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Proposal

- **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:** novel data from French and Jordanian Arabic arguing for reconstruction with resumption inside islands.

- **Our claims:**
  - **Claim 1:** Whenever an XP triggers reconstruction effect, a copy of that XP (rather than movement of that XP) is present.
    \[ \Rightarrow \] 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)).
    \[ \Rightarrow \] Resumption will force a definite interpretation of the copy.
    \[ \Rightarrow \] 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) The secretary called the patient that every doctor will examine tomorrow.

---
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⇒ (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 reconstruction:\(^1\) 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) The secretary called the patient that every doctor will examine patient.
⇒ Interpretation of the copy in (2a) and (2b) as an indefinite (see Kayne (1994) for arguments).

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 islandhood\(^3\), as illustrated with wh- question and dislocation from French in (3a) and (3b), and dislocation from LA in (3c):

(3a) Quel étudiant es-tu fâché [Adjunct Island parce que le doyen *(I)’a renvoyé]? ‘Which student are you furious because the principal expelled him?’

(3b) Cet étudiant, tu es fâché [Adjunct Island parce que le doyen *(I)’a renvoyé]. ‘This student, you are furious because the principal expelled him.’

(3c) Ha-l-muttahamme tfeeja?to [Adjunct Island la?nno ?rifto ?enno 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 sentence\(^4\).

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

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

\(^3\)when movement is banned in structures such as adjuncts, complex-NPs (strong islands), or highly restricted in others such as wh- structures (weak islands).

\(^4\)Since 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) [l-miiz-a₁ l-kasleen/₂ ma baddna ma yabbir wala m’yllme₁ ?ànno student-her the-bad Neg want-1p tell-1p no teacher that huwwe₂ zafar b-l-fahisı́ he cheated-3sm in-the-exam ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we don’t want to tell any teacher₁ that he₂ cheated on the exam.’

(b) *[l-miiz-a₁ l-kasleen/₂ ma badda tahif wala m’yllme₁ lee student-her the-bad Neg want.3fs know.3fs no teacher why l-mudiira jdmatrix-o₂ mn l-madrase the-principal expelled-him from the-school ‘Her₁ bad student₂, no teacher₁ wants to know why the principal expelled him₂ from the school.’

(c) *[l-miiz-a₁ l-kasleen/₂ ma hkiina ma s wala m’yllme₁ ?able-ма student-her the-bad Neg talked-1p with no teacher before (ha)-l-majduub₂ yusual (this)-the-idiot arrive-3sm ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we didn’t talk to any teacher₁ before this idiot₂ 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.

On the basis of the contrast in (4), Aoun et al. (2001) argue that resumptive elements which appear inside islands (weak island in (4b), and strong island in (4c)) behave differently from resumptive elements which are not inside islands as in (4a). They suggest the terms ‘true resumption’ and ‘apparent resumption’ respectively for these two cases.

⇒ The (possessive) pronoun in the left-dislocated DP in (4a) can be bound by the negative QP wala m’yllme ‘no teacher’. This can be obtained if we suppose that the left-dislocated DP is reconstructed in the scope of the negative QP. Aoun et al. (2001) conclude from (4a) that resumption can be derived with movement when no island appears (case of apparent resumption). The LF schema for (4a) is given in (5). Notice that there is a copy of the dislocated antecedent adjoined to the resumptive element (RP).

(5) Apparent resumption:

\[
[\text{DP} \ldots \text{pronoun}_1 \ldots]_2 [\text{IP} \ldots \text{QP}_1 \ldots [\text{CP} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \text{pronoun}_1 \ldots]_2 \text{RP}_2]]
\]

⇒ In contrast, resumptive elements inside islands seem not to show reconstruction effects, as (4b) and (4c) show. The wh- and adjunct clauses in (4b) and (4c) constitute islands for movement. 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 /l-miiz-[a₁] l-kasleen/₂ ‘her bad student’ as shown in (6): the anaphoric element ‘her’ cannot be interpreted in the scope of the negative QP ‘no teacher’ (BVA violation), because there is no copy of the antecedent in the embedded clause.
(6) **True resumption:**
\[ [DP \ldots \text{pronoun}_1 \ldots]_2 [IP \ldots \text{QP}_1 \ldots [\text{Island} \ldots [DP \text{RP}_2]]] \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent resumption</th>
<th>True resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>No reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Reconstruction with Resumption

