

WHEREABOUTS OF *WAY* ‘WHY’ IN KOREAN AND ANTI-INTERVENTION & ANTI-SUPERIORITY*

Myung-Kwan Park
Dongguk University

1. Introduction

The reason *wh*-adverb *why* is easy to locate in English sentences, as it is always realized in clause-initial position. As generally assumed, let’s say it is overtly realized in the [Spec, CP] position.

(1) Why did John leave?

However, its Korean counterpart *way* ‘why’ (henceforth, WHY) occurs either before or after the subject NP. Since Korean is a free word order and *wh*-in-situ language, it is not easy to identify where the Korean reason *wh*-adverb is base-generated.

(2) a. Way Cheli-ka ttena-ass-ni?
why Cheli-NOM leave-PST-Q
‘Why did Cheli leave?’

b. Cheli-ka way ttenassni?

Investigating the intervention effects of negative polarity items (NPIs) on WHY in Korean, Ko (2005) argues relating to its placement that WHY in this language is base-generated in the [Spec, CP] position. On the other hand, Miyagawa (2017) more recently reconsiders what Saito (1994) calls the additional *wh*-effect on *naze* ‘why’ in Japanese to argue that WHY in this language is based-generated in VP-adjointing position. When we assume that *way* in Korean (K) and *naze* in Japanese (J) behave in the same way syntactically/semantically, we can see that since Ko’s (2005) and Miyagawa’s (2017) ideas on the generation of WHY cannot be correct simultaneously, we need to harmonize the two ideas to account for the syntactic aspects of WHY in these two languages. To anticipate the line of discussion ahead, we concur with Miyagawa (*ibid.*) that WHY in K/J is based-generated in VP-adjointed position, but as essentially dictated by Ko (*ibid.*) it has a tendency to move overtly in the same clause to the position (i.e., [Spec, CP]) where it takes scope.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a detailed review of Ko’s (2005) and

* I would like to thank Jun Abe, Suyoung Bae, Daeho Chung, Yoshio Endo, and Qilin Tian for their help with data collection/correction and valuable feedbacks during the preparation for this paper.

Miyagawa's (2017) proposals on the base placement of WHY in K/J, showing how their analyses work. Section 3 starts to argue that Ko's (2005) CP Modifier Hypothesis is not valid, and goes on to propose that WHY is generated low in the clausal structure, but it undergoes scrambling to the Spec of the clause-mate [+Q] C preemptively at overt syntax, and to demonstrate how this proposal can effectively account for the NPI intervention effect at issue. Along the line of Miyagawa's (2017) analysis for adjunct causal/reason WHAT in Japanese, section 4 investigates Korean rationale WHAT that can also be interpreted as a causal/reason wh-adverbial. We argue that rationale WHAT in Korean is base-generated in VP-peripheral position and undergoes scrambling to the Spec of the clause-mate [+Q] C; otherwise, it is ruled out. Section 5 examines apparently WHY-less questions in Kyengsang Dialect of Korean, and argues that these questions are in fact adjunct WHAT-less questions. Section 6 turns to Saito's (1994) additional wh-effect on WHY, and shows how the proposed overt clause-bounded WHY movement hypothesis can shed new lights on the effect at hand, particularly concentrating on the contrast between K/J and Chinese in light of this effect. Section 7 wraps up with a summary and conclusion.

2. Exceptional Behaviors of WHY

It has been observed in the literature that WHY in K/J is not or less sensitive to the NPI intervention effect (IE) (See Cho 1998, Lee 2002, Choi 2003, and Ko 2005 for Korean; and Miyagawa 1997, Kuwabara 1998, Watanabe 2000, Tomioka 2007, 2009 for Japanese). The linear order or c-command relation between WHY and an NPI does not matter, as illustrated in (3) and (4) with NPI interveners:¹

(3) a. (adapted from Cho 1998: 405, her (12)):

Amwuto way an o-ess-ni?
 anyone why NEG come-PST-Q

'Why didn't anyone come?'

b. **Way amwuto** an o-ess-ni?
 why anyone NEG come-PST-Q

'Why didn't anyone come?'

(4) (=Ko 2005: 872, her (8)):

a. {**Amwuto/?John-pakkey**} **way** ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
 anyone/John-only why that book-ACC read-CI-NEG-PST-Q

'Why did {no one/only John} read that book?'

¹ Other potential scope-baring elements (SBEs) than NPIs do not seem to induce the IE for WHY in Korean (and Japanese) either, as reported in Ko (2005, 873).

- b. **Way** {**amwuto/John-pakkey**} ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ni?
 why anyone/John-only that book-ACC read-CI-NEG-PST-Q
 ‘Why did {no one/only John} read that book?’

Likewise, WHY in the embedded interrogative clause is not subject to the IE when it is c-commanded by an NPI:

- (5) (adapted from Ko 2005, 873, her (12)):
 John-un [**amwuto way** ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-nunci] mwul-ess-ta
 John-TOP anyone why that book-ACC read-CI-NG-PST-Q ask-PST-DCL
 ‘John asked why no one read that book.’

Ko (2005) accounts for WHY’s obviation of the IE by proposing, following Cinque’s (1999) adverb positioning theory, that WHY in *wh-in-situ* languages like K/J is externally merged at the [Spec, CP] position, whether in a declarative or in an interrogative clause.² Ko terms her proposal the *CP-Modifier Hypothesis* (CMH). When externally merged at the [Spec, CP] position of an interrogative clause as in (3) through (5), WHY does not move at all as the licensing feature ([+Q]) resides in the vicinity.

Investigating what Saito (1994) dubs the additional wh-effect on WHY, however, Miyagawa (2017) argues that when occurring with other wh-phrases, WHY is generated/interpreted in a lower position than Ko postulates. The additional wh-effect can be aptly rephrased as anti-superiority that requires WHY to be c-commanded by one of the other wh-phrases in multiple wh-questions. Thus, (6a) and (7) are ruled in, but (6b) is rule out as anti-superiority is violated.

- (6) a. John-ga nani-o naze katta no?
 John-NOM what-ACC why bought Q
 ‘Why did John buy what?’
 b. *John-ga naze nani-o katta no?
- (7) Dare-ga naze nani-o katta no?
 who-NOM why what-ACC bought Q
 ‘Why did who buy what?’

From the anti-superiority of WHY, Miyagawa (2017) goes on to suggest that though it is generated and stays in VP-adjoining position as *because of what* (Beck, 1995, 1996), WHY moves covertly. Miyagawa specifically proposes that a structure for WHY in K/J consists of an operator that binds a variable in a *because* clause, and it is the operator portion that is pronounced as WHY. Generated in lower position, WHY moves overtly to the position of the

² On top of Ko (2005), see also Hagstrom (1998) and Kim (2002, 2005), who advocate a syntactic approach to the IE.

operator (i.e., Spec of ReasonP that Shlonsky and Soarem (2011) postulate just above TP) before the operator moves ultimately to [Spec, CP] to take scope.

3. Anti-intervention and whereabouts of WHY

Miyagawa (2017) argues based on the following VP idiom and VP-fronting tests that WHY in Japanese stays overtly in VP-peripheral position. We rehearse his argument with Korean. The first test concerns a VP idiom like *miyekkwuk-ul mek-* ‘fail (in) a test’ that is composed of an object NP and a transitive verb. If the object NP in the idiom VP undergoes scrambling over the topic in [Spec, TP/CP] as in (9), the VP only obtains a literal meaning, now that the object NP and the verb are discontinuous. Based on this thesis, when the reason wh-adverb WHY is generated in [Spec, CP] as claimed by Ko (2005), it is predicted that the same object NP scrambled before WHY in (8) is also only interpreted literally. Contrary to this prediction, the object NP in (8) allows for an idiomatic reading, which Miyagawa takes to invalidate Ko’s CP-Modifier Hypothesis on WHY.

