

The *Nani-o X-o* Construction*

Hiroaki Konno

1. Introduction

This article deals with a colloquial and idiomatic interrogative expression in Japanese that characteristically contains two accusative-marked phrases in a single clause. It is illustrated by sentences like the following:¹

- (1) Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?²
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q
 ‘Why do you talk rubbish?’

We will call expressions of this kind the *nani-o X-o* construction.

The aim of the present paper is to offer a detailed analysis of the *nani-o X-o* construction from both syntactic and semantic perspectives. Section 2 describes the syntax of the *nani-o X-o* construction and shows that it is a partially fixed construction in conflict with a certain morphosyntactic constraint in Japanese. Section 3 examines the semantics/pragmatics of the *nani-o X-o* construction and points out that it counts as a speech act construction and functions roughly as an accusation by the speaker. Section 4 compares the *nani-o X-o* construction with the *naze* (‘why’) construction and argues that the former is different from the latter and should be regarded as an independent construction. Section 5 investigates the relation between the form and function of the *nani-o X-o* construction and reveals

* A few years ago one of my fellow students at the University of Tsukuba introduced Maynard (2000) at a class. After the presentation, I, giving an instance of the construction to be analyzed in this paper, commented that *nani-o* in Japanese could be used with a saturated transitive verb to express an accusation and added that the sentence, however, might be unacceptable because it violated a certain constraint in Japanese. Yukio Hirose, replying my comments, said that my sentence sounded to him not as bad as I had expected, which gave me a cue to think about the construction seriously. My thanks to him are therefore immeasurable. My special thanks also go to Hiromitsu Akashi, Manabu Kusayama, and Masao Okazaki for not only acting as informants but also discussing the nature of the construction with me. Finally, I would like to thank Katsuo Ichinohe, Nobuhiro Kaga, Toshinobu Mogi, Joe Morita, Minoru Nakau, and three *TES* reviewers for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

¹ The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of examples: Acc = accusative case marker, Assert = assertive morpheme, C = complementizer, Cop = copula, Dat = dative case marker, Excl = exclamative morpheme, Gen = genitive case marker, Neg = negative morpheme, Nom = nominative case marker, Past = past tense morpheme, Perf = perfective morpheme, Polite = polite form, Pres = present tense morpheme, Q = question marker, Quot = quotative particle, Top = topic marker.

² The sentence-final form *nda* is a contraction of *no da*, where *no* is a sentential nominalizer and *da* is a copula. It performs a variety of pragmatic functions. Thus, when used in a *wh*-interrogative like (1), it serves as an emphatic question marker (hence *Q*); when used in a declarative sentence like (27b) below in the text, it serves as an assertion marker (hence *Assert*).

that it is systematic in the following three respects: (i) most of its syntactic properties are reducible to its communicative function; (ii) its syntactic deviance is mitigated by its semantic coherence; and (iii) its formal markedness is in proportion to its functional specialization. Generalizing the final point, it proposes a descriptive generalization about the correlation between formal markedness and functional specialization. Section 6 is a brief conclusion.

2. The Syntax of the *Nani-o X-o* Construction

We will begin by describing the syntax of the *nani-o X-o* construction. It will be shown that the construction involves several syntactic idiosyncrasies and that it is a partially fixed construction.

First, as will be seen in the examples throughout the article, the *nani-o X-o* construction consists of a single clause that contains two accusative-marked phrases. One of them is the accusative-marked *wh*-adjunct *nani-o* ('what-Acc'), which, according to Kurafuji (1997), is interpreted as *naze* ('why'),³ and the other is the accusative-marked object of a transitive verb.

As Kurafuji (1997:257) correctly points out, the simultaneous occurrence of *nani-o* and *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction is in conflict with the Double-O Constraint in Japanese (Harada (1973, 1977), Shibatani (1978)), the gist of which is summarized in the following quote from Saito and Hoshi (2000:271):

(2) *The Double-O Constraint*

A simple sentence cannot contain more than one *o*-marked phrase.⁴

Henceforth, we will abbreviate this constraint as "DOC." The violation has led

³ The *nani-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction can basically be replaced with *naze* ('why'), and the example in (1) is paraphrased as:

- (i) Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?
 why rubbish-Acc say Q
 'Why do you talk rubbish?'

However, there are many syntactic and semantic differences between these two constructions. See section 4 for discussion of this issue.

⁴ The DOC is illustrated by the following examples:

- (i) a. *Hanako-wa Taroo-o mune-o sashita.
 Hanako-Top Taro-Acc chest-Acc stabbed
 'Hanako stabbed Taro in the chest.'

(Harada (1977:94))

- b. *Taroo-ga sono toori-o kuruma-o untenshita.
 Taro-Nom that street-Acc car-Acc drove
 'Taro drove a car along the street.'

(Homma (2001:755))

Each example in (i) involves two *o*-marked phrases in a single clause and violates the DOC. Hence the ungrammaticality.

Kurafuji (1997), Ochi (2002) and Hiraiwa (2002) to judge the construction marginal. Kurafuji (1997:257), giving the example in (4), makes the following remark:

(3) Japanese has a surface phonological constraint which rejects the double accusative sequence (...XP-*o* YP-*o*...), and the sentence in [(4)] violates this constraint.

(4) ??Jon-wa nani-o henna uta-o utatte-i-ru no?
 John-Top what-Acc strange song-Acc sing-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why is John singing a funny song?’

In view of this fact, one might be tempted to claim that the *nani-o X-o* construction does not exist in Japanese to start with, or that even if it exists, it is a mere slip-of-the-tongue that is not worthy of any serious grammatical investigation. However, this is a hasty conclusion; exceptional cases do exist. For instance, as extensively discussed in the literature, there are cases in which the (normally) intransitive verb *sleep* is exceptionally used transitively. One such case is illustrated by the following sentence:

(5) He slept the night away. (Jackendoff (1997:534))

How to deal with cases like (5) is of course a matter of debate (see Jackendoff (1997)). But what is important for our purposes here is that just because an expression is in conflict with a given grammatical convention does not necessarily entail that it can never be used.

Exactly the same can be said of the *nani-o X-o* construction. In fact, it is not difficult to find instances of the construction in both transcribed and written texts:^{5, 6}

(6) a. Nani-o sonnani aimaina koto-o ossharu ndesuka.
 what-Acc such ambiguous thing-Acc say Q.Polite
 ‘Why do you make such an ambiguous remark?’
 b. Amerika-wa kitachosen-ga jyunshu shite-i-nai to
 the US-Top North Korea-Nom observe do-be-Neg Quot
 itte-i-ru jyanaidesuka. Nani-o sonna inchiki-o
 say-be-Pres Assert.Polite what-Acc such nonsense-Acc
 itte-i-ru ndesuka.
 say-be-Pres Q.Polite
 ‘The US insists that North Korea doesn’t observe the agreement,
 doesn’t it? Why are you talking such nonsense?’
 (KKKS)

⁵ There are even speakers who readily accept (4).

