

Reconstruction without movement*

Nicolas GUILLIOT & Nouman MALKAWI

nicolas.guilliot@wanadoo.fr

malkawi72m@yahoo.fr

<http://nicolas.guilliot.chez-alice.fr>

University of NANTES—LLING EA3827

16th CGG—April 20-22, 2006

Overview

- *Traditional analyses of reconstruction:*

-Whenever an XP triggers reconstruction effect, movement of that XP has occurred (see Lebeaux (1990), Chomsky (1995) among others).

-Even with resumption, whenever an XP triggers reconstruction effect, movement of that XP has occurred (see Aoun et al. (2001)).

- *Problem:* reconstruction with resumption **inside islands** in French/Jordanian Arabic.

- *Our claims:*

Claim 1: Whenever an XP triggers reconstruction effect, a **copy** of that XP (rather than movement of that XP) is present.

⇒ This copy can be created either by movement or ellipsis. Generalizing **NP-deletion's analysis** of pronouns (Elbourne (2001)) to resumption, reconstruction effects will follow.

Claim 2: In principle, copies may be interpreted either as indefinite (see Kratzer (1998)'s skolemized choice functions) or definite (in the sense of Fox (2002)).

⇒ Resumption will force a **definite** interpretation of the copy.

⇒ A functional reading then follows either from indefinite interpretation of the copy (when available), or from the presence of a bound pronoun in that copy.

1 What is Reconstruction?

Reconstruction: interaction between displacement (dislocation, topicalization, interrogation, relativization) and interpretation procedures such as binding conditions or scope.

(1) (a) Mary saw the picture of him that each man prefers.

(b) Which patient did every doctor examine?

*We would like to thank David Adger, Joseph Aoun, Hamida Demirdache (Phd supervisor), Danny Fox, Magda Oiry, Orin Percus, Dafna Ratiu, Maribel Romero, Alain Rouveret and Uli Sauerland.

⇒ (1a) and (1b) both have a ‘reconstructed’ reading.

(1a) → a different *picture* for *each man*.

- Binding reconstruction: *him* is interpreted as a variable bound by the quantifier;
- Scope reconstruction¹: narrow scope of *picture* with respect to *each man*.

(1b) → a different *patient* for *every doctor*.

- Scope-only reconstruction: narrow scope of *patient* with respect to *each doctor*.

GG/minimalist account of reconstruction effects: the copy theory of movement.

⇒ Syntactic mechanism given by Lebeaux (1990), Bianchi (1995), Sauerland (2004) among others, to allow interpretation of a displaced constituent in its base position:

- (2) (a) Mary saw the picture of him that each man prefers ~~picture of him~~².
 (b) Which patient did every doctor examine ~~patient~~?

⇒ Copies in (2a) and (2b) are interpreted as indefinite (see Kayne (1994) for arguments, and also section 5.1).

Assumption 1: Whenever reconstruction effects appear, movement has occurred.

2 What about Resumption?

Resumption: when a pronoun occupies a site where a gap (A’ trace) would be expected.

2.1 Resumption can save islands

Resumptive strategy can circumvent islandhood³, as illustrated with *wh*- question and dislocation from French in (3a) and (3b), and dislocation from Lebanese Arabic in (3c):

- (3) (a) *Quel étudiant es-tu fâché [Adjunct Island parce que le doyen *(l)’a renvoyé]?*
 ‘Which student are you furious because the principal expelled **him**?’
 (b) *Cet étudiant, tu es fâché [Adjunct Island parce que le doyen *(l)’a renvoyé].*
 ‘This student, you are furious because the principal expelled **him**.’
 (c) *Ha-l-muttahamme tfeejaʔto [Adjunct Island laʔnno ʔrifto ʔenno*
 this-the-defendant surprised-2pl because learnt-2pl that
habasuw-(a)].*
 imprisoned-her
 ‘This defendant, you were surprised because you learnt they sent her to jail.’

⇒ Insertion of a pronoun in (3a), (3b), and (3c) rescues the sentence⁴.

¹For convenience, we refer to all cases of distributive reading of the displaced constituent as scope reconstruction.

²Presence of binding reconstruction in restrictive relatives argues for head-raising analysis, as initially proposed by Vergnaud (1973).

