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Certain quantificational and focus elements (“interveners”) have long been known to disrupt the interpretation of wh-in-situ (Hoji 1985 and many others), but the correct description of the set of interveners and the nature of intervention effects have been the subject of continued debate. In this paper, I tie the distribution of intervention and the nature of interveners to the interpretation of movement configurations at LF. Building mainly on data from intervention effects in English and Japanese, I show that movement cannot target a region in the structure in which focus alternatives are simultaneously computed. I propose that this restriction on the grammar of scope-taking is the result of a logical problem with Predicate Abstraction computed over non-singleton alternatives. This problem is noted in Rooth’s (1985) seminal work introducing the theory of alternatives, and in later work such as Poesio (1996); Hagstrom (1998); Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002); Shan (2004); Novel and Romero (2009); Charlow (2015, 2017); Beck (2016); Ciardelli, Roelofsen, and Theiler (2017), who all attempt to correct this problem in some way. I argue instead that the data presented in this paper provide an empirical argument for a static, simple-typed system with movement alongside alternative computation as scope-taking mechanisms. Dynamic access to assignments may only be possible at certain intervals — clause or phase edges. The proposal has far-reaching implications for how a wide array of linguistic phenomena should be modeled, including the nature of movement, reconstruction, focus, and intensionality.

**Keywords:** intervention effects, scope-taking, assignment function, wh-questions, movement, focus alternatives, Predicate Abstraction

**Acknowledgements:** For valuable comments and discussion, I thank audiences at Rutgers University, UCLA, Stony Brook University, Yale University, UPenn, NYU, GLOW 2015, NELS 2016, LSA 2016, participants of the NYU seminar on wh-constructions cross-linguistically in Fall 2017, and the workshop on wh-intervention at the National University of Singapore in 2019. Special thanks to Lucas Champollion, Chris Collins, Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine, Danny Fox, Bob Frank, David Pesetsky, Anna Szabolcsi, and Satoshi Tomioka. None of these people are responsible for what I have done with their suggestions.
## Contents

1 **Introduction** 3

2 **Background** 5
   2.1 Intervention effects 5
   2.2 *Wh*-questions preliminaries 9
      2.2.1 English interrogative syntax 9
      2.2.2 In-situ composition 10

3 **Proposal: Intervention as movement into focus alternatives** 15
   3.1 Predicate Abstraction 15
   3.2 The problem of Predicate Abstraction across alternatives 16
   3.3 Proposal: Intervention results from attempted PA over alternatives 18

4 **Intervention is the result of scope-taking across alternatives** 20
   4.1 Intervention and movement in English 21
   4.2 Intervention does not correlate with superiority in English 23
      4.2.1 English superiority-obeying questions 23
      4.2.2 English superiority-violating questions 25
   4.3 Intervention tracks scope rigidity in Japanese 30

5 **Some implications** 35
   5.1 Focus 36
      5.1.1 Beck (2006) 36
      5.1.2 Generalized intervention 37
   5.2 Intervention, topichood, and prosody 38
   5.3 Negation 39
   5.4 Modals 40
   5.5 Movement and abstraction at phase edges 41
      5.5.1 Successive-cyclicity and intermediate landing sites 41
      5.5.2 Reconstruction 42
      5.5.3 Relativization in *wh*-questions 43
      5.5.4 Relativized Abstraction 44

6 **Conclusion** 44
1 Introduction

This paper sets out to investigate the syntax and semantics of *wh*-in-situ, using English multiple *wh*-questions as its main testing ground, with supporting data from Japanese, and leading to important lessons for the basic architecture of compositional syntax/semantics.

A well-known fact about English questions is that only one *wh*-phrase is fronted in the process of question formation, and any other *wh*-phrases remain *in-situ*.

(1) A multiple *wh*-question in English:

```
Who did Mary introduce to whom?
```

The literature offers two types of approaches to the interpretation of *wh*-in-situ: one involving covert movement, and the other involving in-situ composition — using Rooth-Hamblin alternative computation, unselective binding, or choice functions (e.g. Hamblin 1973; Pesetsky 1987; Reinhart 1997, 1998). These two modes of scope-taking — movement and non-movement — have been invoked in many other parts of the grammar, for example in theories of Association with Focus, existentials and indefinites, and disjunction, among others.

(2) Two ways of interpreting *wh*-in-situ in an English multiple question:

```
Who did Mary introduce to whom?
```

a. LF: 

```
Who [whom] C did Mary introduce to ?
```

covert movement

b. LF: 

```
Who C did Mary introduce to [whom] ?
```

in-situ composition

One pressing question is how the use of these mechanisms might be diagnosed, given that this is not obvious from the surface form of the question. Over the years, several diagnostics of LF structures have been developed: syntactic islands and the licensing of parasitic gaps and of Antecedent Contained Deletion indicate the presence of (covert) movement in such structures (e.g. Ross 1967; Sag 1976; Nissenbaum 2000; Pesetsky 2000). On the other hand, ‘focus’ intervention effects reflect the use of in-situ composition (e.g. Beck 2006, 2016; Cable 2010; Kotek 2014; Li and Law 2016).²

---

¹Throughout, solid arrows indicate overt movement, dashed arrows indicate covert movement, and curly arrows indicate areas of in-situ (alternative) computation. These arrows are used as a notational convenience only.

²The theories of intervention effects currently dominating the literature assume that this in-situ composition involves Rooth-Hamblin alternatives. I will continue to adopt this assumption here, which — as we will see — will become crucial later. As no theory of intervention has been developed based on a choice-function mechanism or using unselective
I argue that intervention effects are the result of a movement operation whose landing site is a position where Rooth-Hamblin (focus) alternatives (projected from an in-situ wh-phrase) are being computed:

(3) **Intervention as a crossing dependency between movement and focus alternatives:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{LF}}: \quad [\text{CP} \ C \ \ldots \ \text{DP} \ \lambda x \ \ldots \ \text{wh} \ \ldots \ x ]
\end{array}
\]

I propose that this ungrammaticality is the result of a logical incompatibility between the interpretation of movement and the computation of alternatives. As has been shown in work going back to Rooth (1985) and more recently in Poesio (1996); Shan (2004), and Novel and Romero (2009), among others, Predicate Abstraction (PA) over non-singleton sets of alternatives cannot be defined to yield the desired interpretation in static semantic models, such as the one developed in the popular Heim and Kratzer (1998) framework. Although the authors mentioned above (and several others) attempt to fix this problem by changing one or more basic assumptions about Grammar — the nature of movement, of focus, or of the semantic types system — I argue instead that our simple static system should be maintained. Intervention happens precisely when the undefined operation of PA over alternatives is attempted, as described in the generalization in (4).

(4) **Intervention is the result of Predicate Abstraction over alternatives:**

Scope-taking via movement into regions of focus alternatives computation leads to ungrammaticality at LF.

Intervention is avoided whenever the configuration in (3) can be avoided at LF — by moving the wh or the intervener out of the way, so that PA over sets of alternatives is no longer needed in the structure. I motivate this claim through a careful study of the patterns of intervention effects in English multiple questions. Additional support is provided from the behavior of intervention effects in Japanese.

This claim, that intervention is the result of scope-taking via movement into regions of alternative computation, has far-reaching implications across various domains of grammar. I discuss several of these implications — concentrating in particular on the nature of (successive-cyclic) movement and reconstruction, intentionality, and focus. I conclude by discussing some open questions and avenues for future research.

binding, I will leave for future work the question of how (or if) my proposal can be adapted and reframed using these tools. See Pesetsky (2000); Grohmann (2006); Tomioška (2007b); Mayr (2010, 2014); Li and Law (2016); Branan (2017b) for approaches which attribute the source of intervention to a problem other than the computation of focus alternatives, but do not propose another mode of composition for wh-in-situ. See also section 5.2 for some discussion of these alternative proposals.
2 Background

Before presenting the main claim I set out to defend in the paper — that intervention can be described as a crossing dependency, the result of scope-taking via movement into a region where alternatives are computed — I provide a brief survey of our current understanding of intervention effects, concentrating in particular on English data, which is central to this paper. I additionally introduce some expository assumptions about the syntax and semantics of \(wh\)-questions, to ground the discussion in sections 3 and 4.

2.1 Intervention effects

Over the past 30 years, a large and growing literature has described intervention effects in \(wh\)-questions. Descriptively, this refers to the inability of an in-situ \(wh\)-phrase to be outscoped by certain quantificational elements, called interveners. Such effects are most easily observed in \(wh\)-in-situ languages, such as Japanese, prompting an extensive body of literature to study these effects (Hoji 1985; Hagstrom 1998; Kim 2002; Beck and Kim 2006; Tomioka 2007b, a.o.).

Consider (5a–c), where the \(wh\)-mo “NPI” serves as an intervener.\(^3\) The word order in (5a) is grammatical, but it becomes unavailable when an intervener is present, (5b). The question is rescued by scrambling the interrogative \(wh\)-word over the intervener (5c).\(^4\)

\[(5) \quad \text{A canonical intervention example in Japanese:} \quad \text{(Tomioka 2007b: 1571–1572)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad \checkmark \text{Hanako-ga } & \text{nani-}o \ \text{yon-da-no?} \\
& \text{Hanako-NOM what-ACC read-PAST-Q} \\
& \text{‘What did Hanako read?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. \quad * \text{Dare-mo } & \text{nani-}o \ \text{yoma-nak-atta-no?} \\
& \text{who-MO what-ACC read-NEG-PAST-Q}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
c. \quad \checkmark \text{nani-}o \ & \text{dare-mo } \text{yoma-nak-atta-no?} \\
& \text{what-ACC who-MO read-NEG-PAST-Q} \\
& \text{‘What did no one read?’}
\end{align*}
\]

A similar phenomenon is observed in German, for \(wh\)-in-situ in multiple \(wh\)-questions such as (6a). Here we observe the negative quantifier \(niemand\) (‘no one’) acting as an intervener: \(niemand\) cannot precede an in-situ \(wh\)-word (6b). The resulting ungrammaticality can be avoided by scrambling the \(wh\)-phrase over the intervener, as in (6c).

\(^3\)More accurately, \(wh\)-mo is an \textit{neg-word} — a negation-dependent universal quantifier, see Shimoyama (2008).

\(^4\)Throughout the paper, interrogative \(wh\) are in \textit{italics} and quantifiers of interest (potential interveners) — as well as sentential negation below — are in \textbf{bold}. 

5
A canonical intervention example in German:  
(6) *(Wer hat Luise wo angetroffen?  
who has Luise where met  
‘Who met Luise where’?

b. *(Wer hat niemanden wo angetroffen?  
who has no one where met  
‘Who didn’t meet anybody where’?

c. *(Wer hat wo niemanden angetroffen?  
who has where no one met  
‘Who didn’t meet anybody where’?

Descriptively, therefore, intervention effects affect *wh*-in-situ. Theoretically, I adopt here the idea that intervention effects affect alternative computation but not movement: interveners disrupt the interpretation of alternatives projected by *wh* which must be interpreted by interrogative C (Beck 2006; Beck and Kim 2006; Kotek 2014, 2016b). However, I will describe a new and different mechanism causing intervention than proposed in these previous works. The crucial ingredient that differentiates my proposal from all previous ones is in not predicting a stable set of interveners, but rather taking intervention to be a flexible phenomenon, dependent on the syntactic structure and semantic scope-taking mechanisms available in the language and used in a given derivation.

I describe the mechanism of Rooth-Hamblin alternatives in more detail in section 2.2.2 below, and I elaborate on the idea that alternatives are crucial for the understanding of intervention effects in section 3. At this stage, we can stay agnostic with respect to the exact inventory of so-called interveners, and provide the following schematic description of the phenomenon: Intervention effects happen when an LF-in-situ *wh*-phrase is separated from the interrogative complementizer by an intervener, and can be avoided by moving the *wh*-phrase above the intervener.

(7) The Beck (2006) LF intervention schema:

a. ✓ [CP C ... *wh ]

b. * [CP C ... *intervener ... *wh ]

c. ✓ [CP C ... *intervener ... *t ]

Turning next to English, the most comprehensive study of intervention effects in English is presented in Pesetsky 2000. Pesetsky observes a correlation between superiority and intervention effects in multiple questions with D-linked *wh*-phrases, building and expanding on an observation in É Kiss 1986. D-linked questions exceptionally allow for superiority violations, (8b); however,
in-situ wh-phrases in superiority-violating questions are sensitive to intervention effects, (8c), while superiority-obeying questions appear to be immune from such effects, (8d).

(8) Intervention effects in English correlate with superiority:
   a. Which student ___ read which book? obeying
   b. Which book did which student read ___? violating
   c. Which student didn’t ___ read which book? obeying
   d. * Which book didn’t which student read ___? violating
      (cf Which book did which student not read ___?)

The intervention effect in English is not limited to sentential negation. Pesetsky (2000) provides data with additional interveners such as only NP, no one, never, and very few. See additional data involving universal quantification in section 4. (The data here is from Pesetsky 2000, ch 5.)

(9) Intervention effect with only only affects superiority-violating question:
   a. Which girl did only Mary introduce ___ to which boy?
   b. * Which boy did only Mary introduce which girl to ___?

(10) Intervention effect with very few only affects superiority-violating question:
   a. Which picture did very few children want to show ___ to which teacher?
   b. * Which teacher did very few children want to show which picture to ___?

