Island sensitivity of (non-)standard *wh*-in-situ in Korean

Okgi Kim & Seulkee Park

okgikim@uwm.edu & seulkeepark@khu.ac.kr

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee & Kyung Hee University

The 95th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America

Jan-09-2021

The puzzle

- *Wh*-in-situ languages like Chinese exhibit an argument/adjunct asymmetry regarding island sensitivity (Huang 1982a,b):

  (1) a. ni   zui xihuan [NP [CP mai **shenme**] de ren]?
         you most like   buy what   DE person
         'What do you like [the person who bought t]?' (Huang et al. 2009: (120))

       b. *ni zui xinshang [NP [CP **weishenme** gongzuo] de ren]?
         you most appreciate   why   work   DE people
         'What is the reason *x* such that you appreciate most people who work for *x*?'
         (Stepanov & Tsai 2008: (9b))

- It becomes more complicated when we consider *weishenme/wei-le shenme* 'why/for what' asymmetry in island sensitivity (Tsai 1994a,b; Stepanov & Tsai 2008):

  (2) ni   zui xinshang [NP [CP **wei(-le)shenme** gongzuo] de ren]?
       you most appreciate   for(-LE)what   work   DE beef
       'What is the purpose *x* such that you appreciate most people who work for *x*?'
       (Stepanov & Tsai 2008: (9a))

  ▷ the reason adjunct *weishenme* is island-sensitive, whereas the purpose adjunct *wei(-le) shenme* is island-insensitive.

Noun versus Adverb Generalization

- Many researchers (Tsai 1994a,b; 1999; Stepanov & Tsai 2008; Fujii et al. 2014; a.o.) have argued that the island behaviors of *wh*-in-situ fall under the morphological generalization in (3), which, following Fujii et al. (2014), will be referred to as the Noun versus Adverb Generalization:[1]

  (3) *Noun versus Adverb Generalization (NAG)*:
      An in-situ *wh*-phrase is island-insensitive iff it is (or contains) a *wh*-nominal.
      (Fujii et al. 2014: (3))

- In (1), the island-insensitive *shenme* is a *wh*-nominal, whereas the island-sensitive *weishenme* is a pure adverb.

- In (2), the island-insensitive, purpose *weishenme* has a nominal element *shenme* 'what' in it.

---

[1] A *wh*-nominal can be licensed in situ by a Q-operator via unselective binding, since it introduces a choice function variable, but a *wh*-adverb cannot, since it does not introduce such a variable. The *wh*-adverb undergoes LF movement to take sentential scope, in which case it induces island effects when it occurs inside an island.

Goals of this talk

In this talk, we aim

- to show that the NAG is not sufficient to explain the island behaviors of (non-)standard *wh*-in-situ in Korean.
- to suggest that the island behaviors of in-situ *wh*-phrases closely correlate with base positions, not categorial status: specifically, an in-situ *wh*-phrase is island-sensitive iff it is base-generated in the CP domain (Spec-CP).

Standard *wh*-questions

- Standard *wh*-questions using *mwe-l* 'what-ACC', *mwes-ulo* 'what-with', and *ettehkey* 'how':[2]

    (4) Mimi-nun **mwe-l**   ilk-ess-ni?
         Mimi-TOP what-ACC read-PST-QUE
         'What did Mimi read?'

    (5) ne-nun   **mwes-ulo** kkochpyeng-ul kkay-ss-ni?
         you-TOP what-with vase-ACC   break-PST-QUE
         'With what did you break the vase?'

    (6) Mimi-nun **ettehkey** cha-lul   kochi-ess-ni?
         Mimi-TOP how   car-ACC fix-PST-QUE
         'How did Mimi fix the car?'

---

[2]The *wh*-phrases *mwe-l* and *mwes-ulo* are contracted forms of *mwues-ul* and *mwues-ulo*, respectively.

Non-standard *wh*-questions

- The three *wh*-phrases can be used "non-standardly" in that they receive 'why'-like interpretations in certain contexts:

    (7) Mimi-nun **mwe-l^w** *(kulehkey) manhun nonmwun-ul ilk-ess-ni?
         Mimi-TOP what-ACC so   many   paper-ACC   read-PST-QUE
         'Why (the hell) did Mimi read so many papers?'