⁶ The data sources used are Kokkai Kaigiroku Kensaku Shisutemu (abbreviated as “KKKS”) and Aozora Bunko (“AB”). The former is available at http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/KENSAKU/swk_startup.html and the latter at <http://www.aozora.gr.jp/>.

- (7) a. Nani-o yomaigoto-o iiyagaru.
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc say
 ‘Why do you talk rubbish?’
- b. O, oi, Yuuki-dono, Sakyoo-dono, nani-o jyodan-o yuu noda
 hey Yuki-Mr. Sakyoo-Mr. what-Acc joke-Acc say Q
 ‘H, hey, Mr. Yuki and Mr. Sakyoo, why do you joke?’
- c. “Nani-o tawaketakoto-o mosu”
 what-Acc nonsense-Acc say
 ‘Why do you talk nonsense?’
- d. Omae-wa nani-o soo kurushisoo kao-o
 you-Top what-Acc so distressful face-Acc
 shite-i-ru noda.
 do-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why do you look so distressful?’
- e. Nani-o yakamashii koto-o yuu nda.
 what-Acc fussy thing-Acc say Q
 Oogon-no kan-wa chanto omae-no te-ni
 gold-Gen crown-Top properly you-Gen hand-Dat
 kaette-i-ru jyanaika.
 return-be-Pres Assert
 ‘Why do you make such a fuss? The golden crown has already
 returned to you, hasn’t it?’

(AB)

The existence of these attested cases clearly suggests that although it violates the DOC, the *nani-o X-o* construction does exist.

The observation by Kurafuji (1997), Ochi (2002) and Hiraiwa (2002) is undoubtedly the case and we agree with them that the *nani-o X-o* construction violates the DOC. However, this is not to say that the construction does not exist. The correct characterization seems to be the following:

- (8) The *nani-o X-o* construction exists despite its violation of the DOC.⁷

This characterization correctly captures the fact that acceptability judgments of the construction vary from speaker to speaker; some reject it for its DOC violation (cf. (4)), while others accept it despite the violation (cf. (1), (6) and (7)).⁸

Having confirmed the existence of the *nani-o X-o* construction, let us proceed to

⁷ The violation has certain implications, for which see section 5.

⁸ See section 5 for an account of why speakers of the latter type should exist.

observe a second syntactic property of the construction. The order of the two accusative phrases *nani-o* and *X-o* is fixed in the *nani-o X-o* construction:

(9) a. Nani-o yomaigoto-o iiyagaru. (= (7a))

b. *Yomaigoto-o nani-o iiyagaru.

(10) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda? (= (1))

b. *Bakagetakoto-o nani-o yuu nda?

Nani-o has to precede *X-o* in the construction and switching their order directly affects grammaticality, as shown by the contrasts in (9) and (10).⁹ The irreversibility cannot be predicted on general grounds, since, as is well-known, scrambling is generally allowed in Japanese:

(11) a. Nani-o Taroo-ni tsutaeta nda?

what-Acc Taro-Dat told Q

b. Taroo-ni nani-o tsutaeta nda?

Taro-Dat what-Acc told Q

‘What did you tell Taro?’

Thirdly, the tense and aspect of the *nani-o X-o* construction is restricted. The construction can occur in the present tense, but not in the past tense:

(12) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?

what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q

‘Why do you talk rubbish?’

b. *Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itta nda?

what-Acc rubbish-Acc said Q

‘Why did you talk rubbish?’

Furthermore, it can be expressed in the progressive aspect, but not in the perfective or prospective aspect:

(13) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda?

what-Acc rubbish-Acc say-be-Pres Q

‘Why are you talking rubbish?’

b. *Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-shimat-ta nda?

what-Acc rubbish-Acc say-Perf-Past Q

‘(Lit.) Why have you talked rubbish?’

c. *Nani-o bakagetakoto-o ii-soo nanda?

what-Acc rubbish-Acc say-about.to Q

⁹ A Google search for the sequence *nani-o yomaigoto-o* gave 29 hits when I did it on January 15, 2004, while the search for the inverted counterpart *yomaigoto-o nani-o* gave no hits. Similarly, a search for *nani-o bakagetakoto-o* gave as many as 52 hits, but one and only one hit for *bakagetakoto-o nani-o*. These facts give further credence to our observation in (9) and (10).

‘(Lit) Why are you about to talk rubbish?’

Fourthly, the *nani-o X-o* construction has to occur as a main clause and cannot be subordinated:

- (14) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q
 ‘Why do you talk rubbish?’
- b. * [Watashi-wa [kimi-ga nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu noka]
 I-Top you-Nom what-Acc rubbish-Acc say C
 wakara-nai].
 understand-Neg
 ‘I don’t understand why you talk rubbish.’

Thus, the construction counts as an instance of main clause phenomena.

By contrast, if a sentence does not contain the sequence *nani-o X-o*, it can be embedded. For example, (15a), which only contains the accusative *wh*-adjunct *nani-o*, can be embedded as in (15b) (see also Kurafuji (1997:262) and Ochi (2002:14) for similar examples):

- (15) a. Nani-o sawaide-i-ru no?
 what-Acc make.noise-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why are you making noise?’
- b. [Watashi-wa [kimi-ga nani-o sawaide-i-ru noka]
 I-Top you-Nom what-Acc make.noise-be-Pres C
 wakara-nai].
 understand-Neg
 ‘I don’t understand why you are making noise.’

Fifthly, as is generally the case with clauses other than imperatives, the person of the subject of the *nani-o X-o* construction is not restricted:

- (16) {Ore/Omae/Taroo}-wa nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda?
 I You Taro -Top what-Acc rubbish-Acc say-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why {am I/are you/is Taro} talking rubbish?’

As shown, the construction can occur with first, second and third person subjects.

Sixthly, the main verb of the *nani-o X-o* construction allows variation:

- (17) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o kangaete-i-ru nda?
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc think-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why are you thinking rubbish?’
- b. Nani-o hon-o yonde-i-ru nda? (Moo
 what-Acc book-Acc reading-be-Pres Q already

shuppatsu-suru zikan da zo.)
 depart-do time is I.tell.you
 'Why are you reading a book? It's time to leave.'

Typical examples of the construction contain either *yuu* ('say') or *suru* ('do') as the main verb, but the construction is also compatible with such transitive verbs as *kangaeru* ('think') and *yomu* ('read'), as seen in (17).

Seventhly, it is possible for some element to intervene between *nani-o* and *X-o*:

- (18) a. Omae-wa nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda? (= (16))
 b. Nani-o omae-wa bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda?