(11) Intervention effect with never only affects superiority-violating question:
   a. Which student did he never claim ___ would talk about which topic?
   b. * Which topic did he never claim which student would talk about ___?

(12) Intervention effect with no one only affects superiority-violating question:
   a. Which book did no one give ___ to which student?

5D-linking in the examples here is crucial. Non-D-linked questions must obey Superiority and hence do not provide the right grounds for testing for the presence of intervention.

(i) The Superiority effect (Kuno and Robinson 1972):
   When TP contains two wh-words, the one that undergoes wh-movement is the one closest to the interrogative C.

(ii) a. Who ___ read what?
    b. * What did who read ___?

(iii) a. Who did Jane persuade ___ to read what?
    b. * What did Jane persuade who(m) to read ___?

6In fact, I return to sentential negation to question its status as an intervener in English in section 5.3.
b. * Which student did **no one** give *which* book to **___**?

In all cases, the observed generalization is that only superiority-violating questions are subject to intervention effects. Superiority-obeying questions are immune from these effects. This, along with evidence from the licensing of Antecedent Contained Deletion, leads Pesetsky (2000) to his proposal that superiority-obeying and superiority-violating multiple questions in English must be derived from underlyingly distinct LFs, which I will now introduce. In the coming sections I will refine the generalization observed by Pesetsky, but nonetheless continue to adopt the syntactic assumptions underlying the behavior we observe above.

**A note on judgments**

Before moving on, two notes are in order about the nature of the data and judgments introduced throughout this paper.

First, intervention effect-related judgments are notoriously difficult to obtain. Unlike judgments in other domains such as island effects, judgments here are sometimes described as confusing, weak, or hard to interpret. The literature variably describes the contrast between an intervention-sentence and a non-intervention-sentence as a *, ??, or ?, making comparisons across sources very difficult. Experimental studies of intervention are rare, in part because of this difficulty (but see Haida and Repp 2013; Kitagawa, Tamaoka, and Tomioka 2013; Kotek and Erlewine 2016; Kotek 2014, 2019, and Tomioka 2019 for some attempts and discussion of the difficulty associated with the design and interpretation of results). See in particular the discussion in Tomioka 2019, who takes this to be an open problem in this domain. A close experimental investigation of intervention effects will be beyond the scope of this paper, but would be a welcome extension of this paper.

Second, it is important to note that for many speakers, intervention effects in multiple questions are diagnosed by the loss of the **pair-list** reading of the question (A2) in (13). A **single-pair** answer reading may survive (A1). This has been reported for intervention effects in superiority-violating questions in English and for intervention effects in German questions in footnotes in previous work (Pesetsky 2000; Beck 2006, cf also Beck 1996). See discussion in Kotek (2014) for details.

(13) **A single-pair and a pair-list reading of a multiple question:**

Q: *Who ate what?*

A1: Sarah ate the beans. *single-pair*

A2: Sarah ate the beans, Mary ate the eggplant, and Sue ate the broccoli. *pair-list*
2.2 Wh-questions preliminaries

With preliminary data on intervention effects in place, next I spell out the assumptions I adopt in this paper concerning the syntax and semantics of English multiple questions.

2.2.1 English interrogative syntax

As shown in section 2.1, intervention effects in English questions are sensitive to Superiority: we see that superiority-violating questions are subject to intervention effects, while superiority-obeying questions are immune from such effects. I adopt the analysis developed in Pesetsky (2000) and adopted in Beck 2006, where this pattern is explained by assuming different LFs for superiority-obeying and superiority-violating multiple questions. To make this explicit, we adopt the following set of assumptions:

First, we assume that an interrogative probe on C multiply searches for all interrogative phrases in its c-command domain. Second, adopting Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990, cf. Chomsky 1995), we assume that the wh-phrase base-generated highest in the question (throughout: wh) is always found by the probe before any lower ones (throughout: wh) can be.

In the case of superiority-obeying questions, we assume the following derivation: (a) The interrogative probe on C finds wh₁, Agrees with it, and attracts it to Spec,CP to satisfy an EPP requirement. (b) The probe then goes on to find and Agree with wh₂. (c) Wh₂ is active and may move following this agreement operation. Traditionally, such movement is assumed to target an inner specifier of CP, tucking in below wh₁ (Richards 1997). Kotek 2014, 2019 shows cases in which movement is partial: targeting a position lower in the clause, such as the edge of vP or the edge of an island. This choice is guided by the particulars of the derivation, and will be a topic I return to below. (d) A pronunciation rule as in (15) ensures that the highest wh-phrase in Spec,CP is pronounced at the head of its movement chain (hence, in its moved position), and all other wh-phrases are pronounced at the tail of their respective chains (hence, in-situ). The resulting LF is shown in (14a).

In the case of superiority-violating questions we assume a slightly different derivation: (a) The interrogative probe on C finds wh₁, Agrees with it, but leaves it in-situ. (b) The probe then goes on to find and Agree with wh₂, attracting to the highest Spec,CP. (c) This ensures the correct pronounced word order for this question, given the pronunciation rule (15). The resulting LF is shown in (14b).

Where “higher” and “lower” are defined in terms of asymmetric c-command: we deal here with structures in which wh₁ asymmetrically c-commands wh₂. For simplicity, I do not consider questions with more than two wh-phrases in this paper.
(14) LFs for superiority-obeying and superiority-violating questions in English:

a. LF: Which student\(_1\) which book\(_2\) C read ?

b. LF: Which book\(_2\) did which student\(_1\) read ?

(15) Pronunciation rule (English) (Pesetsky 2000: 28):

a. The first instance of wh-phrase movement to C is overt, in that wh is pronounced in its new position and unpronounced in its trace positions.

b. Secondary instances of wh-phrase movement to C are covert, in that wh is pronounced in its trace position and unpronounced in its new position.

By the end of the derivation for superiority-obeying questions, all wh-phrases are above TP at LF, hence above any interveners. The structure is therefore predicted not to be sensitive to intervention effects, as desired (recall the schema in (7)). Superiority-violating questions, on the other hand, contain a wh-phrase that is interpreted in-situ at LF; hence, if an intervener separates this in-situ wh-phrase from C, we predict an intervention effect.

2.2.2 In-situ composition

Finally, I introduce here the mechanism of in-situ composition introduced by the squiggly arrows in the examples above — Rooth-Hamblin alternatives. Rooth-Hamblin alternatives are a parallel mode of semantic composition, where a set of alternatives (known as focus-semantic or alternative values) is computed compositionally for each syntactic node in the derivation in parallel to its ordinary semantic value (Rooth 1985, 1992, see also Hamblin 1973). This computation has been argued to supply operators such as focus operators and question complementizers with a relevant set of alternative denotations or propositions.

I adopt the bi-dimensional semantics for wh-words of Ramchand 1997; Beck 2006; Kotek 2014, 2019: Wh-words denote sets of alternatives (as a Roothian focus-semantic value) which can be taken to stand for (short) possible answers to the corresponding question, but lack a defined ordinary value. This is illustrated for what in (16), where I assume that the contextually relevant individuals in the domain are Moby Dick, War and Peace, Oliver Twist:

(16) The semantics of what:

| ordinary value: | \([what]^f\) is undefined |
| alternatives: | \([what]^f = \{ x \in D_c : x \text{ is not human} \} =_c \{ \text{Moby Dick, War & Peace, Oliver Twist} \} |
Consider the (simplified) LF representation for the wh-in-situ pseudo-English question “Hanako bought what?” in (18), a parallel to the Japanese example in (5a) above, repeated here as (17):⁸

(17) **A Japanese question:**

✓ Hanako-ga  nani-o  yon-da-no?
  Hanako-nom what-acc read-past-q
  ‘What did Hanako read?’

This LF does not involve any (overt or covert) wh-movement, and hence the non-movement mode of composition is used to interpret the question: Rooth-Hamblin alternative computation.

(18) **Focus alternatives compose point-wise in a simple question:**

\[
\text{CP}_2 \quad \text{AltSHIFT} \quad \text{CP}_1
\]

\[
\text{C} \quad \text{TP}
\]

\[
\{ \text{Hanako read MD,} \}
\]

\[
\{ \text{Hanako read WP,} \}
\]

\[
\{ \text{Hanako read OT} \}
\]

\[
\{ \lambda y . \lambda x . x \text{ read } y \} \quad \{ \text{MD, WP, OT} \}
\]

\[
\text{read} \quad \text{what}
\]

Notice that in (18), the wh-phrase what has a focus-semantic value corresponding to contextually relevant individuals in its domain — here, the individuals Moby Dick, War and Peace, Oliver Twist. The focus-semantic values of the other terminal nodes correspond to the singleton set containing their ordinary value (Rooth 1985, 1992). These alternatives compose pointwise at each non-terminal node, resulting in the complement of the interrogative C having a set of propositions as its focus-semantic value. This set of alternative propositions then serves as the input to the adjoined AltSHIFT

---
⁸This structure is simplified in many ways; notably, the full-fledged structure will have to be intensionalized.
operator, the interrogative operator, which returns these alternative propositions as the ordinary meaning of the question (Kotek 2014, 2019, see also Shimoyama 2001; Beck and Kim 2006).

(19) **The semantics of the question operator:**

a. \[ \text{AltShift} \, \alpha \, \sigma \, K \, o = \text{AltShift} \, \alpha \, \sigma \, K \, f \]

b. \[ \text{AltShift} \, \alpha \, \sigma \, K \, f = \{ \text{AltShift} \, \alpha \, \sigma \, K \, o \} \]

This procedure of pointwise composition of focus alternatives proceeds in parallel to the computation of ordinary semantic values for each node in the LF. Because what lacks an ordinary semantic value, any node that composes with it also lacks an ordinary value. This undefinedness is inherited by the structure up to node CP, (20a–c). AltShift corrects this problem by taking the focus-semantic value of CP and turning it into the ordinary value of the question, (20d).

(20) **Ordinary semantic values in (18):**

a. \( [\text{VP}]^o \) is undefined

b. \( [\text{TP}]^o \) is undefined

c. \( [\text{CP}_1]^o \) is undefined

d. \( [\text{CP}_2]^o = [\text{CP}_1]^f = \{ \lambda w. \text{Hanako read } x \text{ in } w : x \text{ is not human} \} \)

\[ \text{Hanako read MD in } w, \text{Hanako read WP in } w, \text{Hanako read OT in } w \} \]

e. \( [\text{CP}_2]^f = \{ \{ \text{Hanako read MD in } w, \text{Hanako read WP in } w, \text{Hanako read OT in } w \} \} \)

The end result, then, is that these alternative propositions correspond to possible (weak) answers to the question (Hamblin 1973; Karttunen 1977). Once the ordinary value of CP is set using AltShift, we adopt the assumption from Rooth 1985, 1992 that the focus-semantic value of CP is a singleton set containing its ordinary value (20e).

The question operator AltShift is the only operator that is able to take a complement which lacks an ordinary value, and “fix” this missing piece in the derivation. It does so by turning the focus-semantic value of the question into its ordinary value. See Kotek 2019 for discussion of the distribution of AltShift cross-linguistically, and Uegaki 2018 for a proposal that the Japanese question particle -ka is a spellout of this AltShift operator. In the absence of this alternative-resetting step, the question is predicted to be ungrammatical, a consequence of the Principle of Interpretability in (21). This point will become important in section 5.1.

---

9I follow Kotek 2014, 2019 in assuming that the interrogative complementizer C is semantically inert: It simple takes the denotation of its sister and returns it as the denotation of its mother, unchanged. I note that the denotation I adopt here for AltShift has been attributed to interrogative C in Beck 2006; Beck and Kim 2006. However, separating C from the AltShift operator allows us to apply AltShift multiply in a single clause to yield pair-list (family of question) meanings for multiple questions, as shown below.
(21) **The Principle of Interpretability (Beck 2006, p. 16):**

An LF must have an ordinary semantic value.

This same type of mechanism is also able to model multiple *wh*-questions. For a question such as *which book did which student read?*, I adopt an LF as in (14b). Here, *which book* has moved to Spec,CP, and *which student* remains in-situ and is interpreted by projecting Rooth-Hamblin alternatives which are interpreted by AltShift. I follow Kotek 2014, 2019 in assuming that the pair-list reading of a multiple question is modeled as a family of questions (Roberts 1996; Hagstrom 1998; Krifka 2001; Büring 2003; Willis 2008; Fox 2012; Nicolae 2013; Constant 2014, a.o.). This is achieved by allowing multiple AltShift operators in the derivation, as shown in (22):

(22) **A simplified LF for a superiority-violating question with a pair-list reading:**

```
CP
  AltShift₁
    1
  DP_y
    λy
      2
        which book
          AltShift₂
            3
              C
              did
               TP
                 DP
                  VP
                    which student
                      read_y
```

I illustrate key parts of the derivation in (23), assuming as above a small domain for the *wh*-phrases, for purposes of illustration.¹⁰ This LF yields a family of questions denotation sorted by the higher *wh*-phrase, *book*. Spelling this out for our small context, the result is in (23f).¹¹

---

¹⁰For illustrations for a superiority-obeying question and for the single-pair reading of both types of questions, I refer the reader to Kotek 2014, 2019.

