Chengdong Wang*

On the syntax and pragmatics of the 'why + not + XP' construction: a cartographic approach

https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2024-0101
Received November 29, 2024; accepted August 5, 2025

Abstract: This article argues that the 'why + not + XP' construction is similar to Stripping and why-Stripping in some aspects, but it has its unique representation and derivation. As syntax encodes information that helps realize the performance of speech act, this article proposes that a syntactic structure consists of a representation of the addressor and the addressee high above in syntax; there is a response layer below and the proposition is realized in the CP layer. Accordingly, syntax is interfaced with pragmatics in the 'why + not + XP' construction. This article also argues that the derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction involves the covert movement of the DP to [Spec, FocP] and the base-generation of the *wh*-phrase *why* in [Spec, ForceP]; the negative marker *not* is base-generated in the specifier of a polarity phrase which is sandwiched between ForceP and FocP; a subsequent deletion of FinP at PF derives the well-formed 'why + not + DP' construction. This analysis can also be extended to the explanation of similar constructions with VP, PP, AP, AdvP and CP remnants and the construction with 'why + not', thus providing a principled explanation of the 'why + not + XP' construction.

Keywords: ellipsis; cartography; why not; syntax and pragmatics

1 Introduction

The topic of ellipsis has been attracting an increasing amount of attention in the field of linguistics, particularly in syntax, largely because of its unique structures. Specifically, some syntactic structures, though being deleted at Phonetic Form, still have a complete semantic interpretation at Logical Form.

Stripping has been studied by syntacticians (Chao 1987; Depiante 2000; Hankamer and Sag 1976; Lobeck 1995; Merchant 2004; Ortega-Santos et al. 2014; Yoshida et al. 2015, among many others) and it has been argued that Stripping involves an

***Corresponding author: Chengdong Wang**, Dalian University of Foreign Languages, Dalian, China, E-mail: chengdongw@163.com

overt movement of focused elements and a deletion of parts of structures. In a typical example of Stripping in English in (1a), the focused element *a pineapple* has the same semantic interpretation as the second conjunct in (1b) and the DP *a pineapple* forms a contrast with its correlate *an apple* in the first conjunct.

(1) a. Mary bought *an apple*, and *a pineapple*, too.
b. Mary bought *an apple*, and Mary bought *a pineapple*, too.

Besides, the *wh*-phrase *why*, the negative marker *not* and the sequence *why not* can be placed in front of the DP in the second conjunct, as shown in (2).

(2) a. Mary bought *an apple*, but **why** *an apple*?
b. Mary bought *an apple*, but **not** *a pineapple*.
c. Mary bought *an apple*, but **why not** *a pineapple*?

In addition to DPs, other phrases, such as PP, VP, AP, AdvP and even CP, can also follow the sequence *why not*, as exemplified in (3a-e). Furthermore, the sequence *why not* can occur alone without being followed by any other constituents, as in (3f).

(3) a. Lily went to the park with John, but *why not* **[$_{PP}$ with Tom]**?
b. Richard should sell his bike, but *why not* **[$_{VP}$ lend his bike]**?
c. Lucy made too strong a cappuccino, but *why not* **[$_{AP}$ slightly mild]**?
d. Jim finished the job carelessly, but *why not* **[$_{AdvP}$ carefully]**?
e. John sometimes believes that he could become a famous movie star, but *why not* **[$_{CP}$ that he could become a well-known writer]**?
f. "Do you want Italian food tonight?" "*Why not*?"

In the literature, why-Stripping has been studied in English, Spanish, Japanese, Korean and other languages (Kim et al. 2021; Nakao et al. 2013; Ortega-Santos et al. 2014; Weir 2014; Yoshida et al. 2015, etc.). However, there are few previous studies investigating the syntax and pragmatics of the 'why + not + XP' construction. Weir (2014) and Yoshida et al. (2015) have specified the syntactic position of the negative marker *not* in their discussion of why-Stripping, that is, the negative marker *not* is adjoined to the right of the *wh*-phrase *why*, but they didn't go into details regarding the basic properties of the 'why + not + XP' construction, its derivational mechanism and the syntax-pragmatics interface. Admittedly, the 'why + not + XP' construction is not an entirely novel structure and it is similar to Stripping and why-Stripping in terms of some basic properties. However, the 'why + not + XP' construction has its unique representation and derivation. This article explores the syntax and pragmatics of the 'why + not + XP' construction from the perspective of the Cartographic Approach (Cinque 1999; Cinque and Rizzi 2010; Rizzi 1997, 2001, 2013; Rizzi and Cinque 2016). I agree with Yoshida et al. (2015) that the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in why-Stripping, but I claim that the *wh*-phrase *why* is closely related to the antecedent

clause and the constituent in its c-commanding domain and the negative marker *not* is base-generated in a polarity phrase outside of TP; besides, the antecedent clause, the *wh*-phrase *why*, the negative marker *not* and the constituent within TP all play a crucial role in determining the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of the sentence. In addition, I propose that there is a syntactic structure high above in syntax and this structure consists of a representation of the addressor and the addressee and a response layer; accordingly, syntax can be interfaced with pragmatics in the 'why + not + XP' construction.

The organization of this article is as follows. Section 2 presents the basic properties of the 'why + not + DP' construction. Section 3 first focuses on and provides an explanation of the 'why + not + DP' construction and then extends the explanation to similar constructions with VPs, PPs, APs, AdvPs or CPs remnants and also to the construction with no constituents following 'why + not', thus providing a principled explanation of the syntax and pragmatics of the 'why + not + XP' construction. Section 4 concludes this article.

2 Basic properties of the 'why + not + DP' construction

At first glance, it seems as if the 'why + not + DP' construction is derived from the collective consequence of Sluicing and Stripping, as they both involve the syntactic operations of movement and deletion.

Specifically, in a typical example of Sluicing in English as in (4a), the *wh*-phrase *who*, being a complement to the predicate *met*, has moved from its base position within TP to [Spec, CP], followed by a subsequent deletion of the complement of C, namely TP, at PF (Merchant 2001; Ross 1969, etc.), as in (4b).

(4) a. Mary met someone yesterday, but we don't know *who*.
b. Mary met someone yesterday, but we don't know [$_{CP}$ *who*$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~Mary met t$_i$ yesterday~~]].

In a parallel fashion, in a typical example of Stripping in English as in (5a), the DP *a pear* has undergone focus movement from within TP to [Spec, FocP] and then TP is deleted at PF, thus stranding the remnant DP *a pear* (Depiante 2000; Nakao 2008; Yoshida et al. 2015, etc.), as in (5b).

(5) a. Tom ate a banana, but not *a pear*.
b. Tom ate a banana, but [$_{CP}$ not [$_{FocP}$ [$_{DP}$ *a pear*]$_i$] [$_{TP}$ ~~Tom ate t$_i$~~]].

2.1 The 'why + not + DP' construction, Sluicing and Stripping

A careful observation indicates that the 'why + not + DP' construction is not derived from Sluicing and Stripping and that the three constructions have different syntactic representations and properties.

First, in a typical example of Sluicing in English, there is no restriction on the type of *wh*-phrases that can occur in the structure, as shown in (6a); however, there is a strict restriction on the type of *wh*-phrases that can appear in the 'why + not + DP' construction; only the *wh*-phrase *why* (or *how come*) is acceptable while other *wh*-phrases are excluded, as in (6b).

