In Japanese cleft constructions, the causal \textit{wh}-phrase \textit{naze} (\textit{why}) behaves very differently from other \textit{wh}-phrases. \textbf{First}, clefting the combination of the \textit{wh}-phrase and the non \textit{wh}-phrase is typically disallowed (1a), whereas \textit{naze} can be clefted together with a non \textit{wh}-phrase (1b). \textbf{Secondly}, unlike the single cleft construction (2a), when multiple elements are clefted, the clefted phrases usually require a case-marker (2b). However, the case-marker is not required when one of the clefted phrase is \textit{naze} (2c). \textbf{Finally}, in multiple cleft constructions, the order of clefted phrases is free (3a/a'), but when one of the clefted phrases is \textit{naze}, the order is fixed and \textit{naze} must precede the non-\textit{wh} phrase (3b/b').

The peculiarities of the causal \textit{wh}-phrase are also found in English. Bromberger (1991) observes that the focus position affects the range of possible answers in \textit{why}-questions (4), but not in other type of \textit{wh}-questions (5). Further, \textit{why} can appear in the bare-binary combination construction (\textit{Why Adam?}, \textit{Why at school}?), but other \textit{wh}-phrases do not allow this construction (*\textit{When Adam}?, *\textit{What at school}?). In this paper, I argue that these seemingly independent peculiarities of the causal \textit{wh}-phrase are actually correlated and explained uniformly. Specifically, I propose that the causal \textit{wh}-phrase \textit{naze}/\textit{why} and the focused phrase form a single unit both semantically and syntactically.

Extending Davidson's (1967) analysis that action sentences are logically represented with event quantification (6), Herburger (2000) argues that focus imposes structure on event quantification. She shows that the focused element is interpreted in the scope of the event quantifier and non-focused elements are interpreted in its restriction (7). Now for the case where \textit{why} co-occurs with a focused element, I propose that the variable of \textit{why}, namely \textbf{cause}(e',e), appears in the scope of the event quantifier together with the focused element, as in (8). Under this analysis, shifting the focus position is predicted to affect possible answers. (8b) and (9b) are not equivalent. Since the restriction of the event quantifier represents background information, (8) is a question about some eating event of apples and (9) is a question about some eating event by Adam. The two questions are asking about different events, so the answers should be different.

I propose that this special semantic property of \textit{why}, namely that it composes a scope unit with a focused element, results from its special syntax. Assuming that every focused element has a focus projection \textbf{FocP} (10), I argue that the focus sensitive \textit{why} is generated within \textbf{FocP spec} (11). I show that this ability to occur within \textbf{FocP} is what allows the bare-binary combination construction with \textit{why} (\textit{Why Adam}?). Further, this analysis of focus-sensitive \textit{why} accounts for the unique property of Japanese clefts with \textit{naze}. Since \textit{naze} and the clefted phrase form a constituent together (\textbf{FocP}), clefting the combination of \textit{naze} and non \textit{wh}-phrase behaves as single cleft. Thus, the case-marker is not required on the clefted phrase. Furthermore, since the specifier position precedes the complement position within \textbf{FocP}, \textit{naze} always precedes the focused element, unlike typical multiple cleft constructions.  

(500 words)
(1) a. *[Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa ITSU SONO RONBUN-(O) na no? Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top when that paper-acc be Q (lit. When is it that paper that Hanako will present at Kyoto?)
   b. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa NAZE SONO RONBUN na no? Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top why that paper be Q (Why is it that paper that Hanako will present at Kyoto?)

(2) a. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa SONO RONBUN da. Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top that paper be (It is that paper that Hanko will present at Kyoto.)
   b. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa 10GATU-*(NI) SONO RONBUN-*(O) da. Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top October-in that paper-acc October-in be (It is that paper in October that Hanako will present at Kyoto.)
   c. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa NAZE SONO RONBUN na no? Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top why that paper be Q (Why is it that paper that Hanako will present at Kyoto?)

(3) a. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa 10GATU-NI SONO RONBUN-O da. Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top October-in that paper-acc October-in be
   a'. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa SONO RONBUN-O 10GATU-NI da. Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top that paper-acc October-in be (It is that paper in October that Hanako will present at Kyoto.)
   b. [Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa NAZE SONO RONBUN na no? Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top why that paper-acc be Q
   b'. *[Hanko-ga Kyoto-de happyosuru no]-wa SONO RONBUN NAZE na no? Hanako-nom Kyoto-at present C-top that paper-acc why be Q (Why is it that paper that Hanako will present at Kyoto?)

(4) a. Why did ADAM eat apples? -- Because he was the one Eve convinced.
   b. Why did Adam eat APPLES? -- Because it was the only food around.
(5) a. Where did ADAM eat apples? -- At the Garden of Eden.
   b. Where did Adam eat APPLES? -- At the Garten of Eden.
(6) a. Adam ate apples.
   b. ∃e (eating (e) & Agent (e, Adam) & Theme (e, apples)) [ignoring tense]
(7) a. ADAM ate apples.
   b. [∃e: eating (e) & Theme (e, apples)] Agent (e, Adam)

(8) a. Why did ADAM eat apples?
   b. WH e' [∃e: eating (e) & Theme (e, apples)] cause (e', e) & Agent (e, Adam)
(9) a. Why did Adam eat APPLES?
   b. WH e' [∃e: eating (e) & Agent (e, Adam)] cause (e', e) & Theme (e, apples)

(10) FocP (11) FocP
    Foc       DP                why/naze Foc       DP
    Adam     Adam
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