³When movement is banned in structures such as adjuncts, complex-NPs (strong islands), or highly restricted in others such as *wh*- structures (weak islands). Notice that only strong islands will be investigated here.

⁴Since extraction out of a strong island is prohibited, several studies resort to a base-generation approach of resumption, in which the resumptive element is generated in the island, and the antecedent base-generated in its surface position.

2.2 Reconstruction with resumption

Consider the contrast noticed in Aoun et al. (2001) for Lebanese Arabic (LA):

- (4) (a) $[təlmiiz-a_1 \ l-kəsleen]_2$ *ma baddna nχabbir wala mɣallme_1 ʔənnə*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* want-1p tell-1p no teacher that
huwwə_2 zaɣbar b-l-faħiṣ
 he cheated-3sm in-the-exam
 ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we don’t want to tell any teacher₁ that **he**₂ cheated on the exam.’
- (b) $*[təlmiiz-a_1 \ l-kəsleen]_2$ *ma badda taɣrif wala mɣallme_1 lee*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* want.3fs know.3fs no teacher why
l-mudiira ʃaħatit-o_2 mn l-madrəse
 the-principal expelled-him from the-school
 ‘Her₁ bad student₂, no teacher₁ wants to know why the principal expelled **him**₂ from the school.’
- (c) $*[təlmiiz-a_1 \ l-kəsleen]_2$ *ma ħkiina maɣ wala mɣallme_1 ʔable-ma*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* talked-1p with no teacher before
(ha)-l-majduub_2 yuusəl
 (this)-the-idiot arrive-3sm
 ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we didn’t talk to any teacher₁ before **this idiot**₂ arrived.’

⇒ If there is no island as in (4a), the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading is allowed (a different *student* for *each teacher*), whereas it is not available anymore when a weak or strong island intervenes (see (4b) and (4c)).

Aoun et al. (2001)’s approach: apparent vs true resumption.

⇒ The (possessive) pronoun in the left-dislocated DP in (4a) can be bound by the negative QP *wala mɣallme* ‘no teacher’. Aoun et al. (2001) conclude from (4a) that resumption can be derived with movement (adjunction structure with the RP and the copy) when no island appears (case of apparent resumption, as the LF schema in (5) shows):

- (5) *Apparent resumption:*
 $[_{DP} \dots \text{pronoun}_1 \dots]_2 [_{IP} \dots \text{QP}_1 \dots [_{CP} \dots [_{DP} [_{DP} \dots \text{pronoun}_1 \dots]_2 \text{RP}_2]]]$

⇒ In contrast, resumptive elements inside islands seem not to show reconstruction effects, as (4b) and (4c) show. Resumptive pronouns and epithets within islands are true last resort resumptives. This strategy implies the absence of movement, and thus the absence of a copy of $[təlmiiz-a]_1 \ l-kəsleen]_2$ ‘her bad student’ as shown in (6):

- (6) *True resumption:*
 $[_{DP} \dots \text{pronoun}_{*1} \dots]_2 [_{IP} \dots \text{QP}_1 \dots [_{Island} \dots [_{DP} \text{RP}_2]]]$

Apparent resumption	True resumption
Reconstruction	No reconstruction

Table 1. Reconstruction with Resumption

Assumption 2: Even with resumption, when reconstruction holds, movement is present.

2.3 The Paradox

Assumption 1: Whenever reconstruction effects appear, movement has occurred.

Assumption 2: Even with resumption, when reconstruction effects appear, movement has occurred.

⇒ These two conclusions lead to the following prediction:

Reconstruction should never occur within islands.

However, consider the following dislocation structures from Jordanian Arabic (JA) in (7) and French in (8), and *wh*- structures from French in (9). All these examples involve resumption (clitic or doubled clitic) within an island:

(7) *Clitic/doubled clitic inside strong (adjunct) island:*

[*ʔalib*-[*ha*]₁ *l-kassoul*]₂ *ma ziʔlat* [*wala mʕallmih*]₁ *laʔannuh*
 student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because
l-mudiirah kaʔʕat-oh₂ / *-oh₂ hu₂ mn l-madrase*
 the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from the-school
 ‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’

(8) *Clitic inside strong (adjunct) island:*

La photo₁ de sa₂ classe, tu es fâché parce que chaque prof₂ l₁’a déchirée.
 ‘The picture of his class, you are furious because each teacher tore **it**.’