(6) a. Mary met someone, but we have no idea *who* / *when* / *where* / *why* / *how*.
b. Mary bought an apple, but *why* / *how come* / **who* / **when* / **where* / **how* not a pineapple?

Second, only matrix clauses can accommodate Stripping, while embedded clauses cannot, as in (7a) and (7b); however, the 'why + not + DP' construction can not only occur in matrix clauses but also in embedded clauses, as in (7c) and (7d).

(7) a. Mary bought an apple, but not *a pineapple*.
b. *Mary bought an apple, but we think not *a pineapple*.
c. Mary bought an apple, but *why not a pineapple*?
d. Mary bought an apple, but we would like to know *why not a pineapple*?

In addition to these differences, the remnant in the 'why + not + DP' construction can be contrasted with a correlate in the antecedent clause or repeated from the antecedent clause, as in (8a) and (8b); in contrast, the remnant in Stripping can only be contrasted with a correlate in the antecedent clause, as in (8c), and the remnant in why-Stripping is repeated from the antecedent clause, as in (8d).

(8) a. John is looking for *an action film*, but why not *a science fiction film*?
b. John isn't looking for *an action film*, but why not *an action film*?
c. Mary ate *an apple*, but not *a pear*.
d. Mary bought *a magazine*, but why *a magazine*?

In this respect, the 'why + not + DP' construction behaves like Stripping and why-Stripping in terms of the properties of the remnant,[1] but the 'why + not + DP'

1 One of the anonymous reviewers has pointed out island-effect in Sluicing, Stripping and why-Stripping. It has been observed that Sluicing and why-Stripping are island-insensitive (Merchant 2001; Yoshida et al. 2015), while Stripping is island-sensitive. Regarding 'why + not + XP' construction, it is also island-insensitive, a property which it shares with Sluicing and why-Stripping. As this section is devoted to the discussion of differences, I will not discuss the island-insensitiveness here.

construction differs from Sluicing, Stripping and why-Stripping in one way or another and it is not a collective consequence of the three constructions.

2.2 The 'why + not + DP' construction and Sluice stripping

Another construction which resembles the 'why + not + DP' construction is called Sluice stripping (Nevins 2008), the derivation of which involves a *wh*-remnant and a non-*wh*-remnant, followed by a subsequent deletion of other constituents at PF. A typical example of Sluice stripping is shown in (9).

(9) a. Lou will ask Doris about syntax, but I can't imagine [*who*] [*about phonology*].
b. Lou will ask Doris about syntax, but I can't imagine [$_{CP2}$ [$_{CP1}$ [*who*]$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~he will ask t$_i$ t$_k$~~]] [$_{PP}$ *about phonology*]$_k$].

According to Nevins, the derivation of (9) involves the leftward movement of the *wh*-phrase *who* to [Spec, CP_1] and the rightward movement of the PP *about phonology* out of the TP containing it, followed by an adjunction of the PP to the CP_1 and a deletion of the TP at PF.

It appears as if the 'why + not + DP' construction and Sluice stripping share common properties in that both constructions contain a *wh*-remnant and a non-*wh*-remnant and both involve a deletion operation at PF. However, the two constructions differ in at least two aspects.

First, other *wh*-phrases are acceptable in Sluice stripping apart from the *wh*-phrase *why*, as in (10a), but the 'why + not + DP' construction can only accommodate the *wh*-phrase *why* (or *how come*) while other *wh*-phrases are not acceptable, as in (10b).

(10) a. Lou will ask Doris about syntax, but I can't imagine *who* / **why about phonology*.
b. Mary studies syntax, but we wonder *why* / *how come* / **who* / **where* not semantics.

Second, Nevins proposed that Sluice stripping involves a rightward movement of the non-*wh*-remnant. One of the reviewers has rightly pointed out that, according to Rochemont (1986) and Kim (1997), focus movement of a constituent to the right is possible in English. Accordingly, it is appealing to assume that the DP also undergoes a rightward movement in the 'why + not + DP' construction. However, the rightward movement of a focused constituent is based on the assumption that the specifier of FocP is final (Kim 1997). In other words, the specifier is to the right of the head of FocP and the complement is to the left of the head. Besides, in Kim's analysis of Sluicing in English, both CP and TP are head-initial which makes it difficult to explain why only the FocP is head-final while other phrases are head-initial.

In addition, a heavy DP can undergo rightward raising out of the TP in which it is contained (heavy DP shift), as in (11b). In contrast, it sounds weird for a light DP or a pronoun to do the same, as in (12b) and (12d). However, in the 'Why + not + DP' construction, both the heavy DP and the light DP can occur, as in (13).

(11) a. John bought [a book written by Noam Chomsky] [yesterday].
b. John bought [t_i] [yesterday] [a book written by Noam Chomsky]$_i$.

(12) a. John bought [a book] [yesterday].
b. *John bought [t_i] [yesterday] [a book]$_i$.
c. John met [him] [yesterday].
d. *John met [t_i] [yesterday] [him]$_i$.

(13) a. John bought [a book written by Noam Chomsky] [yesterday], but why not [a book written by Jason Merchant]?
b. John bought [an apple] [yesterday], but why not [a pear]?
c. John refused [her] [yesterday], but why not [him]?

Accordingly, I assume that the DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction involves a leftward movement.

2.3 An interim summary

After presenting the basic properties of the 'why + not + DP' construction, I argue that it is not derived from Sluicing, Stripping and Sluice stripping because it imposes strict restrictions on the type of *wh*-phrases and it has its unique properties and representations. Besides, I suggest that there is a syntax-pragmatics interface in the 'why + not + DP' construction which connects syntactic structure and the speech act it performs. The next section discusses the syntactic derivation and the syntax-pragmatics interface of the 'why + not + DP' construction and then the analysis is extended to similar constructions with PP, VP, AP, AdvP and even CP remnant as well as the construction with 'why not' only.

3 The approach

3.1 The theoretical framework

Cartography is a research program within the Government and Binding framework of syntactic theory. According to Cinque and Rizzi (2010), the purpose of the Cartographic approach is to draw maps of syntactic structures as precise and detailed as

possible. Its research projects involve the study of functional categories, their content, number and order. Although the concept of Cartography was first proposed by Cinque (1999), Rizzi (1997) was the first explicitly cartographic study of the complementizer space, or the clausal left periphery (Shlonsky 2010). Rizzi (1997) proposed that the functions of complementizers can be divided into two systems, namely the force-finiteness system and the topic-focus system, with the former being the essential part while the latter being present in a structure only if needed. Therefore, the linear order of these two systems is as follows:

(14) Force… (Topic) … (Focus)… Finite

In addition, the speech act that is performed by making an utterance and the meaning which the utterance conveys are connected. In other words, syntax provides the basic framework that makes possible the performance of a speech act and the conveyance of meaning. Although in recent theories of syntax, topics related to speech act have been left to the study of semantics and pragmatics (Haegeman and Hill 2013; Hill 2007; Speas and Tenny 2003; Tenny 2006; Wiltschko and Heim 2016; Zu 2018), the research findings have contributed to the study of syntacticization of discourse. Performing a speech act involves both the addressor and the addressee. In the syntacticization of discourse, there should be a representation of the addressor and the addressee in syntax and this representation is structurally located above the actual utterance.