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

### 2.3 Paradox: reconstruction in islands

**Assumption 1:** Whenever reconstruction holds, movement is present.

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

⇒ These two conclusions lead to the following prediction:

**Reconstruction should never occur within islands.**

However, consider the following dislocation structures from 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 in (a)) or weak (wh- in (b)) island:**

(a) \[ [talib-\text{ha}_1]_1 l-kassoul\text{-l}_2 \text{ ma } z\text{Klat} [\text{wala } m\text{allmih}_1]_1 \text{l\text{a}lnnuh student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because l-mudiirah kahf\text{-at-oh}_2 / -oh_2 \text{ hu}_2 \text{ mn } l-madrase the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from-the-school} \]  

‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’

(b) \[ [talib-\text{ha}_1]_1 l-kassul\text{-l}_2 \text{ ma } \text{badku } ti\text{\textsc{sh}al\text{u}} [\text{wala } m\text{allmih}_1]_1 \text{lahj student-her the-bad Neg want.2pl ask no teacher why l-mudiirah kahf\text{-at-oh}_2 / -oh_2 \text{ hu}_2 \text{ mn } l-madrase the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from-the-school} \]  

‘Her bad student, you don’t want to ask any teacher why the principal expelled him from the school.’

(8) **Clitic inside strong (adjunct) or weak (wh-) island:**

(a) \textit{La photo}_1 de sa\textit{2 classe, tu es f\textsc{\textasciitilde}ch\textsc{\textasciitilde} parce que chaque prof\textit{2} l\textsc{\textasciitilde}, a d\textsc{\textasciitilde}ch\textsc{\textasciitilde}r\textsc{\textasciitilde}e.}  

‘The picture of his class, you are furious because each teacher tore it.’

(b) \textit{La photo}_1 de sa\textit{2 fille, tu te demandes pourquoi chaque homme\textit{2} l\textsc{\textasciitilde}, a gard\textsc{\textasciitilde}\textsc{\textasciitilde}.}  

‘The picture of his daughter, you wonder why each man kept it?’
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(9) Clitic inside strong (adjunct) or weak (wh-) island:

(a) Quelle photo_{1} de lui_{2} es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme_{2} l_{1} a déchirée?  
   ‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore it?’

(b) Quelle photo_{1} de sa_{2} fille te demandes-tu si chaque homme_{2} l_{1} a gardée?  
   ‘Which picture of his daughter do you wonder whether each man kept it?’

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

(7a) → a different student for each teacher (strict mapping teacher/picture).
   • Binding reconstruction: the possessive -ha ‘her’ is interpreted as a bound variable.

(9a) → 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 three parameters:
   • the type of resumption
   • the type of island
   • the type of binding condition.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak resumption</th>
<th>Strong resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitics</td>
<td>Strong pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubled clitics</td>
<td>Epithets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Typology of Resumption

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

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

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

(a) [talib-[ha]_{1} l-kassoul]_{2} ma hakjan ma\$ [wala m\$ allmih]_{1} gabl-ma 
   student-her the-bad Neg talked.3pl with no teacher before 
   luf-uh_{2} / -uh_{2} hu_{2} l-mudiirah 
   saw.3sf-Cl / -Cl he the-principal.3sf 
   ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before the principal saw him.’
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(b) *\([t\text{al}i\text{b-}[h\text{a}]_1 \ l-k\text{assoul}]_2 \ m\text{a} \ h\text{ak}j\text{an} \ m\text{a}\text{f}]_1 \ [w\text{ala} \ m\text{\'}\text{al}m\text{ih}]_1 \ g\text{abl-ma}
student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu_2 / ha-l\_\text{g} ab\_2 yesal
he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm

‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’

| Weak resumption | Strong resumption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√)</td>
<td>no reconstruction with BVA (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption

3.2 The type of island: weak vs strong

The nature of the island (weak vs strong) also plays a role in allowing or banning reconstruction, but only with strong resumption.

⇒ **Weak** islands **allow** for reconstruction with strong resumption.
⇒ **Strong** islands **ban** reconstruction with strong resumption.

(11) Strong resumption in weak island (a) vs strong island (b):

(a) \([t\text{al}i\text{b-}[h\text{a}]_1 \ l-k\text{assoul}]_2 \ m\text{a} \ b\text{ad}k\text{u} \ t\text{i\text{\'}}\text{al}u \ [w\text{ala} \ m\text{\'}\text{al}m\text{ih}]_1 \ l\text{a}\text{ff}
student-her the-bad Neg want.2pl ask.2pl no teacher why
hu_2 / ha-l\_\text{g} ab\_2 \text{\_g} af \ b-l-mt\text{\'}han
he / the-idiot.3sm cheated.3sm in-the-exam

‘Her bad student, you don’t want to ask any teacher why he / this idiot cheated on the exam.’