    (8) PRO$_i$ cha-ka   iss-umyense, ne$_i$-nun **mwes-ulo^w** tto   cha-lul sa-ss-ni?^{34}
              car-NOM exist-though you-TOP what-with again car-ACC buy-PST-QUE
         'Although PRO$_i$ having the car, why did you$_i$ buy a car again?'

    (9) Mimi-nun **ettehkey^w** mikwuk-ey   ka-key   toy-ess-ni?
         Mimi-TOP how   America-LOC go-CONN become-PST-QUE
         'Why did Mimi go to America?'

- We use the ^{w} superscript to indicate the non-standard *wh*-items.

---

[3][암행]어사는 소라껍질을 보고 물었다. "저건 **뭣으로** 저렇게 달아매었느냐?" "거 풍경으로 그저 바람 불면 싱강싱강 소리 나라고 달았습니다." (https://www.jeju.go.kr)

[4]Japanese *nande* 'what-with' can be also interpreted as a reason or an instrumental adverbial (Fujii et al. 2014).

Non-standard *wh*-questions (Cont'd)

- The non-standard *wh*-items can be replaced by the regular *wh*-adjunct *way* 'why':

  (10) Mimi-nun **way** kulehkey manhun nonmwun-ul ilk-ess-ni?
        Mimi-TOP why so   many   paper-ACC read-PST-QUE
        'Why (the hell) did Mimi read so many papers?'

  (11) PRO$_i$ cha-ka   iss-umyense, ne$_i$-nun **way** tto   cha-lul sa-ss-ni?
             car-NOM exist-though you-TOP why again car-ACC buy-PST-QUE
        'Although PRO$_i$ having the car, why did you$_i$ buy a car again?'

  (12) Mimi-nun **way** mikwuk-ey   ka-key   toy-ess-ni?
        Mimi-TOP why America-LOC go-CONN become-PST-QUE
        'Why did Mimi go to America?'

Island-sensitive *mwe-l*[w]

- If the NAG is correct, it is expected that *mwe-l*[w] is island-insensitive, since it is a *wh*-nominal; however, this is not the case, as shown below:

    (13) a. *Mimi-nun [[**mwe-l**[w] kulehkey manhun nonmwun-ul ilk-un] salam]-ul
           Mimi-TOP what-ACC so many paper-ACC read-MOD people-ACC
           pinanhayss-ni?
           criticized-QUE

           'Mimi criticized the people who read so many papers why?'

        b. *Mimi-nun [Kim-i **mwe-l**[w] kulehkey ilccik ttena-se] hwakanass-ni?
           Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM what-ACC so early leave-because got.angry-QUE

           'Mimi got angry because Kim left so early why?'

Island-insensitive *ettehkey*

- The NAG incorrectly predicts *ettehkey* 'how' to be island-sensitive, since it is a *wh*-adverb:

  (14) Mimi-nun [[Kim-i **ettehkey** yoliha-n] umsik]-ul mekess-ni?
  Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM how cook-MOD food-ACC ate-QUE
  'Mimi ate the food that Kim cooked how?'

- Chung (2005): *ettehkey* is island-insensitive because it has a nominal part *tte* in it, as in [$_{DP/NP}$ *e-tte*]-*h-key* 'Det-CNP-do-adverbializer'.

- If Chung's view is correct, *ettehkey*^{w} is expected to be island-insensitive, since it is isomorphic to its standard counterpart, but this expectation is not borne out:[5]

  (15) *Mimi-nun [[Kim-i **ettehkey**^{w} yoliha-key toy-n] umsik]-ul mekess-ni?
  Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM how cook-CONN become-MOD food-ACC ate-QUE
  'Mimi ate the food that Kim cooked why?'

---

[5]*Ettehkey*^{w} is also sensitive to an adjunct island, unlike its standard counterpart.