3.2 The syntax-pragmatics interface

On the basis of analyses of Miyagawa (2010, 2012, 2017, 2022), Oguro (2015), Ross (1970), Speas and Tenny (2003), Wiltschko (2014, 2017), it has been suggested that syntax encodes information that helps realize the performance of speech act. Therefore, I propose that a syntactic structure consists of a representation of the addressor and the addressee (Addressor Addressee Phrase, AAP) high above in syntax; there is a response layer (Response Phrase, RespP) below and a proposition is realized in the CP layer. The AAP hosts the representation of the addressor and the addressee; the RespP represents the addressor's or the addressee's response to a discourse, such as making a suggestion, seeking further information, making a complaint or taking an offer. It is the AAP and RespP that function as the locus of the illocutionary force of an utterance. In other words, they serve as the syntax-pragmatics interface and help realize the performance of a speech act. Oguro (2017) has suggested that interrogative sentences can be divided into plain conjectual questions, polite conjectual questions and information-seeking questions, with the latter involving both the addressor and the addressee. The addressee is expected to respond to the addressor in a linguistic

communication. Accordingly, in the 'why + not + DP' construction, the addressor raises a constituent question and performs the speech act of seeking further information, making a suggestion or accepting an offer.

The syntax-pragmatics interface can also be applied to why-Stripping (Kim et al. 2021; Nakao et al. 2013; Ortega-Santos et al. 2014; Weir 2014; Yoshida et al. 2015, etc.) in that this construction also involves both the addressor and the addressee and that the addressor raises a question and performs a speech act of seeking further information from the addressee.

In the spirit of the Cartographic approach, CP can be further divided into Force Phrase (ForceP), Focus Phrase (FocP) and Finiteness Phrase (FinP). I follow Hofmann (2018), Ladusaw (1992), Laka (1990) and Potts (2002) in claiming that the negative marker *not* can project a polarity phrase (ΣP) above TP. This ΣP is headed by the negative marker *not* and it is sandwiched between ForceP and FocP. Therefore, the linear ordering of phrases relevant to the discussion can be represented as follows:

(15) AAP…RespP…ForceP…ΣP…FocP…FinP…TP

It is worth pointing out that when comparing examples (14) and (15) it is noticeable that the TopicP layer is missing. The reason is that TopicP is present in the structure only if needed (Rizzi 1997). According to my assumption, the hierarchical structure does not involve any topic, hence the absence of TopicP.

3.3 The overall structural computation

I agree with Yoshida et al. (2015) that the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated, specifically in [Spec, ForceP], thus typing the whole clause as being an interrogative (Cheng 1991). In addition, I suggest that the *wh*-phrase *why* is connected with the antecedent clause which serves as a presupposition for the former. Without an antecedent clause, the 'why + not + DP' construction will be ungrammatical, as the contrast shows in (16a) and (16b).

(16) a. John bought an apple, but why not a pear?
b. *Why not a pear?

In the meantime, the *wh*-phrase *why* is also focus-associated with a constituent within its c-commanding domain. On the basis of Hofmann (2018), Ladusaw (1992), Laka (1990) and Potts (2002), I assume that the polarity phrase (ΣP) is headed by the negative marker *not* and it is sandwiched between ForceP and FocP, the idea of which is different from Merchant (2006a) and Weir (2014), which state that the negative marker *not* is directly adjoined to the right of the *wh*-phrase *why*. It has to be pointed out that the 'why + not + DP' construction introduces sentential negation

rather than constituent negation. When the DP serves as a complement to the predicate verb, it can stay in-situ. Following Szendröi (2001), I assume that the conceptual-intentional interface can access both PF and LF and that both the syntactic and the prosodic representations feed into the conceptual-intentional system. Accordingly, the in-situ DP can be regarded as an information focus at PF (Kiss 1998; Kim 1997; Rochemont 1986), as represented by the DP *a sofa* in (17):

(17) Mary bought a table, but why did not Mary buy ***a sofa***?

Although the DP *a sofa* has received an interpretation of information focus in its base position, (17) is not the structure under discussion. Whichever constituent is deleted at PF, be it a VP, TP or FocP, the DP *a sofa* will also be deleted, making it impossible to generate the 'why + not + DP' construction. On the basis of Gärtner (2002), I suggest that the DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction has undergone covert movement to [Spec, FocP]. Besides, when the lower copy, which is supposed to be pronounced, is contained within an ellipsis domain, ellipsis forces the highest copy to be pronounced instead due to a requirement that focus be overtly realized. Regarding the syntax-pragmatics interface, the *wh*-phrase *why* is then moved from [Spec, ForceP] to [Spec, RespP] where it can be focus-associated with a constituent in its c-commanding domain. The RespP further projects into AAP which relates both the addressor and the addressee with the discourse. The APP and the RespP serve as the syntax-pragmatics interface, performing a speech act of seeking further information or accepting an offer. Finally, as Focus Condition on Ellipsis (Merchant 2001) is satisfied, FinP is deleted at PF, thus deriving a well-formed 'why + not + DP' construction.

3.4 Evidence for full-fledged syntax at the ellipsis site and for the movement of the DP out of the ellipsis site

In the 'why + not + DP' construction, I argue that the DP undergoes covert movement. Specifically, the DP has moved to [Spec, FocP] and such a movement is triggered by the weak [+Focus] feature of the head of FocP.

Given that the DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction involves covert movement, such an operation shares syntactic properties with the remnant *wh*-phrase in English Sluicing, as the latter also undergoes movement according to the PF deletion analysis (Kim 1997; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001, 2004, 2006b, 2008, 2010, 2013, 2015, 2016; Ross 1969, etc.). Merchant (2001) argued that the *wh*-phrase in English Sluicing undergoes leftward movement from within TP to [Spec, CP], followed by a subsequent deletion of the complement of C, namely TP, at PF, thus stranding the *wh*-phrase. The remnant *wh*-phrase is closely-related to the correlate in the antecedent clause, showcasing the connectivity effect, such as the Case effect, the Binding effect

and the Preposition-omission effect. Therefore, I assume that the DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction also displays connectivity effect with its correlate. Specifically, in this section, the Case effect is presented to provide evidence for full-fledged syntactic structure at the ellipsis site; the Binding effect and the Preposition-omission effect are presented to provide evidence for the movement of the DP out of the ellipsis site.

3.4.1 Case effect

Morphological case has different representations in different languages. English is impoverished in morphological case which can only be found in pronouns and DPs, with the former being represented as nominative case, accusative case and genitive case and the latter being only represented as genitive case, but German is rich in morphological case. (18a) and (18b) are revised examples from Merchant (2001, 2004, 2006b).

(18) a. Peter will **dem** Sekretär gefallen, aber warum nicht
Peter wants **the.**$_{\text{DAT}}$ secretary please, but why not
dem / *__den__ Chef?
the.$_{\text{DAT}}$ / *__the.__$_{\text{ACC}}$ boss
'Peter wants to please the secretary, but why not the boss?'

b. Peter will **den** Sekretär loben, aber warum nicht
Peter wants **the.**$_{\text{ACC}}$ secretary praise, but why not
*__dem__ / __den__ Chef?
*__the.__$_{\text{DAT}}$ / __the.__$_{\text{ACC}}$ boss
'Peter wants to praise the secretary, but why not the boss?'

In (18a), as the correlate *dem Sekretär* (the secretary) in the antecedent clause functions as the complement to the predicate *gefallen* (please), its morphological case is represented as dative case and therefore the DP *dem Chef* (the boss) in the second clause is also represented as dative case; however, in (18b), the correlate *den Sekretär* (the secretary), being the complement to the predicate *loben* (praise), has accusative case and the DP *den Chef* (the boss) in the second clause should also have accusative case.

