



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Adjunct Wh-in-situ and the Nominal Island

Item Type	article;article
Authors	Ochi, Masao
Download date	2024-08-15 05:16:50
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/37006

Adjunct Wh-in-situ and the Nominal Island*

Masao Ochi

University of Connecticut

0. Introduction

The island effects observed with adjunct wh-in-situ in languages such as Chinese and Japanese have been attributed to the Empty Category Principle (ECP). This paper reexamines the distribution of adjunct wh-in-situ from a slightly different perspective. Along this line, the ECP is argued to be inadequate in accounting for the distribution of adjunct wh-in-situ, which is a welcome move for the Minimalist Program, which attempts to dispense with the ECP altogether.

1. Adjunct Wh-in-situ

Since the seminal work of Huang (1982), it has been well-established that wh-in-situ in languages such as Chinese and Japanese is not island-free. In particular, Huang points out an important generalization: Argument wh-in-situ is immune from island effects while adjunct wh is not. (1) and (2) illustrate this point with wh-island (a), the complex NP island (b), the subject island (c), and the adjunct island (d).¹

- (1) a. ?John-wa [Mary-ga nani-o katta kadooka] siritai no
John-Top Mary-Nom what-Acc bought whether want-to-know Q
'?*What does John want to know [whether Mary bought t]'
- b. John-wa [[Mary-ga nani-o katta toiuu] uwasa]-o kiita no
John-Top Mary-Nom what-Acc bought Comp rumor-Acc heard Q
'?*What did John hear [the rumor that Mary bought t]'
- c. [Mary-ga nani-o katta koto]-ga minna-o odorokaseta no
Mary-Nom what-Acc bought fact-Nom everyone-Acc surprised Q
'?*What did [the fact that Mary bought t] surprise everyone'

* For helpful comments and suggestions, I thank Željko Bošković, Howard Lasnik, and Rosanne Pelletier.

¹ Argument wh-in-situ in Japanese is known to show a weak wh-island effect (see Nishigauchi 1986). I will abstract away from this fact due to space limitation.

- d. John-wa [Mary-ga nani-o katta toki] okotta no
John-Top Mary-Nom what-Acc bought when get-upset Q
'?*What did John get upset [when Mary bought t]'
- (2) a. *John-wa [Mary-ga naze yasunda kadooka] siritai no
John-Top Mary-Nom why be-absent whether want-to-know Q
'*Why does John want to know [whether Mary was absent t]'
- b. *John-wa [[Mary-ga naze yasunda toiuu] uwasa]-o kiita no
John-Top Mary-Nom why be absent Comp rumor-Acc heard Q
'*Why did John hear [the rumor that Mary was absent t]'
- c. *[John-ga naze yasunda koto]-ga minna-o odorokaseta no
John-Nom why be absent fact-Nom everyone-Acc surprised Q
'*Why did [the fact that John was absent t] surprise everyone'
- d. *John-wa [Mary-ga naze yasunda toki] okotta no
John-Top Mary-Nom why be-absent when get-upset Q
'*Why did John get upset [when Mary was absent t]'

Regarding the absence of island effects in (1), authors such as Tsai (1994) and Reinhart (1995) propose that the argument (or nominal) *wh*-in-situ can be licensed in-situ via unselective binding, an option which is not available for adjunct (or non-nominal) *wh*-phrases.² For instance, Reinhart (1995) sets up the semantics of unselective binding in such a way that only the function variables (in the D-position) which bind N-variables (in N) can be unselectively bound (via choice function), which is not available for *wh*-adverbs. Adjunct (or non-nominal) *wh*-in-situ must then move in covert syntax to the specifier of interrogative CP in order to be licensed, and when the movement crosses an island, it violates some constraint on movement, which has been attributed to the Empty Category Principle (ECP), a principle which has no natural status within the Minimalist Program.

2. Adjunct *wh*-in-situ and the nominal island

2.1. Generalization

There is a simple generalization about islands in Japanese, which has not been discussed in the literature. All the islands in (1) and (2) are headed by nouns, meaning that they all constitute complex NPs. I will demonstrate this point below for subject island, *wh*-island, and the adjunct island (ignoring the complex NP island for an obvious reason).

