# Movement and alternatives don't mix:
A new look at *wh*-intervention effects[1]

Hadas Kotek, Yale University, hadas.kotek@yale.edu
NELS 47, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, October 2016

1 Introduction

1.1 Interpreting *wh*-in-situ

Wh-questions in English involve an **overt movement step**:

(1) *Who* did Mary introduce ____ to Sue?

In **multiple** *wh*-questions, only **one** *wh*-phrase moves overtly.

(2) *Who* did Mary introduce ____ to whom?

☞ **How are in-situ *wh*-phrases interpreted?**

1.2 Two approaches to *wh*-in-situ

The covert movement approach:[2]
Wh-phrases **must move to C** by LF for interpretability (Karttunen, 1977, among others).

(3) LF: *Who whom* C did Mary introduce ____ to ___?

The in-situ approach: *Wh*-phrases **are interpreted in their base-positions**, through focus-alternative computation (Hamblin, 1973; Rooth, 1985, 1992, a.o.).

(4) LF: *Who* C did Mary introduce ____ to *whom* ?

1.3 *Wh*-in-situ and intervention effects

☞ *Wh*-in-situ is sensitive to **intervention effects**.

(5) **Japanese: Intervention effects avoided through scrambling**

    a. ✓ Hanako-ga │*nani-o*│ yon-da-no?
        Hanako-NOM what-ACC read-PAST-Q
        'What did Hanako read?'

    b. ?* **Dare-mo** │*nani-o*│ yom-ana-katta-no?
        no-one   what-ACC read-NEG-PAST-Q

    c. ✓ │*Nani-o*│ **dare-mo** ____ yom-ana-katta-no?

        what-ACC no-one   read-NEG-PAST-Q
        'What did no one read?'   *data from Tomioka (2007)*

[2] Throughout, solid arrows indicate overt movement, dashed arrows indicate covert movement, and curly arrows indicate areas of focus-alternatives computation. These arrows are used here as a notational convenience only.

Intervention effects affect regions of alternative computation but not (overt or covert) movement (Beck, 2006; Beck and Kim, 2006; Kotek, 2014a,b; Kotek and Erlewine, 2016)

(6) **The Beck (2006) intervention schema:**

    a. * [$_{CP}$ C ... **intervener** ... *wh*]

    b. ✓ [$_{CP}$ C ... *wh* **intervener** ... *t*]

Different theories of what interveners/intervention are: **Focus** (Beck, 2006; Beck and Kim, 2006); **Quantification** (Beck, 1996; Mayr, 2014); **Topics** (Grohmann, 2006); **Prosody** (Tomioka, 2007).

1.4 Summary of the proposal

(7) **The new intervention schema**
     * C ... λ ... *wh*

(8) **Predicate Abstraction:**

Heim and Kratzer (1998): **a λ-binder is introduced below the landing site of movement**, abstracting over the trace.

Shan (2004, cf Rooth 1985, others): Predicate Abstraction is not well defined in region of alternative computation (in simple semantic models).

> **Movement can't target a region where focus alternatives are computed.**

☞ Predict **intervention in more places** than previously thought.

☞ Predict **more interveners** than previously thought.

Today: Both of these predictions are correct.

2 The state of the art

Pesetsky (2000): **intervention correlates with superiority**

(9) 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 ____?)

Syntax by Pesetsky (2000); **Semantics** by Beck (2006):

Superiority-obeying questions: *Wh*-in-situ covertly moves to C at LF.

(10) LF: *Which student which book* C ____ read ___?   **Predict: no intervention**

Superiority-violating questions: *Wh* is truly LF-in-situ, interpreted via focus-alternatives .

(11) LF: *Which book* C did *which student* read ____?   **Predict: intervention!**

Note: for many (perhaps all) speakers, intervention will be diagnosed by the loss of the pair-list reading of the question. A single-pair may survive.[3]

3   New patterns of intervention

The literature has several different ways of defining what interveners are (Beck, 1996, 2006; Grohmann, 2006; Tomioka, 2007; Haida, 2007; Mayr, 2014).

☞ Everyone agrees **indefinites, bare plurals, existentials, definite descriptions, do not act as interveners**.

However, they act as interveners if forced to take scope via movement.

English subjects normally undergo A-movement from a vP-internal position to Spec,TP.

Q: Under the proposal I sketched here, why don't subjects always intervene?

A: Subjects are normally able to **reconstruct**, avoiding intervention.

Prediction: if reconstruction is blocked, we should observe intervention effects.

