When Movement fails to Reconstruct*

Nicolas GUILLIOT   &   Nouman MALKAWI

nicolas.guilliot@wanadoo.fr   malkawi72m@yahoo.fr

University of NANTES—LLING EA3837

29th GLOW—April 6-8, 2006

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.
⇒ 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) The secretary called the patient that every doctor will examine tomorrow.

⇒ (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):

(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   tfeeja?to   [$_{Adjunct\ Island}$ la?nno   ʕrifto   ?enno*
           this-the-defendant   surprised-*2pl*   because   learnt-*2pl* that
           ħ*abasuw-*(a)].*
           imprisonned-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) *[təlmiiz-a$_1$ l-kəsleen]$_2$ ma   baddna   nχabbir   wala   mʕallme$_1$ ʔənno*
          student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   want-*1p*   tell-*1p*   no   teacher   that
          huwwe$_2$ *zaʕbar*   *b-l-faħiş*
          he   cheated-*3sm*   in-the-exam
          'Her$_1$ bad student$_2$, we don't want to tell any teacher$_1$ that **he$_2$** cheated on
          the exam.'

     (b) **[təlmiiz-a$_1$ l-kəsleen]$_2$ ma   badda   taʕrif   wala   mʕallme$_1$ lee*
          student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   want.*3fs*   know.*3fs*   no   teacher   why
          l-mudiira   *ʃaħaţit-**o**$_2$*   *mn*   *l-madrase*
          the-principal   expelled-him   from   the-school
          'Her$_1$ bad student$_2$, no teacher$_1$ wants to know why the principal expelled
          him$_2$ from the school.'

     (c) **[təlmiiz-a$_1$ l-kəsleen]$_2$ ma   ħkiina   maʕ   wala   mʕallme$_1$ ʔable-ma*
          student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   talked-*1p*   with   no   teacher   before
          (ha)-l-majduub$_2$ *yuusal*
          (this)-the-idiot   arrive-*3sm*
          'Her$_1$ bad student$_2$, we didn't talk to any teacher$_1$ 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 intevenes (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 mʕallme* '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:*
      [$_{DP}$ ... pronoun$_1$ ...]$_2$ [$_{IP}$ ... QP$_1$ ...[$_{CP}$ ...[$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ ... ~~pronoun$_1$~~ ...]$_2$ 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 *[təlmiiz-[a]$_1$ l-kəsleen]$_2$* '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:*
       $[_{DP} \ ... \ \text{pronoun}_{*1} \ ...]_2 \ [_{IP} \ ... \ \text{QP}_1 \ ...[_{Island} \ ...[_{DP} \ \text{RP}_2] \ ]]$

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   Paradox: reconstruction in islands

Assumption 1: Whenever reconstruction holds, movement is present.
Assumption 2: Even with resumption, when reconstruction holds, movement is present.

$\Rightarrow$ 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) *[ṭalib-[ha]$_1$ l-kassoul]$_2$ ma   ziʕlat   [wala   mʕallmih]$_1$ laʔannuh*
        student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   upset.*3sf*   no   teacher   because
        l-mudiirah   kaħʃat-oh$_2$ /   -oh$_2$ hu$_2$ 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) *[ṭalib-[ha]$_1$ l-kassul]$_2$ ma   badku   tisʔalu   [wala   mʕallmih]$_1$ lajʃ*
        student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   want.*2pl*   ask   no   teacher   why
        l-mudiirah   kaħʃat-oh$_2$ /   -oh$_2$ hu$_2$ 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) *La photo$_1$ de sa$_2$ classe, tu es fâché parce que chaque prof$_2$ **l**$_1$ 'a déchirée.*
        'The picture of his class, you are furious because each teacher tore **it**.'

   (b) *La photo$_1$ de sa$_2$ fille, tu te demandes pourquoi chaque homme$_2$ **l**$_1$ 'a gardée.*
        'The picture of his daughter, you wonder why each man kept **it**?'

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

   (a) *Quelle photo$_1$ de lui$_2$ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme$_2$ $\boldsymbol{l}_1$ '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$_2$ $\boldsymbol{l}_1$ '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**.

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.
⇒ **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) *[ṭalib-[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-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.'