First, sentential subject in Japanese is always realized as IP + *koto* 'fact.'

- (3) a. [_{NP} [John-ga yasunda] koto]-ga Hanako-o odorokaseta
John-Nom be absent fact-Nom Hanako-Acc surprised
'[The fact that John was absent] surprised Hanako'
- b. * [_{CP} John-ga yasunda to]-ga Hanako-o odorokaseta
John-Nom be absent that-Nom Hanako-Acc surprised

Turning to the *wh*-island, Fukui (1995) claims that the Q-morpheme *ka* and *kadooka* 'whether' in Japanese, which are standardly analyzed as Cs, are of the category N. For instance, factive predicates in Japanese select only nominal complements, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (4b).

² Tsai (1994) and Reinhart (1995) argue that the relevant distinction is a nominal vs. non-nominal distinction. See Ochi (1999; chapter 4) for the empirical argument that the relevant distinction should be characterized as an argument vs. adjunct distinction, much in line with Huang's (1982) original position.

- (4) a. John-ga Mary-o oboeteiru
John-Nom Mary-Acc remember
'John remembers Mary'
b. *John-ga [[Mary-ga kuruma-o katta] to] oboeteiru³
John-Nom Mary-Nom car-Acc bought Comp remember
'John remembers that Mary bought a car'
c. John-ga [[Mary-ga kuruma-o katta] koto]-o oboeteiru
John-Nom Mary-Nom car-Acc bought fact-Acc remember
'John remembers the fact that Mary bought a car'

Now, the fact that *oboeteiru* 'remember' takes the interrogative complement headed by *ka* 'Q' and *kadooka* 'whether' indicates that these elements are nouns.

- (5) John-wa [Mary-ga kuruma-o katta ka/kadooka](-o) oboeteiru
John-Top Mary-Nom car-Acc bought Q-Acc remember
'John remembers whether Mary bought a car'

The nominal nature of the Q-morpheme *ka* and *kadooka* 'whether' is also corroborated by the fact that the embedded clause in (5) is optionally accompanied by a Case particle such as *o* 'Acc.' I thus assume, following Fukui (1995), that the Q-morpheme *ka* and *kadooka* 'whether' bear some nominal properties.⁴ This generalization indicates that the wh-island in Japanese is constituted by a complex NP island.

³ Fukui (1995) argues that *to*, which is normally analyzed as a declarative complementizer, is a postposition. I will not be concerned with the categorical status of *to*.

⁴ Murasugi (1991) provides a potential argument against Fukui's (1995) view, which is based on *ga/no* conversion (see Miyagawa 1993). It is known that in Japanese, the subject of a prenominal clause can optionally be marked with the genitive marker *-no* (see (i) vs. (ii)).

- (i) John-ga/*no kita
John-Nom/Gen came
'John came'
(ii) John-ga/no kita riyuu
John-Nom/Gen came reason
'the reason that John came'

Murasugi (1991) provides data such as (ii) and argues that *ga/no* conversion does not occur in the embedded interrogative clause, which would be unexpected if *ka* 'Q' is a nominal element.

- (iii) Mary-wa [John-ga/*no nani-o katta ka]-o sitteiru
Mary-Top John-Nom/*Gen what-Acc bought Q-Acc know
'Mary knows what John bought'

Although I agree with Murasugi (1991) and find (iii) to be degraded, it should be noted that there are also examples which allow *ga/no* conversion in the same configuration.

- (iv) a. ?Mary-wa [dare-no kuru no-ka]-o sir-i-tagatteiru
Mary-Top who-Gen come Q-Q-Acc want-to-know
'Mary wants to know who is coming'
b. Mary-wa [John-no kuru no-kadooka]-o sir-i-tagatteiru
Mary-Top John-Gen come Q-whether-Acc want-to-know
'Mary wants to know whether John is coming'

(iv) are different from (iii) in at least two respects. First, (iii) has a direct object between the genitive subject and the predicate *katta* 'bought.' As originally pointed out by Harada (1971), such examples tend to be judged to be awkward (see Watanabe 1996 for discussion). Second, the examples in (iv) have the particle *no*, which is a Q-particle (it is used in matrix questions, as in (v)).