Intervention Effect

- Unlike other *wh*-items, *way* does not exhibit the Intervention Effect (IE), given that it can be preceded by Scope Bearing Elements (SBEs, a.k.a. interveners) like *man* 'only' and *amwuto* 'anyone' (Beck & Kim 1997; Ko 2005; Beck 2006; a.o.):

  (16)   a. *Mimi-man **mwe-l**   ilk-ess-ni?
            Mimi-only what-ACC read-PST-QUE
            'What did only Mimi read?'

       b. **mwe-l**   Mimi-man ilk-ess-ni?
          what-ACC Mimi-only read-PST-QUE
          'What did only Mimi read?'

  (17)   a. Mimi-man **way** manhun chayk-ul   ilk-ess-ni?
            Mimi-only why many   book-ACC read-PST-QUE
            'Why did only Mimi read many books?'

       b. **way** Mimi-man manhun chayk-ul   ilk-ess-ni?
          why Mimi-only many   book-ACC read-PST-QUE
          'Why did only Mimi read many books?'

Ko (2005): external merge of *way* in Spec-CP

To account for the peculiar behaviors of *way*, Ko assumes that

- in an interrogative clause, *way* 'why' is externally merged in its checking position, Spec-CP, whereas other *wh*-phrases undergo LF movement to Spec-CP for feature checking.

- IE is taken as a constraint on *wh*-movement at LF:

    (18) *Intervention Effect*: *[... C$_{[+Q]}$ **SBE** wh ...]$_{LF}$
         At LF, a *wh*-phrase cannot be attracted to its checking (scope) position across an SBE. (Ko 2005: 871)

    (19) a. LF for (16a): [$_{CP}$ C$_{[+Q]}$ ...   **SBE**   ...   *wh*]

         b. LF for (16b): [$_{CP}$ C$_{[+Q]}$ ...   *wh*$_i$ **SBE**   ...   t$_i$]

    (20) a. LF for (17a): [$_{CP}$ **SBE**$_i$ *way* C$_{[+Q]}$ ...   [$_{IP}$ t$_i$]]

         b. LF for (17b): [$_{CP}$ *way* C$_{[+Q]}$ ...   [$_{IP}$ **SBE**   ]]

Supporting data for the external merge of *way* in Spec-CP

The external merge of *way* in Spec-CP is supported by the fact that

- *way* always scopes over negation:

  (21) John-un **way** Mary-lul cohaha-ci-anh-ni?
        John-TOP why Mary-ACC like-CI-not-QUE
        'What is the reason *x* such that John does not like Mary?
        (Reason ≫ Not)'
        '*What is not the reason *x* such that John likes Mary for *x*?
        (Reason ≪ Not)' (Ko 2005: (55))

- *way* cannot be preceded by epistemic adverbs like *amato* 'probably' and *pwunmyenghi* 'evidently', which cannot undergo A′-scrambling or A′-topicalization to the CP domain:

  (22) a. {*?amato/*?pwunmyenghi} **way** John-i ttena-lkeskath-ni?
           probably/evidently why John-NOM leave-is.likely-QUE
           'For what reason *x* is it {probable/evident} that John will leave for *x*?'

       b. **way** {amato/pwunmyenghi} John-i ttena-lkeskath-ni?
          why probably/evidently John-NOM leave-is.likely-QUE
          'What is the reason *x* s.t. for *x*, it is {probable/evident} that John will leave?'
          (Ko 2005: (57))

Three diagnostic tests for identifying *wh*-items base-generated in Spec-CP

- Adopting Ko's ideas, we employ (i) Intervention Effect, (ii) scopal interactions with negation, and (iii) ability to follow epistemic adverbs as diagnostic tests to detect whether a given *wh*-item is base-generated in Spec-CP or not.

External merge of *mwe-l*[w] in Spec-CP

- We assume that *mwe-l*[w] is externally merged in Spec-CP as its licensing position, given that it behaves exactly like *way* in regard to the three diagnostics:

  (23) a. Mimi-man **mwe-l**[w] kulehkey manhun chayk-ul ilk-ess-ni?
            Mimi-only what-ACC so   many   book-ACC read-PST-QUE

            'Why did only Mimi read so many books?'

  b. **mwe-l**[w] kulehkey manhun chayk-ul Mimi-man ilk-ess-ni?
      what-ACC so   many   book-ACC Mimi-only read-PST-QUE

      'Why did only Mimi read so many books?'