5

(b) *[*ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul*]₂ *ma ḥakjan 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 ($\sqrt{}$)
Strong resumption	**no reconstruction with BVA (*)**

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) *[ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma badku tisʔalu [wala mʕallmih]₁ lajʃ*
    student-her the-bad *Neg* want.*2pl* ask.*2pl* no teacher why

hu₂ / ha-l-ġabi₂ ġaʃ b-l-mtiḥan
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) *[*ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul*]₂ *ma ḥakjan 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.'

	Weak island	Strong island
Weak resumption	reconstruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$)	reconstruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$)
Strong resumption	**reconstruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$)**	no reconstruction with BVA (*)

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**.

	No island	Weak island	Strong island
WRes	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)**	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)**	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)**
SRes	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) and with Cond. C (*)	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) and with Cond. C (*)	no rec. with BVA (*) and with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)

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) *[ṭalib-[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-oh$_2$ 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) *ʕalamit$_2$ Karim$_1$, bitfakir ʔinnu pro$_1$ lazim ʔiǧayyar-ha$_2$.*
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) *[ṭalib-[ha]$_1$ l-kassul]$_2$ ma badku tisʔalu [wala mʕallmih]$_1$ lajʃ*
student-her the-bad *Neg* want.*2pl* ask no teacher why
l-mudiirah kaħʃat-oh$_2$ / -oh$_2$ hu$_2$ 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) *[ʔakhu Laila$_1$]$_2$ pro$_1$ sa'alat lajʃ l-mudiirah tardat-uh$_2$ /*
brother Laila she asked.*3sf* why the-principal expelled.*3sm-Cl* /
-uh$_2$ hu$_2$
Cl he
'The brother of Laila, she asked why the principal expelled him.'

---

[5]Notice 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) *[ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma ziʕlat [wala mʕallmih]₁ laʔannuh*
student-her the-bad *Neg* upset.*3sf* no teacher because
l-mudiirah kaħʃat-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.'

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

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

(a) *[ṭalib-[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 ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) **[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ galat ʔinnu hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂ safar*
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) *[ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma badku tisʔalu [wala mʕallmih]₁ lajʃ*
student-her the-bad *Neg* want.*2pl* ask.*2pl* no teacher why
hu₂ / ha-l-ġabi₂ ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) **[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ sa'alat l-mʕallmih lajʃ hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂*
brother Laila she said.*3sf* the-teacher.*3sf* why he / the-idiot
ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) *[ṭalib-[ha]$_1$ l-kassoul]$_2$ ma ħakjan maʕ [wala mʕallmih]$_1$ gabl-ma
         student-her the-bad *Neg* talked.*1pl* with no teacher before
         hu$_2$ / ha-l-ġabi$_2$ 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$_1$]$_2$* pro$_1$ *ziʕlat laʔannuh 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.'

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] N̶P̶]

      (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) *[ṭalib-[ha]₁   l-kassoul]   ma   ziʕlat   [wala   mʕallmih]₁   laʔannuh*
             student-her   the-bad   *Neg*   upset.*3sf*   no   teacher   because
             l-mudiirah   kaħʃat-oh   / -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 sa₂ classe, tu es presuadé que chaque prof₂ **l**'a déchirée.*
             'The picture of his class, you are sure that each teacher tore **it**.'

(21)   (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 (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) *[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.'

         (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.'

(23)   (a) *[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ ... 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:

(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)   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 (26):

(26) *Apparent resumption:*
$[_{DP}$ ... pronoun$_1$ ...$]_2$ $[_{IP}$ ... QP$_1$ ...$[_{CP}$ ...$[_{DP}$ $[_{DP}$ ... ~~pronoun~~$_1$ ...$]_2$ 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   ʃuft-uh   mat*
          Karim-*Cl*   that   saw.*1s-Cl*   dead
          'Karim that I saw is dead.'

      (b) *hu   Karim   illi   ʃuft-uh   mat*
          he   Karim   that   saw.*1s-Cl*   dead
          'Karim that I saw is dead.'

      (c) *ʃuft   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 theroy of movement when available).

This claim accounts for the fact that reconstruction with strong resumption:
- is sensitive to islandhood (available only with no/weak island[6]);

---

[6]The 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 intevenes (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) *[ṭalib-[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 ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) **[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ galat ʔinnu hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂ safar*
brother Laila she said.*3sf* that 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) *[ṭalib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma badku tisʔalu [wala mʕallmih]₁ lajʃ*
student-her the-bad *Neg* want.*2pl* ask.*2pl* no teacher why
hu₂ / ha-l-ġabi₂ ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) **[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ sa'alat l-mʕallmih lajʃ hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂*
brother Laila she said.*3sf* the-teacher.*3sf* why he / the-idiot
ġaʃ b-l-mtiħan
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) **[ṭalib-[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   Laila₁]₂ 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.'