Therefore, in the derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction, the DP and its correlate share the same functions in their own clause.

3.4.2 Binding effect

According to the Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981), an anaphor must be bound in its governing category and referential expressions must be free everywhere.

(19) a. John blamed Mary for the mistake, but *why not* **himself$_i$** [$_{TP}$ ~~***John$_i$*** ***blamed*** ***t$_i$***~~]?
b. *She is repainting all of these pictures, but *why not* **pictures of Mary$_i$** [$_{TP}$ ~~***she$_i$*** ***is repainting t$_i$***~~]?

In (19a), the anaphor *himself* is bound by the subject *John*, as indicated by the co-indexation. In (19b), the referential expression *Mary* is coindexed with and bound by the subject pronoun *she*, which violates the Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981) and results in ungrammaticality of the sentence. The Binding effect indicates that the DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction is originally located in a position where it is c-commanded by its antecedent. Since the lowest copy of the DP is within the ellipsis domain, after the covert movement of the DP has taken place, ellipsis of FinP at PF forces the highest copy to be pronounced due to a requirement that focus be overtly realized.

3.4.3 Preposition-omission effect

Merchant (2001) indicated that preposition-stranding is allowed in Sluicing if and only if it is allowed in the formation of a *wh*-question in a language. For example, in (20), the preposition *with* is stranded in the derivation of a *wh*-question with the *wh*-phrase *who* having moved to the front of the sentence alone.

(20) **Who$_i$** is Mary speaking ***with t$_i$***?

Likewise, in a Sluicing example in (21), the *wh*-phrase *who* can occur alone and the presence of the preposition *with* is optional.

(21) a. Mary is speaking with someone, but we have no idea **who$_i$** [$_{TP}$ ~~Mary is speaking~~ ~~**with t$_i$**~~].
b. Mary is speaking with someone, but we have no idea **[with who]$_j$** [$_{TP}$ ~~Mary is speaking~~ ~~**t$_j$**~~].

According to the PF deletion approach to the analysis of Sluicing in English, the absence of the preposition *with* is due to the assumption that only the *wh*-phrase *who* has undergone overt movement while the preposition *with* is stranded in-situ and is subsequently deleted at PF.

However, as argued by Craenenboeck (2010), there are apparent exceptions to the Preposition-Stranding Generalization (Merchant 2001). There are languages where preposition-stranding in nonelliptical contexts is not acceptable, but it seems much better under Sluicing. Spanish is one of the languages.

(22) *Qué chica rubia ha hablado Juan con?
what girl blonde has talked Juan with
INTENDED: 'What blonde girl did Juan talk to?'

(23) Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé cuál.
Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know which
'Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don't know which.'
(Craenenboeck 2010)

(22) and (23) appear to pose a serious threat to the Preposition-Stranding Generalization. However, Vicente (2008) argues that the underlying structure in (23) is not a preposition-stranding full *wh*-question, but rather a short cleft, as in (24).

(24) Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé
Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know
cuál ~~es~~ ~~pro~~.
which is it
'Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don't know which girl it was.'
(Craenenboeck 2010)

Accordingly, (23) no longer poses a threat to the Preposition-Stranding Generalization, because there is no preposition in the deleted structure and there is no instance of preposition-stranding either.

In the case of English, the Preposition-Stranding Generalization still holds. Accordingly, in the 'why + not + DP' construction, the DP *Lily* undergoes covert movement alone from the complement position of the preposition *with*, thus leaving the preposition *with* stranded in-situ and subsequently deleted at PF, as in (25a). The pied-piping of the preposition *with* and its complement DP *Lily* is provided in (25b) in order to allow for a clear examination of the movement patterns of the PP *with Lily* to mirror the one observed in (21b).

(25) a. Mary is speaking with John, but why not **[Lily]$_i$** [$_{TP}$ ~~*Mary is talking with* t_i~~]?
b. Mary is speaking with John, but why not **[with Lily]$_j$** [$_{TP}$ ~~*Mary is talking* t_j~~]?

The above linguistic facts have indicated that connectivity effect does exist in the 'why + not + DP' construction where the DP has undergone movement.

3.5 Syntactic functions of 'why' and 'not'

The *wh*-phrase *why* and the negative marker *not* share one common feature, that is, both can be associated with a constituent in their c-commanding domain. Bromberger (1992) has pointed out that the *wh*-phrase *why* in an interrogative sentence can be focus-associated with any constituent in its domain. Specifically, the answer to an interrogative sentence is determined by which constituent is focus-associated with the *wh*-phrase *why*.

(26) Why did Lucy borrow a pencil?

In (26), when the subject *Lucy* receives focus, a possible answer might be "Because Lucy is the only person who does not have a pencil"; when the object *a pencil* receives focus, we might respond "Because Lucy wants to draw a picture of the house with it"; likewise, when the VP *borrow a pencil* receives focus, a possible answer might be "Because Lucy does not want to buy a new one".

However, *wh*-phrases other than *why* in an interrogative sentence cannot be focus-associated with a constituent in their c-commanding domain.

(27) *Where* / *How* / *When* did Lucy borrow a pencil?

In (27), the answer to the question can only be about the place, the manner or the time about the event of Lucy borrowing a pencil. Therefore, only the *wh*-phrase *why* but not other *wh*-phrases can be focus-associated with a constituent in its c-commanding domain.

In a parallel fashion, the negative marker *not* also has the property of being associated with a constituent in its c-commanding domain and making it the target of negation.

(28) a. Mary didn't borrow the book from the library.
b. [$_{TP}$ Mary$_i$ didn't [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ borrow the book from the library]].

According to the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Fukui and Speas 1986; Kuroda 1988; Koopman and Sportiche 1985, etc.), all subjects originate in VP and are moved to their surface position. Therefore, the subject *Mary* originates in VP and is moved to [Spec, TP], as in (28b). According to Haegeman (1995), the negative marker *not* is base-generated in [Spec, NegP] and the NegP is located in front of VP, thus taking negation scope over VP which contains the base-generated subject *Mary*. In (28), when the subject *Mary* receives focus, the sentence states the fact that it is not Mary who borrowed the book from the library; when the object *the book* receives focus, the sentence might mean it isn't a book that Mary borrowed from the library; when the adjunct *from the library* receives focus, the sentence might mean the place Mary borrowed the book is not from the library and she might have borrowed it from one of her friends.

As both the *wh*-phrase *why* and the negative marker *not* share the property of being associated with a constituent in their c-commanding domain, both can be associated with a DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction.

3.6 Syntactic positions of 'why' and 'not'

As English is a *wh*-movement language, *wh*-phrases, except in echoic sentences, undergo overt movement to the front of a sentence in order to type the clause as being an interrogative, as in (29).

(29) Who$_i$ did Lucy meet ~~t_i~~ yesterday?

The *wh*-phrase *why* is no exception, which means *why* is usually involved in overt movement and this helps explain the ambiguity of the following sentence.

(30) Why did Mary say that Lucy bought a book?

(30) is ambiguous in that the *wh*-phrase *why* can be associated with both the matrix clause and the embedded clause. Specifically, the matrix clause interpretation is seeking for the reason why it is Mary who said that Lucy bought a book; the embedded clause interpretation is asking for the reason why Lucy bought a book from Mary's narrative. The ambiguity has to do with the overt movement of the *wh*-phrase *why* which is moved from the embedded clause to the matrix clause.

Although the *wh*-phrase *why* can undergo overt movement in English, Ko (2005) and Yoshida et al. (2015) have proposed that the *wh*-phrase *why* can be base-generated in [Spec, CP]. I follow their idea in suggesting that the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP] in the 'why + not + DP' construction and this is supported by the following evidence.

