

1 The Basic Puzzle

1.1 *wh*-in-situ

Korean is a *wh*-in-situ language. *wh*-words, including *why*, can stay in-situ and still receive wide-scope question interpretation.

- (1) a. Mary-ka way Seoul-ey ka-ass-ni?
Mary-Nom why Seoul-to go-Past-Q
'Why did Mary go to Seoul?'
- b. John-i [Mary-ka way Seoul-ey ka-ass-nunci] mwul-ess-ni?
John-Nom Mary-Nom why Seoul-to go-Past-Q ask-Past-Q
'Did John ask why Mary went to Seoul?'
- c. John-un [Mary-ka way Seoul-ey ka-ass-tako] malhay-ss-ni?
John-Top Mary-Nom why Seoul-to go-Past-C say-Past-Q
'Why_i did John say that [Mary went to Seoul t_i]?'

The relationship between the [+wh]C⁰ and the in-situ *wh*-XP can be separated by a finite clause.

1.2 Intervention Effects

wh-movement is subject to Intervention Effects.

- (2) a. *Q[+wh] SBI wh
*Amwuto mwues-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
anyone what-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q
'What did no one read?'

- b. Q[+wh] wh_i SBI t_i
Mwues-ul amwuto t_i ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
what-Acc anyone read-CI-not-Past-Q
'What did no one read?'

- The *wh*-XP can cross the SBI in overt syntax.
- The relationship between the Q[+wh] and the *wh*-XP cannot cross the SBI.

1.3 Absence of Intervention Effects with *why*

However, *why*-questions are, at first glance, not subject to Intervention Effects.

- (3) a. Amwuto way ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q
'Why did no one read the book?'
- b. Way amwuto ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
why anyone the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q
'Why did no one read the book?'

1.4 The re-appearance of IE-effects with *why*

Ko (2003) shows that *why*-questions do show Intervention Effects in embedded clauses.

- (4) *C[+wh] .. SBI [... why]
- a. *Amwuto [John-i way saimha-yess-tako] malha-ci-anh-ass-ni?
anyone John-Nom why resign-Past-C say-CI-not-Past-Q
'What is the reason *x* such that no one said that John resigned for *x*?'
- b. Mary-nun [John-i way saimha-yess-tako] malha-yess-ni?
Mary-Top John-Nom why resign-Past-C say-CI-not-Past-Q
'What is the reason *x* such that Mary said that John resigned for *x*?'
- (5) *C[+wh] [SBI .. why]
- a. *John-un [amwuto way ku chayk-lul ilk-ci-anh-ass-tako] malha-yess-ni?
John-Top anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-C say-Past-Q
'What is the reason *x* such that John said that [no one read the book for *x*]?'
- b. John-un [amwuto way ku chayk-lul ilk-ci-anh-ass-nunci] mwul-ess-ni?
John-Top anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q ask-Past-Q
'Did John ask why no one read the book?'

Ko (2003)'s conclusion is that the real factor behind when IE appear with *why* is the distance between the C[+wh] where it is interpreted and the surface position of *why*.

2 The External Merge Analysis

- (6) Ko (2003)'s proposal: *why* is directly merged in [Spec,CP]. The C⁰ in whose [Spec,CP] *why* is merged may be declarative or interrogative.

Similar proposals have been made for English (Bromberger (1992)), French (Rizzi (1990), Željko Bošković (2000)), and Italian (Rizzi (1999)).

2.1 The absence of Intervention Effects with local construals of *why*

In the case of local construals, *why* is Merged in the [Spec,CP] of the C[+wh] it is interpreted with.

- (7) a. [_{TopP} **Amwuto**_i [_{CP} **way** [_{TP} _{t_i} ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni]]?
 anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q
 'Why did no one read the book?'
 b. [_{CP} **Way** [_{TP} **amwuto** ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni]?
 why anyone the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q
 'Why did no one read the book?'

The dependency between the C[+wh] and the wh-XP does not cross over any SBI, and hence we do not find any IE.