- (8) Yengi-man miyekkwuk-ul way mek-ess-ni?
 Yengi-only seaweed soup-ACC why eat-PST-Q
 ‘Why did only Yengi eat seaweed soup?’

- (9) (*)Miyekkwuk-ul Yengi-nun mek-ess-ni?
 -TOP/FOC

The second test using VP fronting is applied as in (10). When WHY is included inside the fronted VP, the example like (10) would render compelling evidence that it is overtly placed inside it. Besides, Miyagawa (2017) claims that the intervention effect does not arise to WHY in (10), in contrast to WHAT in (11), where both the fronted VP and the subject NP are attached with IE-inducing focus markers.

- (10) [Cheli-eykey ku-uy cangnan-ul way kyengkohaki]-cochato
 Cheli-to he-GEN prank-ACC why warn-even
 Yengi-man ha-yss-ni?
 Yengi-only do-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Even why warn him about his prank, only Yengi did.’

- (11) (*)[Cheli-eykey mwues-ul kyengkoha-ki]-cochato Yengi-man ha-yss-ni?

The validity of these two arguments needs to be assessed more carefully. Before doing so, we argue that the more serious problem with Ko’s (2005) CP-Modifier Hypothesis lies in the occurrence of WHY in a declarative clause as in (12).

- (12) Cheli-nun [Yengi-ka way ttena-ass-tako] sayngkakha-ni?
 Cheli-TOP Yengi-MOM why leave-PST-COMP think-Q
 ‘Why does Cheli think that Yengi left?’

To accommodate WHY in a declarative clause, Ko suggests that WHY in this context is also base-generated in the [Spec, CP] position. However, there is no reason for base-generating declarative-clause-internal WHY in the [Spec, CP] position, unlike interrogative-clause-internal WHY that can possibly enter into feature-checking with the interrogative Q-particle in its base-generated [Spec, CP] position.

The additional *wh*-effect on WHY in relative clauses as in (13) provides more convincing evidence for its placement far below [Spec, CP]. The relative clause in (13) constitutes an island for WHY associating with the matrix Q-particle. As Saito (1994) notes, however, the additional argument *wh*-phrase saves relative-clause-internal WHY, allowing it to take matrix scope.

- (13) C-nun [Y-ka ?nwukwu-eykey/*M-eykey way cwu-n] chayk-ul
 C-TOP Y-NOM who-to/M-to why give-REL book-ACC
 chac-ko issni?³
 look+for-be+ING-Q

Lit. ‘Is C looking for the book that Y gave to *M/whom why?’

Since [Spec, CP] is not available to relative-clause-internal WHY as in (13), its base-generation in lower position in the structure is inevitable.

Now, when Ko’s CP-Modifier Hypothesis on WHY is not valid, a question is how to account for its obviation of intervention effects, or **anti-intervention** (following Miyagawa’s (2017) terminology). Departing from Miyagawa (2017), we propose that though it is not base-generated in the [Spec, CP] position, WHY optionally raises overtly via scrambling from the VP-peripheral to the [Spec, CP] position in the same clause where it is generated, opting to enter into feature checking with the Q-particle. The movement of WHY as a *wh*-in-situ is in principle covert, but this covert movement can take place at overt syntax when available. Given this idea, we return to the paradigmatic examples of anti-intervention in (3a-b), repeated as (14a-b):

- (14) a. (adapted from Cho 1998: 405, her (12)):

Amwuto way an o-ess-ni?
 anyone why NEG come-PST-Q

‘Why didn’t anyone come?’

³ WHY together with a c-commanding additional argument *wh*-phrase is subject to NPI intervention effects, as in (i).

- (i) *Amwuto [[Yengi-ka nwukwu-eykey way cwu-n] chaykul] an chac-ko iss-ni?
 anyone Yengi-NOM who-to why give-REL book-ACC NEG look+for-be+ING-Q

Lit. ‘Is no one looking for a book that Yengi gave to whom why?’

- b. **Way amwuto** an o-ess-ni?
 why anyone NEG come-PST-Q
 ‘Why didn’t anyone come?’

Since (14b) has WHY before the NPI, the former is not subject to the IE. But WHY in (14a) is apparently blocked by the NPI, but the sentence is also acceptable, exhibiting anti-intervention. In Ko’s analysis, anti-intervention arises as WHY is base-generated in [Spec, CP] and properly interpreted in association with the Q-particle; the NPI before WHY in (14a) is scrambled, not able to function as an intervener between WHY and the Q-particle. Our analysis proceeds in the same fashion, except that WHY generated in VP-peripheral position takes a non-default option of moving overtly via scrambling to the clause-mate [Spec, CP].

As WHY can optionally undergo scrambling overtly to [Spec, CP], it is clause-bounded, like other adverbs in general in K/J. Its clause-bounded restriction accounts for the re-emergence of the IE for WHY. As Ko (2005) observes, the IE re-emerges when WHY is merged within a declarative ([-Q]) embedded clause and c-commanded by an NPI in the same clause or in a higher clause, as schematized in (15a, b) and exemplified in (16-17):

- (15) a. *[_{CP[+WH]} Q ... [_{CP[-WH]} ... NPI ... WHY ...] ...
 b. *[_{CP[+WH]} Q ... NPI ... [_{CP[-WH]} ... WHY ...] ...

- (16) (adapted from Ko 2005, 875, her (18a)):

*John-un [**amwuto way** ku chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ess-ta-ko] malha-ess-ni?
 John-TOP anyone why that book-ACC read-CI-NEG-PST-DCL-C say-PS-Q

‘What is the reason x s.t. John said that no one read that book for x?’

- (17) (adapted from Ko 2005, 874, her (16)):

***Amwuto** [John-I **way** saimha-ess-ta-ko] malha-ci anh-ess-ni?
 anyone John-NOM why resign-PST-DCL-C say-CI not-PST-Q

‘What is the reason x s.t. no one said that John resigned for x?’

Both in (16) and (17), WHY stays in the embedded declarative clause and is associated with the matrix Q. WHY in the former sentence is c-commanded by the NPI *amwuto* in the same embedded clause, while WHY in the latter, by the NPI *amwuto* in the matrix clause. Both sentences do show the IE.⁴ The obviation of the IE does not arise because WHY cannot move overtly from the embedded clause to matrix [Spec, CP] as a rescue strategy from the IE; recall that if overtly moved, WHY capitalizes on scrambling, but its overt movement is clause-bounded. Not overtly moved, WHY in (16) and (17) rather needs to undergo covert movement

⁴ Jun Abe (perl. commun.) pointed out that in Japanese, while (17) is very bad, (16) is fairly good. The analogous claim is made by Tomioka (2009) for (24) which is similar in structure to (16). See the discussion below for why, contrary to what is predicted by Ko’s (2005) analysis, (16) in contrast to (17) can be ruled in.

to the matrix [Spec, CP], but the intervening NPI precludes its movement because both WHY and NPI share the focus feature competing for the goal (see Malhotra (2009) and Zhang and Chacón (2018) for the recent analysis of the IE). It is to be underscored that since sentences like (16) and (17) are ruled out, the disappearance of the IE with WHY as in (14a) is not a general phenomenon, but it comes about from a rescue strategy via overt scrambling of WHY, only when available. Bear in mind that WHY in sentences like (14a) occurs with the NPI in the same clause with the [+WH] Q-particle, and as a last resort, it undergoes overt movement/scrambling to [Spec, CP], concurrently moving the preceding NPI to CP-periphery, with the result that WHY is immune from the IE.

