

# Wh-Questions and their Interactions with the Particle *To* in Nagasaki Dialect\*

KAZUKI KUWABARA

*Kanda University of International Studies*

This paper examines the distribution of the particle *to* and its interaction with wh-phrases in Nagasaki dialect. I show that the particle *to*, which appears to indicate the interrogative force, is a complementizer with no illocutionary force. It is also demonstrated that the particle *to* is a counterpart of the complementizer *no* used in questions in standard Japanese, which I argued is a manifestation of finiteness (Kuwabara (2010a,b, 2011)). I argue that Rizzi's (2001) proposal for positing two types of C heads for wh-phrases can be extended to account for the seemingly puzzling interactions of wh-interrogatives with the complementizer with no interrogative force in Nagasaki dialect.

## 1. Introduction

This paper examines the distribution of the particle *to* and its interaction with wh-questions in Nagasaki Japanese, a dialect spoken in Nagasaki prefecture. Interrogative sentences in Nagasaki dialect are typically marked by the particle *to* at the right edge of the clause. As illustrated in (1)-(2), *to* seems to mark the sentence either as a yes-no question or a

---

\* Parts of the material in this paper were presented at the *Workshop on Theoretical Linguistics* (Graduate School of Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies, October 20, 2007), at the *Workshop on A New Trend in the Generative Study of Japanese* (Kanda University of International Studies, September 3, 2009), at the *Workshop on the Interface between Syntax and Discourse* (Center for Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies, March 10, 2010), and at the *Workshop on the Research in Japanese Generative Grammar in 70s* (Center for Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies, July 1, 2010). I thank the audiences for their comments. Special thanks are due to Jun Abe, Shuji Chiba, Guglielmo Cinque, Yoshio Endo, Daisuke Inagaki, Liliane Haegeman, Nobuko Hasegawa, Koji Hoshi, Kazuko Inoue, Yasuo Ishii, Hideki Kishimoto, Susumu Kuno, Shigeru Miyagawa, Hisashi Noda, Yoshio Otake, Luigi Rizzi, Mamoru Saito, Masaki Sano, Ur Shlonsky, Koji Sugisaki, Satoshi Tomioka, and Saeko Urushibara. I am grateful also to Kiyoshi Tajima, who acted as an informant of Nagasaki Japanese and for providing me with useful comments. Obviously none of them can be held responsible for use that I made of their comments.

wh-question:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. Sono okasi oisika to?  
that cake good C  
'Is the cake good?'
- b. Moo kita to (ne)?  
already came C SP  
'Has he already come?'
- (2) a. Anta-wa nani siyotta to?  
you-TOP what doing-was C  
'What were you doing?' (Shourounagashi, p. 69.)
- b. Obaachama sindara doko-ni iku to?  
grandmother dies-when where-to go C  
'Where does my grandma go when she dies?'  
(Shourounagashi, p. 37.)

Thus, *to* is often described as a question particle in the literature on Japanese dialectology (Sakaguchi (1998)). This paper explores the possibility that the particle *to* in questions like (1)-(2) instantiates the C head with no illocutionary force. I also show that the particle *to* is a counterpart of *no* in standard Japanese,<sup>2</sup> which I argued is a manifestation of Fin(iteness) head in the C system (Kuwabara (2010a,b, 2011)).<sup>3</sup> It will be demonstrated that the particle *to* exhibits the same behavior as the particle *no* regarding the interaction with wh-questions. Although *no* is a non-interrogative complementizer, its presence is required for a reason wh-adjunct *naze* 'why'. I show that the same interaction is also found between the particle *to* and a reason wh-adjunct *nasite* 'why' in Nagasaki dialect. I argue that this peculiar interaction

---

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in the glosses in this paper: ACC=Accusative, C=Complementizer, COP=Copula, DAT=Dative, GEN=Genitive, NOM=Nominative, POL=Politeness Affix, Q=Question Particle, SP=Sentence Particle, TOP=Topic, WH-QP=Wh-Question Particle, and Y/N-QP=Yes/No Question Particle.

<sup>2</sup> See also Kose (1971) and Atago (1976).