Finally, I note that many adjunct clauses are headed by nouns, including the temporal adjunct clause (headed by *toki* 'when') in (1d) and (2d). One piece of evidence for this claim is provided below. A case-particle in Japanese attaches only to an NP. For instance, it cannot be attached to a clause in Japanese (see 6a).

- (6) a. John-wa [Mary-ga kita to](*-o) itta
 John-Top Mary-Nom came Comp-Acc said
 'John said that Mary came'
 b. John-wa jyooku-o itta
 John-Top joke-Acc said
 'John said a joke'

Now, as shown in (7), *ato/toki* 'after/when' can appear followed by a case-particle *o* 'Acc' (these elements also take genitive modifiers *sensoo-no* 'war-Gen').

- (7) John-wa [sensoo-no ato/toki]-o oboeteiru
 John-Top war-Gen after/when-Acc remember
 'John remembers [the time after/during the war]'

Thus, temporal adjunct clauses in Japanese are also complex NPs headed by nouns such as *ato/toki* 'after/when.' However, not every adjunct clause is headed by a noun in Japanese. For instance, heads of reason clauses such as *node/kara* 'because' are not nouns, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (8) (cf. 7). This fact shows that *node/kara* 'because' are not nouns.

- (8) *John-wa [sensoo-no node/kara]-o oboeteiru
 John-Top war-Gen because-Acc remember
 'John remembers the reason of the war'

Crucially, *naze* 'why' can occur in the adjunct clause headed by *node/kara* 'because.' (9b) is significantly better than (9a).⁵

- (9) a. *Koochi-wa [_{NP} [_{IP} John-ga naze yasunda] ato/toki] okotta no
 coach-Top John-Nom why be-absent after/when angry-be Q
 '*Why did the teacher get upset [after/when John was absent t]'
 b. ?Koochi-wa [_{CP} [_{IP} John-ga naze yasunda] node/kara] okotta no
 coach-Top John-Nom why be-absent because angry-be Q
 '*Why did the teacher get upset [because John was absent t]'

This contrast is not an isolated phenomenon specific to Japanese, as similar contrasts obtain in Chinese and Korean as well. The Chinese data in (10a-b) involve *weisheme* 'why' within a temporal clause and they are simply ungrammatical. In contrast,

-
- (v) Dare-ga kuru no
 who-Nom come Q
 'Who will come'

For some reason, the presence of the Q-particle *no* seems to improve the examples with genitive subject within the interrogative complement clause.

⁵ See also Koizumi (1991) for the claim that *naze* 'why' can sometimes occur in islands (although for him, semantic-pragmatic conditions are the crucial factors in allowing/disallowing *naze* in islands).

(10c) has *weishenme* within the adjunct clause headed by *yinwei* 'because' and it is significantly better.⁶

- (10) a. *John [zai Mary weishenme chidao de shihou] shenqi
 John at Mary why late DE time angry
 'Why did John get angry [when Mary was late t]'
 b. *John [zai Mary weishenme chidao zhi hou] shenqi
 John at Mary why late ZHI after angry
 'Why did John get angry [after Mary was late t]'
 c. ?John [yinwei Mary weishenme chidao] (er) shenqi
 John because Mary why late so angry
 '*Why did John get angry [because Mary was late t]'

It is easy to determine the categorial status of *shihou* 'when,' *hou* 'after,' and *yinwei* 'because,' given the well-known fact that PPs are head-initial while NPs are head-final in Chinese. *Shihou* 'when' and *hou* 'after' are nouns, since they follow their complement clauses. I suggest that *zai* 'at' takes an NP whose head is *shihou* 'time' and *hou* 'after,' as shown in (11a-b) below. On the other hand, *yinwei* 'because' is a preposition, which is why it is head-initial.⁷ The contrast between (10a-b) and (10c) is parallel to the one between (9a) and (9b).