Note that the last resort movement is not allowed for argument wh-phrases (WPs) in Korean. As well documented in the literature (Hoji 1985; Kim 1989, 1991; Sohn 1995; Beck and Kim 1997, among others), WPs in K/J display the IE. As in (18a), WPs cannot be licensed at LF by their associated Q-particles when c-commanded by an NPI:⁵

(18) Argument WP-NPI Interaction:

- a. {***Amwuto**/***Mary-pakkey**} **mwues-ul** mek-ci-anh-ass-**ni**?⁶
 anyone/M.-only what-ACC eat-CI-NEG-PST-Q

(Intended) ‘What did no one/only Mary eat?’

- b. **Nwu-ka** {**amwukesto/sakwa-pakkey**} mek-ci-anh-ass-**ni**?
 who-NOM anything/apple-only eat-CI-not-PST-Q

‘Who did not eat anything/anything except for apples?’

(18a), where the WP *mwues-ul* ‘what-ACC’ is c-commanded by the NPI *amwuto* ‘anyone’ or *Mary-pakkey* ‘Mary-only’, displays the IE. By contrast, (18b), where the c-command relation is reversed, shows no IE.⁷ When the WP in (18a) moves via scrambling to a position higher than the NPI, then the IE disappears as well, as in (19) below:⁸

⁵ See Sohn (1995) for Korean data and Tanaka (1997, 2003) for Japanese data, among others.

⁶ There exist speaker variations on the IE. See Lee and Tomioka (2001) and Ko (2005), and Tomioka (2007, 2009), among others.

⁷ Focus or scope-bearing expressions with a delimiter *-man* ‘only’ or *-to* ‘even’ and quantificational expressions like *nwukwunka* ‘someone’ and *nwukwuna* ‘everyone’ also induce the IE (but with varying degrees and with speaker variations) on WPs, as exemplified below. (See Kim 1991, Ko 2005, and Tomioka 2007, 2009, among others.)

⁸ Beck (2006) and Beck and Kim (2006) propose a semantic account for the IE. They attribute the IE to a semantic anomaly based on Rooth’s (1992) alternative semantics of focus, according to which focus evokes two types of semantic values, an ordinary and a focus semantics value. WPs cannot be in the domain of a focus-sensitive operator, as then the ordinary value of the focus-sensitive operator cannot be determined, leading to a semantic anomaly. Notice that WPs have focus values and but not ordinary values.

- (19) **Mwues-ul₁** {**amwuto/Mary-pakkey**} t₁ mek-ci-anh-ass-ni?
 what-Acc anyone/M.-only eat-CI-not-Past-Q
 ‘What did {no one/only Mary} eat?’

Why is there a contrast between adjunct WHY and other argument WPs in light of the IE? Unlike the former, the latter do not undergo covert phrasal movement (Nishigauchi, 1986, 1990; Pesetsky, 2000), so that its overt phrasal movement cannot take place. Scrambling can apply to argument WPs as in (19), but its application in (18a) impinges on a ban on string-preserving vacuous scrambling (Saito, 1985). Consequently, association of argument WPs with the Q-particle in LF unselective binding in (18a) is interrupted by the intervening NPI, inducing the IE.⁹ Meanwhile, overt movement of WHY in (14a) looks similar to potential overt movement of argument WP WHAT in (18a), but note that only the former is grammatically motivated in the sense of wearing itself on the sleeves.

As a last resort strategy of obviating the IE, the overt movement of WHY that generally moves covertly can take place only when the element preceding it is properly licensed at overt syntax. Unlike that in K/J, the position prior to [Spec,CP] in Chinese is grammaticalized to host the topic of a clause. Hence there is a contrast between (20), (21), and (22), as noted by Jin (2020).

- (20) # {**Meiyou ren /henshao ren**} weishenme yao cizhi?
 {no person /few person} why want.to resign
 ‘Why do {nobody/few people} want to resign?’
- (21) **Suoyoude/mei-(yi)-ge ren** weishenme dou yao cizhi?
 all person why DOU want.to resign
 ‘Why does everyone want to resign?’
- (22) ? {**Zhishao san-ge ren/ chaoguo san-ge ren/**
 {at.least three-CLF person/ more.than three-CLF person/
san-ge ren/ ji-ge ren} weishenme yao cizhi?
 three-CLF person/ a.few-CLF person} why want.to resign
 ‘Why do {at least three people/more than three people/three people/a few people} want to resign?’

Jin (*ibid.*) observes that the apparent IE in WHY-questions of Chinese is sensitive to the monotonicity of quantifiers occurring before *weishenmu* ‘why’. The overall pattern discovered by Jin (*ibid.*) is summarized as follows. First, in Chinese matrix (and embedded) WHY-questions, monotone decreasing quantifiers as in (20) consistently induce the IE. Second,

⁹ Hwang (2011) claims that the IE arises when a WP blocks the NPI-Neg dependency. She casts doubt on the observation that other scope bearing elements like focus expressions and quantifiers induce the IE.

monotone increasing quantifiers such as MOST-phrases and EVERY-phrases as in (21) do not induce the IE. Third, a subset of monotone increasing and non-monotonic quantifiers as in (22), such as modified numerals, bare numerals and other number-denoting quantifiers, induce weak IE in matrix WHY-questions. This pattern of behaviors for the three types of Chinese quantifiers concerning the IE follows from the ability for them to be construed as a topic in the outer Spec of CP in front of WHY overtly moved to the inner Spec of CP. Monotone decreasing quantifiers cannot serve as a topic, whereas monotone increasing quantifiers such as MOST-phrases and EVERY-phrases can. On the other hand, a subset of monotone increasing and non-monotonic quantifiers need discourse accommodation to do so.

Now returning to K/J, Tomioka (2009: 267-268) notes two cases in Japanese where WHY in the embedded declarative clause, unlike its counterpart in (16a-b), is not ruled out despite the apparent IE:

(23) (Tomioka 2009: 267, his (29)):

(?)**pro** [daremo naze ko-nakat-ta-to] omou?
 pro anyone why come-NEG-PST-C think-prof-Q
 ‘Why do you think that no one came?’

(24) (Tomioka 2009: 268, his (30)):

(Jaa) ERIKA-wa [daremo naze ko-nakat-ta-to] omotte-iru-no?
 then ERIKA-CONTR anyone why come-NEG-PST-C think-prof-Q
 ‘Why does ERIKA think that no one came?’

In (23), the matrix subject is the second person (the hearer), realized as *pro*, and in (24), the matrix subject bears a contrastive topic feature. Tomioka (*ibid.*) relies on the unique property of a WHY-question that the non-WH-portion of a clause except WHY is presupposed (see Bromberger (1992) and Lawler (1971) in discussing presuppositions in WHY questions) (See also Wee (2007)). He assumes, following Krifka (2001), that in an ordinary wh-question, the WP belongs to focus, while the rest belongs to the background, which is further divided into Topic (Link) and Tail (Valluduvu 1992). The peculiar aspect of (23) and (24) is that since the level of presupposition (i.e., the embed clause where WHY occurs overtly) and the scope of WHY (i.e., the matrix clause where the Q-particle occurs) are not the same, the presupposition level needs to be lifted up to the matrix clause. Tomioka observes that the use of a second-person matrix null subject in (23) or a contrastive topic in (24) facilitates such a needed promotion of the embedded proposition that “no one came” to the whole-sentence or global presupposition.