¹¹I will explicitly discuss the abstraction step between steps 2 and 1 after introducing my proposal in section 3. For present purposes it suffices to know that this step is not problematic in this derivation. I explain why in (32) below.
(23) **Key parts of the derivation of (22):**

a. \([\text{which student}]^o \) is undefined
   \([\text{which student}]^f = [\text{student}]^o = \{ \text{Mary, Dana, Lynn} \}\)

b. \([\text{which book}]^o \) is undefined
   \([\text{which book}]^f = [\text{book}]^o = \{ \text{Moby Dick, War & Peace, Oliver Twist} \}\)

c. \([\text{q}3\ y]_o \) is undefined
   \([\text{q}3\ y]^f = \{ \lambda w. x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \}\)

d. \([\text{q}2\ y]_o = [\text{q}3\ y]_f = \{ \lambda w. x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \}\)
   AltShift$_2$ applied
   \([\text{q}2\ y]^f = \{ \lambda w. x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \}\)

e. \([\text{CP}]_o \) is undefined
   \([\text{CP}]_f = \{ \lambda w. x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \} : y \in \text{book} \}

f. \([\text{CP}]_o = [\text{CP}]_f = \{ \lambda w. x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \} : y \in \text{book} \}
   \text{AltShift}_1 \text{ applied}

\[\begin{align*}
   &= \{ \{ \text{Mary read MD} \} , \{ \text{Dana read MD} \} , \{ \text{Lynn read MD} \} , \\
   &\quad \{ \text{Mary read WP} \} , \{ \text{Dana read WP} \} , \{ \text{Lynn read WP} \} , \\
   &\quad \{ \text{Mary read OT} \} , \{ \text{Dana read OT} \} , \{ \text{Lynn read OT} \} \} \\
\end{align*}\]

To conclude this section, the Rooth-Hamblin alternatives mechanism yields the desired question semantics without establishing a syntactically local (movement) relationship between a *wh*-phrase and C. It is precisely this mechanism that is subject to intervention effects, as we will see below. Throughout, I will continue to use the squiggly arrow notation to indicate that Rooth-Hamblin alternatives project from an in-situ *wh*-phrase and pointwise compose up the structure, leading to a derivation that could be subject to intervention effects. That is, the LF in (24) is equivalent to the one in (18):

(24) **A squiggly arrow marks the part(s) of structure where alternatives are projected:**

\[\text{C Hanako read what?} \quad (= 18)\]

---

\[12\]To simplify my LFs, throughout I omit the AltShift operator and only illustrate C wherever it is not directly relevant to the discussion.
3 Proposal: Intervention as movement into focus alternatives

In the remainder of this paper I defend the idea that intervention is the result of scope-taking across alternatives. The generalized intervention schema is as in (25):

\[(25)\] Intervention as a crossing dependency between movement and focus alternatives:

\[
* \text{LF: } [\text{CP } C \ldots \text{DP } \lambda x \ldots \text{wh } \ldots x ]
\]

This proposal builds on the ideas in Kim (2002); Beck (2006); Beck and Kim (2006); Kotek (2014, 2019) that intervention is related to focus interpretation. However, these previous authors propose that interveners themselves are focus-sensitive operators; interveners cause intervention by virtue of being the first operator to interpret the alternatives projected by \textit{wh}-in-situ, blocking interpretation by the interrogative complementizer or AltShift, and leading to semantic incompatibility diagnosed as an intervention effect. As a result, these authors predict a stable set of interveners: those operators that associate with focus. This provides a handy explanation for why only and even act as interveners, but struggles with interveners like every, no one, and never, as well as with the observed cross-linguistic variability in the set of interveners, discussed most recently in works such as Erlewine and Kotek 2018c; Beck 2019; Howell, Hohaus, Berezovskaya, Braun, Sachs, Durmaz, and Beck 2019. See also Eilam 2008 and Branan 2017b on the absence of intervention effects in Amharic and Egyptian Arabic, respectively, as well as Haida and Repp 2013 on the status of also as an intervener in German, and the discussion in section 4.3.

Instead, I propose that the cause of intervention is rooted in a much more fundamental fact about the nature of Grammar: going back to Rooth (1985), with the very inception of the theory of Association with Focus, it has been known that Predicate Abstraction is not well defined over non-singleton sets of alternatives in simple, static semantic models.

3.1 Predicate Abstraction

Predicate Abstraction is often used in a derivation to facilitate binding of a variable with its antecedent. Such a relation is often established through syntactic movement. In a simple example such as (26), the \textit{wh}-word who is fronted in the process of question formation. A binder is introduced below the landing site of movement, which is then co-indexed with the trace of the moved \textit{wh}-word.
Movement and abstraction in a simple example:

The Predicate Abstraction rule then facilitates a change to the assignment function \( g \), such that the index introduced by the binder is updated to point to the variable being bound. This ensures that movement and quantification yield their expected meanings.

Predicate Abstraction (PA, Heim and Kratzer 1998: 186):

Let \( \alpha \) be a branching node with daughters \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \), where \( \beta \) dominates only a numerical index \( i \). Then, for any assignment \( g \), \( [\alpha]^{\lambda} = \lambda x \cdot [\gamma]^{g[x/i]} \).

3.2 The problem of Predicate Abstraction across alternatives

Returning to the issue of Predicate Abstraction across alternatives, it has been observed that in cases with non-singleton sets of alternatives, PA cannot be defined to yield the desired bound-variable interpretation (Poesio 1996; Hagstrom 1998; Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002; Shan 2004; Novel and Romero 2009; Yatsushiro 2009; Charlow 2015; Beck 2016; Ciardelli et al. 2017). The crux of the matter is that there is no way to correctly define the focus-semantic value of predicate-abstracted nodes. In what follows I describe this problem in brief, following the presentation in Shan 2004. I provide a more detailed discussion in the Appendix.

First, consider the question *Who saw nobody?*, where \([\text{who}]^{f} = \{\text{Mary}, \text{Dana}, \text{Lynn}\}\), and assuming (as is standard) QR of the quantified object *nobody* (May 1977, 1985), (28a). Our goal is to apply PA to the set \( \{\text{Mary saw } t_1, \text{Dana saw } t_1, \text{Lynn saw } t_1\} \), binding the trace and composing the moved quantifier above. PA over a set of propositional alternatives should intuitively apply pointwise, yielding a set of functions. However, because the input to PA is an assignment-sensitive set of propositions, PA yields instead a function returning a set of propositions, which is of an incorrect type, (28b).

A naive application of Predicate Abstraction which doesn’t work:

- a. LF: nobody \( \lambda i \text{ who saw } t_i \)
- b. \( \lambda x \cdot \{\text{Mary saw } t_i, \text{Dana saw } t_i, \text{Lynn saw } t_i\} \) \( \odot \langle e, \langle st, t \rangle \rangle \)

To facilitate composition above the set in (28b), the result of PA must be transposed from a function into sets, of type \( \langle e, \langle st, t \rangle \rangle \), into a set of functions, of type \( \langle e, st, t \rangle \). Such a rule can be
explicitly stated, as in (29):

(29) **A type-shifter for turning type \(\langle e, \tau, t \rangle\) functions into type \(\langle \langle e, \tau \rangle, t \rangle\) functions:**

\[
\Lambda Q_{\langle e, \tau, t \rangle}. \{ f_{\langle e, \tau \rangle} : \forall x. f(x) \in Q(x) \}
\]

However, such a rule over-generates: it yields the desired “uniform” functions, (30a), as well as “non-uniform” ones, (30b). Non-uniform functions as in (30b) predict sentence meanings that are not attested in natural language, and are therefore undesirable.

(30) **Uniform and non-uniform functions are both generated by (29):**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_1, & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_1, & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_1 \\
& & x_2 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_2, & & x_2 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_2, & & x_2 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_2, & & \ldots \\
& & x_3 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_3, & & x_3 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_3, & & x_3 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_3,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_1, & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_1, & & x_1 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_1 \\
& & x_2 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_2, & & x_2 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_2, & & x_2 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_2, & & \ldots \\
& & x_3 \mapsto \text{Dana saw } x_3, & & x_3 \mapsto \text{Lynn saw } x_3, & & x_3 \mapsto \text{Mary saw } x_3,
\end{align*}
\]

There is no way of “pruning” the undesirable functions, as in (30b), keeping only the uniform ones, as in (30a). As a result, there is no way to correctly define PA in a *static* semantic system with simple semantic types and with movement alongside focus-alternatives. I refer the reader to the Appendix, as well as to Rooth (1985: 45–59), Shan (2004) and Novel and Romero (2009) for a more detailed illustration of this problem.

Although this issue has largely been put aside in the past, it has recently attracted the attention of several authors. Shan (2004) argues that this problem cannot be overcome, and hence motivates the adoption of a variable-free semantics without any movement.\(^\text{13}\) Beck (2016), instead, develops a solution which changes the nature of the computation of focus-alternatives, where focus uses distinguished variables (Kratzer 1991; Wold 1996) instead of being unselective (Rooth 1985, 1992).\(^\text{14}\) Novel and Romero (2009) show yet a third solution, involving type-lifting the entire semantic types system, taking assignment functions to be a part of the denotations of all lexical items (see also Charlow 2017; Ciardelli et al. 2017 for solutions along similar lines, as well as the discussion in Rooth 1985).\(^\text{15}\) I entertain this final proposal in more detail in section 5.5.4.

\(^\text{13}\) Shan also points out problems for solutions proposed in Poesio (1996) and Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002).

\(^\text{14}\) Rooth’s theory of focus is regulated solely by the \(\sim\) operator. For Beck (2016), it is crucial that some focus operators are *unselective*, while others are *selective*. See section 5.1 for additional details.

\(^\text{15}\) Under this approach, for example, individuals are no longer objects of type \(e\) but instead they are a function of type \(a \to e\), where \(a\) is the type of assignment functions.
3.3 Proposal: Intervention results from attempted PA over alternatives

I propose that none of these amendments to the standard static semantic system should be adopted wholesale. Instead, intervention effects arise precisely when we attempt to Predicate Abstract over alternatives. A dynamic “fix” as in Charlow 2017 may be available in some limited cases only, which I discuss in section 5.5.4.

(31) Intervention effects reflect scope-taking via movement into alternatives:

Intervention is the result of movement into a part of structure where non-trivial alternatives are being computed — because Predicate Abstraction, necessary to interpret the movement step, is not well-defined in such cases.

The emphasis on non-trivial alternatives in (31) is crucial: the problem illustrated in 3.2 only arises when we attempt to simultaneously bind a variable in a uniform fashion while allowing multiple values for an alternative-generating phrase in the same step of the derivation. This only happens when the focus-semantic value of the phrase being abstracted over is a non-singleton set. This point becomes particularly important when we consider the denotation of multiple questions, where — as we have already seen — intervention effects are observed in English. To illustrate this, let us spell out the missing step in the derivation of (23): the step of Predicate Abstraction that must occur between nodes (2) and (1), marked as * in the LF below. I repeat the relevant steps from (23), and spell out the missing step in (32c–d).

(32) Abstracting over a singleton set does not lead to a problem:

\[
[\text{CP A1\text{\textsc{shift}}} 1 \text{ which book } [\star \lambda y [\text{TP which student } [\text{VP read } y ]]]]]
\]

\[\text{\quad a. } [\text{which book}]^o \text{ is undefined}
\]
\[\text{\qquad } [\text{which book}]^f = [\text{book}]^o = \{ \text{Moby Dick, War & Peace, Oliver Twist } \} \quad (= \text{23b})
\]

\[\text{\quad b. } [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_2 2] = [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_2 3] = \{ \lambda w . x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \}
\]
\[\text{\qquad } [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_2 2] = \{ \lambda w . x \text{ read } y \text{ in } w : x \in \text{student} \} \quad (= \text{23d})
\]

\[\text{\quad c. } [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_1 1 \text{ which book } [\star \lambda y [\text{TP which student } [\text{VP read } y ]]]]]
\]

\[\text{\qquad } [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_1 1 \text{ which book } [\star \lambda y [\text{TP which student } [\text{VP read } y ]]]]]
\]

\[\text{\quad d. } [\text{Alt\text{\textsc{shift}}}_1 1 \text{ which book } [\star \lambda y [\text{TP which student } [\text{VP read } y ]]]]]
\]

[18] A precursor to this idea is in Kratzer 2005, footnote 14: “There is a question about the correctness of the definition for Predicate Abstraction. It does not quite deliver the expected set of functions. As far as I can see, however, no wrong predictions are actually made, as long as we only use the definition for generating propositional alternatives. There may in fact be interesting constraints to explore. Shan (2003) shows, for example, that Kratzer and Shimoyama’s Hamblin semantics would produce the wrong alternative set for sentences like Who thought everyone showed which paper by his advisor to her mother. Shan’s sentence is a classical example of an intervention effect (Beck 1996), however, and we would want to rule it out as ungrammatical. On Kratzer and Shimoyama’s account it would be ruled out on the assumption that the nuclear scope of quantifiers like everyone is existentially closed (Heim 1982), hence the lower wh-phrase is stuck within the scope of a non-matching operator.”
c. \([\star]^o = \lambda y . [\square]^o = \lambda y . \{ \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Predicate Abstraction}

Applying the type-shifter in (29) pointwise:

\([\star]^o = \{ \lambda y . \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \}\]
\([\star]^f = \{ \lambda y . \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \}\]

d. \([\square]^o = [\star]^o ([\text{which book}]^o) \) is undefined
\([\square]^f = [\star]^f ([\text{which book}]^f) \)

\(= \{ \lambda y . \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Function Application}

\(= \{ \lambda y . \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{pointwise FA}

\(= \{ \lambda y . \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{\(\beta\) conversion}

\(e. \ [\square]^f = \{ \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} : y \in \text{book} \) \hspace{1cm} (= 23e)

\(f. \ [\text{CP}]^o = [\text{AltShift}_1 \ (\square)]^o = \{ \lambda w . x \ \text{read} \ y \ \text{in} \ w : x \in \text{student} \} : y \in \text{book} \) \hspace{1cm} (= 23f)

\[= \{ \text{Mary read MD} \} , \{ \text{Mary read WP} \} , \{ \text{Mary read OT} \} \]
\[= \{ \text{Dana read MD} \} , \{ \text{Dana read WP} \} , \{ \text{Dana read OT} \} \]
\[= \{ \text{Lynn read MD} \} , \{ \text{Lynn read WP} \} , \{ \text{Lynn read OT} \} \]

As steps (32c–d) illustrate, Predicate Abstraction over a singleton set of alternatives can lead to a well-defined result, as in (32e). This is because there is no way to create the kind of non-uniform functions that caused a problem in (30b) — we only encounter a problem when a non-singleton set is under consideration.

