-linked *wh*-phrase *who the hell/in the world* cannot go over the negation in (11b). Thus, (11b) only gets rhetorical reading: i.e., only possible meaning is, for example, *You invited everybody!* (Endo 2007). Then, a natural conclusion here is that Turkish reason WHAT-word *ne* in (9) shows a property of non-D-linked *wh*-phrases. Furthermore, this conclusion amounts to saying that Turkish reason WHAT-word *ne* is base-generated in the lower position than the NegP, whereas the WHY-word *neden* is higher than the NegP. Therefore, we consequently obtained a similar hierarchical difference between the reason WHAT-words and the WHY-words in both Turkish and Japanese. This is desirable consequence to provide a unified analysis for reason *wh*-phrases in the two languages.

In fact, our unified analysis of reason *wh*-phrases can be supported further since Japanese *nani-o* shows non-D-linked properties just like Turkish *ne*. Nakao (2009) provides several similarities between a *nani-o* sentence and the English sentence that involves aggressively non-D-linked phrases such as *wh-the-hell*. For instance, as her examples below indicate, (i) neither of the sentences can be embedded in a veridical predicate as in (12); and (ii) in a multiple *wh*-question, no pair-list reading can be obtained as in (13).

- (12) a. watasi-wa [kare-ga ^{??}n ani-o/naze sawagu ka] wakaru. b. *I know who the hell would buy that book. I-Top he-Nom what-Acc/why make noise Q know 'I know why he makes a noise.'
- (13) a. dare-ga nani-o naite-i-ru no. [Single Pair/*Pair List] b. ? Who the hell is in love with who? who-Nom what-Acc is crying Q [Single Pair/*Pair List] 'Who is crying why?'

Therefore, it can be concluded that *ne* and *nani-o* are similar in that they both have non-D-linked properties.

In sum, I report that the Turkish reason *wh*-phrase *ne* necessarily appears in the immediately preverbal position, which is the focus position in this language. Then, I propose that the Japanese *nani-o* and Turkish *ne* obligatorily bear the [Foc]-F, which correlates to additional information: i.e., speaker's emotion. It is this [Foc]-F that makes (i) *ne* sit in the focus position and (ii) *nani-o* precede the object to avoid IE. Also I argue that both *ne* and *nani-o* have properties of non-D-linked phrases, since the former allows only a rhetorical reading if the negation appears, and the latter shows various similarities to the aggressively non-D-linked phrases in English. Furthermore, as a consequence, this paper argues that both Japanese and Turkish have a similar hierarchical difference between the reason WHAT-words and the WHY-words: the former is base-generated lower than the NegP; the latter higher than the NegP.

<u>Selected References:</u> **Iida, Y.** 2011. On the Adjunction-based Licensing of the Accusative *Wh*-adjunct *Nani-o. Proceedings of 12th TCP*: 93-112. **Kurafuji, T.** (1996) Unambiguous Checking. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 29: 81-95. **Nakao, C.** (2009) On Accusative *Wh*-adjuncts in Japanese. *Proceedings of WAFL* 5: 241-255.