The thing to note is that in the absence of an NPI before WHY in the embedded declarative clause as in (12), repeated below, the promotion of the embedded presupposition to the global presupposition is allowed freely without any restriction on the status of a matrix subject.

- (12) Cheli-nun [Yengi-ka way ttena-ass-tako] sayngkakha-ni?
 Cheli-TOP Yengi-MOM why leave-PST-COMP think-Q

‘Why does Cheli think that Yengi left?’

In our analysis, the obviation of the IE in (23) and (24) arises as WHY in the embedded declarative clause markedly moves overtly to the matrix [Spec, CP]; recall that WHY in the embedded declarative clause generally stays in situ; its overt scrambling to the matrix clause [Spec, CP] is ruled out just like overt scrambling of adverbs in general. As in (25) corresponding to (12), however, WHY overtly scrambled to the matrix clause can be markedly associated interpretively with the embedded clause.

- (25) ?(?)[Way₁ [Cheli-nun [Yengi-ka t₁ ttena-ass-tako] sayngkakha]-ni?

On a par with WHY in (25), WHY in (23) and (24) can move via scrambling to the matrix [Spec,CP] position, pushing the preceding embedded NPI leftward outside the IE-inducing domain, obviating the IE.¹⁰ In another aspect, as Aoshima et al. (2004) argue in their study of sentence processing in Japanese, when the matrix subject is phonologically null in (23), the following NPI and WHY tend to be initially parsed as belonging to the matrix clause. Likewise when the contrastive topic-marked subject is analyzed as a left-dislocated element in (24), the following NPI and WHY are also parsed in the same way, which in turn obviates the IE.

Now is a good point to return to the two arguments advanced for overt-syntax VP-internal placement of WHY in Korean based on Miyagawa’s (2017) VP idiom and VP fronting tests. The relevant examples (8) and (10) are repeated below.

- (8) Yengi-man miyekkwuk-ul way mek-ess-ni?
 Yengi-only seaweed soup-ACC why eat-PST-Q

‘Why did only Yengi eat seaweed soup?’

- (10) [Cheli-eykey ku-uy cangnan-ul way kyengkohaki]-cochato
 Cheli-to he-GEN prank-ACC why warn-even
 Yengi-man ha-yss-ni?
 Yengi-only do-PST-Q

Lit. ‘Even why warn him about his prank, only Yengi did.’

Though these two tests are well-thought-out ones, they are not convincing about the points that they are intended to make. In (8), according to Ko’s CP-Modifier Hypothesis, it is wrongly predicated that the object before WHY loses an idiomatic reading. Our analysis also apparently predicts the same. However, as (8) preserves the same word order as that of the VP idiom except

¹⁰ Qilin Tian (perl. comm.) informs me that the Chinese examples corresponding to (23) and (24) are bad, which renders support to a scrambling analysis for the examples like (23) and (24) in Korean where scrambling is available (but Chinese does not have such kind of scrambling).

for the intervening WHY, it seems to retain the idiomatic reading despite the scrambling of WHY to the [Spec,CP] position. Likewise, in (10) WHY inside the VP fronted to TP can still raise out of it to [Spec,CP], thereby obviating the IE due to the focus markers.

4. Adjunct WHAT in place of WHY

Miyagawa (2017) reports that in Japanese there is a special case of WHY questions expressed with WHAT plus ACCusative marker as in (26), arguing that this adjunct WHAT occurs lower in the structure:

- (26) Taroo-wa **nani-o** awatete-iru no?
 Taro-top what-ACC panick-ing Q
 ‘Why (in the hell) is Taro panicking?’

Corresponding to its Japanese counterpart, Korean has the following form *mwe-l* ‘what+ACC’ that derives via reduction from *mwe-le* ‘what-for’ or *mwe(-l) ha-le* ‘in order to do what’:^{11, 12}

¹¹ There are other uses of *mwe-l* ‘what-ACC’, which derive from *mwe-l poko* ‘what-ACC see’ and *mwel-lo hay-se* ‘what-ACC-for reason-for’. These uses tend to occur with copula, stative adjectives, and ergative verbs.

- (i) Cheli-ka **mwe-l** (po-ko) sakikkwun-i-ya?
 Cheli-NOM what-ACC see-REAS swindler
 Lit. ‘Why is Cheli a swindler?’
- (ii) Yengi-ka **mwe-l** (po-ko) yeyppu-ni?
 who-NOM what-ACC see-REAS pretty-Q
 Lit. ‘Why is Yengi pretty?’
- (iii) Nwu-ka **mwe-l** {(iyu-lo)/(lo hay-se)}/mwe-ttaym {ey/si} haykotoy-ess-ni/sulphum-ey
 who-NOM what-ACC reason-for/for do-REAS/what-for get fired-PST-Q/sorrow-into
 ppacy-ess-ni?
 fall-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Why did who get fired?/Why did who fall in sorrow?’
- (iv) Twul-i **mwe-l** wenin-ulo heyecy-ess-nunci sayngkakha-y pok-ela.
 two-NOM what-ACC cause-for divorce-PST-Q think-try-IMP
 Lit. ‘Think about what the two got divorced for.’

¹² Considering its morphological make-up (it is composed of by *mwe* ‘what’ and *-le* ‘verbal inflection denoting purpose’), the Korean *mwu-le* is more reasonably assimilated to *nan-de* ‘what-with/for’ (cf. Fujii and Takita, 2007) than to the Accusative-marked adjunct WHAT *nani-o* in Japanese.

- (27) pro ilen ke-l **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l) ha-le** kaci-ko-o-ass-e?
 this thing-ACC what-ACC/what-PURP/what do-PURP have-come-PST-INFORM
 ‘What did you bring this home for?’

Since it comes from the object position of the purpose/rationale phrase *mwe ha-le* ‘in order to do what’, we dub *mwe-l* as rationale WHAT (See Endo (2015) also for the rationale *what . . . for* construction in English and Japanese). Here a question is raised whether rationale WHAT allows only a purpose construal. Though the full form enforces such a construal in allowing only the response to it as in (28a), the reduced forms such as *mwe-l/mwe-le* can be responded to in two ways as in (28a) and (28b), allowing both purpose and reason interpretations.

- (28) a. Hwatan-e (pro) noh-uley-ko.
 Flower be-on put-PURP-CONJ
 ‘In order (for me) to put it on the flower bed.’
- b. Chinkwu-ka (pro) cwu-ese.
 friend-NOM give-REASON
 ‘Because (my) friend gave it to me.’

Now examining the behaviors of Korean rationale WHAT, first, it is distinguished from WHY, in that it is subject to the negative/inner island constraint. Though the latter as in (29b) can, the former as in (29a) cannot occur with negation.

- (29) a. *pro kule ke-l **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l) ha-le** an
 that thing-ACC what-ACC/what-PURP/what(-ACC) do-PURP NOT
 kaciko-o-ass-e?
 have-come-PST-INFORM
 ‘What did you not bring that kind of thing home for?’
- b. pro kule ke-l **way** an kaciko-o-ass-e?
 WHY NOT
 ‘Why did you not bring that kind of thing home?’

As the inner island constraint is invoked when the element sensitive to it is generated in lower position than negation, the unacceptability of sentences like (29a) in contrast to (29b) renders compelling evidence that rationale WHAT is not in higher but in lower position than negation.

Its sensitivity to the inner island prevents testing the IE for rationale WHAT using the NPI as in (30):

- (30) *pro amwu kesto **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le** an
 anything what-ACC/what-PURP/what-ACC do-PURP NOT
 kaciko-o-ass-e?
 have-come-PST-INFORM
 ‘Why did you not bring anything home?’