(9) *Clitic inside strong (adjunct) island:*

Quelle photo₁ de lui₂ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme₂ l₁’a déchirée?
 ‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore **it**?’

⇒ The examples in (7), (8) and (9) can all have a ‘reconstructed’ functional reading:

(7) → a different *student* for *each teacher* (strict mapping teacher/picture).

- Binding reconstruction: the possessive *-ha* ‘her’ is interpreted as a bound variable.

(9) → Answer: *la photo de lui à son mariage* (‘the picture of him at his wedding’).

- Binding reconstruction: the pronoun *lui* is interpreted as a bound variable.

If reconstruction is **only** a consequence of syntactic movement, as suggested in Lebeaux (1990), Chomsky (1995) and Aoun et al. (2001) among others, **how is reconstruction possible in a strong island?**

3 What really matters for Reconstruction?

In JA, presence vs absence of reconstruction depends descriptively on two parameters⁵:

- the type of resumption
- the type of binding condition.

⁵Obviously, other parameters play a crucial role in banning or allowing reconstruction, such as arguments vs adjuncts, or even weak vs strong islands. But these will not be investigated here.

3.1 The type of resumption: weak vs strong

The distinction between strong (strong pronoun or epithet) and weak (clitic and doubled clitic) resumptives plays an important role in allowing or banning reconstruction, but only **within strong islands**.

Weak resumption	Strong resumption
Clitics	Strong pronouns
Doubled clitics	Epithets

Table 2. Typology of Resumption

⇒ **Weak** resumptives (clitic or doubled clitic) in strong islands **allow** for the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading, as shown in (10a).

⇒ **Strong** resumptives (strong pronoun or epithet) in strong islands **ban** the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading (see (10b)).

(10) *Weak resumption (a) vs strong resumption (b) in strong (adjunct) island:*

- (a) *[talib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma ħakjan maʕ [wala mʕallmih]₁ gabl-ma*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* talked.1pl with no teacher before
tʃuf-uh₂ / -uh₂ hu₂ l-mudiiarah
 saw.3sf-Cl / -Cl he the-principal.3sf
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before the principal saw him.’
- (b) **[talib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma ħakjan maʕ [wala mʕallmih]₁ gabl-ma*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu₂ / ha-l-ġabi₂ yesal
 he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’

	Strong island
Weak resumption	reconstruction with BVA (✓)
Strong resumption	no reconstruction with BVA (*)

Table 3. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption

3.2 The type of binding condition: positive vs negative

The type of binding condition also determines presence or absence of reconstruction, but only **with weak resumption**.

Weak Resumption:

⇒ Whether or not an island appears in the structure, weak resumption gives rise to:

- reconstruction with positive binding conditions (BVA satisfied in (a) examples)⁶;
- **no** reconstruction with negative conditions (Cond. C not violated in (b) examples).

⁶Notice that Condition A unsurprisingly behaves strictly in parallel to BVA, as both conditions are positive binding conditions.

(11) *BVA vs Condition C with no island:*

- (a) [ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma beddna ngol [l-wala mʕallmih]₁ ʔenno
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that
 l-mudiirah tardat-oh₂ mn l-madrased
 the-principal expelled.3sm.-Cl from the-school
 ‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that the principal
 expelled him from the school.’
- (b) ʕalamit₂ Karim₁, bitfakir ʔinnu pro₁ lazim ʔijayyar-ha₂.
 grade Karim think.2sm that he must change-it
 ‘Karim’s grade, you think that he must change it.’

(12) *BVA vs Condition C in strong island:*

- (a) [ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma ziʕlat [wala mʕallmih]₁ laʔannuh
 student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because
 l-mudiirah kaʕʕat-oh₂ / -oh₂ hu₂ mn l-madrased
 the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from the-school
 ‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him
 from school.’
- (b) ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ ziʕlat laʔannuh l-mudiirah tardat-uh₂
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl
 / -uh₂ hu₂
 / Cl he
 ‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.’

Strong Resumption:

⇒ This contrast is not present with strong resumption, as positive and negative binding conditions follow the same pattern:

- reconstruction when no island intervenes;
- no reconstruction when a strong island intervenes.