As shown, the topicalized subject *omae-wa*, for instance, may intervene between *nani-o* and *X-o*. Thus, though what makes the *nani-o X-o* construction morphosyntactically marked is the sequence *nani-o X-o*, it is not the case that it is completely frozen.

Finally, it is possible to omit everything but *nani-o* and *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction:

- (19) Nani-o bakanakoto-o. Niisan-ga rikutsu-ga
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc elder.brother-Nom argument-Nom
 i-e-n katte sonana bakana koto-o shite.
 say-can-Neg because such foolish thing-Acc do
 '(Lit.) Why foolish things? You are doing such a foolish thing
 because your brother cannot argue, aren't you?'
 (AB)

From the observations so far, the surface syntax of the *nani-o X-o* construction is schematized as follows:

- (20) [S[*SCR/MC/*PAST/*PERF/*PROS] (...) *nani-o* (...) *X-o* (...)]

In our notation, the subscripts "**SCR*", "**MC*", "**PAST*", "**PERF*", and "**PROS*" respectively represent the five syntactic specifications (i) that *nani-o* precede *X-o*, (ii) that the construction occur as a main clause, (iii) that it not be expressed in the past tense, (iv) that it not be expressed in the perfective aspect, and (v) that it not be expressed in the prospective aspect; and the parentheses indicate optional materials. As the schema indicates, the *nani-o X-o* construction is syntactically fixed in that it is subject to the five specifications. At the same time, the construction is syntactically flexible in that it allows variants as far as they are not in contradiction with those specifications. Thus, the *nani-o X-o* construction is syntactically characterized as a partially fixed construction. We will consider its function in the next section.

3. The Semantics/Pragmatics of the *Nani-o X-o* Construction

As mentioned at the outset, the *nani-o X-o* construction is a colloquial and idiomatic interrogative expression. Its most appropriate context is demonstrated by the following attested example:

- (21) “Nani-o, kimi, bakana koto-o itte-ru nda!”
 what-Acc you foolish thing-Acc say-be.Pres Q
 Chui-wa, haradashigeni tsuuyaku-ni itta.
 lieutenant-Top angrily interpreter-Dat said
 ‘“Why are you talking rubbish?” the lieutenant said to the interpreter
 angrily.’

(AB)

As indicated by the use of *haradashigeni* (‘angrily’) in the quoting part, (21) describes a situation in which the lieutenant expressed anger and accused the interpreter of talking rubbish; the *nani-o X-o* construction is used to accuse someone of doing something.

In this relation, observe the following example:

- (22) Kyoojyu-wa “Nani-o sonna kasetu-o teeanshite-i-ru
 professor-Top what-Acc such hypothesis-Acc propose-be-Pres
 nda?” to insee-o hinanshita.
 Q Quot graduate-Acc accused
 ‘(Lit.) The professor accused the graduate student, “Why are you
 proposing such a hypothesis?”’

In (22) the *nani-o X-o* construction functions as the quoted part of a sentence with *hinansuru* (‘accuse’) as the quoting verb. What, then, does this fact tell us about the function of the construction?

According to Yamanashi (2002), quotation serves as a grammatical test to see what illocutionary force a given expression conventionalizes. If an expression conventionalizes a certain illocutionary force in the sense of Grice (1975), that force can be (directly) reflected in the quoting part of a sentence with the expression in question as the quoted part. By contrast, if an expression conversationally conveys a certain illocutionary force, that force cannot be reflected in the quoting part. To illustrate the point, let us consider the following acceptability contrast pointed out by Yamanashi (2002:229, 231):

- (23) a. “Hey, Walt, how about you all leaving me your record player?”
 requested Duke.
 b. ?“It’s hot in here,” requested John.

As the acceptability contrast in (23) shows, the interrogative sentence *How about*

you all leaving me your record player? can function as the quoted part of a sentence with *request* as the quoting verb,¹⁰ while the affirmative one *It's hot in here* cannot. This indicates that the former is conventionally used as a request, while the latter is only conversationally used as a request, according to Yamanashi.

Given this, we can now understand the significance of the grammaticality of (22); it means that the *nani-o X-o* construction conventionalizes the illocutionary force of an accusation.

The fact that the *nani-o X-o* construction conventionally conveys an accusation has an important effect upon the flexibility of its communicative function, which is illustrated by the following contrast:

- (24) a. *Taroo-wa "Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to
 Taro-Top what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q Quot
 Hanako-ni tazuneta.
 Hanako-Dat asked
 'Taro asked Hanako, "Why do you talk rubbish?'"
- b. Taroo-wa "Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to
 Taro-Top what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q Quot
 Hanako-o hinanshita.
 Hanako-Acc accused
 '(Lit.) Taro accused Hanako, "Why do you talk rubbish?'"

Example (24a), where the *nani-o X-o* construction occurs as the quoted part of a sentence with *tazuneru* ('ask') as the quoting verb, sounds unacceptable, while example (24b), where the construction occurs as the quoted part of a sentence with *hinansuru* ('accuse') as the quoting verb, is impeccable (cf. also (22)). The unacceptability of (24a) means that the construction cannot express a (genuine) question. Thus, although it involves the *wh*-word *nani-o* and appears as if it were a question, the construction cannot literally express a question; it is a rhetorical question that conventionally and exclusively expresses an accusation.

Given that the *nani-o X-o* construction conventionally and exclusively conveys an accusation, it is easily predicted that it cannot express, for example, a praise. This is in fact the case. Observe the following:

- (25) *Kyoojyu-wa "Nani-o sonna kasetu-o teeanshite-i-ru
 professor-Top what-Acc such hypothesis-Acc propose-be-Pres
 nda?" to insee-o hometa.
 Q Quot graduate-Acc praised

¹⁰ For a detailed analysis of expressions with *how about*, see Eilfort (1989) among others.

‘(Lit.) The professor praised the graduate student, “Why are you proposing such a hypothesis?”’

The construction cannot serve as the quoted part of a sentence with *homeru* (‘praise’) as the quoting verb, as seen in (25) (contrast (25) with (22), which is acceptable). This is because the act of accusation contrasts with that of praise in that when we accuse someone of doing something, we negatively evaluate what he/she does, while when we praise someone for doing something, we positively evaluate what he/she does (cf. Fillmore (1971)).¹¹ Thus, in (25) the illocutionary force of an accusation inherent in the *nani-o X-o* construction clashes with that of a praise reflected in the quoting verb *homeru* (‘praise’), which results in the unacceptability.

Similarly, some speakers judge the *nani-o X-o* construction unacceptable when *X-o* is modified by adjectives such as *subarashii* (‘brilliant’):¹²

- (26) (*)Nani-o subarashii kasettsu-o teeanshite-i-ru nda?
 what-Acc brilliant hypothesis-Acc propose-be-Pres Q
 ‘(Lit.) Why are you proposing a brilliant hypothesis?’