<sup>3</sup> Based on the analysis of the cleft construction and truncated wh-questions, Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) also identify a particle *no* as a head of FinP. A more systematic analysis of a complementizer *no* as the Fin head is made by Endo (2007), in which he draws attention to the phenomena having to do with how the elements (such as *no* and other sentence final particles) in the CP zone contribute to the satisfaction of the EPP. See also Ono (2006) who analyzes the particle *no* used in exclamatory sentences as instantiating Fin.

between *to* and a reason wh-adjunct in Nagasaki Japanese can be accounted for in the same way as the interaction between *no* and *naze* by adopting Rizzi's (2001) proposal about the postulation of the two distinct C heads for wh-interrogatives.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the basic data on the particle *to* and its interactions with wh-interrogatives in Nagasaki dialect. I first show that the particle *to* is a complementizer with no interrogative force. Then, it is further demonstrated that the particle *to* is a counterpart of *no* in standard Japanese, which I argued is a realization of a Fin head (Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011)). I then present the array of data having to do with the interaction between a reason wh-adjunct and the non-interrogative complementizer *to/no*. Section 3 explores how the analysis based on the articulated CP structure can account for the seemingly intractable paradox about the interaction of a reason wh-adjunct with the complementizer with no illocutionary force. Section 4 offers a brief conclusion.

## 2. The Particle *To/No* and the C System of Japanese

### 2.1. *To* as a Complementizer without Illocutionary Force

As we have already seen in (1)-(2), the particle *to* in Nagasaki dialect is typically found at the right periphery of the interrogative sentence. For this reason, *to* is commonly described as a question particle, according to which we may assume that *to* instantiates the C head with the interrogative force. Similar examples are provided in (3)-(4), which seem to indicate that *to* expresses the specification of the interrogative force.

(3) Yes-No Questions:

- a. Oi-ga warui to yuu to (ne)?  
I-NOM bad that say C SP  
'Do you say that I am bad?'
- b. Otoosan-ni sikararete naichyoru to?  
father-by scolded-was-because crying-is C  
'Are you crying because you were scolded by your father?'

- c. Obaachama-mo sinu to?  
grandmother-also die C  
'Does my grandma die, too?'
- d. Sono hon-wa omosiroka to (ne)?  
that book-TOP interesting C SP  
'Is that book interesting?'

(4) Wh-Questions:

- a. Doko-ni ikitaka to?  
where-to want-to-go C  
'Where do you want to go?'
- b. Dono hito-ba sitoru to?  
which person-ACC know C  
'Which person do you know?'
- c. Dono hon-ba yomitaka to?  
which book-ACC want-to-read C  
'Which book do you want to read?'
- d. Itsu-made Tokyo-ni oru to (ne)?  
when-until -in stay C SP  
'Until when will you stay in Tokyo?'
- e. Nan-no hana-ga saitotta to?  
what-GEN flower-NOM bloom-was C  
'What flowers were in bloom?'

These examples seem to indicate that *to* in Nagasaki Japanese is a morphological realization of the [Q] feature specified for C. There is, however, good evidence that *to* in (1)-(4) does not express the specification of the interrogative force. The particle *to* is also used in the cleft construction. This is illustrated in (5).

- (5) [Ondai-e iku toyuu yakusoku-ba ippootekini  
 music college-to go that promise-ACC unilaterally  
 yabutta to]-wa oi ya ken gakuhi igai-wa  
 broke C-TOP I COP because school expenses except-TOP  
 zikatsu-suru ken.  
 self-support-do SP  
 ‘Because it is I who unilaterally broke the promise that I go to a  
 music college, I will make my own living except for school  
 expenses.’

(*Shourounagashi*, p. 86.)

In (5), *to* is used to mark the presupposition clause of the cleft construction. The bracketed clause head by *to* expresses a proposition and it is not a question. This consideration points to the possibility that *to* used in questions like (1)-(4) is not an instance of an interrogative complementizer. The straightforward evidence for this view is provided by the following examples, in which the particle *to* is followed by another particle *kai*.

- (6) a. Kono koto sittchoru to kai?  
 this thing know C Y/N-QP  
 ‘Do you know this?’  
 b. Sikararete naichyoru to kai?  
 scolded-was-because crying-is C Y/N-QP  
 ‘Are you crying because you were scolded?’

