

can be base-generated at the edge of an island (cf. (2)*b*). We also assume that interveners carry [foc] too.

Question FDW is not subjected to intervention effects while general FDW is. Since question FDW is terminated by a head with [foc_Q], ([foc] of) an intervener does not block the widening process, which is why QP languages do not display intervention effects inside islands (cf. (1)*b*). In contrast, an intervention effect may be detected inside islands in non-QP languages (cf. (2)*b*) because general FDW must stop at the first [foc], and an intervener carries [foc] too.

Regarding *wh*-islands, there is another difference between QP and non-QP in-situ languages. The *wh*-island condition exists in QP languages because the embedded interrogative C (e.g. *də* in Sinhala, *ka* in Japanese, and *nunci* in Korean) carries [foc_Q], which prevents further domain widening beyond the embedded CP. However, non-QP in-situ languages are not constrained by *wh*-islands because [foc], not [foc_Q], is the target. Moreover, use of general FDW to overcome *wh*-islands, if correct, leads to a prediction that [foc] of Foc⁰ can license *wh*-interrogative CP in non-QP in-situ languages such as Chinese, Malayalam, and Turkish, which is indeed borne out. A disjunction phrase in non-QP languages can make a question a Yes/No or a disjunctive (or alternative) question while one in QP languages is always interpreted in a Yes/No question as follows:

- (3) a. [John-oo Mary-oo] wannu? [M] b. [Taro ka Hanako]-ga kimasita ka? [J]
 John-or Mary-or came Taro or Hanako-Nom came ka
 ‘Did John or Mary come?’ (ambiguous) ‘Did Taro or Hanako come?’ (Y/N only)

Finally, we claim that the difference between QP and non-QP languages is attributable to the morphosyntactic properties of *wh*-elements: ones in QP cannot carry a focus feature (hence, they can be NP) while ones in non-QP languages must (hence, they always represent DP). Suppose that *wh*-interrogative pronouns are base-generated at D⁰ and *wh*-phrases must carry a focus feature crosslinguistically. Then, since *wh*-elements in QP languages cannot entertain a focus feature, another functional category, i.e. Q⁰, is necessary to host a focus feature. In contrast, focus features are inherent in *wh*-elements in non-QP languages, so no QP is projected.

Moreover, Malayalam, Japanese, and Sinhala can make focused existential quantifiers by making a disjunction particle c-command a *wh*-element. However, the two elements must be adjacent to each other in Japanese and Sinhala while they can be away from each other in Malayalam. This difference too can be explained under the present account. In QP languages, *wh*-elements of indefinites can be base-generated and remain in NP because they do not carry a formal feature such as [foc]. Thus, it is possible for a disjunction particle with [foc] to be base-generated in D⁰. If so, it explains why a disjunction particle and a *wh*-element are inseparable. However, in non-QP in-situ languages, *wh*-elements are D⁰ due to their inherent focus feature even if they are non-interrogative phrases, which obligatorily places a disjunction particle (or an operator) outside DP; hence, the particle and a *wh*-element can be placed apart from each other in Malayalam. Similarly, *wh*-elements on their own present various interpretations in Chinese and Turkish depending on what syntactic context they appear in. This fact naturally follows if they need to be bound by clause-level operators, which must appear outside DP, as Tsai (1994) argues.

[Selected references] Cable, S. (2010) *The Grammar of Q: Q-Particles, Wh-Movement, and Pied-Piping*, OUP, Oxford; Hagstrom, P. (1998). *Decomposing Questions*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT; Jayaseelan, K.A. (2001) “Questions and Question-Word Incorporating Quantifiers in Malayalam,” *Syntax* 4:2, 63-93; Kotek, H/ (2014) *Composing questions*, doctoral dissertation, MIT; Kotek, H, and Erlewine M.K.(2016) “Covert Pied-Piping in English Multiple *Wh*-Questions,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 47, 669-693; Mathew, R. (2015) *Head Movement in Syntax*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia; Rooth, M. (1985) *Association with Focus*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Tsai, W.-T. Dylan (1994). *On Economizing the Theory of A'-Dependencies*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.