(b) *\([t\text{al}i\text{b-}[h\text{a}]_1 \ l-k\text{assoul}]_2 \ m\text{a} \ h\text{ak}j\text{an} \ m\text{a}\text{f}]_1 \ [w\text{ala} \ m\text{\'}\text{al}m\text{ih}]_1 \ g\text{abl-ma}
student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu_2 / ha-l\_\text{g} ab\_2 yesal
he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm

‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’

| Weak resumption | Strong resumption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√)</td>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√)</td>
<td>no reconstruction with BVA (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption & weak vs strong island

3.3 The type of binding condition: positive vs negative

Finally, the type of binding condition also determines presence or absence of reconstruction, but only with **weak resumption**.
Table 5. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption, +/- strong island & positive vs negative condition

**Weak Resumption:**

⇒ Whether or not an island appears in the structure, weak resumption gives rise to:
- reconstruction with positive binding conditions (BVA satisfied in the (a) examples);5
- no reconstruction with negative conditions (Condition C is not violated in the (b) examples).

(12) BVA vs Condition C with no island:

(a) [talib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma beddna ngol [l-wala mʕ allmih]₁ ?enno student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that l-mudiirah tardat-oh₂ mn l-madrase 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 ḫinnu pro₁ lazim ḫajyyar-ha₂. grade Karim think.2sm that he must change-it ‘Karim’s grade, you think that he must change it.’

(13) BVA vs Condition C in weak island:

(a) [talib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma badku tisʔalu [l-wala mʕ allmih]₁ laff student-her the-bad Neg want.2pl ask no teacher why l-mudiirah kahʕat-oh₂ / -oh₂ ḫu₂ mn l-madrase the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from the-school ‘Her bad student, you don’t want to ask any teacher why the principal expelled him from the school.’

(b) ḫaku Laila₁ pro₁ saʕalat laff l-mudiirah tardat-uh₂ / brother Laila she asked.3sf why the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl / -uh₂ ḫu₂ Cl he ‘The brother of Laila, she asked why the principal expelled him.’

---

5Notice that Condition A unsurprisingly behaves strictly in parallel to BVA, as both conditions are positive binding conditions.
(14) **BVA vs Condition C in strong island:**

(a) \[\text{[talib-[ha]}_1 \text{ l-kassoul]}_2 \text{ ma z\text{"a}’lat} [\text{wala m\text{"a}’llmih]}_1 \text{ la\text{"a}’annuh} \text{ student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because} \text{ l-mudiirah ka\text{"a}f-at-ob}_2 / -oh_2 \text{ hu}_2 \text{ mn l-madrase} \text{ the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from-the-school} \]

‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’

(b) \[\text{\’Rakhu Laila}_1/2 \text{ pro}_1 \text{ z\text{"a}’lat la\text{"a}’annuh l-mudiirah tardat-uh}_2 \text{ brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl / -uh}_2 \text{ hu}_2 / \text{ Cl he} \]

‘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 or a weak island intervenes;
- no reconstruction when a strong island intervenes.

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

(a) \[\text{[talib-[ha]}_1 \text{ l-kassoul]}_2 \text{ ma beddna ngol [l-wala m\text{"a}’llmih]}_1 \text{ ?enno student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that} \text{ hu}_2 \text{ gaf b-l-mti\text{"a}n} \text{ he cheated.3.sm in-the-exam} \]

‘Her bad student, we don’t want to telle any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’

(b) \[\text{\’Rakhu Laila}_1/2 \text{ pro}_1 \text{ galat ?innu hu}_2 / \text{ ha-l-habilih}_2 \text{ safar} \text{ brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm} \]

‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’

(16) **BVA and Condition C in weak island:**

(a) \[\text{[talib-[ha]}_1 \text{ l-kassoul]}_2 \text{ ma badku ti\text{"a}lalu [wala m\text{"a}’llmih]}_1 \text{ la\text{"a}f student-her the-bad Neg want.2pl ask.2pl no teacher why} \text{ hu}_2 / \text{ ha-l-gaf} \text{ ab}_2 \text{ gaf b-l-mti\text{"a}n} \text{ he / the-idiot.3sm cheated.3sm in-the-exam} \]

‘Her bad student, you don’t want to ask any teacher why he / this idiot cheated on the exam.’