The adjective *subarashii* (‘brilliant’) usually functions as a marker of the speaker’s positive subjective attitude. Modifying *X-o* with it therefore contradicts with using the *nani-o X-o* construction, which, as argued above, expresses an accusation and entails the speaker’s negative subjective attitude. Hence the unacceptability of (26).

There are also speakers who accept (26). It sounds acceptable when, for example, the speaker sarcastically evaluates the hypothesis proposed as “brilliant.” In this case, (26) functions as an irony and conveys the speaker’s accusation of the hearer’s proposing an absurd hypothesis. Note that even in this coerced situation, the construction still expresses an accusation. The existence of these two types of judgments tells us that whether or not the *nani-o X-o* construction is accepted depends heavily on whether or not it successfully functions as an accusation; the construction is accepted as far as contextual factors do not prevent it from expressing an accusation. To sum up so far, the *nani-o X-o* construction is (i) conventionally and (ii) exclusively used to accuse someone of doing something.

The functional specification has a direct bearing upon the simultaneous occurrence of the accusative *wh*-adjunct *nani-o* and the accusative object *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction. In fact, if *nani-o* is omitted from the example in (12a),

¹¹ I am grateful to Yukio Hirose for bringing Fillmore’s paper to my attention.

¹² The parenthesized asterisk indicates that some speakers accept (26), while others do not.

the sentence no longer serves as an accusation, as seen in (27b):

- (27) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda? (= (12a))
 b. #Bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda.
 rubbish-Acc say-be-Pres Assert
 ‘(Ah,) I’m talking rubbish.’

(27b) is interpreted as the recognition of what the speaker him/herself is doing, for example, and cannot function as an accusation. Thus, *nani-o* plays an important role in the semantics of the *nani-o X-o* construction.

In view of this fact, one might suppose that the semantic properties of the *nani-o X-o* construction observed above actually derive from those of *nani-o*. However, the presence of *nani-o* alone is not sufficient for a sentence to function exclusively as an accusation. Sentences that contain *nani-o* but not *X-o* are ambiguous between an accusation and a question. For example, observe (28):

- (28) a. Taroo-wa “Nani-o sawaide-i-ru no?” to
 Taro-Top what-Acc make.noise-be-Pres Q Quot
 Hanako-o hinanshita.
 Hanako-Acc accused
 ‘(Lit.) Taro accused Hanako, “Why are you making noise?”’
 b. Taroo-wa “Nani-o sawaide-i-ru no?” to
 Taro-Top what-Acc make.noise-be-Pres Q Quot
 Hanako-ni tazuneta.
 Hanako-Dat asked
 ‘Taro asked Hanako, “Why are you making noise?”’

In the quoted parts of the examples in (28), *nani-o* occurs with the intransitive verb *sawagu* (‘make noise’). As the acceptability shows, the sentence *Nani-o sawaide-i-ru no?*, which involves *nani-o* but not *X-o*, can function as the quoted part of a sentence with either *hinansuru* (‘accuse’) or *tazuneru* (‘ask’) as the quoting verb; it can function as either an accusation or question.¹³ The presence of the

¹³ There are cases in which a sentence which contains *nani-o* but not *X-o* functions exclusively as an accusation. Some informants have pointed out to me that the following examples sound accusatory, not interrogatory.

- (i) a. Nani-o hashitte-i-ru nda?
 what-Acc run-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why are you running?’
 b. Nani-o sonnnani asette-ru nda?
 what-Acc such panic-be.Pres Q
 ‘Why are you in such a panic?’

The functional specification in (i) seems to be due to some contextual factors irrelevant to our discussion. For the *nani-o X-o* construction functions exclusively as an accusation without

sequence *nani-o X-o* is therefore crucial for the construction to function exclusively as an accusation.¹⁴

There is a further subtle aspect to the semantics of the *nani-o X-o* construction. To see this, observe the following example:

- (29) Gitaroo : (Fumanna kao-o shite) Konpira-no kamisan
 Gitaro dissatisfied face-Acc doing Kompira-Gen god
 iute, omae oota koto-ga aru-ke?
 say you met thing-Nom is-Q
 Miko : (Nirande) Nani-o shitsureena koto-o yuu noja,
 medium glaring what-Acc rude thing-Acc say Q
 kamisama-no osugata-ga me-ni mi-eru mon ka.
 God-Gen figure-Nom eye-Dat see-can thing Q
 'Gitaro: (With a dissatisfied look) You speak of the god of Kompira.
 But have you ever seen him?
 The medium: (Glaring at him) Why do you make such rude remarks?
 Never can we see the figure of gods!'

(AB)

In (29) the medium, replying to the immediately preceding remark by Gitaro, expresses her accusatory attitude toward him, which is also confirmed by the occurrence of the circumstantial description *nirande* ('glaring') and the adjective *shitsureena* ('rude'). As suggested by the dialogue, the *nani-o X-o* construction represents the speaker's reaction to the described situation unfolding right in front of his/her very eyes, which has a certain grammatical ramification.

Recall here that the *nani-o X-o* construction can occur in the present tense, as shown in section 2. As is well-known, a sentence in the simple present tense often receives a habitual (or generic) interpretation:

- (30) Mizu-wa hyakudo-de futtoo suru.
 water-Top 100°C-at boil does
 'Water boils at 100°C.'

This, however, is not the case with the *nani-o X-o* construction. Because of the functional property just discussed, a *nani-o X-o* sentence in the simple present tense always receives an instantaneous reading and cannot have a habitual one. Accordingly, the construction cannot contain the frequency adverb *yoku* ('often'), for instance:

exception, while as shown in (28), sentences that contain *nani-o* but not *X-o* are in principle ambiguous between an accusation and a question. We will not go into details of this issue.

¹⁴ See section 5.1 for further discussion on the semantic roles played by *nani-o* and *X-o*.

- (31) a. Nani-o bakanakoto-o yuu nda?
 what-Acc rubbish-Acc say Q
 ‘Why do you talk rubbish?’
- b.??Nani-o yoku bakanakoto-o yuu nda?
 what-Acc often rubbish-Acc say Q
 ‘Why do you often talk rubbish?’

(31b) has to be interpreted as **habitual** due to the lexical property of *yoku* (‘often’), which is incompatible with the instantaneous connotation of the construction. Hence its marginality.

The observations so far lead us to characterize the communicative function of the *nani-o X-o* construction as follows:

- (32) The *nani-o X-o* construction is conventionally and exclusively used to accuse someone (typically, the hearer) of doing something right in front of the speaker’s very eyes.

