

## Response to first reviewer's comments

this is the review starting *the paper argues*

December 2, 2016

This was by far the most detailed of reviews, and we thank the reviewer for such careful consideration. The reviewer asks what the novel/difference of our proposal with respect to the Q-theory and we have done is to argue for an SSO approach to various copies of the QP and more significantly, discontinuous spell-out of different material in the two copies to account for discontinuous structures. This voids the need for LF-movement that Cable assumes for Sinhala (as the review points out as an objection). While it is true that our solution also resorts to interface effects (LF vs. PF), we have essentially established an underlying uniformity of syntax across the typological range of wh-constructions, without positing the need for Q-adjunction vs. Q-complementation. The review further points out the issue of Japanese, suggesting that *ittai* suggests that Q moves on its own to the exclusion of the wh-phrase. We present a relatively complete set of facts, and specifically an extra set of data that Hagstrom himself uses to argue for Q-migration, where Q is always merged locally to a wh-word before **overtly** moving, even out of an island if necessary. We argue that such overt movement (Q-migration or otherwise), cannot preclude the pied-piping of the wh-phrase with it and leaving the relevant copies. Discontinuous spell-out takes care of the rest. The next point address Japanese and Vata, where the reviewer notes that if Q and wh do not move together, then the semantics for the wh-word cannot obtain. As mentioned above, we argue that the QP always moves together, what we have is discontinuous spellout. Given that Q is a variable over choice functions, multiple copies of [Q wh] will all be bound by either existential closure or more relevantly interrogative C. This results in the desired wh-indefinite reading in all copies, while avoiding the issue of copy non-uniformity of operator-variable chains. Interrogative C then provides propositional set formation, as usual. The final two points the reviewer raises has to do with multiple wh-questions, superiority effects and multiple wh-movement. These are rather large issues in themselves and warrant a separate paper. For reasons of time and space, it was simply not

possible to include these facts at these time but we will be certain to turn our attention to these issues for future research.