  (24) John-un **mwe-l**[w] kulehkey swipkey cichi-cito   anh-ni?
        John-TOP what-ACC so   easily   get.tired-CONN not-QUE

        'What is the reason x such that John does not get tired so easily? (Reason $\gg$ Not)'
        '*What is not the reason x such that John gets tried so easily for x? (Reason $\ll$ Not)'

  (25) {*amato/*pwunmyenghi} **mwe-l**[w] kulehkey John-i   ilccik ttena-lkeskath-ni?
        probably/evidently   what-ACC so   John-NOM early leave-is.likely-QUE

        'For what reason x is it {probable/evident} that John will leave for x?'[6]

---

[6]Epistemic adverbs can follow *mwe-l*[w], as in *mwe-l*[w] *kulehkey* {*amato/pwunmyenghi*} *John-i ilccik ttena-lkeskath-ni?*

Island-sensitive *mwe-l*^{w} is base-generated in Spec-CP

- As we have already seen in (13), repeated here as (26), *mwe-l*^{w} is island-sensitive:

  (26) a. *Mimi-nun [[**mwe-l**^{w} kulehkey manhun nonmwun-ul ilk-un]   salam]-ul
          Mimi-TOP what-ACC so   many   paper-ACC read-MOD people-ACC
          pinanhayss-ni?
          criticized-QUE

          'Mimi criticized the people who read so many papers why?'

       b. *Mimi-nun [Kim-i   **mwe-l**^{w} kulehkey ilccik ttena-se]   hwakanass-ni?
          Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM what-ACC so   early leave-because got.angry-QUE

          'Mimi got angry because Kim left so early why?'

- However, its standard counterpart (i.e. *wh*-argument) is island-free:

  (27) a. Mimi-nun [[**mwe-l** ha-n]   salam]-ul pinanhayss-ni?
          Mimi-TOP what-ACC do-MOD people-ACC criticized-QUE

          'Mimi criticized the people who did what?'

       b. Mimi-nun [Kim-i   **mwe-l**   hay-se]   hwakanass-ni?
          Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM what-ACC do-because got.angry-QUE

          'Mimi got angry because Kim did what?'

- Whereas standard *mwe-l*, base-generated below CP (specifically, in *v*P), is island-insensitive, non-standard *mwe-l*^{w}, base-generated in Spec-CP, is island-sensitive.

External merge of *ettehkey*[w] in Spec-CP

- We assume that *ettehkey*[w] is externally merged in Spec-CP, given that it patterns like *way* and *mwe-l*[w] with respect to the three diagnostics:

  (28)   a.   Mimi-man **ettehkey**[w] mikwuk-ey   ka-key   toyess-ni?
              Mimi-only   how   America-LOC go-CONN   became-QUE

              'Why did only Mimi go to America?'

         b.   **ettehkey**[w] Mimi-man   mikwuk-ey   ka-key   toyess-ni?
              how   Mimi-only America-LOC go-CONN   became-QUE

              'Why did only Mimi go to America?'

  (29)   John-un **ettehkey**[w] mikwuk-ey   ka-ci   anh-key   toyess-ni?
         John-TOP   how   America-LOC go-CONN   not-CONN   became-QUE

         'What is the reason x such that John didn't go to America? (Reason $\gg$ Not)'
         '*What is not the reason x such that John went to America for x? (Reason $\ll$ Not)'

  (30)   {*?amato/*?pwunmyenghi} **ettehkey**[w] John-i   ttena-key   toy-lkeskath-ni?
         probably/evidently   how   John-NOM   leave-CONN   become-is.likely-QUE

         'For what reason x is it {probable/evident} that John will leave for x?'[7]

---

[7]Epistemic adverbs can follow *etteheky*[w], as in *ettehkey*[w] {*amato/pwunmyenghi*} *John-i ttena-key toy-lkeskath-ni?*

Base-generation of manner/instrumental *ettehkey* below NegP

- Example (31) illustrates the so-called *how-why* asymmetry with regard to the Negative Island Effect, a phenomenon in which negation blocks extraction of certain *wh*-phrases (Rizzi 1990; Shlonsky & Soare 2011; a.o.):

    (31) a. Why didn't Geraldine fix her bike?
          b. *How didn't Geraldine fix her bike? (Shlonsky & Soare 2011: (14))

- The asymmetry can receive a natural account if we assume that while *how* is base-generated below NegP, *why* is directly merged in the CP region (Rizzi 2001; Tsai 2008):

    (32) a. [$_{CP}$ *why* [$_{TP}$ ... NegP ...]]

          b. [$_{CP}$ *how* [$_{TP}$ ... NegP t*$_{how}$* ...]]