First, the *wh*-phrase *why* in the 'why + not + DP' construction can not only be focus-associated with a constituent in the matrix clause but also with the one in the embedded clause.

(31) a. Mary bought an apple, but why not *a pear*?
b. Mary bought an apple, but why not [$_{DP}$ *a pear*]$_i$ [~~Mary bought t_i~~]?
c. Tom denied that Mary bought an apple, but why not *a pear*?
d. Tom denied that Mary bought an apple, but why not [$_{DP}$ *a pear*]$_j$ ~~[Tom denied [$_{CP}$ that Mary bought t_j]]~~?

As indicated in (31a) and (31c), the focus association of the *wh*-phrase *why* with the DP *an apple* in the embedded clause shows that the relation between them is not mediated by movement of the *wh*-phrase *why* from around the DP. Besides, Merchant (2001) has pointed out that long-distance why-Sluicing cannot escape a finite clause, as shown in (32).

(32) *Mary said John left for a certain reason, but I don't know why.

The ungrammaticality of (32) shows a sharp contrast with (31c) in that the *wh*-phrase *why* in (31c) does not show such restriction, even though it is focus-associated with the DP in the embedded clause. Therefore, it is reasonable that the *wh*-phrase *why* does not move and it is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP].

Second, Collins (1991) stated that the *wh*-phrase *why* in sentences with quantifier phrases results in ambiguity.

(33) a. Why does everyone love Mary?
b. Why does everyone love **MARY**? (unambigous)

In (33a), when the *wh*-phrase *why* is within the domain of the quantifier phrase *everyone*, the sentence can be interpreted as "for each person, there exists a reason, such that each person loves Mary for that reason"; when the quantifier phrase *everyone* is within the domain of the *wh*-phrase *why*, the sentence can be interpreted as "there exists one mutual reason, such that for all the people, they love Mary for that mutual reason". It is worth noting that when the DP *Mary* receives focus and is focus-associated with the *wh*-phrase *why*, the ambiguity disappears, as in (33b), which can only be interpreted as "there exists one mutual reason, such that for all the people, they love Mary for that mutual reason".

A similar case also appears in the 'why + not + DP' construction, as in (34).

(34) Everyone loves Mary, but why not Lucy?

If the assumption is on the right track, that is, the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP] which places it in a c-commanding position over the quantifier phrase *everyone*, then (34) can only be interpreted as "everyone loves Mary, but why is it not the case that everyone loves Lucy".

Regarding the syntactic position of the negative marker *not*, Haegeman (1995) claimed that Negation Phrase (NegP) is a maximal projection headed by a phonetically or morphologically null negative element and that NegP is situated between TP and VP. The negative marker *not* is generated in [Spec, NegP] and is capable of making the following constituents, such as VP, PP or DP, a target for negation.

As the ΣP headed by the negative marker *not* is sandwiched between ForceP and FocP, there are two negative words in the sentence and this seems to result in a double negation problem,[2] as in (35a). However, it turns out that the double negation problem does not exist and the sentence still has a sentential negation interpretation, as in (35b).

(35) a. John didn't buy a new phone, but why **[$_{\Sigma P}$ not]** a new phone ~~[John did **[$_{NegP}$ not]** buy]~~?
b. John didn't buy a new phone, but why did **not** John buy a new phone?

The fact that (35a) and (35b) are semantically identical is surprising because two negative expressions would normally lead to a positive interpretation. On the basis of Hofmann (2018), I argue that the negative marker *not* in the ΣP is closely related to the negative marker *not* in NegP, with the former being uninterpretable and the latter

2 The double negation problem refers to the occurrence of two negative expressions in a sentence which has a positive interpretation accordingly, such as the example below.
E.g. John doesn't think the mission is not possible = John thinks the mission is possible.

interpretable. Being uninterpretable, the negative marker *not* in the ΣP serves as a probe and searches in its c-commanding domain for a goal which can value its uninterpretable feature. The negative marker *not* in NegP, being interpretable, serves as an appropriate goal and values the uninterpretable feature on the probe. Ladusaw (1992) has suggested that negative expressions can be semantically vacuous in the licensing context of an instance of sentential negation. Accordingly, I assume that it is the uninterpretable negative marker that is semantically vacuous and that its uninterpretable feature is licensed by the semantically interpretable feature on the goal. As the connection between the negative marker *not* in the ΣP and the one in NegP is established, a sentential negation can be introduced. Let's take (36) as an example.

(36) a. Mary didn't eat the bread, but why **[$_{\Sigma P}$ not]** [the bread]$_i$ ~~[$_{FinP}$ [$_{Fin'}$ did]$_j$]~~ ~~[Mary t$_j$ **[$_{NegP}$ not]** eat t$_i$]~~?
b. Mary didn't eat the bread, but why didn't Mary eat the bread?

(36a) and (36b) have the same semantic interpretation even though in the second conjunct there are two negative markers in the former while there is only one in the latter. According to my assumption, the higher negative marker *not* carries an uninterpretable feature and the lower negative marker *not* carries an interpretable feature. The higher *not* probes in its c-commanding domain for a goal. The lower *not* serves as an appropriate goal and the probe-goal agreement relation is established. As the uninterpretable feature is valued, the higher *not* becomes semantically vacuous and it is the lower *not* that enters into the semantic interpretation which introduces a sentential negation. Finally, the FinP which contains the interpretable lower *not* is deleted at PF, thus deriving (36a) which is semantically identical to (36b).

Having presented the syntactic positions of the *wh*-phrase *why* and the negative marker *not*, it is necessary to discuss which constituent is deleted and what the motivation is in the derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction.

3.7 Deletion and motivation

Auxiliaries normally undergo T-to-C movement in matrix *wh*-questions in English, as shown in (37).

(37) [$_{CP}$ Why [$_C$ did$_i$] [$_{TP}$ Mary [$_T$ ~~t$_i$~~] read the magazine]]?

However, both the auxiliary and TP are prohibited from occurring in the 'why + not + DP' construction, as in (38a), and the reconstruction of the auxiliary and TP in the derived sentence results in its ungrammaticality as in (38b) and (38c).

(38) a. Mary read a book, but *why not a magazine*?
b. *Mary read a book, but *why not a magazine* **did**?
c. *Mary read a book, but *why not a magazine* **[did]$_i$ [$_{TP}$ Mary t$_i$ read]**?

The ungrammaticality of (38b) and (38c) can be explained by the assumption that the auxiliary in the 'why + not + DP' construction has undergone overt head movement from T to Fin and it is subsequently deleted at PF along with FinP, as in (39).

(39) Mary read a book, but *why not a magazine* ~~**[$_{FinP}$ t$_{Fin}$ did]$_j$ [$_{TP}$ Mary t$_j$ read]]**~~?

The question that needs to be answered is why FinP is deleted at PF and what triggers the motivation for deletion. Generally speaking, it is possible for a DP to stay in-situ in a sentence, as the DP *a pear* in (40a). If the DP *a pear* has undergone movement to the left periphery of TP and the ensuing constituents are maintained, the derived sentence will become ill-formed, as in (40b). The ill-formedness can be remedied only when all its ensuing constituents are deleted at PF, as in (40c).

