

few exceptions being *all/both the books*.) When the phonetic shape of (2b) is peeled off we get the LF representation in (2c). The WH-operator-variable construction holds between the *wh*-operator (O) *which* and the variable (V) *the*, with *book* as the restriction (R). TP in (2c) denotes a set of propositions due to the fact that *which the book* denotes a set of discursively determined books. The disjunction takes this set of propositions as its argument and returns one of them as its value. The core meaning of a *wh*-question is now captured as this disjunction function.

Wh-Movement in this view is driven by the need for the disjunction function to take the set of propositions denoted by TP as its argument, not by need to create an operator-variable construction. The fact that movement of the disjunction function must pied-pipe *which book* falls out automatically if we assume that movement (i.e., Internal Merge) requires a phonetic vehicle, the disjunction function \vee being phonetically empty in English (Overt Syntax Hypothesis). From this it also falls out that in languages where the disjunction function has a phonetic shape, like the particle *ka* in Japanese, the particle alone will undergo *Wh*-Movement, resulting in the appearance of absence of *Wh*-Movement.

It will be demonstrated that this system, supplemented by the use of focus feature and a way to associate one disjunction function with multiple *wh*-phrases, can handle cross-linguistic variation in multiple *wh*-questions in languages like English, Japanese and Bulgarian, without involving LF *wh*-movement or unselective binding as is widely assumed.