The proposal in (31) leads to two predictions, which I will substantiate below: (a) we should observe intervention effects in more environments than identified in previous literature, since movement is used in many corners of the grammar, and (b) we should find more interveners than previously recognized in the literature — because intervention is caused by moved material leading to the configuration in (3). Interveners are not a predetermined set that shares a certain characteristic. To test these predictions, below I will concentrate on showing that we can ‘turn on’ and ‘turn off’ intervention behavior by forcing items to take scope via movement or through other means, correlating with the presence or absence of an intervention effect. This result will be problematic for all previous accounts of intervention, which all predict a stable and limited (albeit distinct across accounts) set of interveners.

19
As discussed in section 2.1, judgments concerning intervention effects are quite delicate. To ensure that all the questions presented below were judged with respect to the pair-list reading, to mitigate interference from a potential single-pair reading, these questions were all presented to speakers in contexts supporting a pair-list interpretation. I will present some contexts below, but in the interest of space, I will omit some others.

A * judgment next to a question which exhibits an intervention effect is meant to indicate the loss of the pair-list reading of the question, judged in a supportive context.\footnote{Almost without exception, unless this is pointed out to speakers, the single-pair reading also becomes unavailable. However, in some cases discussed, the single-pair reading seems more readily available. I leave this observation as an open avenue for future research.} I use the * notation here to indicate a contrastive judgment, such that the intervention-sentence is degraded compared to its non-intervention counterpart. It is not meant as a comment on the strength of the judgment. Because of the complex nature of some of the examples, some judgments are easier for some speakers to perceive than others. However, this variation aside, each data point I report below has been confirmed with over a dozen speakers over multiple sessions.

4 Intervention is the result of scope-taking across alternatives

In this section I return to the nature of intervention effects in \( \text{wh} \)-questions. Recall that in section 2.1, I presented data from Pesetsky (2000), where only NP, no one, never, very few, and sentential negation acted as interveners in English questions, (8), (9–12). We furthermore observed a correlation between superiority and intervention effects in English questions, such that only superiority-violating questions were subject to intervention. This led Pesetsky to propose underlyingly distinct LFs for superiority-obeying and superiority-violating questions, which I introduced in section 2.2:

\[
\text{(33) } \quad \text{LF representations of superiority-obeying and superiority-violating questions:}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad & \left[ \text{CP } \text{wh} \_1 \text{wh} \_2 \left[ \text{C } \left[ \text{TP } \ldots \text{t} \_1 \ldots \text{t} \_2 \right] \right] \right] \quad \text{superiority-obeying} \\
b. \quad & \left[ \text{CP } \text{wh} \_2 \left[ \text{C } \left[ \text{TP } \ldots \text{wh} \_1 \ldots \text{t} \_2 \right] \right] \right] \quad \text{superiority-violating}
\end{align*}
\]

In this section I show that although we correctly predict that, in general, superiority-obeying questions are immune from intervention effects and superiority-violating questions are subject to such effects — exceptions can be found. In particular, Kotek (2014, 2016a, 2019) shows that in the case of English superiority-obeying questions, the covert movement step associated with the phonologically in-situ \( \text{wh} \)-phrase can potentially target non-interrogative intermediate CPs as final
landing sites. The $wh$-phrase is then interpreted using Rooth-Hamblin alternatives between its (covert) landing site and the edge of the clause:

\[(34)\quad \text{Covert } wh\text{-movement in superiority-obeying questions can be partial:} \]
\[
[CP \; wh_1 \; C \; \ldots \; wh_2 \; [VP \; \ldots \; t_1 \; \ldots \; t_2]]
\]

As a consequence, even in a superiority-obeying question, a region susceptible to intervention effects can be formed. Whenever we can clearly diagnose the highest possible LF position of $wh_2$ in (34) and block movement to C, we predict intervention effects above this landing site in superiority-obeying questions. Conversely, when $wh_1$ is given wide scope through non-interrogative movement, or when an intervener is moved out of the way in structures as in (33b), intervention can be avoided in superiority-violating questions.

I show evidence in support of the generalization that intervention happens when movement into a region of focus-alternative computation is forced, and is avoided otherwise — regardless of intervention but in support of the idea that scope-taking across regions of (non-singleton) alternative computation is key:

\[(3)\quad \text{Intervention as a crossing dependency between movement and focus alternatives:} \]
\[
* \text{LF: } [CP \; C \; \ldots \; DP \; \lambda x \; \ldots \; wh \; \ldots \; x]
\]

\[(4)\quad \text{Intervention is the result of Predicate Abstraction over alternatives:} \]

Scope-taking via movement into regions of focus alternatives computation leads to ungrammaticality at LF.

4.1 Intervention and movement in English

I begin by addressing the question of the set of interveners. As discussed above, there is disagreement about the correct characterization of this set (e.g. Beck 1996, 2006; Grohmann 2006; Tomioka 2007b; Haida 2007; Mayr 2014). A point of agreement across all previous accounts of intervention, however, is that certain elements — indefinites, bare plurals, existentials, and definite descriptions — never act as interveners.\(^\text{18}\) In what follows, I show that in fact such elements do trigger intervention, when they are forced to take scope through movement.

To show that non-interveners can be ‘turned into’ interveners, I consider the behavior of English subjects. Under the proposal I sketched above, subjects — which by assumption undergo A-movement from $vP$ to TP — should always lead to intervention in superiority-violating questions.

\(^\text{18}\)At least under collective interpretations. See Mayr (2010, 2014) for a discussion of distributivity and distributivity operators as causes of intervention.
The reason they do not appear to do so, I propose, is due to the fact that under normal circumstances, subjects are able to reconstruct into their base positions, avoiding intervention. I show next that this prediction is borne out.

(35) Subjects and intervention:
   a. Predicted intervention configuration, given (3):
      \[ \text*{\textit{CP C \text{TP subject } \lambda x \ldots \text{vP } x \ldots \text{wh } \ldots ]]} \]
   b. Avoided through reconstruction at LF:
      \[ \text{\checkmark \textit{CP C \text{TP } \ldots \text{vP subject } \text{wh } \ldots ]]} \]

The relevant test cases are presented in examples (36a–b). These examples contain a raising predicate, which, all things being equal, should allow the matrix subject to reconstruct to a lower base position. However, this reconstruction step can be blocked by binding from the subject into a bindee along the path of reconstruction. This introduces impossible requirements on the subject: either it reconstructs, avoiding intervention but undoing the binding relation, or it does not, preserving the binding relation but creating an intervention configuration. Either way, the example in (36b) shows that this leads to ungrammaticality. Example (36a) provides a baseline of similar complexity lacking the binding configuration, which is judged by speakers as quite complex, but acceptable.

(36) Intervention caused by blocking of subject-reconstruction through binding:
   Context: The lawyers are likely to appeal different decisions to different courts. Tell me,
   a. \text{\checkmark Which court did \textbf{the lawyers} seem to the reporters to be likely to appeal \textit{which decision} to \_?} \hspace{1cm} \text{superiority-violating, reconstruction possible}
   b. \text*{Which court did \textbf{the lawyers}, seem to each other, to be likely to appeal \textit{which decision} to \_?} \hspace{1cm} \text{superiority-violating, reconstruction impossible}

The proposed LFs for (36a–b) are given in (37a–b), assuming that the binding relation in (36b) is maintained. Maintaining this relation requires a movement step into a region of focus-alternatives computation, with the \textit{wh}-phrase \textit{which decision} interpreted in-situ at LF, since this is a superiority-violating question. The result is the intervention configuration, (3), leading to ungrammaticality.

(37) Proposed LFs for (36a–b):
   a. \text{\checkmark LF for (36a): \textit{Which court did [TP [vP seem to the reporters to [vP be likely \textbf{the lawyers} to appeal \textit{which decision to \_}]?}}} \hspace{1cm} \text{full reconstruction possible}
An alternative LF to (37b) where the subject reconstructs into its base position would solve the intervention problem but would break the binding relation, also predicting ungrammaticality.

We thus see that definite descriptions can cause intervention effects in English multiple questions. These are elements that can normally be interpreted without movement, or whose A-movement can be reconstructed, avoiding intervention. However, when full reconstruction becomes unavailable, we observe a degradation in the grammaticality of the superiority-violating question. This is also the case with indefinites and bare numerals, other traditional non-interveners.

(38) Intervention with indefinites and bare numerals:

a. ✓ Which court did {some, four} lawyers seem to the reporters to be likely to appeal which decision to ___? superiority-violating, reconstruction possible

b. * Which court did {some, four} lawyers, seem to each other, to be likely to appeal which decision to ___? superiority-violating, reconstruction impossible

4.2 Intervention does not correlate with superiority in English

Next I show that the correlation between intervention effects and superiority in English is epiphenomenal (Pesetsky 2000; Beck 2006). The crucial property predicting the presence or absence of intervention in a structure is whether an intervener has moved above a wh-phrase that is interpreted in-situ at LF, or whether such a configuration can be avoided in some way.

4.2.1 English superiority-obeying questions

We begin by considering superiority-obeying questions, which, as we have seen, are usually immune from intervention effects. However, we observe intervention effects in superiority-obeying questions when covert wh-movement is restricted in some way.

Here I illustrate two ways to restrict covert movement. The first involves binding, following a logic very similar to the one employed in (36) above: a bindee cannot move out of the scope of a binder. Hence, by introducing a binding relationship into a sentence, we mark the highest possible movement position of the bindee. Examples (39a–b) provide baselines, with a reflexive (herself or himself) bound by a binder (daughter and Obama, respectively). The higher binder in (39a) predicts a higher possible landing site for covert wh-movement in this example compared to (39b). Recall from (34) that covert wh-movement need not target interrogative C; in (39b), this movement would be extremely local, if it happens at all, remaining below Obama to maintain the
binding relation. In (39a), on the other hand, movement can target the vP edge or any position below it. The wh-phrase is then interpreted via Rooth-Hamblin alternatives between this landing site and AltShift, predicting a region of structure where intervention effects should be observable.

(39) **Baselines, with binders underlined:**

a. *Which daughter showed Obama which picture of herself?*

b. *Which daughter showed Obama which picture of himself?*

Next, we add an intervener (here: only) into the sentence, to create a possible intervention configuration. We observe an intervention effect in (40b), where which picture of himself must be interpreted using alternative computation below the scope-taking position of the intervener only Obama. On the other hand, there is no intervention effect in (40a), where there is a possible landing site of wh-movement above the intervener but below the binder, leading to a converging LF.

(40) **Intervention in superiority-obeying question (Bob Frank, p.c.):**

a. *Which daughter showed only Obama which picture of herself?*

b. *Which daughter showed only Obama which picture of himself?*

The next argument comes from the behavior of Association with Focus (Rooth 1985, 1992, a.o.), and is based on data from the existing literature. The interpretation of focus-sensitive operators such as only depends on the presence of an F-marked constituent within the scope of the operator. F-marking that occurs outside the scope of the operator does not contribute to the evaluation of that operator. This is explained through the *Principle of Lexical Association* (PLA): An operator like only must be associated with a constituent in its c-command domain at LF (Tancredi 1990 p. 30, Aoun and Li 1993; see also Erlewine 2014).

Evidence motivating this structural restriction on Association with Focus is shown in (41): The topicalization example in (41a) is ungrammatical with the intended interpretation, but the corresponding example with in-situ focus is grammatical, (41b).

(41) **F-marked constituents may not move out the scope of only:**

a. *MaryF, John only likes ___.*

   Intended: ‘As for Mary, John only likes herF (and no one else).’

b. ✓ John only likes MaryF.

Next we use the PLA to restrict covert wh-movement, by introducing F-marking into wh-in-situ, with the focus operator also serving as the intervener. Example (42a) provides a baseline,
superiority-obeying multiple question that is able to receive a pair-list interpretation. Example (42b) shows that intervention effects are observed when F-marking is introduced inside the in-situ wh-phrase in this question, as predicted (Erlewine 2014).\textsuperscript{20}

(42) The PLA restricts covert movement of wh-in-situ, causing an intervention effect:

a. Baseline: I can tell you which student read which book.

b. Context: The students in the class were each supposed to read one book and one article about syntax, and write a paper about them. However, everyone got confused and read one book or one article. I’ve been reading everyone’s papers. I’ve finished all the ones about books, so:

*I can tell you which student only read [which book] (about syntax).