- (11) a. *John [_{PP} zai [_{NP} [Mary weishenme chidao]-de shihou]] shengqi
 John at Mary why late-DE⁸ time angry
 'Why did John get angry [when Mary was late t]'
 b. *John [_{PP} zai [_{NP} [Mary weishenme chidao]-zhi hou]] shengqi
 John at Mary why late-ZHI after angry
 'Why did John get angry [after Mary was late t]'
 c. John [_{PP} yinwei [Mary weishenme chidao]] (er) shengqi
 John because Mary why late so angry
 '*Why did John get angry [because Mary was late t]'

Korean also shows the relevant contrast⁹ (12a) has *way* 'why' in the temporal adjunct clause headed by the noun *tae* 'time' and the example is fairly degraded. In contrast, (12b) has the same adjunct wh-phrase in a non-nominal adjunct clause, and the example is better than (12a).

- (12) a. ?*John-un [Mary-ka way ku job-ul kumantwuessu-l tae] hwa-nass-ni
 John-Top Mary-Nom why that job-Acc quit-rel when/time angry-Q
 'Why was John upset [when Mary quit that job t]'
 b. ?John-un [Mary-ka way ku job-ul kumantwes-e] hwa-nass-ni
 John-Top Mary-Nom why that job-Acc quit-because angry-Q
 'Why was John upset [because Mary quit that job t]'

Based on these sets of data, I conclude the following:

⁶ I am grateful to Tien-Hsin Hsin (p.c.) for the data.

⁷ It may be analyzed as C, but at least the interrogative C is head-final (see Lin 1992).

⁸ *de* and *zhi* are particles which attach to prenominal modifiers in Chinese. This also corroborates the nominal status of *shihou* 'when' and *hou* 'after.'

⁹ I thank Na-Rae Han (p.c.) for the judgment.

- (13) Adjunct *wh-in-situ* cannot occur in the islands headed by a noun but can occur in (a subset of) islands headed by non-nominal elements.¹⁰

Notice that this point is crucial, since the traditional ECP fails to capture the fact that the adjunct *wh-in-situ* can occur in (some) non-nominal adjunct islands.

2.2. DP as a Barrier for Adjunct Extraction

I believe that (13) is in fact part of a wider generalization. It has been noted in the literature (see Huang (1982), Chomsky (1986), and Culicover and Rochemont (1992)) that a noun phrase allows extraction of an argument *wh*-phrase (14) but disallows extraction of an adjunct *wh*-phrase (15b).

- (14) Who do you like [a picture of *t*]

- (15) a. *[Which table] did you like [_{NP} a book [_{PP} on *t*]]
 b. *[_{PP} On which table] did you like [_{NP} a book *t*]

(15a) is a violation of the Adjunct Condition, as it involves extraction out of the PP adjunct within the object NP.¹¹ However, it is not clear how (15b) is ruled out under the current approach.¹² In Chomsky and Lasnik's (1993) terms, for instance, the movement of the PP *on which table* crosses no barrier. More specifically, the movement crosses NP, VP, and IP nodes, but none of them are barriers, since all of them are complements. Thus, the descriptive generalization we obtain is as follows.

- (16) (Simplex) DP is a barrier for movement of an adjunct.

Assuming that adjunct *wh-in-situ* in languages such as Japanese must move to the interrogative C at some point in the derivation, we can conclude that the impossibility of *in-situ* adjunct *wh*-phrases holds for all nominal domains, not merely complex NPs: Whatever explains (16) will account for the contrast in (9), (10), and (12) among others.¹³

¹⁰ It should be noted that adjunct *wh-in-situ* fails to occur in some non-nominal islands. For instance, (i) shows that *naze* 'why' cannot occur in the adjunct clause headed by *nagara* 'while,' which is non-nominal (see Koizumi 1991).

- (i) *John-wa [ame-o naze tabe-nagara] aruita no
 John-Top candy-Acc why eat-while walked Q
 'Why did John walk [while eating a candy *t*]'

¹¹ See Takahashi (1994) for a minimalist analysis of CED effects.

¹² Culicover and Rochemont (1992) argue that this generalization follows from the head-government requirement of the ECP (see also Rizzi 1990), assuming that N (or D) is not a proper governor. In the next section, I will offer an analysis based on this idea.

¹³ There is further empirical support for the claim that the (non)nominal status of the adjunct head is of importance here. The following examples in (i) are synonymous. (1a) contains an adjunct clause whose head (i.e. *node/kara* 'because') is not an N, and (1b) contains a complex NP of the form the N *riyuu* 'reason' + its appositive clause, with the meaning 'for the reason that'. When the *wh*-phrase contained is an argument *dare* 'who,' both examples are fine.

