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1 Introduction

• In this paper, we argue that Newari permits wh-operators to either covertly move to fix their scope, or may take scope in-situ.

• Additionally, we argue that clausal complements to verbs (“verbal argument CPs”) may be islands for covert movement in Newari, unexpectedly.

1.1 Theoretical Background

• Some languages move wh-operators overtly, others leave them in-situ:

  (1) What did Ram eat?

  (2) Rām-na chu na-la?
      Ram-ERG what eat-PST
      ‘What did Ram eat?’

(A) Broadly, there are two analyses of how wh-in-situ takes wide scope without overtly moving. One approach posits covert movement of the wh-operator (Huang 1982, Soh 2005, Yang 2012):

  (3) Surface syntax: [CP [TP Ram what ate]]

  a. [TP Ram what ate]

  b. [TP Ram t1 ate]

  [LF: [CP what, [TP Ram t1 ate] ] ]

• Prima facie, covert movement analyses predict that wh-in-situ should exhibit many of the same properties as overt movement, e.g., island effects in Mandarin Chinese (Huang 1982, Bayer 2006, Cheng 2009)

  (4) *Qiaofeng xihuang DP [CP Botong weishenme xie de shu] Qiaofeng like Botong why written DE book ‘For what reason x, Qiaofeng likes the book that Botong wrote for x’

• Another approach proposes that wh-in-situ can take wide semantic scope in-situ through focus composition (Beck 2006, Hamblin 1973, Karttunen 1977)

  (5) a. [[TP Ram ate what]]^g = undefined

  b. [TP Ram ate what] |^g,h = Ram ate h(1)

• Beck (2006) argues that the focus alternatives composition analysis accounts for intervention effects, in which a wh-operator in-situ is ungrammatical if it’s in the scope of another focus-operator, because the focus-operator’s argument’s semantic value is undefined:

  (6) a. [[CP Q Ram ate what]]^g = λp∃x[p = x]. Ram ate x in w]

  b. [[CP Q Ram ate what]]^g,h = λp[ |p = λw. Ram ate h(1) in w]

  (7) * [CP C ... Intervener ... wh]

  (8) * John-hi kyaa khariide-gaa?
      John-only what buy-FUT
      ‘What will only John buy?’
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Minsu-only who-ACC see-Pst-Q ‘Who did only Minsu see?’

‘Who did only Minsu see?’ Korean (Beck 2006)

a. [John what buy]g = undefined
b. [Only]g([John what buy]g) = ?

1.2 The Puzzle

• In Newari, intervention effects are not observed for \(wh\)-in-situ in main clauses:

(11) Rām-na-caka chu na-u?
Ram-ERG-only what eat-PST
✓ ‘What did only Ram eat?’

• However, an intervener blocks an embedded \(wh\)-in-situ from taking wide scope:

(12) Sitā-ṃ [\(\text{CP}\) Rām-na chu na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u
Sita-ERG Ram-ERG what eat-PST that say-PST
✓ ‘Sita said what Ram ate.’
✓ ‘What did Sita say that Ram ate?’

(13) Sitā-ṃ [\(\text{CP}\) Rām-na-caka chu na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u
Sita-ERG Ram-ERG-only what eat-PST that say-PST
✓ ‘Sita said what only Ram ate.’
* ‘What did Sita say that only Ram ate?’ (Intervention effect)

• Additionally, \(wh\)-in-situ is not sensitive to traditional island constructions (e.g., relative clauses), in (14).

(14) Relative Clause in main clauses
✓ Rām-na [\(\text{RC}\) su-na dā ma] guru nāplā-u?
Ram-ERG who-ERG hit CL teacher meet-PST
‘which person \(x\), such that \(x\) met the teacher who \(x\) hit?’

• Unless the relative clause is in the scope of verbal complement CP, in (15).

(15) Relative Clause inside argument CP
* ākās-ām [\(\text{CP}\) Rām-na [\(\text{RC}\) su-na dā ma] guru nāplā-u]
Akash-ERG Ram-ERG who-ERG hit CL teacher meet-PST dhā-u?
say-PST
✓ ‘Who is the person \(x\), such that Akash said that Ram met the teacher who \(x\) hit?’