Instead, when the exclusive focus particle *-man* ‘only’ is used, the IE does not arise with rationale WHAT as in (31a), in a parallel fashion as WHY as in (31b):

- (31) a. pro chayk-man **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le**
 book-ACC what-ACC/what-PURP/what-ACC do-PURP
 kaciko-o-ass-e?¹³
 have-come-PST-INFORM
 ‘Why did you bring only books home?’
- b. pro chayk-man **way** kaciko-o-ass-e?
 book-ACC WHY have-come-PST-INFORM
 ‘What did you bring only books (home) for?’

The obviation of the IE in (31a) can be accounted for by extending our proposed analysis for WHY to rationale WHAT. After it is generated in VP-peripheral position lower than negation, rationale WHAT undergoes scrambling to [Spec,CP], thereby doing away with the IE, in the same fashion as WHY. Bear in mind, however, that though they move at overt syntax, the former but not the latter is sensitive to the inner island constraint.

Likewise, the embedded rationale WHAT as in (32) avoids the IE by using the same strategy: its overt scrambling to the embedded C domain.

- (32) S-ka [C-man chayk-ul **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le** kacye+o-ass-nyako/-nunci]
 S-NOM C-only book-ACC bring-PST-Q/-Q
 mwul-ess-ta.
 ask-PST-DCL
 ‘S asked what C brought a book for.’

¹³ *Mwe-l* after the subject NP with the exclusive particle is slightly degraded, in a parallel fashion as WHY:

- (i) a. Cheli-man ?**mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **hale** w-ass-ni?
 Cheli-only what-ACC/what-PURP/what-ACC do-PURP come-PST-Q
 ‘What did only Cheli come for?’
- b. ?Cheli-man ?**way** w-ass-ni?
 why

However, the fully reduced form of rationale WHAT is substantially degraded when it occurs in embedded declarative clauses; it is distinctively in contrast with other variant forms such as *mwe-le* and *mwe(-l) ha-le*, which sound acceptable in the same contexts. The former needs to be licensed only via its overt scrambling to the clause-mate C domain.

- (33) a. *S-man [C-ka chayk-ul **mwe-l** kacyew-ass-tako] malha-yss-ni?
 S-only C-NOM book-ACC what-ACC bring-PST-COMP say-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘What did only S say that C brought a book for?’

- b. ?S-man [C-ka chayk-ul **mwe-le/mwe(-l) ha-le** kacyew-ass-tako] malha-yss-ni?

We move onto anti-superiority of rationale WHAT. Miyagawa (2017) notes that in Japanese, anti-superiority holds as in (34), where the adjunct WHAT cannot occur before the subject wh-phrase:

- (34) ***Nani-o** dare-ga awateteiru no?
 what-ACC who-nom panicking Q
 ‘Who is panicking why?’

In Korean, however, either word order is allowed between an object wh-phrase and the rationale WHAT, as in (35a) and (35b):

- (35) a. pro **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le** nwukwu-lul chotayha-yass-e?
 what-ACC/what-PURP/what do-PURP who-ACC invite-PST-INFORM
 ‘What did you invite who (home) for?’
 b. pro nwukwu-lul **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le** chotayha-yass-e?
 who-ACC what-ACC/what-PURP/what do-PURP invite-PST-INFORM
 ‘What did you invite who (home) for?’

By contrast, the rationale WHAT after a subject wh-phrase is fine, but the former before the latter is degraded, as shown in (36a-b):

- (36) a. ?***Mwe-l**^{OK}**mwe-le** nwu-ka yeki-ey te namkeytoy-ni?
 what-ACC/what-PURP who-NOM here-at longer stay-Q
 ‘What is who going to stay longer for?’
 b. nwuka ?**mwe-l**^{OK}**mwe-le** yekiey te namkeytoyni

We suspect that the anti-superiority behaviors of rationale/adjunct WHAT in Korean and Japanese are due to their possible base-generation positions in K/J. Yoshio Endo (perl. commun.) notes that in Japanese, adjunct *nani-o* ‘what-ACC’ and *nan-de* ‘what-for/with’ are generated in lower and higher positions than subject NPs, respectively, as the following pairs show:

- (37) a. Dare-ga **nani-o** naiteiru no?
Who-NOM what-ACC cry Q
‘Why is who crying?’

b. ??/*Nani-o dare-ga naiteiru no?

- (38) a. ??Dare-ga **nan-de** naiteiru no?
who-NOM WHAT-for cry Q
‘What is who crying for?’

b. Nan-de dare-ga naiteiru no?

Along this line, we submit that the Korean rationale WHAT as in (35a) and (35b) is generated in flexible ways in relation to object NPs, not subject to anti-superiority that the Korean WHY is sensitive to. On the other hand, the same WHAT as in (36a) and (36b) is generated below subject NPs, amenable to anti-superiority like WHY.

In addition to syntactic behaviors, the sentences containing the Korean rationale WHAT are meaning-wise characterized as expressing a complaint, retort, or grumble.¹⁴

- (39) pro **mwe-l/mwe-le/mwe(-l)** **ha-le** o-ass-e?
what-ACC/what-PURP/what do-PURP come-PST-INFOM

To summarize, the Korean rationale WHAT displays the following properties.

- (40) a. sensitive to the inner/negative island constraint;
b. not subject to anti-intervention;
c. not subject to anti-superiority
d. has a causal/reason meaning as well as a rationale meaning.
e. connotes such emotion as complaint, resort, and grumble.

Crucially, it is generated in VP-peripheral position lower than negation, but like WHY, it needs to undergo scrambling to the clause-mate C domain.

5. Adjunct WHAT-less questions

Kim (2020, 2021) reports that Kyengsang Dialect of Korean (KDK) allows a phonological suppression of causal/reason wh-adverb like WHY in the follow contexts (41) and (42), taken from Kim. The peculiar aspect of this dialect is that it distinguishes the two types of Q-particle in the matrix clause; *-no* for wh-questions and *-na* for ‘yes/no’ questions:

¹⁴ Ochi (2004) notes that the sentences containing adjunct WHAT connotatively express the ‘emotions such as annoyance, impatience, surprise’.

- (41) Scenario 1: Believing in the weather broadcast of long term raining, Chelswu would bring an umbrella with him, but the weather broadcast betrayed him all the time. After all, he decided this morning not to bring the umbrella even though his mother recommended him to do so. Now, when he is leaving for home after work with a heavy load to carry, there comes rain. He desperately says:

Sentence (i): Pi-ka o-ko kha-no cincca.
 rain-NOM come-KO do so-Q really
 ‘How come it really is raining?’

Sentence (ii): Wa pi-ka o-ko kha-no cincca.
 why rain-NOM come-KO do so-Q really
 ‘How come it really is raining?’

- (42) Scenario 2: Chelswu made an appointment with his friends to see them at a cafeteria, and arrived there a little earlier. He has been seated alone but none of his friends have showed up even 10 minutes after the appointed time. He starts to say:

Sentence (iii): Amwuto an o-no?
 anyone not come-Q
 ‘How come no one appears?’

Sentence (iv): Wa amwuto an o-no?
 why anyone not come-Q
 ‘How come no one appears?’

Taking sentences (i) and (iii) in the scenarios of (41) and (42) to be construed not as reason but as causal WHY questions in light of Ochi’s (2014) dichotomy,¹⁵ Kim (*ibid.*) argues that WHY in these sentences are base-generated in [Spec,CP] position but optionally realized with no phonetic features.