- (i) a. Sensei-wa [dare-ga siken-o ukenakatta node/kara] okotta no
 teacher-Top who-Nom exam-Acc took-not because angry-be Q
 '*Who did the teacher get upset [because *t* didn't take the exam]'
 b. Sensei-wa [_{NP} [dare-ga siken-o ukenakatta toiyuu] riyuu]-de okotta no
 teacher-Top who-Nom exam-Acc took-not Comp reason-with angry-be Q
 '*Who did the teacher get upset [for the reason that *t* didn't take the exam]'

- '*What did John hear [the rumor that Mary bought t]'
- b. *John-wa [(Mary-ga naze yasunda toiuu) uwasa]-o kiita no
 John-Top Mary-Nom why be absent Comp rumor-Acc heard Q
 '*Why did John hear [the rumor that Mary was absent t]'

(20a) is fine as the argument *wh*-in-situ can be licensed by unselective binding.¹⁵ In contrast, (20b) is ungrammatical as *naze* 'why,' being an adjunct, cannot be licensed in-situ. It needs to reach the Q-Comp for licensing. However, lacking the D-feature, *naze* 'why' cannot be attracted to the edge of the (complex) DP, and the example is ungrammatical for this reason. Similarly, (9), repeated below, can be analyzed in a similar way.

- (21) a. *Koochi-wa [_{NP} [_{TP} John-ga naze yasunda] ato/toki] okotta no
 coach-Top John-Nom why be-absent after/when angry-be Q
 '*Why did the teacher get upset [after/when John was absent t]'
- b. ?Koochi-wa [_{CP} [_{TP} John-ga naze yasunda] node/kara] okotta no
 coach-Top John-Nom why be-absent because angry-be Q
 '*Why did the teacher get upset [because John was absent t]'

The crucial difference between (21a) and (21b) is the categorial status of the head of the islands. In particular, (21a) is bad for the same reason as (20b): The adjunct clause is a DP and hence is a phase. Consequently, *naze* 'why' inside it is invisible from outside this phase. (21b), on the other hand, is fine because there is no nominal island (i.e., a DP phase) which separates the interrogative C and *naze* 'why.'

4. Some Related Issues

4.1. Adjunct Extraction and D

In the previous section, I attributed the nominal island effect to the D head of a DP, which constitutes a phase. There is some indication that such an account is on the right track.¹⁶ Nominals in some Slavic languages are argued to be "bare NPs," lacking the DP projection (see Corver 1992 among others). Along this line, Stepanović (1998) suggests that extraction of adjunct from NP is allowed in Serbo-Croatian because nominals in this language lack D.

- (22) a. Petar je pročitao knjige sa ove police
 Peter is read books from this shelf
 'Peter read books from this shelf'
- b. Sa koje police je Petar pročitao knjige
 from which shelf is Peter read books
 '*From which shelf did Peter read [books t]'

These data indicate that DP is a phase while NP is not. Hence, adjunct extraction out of NPs in languages such as Serbo-Croatian is predicted to be allowed.

¹⁵ Alternatively, the D-feature of *nani* 'what' is first attracted by the D head of the complex NP, which is subsequently attracted by the interrogative C. This idea is analogous to the proposal of Hagström (1998).

¹⁶ The idea that D plays a crucial role for barring extraction out of DP is originally due to Culicover and Rochement (1992).

4.2. Inner Island

The proposal made in the last section is based on Takahashi's (1994) insight on inner islands. It is commonly assumed in the literature that the inner island is a weak island, barring only adjunct extraction.