• To sum up, Newari \(wh\)-in-situ in CPs that are argument to verbs display both island effects and intervention effects. In other cases, (i.e. in main clauses and adjunct clauses), \(wh\)-in-situ displays neither island effects nor intervention effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Island effect</th>
<th>Intervention effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main clause</td>
<td>([\text{M-CP} [\text{Adj-CP} ... \text{wh} ... ]])</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-complement CP</td>
<td>([\text{M-CP} [\text{Arg-CP} ... \text{wh} ... ]])</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the diagnostics for covert movement and focus composition fail for \(wh\)-in-situ in general in Newari.

Questions:
(1) Why do \(wh\)-phrases fix their scope depending on where they surface?
(2) Why do we not find traditional island structures in Newari?
(3) Why does Newari pattern this way, but previously studied languages (Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Hindi) do not?

1.3 Our Proposal

• Newari permits either covert movement (CM) or focus alternatives composition (FA), to interpret the \(wh\)-phrases, as shown in (16), and it only permits in-situ focus alternatives composition for those in argument CPs, as in (17).

(16) ✓ \([\text{CP-matrix} \text{C ... } [\text{CP-adj} \text{C ... wh} ... ]]\)

(17) ✓ \([\text{CP-arg} \text{C ... } [\text{CP-arg} \text{C ... wh} ... ]]\)
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2 Non-Verbal-Argument CPs

2.1 Basic wh-questions

- In Newari wh-phrases stay in-situ to take matrix scope.

(18) a. Rām-na chu na-la
   Ram-ERG what eat-PST
   ‘What did Ram eat?’

   b. su-na aṃ na-la
   Who-ERG mango.ABS eat-PST
   ‘Who ate mangos?’

- Wh-phrases can optionally scramble to the closest the CP edge.

(19) Chu Rām-na ___ na-la?
    what Ram.ERG ___ eat-PST
    ‘What did only Ram eat?’

2.2 Main clauses

- We do not observe intervention effects (for both argument-wh and adjunct-wh) in Newari main clauses as in (20).

(20) a. ✓ Rām-a-caka chu na-u?
    Ram-ERG-only what eat-PST
    ‘What did only Ram eat?’

   b. ✓ Rām-na-caka che aṃ na-u?
    Ram-ERG-only why mango.ABS eat-PST
    ‘Why did only Ram eat a mango?’

2.3 Adjunct clauses

- Island sensitivity is predicted for wh-in-situ on covert movement analyses:

(21) * Qiaofeng xihuan [CP Botong weishenme xie de] shu?
    Qiaofeng like Botong why write de book
    Intended: ‘For what reason x, such that Qiaofeng like the book that Botong wrote for x?’ Mandarin (Huang 1982)

- We find no island sensitivity for wh-operators in Newari relative clauses, because-clauses, complex NP clauses, and comparative clauses (More data in Appendix B).

(22) wh-phrase taking wide scope from relative clause
    ✓ Rām-na [NP [RC su-na dā ma] guru] nāplā-u?
      Ram-ERG who-ERG hit CL teacher eat-PST
      ‘which person x, such that x met the teacher who x hit?’

(23) wh-phrase taking wide scope from comparative clause
    ✓ Rām-a [CP su-na bwæm wani-u shyā yaku] swimming
      Ram-ERG who-ERG run go-PST than more swimming
      ya-i. do-NonPst.
      ‘Who is the person x, such that Ram swims more than x runs?’

(24) adjunct wh-phrase taking wide scope from because clause
    ✓ [Adj ji-m gana ma wam-u lim], ji fel ju-la.
      1.SG-ERG where NEG go-PST because, 1.SG. fail happen-PST
      ‘Where is the place x, such that because I didn’t go x, I failed (the test)?’

- We do not observe intervention effects in adjunct clauses.

    Ram-ERG-only who-ERG hit CL teacher meet-PST
    ‘which person x, such that Ram met the teacher who x hit?’

(26) ✓ Rām-a-caka [CP su-na bwæm wani-u shyā yaku] swimming
    Ram-ERG-only who-ERG run go-PST than more swimming
    ya-i. do-NonPst
    ‘Who is the person x, such that only Ram swims more than x runs?’
2.4 So far

- Neither main clauses nor adjunct clauses show intervention effects in Newari. Adjunct CPs don’t show island effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clausal Structure</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[CP-M (\ldots) (wh) (\ldots)]</td>
<td>[-Intervention]</td>
<td>Covert Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CP-M [Adj-CP (\ldots) (wh) (\ldots)]</td>
<td>[-Intervention, - Island]</td>
<td>Covert Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We so far conclude that covert movement is what happens here, and adjunct clauses are not the traditional island constructions as we know.