(b) \[\text{\’Rakhu Laila}_1/2 \text{ pro}_1 \text{ sa’alat l-m\text{"a}’llmih la\text{"a}f hu}_2 / \text{ ha-l-habilih}_2 \text{ brother Laila she said.3sf the-teacher.3sf why he / the-idiot gaf b-l-mti\text{"a}n} \text{ cheated.3sm in-the-exam} \]

‘The brother of Laila, she asked the teacher why he/the idiot cheated on the exam.’
(17) **BVA and Condition C in strong island:**

(a) */tali-/ha l-kassoul ma hakjan ma\'i [wala ni\'al-mih] gabl-ma student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu / ha-l-\j\ abi yesal he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’

(b) \[takhu Laila\] pro1 zi\'lat la\'an-nuh hu / ha-l-habil-h2 safar brother Laila she upset.3sf because he / the-idiot left.3sm
‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because he/the idiot left.’

**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:

(18) (a) [[the/it] NP]
    (b) [the/it 1]

⇒ In (18a), the pronoun takes an NP-complement as argument (undergoing NP-deletion under identity with a linguistic antecedent).
⇒ In (18b), 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 (18a)), or the index (see (18b)).

(19) Faire les structures pronoms faibles

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 (18)).

Reconstruction holds with BVA in (20) as weak resumptives can be analysed with the NP-argument, giving rise to the schemas in (21):

(20) (a) \[talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul] ma zi\acr lat \[wala m\acr allmih]_1 la\acr annuh student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because l-mudiiarah kah\acr at-oh \(/-\acr oh hu mn l-madrase\) the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from-the-school ‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’

(b) \(La\ \photo\ \de\ \so\_2\ \classe,\ \tu\ \es\ \presuad\acute{\e}\ \que\ \chaque\ \prof_2\ \l’a\ \d\acute{e}chir\acute{\e}e.\) ‘The picture of his class, you are sure that each teacher tore it.’

(21) (a) \(\{talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul \ldots [wala m\acr allmih]_1 \ldots [DP -\acr oh [NP talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul]]\) the bad student of her\(_1\) \ldots no teacher\(_1\) \ldots [DP her [NP bad student of her\(_1\)]]\)

(b) \(la\ \photo\ \de\ \so\_2\ \classe\ \ldots \ \chaque\ \prof_2\ \ldots [DP l’ [NP photo \ de \ so\_2\ \classe]]\) the picture of his\(_2\) class \ldots each teacher\(_2\) \ldots [DP it [NP picture of his\(_2\) class]]\)

⇒ Under (21), 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 (22) as weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (no elided NP), giving rise the schemas in (23):

(22) (a) \(\{\acrakh\ Laila_1/2\ \pro_1\ zi\acr lat\ \la\acr annuh\ l-mudiiarah\ tardat-\acr uh_2\) the brother of Laila\(_1\) she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl \(/-\acr uh_2\) hu\(_2\) \(/\ \acr Cl\) he

‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.’

(b) \(Le\ \crayon_2\ \de\ \Laila_1,\ \je\ \suis\ \persuad\acute{\e}\ \qu’elle_1\ \l’\ a\ \vol\acute{\e}.\) Lit. ‘The pen of Laila, I’m sure that she stole it.’

(23) (a) \(\{\acrakh\ Laila_1/2\ \ldots \pro_1 \ldots [DP -\acr oh_2]\) the brother\(_2\) of Laila\(_1\) \ldots she\(_1\) \ldots [DP him\(_2\)\]

(b) \(le\ \crayon_1\ \de\ \Laila_2\ \ldots \elle_2 \ldots [DP l’_1]\) the pen\(_1\) of Laila\(_2\) \ldots she\(_2\) \ldots [DP it\(_1\)\]

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

(24) 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:

(25) John\(_1\) gave his\(_1\) paycheck to his mistress. Everybody\(_2\) else put \([DP \it_1 [NP \paycheck\ \of\ \him\(_2\)]]\) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3)sg.</th>
<th>(3)pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>il/elle/le/la/lui/I</td>
<td>ils/elles/les/leur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>le/la/I</td>
<td>les/leur(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (26):