(13) *BVA and Condition C with no island:*

- (a) [ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma beddna ngol [l-wala mʕallmih]₁ ʔenno
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that
 hu₂ ʕaj b-l-mtiʕan
 he cheated.3.sm in-the-exam
 ‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the
 exam.’
- (b) *ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ galat ʔinnu hu₂ / ha-l-habili₂ safar
 brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’

(14) *BVA and Condition C in strong island:*

- (a) **[talib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma ħakjan maʕ [wala mʕallmih]₁ gabl-ma*
 student-her the-bad *Neg* talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu₂ / ha-l-ġabi₂ yesal
 he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’
- (b) *[ʔakhu Laila]₁ pro₁ ziʕlat laʔannuh hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂ safar*
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because he/the idiot left.’

	No island	Strong island
Weak resumption	reconstruction with BVA (✓), not with Cond. C (✓)	reconstruction with BVA (✓), not with cond. C (✓)
Strong resumption	reconstruction with BVA (✓) and with Cond. C (*)	no reconstruction with BVA (*) and with Cond. C (✓)

Table 5. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption, no vs strong island & positive vs negative condition

4 Main proposal

Our analysis of reconstruction is based on the following central claim:

Claim 1: Whenever an XP triggers reconstruction, a copy of that XP is present.

⇒ Reconstruction with weak resumption based on ellipsis via NP-deletion’s analysis of resumptive pronouns (see Elbourne (2001) among others);

⇒ Reconstruction with strong resumption based on movement when available (along the lines of Aoun et al. (2001)).

4.1 Weak resumptives as definite determiners

Elbourne (2001) assimilates third person pronouns to definite determiners, and further assumes the following structures:

- (15) (a) [_{DP} [_D the/it] NP]
 (b) [_{DP} the/it 1]

⇒ In (15a), the pronoun takes an NP-complement as argument (undergoing NP-deletion under identity with a linguistic antecedent).

⇒ In (15b), the pronoun takes an index (variable) as argument.

Our claim: Weak resumptives are definite determiners in the sense Elbourne (2001), taking either the NP-complement as argument (see (15a)), or the index (see (15b)).

This proposal will account for the fact that reconstruction with weak resumption:

- is not sensitive to islandhood (always available with BVA);
- is sensitive to binding conditions (available with BVA, but absent with cond. C).

Insensitivity to islandhood is predicted as reconstruction follows from ellipsis and not movement.

Sensitivity to binding conditions also follows: reconstruction holds with positive binding conditions (BVA), but never with negative ones (Cond. C), as pronouns allow for two possible arguments (see possible structures in (15)).

Reconstruction holds with BVA in (16) as weak resumptives can be analysed with the NP-argument, giving rise to the schemas in (17):

- (16) (a) [*ṭalib*-[*ha*]₁ *l-kassoul*] *ma ziʕlat* [*wala mʕallmih*]₁ *laʕannuh*
 student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because
l-mudiirah kaḥʕat-oh / *-oh hu mn l-madrise*
 the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from the-school
 ‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’

- (b) *La photo de sa₂ classe, tu es persuadé que chaque prof₂ l’a déchirée.*
 ‘The picture of his class, you are sure that each teacher tore **it**.’

- (17) (a) *ṭalib*-[*ha*]₁ *l-kassoul* ... [*wala mʕallmih*]₁ ... [_{DP} *-oh* [_{NP} *ṭalib-ha₁ l-kassoul*]]
 the bad student of her₁ ... no teacher₁ ... [_{DP} her [_{NP} bad student of her₁]]
 (b) *la photo de sa₂ classe* ... *chaque prof₂* ... [_{DP} *l’* [_{NP} *photo de sa₂ classe*]]
 the picture of his₂ class ... each teacher₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture of his₂ class]]

⇒ Under (17), binding reconstruction is predicted, as a copy of the displaced constituent appears within the scope of the quantifier, leading to the bound variable reading of the pronoun/possessive.

Reconstruction does not hold with Condition C in (18) as weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (no elided NP), giving rise the schemas in (19):

- (18) (a) [*ʔakhu Laila*]₁ *pro₁ ziʕlat* *laʕannuh l-mudiirah tardat-uh₂*
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl
 / *-uh₂ hu₂*
 / *Cl he*
 ‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.’