- (23) a. What didn't John fix t
b. *How didn't John fix the car t

However, Takahashi (1994) argues that an argument wh-phrase is not always free from the inner island effect. In particular, when the wh-phrase originates in a clause lower than the clause containing negation, the relevant example is fairly degraded.¹⁷

- (24) ??What didn't John claim that Peter fixed t

Takahashi (1994) analyzes the above paradigm in the following way. Assuming that AGRoP is located higher than negation, the derivation for (23a) proceeds as below:

- (25) What ... John [_{AGRoP} (what) [_{NegP} not [_{VP} fix (what)]]].
 |-----||-----|
 wh-movement A-movement

The argument wh-phrase *what* first moves to the spec of AGRoP for Case-checking purposes, and wh-movement originates at a position higher than negation. This scenario accounts for the grammaticality of (23a). (23b) lacks this option, since *how* does not have Case features. Hence wh-movement originates at a position lower than negation (such as a VP-internal position) and, as a result, is blocked by negation.

Finally, (24) is degraded, since in this case local A-movement does not help: Negation is in the higher clause.

- (26) What ... you [_{NegP} not claim that John [_{AGRoP} (what) [_{VP} fix (what)]]].
 |-----*-----||-----|
 wh-movement A-movement

We can reinterpret this analysis in the following way. Suppose that the interrogative C in English attracts the closest wh-feature for feature-checking purposes. Negation blocks this attraction if it occurs between the C and the highest wh-phrase.¹⁸ Thus, in both Inner Island and Nominal Island cases, argument wh-phrases escape the island effects by first moving to a 'high' position before undergoing wh-movement.

5. Some Remarks on Tsai (1994b)

The discussion above has a resemblance to Tsai's (1994b) insight on the distribution of Chinese adjunct wh-in-situ, where nominality plays a crucial role. Examining the range of verbs whose complements allow *weishenme* 'why,' Tsai (1994b) proposes the following generalization.¹⁹

¹⁷ Here I use *claim* as the matrix predicate so as to exclude the possibility of the neg raising.

¹⁸ See Bošković (in press) for this line of analysis for French wh-questions.

¹⁹ Tsai (1994b) makes a finer distinction between reason and purpose readings of *weishenme* 'why.' I will abstract away from this point. See Lin (1992) for much relevant discussion.

- (27) Verbs taking derived nominals (i.e., propositions which assume the form of NP) block LF extraction of non-referential (non-nominal) wh-phrases from the complement clause.

For instance, verbs such as *renwei* 'think' and *shuo* 'say' allow *weishenme* 'why' within their complement clauses (28a-b) and do not take derived nominals as complement (29a-b). In contrast, verbs such as *tongyi* 'agree' and *jide* 'remember' disallow *weishenme* in the complement clause (28c-d) and take derived nominals as complement (29c-d).

- (28) a. Ni renwei [Lisi weishenme cizhi]
 you think Lisi why resign
 'Why do you think [that Lisi resigned t]'
- b. Ni shuo [Lisi weishenme cizhi]
 you say Lisi why resign
 'Why do you say [that Lisi resigned t]'
- c. *Ni tongyi [Lisi weishenme cizhi]
 you agree Lisi why resign
 'Why do you agree [that Lisi resigned t]'
- d. *Ni jide [Lisi weishenme cizhi]
 you remember Lisi why resign
 'Why does Lisi remember [that he resigned t]'
- (29) a. *Ta renwei [_{NP} Lisi de tuilun]
 he think Lisi DE reasoning
 '*He thinks Lisi's reasoning'
- b. *Ta shuo [_{NP} Lisi de tuilun]
 he say Lisi DE reasoning
 '*He says Lisi's reasoning'
- c. Ta tongyi [_{NP} Lisi de tuilun]
 he agree Lisi DE reasoning
 'He agrees with Lisi's reasoning'
- d. Ta jidi [_{NP} Lisi de tuilun]
 he remember Lisi DE reasoning
 'He remembers Lisi's reasoning'

Based on this correlation, Tsai (1994b) proposes that CPs which are selected by verbs such as *tongyi* 'agree' and *jidi* 'remember' are [+N] (i.e., their Comp is specified as [+N]), whereas those CPs selected by verbs such as *renwei* 'think' and *shuo* 'say' are [-N]. Tsai then proposes the following.

- (30) A Comp with the [+N] property bars LF extraction of non-referential (non-nominal) wh-phrases.²⁰

Extending the analysis, Tsai (1994b) argues that sentential subjects and prenominal clauses such as relative clauses have a [+N] Comp, which is why non-referential (non-nominal) wh-phrases cannot occur inside them.