Base-generation of manner/instrumental *ettehkey* below NegP (Cont'd)

- In Korean, unlike *way*, manner/instrumental *ettehkey* exhibits the Negative Island Effect, indicating that the latter originates below NegP (or in vP):

  (33)　a.　Mimi-nun **way** cha-lul　kochi-ci　anh-ass-ni?
  　　　　　Mimi-TOP why car-ACC fix-CONN not-PST-QUE

  　　　　　'Why didn't Mimi fix the car?'

  　　　b.　*Mimi-nun **ettehkey** cha-lul　kochi-ci　anh-ass-ni?
  　　　　　Mimi-TOP how　　　car-ACC fix-CONN not-PST-QUE

  　　　　　'How didn't Mimi fix the car?'

- Meantime, *ettehkey*^{w} does not exhibit the Negative Island Effect, since it is externally merged in Spec-CP:

  (34)　Mimi-nun **ettehkey**^{w} cha-lul　kochi-ci　anh-key　　toyess-ni?
  　　　　Mimi-TOP how　　　car-ACC fix-CONN not-CONN became-QUE

  　　　　'Why didn't Mimi fix the car?'

Island-sensitive *ettehkey*^{w} is base-generated in Spec-CP

- As we have already seen, *ettehkey*^{w} is island-sensitive, whereas manner/instrumental *ettehkey* is island-insensitive. The relevant examples are repeated below:

  (35) a. Mimi-nun [[Kim-i   **ettehkey** yoliha-n]   umsik]-ul mekess-ni?
         Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM how   cook-MOD food-ACC ate-QUE
         'Mimi ate the food that Kim cooked how?'

      b. *Mimi-nun [[Kim-i   **ettehkey**^{w} yoliha-key toy-n]   umsik]-ul
         Mimi-TOP Kim-NOM how   cook-CONN become-MOD food-ACC
         mekess-ni?
         ate-QUE
         'Mimi ate the food that Kim cooked why?'

- Whereas standard *ettehkey*, base-generated below NegP, is island-insensitive, non-standard *etteheky*^{w}, base-generated in Spec-CP, is island-sensitive.

External merge of *mwes-ulo*[w] in Spec-CP

- Like other non-standard *wh*-phrases, *mwes-ulo*[w] is assumed to originate in Spec-CP as its licensing position:

  (36) a. Mimi-man **mwes-ulo**[w] tto ilpon-ey ka-ss-ni?
        Mimi-only what-with again Japan-LOC go-PST-QUE
        'Why did only Mimi go to Japan again?'

      b. **mwes-ulo**[w] tto Mimi-man ilpon-ey ka-ss-ni?
        what-with again Mimi-only Japan-LOC go-PST-QUE
        'Why did only Mimi go to Japan again?'

  (37) John-un **mwes-ulo**[w] tto ilpon-ey ka-ci anh-ass-ni?
        John-TOP what-with again Japan-ACC go-CONN not-PST-QUE
        'What is the reason x such that John didn't go to Japan? (Reason $\gg$ Not)'
        '*What is not the reason x such that John went to Japan for x? (Reason $\ll$ Not)'

  (38) {*amato/*pwunmyenghi} **mwes-ulo**[w] tto John-i ttena-lkeskath-ni?
        probably/evidently what-with again John-NOM leave-is.likely-QUE
        'For what reason x is it {probable/evident} that John will leave for x?'