- Example: Covert \(wh\)-movement of non-verbal-argument CPs in (22)

\[
\sqrt{\text{Sit\-na [CP }\text{su-na am na-u dhāyā] sy-la?}}
\text{Sita-ERG who-ERG mango.ABS eat-PST that know-NONPST}
\text{‘Who did Sita know that ate the mango?’}
\]

3 Verbal-Argument CPs

- \(Wh\)-phrases inside of a verbal-argument CP can take wide scope in-situ. (See Appendix A for more CP embedding possibilities)

(27) \(\sqrt{\text{Sit\-na [CP }\text{su-na am na-u dhāyā] sy-la?}}
\text{Sita-ERG who-ERG mango.ABS eat-PST that know-NONPST}
\text{‘Who did Sita know that ate the mango?’}

3.1 Intervention effects in V-argument CPs

- Focus intervention effects occur in selected clauses, for both argument-\(wh\) and adjunct-\(wh\), as in (28).

(28) a. \text{Intervention effect for argument-\(wh\) taking matrix scope}
\text{Sit\-m [CP Rām-a-caka }\text{chæ am na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Sita-ERG Ram-ERG-only what eat.PST that say-PST}
\sqrt{\text{‘Sita said what only Ram ate.’}}
* ‘What did Sita say that only Ram ate?’

b. \text{Intervention effect for adjunct-\(wh\) taking matrix scope}
\text{Sit\-m [CP Rām-a-caka }\text{chæ am na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Sita-ERG Ram-ERG-only why mango.ABS eat.PST that say-PST}
\sqrt{\text{‘Sita said why only Ram ate mango.’}}
* ‘Why did Sita say that only Ram ate mango?’

- Intervention effects are ameliorated when the \(wh\) scrambles to the left edge of the CP.

(29) a. \text{Scramble the argument-\(wh\) to fix intervention effect}
\text{Sit\-m [CP chæ Rām-a-caka ____ na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Sita-ERG Ram-ERG-only what eat.PST that say-PST}
* ‘Sita said what only Ram ate.’
\sqrt{\text{‘What did Sita say that only Ram ate?’}}

b. \text{Scramble the adjunct-\(wh\) to fix intervention effect}
\text{Sit\-m [CP chæ Rām-a-caka ____ am na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Sita-ERG Ram-ERG-only mango.ABS eat.PST that say-PST}
* ‘Sita said why only Ram ate mango.’
# ‘Why did Sita say that only Ram ate mango?’

- For fronted argument CPs, overtly moving \(wh\) to the embedded clause edge can also avoid intervention effects.

(30) \text{Overtly moving argument-\(wh\) to ameliorate intervention effect}

a. \text{Intervention effect in fronted CP}
\text{[CP }\text{Rām-a-caka chæ na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Ram-ERG-only what eat.PST that Sita-ERG say-PST}
\sqrt{\text{‘Sita said what only Ram ate.’}}
* ‘What did Sita say that only Ram ate?’

b. \text{Intervention effect avoided in fronted CP}
\text{[CP }\text{Chu Rām-a-caka ____ na-u (dhakā)] dhā-u}
\text{Ram-ERG-only what eat.PST that Sita-ERG say-PST}
\sqrt{\text{‘Sita said what only Ram ate.’}}
* ‘What did Sita say that only Ram ate?’

\text{borui zhang & dustin a. chacón}
\text{zhan3829@umn.edu & dustin@umn.edu}
(31) **Overtly moving adjunct-wh to ameliorate intervention effect**

a. *Intervention effect of adjunct-wh*

\[ \text{CP} \text{Ram-a-caka } \text{chau na-u (dhakā)} \text{ Sitā-m Ram-ERG-only why mango.ABS eat.PST that Sita-ERG dhā-u say-PST} \]

✓ ‘Sita said why only Ram ate mango.’
* ‘Why did Sita say that only Ram ate mango?’

b. *Intervention effect avoided by scrambling adjunct-wh*

\[ \text{CP} \text{Chau Ram-a-caka om na-u (dhakā) Sitā-m why Ram-ERG-only mango.ABS eat.PST Sita-ERG that dhā-u say-PST} \]

✓ ‘Sita said why Ram ate mango.’
✓ ‘Why did Sita say that Ram ate mango?’

• What will happen when the intervener is in the matrix clause? Moved CPs in double embedded clauses show the evidence of intervention effects, as in (32b).