Other means of restricting the highest landing site of movement include NPI licensing and syntactic islands. I refer the reader to Kotek (2016a, 2017) for such examples. The results parallel the ones shown here: when covert wh-movement is restricted, so that wh-in-situ must be interpreted using Rooth-Hamblin alternatives, we observe intervention in superiority-obeying questions when an intervener takes scope along the path of alternatives. When movement is not restricted, or if the intervener is allowed to take scope in a position that isn’t along the path of alternatives, intervention is avoided.

4.2.2 English superiority-violating questions

Next, I briefly discuss the status of intervention effects in superiority-violating questions. Following the analysis adopted in section 2.2 above, intervention effects occur in superiority-violating questions because wh is truly LF-in-situ in such structures. However, there are three ways of undoing the intervention configuration in such cases — by allowing the intervener to scope above the question or reconstruct below wh-in-situ, or by allowing wh to take wide scope above an intervener through non-interrogative movement:

(43) Ways of undoing the intervention configuration in superiority-violating questions:

a. \textsuperscript{✓} LF: \underline{intervener \[CP C ... intervener ... wh \]} QR

b. \textsuperscript{✓} LF: \underline{[CP C ... intervener ... wh ... intervener]} reconstruction

c. \textsuperscript{✓} LF: \underline{[CP C ... wh intervener ... ]} non-interrogative movement

\textsuperscript{20}This example is slightly modified from Erlewine (2014): Erlewine reports that this question retains its single-pair reading but loses its pair-list reading. I have added a baseline and a context to sharpen this judgment.
Wide scope for intervener

The first case of evading intervention, by scoping an intervener out of the question, has already been observed in the existing literature. Pesetsky (2000) shows the following data for multiple questions with the intervener everyone. In a superiority-obeying question containing a universal quantifier, the question may have a list of triples reading, obtained by allowing everyone to scope out of the question and quantify-in (see e.g. Karttunen and Peters 1980; Comorovski 1989, 1996; Krifka 2001), (44a). This question has a second reading, requiring a list of pairs, which is obtained by allowing everyone to take scope in its pronounced position (44b).

(44) Superiority-obeying question with every is ambiguous:

Which newspaper did everyone write to ___ about which book?

a. Wide-scope answering pattern (list of triples):


b. Narrow-scope answering pattern (list of pairs):

Everyone wrote to the New York Times about book X, everyone wrote to the Boston Globe about book Y, and everyone wrote to the Maquoketa Sentinel about book Z.

The superiority-violating question (45), on the other hand, only has one available reading, corresponding to the list-of-triples reading. The list-of-pairs reading is unavailable. Under the current proposal, this is because in such a case, everyone is taking scope inside a region of Rooth-Hamblin alternatives computation. The available list-of-triples reading, on the other hand, allows everyone to take scope above C and not along the path of alternatives, despite its pronounced position. Hence, this reading does not lead to an intervention configuration at LF.21

(45) Superiority-violating question with every is unambiguous:

Which book did everyone write to which newspaper about ___?

Only has answer pattern (a), but not (b).

Pesetsky (2000) furthermore shows that if the universal quantifier is trapped and is unable to scope out of the question, the superiority-obeying question becomes unambiguous and only has a narrow scope reading for the quantifier. The superiority-violating question loses its only reading and becomes ungrammatical. Pesetsky illustrates this point using Quantifier Float, which disallows QR of a quantifier out of the question. For example, (46a) below allows inverse scope of ∀ above at least, but (46b), where the quantifier is floated, only allows surface scope.

---

21See Beck (1996: §3.1) for similar observations for German multiple questions.
(46) **Floated quantifiers are restricted in scope to their surface positions:**

   a. At least one teacher made each student sing the national anthem.
   b. At least one teacher made the students each sing the national anthem.

   \( \forall > \textit{at least} \) possible in (a) but not (b).

In a superiority-obeying multiple question such as (47), (47a) may ask for adult-kid-book triples, such that the kid will persuade the adult to read the book (wide scope reading), or for adult-book pairs, such that each kid in the group will persuade the adult to read the book (narrow scope reading). Example (47b) only permits the list-of-pairs reading. That is, only a narrow-scope reading of the quantifier is available:

(47) **Quantifier float restricts QR; superiority-obeying question becomes unambiguous:**

   a. Tell me which adult each kid will try to persuade ___ to read which book.
   b. Tell me which adult the kids will each try to persuade ___ to read which book.

In the same configuration, a superiority-violating question (48a) is unambiguous, only permitting a wide-scope interpretation of the quantifier, resulting in the list of triples reading of the question. Once the quantifier is floated, as in (48b), the inability of the quantifier to QR out of the question leaves it with no available interpretation:

(48) **Quantifier float restricts QR; superiority-violating question becomes ungrammatical:**

   a. Tell me which book each kid will try to persuade which adult to read ___.
   b. * Tell me which book the kids will each try to persuade which adult to read ___.

Finally, Pesetsky (2000) shows one other way of keeping every from scoping out of the question, through modification with almost. As in the previous examples, the wide-scope reading of the question is blocked, leading to an unambiguous (narrow-scope) interpretation of the superiority-obeying question. In the superiority-violating question, the narrow-scope reading leads to an intervention configuration and hence to ungrammaticality.

(49) **Intervention effect with almost every:**

   a. Which newspaper did almost everyone write to ___ about which book? \( \text{obeying} \)
   b. * Which book did almost everyone write to which newspaper about ___? \( \text{violating} \)

---

22See Pesetsky’s discussion of “unaskable questions:” Scoping almost everyone out of the question does not allow for a proper pair-list interpretation.
Reconstructing the intervener

Moving on to the second case of rescuing an intervention configuration in a superiority-violating question, notice that if we are able to reconstruct an intervener below the LF position of an in-situ *wh*-phrase, intervention should be avoided, (43b).

(43) **Ways of undoing the intervention configuration in superiority-violating questions:**
   
   b. ✓ LF: \[ \text{CP C ... intervener ... } \text{wh ... intervener} \]  

   This prediction can be tested using universal quantifiers. As we have seen, universal quantifiers are able to receive wide scope, a list-of-triples interpretation. Here, however, we will be interested in the narrow scope, list-of-pairs reading. I illustrate this first with the baseline in (50), where *all of the students* is pronounced in its intended scope position.

(50) **Baseline: Superiority-violating question with a raising predicate and low *all*:**

   Context: The first-year students took several classes this past semester, taught by different professors. Each professor thought that the students particularly enjoyed one topic that she taught. Tell me,   
   ✓ *Which* topic did it seem to *which* professor that *all of the students* enjoyed __?

   Next, notice that in a syntactic environment as in (50), raised quantifiers can in principle reconstruct into a lower base position. This is shown in (51), where the universal quantifier is pronounced in a high position, but is able to reconstruct it into its base position, where it takes scope below the existential. Therefore, this environment should allow us to test our prediction.

(51) **All can reconstruct into base position; inverse scope is available:**

   Context: The first-year students took several classes this past semester, taught by different professors. As their TA, I know that:   
   [All of the students]$_1$ seemed to *some* professor $t_1$ to have enjoyed learning about binding.   
   ✓ ∀ > ∃, ✓ ∃ > ∀

   Example (52) provides the test-case. The question is judged as grammatical in the given context (which supports a list-of-pairs interpretation, parallel to (50) above), despite the (surface) intervening position of the quantifier:

---

23In general, this prediction can only be tested with a subset of the known interveners—namely those that allow A-reconstruction. Interveners such as sentential negation or adverbials such as *always, often* or *never* will not be appropriate candidates for this test. Furthermore, as it has been argued that negative DPs do not undergo A-reconstruction (see e.g. Lasnik 1999, as well as Iatridou and Sichel 2011), this prediction also cannot be tested with interveners such as *no one.*
(52) **Superiority-violating question with raised all can have reconstructed reading:**

**Context:** The first-year students took several classes this past semester, taught by different professors. Each professor thought that the students particularly enjoyed one topic that she taught. Tell me,

✓ *Which topic did all of the students seem to which professor to have enjoyed ___?*

Furthermore, as shown above, if the quantifier is floated along the path of alternatives, reconstruction is blocked, and intervention is observed. On the other hand, if the quantifier is floated below the position of *wh*-in-situ, the question is grammatical and only allows the list-of-pairs interpretation.

(53) **Intervention effects reemerge when all is floated along the path of alternatives:**

a. * Which topic did the students all seem to which professor to have enjoyed ___?*

b. ✓ *Which topic did the students seem to which professor to have all enjoyed ___?*

We conclude, therefore, that it is the scope position of the quantifier at LF that is important for the purposes of intervention effects, and not its pronounced position.

**Moving the *wh* out of the way**

Finally, moving to the last case of rescuing an intervention configuration in a superiority-violating question, we predict that intervention can be avoided by giving the in-situ *wh*-phrase wide scope above an intervener, (43c). Given the assumptions adopted in section 2.2, covert *wh*-movement should not be available to *wh*-in-situ in superiority-violating questions, but other — non-interrogative — movements may still be available.

(43) **Ways of undoing the intervention configuration in superiority-violating questions:**

\[
\text{c. ✓ LF: } [\text{CP C } \ldots \text{wh intervener } \ldots \text{ }] \\
\text{non-interrogative movement}
\]

Here I illustrate this prediction using Right-Node Raising (RNR). It is well known that RNR allows exceptional *wh*-movement out of certain islands (Bachrach and Katzir 2009, a.o.). Example (54a) illustrates a canonical relative clause island, which is dramatically improved in (54b), when fed by RNR.\(^{24}\)

\(^{24}\)For notational convenience, I illustrate the base positions of the shared material in each conjunct with \( \text{___} \), and the shared RNR-ed position (which feeds *wh*-movement) with a \( t \text{(race)} \).
RNR allows exceptional *wh*-movement out of islands (Bachrach and Katzir 2009):

a. *Which book did John meet the man who wrote t?*

b. ✓ *Which book did [John meet the man who wrote ___], and [Mary meet the man who published ___] t?*

Building on this observation, we predict that RNR should give *wh*-in-situ in a multiple question exceptionally wide scope, allowing it to evade intervention despite being in a superiority-violating structure. This is indeed the case: Example (55a) is a classic intervention example modeled after Pesetsky’s original examples (cf 9). Example (55b) adds a RNR configuration, and the result is much improved and is no longer subject to intervention.

No intervention in superiority-violating question with RNR:

a. *Which book did only Sue allow which student to read ___?*

b. ✓ *Which book did [only Sue allow ___], and [only Mary require ___], which student to read t?*

See Branan (2017a) for two other cases of exceptionally wide scope for *wh*-in-situ in English superiority-violating questions achieved through non-interrogative movement: extraposition and high attachment of a parasitic gap. Just like in the cases here, when *wh*-in-situ is given wide scope, intervention effects disappear.

We conclude, then, that the crucial factors governing intervention effects are the LF (scope) positions of the intervener and of the in-situ *wh*-phrase in the question. Superiority is only important in that it normally allows *wh*-in-situ to covertly move out of the way in superiority-obeying questions. However, the generalization argued for above obtains: intervention effects are observed when material is forced to move into a part of structure in which alternatives are projected from a lower *wh*-in-situ, and avoided otherwise.

4.3 Intervention tracks scope rigidity in Japanese

Finally, I provide additional evidence in support of the proposal argued for above with data from Japanese, drawn from ongoing co-authored work (Erlewine and Kotek 2017a,b, 2018c). This work argues for the following generalization:

Generalization: Intervention correlates with scope-taking in Japanese

Scope-rigid quantifiers above an in-situ *wh* cause intervention. Quantifiers that allow scope ambiguities — i.e., those that allow reconstruction below *wh* — do not.
Our starting point is an observation in Shibata (2015a) that the scope of different disjunctors correlates with their status as interveners, (57–58). *ka*-disjunction is scope-rigid with respect to negation, and acts as an intervener. At the same time, *naishi*-disjunction leads to scope ambiguities and is not an intervener.²⁵

(57) **ka-disjunction is scope-rigid; naishi is not:**

a. [Taro-ka Jiro]-ga ko-nak-atta.
   Taro-or Jiro-NOM come-NEG-PAST
   (Shibata 2015a: 23)
   ‘Taro or Jiro didn’t come.’

b. [Taro-naishi Jiro]-ga ko-nak-atta.
   Taro-or Jiro-NOM come-NEG-PAST
   (Shibata 2015a: 96)
   ‘Taro or Jiro didn’t come.’

(58) **ka is an intervener; naishi is not:**

a. ?? [Taro-ka Jiro]-ga nani-o yon-da-no?
   Taro-or Jiro-NOM what-ACC read-PAST-Q
   (Hoji 1985:264)

b. ✓ [Taro-naishi Jiro]-ga nani-o yon-da-no?
   Taro-or Jiro-NOM what-ACC read-PAST-Q
   ‘What did [Taro or Jiro] read?’
   (Shibata 2015a: 98)

In current co-authored work in progress (Erlewine and Kotek), we show that this correlation holds across a wide range of quantificational expressions, including universal quantifiers, *only*, *even*, *also*, modified numerals, *wh*-indefinites, and *wh*-NPIs. Here I illustrate just two additional data points in support of the generalization above from this ongoing work.²⁶

First, consider another pair of quantifiers with identical meanings — *wh-mo* universal quantifiers²⁷ and subete ‘all’ — which vary in their scope-rigidity with respect to negation and concomitantly in their status as interveners. Like with disjunction, only the scope-rigid quantifier is an intervener. This is shown in (59–60).