The *nani-o X-o* construction is thus best characterized as an instance of what Lakoff (1984:473) calls “speech act constructions, that is, constructions that are restricted in their use to expressing certain illocutionary forces that are specified as part of the grammar of [Japanese].”

Our discussion so far has clarified the syntax and semantics of the *nani-o X-o* construction. Here, two questions arise as to (i) whether the idiosyncrasies of the construction observed so far are attributable to any established construction, and (ii) what the relation between the syntax and semantics of the construction is. In the following two sections, we will consider these questions in turn.

4. Comparison of the *Nani-o X-o* Construction with the *Naze* Construction

Are the syntactic and semantic/pragmatic idiosyncrasies observed in sections 2 and 3 unique to the *nani-o X-o* construction? As briefly mentioned in section 2, Kurafuji (1997) points out that the *wh*-accusative adjunct *nani-o* in Japanese is interpreted as *naze* (‘why’), which is illustrated by the fact that (33a) is paraphrased as (33b):

- (33) a. Kare-wa nani-o sawaide-i-ru no?
 he-Top what-Acc make.noise-be-Pres Q
- b. Kare-wa naze sawaide-i-ru no?
 he-Top why make.noise-be-Pres Q
 ‘Why is he making noise?’

(Kurafuji (1997:253))

As predicted by Kurafuji’s observation, *nani-o* can be replaced with *naze* (‘why’) in

the *nani-o X-o* construction, too (see also note 3). The example in (1) can be paraphrased as (34b):

- (34) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda? (= (1))
 b. Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?
 why rubbish-Acc say Q

We will call sentences with *naze* ('why') the *naze* construction for convenience. The paraphrase relation might lead one to suppose that the *nani-o X-o* construction shares its idiosyncrasies with the *naze* construction. However, this is not the case; the paraphrase relation merely suggests that the function of the *nani-o X-o* construction partially overlaps with that of the *naze* construction. In fact, most of the idiosyncrasies are the former's own and cannot be attributed to the latter, as will be seen below.

4.1. Syntactic Differences

We first compare the *nani-o X-o* construction with the *naze* construction from syntactic perspectives. First, scrambling the *wh*-word and the object yields ungrammaticality in the *nani-o X-o* construction, as seen in (9), repeated below as (35), while it does not in the *naze* construction, as in (36):

- (35) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?
 b. *Bakagetakoto-o nani-o yuu nda?
 (36) a. Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu nda?
 why rubbish-Acc say Q
 b. Bakagetakoto-o naze yuu nda?
 rubbish-Acc why say Q
 'Why do you talk rubbish?'

Secondly, the *nani-o X-o* construction cannot be expressed in the past tense, as observed in (10), repeated below as (37a), while the *naze* construction can, as shown in (37b):

- (37) a. *Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itta nda?
 b. Naze bakagetakoto-o itta nda?
 why rubbish-Acc said Q
 'Why did you talk rubbish?'

Finally, the *nani-o X-o* construction cannot be embedded, as seen in (14b), repeated below as (38a), while the *naze* construction can, as illustrated by (38b):

- (38) a. *[Watashi-wa [kimi-ga nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu noka] wakara-nai].
 b. [Watashi-wa [kimi-ga naze bakagetakoto-o yuu noka]
 I-Top you-Nom why rubbish-Acc say C

wakara-nai].

understand-Neg

'I don't understand why you talk rubbish.'

In this way, the *nani-o X-o* construction is syntactically more constrained than the *naze* construction, which means that they are syntactically different.

4.2. Semantic/Pragmatic Differences

The *nani-o X-o* construction does not share its semantic/pragmatic characteristics with the *naze* construction, either. First, let us compare the functional range of the two constructions. The *nani-o X-o* construction is used exclusively as an accusation and cannot function as a question, as pointed out in section 3. We repeat the relevant examples here:

(39) a. Taroo-wa "Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to Hanako-o hinanshita.

b. * Taroo-wa "Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to Hanako-ni tazuneta.

(= (24))

By contrast, the *naze* construction functions either as an accusation or question, and can occur in the quoted part of a sentence with either *hinansuru* ('accuse') or *tazuneru* ('ask') as the quoting verb, unlike the *nani-o X-o* construction:

(40) a. Taroo-wa "Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to
Taro-Top why rubbish-Acc say Q Quot
Hanako-o hinanshita.

Hanako-Acc accused

'(Lit.) Taro accused Hanako, "Why do you talk rubbish?"'

b. Taroo-wa "Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu no?" to
Taro-Top why rubbish-Acc say Q Quot
Hanako-ni tazuneta.

Hanako-Dat asked

'Taro asked Hanako, "Why do you talk rubbish?"'

Next, the *nani-o X-o* construction cannot have a habitual reading, which is reflected in its incompatibility with the frequency adverb *yoku* ('often'), as argued in section 3. By contrast, the *naze* construction can receive a habitual interpretation and is compatible with that adverb. This is illustrated by the following contrast:

(41) a. ??Nani-o yoku bakanakoto-o yuu nda? (= (31b))

b. Naze yoku bakanakoto-o yuu nda?

why often rubbish-Acc say Q

'Why do you often talk rubbish?'

The *nani-o X-o* construction is functionally more constrained than the *naze* construction, which means that they are semantically distinct, too.

From these observations, it is now clear that although there holds a paraphrase relation between them in principle, the *nani-o X-o* construction does not share its idiosyncrasies with the *naze* construction. It should be seen as an independent construction.

5. The Relation between the Form and Function of the *Nani-o X-o* Construction

We will now consider the second question posed at the end of section 3: What is the relation between the form and function of the *nani-o X-o* construction? In view of the idiosyncratic nature of the construction observed so far, one might suppose that it is arbitrary. However, on closer inspection it turns out that the form and function of the construction are correlated systematically.

5.1. Functional Motivation for the Syntax

As argued in Lakoff (1984), Hirose (1991) and Konno (2004a) among others, it is often the case that the communicative function of a construction is closely related to its syntax. The *nani-o X-o* construction is no exception in this respect. First, notice again that the order of *nani-o* and *X-o* is fixed and the former has to precede the latter, as seen in (9), repeated below as (42):

- (42) a. *Nani-o yomaigoto-o iiyagaru?*
 b. **Yomaigoto-o nani-o iiyagaru?*

At first sight, this fact appears to be purely syntactic in nature. But further reflection reveals that it is functionally motivated.

The analysis suggested here is based on Nakau's (1992, 1994) Hierarchical Semantics Model, which postulates that the semantic structure of a sentence consists of the modal component and the propositional component and further that the former governs the latter.¹⁵

The dominance relation between the modal and the propositional components is syntactically reflected in the ordering of sentence adverbs, for example. According to Jackendoff (1972:89), speaker-oriented adverbs have to precede subject-oriented adverbs:

- (43) a. Happily, Max carefully was climbing the walls of the garden.