Subjects of individual-level predicates must vacate vP (Diesing, 1992). Hence, the subject can't reconstruct and we observe intervention:

(12) a. ✓ *Which* person are **counselors** available to discuss *which* issue with ____? *stage-level*
      b. * *Which* person are **counselors** λ careful to discuss *which* issue with ____? *individual-level*

Reconstruction can also be prevented by **binding from the subject** into a pronoun or reflexive.

(13) Context: The lawyers seem to be likely to appeal different decisions to different courts.
      a. ✓ *Which court* did **the lawyers** seem **to the reporters** to be likely to appeal *which decision* to ____?
      a'. LF: *Which court* did __ seem **to the reporters** to be likely to **the lawyers** appeal *which decision* to ____?
      b. * *Which court* did **the lawyers** λ seem **to each other** to be likely to appeal *which decision* to ____?

☞ **Intervention caused by traditional non-interveners...**

- Bare plurals
- Definite descriptions
- (Indefinites)
- (Existential quantifiers)

  ... when **reconstruction is blocked** or **movement is forced**.

☞ **Intervention happens whenever a λ-binder must be used in a region where focus-alternatives are also used.**

(14) **The new intervention schema**
      * C ... λ ... *wh*

---
[3]This has been reported for superiority-violating questions in English and for German questions in footnotes in previous work (Beck, 2006; Pesetsky, 2000, cf also Beck 1996). See discussion in Kotek (2014a).

## 4   Superiority and intervention effects

4.1   Background

Recall: Superiority-obeying questions are not susceptible to intervention, but superiority-violating questions are.

☞ **Correlation can be broken in both directions**, in a way consistent with idea that **what matters is regions of alternative computation**.

Intervention is avoided in superiority-obeying questions because *wh*-in-situ can covertly move above interveners.

Prediction: If covert movement is restricted, intervention happens when intervener occurs **above highest possible landing site of movement**.

- *Wh* can move up to the barrier
- ☞ No intervention in region where movement happens
- *Wh* cannot move past barrier
- ☞ Intervention happens above the barrier, where focus alternatives must be used.

(15)   CP

4.2   Intervention in superiority-obeying questions

Using binding to restrict covert movement: bindee cannot move out of the scope of a binder.

(16) **Baselines, with binder underlined:**
      a. *Which <u>daughter</u> showed Trump which picture of herself*?
      b. *Which daughter showed <u>Trump</u> which picture of himself*?

Adding an intervener:

(17) **Baselines, with binder underlined:**
      a. ? *Which <u>daughter</u> showed **only** Trump which picture of herself*?
      b. * *Which daughter showed **only** <u>Trump</u> which picture of himself*?

Other ways to restrict covert *wh*-movement:

- focus association,
- NPI licensing,
- islands

☞ We observe intervention in superiority-obeying questions if we restrict covert *wh*-movement and force in-situ interpretation instead.

## 4.3 No intervention in superiority-violating questions

Recall the second half of the Pesetsky correlation: intervention happens in violating questions because *wh* is truly LF-in-situ.

Three ways of avoiding intervention in superiority-violating questions:

- Scope the intervener out of the question (Beck, 1996; Pesetsky, 2000):

  (18) $^\checkmark$**intervener** wh_2 C ... **intervener** ... wh_1 ... t_2

- Reconstruct the intervener below *wh*-in-situ:

  (19) $^\checkmark wh_2$ C ... **intervener** ... wh_1 ... t_2 intervener

- Give *wh* wide scope above the intervener through non-interrogative movement.

Right-Node Raising can feed exceptional wide scope of a *wh* that is otherwise unavailable in questions (Bachrach and Katzir, 2009, a.o.):

(20) a.   * *Which book* did John meet the man who wrote ＿＿ ?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which book* did [John meet the man who wrote], and [Mary meet the man who published] ＿＿ ?

This exceptional wide scope in RNR is also able to escape intervention effects in superiority-violating questions:

(21) a.   * *Which book* did **only Mary** allow *which student* to read ＿＿ ?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which book* did [**only Mary** allow], and [**only Sue** prohibit], *which student* to read ＿＿ ?

(See also Branan, ms.: data from extraposition, parasitic gap licensing)

4.4 Summary

☞ **No correlation between superiority and intervention.**
   Instead, intervention correlates with movement possibilities for intervener and *wh*.

However, **the general intervention schema still applies:**

(22) **The intervention schema**
   * C ... λ ... *wh*

☞ **Intervention happens in regions where focus-alternatives are computed** (Beck, 2006; Kotek, 2014a,b; Kotek and Erlewine, 2016), when it includes a λ-binder.

5 Some implications and conclusion

5.1 Modals

Modals are not interveners:

All known interveners, as well as the new ones shown here, quantify over individuals. Quantification over worlds does not lead to intervention.