(32) a. \[ \text{Rām-a [CP [CP Sitā-m } \text{chau na-u] sāyl-am dhā-u] swace Ram-ERG Sita-ERG what eat.PST Sayal-ERG say-PST think yā-u do.PST} \]

‘What did Ram think that Sayal said that Sita ate?’

b. * \[ \text{Rām-a-caka [CP [CP Sitā-m } \text{chau na-u] sāyl-am dhā-u] Ram-ERG-only Sita-ERG what eat.PST Sayal-ERG say.PST swace yā-u think do.PST} \]

Intended: ‘What did only Ram think that Sayal said that Sita ate?’

• Overtly moving the entire complex CP object can ameliorate intervention effects.

(33) \[ \text{[CP [CP Sitā-m } \text{chau na-u] sāyl-am dhā-u] Rām-a-caka swace Sita-ERG what eat.PST Sayal-ERG say.PST Ram-ERG-only think yā-u do.PST} \]

‘What did only Ram think that Sayal said that Sita ate?’

---

3.2 **Island effects in V-argument CPs**

• We previously showed that there are no island effects in the matrix clauses. However, we do observe island effects in argument CP clauses (See more in Appendix B).

(34) **Island effects happen in relative clauses inside the argument CP**


‘Who is the person x, such that Akas said that Ram met the teacher who x hit?’

(35) **Island effects of because-clauses inside the argument CP**

* \[ \text{Rām-a [CP [ADJ ji-m } \text{gana ma wam-u lim], ji fel Ram-ERG 1.SG-ERG where NEG go-PST because, 1.SG. fail ju-la] dhā-u happen-PST say-PST} \]

‘Where is the place x, such that Ram said because I didn’t go x, I failed (the test)?’

3.3 **So far**

• The opposite from main clauses: verbal-argument CPs show intervention effects in Newari. Adjunct CPs inside of argument CPs show island effects.

---

1It is likely for some independent reasons the double embedded does not yield a narrow scope reading. The same as in example (33).
4 Recap

Results of examining intervention effects and island effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clausal Structure</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP wh... ]</td>
<td>[-Intervention]</td>
<td>covert / focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP [Adj-CP ... wh... ]]</td>
<td>[-Intervention, - Island]</td>
<td>covert movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP V [Arg-CP ... wh... ]]</td>
<td>[+Intervention]</td>
<td>focus alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP V [Arg-CP [Adj-CP ... wh... ]]]</td>
<td>[+Island]</td>
<td>focus alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Covert wh-movement for non-argument CPs: as the sentences in (22), (23), and (24).
  ✓ [CP-matrix C ... [CP-adj C ... wh ... ]]
  \[\uparrow \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_]$

- In-situ focus composition for argument CPs: as the sentence in (27).
  ✓ [CP-matrix C [CP-arg C ... [CP-adj C ... wh ... ]]]

- Fail to do in-situ focus composition for argument CPs: as the sentences in (34) and (35).
  \* [CP-matrix C [CP-arg C ... [CP-adj C ... wh ... ]]]
  \[\uparrow \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_]$

- Comparing to English derivation of multi-wh-questions (Kotek and Hackl 2013):
  ✓ [CP-matrix wh .. C [CP-arg C ... [CP-adj C ... wh ... ]]]

5 Towards to an Account: A combination of Covert Movement and Focus Alternatives in Newari

- What needs to be explained:
  - Why does the mechanism of fixing wh-scope depend on the construction that the wh-operator surfaces in?
  - Why are Verbal Argument CPs islands for covert movement, but not adjunct clauses?
  - Are the locality constraints on covert movement similar to overt movement?

- We propose that, in general, Universal Grammar permits wh-operators to take scope either by covert movement or focus alternatives

- Given the absence of intervention effects in main clauses, we proposed that wh-operators covertly move in Newari.

- However, in principle, a focus alternative analysis may be available. Thus, the sentence in (36) may be syntactically ambiguous:

  (36) Rām-na chu na-la?
  Ram-ERG what eat-PST ‘What did Ram eat?’

- If so, then covert movement across a verbal argument CP must be blocked. To account for this, we posit that verbal argument CPs contain a silent pronoun in Spec,CP, that is co-indexed with the perspective holder in the clause. This pronoun mediates “conjunct/disjunct agreement”, a kind of evidential agreement that is seen in Tibeto-Burman languages (Zu 2015, Coppock and Wechsler 2016).