2.2 Intervention Effects with non-local construals of *why*

In these cases, *why* is still merged in [Spec,CP]. But it is in the [Spec,CP] of a [-wh] C⁰.

- (8) *C[+wh] .. SBI [why C[-wh].....]
 a. ***Amwuto** [John-i way saimha-yess-tako] malha-ci-anh-ass-ni?
 anyone John-Nom why resign-Past-C say-CI-not-Past-Q
 'What is the reason *x* such that no one said that John resigned for *x*?'
 b. Mary-nun [John-i way saimha-yess-tako] malha-yess-ni?
 Mary-Top John-Nom why resign-Past-C say-CI-not-Past-Q
 'What is the reason *x* such that Mary said that John resigned for *x*?'
 (9) *C[+wh] [SBI [why C[-wh]]]
 a. *John-un [**amwuto way** ku chayk-lul ilk-ci-anh-ass-tako] malha-yess-ni?
 John-Top anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-C say-Past-Q
 'What is the reason *x* such that John said that [no one read the book for *x*?]
 b. John-un [**amwuto way** ku chayk-lul ilk-ci-anh-ass-nunci] mwul-ess-ni?
 John-Top anyone why the book-Acc read-CI-not-Past-Q ask-Past-Q
 'Did John ask why no one read the book?'

To be interpreted, *why* needs to associate with the matrix [+wh] C. This dependency ends up crossing an SBI, and we get an Intervention Effect.

2.3 Some Predictions

- Contrasts and similarities between Chinese and Japanese/Korean
 - *why* is Merged in [Spec,CP], and we find Intervention Effects with non-local construal of *why*.
 - The SBI-*why* order in J/K is derived by A'-scrambling/Topicalization of the SBI. Since scrambling is limited in Chinese to proper names and is unavailable to SBIs, Ko (2003) predicts (correctly) that a J/K-style SBI-*why* order is unavailable in Chinese.
- in-situ *why* cannot appear in infinitival clauses in Korean. This is explained by Ko (2003)'s proposal if we assume that infinitival clauses lack a C⁰ in whose [Spec,CP] the *why* could be merged.

- (10) a. *C[+wh] [_{Inf} *why*.....]
 *John-un [Mary-ka way hakkyo-lul kumantwu-key] seltukhayess-ni?
 John-Top Mary-Nom why school-Acc quit-C persuaded-Q
 'What is the reason *x* such that John persuaded Mary [to quit school for *x*?]
 b. C[+wh] [_{Inf} *for what reason*.....]
 *John-un [Mary-ka etten iyu-lo hakkyo-lul kumantwu-key]
 John-Top Mary-Nom which reason-for school-Acc quit-C
 seltukhayess-ni?
 persuaded-Q
 'What is the reason *x* (among these) such that [John persuaded Mary to quit school for *x*?]
 c. C[+wh] [_{CP} *why*.....]
 John-un [Mary-ka way hakkyo-lul kumantwu-ess-tako] malhayess-ni?
 John-Top Mary-Nom why school-Acc quit-Past-Dec-C said-Q
 'What is the reason *x* such that John said that [Mary quit school for *x*?]

Similar facts seem to obtain in English:

- (11) Why did John decide [PRO to leave]?
 High Construal: What was the reason for the decision to leave?
 ???Low Construal: What was the reason s.t. John has decided [to leave for that reason]?

References

- Bošković Željko (2000) "Sometimes in [Spec,CP], Sometimes In-situ," in R. Martin, D. Michael, and J. Uriagareka, eds., *Step by Step*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 53–88.
- Bromberger, S. (1992) *On what we know we don't know: Explanation, Theory, Linguistics, and How Questions Shape Them*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ko, H. (2003) "Syntax of *why-in-situ*: Merge into [Spec,CP] in the overt syntax," manuscript, M.I.T.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 16, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (1999) "On the Position of 'Int(errogative)' in the Left Periphery of the Clause," manuscript, University of Siena, available at <http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/persona/rizzi.php>.