(23) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which abstract* **should** Mary assign ＿＿ to *which reviewer*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which reviewer* **should** Mary assign *which abstract* to ＿＿ ?

(24) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which paper* did Mary **have to** read ＿＿ for *which class*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which class* did Mary **have to** read *which paper* for ＿＿ ?

(25) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which abstract* were you **forced** to assign ＿＿ to *which reviewer*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which reviewer* were you **forced** to assign *which abstract* to ＿＿ ?

(26) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which paper* was it **necessary** for you to assign ＿＿ to *which reviewer*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which reviewer* was it **necessary** for you to assign *which paper* to ＿＿ ?

(27) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which paper* **may** Mary read ＿＿ for *which class*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which class* **may** Mary read *which paper* for ＿＿ ?

(28) a. $^\checkmark$ *Which paper* **must** Mary read ＿＿ for *which class*?

   b. $^\checkmark$ *Which class* **must** Mary read *which paper* for ＿＿ ?

☞ **Modality must be represented without the use of lambda binders**, e.g. though indices.

5.2 Successive cyclic movement

Notice that under this approach, intermediate landing sites of movement behave differently than the target position of movement.

☞ **Intermediate landing sites do not "count" for intervention.**

(29) *Which book* λ C did Mary think that [$_{CP}$ *t* Ⓛ *which kid* read *t*]?

   LF: $^\checkmark$ *Which book* **λ** C did Mary think that [$_{CP}$ *which kid* read *t*]?

5.3 Conclusion

- **The intervention generalization**: Movement cannot target a region where focus alternatives are computed

  (30) **The intervention schema**

  * C ... λ ... *wh*
     ‿‿‿‿‿‿‿‿‿‿

- **A logical consequence of standard assumptions about structure building, interpretation**:

  - Movement as in e.g. Heim and Kratzer (1998)
  - Focus alternatives computation (Rooth, 1985, 1992)
  - Intensional semantics with simple types

  λ-abstraction not well-defined when computed over alternatives.

- **Previous responses to this problem:**

  - Shan (2004): Adopt a **variable-free semantics** without movement
  - Rooth (1985); Poesio (1996); Novel and Romero (2009): Use a **higher-typed 'superintensional' semantic system**[4]

- **Today: Empirical evidence for the new intervention generalization**

- **Support for standard assumptions** (syntactic movement interpreted using λ-abstraction, focus alternatives, simple semantic types)

  - *Wh*-in-situ requires both covert movement and focus alternatives for its interpretation
  - ... but abstraction and alternative computation cannot overlap

---

[4]That is, the system is lifted so that—at the very least—instead of types e and t, we must use functions from pairs of assignment functions and worlds to individuals or truth-values.

References

Bachrach, Asaf, and Roni Katzir. 2009. Right-node raising and delayed spellout. In *Interphases: Phase-theoretic investigations of linguistic interfaces*, ed. Kleanthes K. Grohmann. Oxford University Press.

Beck, Sigrid. 1996. Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4:1–56.

Beck, Sigrid. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14:1–56.

Beck, Sigrid, and Shin-Sook Kim. 2006. Intervention effects in alternative questions. *Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 9:165–208.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2006. Top issues in questions: Topics—topicalization—topicalizability. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver. MIT Press.

Haida, Andreas. 2007. The indefiniteness and focusing of *wh*-words. Doctoral Dissertation, Humboldt University Berlin.

Hamblin, Charles. 1973. Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10:41–53.

Heim, Irene, and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Blackwell.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:3–44.

Kotek, Hadas. 2014a. Composing questions. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Kotek, Hadas. 2014b. Intervention out of islands. In *Proceedings of NELS 44*, ed. Leland Kusmer and Jyoti Iyer, volume 1, 234—246. Amherst: GLSA.

Kotek, Hadas, and Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine. 2016. Covert pied-piping in English multiple *wh*-questions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47.

Mayr, Clemens. 2014. Intervention effects and additivity. *Journal of Semantics* 31:513–554.

Novel, Marc, and Maribel Romero. 2009. Movement, variables, and Hamblin alternatives. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 14*.

Pesetsky, David. 2000. *Phrasal movement and its kin*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Poesio, Massimo. 1996. Semantic ambiguity and perceived ambiguity. In *Semantic ambiguity and underspecification*, ed. Kees van Deemter and Stanley Peters, chapter 8, 159–201. CSLI Publications.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with focus. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.

Shan, Chung-chieh. 2004. Binding alongside Hamblin alternatives calls for variable-free semantics. In *Proceedings of SALT 16*.

Tomioka, Satoshi. 2007. Pragmatics of LF intervention effects: Japanese and Korean interrogatives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39:1570–1590.