- (b) *Le crayon₂ de Laila₁, je suis persuadé qu’elle₁ l₂’a volé.*
 Lit. ‘The pen of Laila, I’m sure that she stole it.’

- (19) (a) [*ʔakhu Laila*]₁ ... *pro₁* ... [_{DP} *-oh₂*]
 the brother₂ of Laila₁ ... she₁ ... [_{DP} him₂]
 (b) *le crayon₁ de Laila₂* ... *elle₂* ... [_{DP} *l₁’*]
 the pen₁ of Laila₂ ... she₂ ... [_{DP} it₁]

Note finally that the analysis is on a par with Elbourne (2001)'s analysis of 'paycheck' sentence:

(20) John gave his paycheck to his mistress. Everybody else put it in the bank.

⇒ pronouns are definite descriptions composed of a determiner (the pronoun) and the NP-complement elided under identity:

(21) John₁ gave his₁ paycheck to his mistress. Everybody₂ else put [_{DP} it [_{NP} ~~paycheck of him₂~~]] in the bank.

⇒ The presence of the bound pronoun in the elided copy straightforwardly accounts for the 'covariant' reading of the pronoun 'it'.

A further argument for this analysis ⇒ the great similarity between pronouns and determiners in French, as Table 6 shows:

	(3)sg.	(3)pl.
Pro	il/elle/ le/la /lui/ l'	ils/elles/ les/leur
Det	le/la/l'	les/leur(s)

Table 6. Determiners and Pronouns in French

4.2 Strong resumptives: reconstruction through movement

Recall Aoun et al. (2001)'s analysis of apparent resumption in (5) repeated here in (22):

(22) *Apparent resumption:*
 $[_{DP} \dots \text{pronoun}_1 \dots]_2 [_{IP} \dots \text{QP}_1 \dots [_{CP} \dots [_{DP} [_{DP} \dots \text{pronoun}_1 \dots]_2 \text{RP}_2]]]$

In (22), apparent resumption is derived via movement in the following way:

- the dislocated DP is generated in-situ and then fronted to an A-bar position.
- the RP is base-generated adjoined to the dislocated DP in its base position.

(Elbourne, 2001, chap.3) points out that this proposal runs into difficulty since, according to Benmamoun and Choueiri (p.c.), weak pronouns cannot be cliticized onto DPs in the surface (see (23a)). Notice, however, that both strong pronouns in (23b) and epithets (23c) can appear overtly adjoined (be used in apposition) to a DP:

- (23) (a) **Karim-uh illi fuft-uh mat*
 Karim-Cl that saw.1s-Cl dead
 'Karim that I saw is dead.'
- (b) *hu Karim illi fuft-uh mat*
 he Karim that saw.1s-Cl dead
 'Karim that I saw is dead.'
- (c) *fuft Karim ha-l-habilih*
 saw.1s Karim this-the-idiot
 'I saw Karim, this idiot.'

Our claim: Only strong resumption can be analysed along the lines of Aoun et al. (2001)'s distinction between apparent and true resumption (based on the copy theory of movement when available).

This claim accounts for the fact that reconstruction with strong resumption:

- is sensitive to islandhood (available when no island intervenes);
- is insensitive to binding conditions.

Sensitivity to islands is predicted. Reconstruction holds when no island intervenes (see (24)), as movement is licit in these structures (cases of apparent resumption in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001)), but cannot hold within strong islands in (25) (cases of true resumption in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001)).

Insensitivity to binding conditions is also predicted. When movement is licit (no island), creation of a copy adjoined to the strong resumptive will trigger reconstruction (hence violation of condition C and satisfaction of BVA in (24)). Otherwise (strong island), no reconstruction appears (no condition C violation, but violation of BVA in (25)).