²⁵In all intervention examples here, scrambling the *wh*-word above the intervener rescues the structure, as shown in (5) above. See e.g. Hoji 1985; Hagstrom 1998; Kim 2002; Beck 2006; Tomioka 2007b for additional examples.

²⁶Novel data in this section has been verified with five different Japanese speakers.

²⁷As has been widely noted, there are two, superficially similar *wh-mo* forms in Japanese: the universal quantifier series and the NPI/n-word series. However, these forms are easily distinguishable as (a) universal *wh-mo* but not the NPI series preserve original pitch accents on the *wh*-word and (b) universal *wh-mo* but not the NPI series allow case markers; see e.g. Aoyagi and Ishii (1994). On both counts, the form here is a universal *wh-mo*. (The ’ indicates that the first syllable of da’re-mo bears the pitch accent in (59a), echoing the pitch accent on the bare *wh*-word da’re.)

The judgment here is predicted by the generalization that the universal *wh-mo* takes scope in the pronounced position.
(59) **wh-mo universal quantifier is scope-rigid; subete is not:**

a. Da’re-o-mo tsukamae-nak-atta.
   who-ACC-MO catch-NEG-PAST
   ‘pro did not catch anyone.’
   ‘every > not, *not > every

b. [Subete-no mondai]-o toka-nak-atta.
   all-GEN problem-ACC solve-NEG-PAST
   (Mogi 2000:59)
   ‘pro did not solve every problem.’
   ‘every > not, *not > every

(60) **wh-mo is an intervener; subete is not:**

a. ?? Da’re-mo-ga nani-o kai-mashi-ta-ka?
   who-MO-NOM what-ACC buy-POLITE-PAST-Q
   Intended: ‘What did everyone buy?’
   (Hoji 1985:270)

b. √ [Subete-no gakusei]-ga dono-mondai-o toi-ta-no?
   all-GEN student-NOM which-problem-ACC solve-PAST-Q
   ‘Which problem(s) did every student solve?’

Further supporting data comes from the position of ‘only’ -dake. -dake can occur outside or inside a postposition: DP-P-dake or DP-dake-P. Considering their scope with respect to modals, Futagi (2004) show that ‘only’ in -P-dake is scope-rigid, whereas ‘only’ in -dake-P leads to scope ambiguities. Here I show this effect with negation, (61):

(61) **-P-dake is scope-rigid; -dake-P is not:**

a. Taro-wa Hanako-to-dake hanashi-tei-nai.
   Taro-TOP Hanako-with-only talk-PERF-NEG
   lit. ‘Taro hasn’t talked only with H.’
   ‘only > not, *not > only

b. Taro-wa Hanako-dake-to hanashi-tei-nai.
   Taro-TOP Hanako-only-with talk-PERF-NEG
   lit. ‘Taro hasn’t talked with only H.’
   ‘only > not, *not > only

This difference in scope again correlates with the two only’s status as interveners, (62).

---

of the particle mo and cannot reconstruct into a vP-internal base position (Yatsushiro 2009), and therefore cannot scope under negation.

28Tomioka (2007b:1574) states “…subete-no-/zenbu-no-NP are not interveners and can c-command wh-phrases at S-structure without making the sentence deviant,” but does not show the relevant data.
We conclude, then, that movement and the ability of quantifiers to reconstruct predicts whether or not they will lead to intervention effects. Note that another important conclusion to draw from this data is that intervention cannot be predicted by the semantics of the quantificational elements alone, since the two disjunctors, two universal quantifiers, and two onlys have equivalent denotations, differing only in their possible scopes at LF. Instead, the nature of intervention must be attributed to the syntax, namely the scope position of the intervener at LF.

We propose to understand the patterns above as follows: Based on scope interactions between different quantificational objects and negation, Shibata (2015a,b) argues that all (DP) objects in Japanese move overtly out of vP and above NegP (which Shibata argues has a fixed position just above vP), if present. We assume the vP-internal subject hypothesis (see e.g. Fukui 1986; Kitagawa 1986; Kuroda 1988), and conclude that all (DP) arguments evacuate vP in Japanese. These assumptions are illustrated schematically in (63a).

Quantifiers then vary with respect to their ability to reconstruct: those which cannot reconstruct have obligatory wide-scope with respect to negation (63b), whereas those which can reconstruct lead to scope ambiguities with respect to negation, allowing the LFs in (63b) or (63c).

(63) **Scope-rigidity in Japanese (Shibata 2015a,b):**

a. All arguments move out of vP:

\[
\text{[CP ... DP ... [vP ... t ... V ]]} 
\]

b. LF interpretation in surface position leads to wide scope over negation:

\[
\text{LF: [CP ... DP } \lambda x \ldots [\text{NegP [vP ... x ... V]} \text{Neg]} ]} \quad \text{DP > Neg} 
\]

c. Some (not all) quantifiers reconstruct into vP, allowing narrow scope:

\[
\text{LF: [CP ... [NegP [vP ... DP ... V]} \text{Neg]} ]} \quad \text{Neg > DP} 
\]

Next consider a surface structure where the DP could lead to an intervention configuration (64a). (Movement of the *wh*-phrase to its surface position is not illustrated. The interpreting complementizer is at the left edge of CP for illustration purposes only.) We assume that *wh*-phrases are interpreted in-situ at LF by introducing Rooth-Hamblin alternatives which compose pointwise and will be interpreted by the interrogative complementizer (see section 2.2.2).
If a quantifier is scope-rigid, it has no choice but to lead to the LF configuration in (64b). This is an intervention configuration, (3): the calculation of Rooth-Hamblin alternatives must cross an instance of Predicate Abstraction (\(\lambda x\), in bold), which cannot be defined. But if a quantifier is not scope-rigid — i.e. it can reconstruct at LF — the LF in (64c) will also be available. Alternatively, scrambling the \(wh\)-word above the potential intervener also avoids intervention (64d) without requiring the DP to reconstruct (see (5) above).

(64) **Predicting an intervention configuration in Japanese:**

a. Potential intervener (DP) above \(wh\):

\[
[CP \ C \ ... \ DP \ ... \ \text{wh} \ ... \ [VP \ ... \ t \ ... \ V ]]
\]

b. LF interpretation in surface position lead to intervention!

\[
* \text{LF: } [CP \ C \ ... \ DP \ \lambda x \ ... \ \text{wh} \ ... \ [VP \ ... \ x \ ... \ V ]]
\]

c. Reconstruction avoids the intervention configuration:

\[
\checkmark \text{LF: } [CP \ C \ ... \ \text{wh} \ ... \ [VP \ ... \ DP \ ... \ V ]]
\]

d. Scrambling \(wh\) above also avoids intervention:

\[
\checkmark \text{LF: } [CP \ C \ ... \ \text{wh} \ \lambda y \ ... \ DP \ \lambda x \ ... \ y \ ... \ [vp \ ... \ x \ ... \ V ]]
\]

Finally, we note that this proposal leads to the prediction that an otherwise ambiguous quantifiers will become unambiguous in a question, to avoid an intervention effect. Recall that (61b) above showed that the only particle \(dake\) inside a postposition (DP-\(dake\)-P) can take scope above or below sentential negation, and at the same time is descriptively a non-intervener. Now consider example (65) below. The quantificational PP ‘with only Hanako’ Hanako-\(dake\)-to is in a higher position than the \(wh\)-word in the surface structure, and therefore we predict that it will be forced to reconstruct into its \(vP\)-internal base position, which will necessarily be below negation.

(65) **DP-dake-P must reconstruct below \(wh\); only > not reading is not possible:**

Taro-wa Hanako-\(dake\)-to \(nani\)-o \(tabi\)-\(na\)-\(no\)?

Taro-top Hanako-only-with what-\(acc\) eat-\(neg\)-Q

a. *‘What does Taro only not eat with Hanako?’ only > not

Answer: Squid ink pasta (because he gets embarrassed)

b. ? ‘What does Taro not eat with only Hanako?’ not > only

Answer: Dimsum (because it’s better with more people)

The two potential readings are illustrated by the potential expected answers and respective contexts: what is \(x\) such that, just when he is with Hanako, Taro won’t eat \(x\) (wide scope for only
over negation), vs what is x such that Taro does not eat x only with Hanako (narrow scope for only). While both readings are plausible in appropriate supporting contexts, and -dake-P can generally scope above or below negation, only (65b) is possible here. This is as predicted by the reconstruction account of non-intervention, illustrated in (64c) above.

Note further that, as expected, scrambling the wh-word above Hanako-dake-to makes both readings available again. See the LF schema in (64d).

**(66)** When *wh* scrambles above intervener, both scope readings become available:

Taro-wa *nani-o* Hanako-*dake-to ___ tabe-*nai-no?  
Taro-*top* what-*acc* Hanako-only-with eat-NEG-Q

a. ‘What does Taro only not eat with Hanako?’ only > not  
b. ‘What does Taro not eat with only Hanako?’ not > only

5 **Some implications**

I have argued for the generalization in (3–4) — intervention effects in *wh*-questions result from movement into a part of structure in which (non-singleton) Rooth-Hamblin alternatives are computed:

**(3)** *Intervention as a crossing dependency between movement and focus alternatives:*

\[
*\text{LF: } [\text{CP } C \cdots \text{DP } \lambda x \cdots wh \cdots x ]
\]

**(4)** *Intervention is the result of Predicate Abstraction over alternatives:*

Scope-taking via movement into regions of focus alternatives computation leads to ungrammaticality at LF.

This intervention schema in (3) leads to a variety of consequences and predictions — since λ-binding is used in multiple domains for various phenomena in grammar. In this section I discuss several implications of my proposal: for the representation of focus, movement, and intensionality. I discuss the compatibility of my proposal with existing theories of intervention, and in particular the influential proposal in Beck 2006. I also address a remaining question concerning the status of sentential negation as an intervener. Finally, I briefly discuss two possible exceptions to the proposal I have made here. I sketch thoughts on how the strong claim in (3–4) might be altered to accommodate these exceptions.
5.1 Focus

5.1.1 Beck (2006)

An important question at this point concerns the space of data that the proposal in this paper is meant to account for. In particular, an influential account in Beck 2006 proposes that intervention arises whenever a focus-sensitive operator separates an in-situ *wh*-phrase from the interrogative complementizer that is meant to interpret it:

(67) **Intervention in Beck (2006):**

\[ *[CP C \ldots \text{Focus-Op} \ldots \text{wh}] \]

This analysis rests on two assumptions, both compatible with the assumptions I have adopted in this paper. First, Beck assumes a semantics for *wh*-phrases as I have adopted in (16), repeated here: *wh*-elements denote Hamblin sets as their alternative value but have an undefined ordinary value (see also Ramchand 1997).

(16) **The semantics of what:**

| ordinary value:       | \([\text{what}]^o\) is undefined |
| alternatives:        | \([\text{what}]^f = \{ x \in D_c \mid x \text{ is not human} \} =_c \{ \text{Moby Dick, War & Peace, Oliver Twist} \} |}

Second, the question operator is assumed to be the only operator that is able to interpret a structure with defined alternatives but an undefined ordinary value. The problem arises when a focus-sensitive operator other than the interrogative operator is the first one to apply to *wh*-alternatives in a structure; such an operator will, by definition, require both the ordinary and the alternative values of its prejacent in order to make its contribution to the interpretation. However, the ordinary value of a structure containing *wh*-phrases is undefined. This undefinedness will be inherited by the rest of the structure, leading to uninterpretability, described as an intervention effect.

In general, I see no reason why Beck’s (2006) theory can’t be adopted alongside my own. Such a proposal could account for some cases of intervention, explaining why focus operators are robust cross-linguistic interveners and why judgments with such operators are sometimes described as sharper than with other interveners — the reason would be that such derivations are ill formed both for the reasons spelled out by Beck’s proposal and the ones in my proposal.

However, I argue that Beck’s theory cannot be adopted wholesale to explain all cases of intervention, in lieu of my own proposal here. This theory suffers from two weaknesses. First, it

\[ \text{This is AltShift in my proposal, and interrogative C in Beck’s. For Cable (2007, 2010), the Q-morpheme and C are the only such operators.} \]
must define all interveners in terms of focus-sensitivity: if some element intervenes, then it must associate with focus. This is a natural description of interveners such as *only* and *even*, but it is not a good description of interveners such as *every, few, and no one*, and certainly not definites and indefinites, which I have shown can intervene. This weakens the predictive power of the theory: any operator that shows intervention behavior is assumed to associate with focus, regardless of whether or not there is independent evidence that this is indeed the case. Second, like other theories of intervention effects (discussed in §5.2 below), this proposal cannot predict the correlation between intervener-hood and movement into a region of alternatives computation, which I have shown to be crucial. I conclude that while the Beck 2006 proposal may be correct for some cases of intervention, it cannot be the full story for all such cases.