- (31) a. *[Women weishenme niashu] cai you yiyi (Subject Condition)
 we why study just have meaning
 '*Why does [for us to study t] have the meaning'

²⁰ The basic idea behind (30) is that some feature clash occurs when a non-nominal (i.e., [-N]) wh-phrase (such as *weishenme*) moves through a [+N] Comp.

- b. *Ni bijiao xihuan [[weisherme gongzuo]-de ren] (CNPC)
 you more like why work-DE people
 '*Why do you like better [the people who work t]'

It is not obvious that this analysis extends directly to Japanese, however. For one thing, if Murasugi (1991) is correct, prenominal clauses such as relative clauses are IPs in Japanese, not CPs. Nonetheless, they bar extraction of non-referential (non-nominal) wh-phrases such as *naze* 'why.'

- (32) *Taro-wa [[_{IP} Peter-ga naze kaita] hon]-o yonda no
 Taro-Top Peter-Nom why wrote book-Acc read Q
 '*Why did Taro read [the book [that Peter wrote t]]'

Also, some verbs in Japanese selecting a derived nominal as a complement nonetheless allow *naze* 'why' within such a domain (e.g. *tsugeru* 'inform' etc.).

- (33) a. Nihon seifu-wa [Kurinton-no rainichi]-o tsugeta
 Japanese government-Top Clinton-Gen visit-Japan-Acc informed
 'The Japanese government informed Clinton's visit to Japan'
 b. Seifu-wa [Kurinton-ga naze rainichi-o enki-shita to]
 government-Top Clinton-Nom why visit-Japan-Acc postponed that
 tsugeteiru no
 inform Q
 'Why does the government inform [that Clinton postponed his visit to Japan t]'

While within the present analysis it is specifically the presence of a D head which blocks adjunct extraction, such an approach is in fact akin to that of Tsai (1994b); under both analyses, nominal status plays a role in defining syntactic islands for adjunct wh-in-situ.

6. Conclusion

Based on the fact that most syntactic islands in languages such as Japanese are nominals, I suggest that the island effects observed with adjunct wh-in-situ can be captured by making use of the idea that DP constitutes a phase in the sense of Chomsky (1998). This account has the additional desirable result of correctly ruling in adjunct wh-in-situ in certain non-nominal islands.

References

- Bošković, Željko. in press. Sometimes in SpecCP, sometimes in-situ. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1971. Sentence stress and syntactic transformations. *Language* 47: 257-281.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics, MITWPL.
- Corver, Norbert. 1992. On deriving certain left extraction asymmetries: A case study in parametric syntax. In *NELS* 22, 67-84. GSLA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

- Culicover, Peter and M. Rochement. 1992. Adjunct extraction from NP and the ECP. *Linguistics Inquiry* 23: 496-501.
- Fukui, Naoki. 1995. *Theory of projection in syntax*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Hagstrom, Paul. Decomposing questions. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Harada, S. I.. 1971. Ga-No conversion and ideolectal variations in Japanese. *Gengo kenkyuu* 60: 25-38.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kolzumi, Masatoshi. 1991. Syntax of adjuncts and the phrase structure of Japanese. Master's thesis, The Ohio State University.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 1992. The syntax of *zenmeyang* 'how' and *weishenme* 'why' in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1: 293-331.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1993. Case-checking and Minimal Link Condition," in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, MITWPL.
- Murasugi, Keiko 1991. Noun phrases in Japanese and English: A study in syntax, learnability and acquisition, University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Ochi, Masao. 1999. Constraints on feature checking. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1995. Interface strategies. OTS Working Paper, Utrecht University.
- Rizzi, Luigi. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Stepanović, Sandra. 1998. Extraction of adjuncts out of NPs. Paper presented at Workshop on Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax, June 5-7.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Minimality of movement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan 1994a. On economizing the theory of A-bar dependencies, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan 1994b. On nominal island and LF extraction in Chinese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 121-175.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1996. Nominative-genitive conversion and agreement in Japanese: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5: 373-410.

Department of Linguistics, U-1145
 University of Connecticut
 341 Mansfield Rd.,
 Storrs, CT 06269-1145

mao94001@uconnvm.uconn.edu