As described by Chiba (1979), the particle *to* is exclusively used in yes-no questions.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the particle *-kai* is incompatible with wh-questions, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of the following examples:

- (7) a. \*Dare-ga kuru kai?  
 who-NOM come Y/N-QP  
 ‘Who is coming?’

---

<sup>4</sup> See also Yoshida (1998).

- b. \*Donokurai samui kai?  
 how much cold Y/N-QP  
 ‘How cold is it?’

In contrast, *-(n)dai* is exclusively used in wh-questions:

- (8) a. Dare-ga kuru ndai?  
 who-NOM come WH-QP  
 ‘Who is coming?’  
 b. Donokurai samui ndai?  
 how much cold WH-QP  
 ‘How cold is it?’  
 c. Sono hito-wa dare dai?  
 that person-TOP who WH-QP  
 ‘Who is that person?’

If it is *-kai* that marks the sentences in (6) as a question, then *to* must be taken to instantiate a lower head in the right periphery of the clause. This consideration further suggests that questions ending with *to* in Nagasaki dialect involve a complex structure, in which a phonetically null interrogative complementizer occurs above *to*. As a first approximation, we may present something like (9) as the structure of wh-questions with *to*:

- (9) [CP<sub>2</sub> [CP<sub>1</sub> [IP Doko-ni ikitaka]][C<sub>1</sub> to][C<sub>2</sub> +Q ]] (=4a)

We can make the same argument for wh-questions. The particle *to* in wh-questions can be also followed by another particle *ka*.

- (10) a. Nan-ba sito to ka?  
 what-ACC doing-is C Q  
 ‘What are you doing?’ (Sakaguchi 1998: 58)  
 b. Totsuzen nan-ba ii-dasu to ka?  
 suddenly what-ACC start-saying C Q  
 ‘What are you saying suddenly?’ (*Nagasaki Orandamura*, p. 62.)

- c. Musukosan-to dogansite comyunikeisyon-siyoru to desu ka?  
 son-with how communication-do C COP Q  
 ‘How do you communicate with your son?’  
 (Nagasaki Orandamura, p. 30.)
- d. Yotsu-te dare-ga taberu to desu ka?  
 four-you.say who-NOM eat C COP Q  
 ‘Four pieces, who eats them?’ (Nagasaki Orandamura, p. 61.)
- e. Tabun zibun-ga nan-ba siyuru to ka  
 perhaps self-NOM what-ACC doing-was C Q  
 wakaranyatta desyo ne.  
 know-not COP SP  
 ‘Perhaps, she did not know what she was doing.’  
 (Nagasaki Orandamura, p. 81.)

(a)-(d) sentences in (10) are matrix wh-questions, and (10e) is an embedded wh-question. In these examples, *to* linearly precedes *ka*, which is commonly analyzed as an interrogative complementizer. Then, it is plausible that *to* found in questions does not express the specification of the interrogative force. In Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011), I made the same observation about the particle *no* found in interrogative sentences in standard Japanese. As illustrated in (11), the particle *no* is typically found at the end of the interrogative sentence, and therefore it is commonly analyzed as a complementizer with the interrogative force within the generative studies of Japanese.

- (11) a. Taroo-wa nani-o katta no?  
 -TOP what-ACC bought C  
 ‘What did Taroo buy?’
- b. Kinoo Tanaka sensee-ni atta no?  
 yesterday Prof-DAT saw C  
 ‘Did you see Prof. Tanaka yesterday?’

As shown in (12), the particle *ka* together with the copula *desu* can be added above *no*.

- (12) a. Taroo-wa nani-o katta no desu ka?  
 -TOP what-ACC bought C COP Q  
 ‘What did Taroo buy?’  
 b. Kinoo Tanaka sensee-ni atta no desu ka?  
 yesterday Prof-DAT saw C COP Q  
 ‘Did you see Prof. Tanaka yesterday?’