(24) *BVA and condition C with no island:*

- (a) $[t_{alib}-[ha]_1 \ l-kassul]_2 \ ma \ beddna \ ngol \ [l-wala \ m\text{S}allmih]_1 \ ?enno$
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that
 $hu_2 \ \dot{g}a\dot{f} \ b-l-m\text{t}\dot{i}han$
 he cheated.3.sm in-the-exam
 ‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’
- (b) $*[?akhu \ Laila_1]_2 \ pro_1 \ galat \ ?innu \ hu_2 \ / \ ha-l-habilih_2 \ safar$
 brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’

(25) *BVA and Condition C in strong island:*

- (a) $*[t_{alib}-[ha]_1 \ l-kassoul]_2 \ ma \ \text{h}akjan \ ma\text{S} \ [wala \ m\text{S}allmih]_1 \ gabl-ma$
 student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
 $hu_2 \ / \ ha-l-\dot{g}abi_2 \ yesal$
 he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’
- (b) $[?akhu \ Laila_1]_2 \ pro_1 \ zi\text{f}lat \ la?annuh \ hu_2 \ / \ ha-l-habilih_2 \ safar$
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because he/the idiot left.’

	Weak Resumption Reconstruction via ellipsis (à la Elbourne (2001))	Strong Resumption Reconstruction via movement (à la Aoun et al. (2001))
No island	reconstruction with BVA (✓), not with Cond. C (✓)	reconstruction with BVA (✓), and with Cond. C (*)
Strong island	reconstruction with BVA (✓) not with Cond. C (✓)	no reconstruction with BVA (*) or with Cond. C (✓)

Table 7. Summary

5 On copy interpretation

Claim 2: Copies can be interpreted either as definite or indefinite objects.

- Weak resumption (based on ellipsis à la Elbourne (2001)) forces a definite interpretation of the copy (gap vs resumption).
- A functional reading then follows either from indefinite interpretation of the copy (when available), or from the presence of a bound pronoun in that copy.

5.1 How copies get interpreted...

A copy can be interpreted as indefinite. For the analysis of indefinites, we argue for the skolemized choice function proposed in Kratzer (1998), i.e. a function that takes two arguments, one individual x and a set of entities P and returns one individual of that set (written $f_x(P)$):

- (26) Every man loves **a** woman.
 \Rightarrow Functional reading: one different specific woman for each man
 LF: every man₁ loves f_1 (woman).
 $\forall x.[man(x) \rightarrow [loves(x, f_x(woman))]]$

\Rightarrow Skolemized choice function's interpretation of copies is essential to account for scope-only reconstruction: interpretation of the copy in (27) as an indefinite gives rise to the 'reconstructed' functional readings mapping every doctor to a different and specific patient.

- (27) Which patient did every doctor examine ~~patient~~?
 LF: $\lambda p.\exists f. true(p) \wedge p = every\ doctor_x\ examined\ f_x(patient)$

5.2 Gap vs resumption

Scope-only reconstruction holds with a gap, as shown by (27) for English, (28a) for French, and (29a) for JA. But it surprisingly disappears with resumption, as shown by (28b) for French and (29b) for JA⁷.

- (28) (a) *Quelle photo₁ chaque homme a-t-il déchirée* $_1?$ (\surd functional)
 'Which picture did each man tear?'
 (b) *Quelle photo₁ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme **l**₁ 'a déchirée?* (\ast funct.)
 'Which picture are you furious because every man tore **it**?'
 (29) (a) *?aya surah₁ kul zalamih maza Γ $_1?$* (\surd functional)
 Which picture every man tear.past
 'Which picture did each man tear?'
 (b) *?aya surah₁ kul zalamih maza Γ -ha₁?* (\ast functional)
 Which picture every man tear.past-Cl
 'Which picture did each man tear (it)?'

⁷This contrast was first discussed by Doron (1982) with relative clauses in Hebrew.

⇒ Only (28a) and (29a) allow for the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading (as a case of scope-only reconstruction).

Our account: the presence of resumption (as a definite description) blocks interpretation of the copy as indefinite, leading to the schemas in (30).

- (30) (a) *Gap:*
 quelle photo ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} [_{NP} photo]]
 which picture ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} [_{NP} picture]]
 ⇒ *LF:* $\lambda p. \exists f. true(p) \wedge p = each\ man_x\ tore\ f_x(picture)$
- (b) *Resumption:*
 quelle photo ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} I' [_{NP} photo]]
 which picture ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture]]
 ⇒ *LF:* $\lambda p. \exists y. true(p) \wedge p = you\ are\ furious\ because\ each\ man_x\ tore\ the\ picture\ identical\ to\ y$

⇒ In (30a), interpretation of the copy as a skolemized choice function (indefinite) gives rise to the functional reading. In (30b), the copy is interpreted as definite (because of the resumptive pronoun) which obviously does not lead to any functional reading.