¹⁵ In this paper, we follow Nakau's (1992, 1994) theory of modality, which defines modality as follows:

- (i) MODALITY is defined, prototypically, as (i) *a mental attitude* (ii) *on the part of the speaker* (iii) *only accessible at the time of utterance*, where *the time of utterance* is further characterized as *the instantaneous present* (as opposed to particularly to *the durational present and the past*). (Nakau (1992:5))

See Nakau (1992, 1994) for independent evidence for the definition.

b. *Carefully, Max happily was climbing the walls of the garden.

As Endo (2004:243) demonstrates, this constraint is also at work in Japanese:

(44) a. Fushigina-koto-ni Jyon-wa mazime-ni-mo benkyooshita.
 strange-fact-Dat John-Top serious-Dat-also studied

b. *Majime-ni-mo fushigina-koto-ni Jyon-wa benkyooshita.
 serious-Dat-also strange-fact-Dat John-Top studied
 '(Lit.) Strangely, John studied seriously.'

In terms of Nakau's modal-propositional bistructure thesis, speaker-oriented adverbs such as *happily* and *fushiginakotoni* ('strangely'), "relating the speaker's attitude toward the event expressed by the sentence (Jackendoff (1972:56)), belong to the modal component. By contrast, subject-oriented adverbs such as *carefully* and *mazimenimo* ('seriously'), "commenting on the subject of the sentence (Jackendoff (1972:56)), are included in the propositional component. Accordingly, speaker-oriented adverbs take semantic scope over subject-oriented adverbs. The ordering of adverbs in (43a) and (44a) is in accordance with the semantic dominance relation, while that in (43b) and (44b) is not. Hence the ungrammaticality of the latter (cf. Jackendoff (1972:ch. 3)).

With the above discussion in mind, let us examine to which component the two accusative phrases *nani-o* and *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction are each related. In this connection, recall that the construction functions as an accusation and that the presence of *nani-o* is closely related to the accusatory attitude of the speaker expressed, as shown in section 3. This is reflected in the fact that if *nani-o* is omitted from the construction, the sentence no longer serves as an accusation. We repeat the relevant contrast here:

(45) a. Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda?

b. #Bakagetakoto-o itte-i-ru nda.

(= (27))

We can say from this contrast that *nani-o* counts as an expression of modality in the *nani-o X-o* construction.

This analysis is supported, though indirectly, by the fact that *nani-o* by itself can express the speaker's accusatory attitude:

(46) Taroo: Omae-wa hontooni baka da naa.

Taro you-Top really foolish Cop Excl

Ji-roo: Nani-o?!

Ji-roo what-Acc

'Taro: You are a real fool.

Ji-roo: What?!'

In (46), Jiro expresses his accusatory attitude toward (the preceding remark by) Taro by uttering *nani-o*.¹⁶

The other accusative phrase *X-o* is semantically in sharp contrast with *nani-o*. For it functions as the object of the verb and constitutes part of the propositional content to which the speaker's accusatory attitude is directed. Thus, *X-o* is regarded as propositional, unlike *nani-o*, which, together with our argument above, means that *nani-o* semantically governs *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction. The relevant part of the semantic structure of the construction is represented as follows:

(47) [MOD(ALITY) *nani-o* [PROP(OSITION) *X-o*]]

The hierarchical semantic structure in (47) gives a straightforward account of why *nani-o* has to precede *X-o* in the *nani-o X-o* construction; the former takes semantic scope over the latter, just as speaker-oriented adverbs governs subject-oriented adverbs, which corresponds to the linear sequence *nani-o X-o*. Reversing their order conflicts with their semantic dominance relationship. Hence the ungrammaticality of (42b). As has been shown, the restriction in question is considered to be a direct reflex of the semantic structure of the construction.

Secondly, recall the restriction on the tense and aspect of the *nani-o X-o* construction. The construction cannot be expressed in the past tense, the perfective aspect, or the prospective aspect, as seen in section 2. We repeat the relevant examples below:

- (48) a. **Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itta nda?* (= (12b))
 b. **Nani-o bakagetakoto-o itte-shimat-ta nda?* (= (13b))
 c. **Nani-o bakagetakoto-o ii-soo nanda?* (= (13c))

Irrelevant details aside, there is one thing that these three modes of expression have in common: they locate the event described by the sentence remote from the time of utterance. The temporal remoteness is in conflict with one of the functional specifications in the *nani-o X-o* construction observed in section 3: that the construction represent the speaker's reaction to the described situation unfolding right in front of his/her very eyes. Hence the ungrammaticality in (48).

Finally, the *nani-o X-o* construction cannot be embedded, as pointed out in (14b), repeated here as (49):

(49) * [*Watashi-wa [kimi-ga nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu noka] wakara-nai*].

This syntactic property is also functionally explainable. Notice that the main verb of (49) is *wakaru* ('understand') and, further, that the complement clause, which the

¹⁶ Maynard (2000) argues that the non-interrogative *nan(i)* in Japanese is an expression of modality. Though she does not deal with the *nani-o X-o* construction, her conclusion adds further credence to the analysis suggested here.

nani-o X-o construction forms part of, is introduced by the interrogative complementizer *noka* due to the subcategorization requirement of the verb. Accordingly, the complement clause as a whole has to function as a question, which contradicts with the accusatory implication encoded in the construction. Hence the ungrammaticality of (49).

In this way, we can straightforwardly account for why the *nani-o X-o* construction has the form it has by taking its function into consideration.

5.2. *Syntactic Deviance and Semantic Coherence*

We saw in section 2 that the *nani-o X-o* construction violates the DOC. This is because the construction, consisting of a single clause, contains the two *o*-marked phrases *nani-o* and *X-o* in the same syntactic domain. In this connection, the semantic structure in (47) has an important consequence.

Its significance becomes clear if we assume that the DOC has to be satisfied at the level of semantics, too; namely, that more than one *o*-marked phrase cannot belong to a single semantic domain. With this assumption in mind, let us consider whether the *nani-o X-o* construction (also) violates the DOC semantically.

As represented in (47), *nani-o* belongs to the modal component of the semantic structure of the *nani-o X-o* construction, while *X-o* belongs to the propositional component. That is, the two *o*-marked phrases are included in two different semantic domains. We can then say that the construction satisfies the DOC semantically.

The syntactic and semantic structures of the *nani-o X-o* construction are not isomorphic in that the former violates the DOC and is deviant, while the latter satisfies the constraint and is coherent.¹⁷ The contrast is represented roughly as follows:

- (50) a. Syntax: [_S *nani-o X-o*] (= (20))
 b. Semantics: [_{MOD} *nani-o* [_{PROP} *X-o*]] (= (47))

Assuming this mismatch enables us to give a principled account of why, as seen in section 2, some speakers reject the construction for the DOC violation, while others accept it in spite of the violation. In the former case, the syntactic deviance takes precedence over the semantic coherence. By contrast, in the latter, it is the semantic coherence that takes precedence and, consequently, it “mitigates” the syntactic deviance.