Again if *ka* is a manifestation of interrogative force, then *no* must be taken to instantiate a lower head in the CP zone, which is with no illocutionary force. Based on this and other pieces of evidence, it was suggested in Kuwabara (2010a,b, 2011) that *no* in questions like (11)-(12) is a manifestation of Fin, whereas *ka* is a manifestation of Force, as illustrated in (14), adopting Rizzi’s (1997, 2001) articulated CP structure given in (13).<sup>5</sup>

(13) Force Top Int(errogative) Top Foc Top Fin IP (Rizzi 2001: 289)

(14) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> Taroo-wa nani-o katta]] [<sub>Fin</sub> no]] [<sub>Foc</sub> (desu)]]  
 [<sub>Force</sub> (ka)] (= (11a)/(12a))

The parallel between *no* and *to* seems to be unmistakable. Therefore, I can suggest that wh-questions ending with *to* like (4) has the same structure as (14), in which *to* occupies Fin and the interrogative force is expressed by the phonetically null Force head:<sup>6, 7</sup>

(15) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> Doko-ni ikitaka]] [<sub>Fin</sub> to ]] [<sub>Force</sub> +Q]] (= (4a))

The proposal about the particle *to* as a Fin head immediately leads us to expect that *to* may also appear in clauses with declarative force. This is confirmed by the following examples, in which *to* occurs in declarative sentences:

<sup>5</sup> TopP is left out in (14), as it is not directly relevant to the ensuing discussion.

<sup>6</sup> As we saw with (10), the particle *to* can be optionally followed by the copula, which I assume to be located in the Foc head, and the question particle. Thus, more precisely I assume that the null Foc head is present in (15). But I have left out the Foc head, as it is not directly relevant to the present discussion.

<sup>7</sup> I assume that yes-no questions with *to* like (3) also have the same structure as (15), but I will not discuss them in this paper. For the discussion on the interaction of yes-no questions with the complementizer system, see Kuwabara (2010b).

- (16) a. Ippen koko-kara oritakatta to.  
 one time here-from wanted-to-go-down C  
 ‘I always wanted to go down from here.’  
 (*Shourounagashi*, p. 67.)
- b. Otooto-ga kawa-ni otite, anta damatte mitotta  
 younger brother-NOM river-in fell, you silent-was saw  
 to ne!!  
 C SP  
 ‘When your brother fell in the river, you just watched and did  
 nothing.’ (*Shourounagashi*, p. 69.)
- c. Nyoo-bo-mo yoo syaberu to desu yo.  
 wife-also much talk C COP SP  
 ‘My wife talks a lot, too.’ (*Nagasaki Orandamura*, p. 16.)

The examples in (16) are taken from novels, and they all express propositions rather than questions. This is consistent with our proposal. The particle *to* expresses the specification of finiteness and the illocutionary force of the sentence is expressed by the null Force head. Therefore, the particle *to* in principle should be compatible with different clause types other than a question.

## 2.2. The Interaction of *To* with a Reason Wh-Adjunct

This subsection discusses the observation that seems to present a challenge to the current proposal about *to*.

As shown in (4), *to* appears in wh-questions, but its presence is optional. Thus, wh-questions ending with a finite verb are acceptable, as illustrated in (17).

- (17) a. Doko-ni ikitaka?  
 where-to want-to-go  
 ‘Where do you want to go?’
- b. Dono hito-ba sitoru?  
 which person-ACC know  
 ‘Which person do you know?’

- c. Dono hon-ba yomitaka?  
which book-ACC want-to-read  
'Which book do you want to read?'
- d. Itsu-made Tokyo-ni oru?  
when-until -in stay  
'Until when will you stay in Tokyo?'
- e. Nan-no hana-ga saitotta?  
what-GEN flower-NOM bloom-was  
'What flowers were in bloom?'

In contrast with those wh-phrases in (17), the reason wh-adjunct *nasite* corresponding to *naze* in standard Japanese behaves differently. Unlike other wh-phrases, *nasite* requires the presence of the complementizer *to*. According to my informant, the omission of *to* in (18) renders the sentences unacceptable.

- (18) a. Deteyukutoni nasite kireini-suru ??\*(to)?  
leave-even-if why clean-do C  
'Why do we clean up even if we are leaving?'  
(*Shourounagashi*, p. 39.)
- b. Nasite ikan ??\*(to)?  
why go-not C  
'Why aren't you going?'
- c. Nasite kogen okureta ??\*(to)?  
why so late-was C  
'Why were you so late?'
- d. Nasite Tokyo-ni oru ??\*(to)  
why -in stay C  
'Why do you stay in Tokyo?'