Given this discussion, a question may arise concerning the intervener *only*. The standard analysis of *only* takes it to associate with in-situ focus, without movement (e.g. Rooth 1985). If this is correct, we would not predict *only* to intervene under the proposal in (3–4), as there is no scope-taking through movement in such constructions. As a result, many of the examples illustrated in this paper will remain unexplained. However, the correct predictions are made if the analysis in Beck (2006) is assumed to be the relevant problem in this case. Alternatively, correct predictions are also made if sentential *only* is assumed to associate with focus through covert movement with pied-piping (Drubig 1994; Tancredi 1997/2008, 2004; Krifka 2006; Wagner 2006; Erlewine and Kotek 2014, 2018a,b), and constituent *only* must be late-merged in derived positions (Shibata 2015a).

### 5.1.2 Generalized intervention

A question already raised in Beck 2006 concerns intervention with alternatives generated by non-*wh*-elements. Beck refers to this as the Generalized Minimality Effect:

(68) **The Generalized Minimality Effect (Beck 2006):**

\[ * Op_1 \ldots Op_2 \ldots XP_F \]

If Beck’s proposal is correct, then intervention should be observed not only with alternatives projected from a *wh*-phrase, but also with ones projected from a focused phrase in cases of in-situ Association with Focus. As the schema in (68) shows, we predict that in sentences with multiple focus association relations between a focus operator and an F-marked constituent, these dependencies cannot be crossing.

However, such examples can be constructed, as Beck notes. Given the context in (69a), example (69b) instantiates the configuration of crossing focus associations predicted to be ungrammatical.
In particular, the *only* in (69b) is predicted to block the proper interpretation of the F-marked *Bob* by the focus operator *also*. However, example (69b) is judged to be grammatical with its intended interpretation.\(^{30}\) Notice that this prediction crucially relies on the assumption that the focused constituents are interpreted *in-situ* via focus alternatives computation as in Rooth 1985.

(69) **Crossing focus dependencies (Rooth 1996, as cited in Beck 2006):**

a. I *only* introduced [MARILYN]\(_F\) to John Kennedy.

b. I *also only* introduced [Marilyn]\(_F\) to [BOB]\(_F\) Kennedy.

The fact that this prediction of Beck’s (2006) theory of focus intervention is not borne out must mean that (a) Beck’s (2006) logic of focus intervention is not correct and/or (b) the assumption that focused constituents as in (69) are interpreted *in-situ* is not correct. I refer the reader to Erlewine and Kotek (2014) for arguments that Beck’s (2006) logic of focus intervention is indeed correct, and focus intervention effects do affect focus constructions.\(^{31}\) Instead, the assumption that the associate of *only* is interpreted *in-situ* is the faulty one. Evidence for this conclusion comes from overt focus movement in English *it*-cleft constructions, as well as from focus association with VP-level focus operators, where covert focus movement with pied-piping is shown to correctly predict the distribution of intervention effects in such structures.

5.2 **Intervention, topichood, and prosody**

As noted at the beginning of this paper, intervention effects have been attributed in the past not only to focus, but also to other factors. Grohmann 2006 and Tomioka 2007a,b, considering data sets in German and Japanese, respectively, attribute intervention to a problem with topichood: interveners are elements that are forced to occur in a position that is associated with topichood, despite not making appropriate topics.\(^{32}\) At the same time, the problem of intervention has also been attributed to the prosody forced by such structures (Tomioka 2007a,b; Branan 2017b), leading to conflicting requirements on the question and eventually to a crash at the PF level. Yet other proposals attribute intervention to a logical crash resulting from a type-mismatch (Li and

---

\(^{30}\)The F-marked *Marilyn* in (69b) is clearly interpreted as the semantic focus associate of *only*, but it seems to lack a pitch accent. This is referred to as Second Occurrence Focus (SOF) and is licensed by the preceding context (69a), where it is introduced with a pitch accent. It is possible that *Marilyn* here being SOF is precisely what makes (69b) grammatical. See Tomioka 2012 who proposes that SOF is selective, unlike novel focus associations, which are unselective.

\(^{31}\)See Krifka (2006) for evidence that multiple association examples such as (69) are sensitive to syntactic islands in a way that is predicted if their derivation involves covert movement.

\(^{32}\)For example, resisting -wa topic-marking in Japanese.
Law 2016), or from the monotonicity properties of interveners (Mayr 2010, 2014, cf Szabolcsi and Zwarts 1993). It goes beyond the scope of this paper to argue for or against each one of these conceptions of intervention. As with the discussion of Beck 2006 above, it is possible that some cases of *wh*-intervention could also be attributed to problems like the ones described in these theories.

However, an important problem faced by all of these approaches (albeit in different ways, depending on the theory) is the fact that they all predict a stable set of interveners. These approaches are therefore all unable to predict or explain the data I have shown in this paper, where intervenerness crucially correlates with scope-taking via movement in a position where focus alternatives are being computed and is not limited to a certain subset of quantifiers. Another dataset that would be left unexplained by these approaches was shown in section 4.3: In Japanese, quantifiers with identical meanings and surface positions act as interveners as a function of whether or not they can reconstruct (and hence scope below *wh*-in-situ) at LF. To my knowledge, the proposal put forth in this paper is the only one that is able to capture this apparent flexibility of intervention effects.

5.3 Negation

Another remaining issue concerns the status of negation as an intervener. Recall the example of intervention effects from Pesetsky 2000, repeated here:

(8) Intervention effect caused by sentential negation:
   a. Which student didn’t ___ read which book? obeying
   b. *Which book didn’t which student read ___? violating
      (cf Which book did which student not read ___?)

Here, sentential negation appears to give rise to an intervention effect like the one described in the rest of the paper. But there is no obvious movement that would cause an intervention effect under the current proposal.

One possible solution to this puzzle is that negation undergoes head movement, introducing a \(\lambda\)-binder which could be responsible for causing intervention. This would crucially rely on head movement being an LF operation, a contested issue (see e.g. Travis 1984; Chomsky 1986, 1995, 2000; Baker 1988; Pollock 1989; Brody 2000; Matushansky 2006; Lechner 2006; Hartman 2011; Matyiku 2017 for discussion).

Alternatively, it may be that another account of the data in (8) is necessary. This seems to be a likely possibility, in light of the fact that very similar sentences to the one above, varying only in the nature of the auxiliary hosting the negation, lead to dramatic improvement in the status of the examples. A clue may be furnished by the fact that all of the auxiliaries below (other than *didn’t*)
introduce pluralities of events or times. An alternative account may be that the added functional material allows the negation to be interpreted in a different position than its surface position. Whatever the correct analysis, the problem can’t simply be with sentential negation, and the data in (8) must fit into a more complex bigger picture. I leave this as an open issue.33

(70) **Intervention effects greatly ameliorated with different choice of Aux:**
    a. Which student couldn’t ___ read which book? obeying
    b. ? Which book couldn’t which student read ___? violating

(71) a. Which student hasn’t ___ read which book? obeying
    b. ? Which book hasn’t which student read ___? violating

(72) a. Which student wouldn’t ___ read which book? obeying
    b. ? Which book wouldn’t which student read ___? violating

5.4 Modals

All known interveners, including the new interveners presented in this paper, quantify over individuals. Quantification over world variables does not lead to intervention, nor have any of the examples presented here led to the conclusion that tense, mood, or aspect are relevant for intervention. The examples below show pairs of superiority-obeying and violating questions, where we would otherwise expect — but do not find — a contrast such that the (b) examples, which are superiority-violating, are degraded compared to their (a) counterparts, which are superiority-obeying. (Recall also the data in (70–72) above).

(73) **Modals do not cause intervention effects:**
    a. ✓ Which abstract should Grace assign ___ to which reviewer?
    b. ✓ Which reviewer should Grace assign which abstract to ___?

(74) a. ✓ Which paper did Grace have to read ___ for which class?
    b. ✓ Which class did Grace have to read which paper for ___?

(75) a. ✓ Which abstract were you forced to assign ___ to which reviewer?
    b. ✓ Which reviewer were you forced to assign which abstract to ___?

(76) a. ✓ Which abstract did you make Grace assign ___ to which reviewer?
    b. ✓ Which reviewer did you make Grace assign which abstract to ___?

(77) a. ✓ Which paper was it necessary for you to assign ___ to which reviewer?

33Another potential avenue for an explanation may relate these facts to the behavior of weak islands (Szabolcsi and Zwarts 1993) or to negative islands. See also Mayr 2014 on additivity.
b. ✓ Which reviewer was it necessary for you to assign which paper to __?

(78) a. ✓ Which paper may Grace read __ for which class?
   b. ✓ Which class may Grace read which paper for __?

(79) a. ✓ Which paper must Grace read __ for which class?
   b. ✓ Which class must Grace read which paper for __?

This fact could be taken to call into question whether the problem is with abstraction in general, or with movement and abstraction over individuals in particular. On the other hand, the literature provides various theories of mood/tense/aspect that use indices instead of abstraction for variable binding, and this evidence may provide another argument in their favor (see e.g. Keshet 2008).

5.5 Movement and abstraction at phase edges

Finally, I discuss consequences predicted by the proposal put forth in this paper for the representation of movement. As we have already seen, we must allow covert wh-movement to target positions other than interrogative C in order to model the data we have seen here. In the following section I discuss additional consequences for movement and for reconstruction.

5.5.1 Successive-cyclicity and intermediate landing sites

The assumptions adopted in this paper lead to the conclusion that intermediate landing sites of movement must be treated differently than final landing sites. To see this, consider example (80):

(80) Simple multiple question with embedding and no intervener:

   Which book \( \lambda_i \) C did Mary think that \([CP t_i \lambda_j \text{ which kid read } t_j]\)?

This is a multiple wh-question which does not contain an intervener and is judged by speakers as grammatical. The wh-phrase occupying the matrix Spec,CP position has moved from an embedded clause. Under standard assumptions, it undergoes successive-cyclic movement, stopping off at the edge of the embedded CP.\(^{34}\) Again, under standard assumptions, movement leaves behind a trace, together with a corresponding a \( \lambda \)-binder. The question in (80) is additionally superiority-violating, and hence involves a wh-phrase which is interpreted via Rooth-Hamblin alternatives at LF. The resulting structure, then, is an intervention configuration (3). We would hence expect the question to be ungrammatical due to an intervention effect, contrary to fact.

For questions such as (80) to be grammatical, we must admit the possibility that intermediate landing sites of movement behave differently than final landing sites. In particular, notice that

\(^{34}\)And perhaps also at the edge of vP, but it suffices that it moves through CP for the purposes of this illustration.
nothing goes wrong if the $\lambda$-binder introduced in the intermediate landing site is eliminated from the structure along with the intermediate trace — the trace corresponding to the base position of the moved $wh$-phrase will be bound by the higher $\lambda$-binder, introduced below the final landing site of $which\ book$. Once we have this structure, the in-situ $which\ kid$ can be successfully interpreted using Rooth-Hamblin alternatives, without creating an intervention configuration.\footnote{I am not committed to the claim that this intermediate trace is never generated in the first place. I am arguing here that at some level of representation relevant to the calculation of intervention, this trace is not visible or is eliminated from the derivation.}

(81) Relevant LF of a question with embedding for the purposes of intervention:

\[
\text{LF: } \lambda_i C \text{ did Mary think that } [CP \ which\ kid \ read \ t_1]?
\]

The idea that intermediate landing sites of movement should be removed from the derivation has independently gained some traction in recent literature in computational linguistics. For example, Graf, Aksënova, and De Santo (2016) show that intermediate movement can be removed from derivation trees without changing their meaning, leading to computational efficiency and simpler models. Graf and Heinz (2015) show that the complexity of derivation trees without intermediate landing sites of movement is lower than that of derivation trees with such landing sites. Moreover, Stabler (2013), who shows how to implement incremental top-down parsers with Minimalist grammars, does so without appealing to intermediate movements at all. Graf, Monette, and Zhang (2017) show that various syntactic processing effects can be modeled using this parser, and the results are a good fit for the data only when intermediate landing sites of movement are ignored.\footnote{I thank Thomas Graf (p.c.) for discussing this literature with me.}

5.5.2 Reconstruction

A related conclusion concerning the nature of movement that emerges from the above results is that reconstruction must be viewed as total, in the sense that the higher copy of movement and its $\lambda$-binder must again not be visible in the derivation at some relevant level of representation. This was required in order to explain the A-movement data in section 4.1, as well as the reconstruction-related data in section 4.2.2 and the Japanese data in section 4.3. In all of the examples shown in these sections, it had to be the case that the higher copy (or copies) of movement is entirely ignored for the purposes of intervention calculation, for much the same reasons as illustrated above for intermediate copies of movement. Only the scope position of the (potential) intervener is present at LF.

It follows that proposals that view syntactic reconstruction as a copy-theoretic process in which the higher copy of a movement chain is Trace-Converted into a definite description, rather than the
lower copy (as in normal cases of movement, see Rullmann and Beck 1998; Fox 2002), will make incorrect predictions. See Erlewine (2014: §7.3) for an explicit proposal for such a mechanism, potential uses, and also potential issues raised by it. I leave aside here the open debate in the literature for the needs for syntactic reconstruction alongside semantic reconstruction.