(40) a. Mary ate an apple, but why Mary did not eat **[$_{DP}$ a pear]**?
b. *Mary ate an apple, but why not **[$_{DP}$ a pear]$_j$** did [$_{TP}$ Mary eat t$_j$]?
c. Mary ate an apple, but why not **[$_{DP}$ a pear]$_j$** ~~did [$_{TP}$Mary eat t$_j$]~~?

In the derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction, what is deleted is FinP and this deletion satisfies the Focus Condition on Ellipsis (Merchant 2001) which states that an XP α can be deleted only if α is e-given. The concept of e-givenness (Schwarzschild 1999) states that an expression E is e-given if and only if there is an antecedent A which entails E and which is entailed by E, modulo ∃-type-shifting.

As the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP] and it is closely related to the antecedent clause and the constituent in its c-commanding domain, when the antecedent clause has a positive interpretation, the DP in the second conjunct shows a contrast to its correlate, as in (41a); when the antecedent clause has a negative interpretation, the DP is a repetition of its correlate, as in (41b).

(41) a. Mary ate **an apple**, but why not **a pear**?
b. Mary didn't eat **an apple**, but why not **an apple**?

Since the negative marker *not* is base-generated in the ΣP which is higher up in the hierarchy than TP in the second conjunct, when the antecedent clause has a positive interpretation and there is no NegP within TP in the second conjunct, the negative marker *not* in the ΣP is interpretable. It enters into the semantic interpretation of the second conjunct and introduces a sentential negation, as in (42a); when the antecedent clause has a negative interpretation and there is a NegP within TP in the second conjunct, the negative marker *not* in the ΣP is uninterpretable and its feature is valued via agreement with the interpretable NegP goal. Accordingly, the higher *not*

is licensed to become semantically vacuous (Ladusaw 1992) and the lower *not* enters into the semantic interpretation and introduces a sentential negation, as in (42b).

(42) a. Mary ate an apple, but why not a pear? (=Why not [Mary ate a pear]?)
b. Mary didn't eat an apple, but why not an apple? (=Why not [Mary did not eat an apple])?

Regarding the spell-out of the DP in the second conjunct, Yoshida et al. (2015), in their analysis of why-Stripping, proposed that the focused phrase undergoes overt movement because ellipsis forces the movement of the remnant. In other words, if the focused phrase stays in-situ, it will also be deleted at PF. This is shown in the contrast of (43a) and (43b).

(43) a. Why NATTO ~~John was eating~~ ?
b. Why ~~John was eating NATTO~~?

Bobaljik (1995) and Gärtner (2002) have suggested that if the higher copy of a given term is pronounced then we have the effect of overt movement and if the lower copy is pronounced then we have the effect of covert movement. However, I argue that the focused DP in the 'why + not + DP' construction undergoes covert movement from its base position to [Spec, FocP]. As the lower copy is contained within the ellipsis domain, as in (44a), ellipsis forces the highest copy to be pronounced due to a requirement that focus be overtly realized, as in (44b).

(44) a. Mary ate an apple, but why not ~~[Mary ate a pear]~~?
b. Mary ate an apple, but why not [a pear]$_i$ ~~[Mary ate t_i]~~?

Having presented the role played by the *wh*-phrase *why*, the nature of the negative marker *not* and the spell-out of the DP, let's come back and focus on the deletion and motivation.

(45) a. Mary ate an apple, but why not a pear?
b. Mary ate an apple, but [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ why$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not] [$_{FocP}$ [$_{DP}$ a pear]$_i$] ~~[$_{FinP}$ [$_{Fin'}$ did$_k$]] [$_{TP}$Mary [$_{T'}$$t_k$] [$_{VP}$ eat t_i]]]]]]~~?

For ease of exposition, I use A to represent the first part and E to represent the second part. Through ∃-type shifting, the focus-closure of A can be described as 'Focus-closure (A) = ∃x. Mary ate x' which means there exists an x and that x refers to a fruit. Since the *wh*-phrase *why* serves as a bridge connecting the antecedent clause with the second part, the latter has a similar underlying structure 'Mary ate a pear'. Accordingly, the focus-closure of E can be expressed as 'Focus-closure (E) = ∃x. Mary ate x' which also means there exists an x and that x refers to a fruit. Given that A entails the focus-closure of E and E entails the focus-closure of A, the Focus Condition on Ellipsis is satisfied and FinP in the second part is licensed to be deleted at PF.

Finally, the *wh*-phrase *why* moves from [Spec, ForceP] to [Spec, RespP] in order to convey the addressor's response to a previous discourse.[3]

The derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction does not violate relevant syntactic constraints and it conforms to the economy principle in the process of syntactic computations, namely, 'there can be no superfluous symbols in representations or superfluous steps in derivations (Chomsky 1995:92)'.

3.8 Analysis of other remnants in the 'why + not + XP' construction

If the analysis is on the right track, in addition to DPs, the 'why + not + XP' construction can also accommodate other types of phrases as their remnants, such as PPs, VPs, APs, AdvPs and CPs. Besides, it is also possible to have a construction where there is no constituent following the combination *why not*.

3.8.1 Analysis of the 'why + not + PP(VP)' construction

According to the analysis, PPs and VPs also undergo covert movement, followed by a subsequent deletion of FinP at PF.

(46) a. Mary danced with Tom, but **why not [$_{PP}$ with Jim]**?
b. Tom should buy a car, but **why not [$_{VP}$ rent a car]**?

In (46a) and (46b), both the PP *with Jim* and the VP *rent a car* are base-generated within TP. As the [+Focus] feature is weak, both the PP and VP undergo covert movement. The negative marker *not* in both sentences are base-generated in ΣP and the *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP] and is then moved to [Spec, RespP]; the auxiliary *did* undergoes head movement from T to Fin. Since there is no NegP within TP, the negative marker *not* is interpretable and enters into the semantic interpretation and introduces sentential negation. In addition, the higher copies of the PP and VP will be pronounced after the covert movement to [Spec, FocP] because the lower copies within TP will be deleted at PF and ellipsis forces the highest copy to be pronounced due to a requirement that focus be overtly realized, thus deriving the construction under discussion by omitting unimportant details, as in (47).

3 When the *wh*-phrase *why* is moved from [Spec, ForceP] to [Spec, RespP], it is interfaced with pragmatics which enables it to perform a speech act. In (45), the speech act of seeking further information is performed; in other words, the addressor wants to know more about the reason why Mary didn't eat a pear.

(47) a. $[_{AAP}\ [_{RespP}\ [Why]_h\ [_{\Sigma P}\ [_{\Sigma'}\ not]\ [_{ForceP}\ t_h\ [_{FocP}\ [_{PP}\ with\ Jim]_i]]]\ [\sout{_{FinP}\ [_{TP}\ Mary\ [_{T'}\ t_k][_{VP}\ dance]\ [_{PP}\ t_i]]]]]}$?

b. $[_{AAP}\ [_{RespP}\ [Why]_h\ [_{\Sigma P}\ [_{\Sigma'}\ not]\ [_{ForceP}\ t_h\ [_{FocP}\ [_{VP}\ rent\ a\ car]_i]]]$
$\sout{[_{FinP}\ [_{TP}\ should_k]]\ [_{TP}\ Tom\ [_{T'}\ t_k][_{VP}t_i]]]]]}$?

The 'why + not + XP' construction can also accommodate a bare preposition and a bare verb, as shown in (48a) and (48b), respectively.

(48) a. A: John promised to finish the job after Sunday.
B: Why not **[$_P$ before]**?
b. A: Tom should sell a bike.
B: Why not **[$_V$ lend]**?