The same contrast is also found in standard Japanese. While the complementizer *no* is obligatory for *naze*, its presence is not required for other wh-phrases (Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011)).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See also Noda (1995, 1997), and Yoshida and Yoshida (1996).

- (19) a. Taroo-wa naze mada sonna koto-o itteiru ??\*(no)?  
 -TOP why still such thing-ACC saying-is C  
 ‘Why is Taroo still saying such a thing?’
- b. Naze itsumo okurete kuru ??\*(no)?  
 why always late come C  
 ‘Why do you always come late?’
- c. Hanako-wa naze naiteita ??\*(no)?  
 -TOP why crying-was C  
 ‘Why was Hanako crying?’
- d. Naze Aso-san-wa wakamono-ni ninki-ga  
 why -Mr.-TOP young people-among popularity-NOM  
 atta ??\*(no)?  
 was C  
 ‘Why was Mr. Aso popular among young people?’
- (20) a. Dare-ga kita (no)?  
 who-NOM came C  
 ‘Who came?’
- b. Ohiru-ni nani-o tabeta (no)?  
 lunch-for what-ACC ate C  
 ‘What did you eat for lunch?’
- c. Ano hon-wa doko-ni oita (no)?  
 that book-TOP where-on put C  
 ‘Where did you put that book?’
- d. Ano purezento-wa dare-ni ageta (no)?  
 that present-TOP who-DAT gave C  
 ‘To whom did you give that present?’

The asymmetry between reason wh-adjuncts and other wh-phrases discussed above provides an additional rationale for the parallel drawn for *to* and *no*, but it also raises a novel question: why does ‘why’ require the presence of the complementizer that does not indicate the interrogative force?

### 3. Two Types of C Heads for Wh-Interrogatives

In this section, I first present the main features of the analysis offered in

Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011) for the contrast between (19) and (20), and then show that the same analysis can be straightforwardly extended to the similar contrast in Nagasaki dialect. I argued that the peculiar interaction between *naze* and *no* can be accounted for by adopting Rizzi's (2001) proposal about positing two types of C heads for licensing wh-phrases. What is of direct concern to us here is the C head Int(errogative) in (13)(repeated here as (21)), which is dedicated for 'why' in a space above FinP and below ForceP.

(21) Force Top Int(errogative) Top Foc Top Fin IP

The evidence for the postulation of Int in part comes from the interaction between focalized expressions and wh-phrases. As shown in (22), most wh-phrases in Italian cannot co-occur with a focalized expression. By contrast, *perché* 'why' in Italian may co-occur with a focus but must precede it, as shown in (23) (Rizzi 2001: 290, 294).

(22) a. \*A chi QUESTO hanno detto (non qualcos'altro)?  
to whom this have said not something else  
'Lit. To whom THIS they said (not something else)?'

b. \*QUESTO a chi hanno detto (non qualcos'altro)?  
this to whom have said not something else  
'Lit. THIS to whom they said (not something else)?'

(23) a. Perché QUESTO avremmo dovuto dirgli, non qualcos'altro?  
why this had should say.him not something else  
'Lit. Why THIS we should have said to him, not something else?'

b. \*QUESTO perché avremmo dovuto dirgli, non qualcos'altro?  
this why had should say.him not something else  
'Lit. THIS why we should have said to him, not something else?'

The incompatibility in (22) indicates that a wh-phrase moves to the Spec of FocP, and therefore it competes with a focused constituent for this position. The contrast in (23), on the other hand, shows that *perché* is licensed in a position higher than Foc.



On the other hand, if there is, for example, a topic to be accommodated in the left periphery of the clause, the force and finiteness system must split into two analytical complementizers which sandwich the Topic head; otherwise, either one or the other specification would not be adjacent to its selecting or selected domain. Therefore, in topic bearing sentences like (27), a specification of force is manifested by an analytical complementizer *that*, whereas a specification of finiteness is manifested by a phonetically null complementizer (Fin).