Departing from Kim (2020, 2021), we argue that the phonologically unrealized wh-element of sentences (i) and (ii) in the scenarios of (41) and (42) is not causal WHY but adjunct WHAT. First, these questions occur in particular situational contexts characterizing the use of adjunct WHAT. They are used when the speaker asks himself/the addressee for the reasons of a

¹⁵ Ochi (2014) suggests that there are two kinds of WHY, which are distinguished in light of meaning and base-generation position as follows:

- (i) Reason WHYS (e.g., *why* in English, *weishenme* in Chinese, *naze* in Japanese, and so on) are base generated in the periphery of CP (interrogative or non-interrogative) or elsewhere (i.e., within T’).
- (ii) Causal WHYS (e.g., *how come*, and *why the hell* in English, *zenme* in Chinese, and so on) are base-generated in the left periphery of an interrogative CP.

situation taking place in front of them. Thus, they tend to be used felicitously with the present progressive aspect form of verbs. Second, these questions are connotatively interpreted as expressing such emotions as a complaint, retort, or grumble, characterized by adjunct WHAT questions. In association with the scenarios of (41) and (42), the sentences (i) and (iii) imply such emotions. Third, when we add adjunct WHAT to the sentence (i) of (41), the resulting sentence in (43) is a legitimate paraphrase of the original sentence:

- (43) Pi-ka (mwue-l) o-ko kha-no cincca.
rain-NOM what-ACC come-KO do so-Q really
‘How come it really rains?’

Of course, the adjunct WHAT cannot be added to the sentence (iii) of (38) owing to the inner island constraint, as in (44a):

- (44) a. Amwuto (*mwe-l) an o-no?
anyone what-ACC NOT come-Q
Lit. ‘How come no one show up?’
b. (~~Mwe-l~~ iywu-lo) amwu-to an o-no?
what-ACC reason-for anyone NOT come-Q

The mandatory phonological suppression of adjunct WHAT in (44a) is instructive, in that only the negation survives with the *wh* Q-particle; instead of bare adjunct WHAT, the complex form of WHAT *mwe-l iywu-lo* ‘what-ACC reason-for’ (reminiscent of *because of what* as an underlying form of *why* postulated in Beck’s (1995, 132; also 1996) analysis) not subject to anti-intervention needs to be postulated before the NPI in sentences as in (44b). In tandem, Bromberger (1992) notes that association to focus is a favorite strategy for *why*. Yoshida et al. (2015) also observe that *why* tends to associate with a focalized item, that is to say, with a specific component of the event. Likewise, Miyagawa (2017) notes that unlike English, on top of focus-association with it Japanese has a second way to indicate focus domains in a WHY question of Japanese, by placing *naze* in front of focalized elements. Taken together, in KDK entertaining the [+WH] Q particle, only the focus associate VP often preceded by the negation or followed by the anaphoric form of copied VP such as *kule-* or *kha-* ‘do’ can survive while phonologically suppressing adjunct WHAT *mwe-l*.

6. Accounting for anti-superiority/additional *wh*-effects

We now return to anti-superiority/additional *wh*-effects and demonstrate how effectively overt movement of WHY can account for anti-superiority effects. The paradigmatic cases of anti-superiority in Korean are illustrated by (45a-b), where WHY needs to be c-commanded by another *wh*-phrase, not the other way around:

- (45) a. Nwu-ka way ttena-ass-ni?
 who-NOM why leave-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Why did who leave?’
 b. ?*Way nwuka ttenassni?

The same restriction holds in the embedded clause as well, as in (46).

- (46) a. Cheli-nun [nwu-ka way tten-ass-nunci] kwungkumhay ha-nta.
 Cheli-TOP who-NOM why leave-PST-Q wonder-DCL
 ‘Cheli is wondering why who left.’
 b. ?*Cheli-nun [way nwu-ka tten-ass-nunci] kwungkumhay ha-nta.

It is tempting to assimilate this restriction in wh-in-situ languages to the same restriction in multiple wh-fronting languages like Romanian as in (47), taken from Stepanov and Tsai (2008):

- (47) a. cine de ce a plecat? (Romanian)
 who why has left
 b. *de ce cine a plecat?
 why who has left

As in Korean, WHY in Romanian (i.e., *de ce*) needs to be not followed but preceded by another wh-element as shown by the contrast between (47a) and (47b). Thus, the parallel cases of Korean as a wh-in-situ language in (45) and (46) are taken to wear anti-superiority on the sleeves.

To account for anti-superiority effects, we assume the classical idea that WHY preempts the Spec,CP position to meet the ECP (Huang, 1982). Otherwise, it incurs an ECP violation. In (47), when *de ce* moves first to the [Spec, CP] position, the argument wh-phrase preceding it adjoins to it, meeting the ECP. In a parallel way, in (45a) and (46a) WHY overtly preempts the [Spec, CP] position; subsequently, the wh-phrase preceding it overtly undergoes scrambling to the position before WHY in [Spec, CP], not violating any constraint. However, in (45b) and (46b) when WHY moves first, the LF movement of the other wh-phrase following it violates the relation preservation/rigidity condition (Watanabe, 1991) or the intervention condition (Ko, 2005).¹⁶ Alternatively, the unselective binding of the lower wh-phrase when WHY alone is in [Spec, CP] cannot go through.

As noted by Watanabe (1991), (48a) and (48b) with one more wh-phrase preceding WHY

¹⁶ Ko (2005) assumes in line with Bromberger (1992) that WHY as a focus element functions as a scope-bearing element.

unlike (45b) and (46b) are fine as the latter is in licit relation with the former.

- (48) a. Nwu-ka way mwues-ul sa-ass-ni?
 who-NOM why what-ACC buy-PST
 ‘Why did who buy?’
- b. Cheli-nun [nwu-ka way mwues-ul sa-ass-nunci] kwungkumhay ha-nta.
 Cheli-TOP who-NOM why what-ACC buy-PST-Q wonder-DCL
 ‘Cheli is wondering why who bought what.’

Watanabe hypothesizes that a multiple wh-question is allowed as long as the wh phrase coindexed with the head C is in licit relation with another wh-phrase.

WHY in embedded declarative clauses cannot undergo scrambling to the matrix Q-particle domain as in (49c), like adverbs in general owing to a ban on their cross-clausal scrambling. Saito (1994: 217) notes the contrast between (49a) and (49b) in light of the clause-mate condition that embedded-clause WHY and another higher wh-phrase meet:

- (49) a. Bill-i Meyli-eykey [nwu-ka way ku chayk-ul sa-ass-tako]
 Bill-NOM Mary-to who-NOM why that book-ACC buy-PST-COMP
 malha-yss-ni?
 say-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Why₁ did who say to Mary that who bought that book t₁?’
- b. ?*Nwu-ka Meyli-eykey [Con-i way ku chayk-ul sa-ass-tako]
 who-NOM Mary-to John-NOM why that book-ACC buy-PST-COMP
 malha-yss-ni?
 say-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Why₁ did who say to Mary that John bought that book t₁?’
- c. ?*Nwu-ka way₁ Meyli-eykey [Con-i t₁ ku chayk-ul sa-ass-tako]
 who-NOM why Mary-to John-NOM that book-ACC buy-PST-COMP
 malha-yss-ni?
 say-PST-Q
 Lit. ‘Why₁ did who say to Mary that John bought that book t₁?’