These bare constituents are normally not the targets of movement, as illustrated in (49a) and (49b).

(49) a. ***[$_P$ Before]**, why didn't John promise to finish the job [t_i Sunday].
b. ***[$_V$ Lend]**, why shouldn't Tom [t_j a bike].

Compared with (48), it seems as if the ungrammaticality of (49) serves as counter examples of the analysis. However, I argue that (49) is not in conflict with the analysis. What appears to be bare prepositions and bare verbs in the 'why + not + XP' construction as in (48) is actually a full-fledged PP and VP. It is the full-fledged PP and VP that have undergone covert movement rather than the bare P and V. An (2016) argued that although it is mostly syntax that determines what is to be deleted and elements that undergo ellipsis are usually syntactic constituents, PF-deletion also has its own guidelines, one of which is that deleted elements form a continuous string. However, in some cases, the string of deleted elements can sometimes be extended beyond what is initially marked for deletion by syntax, a situation which is called Extra Deletion (An 2016). Accordingly, I suggest that PF deletion can sometimes ignore syntactic constituents and can extend into the ellipsis remnant, deleting parts of it, up to recoverability and under adjacency to a string of elements that are deleted at PF.

In (48), when the PP *before Sunday* and the VP *lend a bike* have moved out of the TP and the ensuing constituents, namely FinP, are deleted at PF, Extra Deletion comes into play and PF deletion extends into the ellipsis remnant and deletes the DP *Sunday* and the DP *a bike*. This Extra Deletion operation is justified because the PP *before Sunday* and the VP *lend a bike* are adjacent to FinP, which is deleted at PF; in addition, the DP *Sunday* and the DP *a bike* are fully recoverable from the correlates in the antecedent clause. The derivation[4] is shown in (50) by omitting unimportant details.

4 Please note that normal PF deletion is marked by single strikethrough (~~FinP~~) while Extra Deletion is marked by double strikethrough (~~DP~~) in order to show the difference.

(50) a. [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ [Why]$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not]][$_{FocP}$ [$_{PP}$ before ~~[$_{DP}$ Sunday]~~]$_i$] ~~[$_{FinP}$~~ ~~[$_{Fin'}$ did$_k$]]~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~John [$_{T'}$ t_k] [$_{VP}$ promise to finish the job] [$_{PP}$ t_i]]]]]~~?
b. [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ [Why]$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not]][$_{FocP}$ [$_{VP}$ lend ~~[$_{DP}$ a bike]~~]$_i$] ~~[$_{FinP}$~~ ~~[$_{Fin'}$ should$_k$]]~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~Tom [$_{T'}$ t_k] [$_{VP}$ t_i]]]]]~~?

3.8.2 Analysis of the 'why + not + AP(AdvP)(CP)' construction

The analysis can also be extended to the 'why + not + XP' construction where AP, AdvP or CP can occur, as exemplified in (3), repeated here in (51).

(51) a. Lucy made too strong a cappuccino, but *why not* **[$_{AP}$ slightly mild]**?
b. Jim finished the job carelessly, but *why not* **[$_{AdvP}$ carefully]**?
c. John sometimes believes that he could become a famous movie star, but *why not* **[$_{CP}$ that he could become a well-known writer]**?

The AP *slightly mild* in (51a) can be followed by the DP *a cappuccino* and the AdvP *carefully* in (51b) can be followed by the VP *finish the job*, as shown in (52a) and (52b), respectively.

(52) a. Lucy made too strong a cappuccino, but *why not* **[$_{AP}$ slightly mild] [$_{DP}$ a cappuccino]**?
b. Jim finished the job carelessly, but *why not* **[$_{AdvP}$ carefully] [$_{VP}$ finish the job]**?

A careful comparison between (51) and (52) indicates that what appears to be a bare AP and AdvP is actually an AP remnant of a complete DP and an AdvP remnant of a complete VP. What has been moved is not a bare AP and a bare AdvP but a complete DP and a complete VP. The AP and the AdvP have moved out of the DP and the VP first and their ensuing constituents are deleted at PF thereafter. Therefore, the derivation of the 'why + not + XP' construction which accommodates AP, AdvP or CP can be illustrated in (53) by omitting unimportant details.

(53) a. [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ Why$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not]][$_{FocP}$ [$_{AP}$ slightly mild]$_h$ ~~[$_{DP}$ a [$_{AP}$ t_h] cappuccino]~~]$_i$]]] ~~[$_{FinP}$ [$_{Fin'}$ did$_k$]]~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~Lucy [$_{T'}$ t_k] [$_{VP}$ make t_i]]]]~~?
b. [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ Why$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not]][$_{FocP}$ [$_{AdvP}$ carefully]$_h$ ~~[$_{VP}$ finish the job~~ ~~[$_{AdvP}$ t_h]]~~$_i$]] ~~[$_{FinP}$ [$_{Fin'}$ did$_k$]]~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~Jim [$_{T'}$ t_k] [$_{VP}$ t_i]]]]~~?
c. [$_{AAP}$ [$_{RespP}$ Why$_h$ [$_{ForceP}$ t_h [$_{\Sigma P}$ [$_{\Sigma'}$ not]][$_{FocP}$ [$_{CP}$ that he could become a well-known writer]$_i$] ~~[$_{FinP}$~~[$_{Fin'}$ ~~did$_k$]]~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~John [$_{T'}$ t_k] [$_{VP}$ sometimes believe [$_{CP}$ t_i]]]]]~~?

3.8.3 Analysis of the 'why + not' construction

The analysis can also be extended to the 'why + not' construction where no constituents follow the combination. The *wh*-phrase *why* is base-generated in [Spec, ForceP] and then moves to [Spec, RespP]; the negative marker *not* is base-generated in the ΣP. As there is no constituent within TP, the negative marker *not* in the ΣP is interpretable and enters into the semantic interpretation.

It might be tempting to assume that there are constituents following the combination *why not* and they are deleted at PF. However, any attempt to recover the deleted constituents will result in ungrammaticality of the sentence, as shown in (54b) and (54d) by omitting unimportant details.

(54) a. The truth is, he probably likes being a salesman, and **why not**?
b. *****The truth is, he probably likes being a salesman, and **why not** [the truth is, he probably likes being a salesman?]
c. "Shall we go picnicking this Saturday?" "Sure, **why not**."
d. *"Shall we go picnicking this Saturday?" "Sure, **why not** [shall we go picnicking this Saturday.]."

According to the analysis, there are no constituents following the combination *why not* and the grammaticality of (54a) and (54c) can be explained. Given the syntax-pragmatics interface, the 'why + not' construction is used to express the addressor's or the addressee's response to a previous discourse. For example, the speech act that is performed in (54c) is that the addressee accepts the offer of going picnicking this Saturday.

4 Summary

On the basis of the Cartographic approach and the syntax-pragmatics interface, this article has divided CP into ForceP, FocP and FinP and has proposed the projections of AAP and RespP high above ForceP. The syntactic representations and structural computation of the 'why + not + DP' construction have been discussed. It has been suggested that in the derivation of the 'why + not + DP' construction both the *wh*-phrase *why* and the negative marker *not* are base-generated and the DP undergoes covert movement. The analysis is also extended to the explanation of the derivation of 'why + not + VP(PP)(AP)(AdvP)(CP)' construction and also to the 'why + not' construction. Therefore, this analysis can not only provide a reasonable explanation of the 'why + not + XP' construction, but also exhibits the economy principle as required in the process of structural computation. Admittedly, the phenomenon of the 'why + not + XP' construction is an intriguing topic and more empirical and cross-

linguistic study could be done in the future research in order to provide a more reasonable explanation of the construction cross-linguistically.

