

## Two kinds of in-situ languages and two ways to overcome islands

Use of alternative semantics (cf. Rooth (1985) among others) is a standard approach to explain why focused phrases including *wh*-phrases can be employed in islands. Naturally, a uniform analysis has been assumed to account for in-situ *wh*-phrases crosslinguistically. However, we will show that there are two kinds of focus domain widening, and languages are divided into two groups whether they can employ both (like Japanese and Sinhala, which we call QP languages) or one of them only (like Malayalam, Chinese, German, and Turkish, which we call DP languages). Moreover, the two types of domain widening do not interact with each other, but phrases formed by the two mechanisms may enter into Agree with an intervener; hence, both are subject to the intervention effect. Finally, we will show that in situ languages in DP languages, such as Chinese, Malayalam, and Turkish, are not subject to *wh*-islands whereas QP ones are, the difference of which is ultimately attributed to the morphosyntactic difference of *wh*-elements.

QP languages differ from DP languages regarding intervention effects inside (non-*wh*) islands: they disappear in the former but do not in the latter as follows (Interveners are underlined):

- (1) a. \* Ranjit-də Chitra mokak-də kiwi-e? [QP language] [S(sinhala)]  
 Ranjit-or Chitra what- də said-C<sub>wh</sub>  
 ‘What did Ranjit or Chitra say?’
- b. [<sub>island</sub> Ranjit-də Chitra mokak kiwia kotə]-də oyaa paadam kəramin hiti-e?  
 Ranjit-or Chitra what say when-də you study doing were-C<sub>wh</sub>  
 ‘(Lit.) You were studying when Ranjit or Chita said what?’
- (2) a. \*Rajan maatram aare kandu? [DP language] [M(malayalam)]  
 Rajan only whom saw  
 ‘Whom did only Rajan see?’ Mathew (2015: 132)
- b. Anup [<sub>island</sub> Rajan (\*maatram) aare kaND-appool] koopiccu?  
 Anup Rajan (only) who saw-when got.angry  
 ‘(Lit.) Anup got angry when only Rajan saw who?’ K. A. Jayaseelan (p.c.)

This difference indicates that different strategies exist to overcome islandhood.

Following Cable (2010), we claim that nominal *wh*-phrases in QP languages project to QP and Q<sup>0</sup> has [foc<sub>Q</sub>] (which is explicitly represented as *də* in Sinhala (cf. (1))). QP languages avoid islandhood (except *wh*-islands) because Q<sup>0</sup> can be base-generated at the edge of an island as in (1)b. The fact that an intervention effect is observed not inside but outside an island in QP languages indicates that the effect arises when [*ufoc*] of an intervener Agrees with [foc<sub>Q</sub>] (of Q<sup>0</sup>). In contrast, DP languages cannot resort to this method because a *wh*-phrase and [foc<sub>Q</sub>] are inseparable, so an intervention effect surfaces whether it is inside an island or not as in (2) in Malayalam.

To circumvent islands, we propose two kinds of focus domain widening, and one of them is available only in QP languages. The mechanism starts from a *wh*-phrase and stops when it hits ([foc<sub>Q</sub>] of) Q<sup>0</sup>. Then QP is covertly pied-piped to CP checking [*ufoc*<sub>Q</sub>] of C<sup>0</sup>.

The other kind is for focused phrases in general, so available in any language. DP languages must resort to this method to lift islandhood. The mechanism starts at a focused item and domain widening stops when it meets ([foc] of) Foc<sup>0</sup> which can be base-generated at the edge of an island. Then FocP is covertly raised to CP.

The two types of focus domain widening do not interact with each other, so widening inside QP is not terminated by an intervener, whose head is Foc<sup>0</sup>, hence, no intervention

effect inside islands in QP languages as in (1)*b*. Nevertheless, domain widening stops when it meets the first same kind of formal focus feature, so it could result in another type of intervention effect. Accordingly, an intervention effect may be detected even inside islands in DP languages such as Malayalam as in (2)*b* because its domain widening must stop at the first  $\text{Foc}^0$ , and an intervener carries  $\text{Foc}^0$  too. Similarly, *wh*-island violation surfaces in QP languages because the embedded interrogative C is  $\text{Q}^0$  preventing further domain widening beyond the CP. However, in-situ DP languages are not constrained by *wh*-islands because  $\text{Foc}^0$  is the target, and  $\text{FocP}$  alone can license *wh*-interrogative CP (but not so in QP languages, which is why an additional QP is necessary in the matrix clause to value [ $\text{ufoc}_Q$ ] of  $\text{C}^0$  (additional-*wh* effect)).

Finally, we claim that *wh*-elements in QP languages can remain to be NP unlike DP languages, so they not only exhibit productive generation of various quantifiers in combination with focus particles, but also can form compounds with pronouns, such as *dare-sore* ('who-it' meaning somebody) and *doko-soko* ('where-there' meaning somewhere), or repeat themselves as in *dare-dare* 'somebody' and *doko-doko* 'somewhere' in Japanese. (Repetition of *wh*-elements is also possible in Sinhala.) In contrast, the fact that  $\text{FocP}$  can license *wh*-interrogative C in in-situ DP languages suggests that [ $\text{ufoc}_Q$ ] of  $\text{C}^0$  is optional there. Accordingly, they do not exhibit obligatory *wh*-question particles or ending unlike QP languages.

[Selected references]

- Cable, Seth (2010) *The Grammar of Q: Q-Particles, Wh-Movement, and Pied-Piping*, OUP, Oxford.
- Çakir, Sinan (2017) "Wh-Island Constraint in Turkish," *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2017/2, 73-91.
- Drubig, Hans Bernhard (1994) "Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus," *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Computerlinguistik*, vol. 51, Tübingen/Stuttgart: Universität Tübingen/Universität Stuttgart.
- Gair, James W. and Lelwala Sumangala (1991) "What to focus in Sinhala," in G. F. Westphal, B. Ao, and H.-R. Chase (eds.), *ESCOL '91: Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference in Linguistics*, 93-108.
- Hagstrom, Paul Alan (1998). *Decomposing Questions*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Jayaseelan, K.A. (2001) "Questions and Question-Word Incorporating Quantifiers in Malayalam," *Syntax* 4:2, 63-93.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2005). "WH-IN-SITU and Movement in Sinhala Questions," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23, 1-51.
- Kotek, Hadas (2014) *Composing questions*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kotek, Hadas, and Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (2016) "Covert Pied-Piping in English Multiple Wh-Questions," *Linguistic Inquiry* 47, 669-693.
- Mathew, Rosmin (2015) *Head Movement in Syntax*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Rooth, Mats (1985) *Association with Focus*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Simoyama, Junko (2001). *Wh-constructions in Japanese*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Sumangala, Lelwala (1992) *Long Distance Dependencies in Sinhala: The Syntax of Focus*

*and WH Questions*, a doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.  
Wagner, Michael (2006) "Association by movement: evidence from NPI-licensing,"  
*Natural Language Semantics* 14, 297-324.