In (49a-b), the higher wh-phrase serves as an intervener for the lower WHY, so that there needs to be a strategy for circumventing this intervener for WHY. Saito argues that WHY directly adjoins to another wh-phrase at LF; since this adjunction counts as an instance of A-movement, embedded-clause WHY in (49b) unlike that in (49a) illicitly crosses CP before adjoining to the matrix subject wh-phrase.

Turning now to anti-superiority effects in Chinese, Takita and Yang (2014) draw attention to Huang's (1982: 545) observation that Chinese does not allow WHY in this language (i.e., *weishenme*) to co-occur with another wh-phrase in any linear order as far as mono-clausal sentences are concerned (see also Cheng and Rooryck, 2002; Tsai 2008, 104). (50a-b) make a relevant point.

(50) a. *(Nimen,) weishenme shei hui cizhi? *[… 'why' ... wh ...]
 you guys why who will resign

Lit. 'Why would who resign?'

b. *Shei weishenme bu lai? *[… wh ... 'why' ...]
 who why not come

Lit. 'Who does not come why?'

(50a) can be accounted for on a par with the (b)-examples of (45)-(46), which are in violation of the relation presentation/rigidity condition or the constraint on unselective binding. The following examples in (51a-b) can also be ruled out in the same way.

(51) a. Ni weishenme pa Zhangsan/*shei?
 you why fear Zhangsan/whom

'Why are you afraid of Zhangsan/whom?'

b. Chuang-shang weishenme tangzhe yige ren/*shenme-ren?
 bed-on why lie one person/what-person

Lit. 'Why does on the bed lie one person/who?'

What is peculiar about Chinese is that anti-superiority effects do apparently not arise in matrix clauses as the ungrammaticality of (50b) and the following examples in (52a-b) show.

(52) a. *Shei weishenme bu lai?
 who why not come

Lit. 'Who does not come why?'

b. *Shei weishenme likai?
 who why leave

Lit. 'Who left why?'

Taking anti-superiority effects to follow from intervention effects, Ko (2005) attributes the ungrammaticality of (50b) and (52a-b) to the information-structure property of the position prior to WHY in Chinese; as pointed out above, it only hosts a topic, but wh-phrases cannot serve as a topic.

However, Ko’s analysis was challenged by Takita and Yang (2014), who note that unlike matrix clauses, embedded clauses allow either word order between WHY and another wh-phrase. The relevant example is given in (53) (adapted from Huang 1982: 525-526), where one wh-phrase precedes WHY.

- (53) Ni xiang-zhidao [shei weishenme mai-le shu]?
 you want-know who why buy-le book
 (a) Lit. ‘Who; do you wonder [t₁ bought books why]?’
 (b) Lit. ‘*Why₁ do you wonder [who bought books t₁]?’

The other example is given in (54) (adapted from Cheng and Rooryck 2002: 21), where WHY precedes another wh-phrase:

- (54) Ni xiang-zhidao [Lisi weishenme mai-le shenme]?
 you want-know Lisi why buy-le what
 (a) Lit. ‘What₁ do you wonder [Lisi bought t₁ why]?’
 (b) Lit. ‘*Why₁ do you wonder [Lisi bought what t₁]?’

Based on the scope readings available to (53) and (54), Takita and Yang (2014) go on to modify Huang’s (1982: 545) observation that Chinese does not allow WHY in this language to co-occur with another wh-phrase, reaching the following generalization. In Chinese, WHY and another wh-phrase cannot take the same scope. In (53) and (54), WHY always takes embedded scope, while another wh-phrase takes matrix scope. Why does this generalization hold? To account for it, we first assume that, contrary to expectation, Chinese wh-phrases undergo overt wh-movement (see Chung and Park (2019) and Soh (2005) for this thesis),¹⁷ and their copies

¹⁷ Miyagawa (2017) revisits the scope interaction between a universal QP and WHY in Chinese as noted by Aoun and Li (1993). When the former c-commands the latter, (1a) yields a pair-list reading, but with the reverse order, (1b) does not.

- (i) a. Meigeren dou weishenme da ta? (ambiguous: every > wh; wh > every)
 everyone all why hit him
 ‘Why did everyone hit him?’
 b. Weishenme meigeren dou da ta? (unambiguous: *every > wh; ^{OK}wh > every)
 why everyone all it him
 ‘Why did everyone hit him?’

Miyagawa (2017) claims that in contrast to Chinese, Japanese does not allow a pair-list, but a single-pair reading; We rehearse the relevant examples corresponding to (ia-b):

- (ii) a. Motwu-ka ta way ku-lul chy-ess-ni?
 Everyone-NOM all why him-ACC hit-PST-Q
 ‘Why did everyone hit him?’

are deleted not at the tails but at the heads of their chains (Pesetsky, 1998, 2000). Under the overt wh-movement hypothesis for Chinese wh-phrases, (53) and (54) do not pose any problem, since owing to the ECP WHY in embedded clause moves first to the embedded [Spec,CP] that houses only one wh-phrase, and another wh-phrase cannot but move to the matrix [Spec,CP]. Now what about (50b) and (52a-b) where WHY and another wh-phrase occur in the matrix clause? In these cases, WHY moves to the matrix [Spec,CP] position, and the other wh-phrase lands in the topic position prior to it, thus incompatible with it, which indicates that Ko's insight on it as pointed out above is correct.

7. Summary and conclusion

In K/J as free word order and wh-in-situ languages, it is hard to pinpoint where WHY is base-generated and where it is realized at overt syntax. In this paper we have revisited anti-intervention and anti-superiority to argue that, contrary to Ko's (2005) CP Modifier Hypothesis, WHY in K/J is not generated in the [Spec,CP] position. To defend this thesis, we have also investigated the syntactic behaviors of rationale or adjunct WHAT in Korean, *mwe-l* 'what-ACC'. In keeping with Miyagawa (2017) concerning its base-generation lower in the structure, we have argued that WHY in these languages undergo scrambling preemptively at overt syntax to enter into feature checking with the Q-particle in the same clause. WHY's clause-bounded scrambling accounts for anti-intervention with pre-WHY NPIs. Intervention effects, however, do arise for WHY that is not subject to overt licensing via scrambling. As for anti-superiority, when WHY-in-situ that does not scramble overtly to [Spec,CP] occurs with a high wh-phrase, the former capitalizes on what Saito (1994) calls the adjunction strategy to adjoin to the latter in taking scope. We have then extended the proposed *overt WHY movement* analysis to *weishenmu* 'why' in Chinese. Suggesting that the position before *weishenmu* overtly moved to [SPEC,CP] counts as a topic, we have shown that the different degrees of intervention effects follow from the topicality of quantified elements as an apparent pre-WHY intervener. Peculiar aspects of anti-superiority in Chinese stem from both overt movement of wh-phrases and one specifier of Comp at the point of construal. Taken together, base-generation of WHY lower in the structure and its overt movement to the clause-mate C domain is a newly proposed analytic option, and it gives a better handle in accounting for both anti-intervention and anti-superiority in the three East Asian languages.

References

Aoshima, S., C. Phillips, and A. Weinberg (2004) "Processing Filler-gap Dependencies in a Head-final Language," *Journal of Memory and Language* 51, 23-54.

b. Way motwu-ka ta ku-lul chy-ess-ni?

We take the availability of a pair-list reading in (ia) – as available to the English example "Who did everyone hit?" – to argue in favor of the overt wh-movement hypothesis in Chinese, thus crossing WHY over the universal QP.