	Weak Resumption Reconstruction via ellipsis (à la Elbourne (2001))	Strong Resumption Reconstruction via movement (à la Aoun et al. (2001))
No island	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with Cond. C** ($\sqrt{}$)	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), and with Cond. C (*)
Weak island	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) **not with Cond. C** ($\sqrt{}$)	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) and with Cond. C (*)
Strong island	rec. with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) **not with Cond. C** ($\sqrt{}$)	no rec. with BVA (*) or with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)

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.
      $\Rightarrow$ 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 (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~~?
      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 examples in (32) and (33a) show, but disappears with resumption, as shown by (33b).

(33)   (a)   *Quelle photo$_1$ chaque homme a-t-il déchirée $\_\_1$?*   ($\sqrt{}$functional)
         'Which picture did each man tear?'

       (b)   *Quelle photo$_1$ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l_1'a déchirée?*   (*funct.*)
         'Which picture are you furious because every man tore **it**?'

$\Rightarrow$ 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$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ ~~photo~~]]
         which picture ... each man$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ ~~picture~~]]
         $\Rightarrow$ LF: $\lambda p.\exists f.$ *true(p)$\wedge$p=each man$_x$ tore f_x(picture)*

       (b)   *Resumption:*
         quelle photo ... chaque homme$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ l' [$_{NP}$ ~~photo~~]]
         which picture ... each man$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ it [$_{NP}$ ~~picture~~]]
         $\Rightarrow$ LF: $\lambda p.\exists y.$ *true(p)$\wedge$p=you are furious because each man$_x$ tore the picture identical to y*

$\Rightarrow$ 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)   *ʔaya   surah$_1$ kul   zalamih   mazaʕ $\_\_1$?*   ($\sqrt{}$functional)
         Which picture every   man   tear.*past*
         'Which picture did each man tear?'

       (b)   *ʔaya   surah$_1$ kul   zalamih   mazaʕ -ha$_1$?*   (*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$_1$ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l_1'a déchirée?*
         'Which picture are you furious because every man tore **it**?'

       (b)   *Quelle photo$_1$ de lui es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme l_1'a déchirée?*
         'Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore **it**?'

$\Rightarrow$ 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) (a) quelle photo ... chaque homme$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ l' [$_{NP}$ ~~photo~~]]
          which picture ... each man$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ it [$_{NP}$ ~~picture~~]]
          $\Rightarrow$ *LF:* $\lambda p.\exists y.$ *true(p)*$\wedge p=$*you are furious because each man$_x$ tore the picture identical to y*

     (b) quelle photo de lui$_2$ ... chaque homme$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ l' [$_{NP}$ ~~photo de lui$_2$~~]]
          which picture of him$_2$ ... each man$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ it [$_{NP}$ ~~picture of him$_2$~~]]
          $\Rightarrow$ *LF:* $\lambda p.$ *true(p)*$\wedge p=$*you are furious because each man$_x$ tore the picture of x*

$\Rightarrow$ 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) (a) ʔaya   surah$_1$ kul   zalamih mazaʕ -ha$_1$?   *(*functional)*
          Which   picture every   man   tear.*past-Cl*
          'Which picture did each man tear (it)?'

     (b) ʔaya   surah$_1$ il-hu$_2$ kul   zalamih$_2$ mazaʕ -ha$_1$?   *($\sqrt{}$functional)*
          Which   picture of-him every   man   tear.*past-Cl*
          '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.
    $\Rightarrow$ 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 sens of Fox (2002)) or indefinite (see Kratzer (1998)'s skolemized choice functions).
    $\Rightarrow$ Resumption forces interpetation 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

A. Alexopoulou and C. Heycock. Relative clauses with quantifiers and definiteness. In *Choice functions and natural languages semantics*, 2002.

J. Aoun, L. Choueiri, and N. Hornstein. Resumption, movement and derivational economy. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32:371–403, 2001.

J. Aoun and A. Li. *Essays on the derivational vs representational nature of grammar.* MIT Press, 2003.

Calixto Aguero Bautista. *Cyclicity and the scope of wh-phrases.* PhD thesis, MIT, 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.