Two ways of licensing 'why' in Korean
Heejeong Ko, MIT

This paper argues that the interactions between 'why' and a quantifier reveal two licensing mechanisms of 'why' in Korean. Most *wh*-phrases in Korean cannot be preceded by an NPI, as shown in (1). Beck and Kim (1997) argue that the LF constraint (2) is responsible for the ungrammaticality of (1). 'Why' in Korean, however, may be preceded by an NPI, as illustrated in (3). The contrast between (1) and (3) led previous researchers to conclude that 'why' in Korean is just *exceptional* to (2) (Cho 1998, Lee 2002). I show that this conclusion is incorrect. As illustrated in (4), an NPI cannot precede 'why' if 'why' is in a declarative clause. Further, (5) shows that the same restriction holds whether or not 'why' and an NPI are clausemates. (3)-(5) reveal two aspects of behavior of 'why'. First, when 'why' and its licenser [Q] are clausemates as in (3), 'why' can be preceded by an NPI, unlike other *wh*-phrases. Second, when 'why' and [Q] are not clausemates as in (4)-(5), 'why' may not be preceded by an NPI, like other *wh*-phrases.

I argue that 'why' undergoes LF-movement like other *wh*-phrases, observing (2). I propose that the puzzling behavior of 'why' is due to the initial merge position of 'why':

- **External-Merge Hypothesis (EMH):** 'why' in Korean is externally merged in [Spec,CP] in the overt syntax – where the CP may be declarative or interrogative (cf. Rizzi (1990) for French *pourquoi*; Rizzi (1999) for Italian *perchè*).

Consider first (3). Under the EMH, 'why' does not undergo any movement in (3). The [uWH] (Uninterpretable-WH-feature) of 'why' is checked off immediately when 'why' is base-merged in [Spec,CP], since the interrogative head has the licenser [Q]. After we check off [uWH] of 'why', we may scramble an NPI over 'why', as in (3). This scrambling does not pose any problem in licensing 'why': Hence, (3) is grammatical. In contrast to (3), 'why' in (4)-(5) needs to move to the higher clause in order to be licensed by [Q]. Once it moves at LF, however, (2) is violated since an NPI intervenes between the LF trace of 'why' and its binder: Hence, 'why' in (4)-(5) cannot be licensed. This paper shows that contra Chomsky (1999), a feature [uWH] can be checked by External-Merge: (3). Through a diagnostic (2) for LF-movement, the paper proves that 'why' is subject to the same LF-movement constraint as other *wh*-phrase: (4)-(5).

(1)   ***Amwuto   mwues**-ul   ilk-ci-an-ass-**ni**?
          Anyone   what-Acc   read-CI-not-Past-Q
        'What did no one read?'

(2)   If an LF trace β is dominated by a quantifier α, then the binder of β must also be dominated by α.

(3)   **Amwuto   way**   saimha-ci-an-ass-**ni**?
          Anyone   **why**   resign-CI-not-Past-**Q**
        'Why did no one resign?'   ([Q] is an interrogative marker)

(4)   ***Amwuto**   [John-i   **way**   saimha-ass-ta-**ko**]   malha-ci-an-ass-**ni**?
          Anyone   [John-Nom   **why**   resign-Past-Dec-**C**]   say-CI-not-Past-**Q**
        'Why did no one say that John resigned _ ?' ([C] is a declarative marker)

(5)   *Ne-nun   [**amwuto   way**   saimha-ci-an-ass-ta-**ko**]   malha-ass-**ni**?
          You-Top   [anyone   **why**   resign-CI-not-Past-Dec-**C**]   say-Past-**Q**
        'Why did you say that no one resigned _?'

[497 words]