- (27) I think [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force</sub> that] next year<sub>i</sub> Top [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>Fin</sub> 0][<sub>IP</sub> John will win the prize t<sub>i</sub>]]] +decl +fin

Thus, under the split C system, the accessory components, if present, will be inevitably sandwiched in between two analytical complementizers.

I assume that the Int head is also an accessory component in the C system, as it is a position dedicated for ‘why’. This invites the conclusion that the split between Force and Finiteness is enforced in the presence of Int. We saw with the examples in (12) that *no* occurs in a position immediately above the finite verb and below the question particle *ka*. Thus, it seems reasonable that *no* is a pure analytical complementizer expressing finiteness. On the other hand, it must be the case that *ka* expresses interrogative force and may optionally express finiteness, since it can be also used without *no*, as illustrated in (28).

- (28) a. Taroo-wa nani-o kai-masi-ta ka?  
 -TOP what-ACC buy-POL-PAST Q  
 ‘What did Taroo buy?’  
 b. Dare-ga ki-masi-ta ka?  
 who-NOM come-POL Q  
 ‘Who came?’

Therefore, we can assume the following feature compositions for *ka* and *no*:

- (29) a. *ka* = +interrogative, (+fin)  
 b. *no* = +fin

In Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011), I argued that the seemingly peculiar interaction between the non-interrogative complementizer *no* with *naze* stems from the fact that the Int head is an accessory component in the C system. I suggested that the LF interface needs to be signaled for the activation of the accessory components, unless they are activated directly by overt movement. Since *naze* is in situ, the activation of the Int head must be signaled by the presence of a pure analytical complementizer *no*. The presence of *ka* alone cannot serve as a signal for the activation of the accessory components in the CP zone, as it can be also a syncretic head expressing the force and finiteness. Thus, if *no* is present, an example like (19a) is assumed to have a structure like (25), in which *naze* covertly moves to the Spec of IntP, and is licensed there. On the other hand, without *no*, a question like (19a) will have a structure like (30), where an Int head is not activated, and hence *naze* fails to be licensed.

(30) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> Taroo-wa naze ...sonna koto-o itteiru]] [<sub>Force</sub> +Q, +fin ]]

? ←—————|

Wh-phrases other than *naze* are licensed by the Force head, as shown in (24). As opposed to the Int head, the Force head, being a core component in the C system, is assumed to be present in all clausal structures (Rizzi (1997: 288)). The presence of the Force head need not be signaled by the presence of the pure analytical complementizer *no*.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, wh-phrases other than *naze* can be licensed even in the absence of *no*.

Once we pay close attention to the cartographical aspect of *no* and *ka*, the asymmetry between *naze* and other wh-phrases regarding the choice of complementizers can be made to follow from the current proposal about the activation of the accessory components together with the theoretical assumptions independently needed for the split C system.

In the preceding section, we saw that a reason wh-adjunct *nasite* in

---

<sup>10</sup> The analysis of wh-questions presented in this section leads us to assume that an accessory component is activated in wh-questions with *no* like (20). That it is indeed the case can be seen in examples like (12a), in which the copula, which is assumed to be a realization of Foc, is sandwiched between *no* and *ka*. For the discussion on this point, see Kuwabara (2011).



Japanese dialectology. I argued, however, that *to* is a complementizer which expresses the specification of finiteness and does not indicate the interrogative force. I further presented the observation that seems to speak against the proposal: a reason wh-adjunct *nasite* requires the presence of *to*. It was shown that this peculiar interaction is the same interaction discussed in Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011) between the particle *no* and a reason wh-adjunct in standard Japanese. I argued that the analysis offered for the behavior of *naze* in Kuwabara (2010a, b, 2011), which is based on Rizzi's (2001) proposal about positing a special Int head for 'why', can be straightforwardly extended to account for the seemingly puzzling behavior of *nasite* regarding the interaction with the non-interrogative complementizer *to*.

The interaction of the complementizer system with the reason wh-adjuncts discussed in this paper has indicated that Italian and Japanese are alike in terms of the organization of the elements in the left/right periphery. This study has also shown that the cartographic approach allows us to make advances in exploring various dialectal phenomena and integrating the findings into a larger theoretical frame.