Base-generation of instrumental *mwes-ulo* below NegP

- Unlike reason *mwes-ulo*ᵂ, instrumental *mwes-ulo* is sensitive to the Negative Island, suggesting that it originates below NegP:

  (39) a. *ne-nun **mwes-ulo** hakkyo-ey ka-ci   anh-ass-ni?
           you-TOP what-with school-LOC go-CONN not-PST-QUE
           'How didn't you go to school?'

        b. ne-nun **mwes-ulo**ᵂ tto   hakkyo-ey ka-ci   anh-ass-ni?
           you-TOP what-with   again school-LOC go-CONN not-PST-QUE
           'Why didn't you go to school again?'

- Since reason *mwes-ulo*ᵂ is base-generated in Spec-CP, it is not subject to the Negative Island Effect, just like *way* 'why', *mwe-l*ᵂ, and *ettehkey*ᵂ.

Island-sensitive *mwes-ulo*[w] is base-generated in Spec-CP

- Unlike instrumental *mwes-ulo*, reason *mwes-ulo*[w] is sensitive to strong islands such as a complex NP island:

  (40) a. *ne-nun [NP [CP John-i **mwes-ulo**[w] tto kkwumi-n] pang-ul]
           you-TOP   John-NOM what-with again decorate-REL room-ACC
           cohaha-ni?
           like-QUE

           'You like the room that John decorated why again?'

      b. ne-nun [NP [CP John-i **mwes-ulo** kkwumi-n] pang-ul] cohaha-ni?
         you-TOP   John-NOM what-with decorate-REL room-ACC like-QUE

         'You like the room that John decorated with what?'

- Whereas standard *mwes-ulo*, base-generated below NegP, is island-insensitive, non-standard *mwes-ulo*[w], base-generated in Spec-CP, is island-sensitive.

Merge sites and island (in)sensitivity of other *wh*-phrases

- The other *wh*-phrases that we have not discussed so far, such as *nwukwu* 'who' and 'low'
  wh-adjuncts like *encey* 'when' and *eti* 'where', are all island-insensitive:

  (41) a. John-un [$_{NP}$ [$_{CP}$ **nwu-ka** yoriha-n] umsik-ul] mek-ess-ni?
        John-TOP   who-NOM cook-REL food-ACC eat-PST-QUE
        'John ate the food that who cooked?'

      b. John-un [$_{NP}$ [$_{CP}$ Mimi-ka **encey** yoriha-n] umsik-ul] mek-ess-ni?
        John-TOP   Mimi-NOM when cook-REL food-ACC eat-PST-QUE
        'John ate the food that Mimi cooked when?'

      c. John-un [$_{NP}$ [$_{CP}$ Mimi-ka **eti-se** yoriha-n] umsik-ul] mek-ess-ni?
        John-TOP   Mimi-NOM where-LOC cook-REL food-ACC eat-PST-QUE
        'John ate the food that Mimi cooked where?'

- All the island-insensitive *wh*-phrases presented above are known as being base-generated
  below CP.

Summary

Table 1: Correlation between the island (in)sensitivity and base positions of (non-)standard *wh*-items

	wh-items	**categories**	**island (in)sensitivity**	**base positions**
standard	*mwe/mwues* 'what'	NP	insensitive	below CP
	nwukwu 'who'	NP	insensitive	below CP
	ettehkey 'how'	AdvP	insensitive	below CP
	encey 'when'	NP/PP	insensitive	below CP
	eti 'where'	NP/PP	insensitive	below CP
	mwes-ulo 'what-with'	NP/PP	insensitive	below CP
	way 'why'	AdvP	sensitive	in the CP domain
non-standard	*mwe-l*[w] 'what'	NP	sensitive	in the CP domain
	ettehkey[w] 'how'	AdvP	sensitive	in the CP domain
	mwes-ulo[w] 'what-with'	AdvP	sensitive	in the CP domain

- A *wh*-phrase, base-generated below CP, is island-insensitive, whereas a *wh*-phrase, base-generated in Spec-CP, is island-sensitive, regardless of whether the given *wh*-phrase is a *wh*-nominal (e.g. *mwe-l*[w]) or a *wh*-adverb (e.g. *ettehkey*), a standard or a non-standard *wh*-phrase.

In other *wh*-in-situ languages

- Our preliminary literature review reveals that the proposed correlation between island (in)sensitivity and base positions may also hold for Chinese and Japanese.