- Aoun, J. and A. Y.-H. Li (1993) “*Wh*-elements In-situ: Syntax or LF?”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 199–238.
- Beck, S. (1995) “Negative Islands and Reconstruction.” In U. Lutz and J. Pafel, (eds), *Extraction and Extraposition in German*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 121–143.
- Beck, S. (1996) *Wh-constructions and Transparent Logical Form*, Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Tübingen.
- Beck, S. (2006) “Intervention Effects Follow From Focus Interpretation”, *Natural Language Semantics* 14, 1-56.
- Beck, S. and S.-S. Kim (1997) “On *Wh*- and Operator Scope in Korean,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 339–384.
- Beck, S. and S.-S. Kim. (2006) “Intervention Effects in Alternative Questions,” *The Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 9, 165-208.
- Bromberger, S. (1992) *On What We Know We Don’t Know: Explanation, Theory, Linguistics, and How Questions Shape Them*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0149.1994.tb02395.x>.
- Cheng, L. and J. Rooryck. (2002) “Licensing *Wh*-in-situ,” *Syntax* 3, 1-19.
- Cho, E. (1998) “*Why*, Contrastive Topic, and LF Movement.” In D. J. Silva, (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 8, CSLI Publications, Stanford University, 403–415.
- Choi, Y.-S. (2003) “Intervention Effect in Korean *Wh*-questions Revisited,” a paper presented at Glow in Asia 4, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- Chung, D. and M.-K. Park (2020) “The Nature of Indeterminate Expressions in Chinese and Korean: Focused on *Wh*-phrases in Conditionals,” *Linguistic Research* 55(3), 479-506.
- Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Endo, T. (2015) “Two ReasonPs: What Are*(n’t) You Coming to the United States For?” In U. Shlonsky, (ed.), *Beyond Functional Sequence: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Oxford University Press, New York, 220–231.
- Fujii, T. and K. Takita. (2007) “*Wh*-adverbials In-situ, Their Island-(in)sensitivity and the Role of Demonstratives in *Wh*-in-situ Licensing,” *Nanzan Linguistic* 3, 107–126.
- Jin, D. (2020) “A Semantic Account of Quantifier-induced Intervention Effects in Chinese *Why*-questions,” *Linguistics and Philosophy* 43, 345–387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-019-09270-x>.
- Kim, S.-S. (2002) “Intervention Effects Are Focus Effects,” *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10, 615-628.
- Kim, S.-S. (2005) “Focus Intervention Effects in Questions,” A manuscript presented at Theoretical East Asian Languages 3, Harvard University.
- Kim, Y.-H. (2020) “*Wh*-less *Wh*-questions in Korean and Their Implications for the Position(s) of WHY,” *Studies in Generative Grammar* 30, 1-20.
- Kim, Y.-H. (2021) “On the (Non-)movement of WHY: A Reply to Miyagawa (2017),” *Studies in Modern Grammar* 109, 1-17.
- Hagstrom, P. (1998) *Decomposing Questions*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Hoji, H. (1985) *Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Huang, C.-T. J. (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hwang, J.-H. (2011) “What Intervenes What?: The Flip Side of Intervention Effects,” *Language Research* 47, 219-244.
- Kim, S. (1989) “*Wh*-phrases in Korean and Japanese Are QPs.” In P. Branigan, J. Gaulding, M. Kubo, and K. Murasugi, (eds.), *Papers from the Student Conference in Linguistics: MIT Working Papers*

- in Linguistics 11*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Cambridge, MA, 119–138.
- Kim, S. (1991) *Chain Scope and Quantification Structure*, Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University.
- Ko, H.-J. (2005) “Syntax of *Wh*-in-situ: Merge into [Spec, CP] in the Overt Syntax,” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23, 867–916.
- Krifka, M. (2001) “For a Structured Meaning Account of Questions and Answers.” In C. Fery and W. Sternefeld, (eds.), *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae*, A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow, Akademie Verlag (= *Studia Grammatica* 52), Berlin, 287–319.
- Kuwabara, K. (1998) “Overt *Wh*-movement and Scope-fixing Scrambling: A Preliminary Study.” In K. Inoue, (ed.), *Report (2): Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language*, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, 115–127.
- Lawler, J. (1971) “Any Questions?” *Chicago Linguistic Society* 7, 163–173.
- Lee, M. (2002) “Why is ‘*Why*’ Different?” A paper presented at Chicago Linguistic Society 38.
- Lee, K.-S. and S. Tomioka. (2001) “LF Blocking Effects Are Topic Effects: WH Questions in Japanese and Korean,” Unpublished ms., University of Delaware.
- Malhotra, S. (2009), “Intervention Effects and *Wh*-movement,” *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 15, 135-144.
- Miyagawa, S. (1997) “On the Nature of *Wh*-scope,” Unpublished ms. , MIT.
- Miyagawa, S. (2017) *Agreement Beyond Phi*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Nishigauchi, T. (1986) *Quantification in Syntax*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ochi, M. (2014) “*Wh*-adjuncts, Left Periphery, and *Wh*-in-situ.” In Y.-H. A. Li, A. Simpson, and W.-T. D. Tsai, (eds.), *Chinese Syntax in a Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 401–428.
- Pesetsky, D. (1998) “Some Optimality Principles of Sentence Pronunciation.” In P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis, and D. Pesetsky, *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 337-383.
- Pesetsky, D. (2000) *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*, MI Press, Cambridge, Mass..
- Rooth, M. (1992) “A Theory of Focus Interpretation,” *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Saito, M. (1994) “Additional *Wh* Effects and the Adjunction Site Theory,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 195–240.
- Shlonsky, U. and G. Soare (2011) “Where’s ‘*Why*’?” *Linguistic Inquiry* 42, 651–669.
- Sohn, K.-W. (1995) *Negative Polarity Items, Scope and Economy*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Soh, H. L. (2005) “*Wh*-in-situ in Mandarin Chinese,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 143-155.
- Stepanov, A., and W.-T. D. Tsai. (2008) “Cartography and Licensing of *Wh*-adjuncts: A Cross-linguistic Perspective,” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 589–638.
- Tanaka, H. (1997) Invisible Movement in *Sika-nai* and the Linear Crossing Constraint,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 143–188.
- Tanaka, H. (2003) “Remarks on Beck’s Effects: Linearity in Syntax,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 314-323.
- Takita, K. and B. Yang. (2014) “On Multiple *Wh*-questions with ‘*Why*’ in Japanese and Chinese.” In M. Saito, (ed.), *Japanese Syntax from a Comparative Perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 206–227.
- Tomioka, S. (2007) Pragmatics of LF Intervention Effects: *Wh*-interrogatives in Japanese and Korean,

Journal of Pragmatics 39, 1570–1590.

- Tomioka, S. (2009) *Why* questions, presuppositions, and intervention effects. *Journal of East Asian Linguist* 18: 253–271.
- Tsai, W.-T. Dylan. (2008) Left Periphery and 'How'-'Why' Alternations, *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17, 83–115.
- Valluduvu, E.(1992) *The Information Component*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Watanabe, A. (1991) *Wh*-in-situ, Subjacency, and Chain Formation, Unpublished ms., MIT.
- Watanabe, A. (2000) "Absorption: Interpretability and Feature Strength." In K. Inoue, (ed.), *Report (4): Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language*, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, 253–296.
- Wee, H.-K. (2007) "Kansephyokwawa cengpokwuco 'Intervention Effect and Information Structure'," *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 32, 627-652.
- Yoshida, M., C. Nakao, and I. Ortega-Santos. (2015) The Syntax of *Why* stripping, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33, 323–70.
- Zhang, B. and D. A. Chacón. (2015) "Embedding, Covert movement, and Intervention in Kathmandu Newari," 2018 *Proceedings of Linguistic Society of America* 3. 69, 1-13.