## References

- Atago, Hachiro Yasutaka (1976) "Hizen-Nagasaki Chihoo no Juntaijoshi 'to' ni tsuite (On the Nominalizing Particle 'to' in the Hizen-Nagasaki Region)," *Bulletin of Faculty of Education, Nagasaki University, Humanistic Science* 25, 214-224.
- Chiba, Shuji (1979) "On Interrogative Particles *-kai* and *-dai*," *Journal of Tsuda College* 11, 153-156.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Endo, Yoshio (2007) *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Hiraiwa, Ken, and Shinichiro Ishihara (2002) "Missing Links: Clefts, Sluicing, and "No da" Construction in Japanese," *The Proceedings*

- of *HUMIT 2001, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 43*, ed. by Tania Ionin, Heejeon Ko and Adrew Nevins, 35-54, MITWPL, Cambridge, MA.
- Kose, Junichi (1971) “Shimabara-hanto no Jyoshi (Sono 3) (Particles in Shimabara Peninsula Dialects, Part 3),” *Bulletin of Aichi University of Education Humanities and Social Sciences* 20, 167-181.
- Kuwabara, Kazuki (2010a) “Reason Wh-Adjuncts and Their Interactions with Complementizers,” *Studies in Language Sciences (Special Issue): The Cartography of Discourse: A Unified Analysis of Main Clauses and Subordinate Clauses*, ed. by Yoshio Endo, 251-283, Graduate School of Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba.
- Kuwabara, Kazuki (2010b) “Nihongo ni okeru Hobunhyoushiki no Sentaku to CP Ryouiki no Kouzou (On the Choice of Complementizers in Japanese Questions and the Structure of CP),” *Tougoron no Shintenkai to Nihongo Kenkyuu* (New Trends in Syntax and the Study of Japanese), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 95-127, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Kuwabara, Kazuki (2011) “Hobunhyoushiki to Wh-ku no Kyouki-kankei ni tsuite; Riyuu-o Arawasu Wh-fukashi-o Chuushin-ni (On the Co-occurrence Relations between Complementizers and Wh-Phrases; With Special Reference to Reason Wh-Adjuncts),” *70-nendai Seiseibunpoo Saininshiki: Nihongo-kenkyuu no Chihei* (Reevaluating the Research in Generative Syntax in 70s: The Horizon of Japanese Linguistics), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 151-176, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Noda, Harumi (1995) “...Noka?, ...No?, ...Ka?, ...ø?: Shitsumonbun no Bunmatsu no Katachi (...Noka?, ...No?, ...Ka?, ...ø?: the Sentence Final Forms of Questions),” *Nihongo Ruigihyougen no Bunpoo (Jo) Tanbun Hen* (Grammar of Synonymous Expressions in Japanese (Volume 1): Simple Sentences), ed. by Tatsuo Miyajima and Yoshio Nitta, 210-219, Kurosio, Tokyo.
- Noda, Harumi (1997) *‘No (da)’ no Kinou* (The Functions of ‘No (da)’), Kurosio, Tokyo.
- Ono, Hajime (2006) *An Investigation of Exclamatives in English and*

- Japanese: Syntax and Sentence Processing*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2001) "On the Position "Int(errogative)" in the Left Periphery of the Clause," *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi, 287-296, Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Sakaguchi, Itaru (1998) *Nagasaki-ken no Kotoba* (Dialects in Nagasaki Prefecture), Meijisyoin, Tokyo.
- Yoshida, Keiko and Tomoyuki Yoshida (1996) "Question Marker Drop in Japanese," *ICU Language Research Bulletin* 11, 37-54.
- Yoshida, Tomoyuki (1998) "Wh-Operator vs., Yes/No-Operator," *ICU Language Research Bulletin* 13, 159-172.

### **Data Source**

- Murakami, Ryu (1995) *Nagasaki Orandamura*, Koudansha, Tokyo.
- Sada, Masashi (2003) *Shouounagashi*, Gentosha, Tokyo.

Department of English  
Kanda University of International Studies  
1-4-1 Wakaba, Mihama-ku  
Chiba-shi, Chiba-ken  
261-0014, JAPAN  
*kuwabara@kanda.kuis.ac.jp*