  (38) a. Wo-māi [CP proj [TP lā na-e dhakā] dhāl-a
  He.ERG meat eat-CNJ C said ‘He said that he will eat meat.’

  b. Wo-māi [CP proj [TP lā na-i dhakā] dhāl-a
  He.ERG meat eat-DISJ C said ‘He said that he will eat meat.’ Newari (Hargreaves 1991)

- This pro blocks the Spec,CP escape hatch, rendering verbal argument CPs islands:

  Focus alternatives composition for argument CPs, but not covert movement
  [CP-matrix C [CP-arg OPconj/disj C ... [CP-arg C ... wh ... ]]]
the expected ways – extraction from traditional islands is unacceptable, and extraction from embedded clauses is:


‘Ram met the teacher, that the child that saw tī was Nepali.’

b. *Jī-m [NP [CP [Adj wa tī wa-la-lim] Nepali-bhāsā bwani-u] I-also 3.SG went because Newari-language study-CL

skul,] wa-na school went

‘I also went to the school that Ram studied Newari language because he went’


nāplā-u meet-PST

‘Ram met the teacher that Sita said that she liked.’

Finally, this approach overgenerates. Recall that *wh*-operators in an adjunct clause embedded in a verbal argument CP cannot take sentential scope, which we diagnosed as an island effect. However, if a focus alternative analysis is always available in principle, this sentence is predicted to be grammatical. Thus, we need some way of blocking focus alternatives in these contexts, even though it seems necessary in other contexts:

(41) Island effects happen in relative clauses inside the argument CP


‘Who is the person x, such that Akas said that Ram met the teacher who x hit?’

Despite these faults, the evidence in Newari suggests that covert movement and focus alternatives are both available, each with their own locality constraints. The data pattern that we’ve described follows as a conspiracy from these constraints, plus independently-motivated grammatical properties (i.e., conjunct/disjunct agreement)

6 Summary

1. Newari non-argument CPs (main clauses and adjunct clauses) do not show intervention effects or island effects, while intervention effects are observed in the argument CPs, and island effects appear when adjunct clauses are embedded inside of the argument CPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clausal Structure</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP wh... ]</td>
<td>[-Intervention]</td>
<td>covert / focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP [Adj-CP ... wh... ]]</td>
<td>[-Intervention, - Island]</td>
<td>covert movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP V [Arg-CP ... wh... ]]</td>
<td>[+Intervention]</td>
<td>focus alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matrix-CP V [Arg-CP [Adj-CP ... wh... ]]]</td>
<td>[+Island]</td>
<td>focus alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The distributed patterns of island effects and interventions in Newari suggest that this language uses both covert movement and focus alternative computation to account for *wh*-in-situ.

A Newari Basics

- Newari canonical word order is SOV.

(42) a. Rām-na aṁ na-i Ram-ERG mango.ABS eat-NON-PST

‘Ram eats mangos.’

- Complement CPs can appear in three possible positions: preceding the matrix verb, following the matrix verb, or sentence-initial. However, *wh* in postverbal position cannot take sentential scope.

| ✓ S [CP ... ] V | ✓ S [CP ... wh ... ] V |
| ✓ S V [CP ... ] | ✓ S V [CP ... wh ... ] |
| ✓ [CP ... ] S V | ✓ [CP ... wh... ] S V |

- Despite these faults, the evidence in Newari suggests that covert movement and focus alternatives are both available, each with their own locality constraints. The data pattern that we’ve described follows as a conspiracy from these constraints, plus independently-motivated grammatical properties (i.e., conjunct/disjunct agreement)
The difference is that unlike many other languages where fronted CP cannot take the wide scope, Newari fronted CP can take the scope. For example, compare Malayalam in (44) to Newari in (45).

(44) * [CP Sita eethu pustakam vaayich ennui] Raman vicaarichu?
   sita which book read COMP Raman thought
   Intended: ‘Which book did Raman this Sita Read?’ Malayalam: (Aravind 2015)

(45) ✓ [CP chu Rām-a ___ na-u (dhakā) Sita-m dhā-u
   what Ram-ERG eat.PST that Sita-ERG say-PST
   ✓ ‘Sita said what Ram ate.’
   ✓ ‘What did Sita say that Ram ate?’

B Extra Data

Complex NPs

(46) No Island effects of complex NPs in matrix clause.
   know-PST
   ‘What is the x, such that Ram know the news that Sita will eat?’