(26) Apparent resumption:

\[
[\text{DP} \ldots \text{pronoun}_1 \ldots]_2 \quad [\text{IP} \ldots \text{QP}_1 \ldots][\text{CP} \ldots][\text{DP} \ldots \text{pronoun}_1 \ldots]_2 \text{RP}_2]
\]

In (26), 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 (27a)). Notice, however, that both strong pronouns in (27b) and epithets (27c) can appear overtly adjoined (be used in apposition) to a DP:

(27) (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 only with no/weak island⁶);

---

⁶The uniform appearance of reconstruction effects in weak islands is not very problematic if one assumes that weak islands are selective islands: that is, they don’t block extraction of operators quantifying over individuals (see Bautista (2001) for recent discussion and references). Reconstruction effects in weak islands in Jordanian Arabic are then expected with strong resumption. The copy theory of movement will create a copy in the base position.
• is insensitive to binding conditions.

**Sensitivity to islands** is predicted. Reconstruction holds when no island or a weak island intervenes (see (28) and (29)), 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 (30) (cases of true resumption in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001)).

**Insensitivity to binding conditions** is also predicted. When movement is licit (no/weak island), creation of a copy adjoined to the strong resumptive will trigger reconstruction (yielding violation of condition C and satisfaction of BVA in (28) and (29)). Otherwise (strong island), no reconstruction appears (no condition C violation, but violation of BVA in (30)).

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

(a) \([\text{talib-[ha]}_1 \ l-kassoul]_2 \ ma \ beddna \ ngol \ [l-wala \ m\text{'allmih}]_1 \ ?enno \text{ student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that} \]

\[hu_2 \ \hat{g}\af \text{ b-l-mt\han} \text{ he cheated.3sm in-the-exam} \]

‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’

(b) \(^*\)\([\text{pakhu}]_1 \ \text{brother} \ Laila \_2 \ \text{Laila pro} \_1 \ \text{she sa’alat said.} \]

\[l-m\text{’allmih}_2 \ \text{the-teacher.3sf} \ \text{why he / the-idiot left.3sm} \]

‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’

(29) **BVA and condition C in weak island:**

(a) \([\text{talib-[ha]}_1 \ l-kassoul]_2 \ ma \ badku \ ti\text{’}alu \ [wala \ m\text{'allmih}]_1 \ lajf \text{ student-her the-bad Neg want.2pl ask.2pl no teacher why} \]

\[hu_2 / \ ha-l\hat{g} \text{ab}_2 \ \hat{g}\af \text{ b-l-mt\han} \text{ he / the-idiot.3sm cheated.3sm in-the-exam} \]

‘Her bad student, you don’t want to ask any teacher why he / this idiot cheated on the exam.’

(b) \(^*\)\([\text{pakhu}]_1 \ \text{brother} \ Laila \_2 \ \text{pro} \_1 \ \text{she sa’alat said.} \]

\[\text{lajf} \ \text{the-teacher.3sf} \ \text{why he / the-idiot} \]

\[\hat{g}\af \text{ b-l-mt\han} \text{ cheated.3sm in-the-exam} \]

‘The brother of Laila, she asked the teacher why he/the idiot cheated on the exam.’

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

(a) \(^*\)\([\text{talib-[ha]}_1 \ l-kassoul]_2 \ ma \ hakjan \ ma\text{’} [wala \ m\text{'allmih}]_1 \ gabl-ma \text{ student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before} \]

\[hu_2 / \ ha-l\hat{g} \text{ab}_2 \ \text{yesal} \text{ he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm} \]

‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’
(b) ʔaʔku Laila₁/₂ pro₁ zi’ilat la’annuh hu₂ / ha-t-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.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Resumption Reconstruction via ellipsis ('à la Elbourne (2001))</th>
<th>Strong Resumption Reconstruction via movement (à la Aoun et al. (2001))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No island rec. with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>rec. with BVA (√), and with Cond. C (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak island rec. with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>rec. with BVA (√), and with Cond. C (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong island rec. with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>no rec. with BVA (*), or with Cond. C (√)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 also 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 $f_x(P)$):

(31) Every man loves a woman.

⇒ Functional reading: one different specific woman for each man

$\forall x. [\text{man}(x) \rightarrow [\text{loves}(x, f_x(\text{woman}))]]$

⇒ Skolemized choice function’s interpretation of copies is essential to account for scope-only reconstruction: interpretation of the copy in (32) as an indefinite gives rise to the ‘reconstructed’ functional readings mapping every doctor to a different and specific patient.