5.5.3 Relativization in wh-questions

A third issue concerns relativization in wh-questions. If abstraction is impossible across alternatives, we might predict that questions with a truly in-situ wh-phrase cannot contain a relative clause, since the latter involves abstraction as part of its formation. This may be too strong a prediction.37 Consider the examples in (82):

(82) Relativization of a structure containing a wh-in-situ:
   a. Who believed \[\text{DP the rumor that Mary read } \text{what}\]?
   b. Who bought \[\text{DP the book that Mary saw } \text{where}\]?

We know that the DPs in (82a–b) are islands for extraction, as shown below. Let us assume that this fact is as relevant for covert movement as it is for overt movement.

(83) Extraction out of a relative clause is impossible:
   a. *What did you believe \[\text{DP the rumor that Mary read } t\]?
   b. *Where did you buy \[\text{DP the book that Mary saw } t\]?

   Intended: “Where x is such that you bought the book that Mary saw at place x?”38

As a result, the in-situ wh-phrase must be interpreted using Rooth-Hamblin alternatives. However, this wh-phrase occurs inside a relative clause which, following standard assumptions, is derived through movement of the head or a null operator in the structure to the edge of the relative clause, with abstraction creating a derived property of type \(\langle e, t \rangle\) (e.g. Heim and Kratzer 1998, chapter 5). This would therefore be predicted to lead to an ungrammatical result, as alternatives would have to cross a \(\lambda\)-binder, contrary to fact. Alternatively, to save such structures, it may be that wh moves above the relative clause, but not outside of the island, thus eschewing the problem.

---

37 Thanks to Chris Tancredi (p.c.) and to Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (p.c.) for asking me about such structures.
38 Cf the grammatical “Where x is such that you bought at place x the book that Mary saw (somewhere)”, with where interpreted in the matrix, without being generated in, and moved out of, the embedded clause.
5.5.4 Relativized Abstraction

Although it may be possible to explain each potential exception through different means, as I have suggested above, I conclude this section by briefly entertaining the idea that these data points may teach us something deeper about Grammar, if taken seriously.

First, it may be necessary to develop a notion of abstraction that is relativized to the type of variable that is being abstracted over. That is, perhaps abstraction over type $e$ individuals is semantically distinct from abstraction over non-type $e$ variables, including for example world and degree variables.

Second, perhaps we should treat some positions in the derivation as privileged. Phase edges suggest themselves as such positions: perhaps PA over individual alternatives in the alternative set is only well-defined at phase edges. Adopting, therefore, the proposed solution to the PA problem from Novel and Romero (2009) and others discussed above, we exceptionally allow type-raising and updating of the assignment function at these privileged positions, but not at others. This would be implemented in the framework developed here by adopting the type-shifter proposed in Charlow 2017, but allowing it to dynamically update the assignment function only at phase edges, and not at each and every point in the derivation, contrary to its use in Charlow’s work. I leave the implementation of this proposal to future work.

6 Conclusion

This paper argues that intervention effects in *wh*-questions arise whenever movement must target a landing site inside a region of structure where Rooth-Hamblin alternatives are computed at LF. Evidence in support of this proposal came from the behavior of English multiple *wh*-questions as well as the behavior of Japanese *wh*-questions. It was shown that intervener-hood correlates with potential interveners’ scope position at LF, and not with their semantics or pronounced position. The paper furthermore established the importance of movement and scope-taking in derived positions: intervention occurs when an element moves into regions of alternative calculation, and is absent if this configuration can be avoided in some way at LF: by scoping the intervener above the question or below *wh*, by moving the *wh* out of the way, or by using a non-movement strategy for interpreting the intervener.

The paper proposes to explain these results in terms of a problem with Predicate Abstraction.

---

39Perhaps along the lines of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990), which affects both probing and movement operations in the syntax. See Szabolcsi and Zwarts (1993) for the idea that Relativized Minimality may also be relevant for scope-taking for individuals vs non-individuals. I thank Ivona Kučrova (p.c.) for discussing this idea with me.

40I thank Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (p.c.) for pointing this out to me and suggesting this solution.
Given standard assumptions about the nature of movement, adopting a simple, static system of types, with alternatives computed as in Rooth (1985, 1992), Predicate Abstraction cannot be properly defined to yield the desired results when abstracting over non-singleton sets of alternatives. Previous authors who have noticed this problem have sought to correct it — by abandoning movement (Shan 2004), by changing the types system (Poesio 1996; Novel and Romero 2009, cf Charlow 2015, 2017; Ciardelli et al. 2017), or by changing the focus system (Beck 2016).

Instead, this paper argued that none of these amendments to the theory should be adopted. The proposal here builds on a standard syntax of probes and goals, allowing for both A- and A-movement. To interpret the resulting structures, we adopt a Heim and Kratzer (1998)-style semantics with simple basic types, in which Rooth-Hamblin alternatives exist alongside movement. Wh-phrases can be interpreted both via movement and via alternative computation in different syntactic structures, as needed. That is, we must adopt a system with an inherent flaw, and we must not fix the flaw. The badness of abstraction over alternatives is a feature, not a bug. Intervention effects occur precisely when we attempt to ignore this prohibition.

This strongest version of the proposal emerged as a rhetoric device useful for generating predictions and probing the grammar. As noted above, λ-binders are used in quite a few additional areas of grammar beside movement for scope-taking, and with more types than just individuals. Several consequences were spelled out for the nature of movement and focus, and special attention was paid to two possible remaining exceptions — concerning abstraction over non-individuals and abstraction in privileged (phase-edge) positions. The paper briefly sketched ways in which these exceptions may eventually restrict and modify the strongest claim in systematic ways, to inform a more nuanced theory of movement, focus, and binding. This full proposal is left for future work.
Appendix

This appendix provides a more detailed explanation of the problem of Predicate Abstraction over alternatives. Our goal is to add Roothian focus alternatives to a static semantic system, such as the one in Heim and Kratzer (1998). (The discussion below is based on the presentation of this problem in Novel and Romero 2009.)

As a first pass, it’s possible to define the Terminal Nodes rule, Pronounces and Traces rule, and Function Application, as in (84):

(84) A recursive definition for computing focus-semantic values:

Terminal nodes (TN):

a. \([\alpha_\tau]^f = \begin{cases} \{[\alpha_\tau]^o\} & \text{if } \alpha \text{ not } F\text{-marked} \\ \text{a subset of } D_\tau & \text{if } \alpha \text{ F-marked} \end{cases}\)

b. Pronouns and traces rule:

\([\alpha_i]^f = \begin{cases} g(i) & \text{if } \alpha \text{ not } F\text{-marked} \\ \{[\alpha_i]^o\} & \text{if } \alpha \text{ F-marked} \end{cases}\)

c. Functional application (FA):

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c} \alpha_\tau \\ \beta_{(\sigma,\tau)} \\ \gamma_{\sigma} \end{array} \right]^f = \begin{cases} \{ b(d) \mid b \in [\beta]^f, d \in [\gamma]^f \} & \text{if } \alpha \text{ not } F\text{-marked} \\ \text{a contextually-determined subset of } D_\tau & \text{if } \alpha \text{ F-marked} \end{cases}\]

However, how should Predicate Abstraction be defined? A solution is given in (85), alongside a short derivation in (86) to illustrate how this rule is used:

(85)

a. Alice saw nobody

b. Nobody \(\lambda_i\) Alice saw \(t_i\)

\[
\lambda x. [\beta]^{M,S\times i} :: \langle e, \tau \rangle \\
\lambda_i [\beta]^{M,S} :: \tau
\]

(86)

a. \([t_i]^{M,S} = g(i)\)

b. \([\text{saw}]^{M,S} = \lambda x. \lambda y. y \text{ saw } x\)

c. \([\text{Alice}]^{M,S} = \text{Alice}\)

d. \([\text{Alice saw } t_i]^{M,S} = 1 \text{ iff Alice saw } g(i)\)

e. \([\lambda Alice saw t_i]^{M,S} = \lambda x. \text{ Alice saw } g^{\times i}(i) = \lambda x. \text{ Alice saw } x\)

f. \([\text{Alice saw nobody}]^{f,M,S} = 1 \text{ iff } \neg \exists x[\text{Alice saw } x]\)

41Note that in trees here, an expression is given on the left of the “::” and its type on the right.
Next, consider a sentence such as (87), as it would be interpreted in a \textit{wh}-in-situ language:

(87)  a. Who saw nobody?
    b. Nobody $\lambda_i$ who saw $t_i$?

Given that the QRed quantifier abstracts over a sister that contains a \textit{wh}-in-situ — interpreted, following our standard assumptions, as a Hamblin set — our goal is to create an abstraction rule over \textit{sets of alternatives}. The derivation in (89) shows how the LF and derivation will be constructed up to the Predicate Abstraction step:

(88)  $\lambda_i$ who saw $t_i$:: ???

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. $[t_i]^{f,M,g} = \{ g(i) \}$
  \item b. $[\text{saw}]^{f,M,g} = \{ \lambda x. \lambda y. y \text{ saw } x \}$
  \item c. $[\text{saw } t_i]^{f,M,g} = \{ \lambda y. \text{ y saw } g(i) \}$
  \item d. $[\text{who}]^{f,M,g} = \{ \text{Alice, Barbara, Carol} \}$
  \item e. $[\text{who saw } t_i]^{f,M,g} = \{ \text{Alice saw } g(i), \text{ Barbara saw } g(i), \text{ Carol saw } g(i) \}$
  \item f. $[\lambda \text{ Alice saw } t_i]^{f,M,g} = ???$
\end{itemize}

To define PA over alternatives, we begin by adding a $\lambda$-operator outside the set arrived at in step (89e) above, as in (90). This mimics the step assumed in (85) above:

(90)  $\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i} :: \langle e, \langle \tau, t \rangle \rangle$

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. $[\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i} = \langle e, \langle \tau, t \rangle \rangle$
  \item b. $[\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i}]^{f,M,g} = \{ g(i) \}$
  \item c. $[\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i}]^{f,M,g} = \{ \lambda y. \text{ y saw } g(i) \}$
  \item d. $[\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i}]^{f,M,g} = \{ \text{ Alice saw } g(i), \text{ Barbara saw } g(i), \text{ Carol saw } g(i) \}$
  \item e. $[\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i}]^{f,M,g} = \{ \lambda x. \text{ Alice saw } g(i), \lambda x. \text{ Barbara saw } g(i), \lambda x. \text{ Carol saw } g(i) \}$
  \item f. $[\lambda x.\ [\beta]^{M,g}^{x/i}]^{f,M,g} = ???$
\end{itemize}

However, this leads to a result which is of the wrong type to be the argument of \textit{nobody}. \textit{Nobody}, defined in (91), expects to take as sister a set of $\langle e, t \rangle$ expressions — type $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$. But the expression in (92) is not of that type. Instead, we require as input a set that looks as in (93).

(91)  \textbf{The denotation of \textit{nobody}}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item $[\text{Nobody}]^{M,g} = \{ \lambda Q(e,t). \lambda x. [Q(x)] \}$
\end{itemize}

(92)  \textbf{What we get isn't what we want}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item $\lambda x.\ \{ \text{ Alice saw } g^{x/i}(i), \text{ Barbara saw } g^{x/i}(i), \text{ Carol saw } g^{x/i}(i) \}$
\end{itemize}

(93)  \textbf{What we want to get}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item $\{ \lambda x. \text{ Alice saw } g^{x/i}(i), \lambda x. \text{ Barbara saw } g^{x/i}(i), \lambda x. \text{ Carol saw } g^{x/i}(i) \}$
\end{itemize}

\footnote{That is, using Rooth-Hamblin alternatives instead of movement.}
To yield a set as in (93), we require a type-shifting rule from type \( \langle e, \langle \tau, t \rangle \rangle \) into type \( \langle \langle e, \tau \rangle, t \rangle \):\(^{43}\)

(94)  A procedure for converting [a function into a set of \( \tau \)-alternatives] to [a set of functions into \( \tau \)-alternatives]:

\[
\lambda Q_{\langle e, \langle \tau, t \rangle \rangle}. \{ \forall x : f(e) \in Q(x) \}
\]

But as Shan (2004) shows, a function into sets carries less information than a set of functions.
By using the type-shifting rule (94) in the derivation in (88), we end up with a set that contains both constant \( \langle e, t \rangle \)-functions (95) and non-constant \( \langle e, t \rangle \)-functions (96). The former describe properties like “to be seen by Alice/Barbara/Carol,” which are desirable. The latter have no meaning in our system, and should be excluded.

(95)  Constant \( \langle e, t \rangle \)-functions (desired):

\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\]

(96)  Non-constant \( \langle e, t \rangle \)-functions (undesirable):

\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&x_1 \mapsto \text{Carol saw } x_1, \\
&x_2 \mapsto \text{Barbara saw } x_2, \\
&x_3 \mapsto \text{Alice saw } x_3
\end{align*} \}
\]

As discussed in section 3, there is no way to fix this problem while holding on to the standard assumptions about movement, types, and alternatives. Several proposals attempt to alter one of the above assumptions in order to fix this problem, but this paper instead argues that this problem should not be fixed, as it is the source of intervention effects. I refer the reader to Shan (2004) and Novel and Romero (2009) for additional discussion.

\[^{43}\text{Hagstrom (1998); Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002) and Yatsushiros (2009) define rules along the lines of (94), and thus over-generate. See also Rooth (1985).}\]
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