Table 2: Correlation between island (in)sensitivity and base positions of *wh*-in-situ in other languages

lg.	*wh*-items	island (in)sensitivity	base positions	references
Chinese	reason *weishenme* 'why'	sensitive	in the CP domain	Lin 1992, Ko 2005, Tsai 2008, Stepanov & Tsai 2008
	purpose *wei(-le) shenme* 'for what'	insensitive	below CP	Stepanov & Tsai 2008
	causal *zenme* 'how'	sensitive	in the CP domain	Tsai 2008
	manner *zenme* 'how'	insensitive	below CP	Jin 2016, Murphy 2017
	zenmeyang 'how'	insensitive	below CP	Lin 1992, Murphy 2017
	other *wh*s (e.g. 'who', 'what', 'when', 'where')	insensitive	below CP	
Japanese	*naze* 'why'	sensitive	in the CP domain	Ko 2005, Ochi 2015
	donna riyuu-des 'for what reason'	insensitive	below CP	Ko 2005
	doo (yatte) 'how'	insensitive	below CP	Nishigauchi 1990
	other *wh*s (e.g. 'who', 'what', 'when', 'where')	insensitive	below CP	

Concluding remarks

- The NAG is not sufficient to explain the island behaviors of (non-)standard in-situ *wh*-phrases in Korean.
- The island (in)sensitivity of (non-)standard in-situ *wh*-phrases closely correlates with base positions: specifically, an in-situ *wh*-phrase is island-sensitive iff it originates in the CP domain (Spec-CP) (possibly, IntP in a split-CP system).
- Further work ☺: we don't yet have an account of why and how the island (in)sensitivity of (non-)standard in-situ *wh*-phrases correlates with their base positions (i.e. Spec-CP vs. below CP).

References

- Beck, Sigrid, and Shin-Sook Kim. 1997. On *wh*-and operator scope in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6(4): 339-384.

- Beck, Sigrid. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14(1): 1-56.

- Fujii, Tomohiro, Kensuke Takita, Barry Chung-Yu Yang, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai. 2014. Comparative remarks on *wh*-adverbials in situ in Japanese and Chinese. *Japanese Syntax in Comparative Perspective*: 181-205.

- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982a. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, MA.

- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982b. Move *wh* in a language without *wh*-movement. *Linguistic Review* 1(4): 369-416.

- Jin, Dawei. 2016. *The Semantics-Pragmatics Interface and Island Constraints in Chinese*. PhD thesis, University of Buffalo.

- Ko, Heejeong. 2005. Syntax of *why*-in-situ: Merge into [Spec, CP] in the overt syntax. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23(4):867-916. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-004-5923-3

- Ko, Heejeong. 2006. On the structural height of reason *wh*-adverbials: Acquisition and consequences. In N. C. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng & Norbert Corver (eds.), *Wh-Movement: Moving on*: 319-349. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.

- Lin, Jo Wang. 1992. The syntax of *zenmeyang* 'how' and *weishenme* 'why' in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1: 293-331.

References (Cont'd)

- Murphy, Andrew. 2017. Toward a unified theory of *wh*-in-situ and islands. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26(2): 189-231.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ochi, Masao. 2015. *Wh*-adjuncts, left periphery, and *wh*-in-situ. In *Chinese syntax in a cross-linguistic perspective*, 401–428. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*, MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position of 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*: 267-296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Shlonsky, Ur and Gabriela Soare. 2011. Where's 'why'? *Linguistic Inquiry* 42: 651-669.
- Stepanov, Arthur, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai. 2008. Cartography and licensing of *wh*-adjuncts: a cross-linguistic perspective. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26(3): 589-638.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 1994a. *On economizing the theory of A-bar dependencies*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, MA.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 1994b. On nominal islands and LF extraction in Chinese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 121-175.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 1999. The hows of *why* and the whys of *how*. In Francesca Del Gobbo and Hidehito Hoshi (eds.), *UCI Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 5*: 155-184. University of California, Irvine.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 2008. Left periphery and *how-why* alternations. *Journal of East Asian Linguist* 17(2): 83-115. DOI 10.1007/s10831-008-9021-0