5.3 Scope-only vs binding reconstruction

Our analysis straightforwardly accounts for the asymmetry between scope-only and binding reconstruction with resumption. Consider the surprising contrast, in French between (28b), repeated here in (31a), and (31b), in JA between (29b), repeated here in (32a), and (32b):

- (31) (a) *Quelle photo₁ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l₁'a déchirée?* (**funct.*)
 ‘Which picture are you furious because every man tore it?’
- (b) *Quelle photo₁ de lui es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l₁'a déchirée?* (✓*f.*)
 ‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore it?’
- (32) (a) *?aya surah₁ kul zalamih mazaŋ -ha₁?* (**functional*)
 Which picture every man tear.past-Cl
 ‘Which picture did each man tear (it)?’
- (b) *?aya surah₁ il-uh₂ kul zalamih₂ mazaŋ -ha₁?* (✓*functional*)
 Which picture of-him every man tear.past-Cl
 ‘Which picture of him did each man tear (it)?’

⇒ Although the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading is not present in (31a) and (32a), it suddenly reappears in (31b) and (32b).

Our account: the presence of the resumptive pronoun (as a definite description) leads to a **definite** interpretation of the copy. As the schemas in (33) show, the contrast is then reduced to the one between *every man saw the picture* versus *every man saw the picture of him*.

- (33) (a) *Scope-only reconstruction*
 quelle photo ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} l' [_{NP} photo]]
 which picture ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture]]
 $\Rightarrow LF: \lambda p. \exists y. true(p) \wedge p = \text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture identical to } y$
- (b) *Binding reconstruction*
 quelle photo de lui₂ ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} l' [_{NP} photo-de lui₂]]
 which picture of him₂ ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture-of him₂]]
 $\Rightarrow LF: \lambda p. true(p) \wedge p = \text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture of } x$

\Rightarrow Obviously, only the second case will lead to a functional reading thanks to the bound variable.

6 Conclusion

- Both the traditional analysis of reconstruction as an exclusive consequence of movement (see Lebeaux (1990), Chomsky (1995) among others) and the distinction between apparent and true resumption (see Aoun et al. (2001)) are problematic, as reconstruction (linked to binding) can occur within islands, as data from French and JA show.
- Reconstruction signals the presence of a copy rather than the presence of movement.
 - \Rightarrow For weak resumption, we argue for reconstruction via NP-deletion's analysis of pronouns à la Elbourne (2001);
 - \Rightarrow For strong resumption, we argue for reconstruction via movement in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001).
- In principle, copies may be interpreted either as definite (in the sense of Fox (2002)) or indefinite (see Kratzer (1998)'s skolemized choice functions).
 - \Rightarrow Resumption forces interpretation of the copy as definite.
 - \Rightarrow A functional reading then follows either from indefinite interpretation of the copy (scope-only reconstruction), or from the presence of a bound pronoun in that copy (binding reconstruction).

Questions, Comments, Help, Jobs... Welcome!

References

- J. Aoun, L. Choueiri, and N. Hornstein. Resumption, movement and derivational economy. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32:371–403, 2001.
- Valentina Bianchi. *Consequences of Antisymmetry for the syntax of headed relative clauses*. PhD thesis, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 1995.
- Noam Chomsky. *The minimalist program*. MIT Press, 1995.
- Edith Doron. The syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns. In *Texas linguistic forum*, volume 19, 1982.

Paul Elbourne. E-type anaphora as np deletion. *Natural Language Semantics*, 9:241–288, 2001.

Danny Fox. Antecedent contained deletion and the copy theory of movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33:63–96, 2002.

Richard Kayne. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press, 1994.

Angelika Kratzer. Scope or pseudoscope? are there widescope indefinites? In *Events in Grammar*. 1998.

David Lebeaux. Relative clauses, licensing and the nature of the derivation. In *Proceedings of NELS*, volume 20, pages 318–332, 1990.

Uli Sauerland. The interpretation of traces. *Natural Language Semantics*, 12:63–127, 2004.

Jean-Roger Vergnaud. *French relative clauses*. PhD thesis, MIT, 1973.