References

An, Duk-Ho. 2016. Extra deletion in fragment answers and its implications. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 25(4). 313–350.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 1995. In terms of merge: Copy and head movement. In Robert Pensalfini & Hiro Ura (eds.), *Papers on minimalist syntax*, 65–103. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Bromberger, Sylvain. 1992. *On what we know we don't know: Explanation, theory, linguistics, and how questions shape them*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chao, Wynn. 1987. *On ellipsis*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts dissertation.

Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. 1991. *On the Typology of wh-questions*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT dissertation.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo & Luigi Rizzi. 2010. The cartography of syntactic structures. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of linguistic analysis*, 51–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Collins, Chris. 1991. Why and how come. In Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng & Hamida Demirdache (eds.), *More papers on WH-movement*, 31–45. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Depiante, Marcela Andrea. 2000. *The Syntax of Deep and surface anaphora: A Study of null complement Anaphora and stripping/bare argument ellipsis*. Storrs, Connecticut: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Fukui, Naoki & Margaret Speas. 1986. Specifiers and projection. In Naoki Fukui, Tova Rapoport & Elizabeth Sagey (eds.), *Papers in theoretical linguistics*, 128–172. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Gärtner, Hans Martin. 2002. *Generalized Transformations and beyond: Reflections on minimalist syntax*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The Syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2013. The syntacticization of discourse. In Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali & Robert Truswell (eds.), *Syntax and its limits*, 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan Sag. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3). 391–428.

Hill, Virginia. 2007. Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface. *Lingua* 117(12). 2077–2105.

Hofmann, Lisa. 2018. *Why not? – Polarity ellipsis and negative concord. Manuscript, Department of Linguistics*. University of California Santa Cruz.

Kim, Jeong-Seok. 1997. *Syntactic focus Movement and ellipsis: A minimalist approach*. Storrs, Connecticut: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Kim, Jeong-Seok, Hye Jin Lee, Su-Hyuk Yoon, Jin Hyung Lee, Jee Young Y. Lee & Soohyun Kwon. 2021. An experimental investigation of *why-stripping* in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 38(2). 271–299.

Kiss, Katalin É. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74(2). 245–273.

Ko, Heejeong. 2005. Syntax of *why-in-situ*: Merge into [SPEC, CP] in the overt syntax. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23(4). 867–916.

Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1985. Theta-theory and extraction. Paper presented at the 1985 GLOW Conference, Brussels.
Kuroda, Sige Yuki. 1988. Whether we agree or not: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese. In W. Poser (ed.), *Papers from the second international workshop on Japanese syntax*, 1–47. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
Ladusaw, William. 1992. Expressing negation. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 2(2). 237–260.
Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT dissertation.
Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? *North East Linguistic Society* 31(2). 301–320.
Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the Theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27. 661–738.
Merchant, Jason. 2006a. Why no(t)? *Style* 20(1). 20–23.
Merchant, Jason. 2006b. Sluicing. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The syntax companion*, 271–291. Oxford: Blackwell.
Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In Kyle Johnson (ed.), *Topics in ellipsis*, 132–173. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Merchant, Jason. 2010. Three kinds of ellipsis. In François Recanati, Isidora Stojanovic & Neftalí Villanueva (eds.), *Context-dependence, perspective, and relativity*, 141–192. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1). 77–108.
Merchant, Jason. 2015. How much context is enough? Two cases of span-conditioned stem allomorphy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(2). 273–304.
Merchant, Jason. 2016. Ellipsis: A survey of analytical approaches. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck & Tanja Temmerman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of ellipsis*, 19–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? Why move? Unifying agreement-Based and discourse configurational languages*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, 79–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2022. *Syntax in the treetops*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
Nakao, Chizuru. 2008. On focus of negation. In Kevin Ryan (ed.), *Proceedings of the 27th west coast conference on formal linguistics poster session*, 61–70. Los Angeles: University of California.
Nakao, Chizuru, Masaya Yoshida & Ivan Ortega-Santos. 2013. On the structure of Japanese 'why'-stripping. In Nobu Goto, Koichi Otaki, Atsushi Sato & Kensuke Takita (eds.), *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia IX 2012: The main session*, 199–212. Japan: Mie University.
Nevins, Andrew. 2008. Sluicing ≠ stripping: Evidence from P-stranding. Paper presented at the 3rd annual Moscow Student Conference on Linguistics, Moscow State University.
Oguro, Takeshi. 2015. WH-Questions in Japanese and the speech act phrase. *Linguistica Atlantica* 34(2). 1–16.
Oguro, Takeshi. 2017. Speech act phrase, conjectural questions, and hearer. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 23(1). 190–199.
Ortega-Santos, Iván, Masaya Yoshida & Chizuru Nakao. 2014. On ellipsis structures involving a wh-remnant and a non-wh-remnant simultaneously. *Lingua* 138(1). 55–85.

Potts, Christopher. 2002. The syntax and semantics of as-parentheticals. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20(3). 623–689.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer Science + Business Media Dordrecht.
Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax*, 287–296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Rizzi, Luigi. 2013. Notes on cartography and further explanation. *Probus* 25(1). 197–226.
Rizzi, Luigi. & Guglielmo Cinque. 2016. Functional categories and syntactic theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2(2). 139–163.
Rochemont, Michael. 1986. *Focus in generative grammar*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In Robert Binnick, Alice Davison, Geogia Green & Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Ross, John Robert. 1970. On declarative sentences. In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*, 222–272. Waltham: Xerox College Publishing.
Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. GIVENness, AvoidF and other constraints on the placement of accent. *Natural Language Semantics* 7(2). 141–177.
Shlonsky, Ur. 2010. The cartographic enterprise in syntax. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(6). 417–429.
Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in grammar. Syntax and semantics*, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Szendröi, Kriszta. 2001. *Focus and the syntax-phonology interface*. London: University College London dissertation.
Tenny, Carol. 2006. Evidentiality, experiencers, and the syntax of sentience in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15(3). 245–288.
van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010. Invisible last resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120(7). 1714–1726.
Vicente, Luis. 2008. *Syntactic isomorphism and non-isomorphism under ellipsis*. Santa Cruz: University of California dissertation.
Weir, Andrew. 2014. 'Why'-stripping targets voice phrase. In Hsin-Lun Huang, Ethan Poole & Amanda Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of the forty-third annual meeting of the North East linguistic society: Volume two*, 235–248. South Carolina: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
Wiltschko, Martina. 2014. *The universal Structure of categories: Towards a formal typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wiltschko, Martina. 2017. Ergative constellations in the structure of speech acts. In Jessica Coon, Diane Massam & Lisa Demena Travis (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of ergativity*, 419–442. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wiltschko, Martina & Johannes Heim. 2016. The syntax of confirmationals: A neo-performative analysis. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, 303–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Yoshida, Masaya, Chizuru Nakao & Iván Ortega-Santos. 2015. The syntax of *Why*-stripping. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(1). 323–370.
Zu, Vera. 2018. *Discourse participants and the structural representation of the context*. New York: New York University dissertation.

Bionote

Chengdong Wang
Dalian University of Foreign Languages, Dalian, China
chengdongw@163.com

Chengdong Wang is an associate professor in the School of English Studies at Dalian University of Foreign Languages, China. He holds a PhD in Linguistics and he has a keen interest in syntax and formal semantics.