The *nani-o X-o* construction is not an isolated case of semantic mitigation. As has frequently been pointed out in the literature, verbs of Latinate origin cannot

¹⁷ I am grateful to Hiromistu Akashi for his suggestions on this point.

enter into the ditransitive construction (see Pinker (1989) and references cited therein). Let us call this constraint the Latinate Constraint (abbreviated as “LC”). The LC is illustrated by the following contrast:

(51) John {gave/*donated} the museum a painting. (Pinker (1989:45))

Donate, for example, is a Latinate verb and cannot enter into the ditransitive construction due to the LC.

In this relation, Takami (2003) makes an interesting observation. He points out that there are speakers who allow ditransitive sentences with *donate*:

(52) ... we donated them a few dollars each month ... (Takami (2003:39))

Takami accounts for the grammaticality of (52) as follows: *donate* is semantically similar to *give*, which is one of the prototypical verbs used in the ditransitive construction, and hence is qualified as dativizable.

Donate is semantically compatible with the ditransitive construction because of its semantic affinity with *give*, as noted by Takami, while it is morphophonologically incompatible with the construction due to the LC. Given this characterization, the variation in judgment observed in (51) and (52) can be accounted for in our terms as follows. If the LC violation takes precedence and is not mitigated by the semantic compatibility, ditransitive sentences with *donate* are not accepted, as in (51). In contrast, if the semantic compatibility takes precedence and mitigates the LC violation, ditransitive sentences with *donate* are accepted, as in (52). This exactly parallels what is the case with the *nani-o X-o* construction.

As a final remark in this subsection, let us discuss two possible objections to our argument. It might be objected that the *nani-o X-o* construction does not involve the DOC violation to start with. Advocates of approaches along these lines would posit an abstract syntactic structure in which *nani-o* and *X-o* each belong to different syntactic domains, which parallels the semantic structure in (47). Notice, however, that it amounts to claiming that there is nothing syntactically problematic in the construction (too) and, consequently, cannot capture the fact that some speakers accept the construction, while others do not.

The other possible objection is concerned with the following well-known fact: path phrases in Japanese can be marked with the accusative case marker *-o* and occur with the *o*-marked object of a transitive verb in the same sentence without causing the DOC violation (Shibatani (1978:262)):

(53) Taroo-wa kyuuna saka-o zitsensya-o isshookenmee oshita.
Taro-Top steep slope-Acc bicycle-Acc hard pushed
'Taro pushed the bicycle hard up the steep slope.'

On the basis of this fact, one might assume that the *nani-o* in the *nani-o X-o*

construction denotes a (metaphorical) path and that the construction does not violate the DOC. Notice, however, that this alternative, just like the one ventured above, amounts to claiming that the *nani-o* X-*o* construction involves neither syntactic nor semantic anomaly. As a result, it fails to give a principled account of why the variation in judgment should exist, too. By contrast, our approach, assuming the DOC violation at the syntactic level and its satisfaction at the semantic level, accommodates the duality easily, as argued above. Thus, the objections should be dismissed.

5.3. Formal Markedness and Functional Specialization

We would finally like to discuss the relation between the form and function of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction in terms of “formal markedness” and “functional specialization.” In this paper, we equate the notion of “formal markedness” with that of “formal normalcy” (see Levinson (2000) among others for a markedness-as-normalcy approach). More precisely, we take “formally marked” as “abnormal with reference to the grammatical convention of a given language,” and “formally unmarked” as “normal with reference to the grammatical convention of a given language.” A grammatical form is characterized as marked if it is in conflict with the grammatical convention of a given language that the corresponding unmarked form is in accord with.

With this in mind, let us return to the *nani-o* X-*o* construction. As argued in sections 2 and 5.2, it (syntactically) violates the DOC, which is one of the grammatical conventions in Japanese. It is therefore characterized as formally marked.

On the meaning side, the construction functions exclusively as an accusation, not as a question, as observed in section 3. We repeat the relevant examples here:

- (54) a. Taroo-wa “Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?” to Hanako-o hinanshita.
 b. *Taroo-wa “Nani-o bakagetakoto-o yuu no?” to Hanako-ni tazuneta.

(= (24))

The *nani-o* X-*o* construction is therefore characterized as functionally specialized. In this way, the formal markedness of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction is in proportion to its functional specialization.

A comparison of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction with the *naze* construction, which does not violate the DOC and hence is formally unmarked, helps to understand this point well. In contrast to the former, the latter functions either as an accusation or a question, as pointed out in section 4.2. We repeat the examples in (40) as (55) below:

- (55) a. Taroo-wa “Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu no?” to Hanako-o hinanshita.

b. Taroo-wa “Naze bakagetakoto-o yuu no?” to Hanako-ni tazuneta.

From these observations, we can say that the formally marked *nani-o X-o* construction is functionally more specialized than the formally unmarked *naze* construction. This is schematized as follows:

(56)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| The <i>nani-o X-o</i> construction (*THE DOC) | — ACCUSATION QUESTION | } | The <i>naze</i> construction (√THE DOC) |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|

In our notation, words in small capitals represent grammatical conventions, and those in capitals functions; stars and roots respectively indicate the marked/unmarked status of a grammatical form with reference to a relevant convention; and solid lines indicate the functional range of an expression. As depicted in (56), the functional range of the *nani-o X-o* construction, which is marked, is narrower than that of the *naze* construction, which is unmarked.

This leads us to propose the following descriptive generalization, which is consistent with the general view that “marked choices are all used with specific effects (Battistella (1996:134))”:¹⁸

(57) *Generalization about the Correlation between Formal Markedness and Functional Specialization*

If a grammatical form is marked with reference to the grammatical convention of a given language, then the function of that form is more specialized than that of the corresponding unmarked form(s).

Two caveats are in order here. One is that the reverse of this generalization does not always hold; the functional specialization of a grammatical form does not necessarily presuppose the formal markedness of that form. It is thus not refuted by the existence of cases where an expression has a specialized function without anything formally marked.

The other is that as the schema in (56) shows, the existence of the use of the marked *nani-o X-o* construction as an accusation does not “block (Aronoff (1976))” or “preempt (Clark and Clark (1979))” that of the unmarked *naze* construction for the same purpose. Thus, there is no “division of pragmatic labor (Horn (1984), Levinson (2000))” between the two constructions. It is this kind of marked/unmarked opposition without blocking effect that the generalization in (57) is intended to capture.