(47) ✓ Rām-a [NP [CP Sītā-m guble ām na-u] (wa) halā]
   Ram-ERG Sita-ERG when mango.ABS eat-PST that rumor
   shy-u know-PST
   ‘What is the time x, such that Ram know the rumor that Sita ate mango at x time?’

(48) Complex NPs are likely to be islands in argument CP. Our language consultant came back forth with the judgments with this pattern:
   tathaya] sy-u] dhā-u news know-PST say-PST

Intended: ‘What is the x, such that Sayal said that Ram know the news that Sita will eat?’

(49) * ākās-ām [CP Rām-a [CP Sītā-m guble ām na-u] (wa)
   Akas-ERG Ram-ERG Sita-ERG when mango.ABS eat-PST that halā shy-u] swace yato?
   rumor know-PST think do.PST
   Intended: ‘When did Akas thought Ram know the rumor that Sita ate mango?’

Relative Clauses

(50) No island effects in relative clauses in matrix clause.
   ✓ Rām-a [NP [RC su-na dā ma] guru] nāplā-u?
   Ram-ERG who-ERG hit CL teacher meet-PST
   ‘Who is the person x, such that Ram met the teacher who x hit?’

(51) Island effects happen in relative clauses in the argument CP.
   Akas-ERG Ram-ERG who-ERG hit CL teacher meet-PST
dhā-u?
   say-PST
   ‘Who is the person x, such that Akas said that Ram met the teacher who x hit?’

Comparative Clauses

(52) No island effects of comparative clauses in the matrix clause.
   ✓ Rām-a [CP su-na bwæm wani-u shyā yaku] swimming
   Ram-ERG who-ERG run go-PST than more swimming
   ya-i.
   do-NonPst
   ‘Who is the person x, such that Ram swims more than x runs?’

(53) Island effects of comparative clauses in the argument CP.
   * ākās-ām [CP Rām-a [THAN sunā bwæm wani-u shyā yaku]
   Akas-ERG Ram-ERG who-ERG run go-PST than more swimming ya-i]
   dhā-u?
   swimming do-NonPST say–PST.
   Intended: ‘Who is the person x, such that Akas said Ram swims more than x runs?’
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Because-Clauses

(54) **No island effects of because-clauses in the matrix clause.**

✓ [ADJ ji-ం gana ma wam-u ōm], ji fel ju-la.
1.SG-ERG where NEG go-PST because, 1.SG. fail

happen-PST
‘Where is the place x, such that because I didn’t go x, I failed (the test)?’

(55) **Island effects of because-clauses in the argument CP.**

* Rām-a [CP [ADJ ji-ం gana ma wam-u ōm], ji fel
Ram-ERG 1.SG-ERG where NEG go-PST because, 1.SG. fail
ju-la] dhā-u
happen-PST say-PST
‘Where is the place x, such that Ram said because I didn’t go x, I failed (the test)?’

Before/After-Clauses

(56) **No island effects of before/after-Clauses in matrix clauses**

✓ [ADJ Sāyāl-ం chu he-i nym/daŋkā] Sītā pasal-e
Sayal-ERG what bring-NONPST before/after Sita store-LOC
wan-i.
go-NONPST
‘What is x, such that before Sayal brings x, Sita will go to the store.’

(57) **No island effects of before/after-Clauses in argument CPs**

✓ Rām-na [CP Sāyāl-ం chu he-i nym/daŋkā] Sītā
Ram-ERG Sayal-ERG what bring-NONPST before/after Sita
pasal-e wan-i] dhā-u.
store-LOC go-NONPST say-PST
‘What is x, such that Ram said that before Sayal brings x, Sita will go to the store.’

Wh-Clauses

(58) **No island effects of wh-clauses in matrix clauses.**

✓ Rām-a [CP Sāyāl-ం su-ito dā-lā dhaya] bihchar yāna-swana?
Ram-ERG Sayal-ERG who.DAT hit-Q that] wonder do.PST-PROG
‘Ram is wondering whether Sita hit whom?’

(59) **No island effects of wh-clauses in argument CP.**

Sītā-na [CP Rām-a [CP Sāyāl-ం su-ito dā-lā dhaya] bihchar
Sita-ERG Ram-ERG Sayal-ERG who.DAT hit-Q that] wonder
yāna-swana] dhā-u?
do.PST-PROG say-PST
‘Sita said Ram is wondering whether Sita hit whom?’
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