(32) Which patient did every doctor examine patient?

$\text{LF: } \lambda p. \exists f. \text{true}(p) \land p=\text{every doctor}_x \text{examined } f_x(\text{patient})$
5.2 Gap vs resumption

Scope-only reconstruction holds with a gap, as examples in (32) and (33a) show, but disappears with resumption, as shown by (33b).

(33) (a) Quelle photo chaque homme a-t-il déchirée? (√functional)
‘Which picture did each man tear?’

(b) Quelle photo es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l’a déchirée? (*func.)
‘Which picture are you furious because every man tore it?’

⇒ Only (33a) allows 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 (34).

(34) (a) Gap:
quelle photo ... chaque homme ... [DP [NP photo]]
which picture ... each man ... [DP [NP picture]]
⇒ LF: λp.∃f. true(p)∧p=each man x tore f x (picture)

(b) Resumption:
quelle photo ... chaque homme ... [DP l’ [NP photo]]
which picture ... each man ... [DP it [NP picture]]
⇒ LF: λp.∃y. true(p)∧p=you are furious because each man x tore the picture identical to y

⇒ In (34a), interpretation of the copy as a skolemized choice function (indefinite) gives rise to the functional reading. In (34b), the copy is interpreted as definite (because of the resumptive pronoun) which obviously does not lead to any functional reading.

Exactly the same contrast appears in JA, as shown in (35):

(35) (a) ?aya surah1 kul zalami h maza® -®1 ? (√functional)
Which picture every man tear past
‘Which picture did each man tear?’

(b) ?aya surah1 kul zalami h maza® -®-®1 ? (*functional)
Which picture every man tear past.Cl
‘Which picture did each man tear (it)?’

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 between (33b), repeated here in (36a), and (36b):

(36) (a) Quelle photo es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l’a déchirée?
‘Which picture are you furious because every man tore it?’

(b) Quelle photo de lui es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l’a déchirée?
‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore it?’
Although the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading is not present in (36a), it suddenly reappears in (36b).

**Our account:** the presence of the resumptive pronoun (as a definite description) leads to a **definite** interpretation of the copy. As the schemas in (37) show, the contrast is then reduced to the one between every man saw the picture versus every man saw the picture of him.

\[(37) \quad \text{(a) quelle photo ... chaque homme}_2 \ldots [DP l'[\text{NP photo}]]
\]
\[
\text{which picture ... each man}_2 \ldots [DP it [\text{NP picture}]]
\]
\[
\Rightarrow LF: \lambda p. \exists y. \text{true}(p) \wedge p = \text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture identical to } y
\]
\[
\text{(b) quelle photo de lui}_2 \ldots chaque homme}_2 \ldots [DP l'[\text{NP photo de lui}]]
\]
\[
\text{which picture of him}_2 \ldots each man}_2 \ldots [DP it [\text{NP picture of him}]]
\]
\[
\Rightarrow LF: \lambda p. \text{true}(p) \wedge p = \text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture of } x
\]

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

Again, exactly the same contrast appears in JA, as shown in (38):

\[(38) \quad \text{(a) ?aya surah}_1 \text{ kul zalamih maza} - ha}_1 \text{? (}^*\text{functional)}
\]
\[
\text{Which picture every man tear.past-Cl}
\]
\[
\text{‘Which picture did each man tear (it)?’}
\]
\[
\text{(b) ?aya surah}_1 \text{ il-hu}_2 \text{ kul zalamih}_2 maza} - ha}_2 \text{? (}^\sqrt{\text{functional)}}
\]
\[
\text{Which picture of him every man tear.past-Cl}
\]
\[
\text{‘Which picture of him did each man tear (it)?’}
\]

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.
  \[\Rightarrow\text{For weak resumption, we argue for reconstruction via NP-deletion’s analysis of pronouns à la Elbourne (2001);}\]
  \[\Rightarrow\text{For strong resumption, we argue for reconstruction via movement in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001).}\]

- In principle, copies may be interpreted either as definite (in the sens of Fox (2002)) or indefinite (see Kratzer (1998)’s skolemized choice functions).
  \[\Rightarrow\text{Resumption forces interpretation of the copy as definite.}\]
  \[\Rightarrow\text{A functional reading then follows either from indefinite interpretation of the copy (scope-only reconstruction), or from the presence of a bound pronoun in that copy (binding reconstruction).}\]
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