To recapitulate, we can say that there hold systematic correspondences between

¹⁸ I am grateful to Manabu Kusayama for his comments on Konno (2004a), which have helped me develop this perspective. For further arguments for it, see Konno (2004a, b, in progress).

the form and function of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction despite its apparent idiosyncrasy.

7. Conclusion

Our close investigation of the form and function of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction has revealed that it is a partially fixed speech act construction which is conventionally and exclusively used to accuse someone of doing something right in front of the speaker's very eyes. The comparison of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction with the *naze* construction has made clear that the former is both syntactically and semantically more restricted than the latter and hence should be regarded as an independent construction. We have further argued that the form and function of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction are systematically related in that the syntactic specifications are functionally motivated, that the syntactic deviance is mitigated by the semantic coherence, and that the formal markedness is in proportion to the functional specialization. It is hoped that the perspectives we have provided in this paper can shed light on a number of other "peripheral" phenomena apt to escape linguistic attention.¹⁹

REFERENCES

- Aronoff, Mark (1976) *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Battistella, Edwin L. (1996) *The Logic of Markedness*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1979) "The Jingle Theory of Double -ing," *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis: A Festschrift for William Haas*, ed. by D. J. Allerton, Edward Carney, and David Holdcroft, 41-56, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Clark, Eve V. and Herbert H. Clark (1979) "When Nouns Surface as Verbs," *Language* 55, 767-811.
- Eilfort, William H. (1989) "The Grammar of English *How About* Constructions," *CLS* 25, 112-122.
- Endo, Yoshio (2004) "Two Approaches to Adverbs: Cinque vs. Ernst," *Tsukuba English Studies* 22: *A Festschrift in Honor of Minoru Nakau*, 235-246, University of Tsukuba.

¹⁹ An attentive reader might notice that the *nani-o* X-*o* construction is very similar to what Kay and Fillmore (1999) calls the WXDY construction in English, illustrated by *What are they doing resuscitating constructions?* (Kay and Fillmore (1999:1)). Interestingly, its function seems to be fixed to express "the pragmatic force of attributing ... INCONGRUITY to the scene or proposition for which the explanation is required (Kay and Fillmore (1999:4))." Furthermore, it is in conflict with the Double -ing Constraint (Ross (1972), Milsark (1972)), as Bolinger (1972:52) notes. It therefore appears possible to take the WXDY construction as another case for the generalization in (57). Here, we simply mention this possibility without further comment and leave the comparison of the *nani-o* X-*o* construction with the WXDY construction for future research.

- Fillmore, Charles J. (1971) "Verbs of Judging: An Exercise in Semantic Description," *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, ed. by Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen, 272-289, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Grice, H. Paul (1975) "Logic and Conversation," *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41-58, Academic Press, New York.
- Harada, Shin-ichi (1973) "Counter Equi NP Deletion," *Annual Bulletin 7*, 113-147, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatics, University of Tokyo. [Reprinted in *Shintakusu to Imi: Harada Shin-ichi Gengogaku Ronbun Senshu*, ed. by Naoki Fukui, 2000, 181-215, Taishukan, Tokyo.]
- Harada, Shin-ichi (1977) "Nihongo ni 'Henkei' wa Hitsuyo da," *Gengo 6:11*, 88-95.
- Hiraiwa, Ken (2002) "Facets of Case: On the Nature of the Double-*o* Constraint," *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics (TCP2002)*, ed. by Yukio Otsu, 139-163, Hituzi Publishers, Tokyo.
- Hirose, Yukio (1991) "On a Certain Nominal Use of *Because*-Clauses: Just Because *Because*-Clauses Can Substitute for *That*-Clauses Does Not Mean That This Is Always Possible," *English Linguistics 8*, 16-33.
- Homma, Shinsuke (2001) "A Note on Traversal Objects," *Imi to Katachi no Intafeisu: Nakau Minoru Kyojyu Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshu*, ed. by Nakau Minoru Kyojyu Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshu Hensyu Iinkai, 751-761, Kurosio, Tokyo.
- Horn, Laurence R. (1984) "Toward a New Taxonomy for Pragmatic Inference: Q-Based and R-Based Implicature," *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, ed. by Deborah Schiffrin, 11-42, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1997) "Twistin' the Night Away," *Language 73*, 534-559.
- Kay, Paul and Charles J. Fillmore (1999) "Grammatical Constructions and Linguistic Generalizations: The *What's X Doing Y?* Construction," *Language 78*, 1-33.
- Konno, Hiroaki (2004a) "The *If You Be* Construction as a Speech Act Construction," *English Linguistics 21*, 34-54.
- Konno, Hiroaki (2004b) "*Mouses*," ms., University of Tsukuba.
- Konno, Hiroaki (in progress) *On the Relation between Formal Markedness and Functional Specialization: A descriptive Analysis of Peripheral Phenomena in English and Japanese*, ms., University of Tsukuba.
- Kurafuji, Takeo (1997) "Case-Checking of Accusative *Wh*-Adjuncts," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 31: Papers from the English Student Conference in Linguistics*, 1996, 253-271, MIT.
- Lakoff, George (1984) "Performative Subordinate Clauses," *BLS 10*, 472-480.

- Levinson, Stephen C. (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Maynard, Senko K. (2000) "Speaking for the Unspeakable: Expressive Functions of *Nan(i)* in Japanese Discourse," *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1209-1239.
- Milsark, Gary (1972) "Re: Doubl-ing," *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 542-549.
- Nakau, Minoru (1992) "Modality and Subjective Semantics," *Tsukuba English Studies* 11, 1-45, University of Tsukuba.
- Nakau, Minoru (1994) *Ninchi Imiron no Genri*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Ochi, Masao (2002) "How Come and Other Adjunct *Wh*-phrases: A Cross-linguistic Perspective," paper read at GLOW in Asia 2002, held at National Tsing Hua University, Hong Kong on January 7, 2002 (downloadable at <http://glow.ling.nthu.edu.tw/6.htm>).
- Pinker, Steven (1989) *Learnability and Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Ross, John Robert (1972) "Doubl-ing," *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 61-86.
- Saito, Mamoru and Hiroto Hoshi (2000) "The Japanese Light Verb Construction and the Minimalist Program," *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 261-295, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1978) *Nihongo no Bunseki*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (2003) "Donate, Purchase nado wa Honto ni Nijyumokutekigo wo Toranai ka: Bokokugowasha no Shiteki to Jitsurei no Hokoku," *Eigo Seinen* 149.6, 38-41.
- Yamanashi, Masa-aki (2002) "Speech-Act Constructions, Illocutionary Forces, and Conventionality," *Essays in Speech Act Theory*, ed. by Daniel Vanderveken and Susumu Kubo, 225-238, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics

University of Tsukuba

e-mail: onnok77@hotmail.com