

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 they-Top why are clamoring-Neg Q
 ‘Why aren’t they clamoring?’ ‘Why aren’t they clamoring?’ (Kurafuji 1996: 87)
- (9) Ne dövüyorsun eşeğ-i?
 what you are not beating donkey-Acc
 * ‘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 ^{??}nani-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.

Selected References: 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.